SUBJECT: Rapid Transit Feasibility Study - Metrolinx Draft Regional Transportation Plan (PW08043d) - (City Wide)  
Public Works Committee Outstanding Business List

RECOMMENDATION:

(a) That the General Manager, Public Works be authorized and directed to continue discussions with Metrolinx in regards to undertaking the appropriate business case analysis required in order to include the functional design, detail design and construction of the B-line rapid transit corridor for the City of Hamilton in their 2009 - 2013 (5-year) Capital Budget, utilizing Light Rail Technology;

(b) That the General Manager, Public Works be authorized and directed to continue discussions with Metrolinx in regards to undertaking the Rapid Transit Feasibility Study (Phase 3) in order to continue the planning and design for the A-line rapid transit corridor, utilizing Light Rail Technology, in conjunction with the design and construction of the B-line rapid transit corridor for the City of Hamilton as part of their 2009 - 2013 Capital Budget, with design and construction funds to be included in a future (5-year) Capital Budget;

(c) That the General Manager, Public Works be authorized and directed to report back to an appropriate Committee of Council following the release of the Final Metrolinx Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Investment Strategy and 5-year Capital Budget;

(d) That the General Manager, Public Works be authorized to and provide a copy of report PW08043d to the Metrolinx CEO and Chair of the Metrolinx Board for their information and consideration in the development of the final Regional Transportation Plan, Investment Strategy and 2009 - 2013 (5-year) Capital Budget;
(e) That the General Manager, Public Works be authorized and directed to continue its undertaking of required rapid transit initiative studies and aggressive public consultation program for Rapid Transit in Hamilton.

(f) That the items related to the Rapid Transit Feasibility Study and the Metrolinx Regional Transportation Plan Process be identified as completed and removed from the Public Works Committee Outstanding Business List.

Scott Stewart, C.E.T.
General Manager
Public Works

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

In June 2007, the Province of Ontario released their MoveOntario 2020 plan, which was a multi-year rapid transit action plan for the Greater Toronto Hamilton Area (GTHA). Metrolinx was then established by the Province to develop and implement a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) along with an Investment Strategy and Capital Plan.

The draft RTP, which was based on the development and public/stakeholder consultation of seven (7) Green Papers and two (2) White papers produced by Metrolinx, was endorsed by the Metrolinx Board on September 26, 2008 and contains 15 Strategic Directions and nearly 100 actions required to be implemented to achieve the vision, goals and objectives of the document. It is believed that the achievement of the plan will result in enhanced prosperity, environmental sustainability and improved quality of life within the GTHA. Metrolinx and the Provincial government believe that the cost of not implementing this aggressive strategy is higher than the $50 billion price tag of the projects identified in the document, as the cost of congestion is estimated at $6 billion annually.

City of Hamilton staff from Public Works, Planning & Economic Development, Corporate Services, Public Health, and Community Services all participated in the review of the Metrolinx Green and White Papers, with consolidated comments (Appendix A & Appendix B) sent to Metrolinx for their consideration in the formation of the draft Regional Transportation Plan.

In general, the draft RTP identifies four corridors within City of Hamilton limits, as well as improved GO Train services. The corridors and their level of funding priority, according to the draft plan are as follows:

- **B-Line (Eastgate to MacMaster University),** identified within Metrolinx’s top 15 priorities, within the 15 year plan
- **A-Line (Downtown to the Airport),** identified within the 15 year plan
- **T-Line (Hamilton Mohawk, connecting Main Street along Mohawk Road to Ancaster Meadowlands),** identified within the 25 year plan
• S-Line (Centennial Rymal), connecting Eastgate Square to the Ancaster Business Park, identified beyond the 25 year plan

A map outlining these corridors has been included as Appendix C. In addition to the above noted corridors, City staff have added potential extensions to planned lines and an additional rapid transit corridor into Waterdown (L-Line) that would form Hamilton's future “B-L-A-S-T” rapid transit system. It should be noted that although the lines follow existing higher order transit corridors that have previously been identified in the Growth Related Integrated Development Strategy (GRIDS) and use corridors to connect key City nodes, specific corridor selection studies and Class Environmental Assessments are still required for each line identified and would be subject to Council approval and that “B-L-A-S-T” is a concept only at this stage.

The final Regional Transportation Plan, Investment Strategy and 5-year Capital Plan, all expected to be released in late November 2008, will have significant impacts for the planning of transportation infrastructure in the GTHA and for Hamilton’s potential rapid transit system, as the Province is expected to contribute significant capital dollars towards each of the identified corridors, although the exact timing has yet to be determined.

The draft Investment Strategy released by Metrolinx does not have a commitment from Metrolinx to contribute to future operating costs of the transit systems that are being constructed through the provision of capital dollars from the Province. This is not to say that avenues to address continued funding and operating costs will not come in the future, rather Metrolinx has determined that the public should be provided first with viable transportation alternatives over the next 5 to 7 years, with a review of additional funding opportunities and mechanisms to come in 2013. All municipalities, as part of the GTHA have requested operating costs from Metrolinx in the future for when the corridors identified in the RTP are realized.

The development of these Provincial documents and the potential funding opportunities associated with them has allowed Hamilton to envision a full rapid transit system and to accelerate rapid transit planning in our community, starting with a focus on the impacts of either a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system or a Light Rail Transit (LRT) system on the two corridors identified in both the Transportation Master Plan (2007) and in the MoveOntario 2020 plan. As such, in November 2007, Public Works staff, together with Planning and Economic Development staff, initiated the Rapid Transit Feasibility Study (RTFS) Phase 1, to review the constraints and opportunities for the development of either a BRT or LRT higher order transit system along both the A-line and B-line corridors.

The RTFS Phase 1 was released to the public for consultation between May and September 2008. In an aggressive public consultation campaign, staff received more than 1600 survey responses. The resulting support for rapid transit in general is 94% and the results can be further broken down by support for each mode, resulting in 66% for Light Rail Transit and only 8% for Bus Rapid Transit. 20% support either mode and 6% do not support rapid transit in any form.

As a result of the public support for LRT and the constraints identified during Phase 1, the RTFS Phase 2 was initiated with a focus primarily on LRT. Phase 2 began to look at the Claremont Access as an alternative to the constraints of James Mountain Road, reviewed potential lane reduction impacts, undertook a staging analysis evaluation
between the A-line, B-line and sections of both in terms of possible construction and reviewed the requirements for the future Rapid Transit Class Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference.

A chronology of key dates and events, regarding the Rapid Transit Feasibility Study and the Metrolinx draft RTP is detailed in Appendix D of this report.

In addition to undertaking the Rapid Transit Feasibility Study, Hamilton has numerous other Corporate Policies, Vision Statements and Plans in place that support rapid transit and LRT. These documents include Provincial Policies such as the Greenbelt Plan and Places to Grow, along with GRIDS, Transportation Master Plan, Public Works Strategic Plan, Corporate Energy Policy and Air Quality & Climate Change Strategic Plan. Most recently, Making Hamilton the Best Place to Raise a Child has become the corporate vision for the City of Hamilton.

A table outlining these documents and others that support rapid transit in Hamilton, the scope of these studies and how they support rapid transit and LRT, is detailed in Appendix E of this report.

The draft Regional Transportation Plan developed by Metrolinx identifies four (4) transit projects in Hamilton within the next 25 years and beyond. In order to make these projects a reality and to develop a rapid transit system in Hamilton that works for both the connection of nodes along the corridors across the City itself and provide an inter-regional connection, both east and west of the City, staff have been aggressive in undertaking the necessary preliminary studies. These studies include determining if a rapid transit system is feasible along the identified corridors (A-line and B-line) and what this system could ultimately look like. Staff have also been able to determine the next steps required in bringing this system to life, as well as to identify the important partnerships and collaborations that need to take place, both within the City and with external agencies, stakeholders and the public, such that once approval of a rapid transit project is granted and funds are in place, staff can undertake the required studies as aggressively as possible.

One project, the B-Line, is recommended to be submitted to Metrolinx for inclusion in their first 5-year rolling Capital Budget (2009 – 2013), to be released in November 2008. The B-Line has been identified as the preferred priority for construction as preliminary evaluations suggest that overall, the east/west corridor (B-Line) would be the best initial investment in terms of its cost effectiveness and providing the highest return in terms of transit mobility. If a maintenance facility is located in the north end, the connection of the facility to the east/west corridor, along the A-Line, would also be cost effective.

An additional project, the planning and design of the A-Line, is recommended to be submitted to Metrolinx as the Rapid Transit Feasibility Study (Phase 3) in order to coordinate planning and design for the A-line rapid transit corridor, in conjunction with the design and construction of the B-line rapid transit corridor. Since the initiation of rapid transit planning in Hamilton, these two corridors have been linked. In part due to their interconnectivity, both to the future City of Hamilton rapid transit system and to the GTHA by connecting to Hamilton’s Regional Transportation hub downtown, but also due to the potential for an LRT maintenance facility located in the north end of the City, adjacent to the proposed A-Line.

Although both the A-Line and the B-Line were identified as part of MoveOntario 2020 and evaluated for rapid transit as part of the Rapid Transit Feasibility Study, neither the
T-line nor the S-Line has been discussed in previous staff reports, nor has staff undertaken any public consultation specific to these proposed routes. However, given the identification of these corridors in the recently released draft Regional Transportation Plan prepared by Metrolinx, the potential for Provincial funding of these corridors (S-Line and T-Line), in addition to the previously identified A-Line and B-Line, have tremendous implications towards providing a complete rapid transit system in Hamilton, and to the interconnectivity of Hamilton as part of the larger Regional area encompassed by the GTHA.

Appendix C illustrates the proposed T-Line (Hamilton Mohawk) and S-Line (Centennial Rymal), in addition to the A-Line (James/Upper James) and B-Line (Main/King) corridors and future potential L-Line (“B-L-A-S-T”). To date, the focus of the Rapid Transit Feasibility Study Phases 1 and 2, has been on the two routes included in the MoveOntario 2020 announcement (A-Line and B-Line). However, the timing is now right to encourage Metrolinx to continue with the long term planning for both the T-Line and the S-Line.

It should be noted however, that staff, as part of the City of Hamilton review of the draft Regional Transportation Plan and draft Investment Strategy, will be reviewing whether the priorities for the S-Line and T-Line should be reversed. Presently, there is significant infrastructure and land use planning taking place along these corridors (Upper Centennial Parkway and Rymal Road)and moving the S-Line forward to within the 25 year plan or earlier of the RTP, and moving the T-line to beyond their 25 year plan, could allow the City of Hamilton, and potentially Metrolinx and the Province in the long term, to realize potential significant cost savings and construction efficiencies as the S-Line would run along Rymal Road and Centennial Parkway, both of which will undergo some reconstruction in the next 5 years. Requesting this change now as part of the review process of the draft RTP could potentially allow the City to combine rapid transit planning and/or construction with planned infrastructure improvements and required road widening already anticipated. The S-Line would connect the Ancaster Industrial Park, Elfrida and Eastgate Square, and would provide access to key destinations, employment lands, and new and recent residential development.

Metrolinx has developed a draft Regional Transportation Plan that encompasses the area between Hamilton and Durham and includes 6 distinct Regions (Hamilton, Halton, Peel, York, Toronto and Durham). Each of the Regions within the GTHA have transportation priorities that have been identified as part of the RTP and each Region is requesting Provincial funding to construct and operate these systems. Should Hamilton choose to not submit the B-Line for funding as part of the Regional Transportation Plan’s first capital budget, and additional planning and design funds for the A-line rapid transit corridor, in conjunction with the design and construction of the B-line rapid transit corridor, funding that may presently be available for Hamilton may be re-allocated elsewhere within the GTHA. Staff believe that there are definite benefits to be realized through construction of rapid transit lines on each of these routes in the short term and as part of the overall potential rapid transit system in Hamilton.

**BACKGROUND:**

The information/recommendations contained within this report have City wide implications.
In June 2007, the Province of Ontario released their MoveOntario 2020 plan, which was a multi-year rapid transit action plan for the Greater Toronto Hamilton Area (GTHA). The plan was developed in response to concerns over transportation issues and focused on tackling gridlock. The Provincial government focused on setting the wheels in motion to build a rapid transit system across the GTHA that would move people and goods quickly and efficiently, would ensure the GTHA continued prosperity and minimize the impacts, both environmental and social, of increased congestion.

The mandate of developing and implementing an integrated multi-modal transportation plan or Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) was given to Metrolinx (former Greater Toronto Transportation Authority - GTTA) in December 2007. In addition to the development of the RTP, the mandate included the development of an Investment Strategy and Capital Plan, along with the co-ordination of other transportation improvement programs across the GTHA, including BikeLinx, Smart Commute and the management and implementation of the PRESTO fare card.

The draft RTP, which was endorsed by the Metrolinx Board on September 26, 2008 contains 15 Strategic Directions and nearly 100 actions required to be implemented to achieve the vision, goals and objectives of the document. It is believed that the achievement of the plan will result in enhanced prosperity, environmental sustainability and improved quality of life within the GTHA. Metrolinx and the Provincial government believe that the cost of not implementing this aggressive strategy is higher than the $50 billion price tag of the projects identified in the document as the cost of congestion is estimated at $6 billion annually.

The draft RTP document was based on the development and public/stakeholder consultation of seven (7) Green Papers and two (2) White papers produced by Metrolinx. The Green Papers focused on transportation trends, challenges and opportunities for the GTHA and best practices from around the world. The White Papers focused on a proposed vision for the GTHA and a series of goals and objectives that formed the basis for the RTP.

City of Hamilton staff from Public Works, Planning & Economic Development, Corporate Services, Public Health, and Community Services all participated in the review of these documents, with consolidated comments being sent to Metrolinx for their consideration in the formation of the draft Regional Transportation Plan. The draft RTP and Investment Strategy has been circulated for internal review and a consolidated set of comments will be submitted on these documents by the end of October, for Metrolinx’s consideration in finalizing these documents. Staff comments on the Green and White Papers have been attached as Appendix A and Appendix B.

In general, the draft RTP identifies four corridors within City of Hamilton limits, as well as improved GO Train services. The corridors and their level of priority, according to the draft plan are as follows:

- B-line (Eastgate to MacMaster University), identified within Metrolinx’s top 15 priorities, within the 15 year plan
- A-line (Downtown to the Airport), identified within the 15 year plan
- T-line (Hamilton Mohawk, connecting Main Street along Mohawk Road to Ancaster Meadowlands), identified within the 25 year plan
- S-line (Centennial Rymal), connecting Eastgate Square to the Ancaster Business Park, identified beyond the 25 year plan
A map outlining these corridors has been included as Appendix C. In addition to the above noted corridors, City staff have added potential extensions to planned lines and an additional rapid transit corridor into Waterdown (L-line) that would form Hamilton’s future “B-L-A-S-T” rapid transit system. It should be noted that although the lines follow existing higher order transit corridors that have previously been identified in the Growth Related Integrated Development Strategy (GRIDS) and use corridors to connect key City nodes, specific corridor selection studies and Class Environmental Assessments are still required for each line identified and would be subject to Council approval and that “B-L-A-S-T” is a concept only at this stage.

The final Regional Transportation Plan, Investment Strategy and 5-year Capital Plan, all expected to be released in late November 2008, will have significant impacts for the planning of transportation infrastructure in the GTHA and for Hamilton’s potential rapid transit system.

The development of these Provincial documents and the potential funding opportunities associated with them has allowed Hamilton to envision a full rapid transit system and to accelerate rapid transit planning in our community, starting with a focus on the impacts of either a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system or a Light Rail Transit (LRT) system on the two corridors identified in both the Transportation Master Plan (2007) and in the MoveOntario 2020 plan. As such, in November 2007, Public Works staff, together with Planning and Economic Development staff, initiated a Rapid Transit Feasibility Study (RTFS) to review the constraints and opportunities for the development of either a BRT or LRT higher order transit system along both the A-line and B-line corridors.

The Rapid Transit Feasibility Study, Phase 1 investigated the major considerations in route selection including such things as land use, existing transit service, rights of way (widths, users, infrastructure [surface and subsurface], construction impacts), timing, signal priority, dedicated lanes, as well as an analysis of the feasibility and requirements for the implementation of a rapid transit system to assist in the determination of the type of technology, LRT or BRT that should ultimately be implemented. This information was illustrated in Staff Report PW08043, which was presented to Public Work Committee on April 14, 2008 and was approved at Council on April 23, 2008. Immediately following the approval of this report, staff initiated public consultation on rapid transit in Hamilton.

Based on the need to further investigate opportunities to address the constraints identified as part of Phase 1, and the overwhelming public support for LRT early in the study, Staff Report PW08043a, which was presented to Public Works Committee on June 16, 2008 and approved at Council on June 25, 2008 recommended that staff not only continue with public consultation, but that Phase 2 of the Rapid Transit Feasibility Study look at means to address the constraints identified as part of Phase 1, with a focus strictly on LRT.

In order to ensure that the public opinion obtained was representative of the overall City opinion, an aggressive public consultation component was undertaken. Although consultation continues to be on-going, significant community input, over 1300 responses, were received over the month of July 2008, which represented each City ward. This aggressive campaign was undertaken through radio and newspaper advertisements, making surveys available on-line and at public offices, municipal service centres and other public facilities. The resulting support (over 1600 total responses) for rapid transit in general is 94% and the results can be further broken down by support for each mode, resulting in 66% for Light Rail Transit and only 8% for
Bus Rapid Transit. 20% support either mode and 6% do not support rapid transit in any form. Information Report PW08043b was submitted to Public Works Committee on September 15, 2008 and was received at Council on September 24, 2008, outlining the results of this public consultation.

The LRT focused technical analysis (Phase 2) was presented in Staff Report PW08043c to Public Works Committee on October 6, 2008 and Council on October 15, 2008. PW08043c was for Council’s information in preparation for the recommendations outlined as part of this staff report (PW08043d) and it was only recommended that PW08043c be received and that it be forwarded to Metrolinx for their consideration in the development of their 5-year Capital Budget.

A chronology of key dates and events, regarding the Rapid Transit Feasibility Study and the Metrolinx draft RTP is detailed in Appendix D of this report.

In addition to undertaking the Rapid Transit Feasibility Study, Hamilton has numerous other Corporate Policies, Vision Statements and Plans in place that support rapid transit and LRT. Most recently, Making Hamilton the Best Place to Raise a Child has become the corporate vision for the City of Hamilton. Part of Making Hamilton the Best Place to Raise a Child includes providing transportation options that will allow people to gain access to employment and services. Rapid Transit will improve accessibility to employment and services by linking key nodes throughout Hamilton and by allowing existing transit resources on the Rapid Transit lines to be reallocated to other or expanded routes.

The Public Works Strategic Plan, which is a guiding document to the RTFS, outlines a vision in which Hamilton is to be recognized as the centre of environmental and innovative excellence in Canada. In order to achieve this vision, specific measurable outcomes, and the Triple Bottom Line concepts for community, environmental, and economic implications must be achieved. Rapid transit will provide Hamilton with an innovative transit solution which will address priorities towards making Public Works a leader in the greening and stewardship of the city.

More specifically LRT, will help to contribute to meeting this vision by:

- Helping further information sharing since LRT requires expertise in a variety of disciplines and will require people to have multi-faceted knowledge.
- Requiring collaboration across a variety of divisions which will enable responsibility sharing throughout the City.
- Budgeting for light rail will be based on sustainable lifecycle funding which will provide a stream of benefits to the City of Hamilton.

In addition to the overall visions that have been supported by City of Hamilton Council, there are numerous policies, strategies and plans that are presently in place or in some sort of development that also support rapid transit in Hamilton including the Provincial Greenbelt Plan and Places to Grow.

A table outlining these documents and others that support rapid transit in Hamilton, the scope of these studies and how they support rapid transit and LRT, is detailed in Appendix E of this report.
The Regional Transportation Plan developed by Metrolinx identifies four (4) transit projects in Hamilton within the next 25 years and beyond. In order to make these projects a reality and to develop a rapid transit system in Hamilton that works for both the connection of nodes along the corridors across the City itself and provide an inter-regional connection, both east and west of the City, staff have been aggressive in undertaking the necessary preliminary studies. These studies include determining if a rapid transit system is feasible along the identified corridors (A-line and B-line) and what this system could ultimately look like. Staff have also been able to determine the next steps required in bringing this system to life, as well as to identify the important partnerships and collaborations that need to take place, both within the City and with external agencies, stakeholders and the public, such that once approval of a rapid transit project is granted and funds are in place, staff can undertake the required studies as aggressively as possible.

In addition, the Corporate visions, departmental policies and strategies, and specific plans that are already in place to guide the future of Hamilton all support rapid transit and the spinoffs of providing Hamilton with improved transportation options.

Rapid transit has also been identified as being important in reaching the goals of the City’s Transportation Master Plan (TMP), Corporate Energy Policy and Air Quality & Climate Change Strategic Plan. It can help reduce single occupancy vehicle use, help achieve TMP targets of 20% reduction in vehicle kilometres travelled over current trends and of increasing the transit modal share to 15%, and is often credited with being a catalyst to economic development and growth. Significant financial gains could result from the implementation of a rapid transit network in Hamilton and the Rapid Transit Feasibility Study outlines how and what the system could look like.

Rapid Transit Team staff have also been working closely with Metrolinx in regards to the development of their 2009 – 2013 Capital Budget. Although, a draft Investment Strategy has been released by Metrolinx for public review and comment, to date, there has been no commitment from Metrolinx to contribute to future operating costs of the transit systems that are being constructed through the provision of capital dollars from the Province. This is not to say that avenues to address continued funding and operating costs will not come in the future, rather Metrolinx has determined that the public should be provided first with viable transportation alternatives over the next 5 to 7 years, with a review of additional funding opportunities and mechanisms to come in 2013.

From a City perspective, operating costs were evaluated at a very high level, looking at the impact of LRT versus BRT over the rapid transit corridors and the entire transit system. Research has continuously indicated that operating costs of LRT are significantly lower than that of BRT. The two highest operating costs with BRT being the number of buses in service in addition to the cost of fuel. Less buses along a corridor, due to the higher capacity of LRT, automatically results in cost savings. This cost savings can then be translated into additional service elsewhere in the City, to either existing under serviced areas or to priority feeder services to the primary rapid transit corridors. Much of the success of other North American LRT systems has been credited to efficient feeder services, which can also lead to requiring less park n’ ride facilities along the corridor. Although there is potentially significant cost savings
between LRT and BRT, all municipalities as part of the GTHA have requested operating costs from Metrolinx in the future for when the corridors identified in the RTP are realized.

**Rapid Transit Feasibility Study (Phases 1 & 2)**

The Rapid Transit Feasibility Study Phase 1 clearly identified that rapid transit along the identified corridors could be achieved. It contained both overall observations about the opportunities and constraints of providing rapid transit, and a section-by-section breakdown of what each corridor would look like if rapid transit is provided. For the RTFS, it was assumed that the existing right-of-way widths would not be significantly changed, and that the same corridor design would be used for either BRT or LRT.

The RTFS Phase 1 also identified there are some sections in the corridor where it may not be possible to provide dedicated lanes for rapid transit without either eliminating on-street parking and loading, or acquiring significant amounts of property, although upon further review as part of Phase 2, additional opportunities for lane exclusivity have been identified. It was also identified in Phase 1 that rapid transit throughout the City would consist of various cross-sections with rapid transit in some areas being provided in a median transit way and in other sections within the curb lane.

Specific constraints when looking at constructing a rapid transit system were also identified as part of Phase 1. The most significant issues being along the A-line which included transversing the escarpment and the TH & B structure on James Street, particularly in regards to LRT. Additional functional analysis was determined as being required in order to address these constraints.

In presenting the initial findings of the RTFS Phase 1 to the public in Spring 2008, there was overwhelming support for LRT. In order to address both the engineering constraints identified as part of Phase 1 and to build upon the support and questions related to LRT in Hamilton, Phase 2 of the RTFS was undertaken, which included an aggressive public consultation component, and continued to identify overwhelming support for LRT.

Phase 2 focused on LRT and began to look at the Claremont Access as an alternative to the constraints of James Mountain Road, reviewed potential lane reduction impacts, undertook a staging analysis evaluation between the A-line, B-line and sections of both in terms of possible construction and reviewed the requirements for the future Rapid Transit Class Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference.

Phase 2 of the Rapid Transit Feasibility Study has determined that it is technically feasible to use the Claremont Access to address the constraint of the grade of James Mountain Road. It would likely be more economical to use the Claremont Access as well. However, there is not enough demand along this route to warrant frequent LRT service, and key nodes including St. Joseph’s Healthcare (James Street North and St. Joseph’s Drive site) and the Hunter Street GO Terminal would be missed.

Further review of the impact of losing vehicular travel lanes along the A-line and B-Line corridors was undertaken in part to address concerns related to the reduction of lanes to accommodate rapid transit. This review identified that there are few areas that are truly impacted by the reduction of lanes and that there may be some opportunities for alternative lane configurations, particularly if LRT is the mode of choice as there is less width typically required for LRT over BRT. The area surrounding the downtown would
be most constrained, particularly due to pinch points in areas between Highway 403 and
downtown. There may also be additional engineering practices and design techniques
that may minimize the space required to accommodate rail in certain constrained areas
of the corridors.

Although this preliminary analysis has positive implications on the ability to
accommodate LRT within the identified corridors, staff is continuously aware that the
impact of lane reductions and other potential traffic impacts on both the A-line and B-
line will be critical to the success of the overall system. The impacts and the ability to
accommodate both rapid transit and traditional traffic, cyclists and pedestrians within
these same corridors will continue to remain at the forefront of future detailed
engineering studies.

Phase 2 of the RTFS also indicated that of either the B-line or the A-line, preliminary
evaluations suggested that overall the east/west corridor (B-Line) would be the best
initial investment in terms of its cost effectiveness, providing the highest return in terms
of transit mobility. Phase 2 also indicated that additional analysis (RTFS – Phase 3) is
recommended prior to determining a preferred rapid transit corridor for the A-Line given
the constraints and potential options available to service from downtown to the Airport.

In addition, as a result of the endorsement of report PW08074 by Council on June 25,
2008, the A-line BRT (lite) will be initiated in fall 2009 as a result of Metrolinx funding
received earlier this year. This new route will serve the key destinations identified as
part of the Rapid Transit Feasibility Study, including the Airport, Mohawk College, St.
Joseph’s Hospital, GO Transit bus and rail station on Hunter Street, the downtown core,
and ultimately the waterfront. The proposed service will initially operate on limited
service hours, but is expected to expand to full all day service comparable to the
existing B-line. This service will begin to attract new ridership and will aid in the cost
effectiveness in constructing the A-line, once some initial ridership along this corridor
has been established.

Projects Recommended to be Submitted to Metrolinx

One project, the B-Line, is recommended to be submitted to Metrolinx for inclusion in
The B-Line has been identified as the preferred priority for construction as preliminary
evaluations suggest that overall, the east/west corridor (B-Line) would be the best initial
investment in terms of its cost effectiveness and providing the highest return in terms of
transit mobility. If the maintenance facility is located in the north end, the connection of
the facility to the east/west corridor, along the A-Line, would be cost effective.

An additional project, the planning and design of the A-Line, is recommended to be
submitted to Metrolinx as the Rapid Transit Feasibility Study (Phase 3) in order to
coordinate planning and design for the A-line rapid transit corridor, in conjunction with
the design and construction of the B-line rapid transit corridor. Since the initiation of
rapid transit planning in Hamilton, these two corridors have been linked. In part due to
their interconnectivity, both to the future City of Hamilton rapid transit system and to the
GTHA by connecting to Hamilton’s Regional Transportation hub downtown, but also due
to the potential for an LRT maintenance facility located in the north end of the City,
adjacent to the proposed A-Line.

It is also recommended that given the constraints identified a part of the RTFS Phases 1
and 2, a more detailed analysis comparing James Mountain Road and the Claremont
Access be carried out as soon as possible. The analysis should include technologies, ridership potential, costs, service frequency, development potential/impacts, and traffic impacts. This additional analysis will be considered Phase 3 of the Rapid Transit Feasibility Study, with a focus strictly on the A-Line. It would be beneficial to continue the A-Line functional planning in line with the more detailed planning and EA component for the proposed B-Line, as part of the 2009 – 2013 Metrolinx Capital Budget. This approach would ensure that once the detail design is completed for the B-Line and construction has commenced, subject to future Provincial funding, the A-Line detailed planning would take place.

Although both the A-Line and the B-Line were identified as part of MoveOntario 2020 and evaluated for rapid transit as part of the Rapid Transit Feasibility Study, with details provided to Council previously in Reports PW08043, PW08043a, PW08043b and PW08043c, neither the T-line nor the S-Line has been discussed in previous staff reports, nor has staff undertaken any public consultation specific to these proposed routes as they were not previously identified as potential future rapid transit corridors that may be supported by Provincial funding. However, given the identification of these corridors in the recently released draft Regional Transportation Plan prepared by Metrolinx, the potential for Provincial funding of these corridors, (S-Line and T-Line), in addition to the previously identified A-Line and B-Line, have tremendous implications towards providing a complete rapid transit system in Hamilton, and to the interconnectivity of Hamilton as part of the larger Regional area encompassed by the GTHA.

Appendix C illustrates the proposed T-Line (Hamilton Mohawk) and S-Line (Centennial Rymal), in addition to the A-Line (James/Upper James) and B-Line (Main/King) corridors and future potential L-Line (“B-L-A-S-T”). To date, the focus of the Rapid Transit Feasibility Study Phases 1 and 2, has been on the two routes included in the MoveOntario 2020 announcement (A-Line and B-Line). However, the timing is now right to encourage Metrolinx to continue with the long term planning for both the T-Line and the S-Line.

It should be noted however, that staff, as part of the City of Hamilton review of the draft Regional Transportation Plan and draft Investment Strategy, will be reviewing whether the priorities for the S-Line and T-Line should be reversed. Presently, there is significant infrastructure and land use planning taking place along these corridors (Upper Centennial Parkway and Rymal Road)and by moving the S-Line forward to within the 25 year plan or earlier of the RTP, and moving the T-line to beyond their 25 year plan, it could allow the City of Hamilton, and potentially Metrolinx and the Province in the long term, to realize potential significant cost savings and construction efficiencies as the S-Line would run along Rymal Road and Centennial Parkway, both of which will undergo some reconstruction in the next 5 years. Requesting this change now as part of the review process of the draft RTP could potentially allow the City to combine rapid transit planning and/or construction with planned infrastructure improvements and required road widening already anticipated. The S-Line would connect the Ancaster Industrial Park, Elfrida and Eastgate Square, and would provide access to key destinations, employment lands, and new and recent residential development.
**ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION:**

**Alternative 1 - Delay Options for Consideration**

One project, the B-Line using Light Rail Technology, is recommended to be submitted to Metrolinx for inclusion in their first 5-year rolling Capital Budget (2009 - 2013). An additional project, the planning and design of the A-Line, is recommended to be submitted to Metrolinx as the Rapid Transit Feasibility Study (Phase 3) in order to coordinate planning and design for the A-line rapid transit corridor, in conjunction with the design and construction of the B-line rapid transit corridor, as part of the Capital Budget (2009 - 2013), with design and construction funds to be included for the A-Line in a future (5-year) Capital Budget, utilizing Light Rail Technology. Two additional projects (S-line and T-line) are recommended for inclusion in their RTP, with priority being given to the S-line in order to potentially realize significant cost savings and construction efficiencies.

An alternative is to delay project submission for the consideration of Metrolinx in this first budget and Regional Transportation Plan. This alternative is not recommended.

Metrolinx has developed a Regional Transportation Plan that encompasses the area between Hamilton and Durham and includes 6 distinct Regions (Hamilton, Halton, Peel, York, Toronto and Durham). Each of the Regions within the GTHA have transportation priorities that have been identified as part of the RTP and each Region is requesting Provincial funding to construct and operate these systems. Should Hamilton choose to not submit the B-Line for design and construction funding and the A-line for planning and design funds to coordinate these project’s as part of the Regional Transportation Plan’s first capital budget, funding that may presently be available for Hamilton now may be re-allocated elsewhere within the GTHA. Staff believe that there are definite benefits to be realized through construction of rapid transit on the B-line in the short term and coordinated planning for the A-line concurrently.

The B-Line and A-Line are both included in MoveOntario 2020, and are supported by City of Hamilton approved plans such as the Transportation Master Plan and GRIDS. As outlined in PW08043, PW08043a, PW08043b and PW08043c, immediate ridership and development potential are expected as a result of the implementation of the B-Line and the A-Line connection to the proposed location of the maintenance facility and connection to the inter-regional transportation hub are important links to the overall system. The S-Line would follow Centennial Parkway and Rymal Road, both of which are expected to undergo some level of planning and reconstruction in the next 5 years. Combining construction of a rapid transit system with other construction efforts would allow for significant cost savings and would reduce disruptions to users of these major roads. The T-line which would connect Main Street with Ancaster Meadowlands, along Mohawk Road, continues to connect Hamilton as part of the overall rapid transit system.

**Alternative 2 - Request Additional Project(s) be moved into the 2009 - 2013 Capital Budget**

At this time, it is not recommended that more than one design and construction project be considered as part of Metrolinx’s 2009 – 2013 Capital Budget. As mentioned previously, the GTHA consists of 6 distinct Regions, all of which have transportation needs and priorities. Although Hamilton is ready to proceed to the next stages of planning, design and construction for the B-Line, it is unrealistic at this time to consider the construction of these two primary transportation corridors of the City being under
construction at the same time. However, it would be logical to coordinate the planning and design for the A-Line at the same time as the design and construction of the B-Line, as part of the 2009 - 2013 Capital Budget given the interconnectivity, both to the future City of Hamilton rapid transit system and to the GTHA by connecting to Hamilton's Regional Transportation hub downtown, but also due to the potential for an LRT maintenance facility located in the north end of the City, adjacent to the proposed A-Line.

However, should circumstances under which the Capital Budget is being determined change, and additional funding becomes available, Hamilton will request that the design and construction of the A-Line become a priority. The inclusion of the continued functional design of the A-Line as part of the 2009 – 2013 Capital Budget would allow for the future funding of the A-Line and subsequent quick implementation should the Pan-Am Games bid for 2015 be successful.

**FINANCIAL/STAFFING/LEGAL IMPLICATIONS:**

There are no staffing implications associated with the recommendations of this report.

In consultation with other municipalities, staff has learned that successful rapid transit projects have dedicated Rapid Transit Offices or Special Project Offices. The size of these offices varies from municipality to municipality.

Rapid transit planning is currently undertaken by Strategic Planning staff, with support of Transit, Finance and various sections of Planning and Economic Development. No staff members are dedicated solely to rapid transit initiatives. Depending on the amount of funding received from Metrolinx and timing within the Capital Budget, the formation of a Rapid Transit Office/Special Projects Office with dedicated staff will be brought forward in a future report to Public Works Committee.

**Legal Implications:**

There are no legal implications associated with the recommendations of this report.

**POLICIES AFFECTING PROPOSAL:**

As previously outlined in the Background section of this report and expanded upon in the Analysis/Rationale, the City of Hamilton has numerous policies and plans in place that support rapid transit in Hamilton. A few of the key documents are outlined below, with a full list and description of supporting documents included in Appendix E of this report.

**Provincial Policies**

1. *Regional Transportation Plan* (RTP) (draft expected July 2008 has been delayed to September 2008) for the Greater Toronto Hamilton Area (GTHA)
2. *MoveOntario 2020*

**Hamilton Policies**

1. *Transportation Master Plan* (TMP)
3. *Vision 2020*
4. *Hamilton Transit Ridership Growth Plan*
The Public Works Strategic Plan includes the goal of being a leader in greening our community. By providing sustainable transportation options that reduce dependency on single occupancy vehicles, this goal is achieved.

Light Rail Transit would also advance the work of Clean Air Hamilton and help satisfy the recommendations of the Air Quality and Climate Change Strategic Plan (PED06336a) which recommends LRT as an important component of improving the health of the community and complements the Corporate Energy Policy (PW07127) by displacing vehicles from the roadway and lessening dependence on oil.

In addition, in December 2007 City Council approved a new vision statement, which is “to be the best city in Canada to raise a child, promote innovation, engage citizens and provide diverse economic opportunities”. The provision of an improved rapid transit system for the City will bring benefits beyond that of just a transit system. It is about the interrelationships between transportation modes and choices and land use, and can be a catalyst for growth and economic development. More specifically, the endorsement of a light rail transit system in Hamilton meets some of the short term goals of a forward thinking Council including:

- To always act as a Team
- To provide high quality services
- To ensure a prosperous environment
- To be an organization that thrives on innovation

RELEVANT CONSULTATION:

There has been a lot of interest in the community since initial discussions regarding Rapid Transit began in April 2008. Since that time, as a result of the media coverage, community interest and the public outreach exercises undertaken by staff, excitement for the initiative has grown and staff have been able to keep the momentum high and have kept rapid transit at the forefront of discussions.

Staff has indicated to the public that comments on Rapid Transit are always welcome either through the project website www.hamilton.ca/rapid-transit, direct project e-mail rapidtransit@hamilton.ca or in person.

In addition, consultation on the Rapid Transit Initiative has included Public Works (Transit, Capital Planning & Implementation, Energy, Fleet & Facilities, Operations & Maintenance), Planning and Economic Development (Development Planning, Community Planning, Downtown and Community Renewal, Strategic Services and Special Projects, Real Estate, Parking and By-law Services), Corporate Services, Community Services and Public Health Services.

Public Works has continued to work collaboratively with Planning and Economic Development in this process as the project is of true importance to the City as a whole with great economic potential and has implications to the Nodes and Corridors Policies of the Official Plan, Zoning By-laws and the Urban Structure Plan. There will also be a role for Public Health Services to play, especially in the area of improved air quality as a result of rapid transit implementation, Community Services, in regards to station design and residential intensification along the corridors. The economic review has strengthened the need for this continued collaboration between internal City departments, stakeholders and the general public. Consultation is imperative to the
success of the rapid transit initiative and will be an on-going and evolving process with all interested parties, stakeholders and the general public.

The Rapid Transit Study Team has also kept in close contact with Metrolinx and believe there to be a strong and respectful relationship between the Province and the City of Hamilton. Both agencies ultimate goal is to develop a successful rapid transit system that will have both Regional connectivity implications as well as spur both the local and provincial economies through the production of jobs and improved quality of life within the GTHA. This relationship will only improve as Hamilton staff and Metrolinx staff continue to move towards making rapid transit in Hamilton a reality.

**CITY STRATEGIC COMMITMENT:**

By evaluating the “Triple Bottom Line”, (community, environment, economic implications) we can make choices that create value across all three bottom lines, moving us closer to our vision for a sustainable community, and Provincial interests.

**Community Well-Being is enhanced.** ☑ Yes ☐ No
Community well-being is enhanced through the support of increased use of transit and other sustainable modes of transportation. Public health is improved through a reduction in emissions and an increase in active transportation.

**Environmental Well-Being is enhanced.** ☑ Yes ☐ No
A sustainable transportation network provides many options for the movement of people; single-occupancy vehicle-dependency is reduced.

**Economic Well-Being is enhanced.** ☑ Yes ☐ No
Compact, mixed use development minimizes land consumtion and servicing costs. Rapid Transit lines can initiate higher levels of economic development.

**Does the option you are recommending create value across all three bottom lines?** ☑ Yes ☐ No
Municipal Class EA process by its very nature considers natural, social and economic impact.

**Do the options you are recommending make Hamilton a City of choice for high performance public servants?** ☑ Yes ☐ No
A highly functional and sustainable transit system provides a viable transportation option for those commuting to/from work and has been shown to attract creative and ambitious staff to live and work in the same community.
April 4, 2008

Leslie Woo - General Manager, Transportation Policy & Planning
Metrolinx
20 Bay Street, Suite 901
Toronto ON
M5J 2N8

Dear Ms. Woo:

Subject: City of Hamilton - Green Papers Comments
Regional Transportation Plan

Overall, through the City of Hamilton’s review of the Metrolinx’s Green Papers, it appears that
the strategies and policies of the City of Hamilton are consistent with the direction Metrolinx is
taking with regard to the development of a comprehensive Regional Transportation Plan
(RTP). The City appreciates and continues to welcome the opportunity to participate in this
endeavour to improve transportation choices throughout the GTHA.

The following General Comments relate to all of the published Green Papers and the
comments are offered for your consideration in the development of the future White Papers.
More specific comments are also provided as they relate to each of the separate papers (#2
through #7), however given the inter-relationship of all of the papers with each other and the
need to plan for all road users and the goals of the community together, many of the
comments noted as more specific comments are applicable to more than one Green Paper.

GENERAL COMMENTS

• All of the papers use a variety of transportation terminology. A glossary of terms for each
section would be beneficial.

• Care should be taken to ensure that terms and cross-references to each of the subject
matters are consistent in the White Papers and that the inter-relationship between them
are clearly stated. The intent of the RTP is to ensure that the planning of each of these
important areas takes into consideration the others, while ensuring a viable transportation
network that meets the needs of all road users.

• There are many goals outlined in the Green Papers, all of which require funding beyond
which many municipalities may have as part of their current budgets. What are the total
funding impact of the proposals in the Green Papers and ultimate White Papers? Will
additional funds be committed by the Province to achieve these goals? What are the
financial implications of the municipalities in regards to the RTP and what if funds are not
available for the implementation of the RTP?

• Aside from the greater linkages being sought in the RTP between transit and land use
planning, greater linkages also need to be made to human services planning within
municipalities to ensure the mixed use desired with mobility hubs and other components
of the RTP. Since municipalities deliver transit, municipalities may be able to influence
how other municipally delivered services coincide with transportation hubs etc., but other
human services are delivered by a wide cross section of non-profit and for-profit agencies in the broader community.

- While a lot of work was completed on hubs and other transportation components (Active Transportation, Goods Movement etc.) there is little discussion regarding corridors. Greater emphasis should be placed on designated key corridors for transit and goods movement regarding inter-regional and local trips. These corridors are the key to connecting the hubs together, both locally and regionally.

- The potential impacts of implementing the strategies of the Green Papers extend well beyond just transportation benefits and should be noted potentially as part of the introduction of each topic as there are tremendous benefits, which also include the enhanced health of our communities through cleaner air and increased physical activity. Public Health and Community Development groups should be consulted as part of this process, particularly where it comes to implementation and marketing strategies to fully capture the net increases in benefits in terms of sustainable development and health benefits. Through the promotion of sustainable transportation choices, sustainable communities, healthier lifestyles, healthy aging and increased quality of life are all benefits. It should also be noted that chronic health issues are of significant concern and can be tied to transportation choices, which is why public health agencies and transportation providers are beginning to work more closely together, through partnerships in education and promotion of healthy transportation alternatives.

- When referring to health benefits resulting from more efficient uses of the transportation system through active transportation and use of transportation demand management initiatives, should also include reduced risk of heart disease and stroke. References to diabetes should state type II diabetes.

- Greater attention should be placed on trend and demographics analysis. Major demographic changes will alter the transportation modes off all areas in the GTHA. What will the situation be if the price of oil continues to rise sharply? How will that impact transportation and infrastructure? What impact will an aging population have on mobility and how will trends differ in the future? These types of questions should be explored in greater detail. Metrolinx may have a role in collection of this data at a broad super-regional level. Furthermore, new technology will affect mobility in the GTHA such as “green cars”. Should contingencies be made for this potential change or will increased congestion make people consider public transportation?

- The GTHA is more of a Super-Region, the term “Region” can get confused with municipal regions such as Halton, Peel, Durham etc.

- Accessibility (both physical and economical) should become a greater focus for all aspects from mobility hubs to active transportation, TOD and transit. This will become even more important as the population continues to age, there is greater incidence of chronic disease or other ability issues and people of different economic background require access to transportation. If a transit system isn’t affordable, it won’t be accessed no matter how convenient. The mandatory implementation of inter-modal facilities at key destinations (i.e. secure bike parking, kiss & ride, car pool preferred parking etc) would assist in meeting this goal.

- Access to reliable and an accessible transportation systems has been identified as one of several inter-related foundational community supports required to make Hamilton the best place to raise a child (Source: Making Hamilton the Best Place to Raise a Child: A Change Framework for Poverty Reduction, June 2006) as well as key support to those aging at home (LIHN consultation, 2007).
The need to link transit and employment is critical, but greater emphasis should be made between ensuring that employers provide a living wage so that their employees can afford the transit fees and an enhanced quality of life.

Many municipalities offer financial incentives for seniors, persons with disabilities or low-income citizens to access public and other alternate transit. A RTP should provide a greater discussion not only on fee integration, but transit fee affordability incentives.

There should be greater emphasis on monitoring and using indicators to measure how successful transportation policies are in achieving goals. Among indicators given, none was listed for land use. Indicators for land use could include determining if there is a mixture of residential, commercial and employment uses or if one particular use dominates in an area of interest (i.e. downtown, near hubs etc). Metrolinx may want to track land use indicators to measure if changes are occurring that are supportive of transit, goods movement, active transportation and successful hubs. Benchmarking can be used to compare municipalities and measure performance.

Greater emphasis should be placed on establishing connections between mobility hubs of each municipality and not just focus on travel into and out of downtown Toronto. This involves short trip travel such as between Hamilton and Burlington for example. Additional buses may be effective for these types of "short distance" interregional trips.

The Regional Transportation Plan should differentiate between what roles and responsibilities will go to Metrolinx and to the municipalities. Moreover, funding requirements/expectations from different agencies should also be explored.

Perhaps a section detailing available financing options could be included in the Regional Transportation Plan. Non-cash incentives could be included such as tax breaks for living near mobility hubs/downtowns etc.

Alternative forms of transportation such as water-based (ferries etc) were not explored as an option and may become a more viable form of transportation in the future.

Other sustainable development policies should be included, where possible, when discussing the design of infrastructure as part of the RTP (i.e. rain gardens, source control, permeable pavements etc)

One key theme that emerges consistently is that a change in the current way of thinking of transportation, transportation networks, and transportation funding is necessary, across the GTHA, at all levels of government, by developers and by members of the general public. An implementation/phasing strategy should be outlined as part of the RTP, particularly in terms of commitments required from each municipality, from both the public and private sectors.

Will the goals of the RTP be achieved if not all GTHA municipalities participate and what are the implications of some measures (i.e. economics) being implemented in the GTHA, but not in the adjacent municipalities i.e. Kitchener-Waterloo and Niagara? Should Metrolinx or the Province be looking at implementing strategies as a province and not just for the GTHA? How effective will the plan be if not all municipalities are on board? Will monitoring systems and or targets be set as part of the RTP?

The above is a specific challenge/concern for the City of Hamilton as Hamilton may not have the same level of congestion on its streets than that of other GTHA municipalities, but there is still the desire to implement sustainable infrastructure and tie into the GTA network. It’s neighbouring municipalities however are not considered to be part of the GTHA and as such, may draw private sector investments away from Hamilton if
strategies are required to be implemented in the City of Hamilton and not in its adjacent municipalities.
Green Paper #2 - MOBILITY HUBS

The following section outlines the City of Hamilton’s comments on Green Paper #2 – Mobility Hubs.

In general, the concept of Mobility Hubs ties into some of the planning that was done as part of the City’s Growth Related Integrated Development Strategy (GRIDS - 2006) and subsequent Hamilton Transportation Master Plan (HTMP – 2007). The HTMP sets a goal of a 20% reduction in vehicle kilometers traveled over current trends by 2031; the Metrolinx RTP goals are in line with, or more slightly more aggressive than the TMP goals.

Although the Mobility Hubs Paper focuses on potential major stations throughout the Region, it does not address how to move people within the cities themselves in an efficient manner. This has to be addressed in order to provide a system that effectively links the municipalities together, as well as provides an effective inter-City system. If inner-City travel is too cumbersome, the ultimate goals of the RTP will not be achievable.

- The report states that the RTP will serve as a guideline for infrastructure investment decisions. It is unclear whether what is implied in the statement is whether the infrastructure decisions would only be with respect to transit i.e. What about infrastructure required for location of human services, community centres, senior centres, or affordable housing all of which are reliant on accessible transportation

- P.7 The report acknowledges the requirement of a transformation shift in thinking and strengthening the relationship between land use and mobility to which we add also human services planning

- P.34 The Report states that “public bodies” must ensure that new capital facilities for health, education and provincial government services be located near mobility hubs. Implicit in the statement would be those capital facilities for which “public bodies” would have some influence. Many employment, housing, cultural, child care and other human services are not delivered by public bodies, but should also be encouraged to locate near mobility hubs

- As density increases across the city, there will be more options to access mobility hubs via non car-travel. However it was not clear how people in lower density areas will be able to access the mobility hubs in the meantime. However, with the City of Hamilton’s nodes and corridors approach (GRIDS), several transit supportive nodes throughout the city will eventually give residents greater access as densities increase over time.

- It will require a partnership to develop areas around hubs in order for them to be successful. What incentives for private development can be introduced to encourage future development around Hubs from upper levels of government? Municipalities are already over strained financially and will likely be unable to take on additional expenditures. Incentives should come from the provincial level. What are the defined limits of a mobility hub i.e. 5km radius? This would be required in order to apply mobility hub policies.

- Section 2.6 Hamilton is missing from urban growth centre map.

- Is the RTP looking towards having a single GTHA Transit System (GO expansion) that will connect between the Mobility Hubs or a completely new system based on the existing municipal transit systems? Will there be standardized fares and passes? Shared marketing and route planners? How will the existing municipal transit systems tie into the RTP mobility hub system? This needs to be further outlined.
With regard to parking, we agree that there should be less of it, but there may still be a need for some parking structures around hubs, otherwise there is little option currently for residents from lower density areas to access higher order transit. In the short term parking structures near the hubs can be a draw for riders to access the hubs. Parking structures are preferred to parking lots and options such as mixed uses structures should be explored. Parking structures allow for additional density over parking lots. In time, as development occurs and density increases, better access can be achieved to mobility hubs and need for parking may be reduced. These parking areas may then be available for redevelopment that would further support the hubs.

- Section 5.4 include “safe and clean” as design characteristics – this may help with the aspects of image.

- Are Mobility Hubs intended to be places for people to gather? By incorporating other facilities the overall health benefits of the hub, not just transportation, will spread into the community. Therefore, through the development of Mobility Hub concepts, it is important to ensure the involvement of Public Health and Community Planning.

- The concepts of Active Transportation and Transportation Demand Management easily tie into Mobility Hubs as well as the inner-City concept of feeder systems into the larger RTP. The links between these concepts should be clearly outlined in the White Papers as well as the overall health and community benefits.

- What are the basic amenities that should be provided at every higher-order station i.e. healthy food choices, secure bike storage and full service repair shops, bike ramps at stairs, lockers, showers? Connections to trails, sidewalks etc should all be clearly marked, ambitious tree planting programs established or other sustainable development practices incorporated.

- As it relates to the planning approvals process, concerns exist in regards to Metrolinx taking on a formal planning role. Additional organizations involved may add a further level of bureaucracy and may discourage private investment around hubs. Also, consider what incentive programs can be implemented to encourage development of hubs and what incentives can be created by other levels of government. Metrolinx may be able to play a role in getting upper levels of government (Provincial/federal) to create incentive programs.

- The transportation plan should consider a hierarchy of hubs at the local level (in addition to hubs listed by Metrolinx). Local level hubs, such as those identified in the City of Hamilton’s nodes and corridors urban structure, can serve as a feeder system to these larger hub areas. Furthermore, additional hubs in the Hamilton area should be considered, especially the Airport centre. Integrating the nodes in Hamilton with those identified by Metrolinx may further increase hub development and increase modal split. (Appendix A and Attachment A)

- Additional detail on implementation and timing should be provided. For example, section 6.2 details the use of customized development charges to finance mobility hub development. More information is required to detail how such options could be evaluated as part of future development charge reviews. This same section also refers to an Investment Strategy (IS) that Metrolinx is currently preparing. Will this IS be published as part of the White Papers? Will it have mandated financial implications for the municipalities? Council approval will be required for any types of municipal commitments in terms of funding.

- There is also discussion of the development of a start-up program to help municipalities in the early stages of development. Who is going to be responsible for this program? What is to be the role of the Region wide urban development agency that is mentioned?
• More detailed information is required in terms of how any strategies or agencies will be involved in terms of overseeing implementation throughout the GTHA.
Green Paper #3 - ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION

The following section outlines the City of Hamilton’s comments on Green Paper #3 – Active Transportation.

In general, the City of Hamilton agrees with the shift in thinking in terms of Traffic Impact to Transportation Impact. The incorporation, into planning, of the various modes of transportation available, as opposed to the single occupancy vehicle is in line with the City of Hamilton’s direction as outlined in its Transportation Master Plan (HTMP – 2007). Through the formation of specific staff positions that deal with both the implementation of the goals of the HTMP, through rapid transit, active transportation solutions as well as general Transportation Demand Management tools, the City of Hamilton is in line with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) outlined as part of this Green Paper.

One of the greatest challenges with the concept of Active Transportation is changing thinking from utilizing the automobile for convenience and the pace of society in trying to fit everything into the limited time society feels it has to work with. Society in general, not just public and private sectors, must buy into the benefits of active transportation.

A key component of a successful Active Transportation network is both providing the various infrastructures as well as the education required in order to allow each road user to safely use them and co-exist with each other.

- Active transportation will positively impact health by incorporating healthy lifestyles into daily living, improving health in those who have risk factors for chronic disease and injury, and improving health in the aging population and those who have chronic diseases.

- It should be noted that the Niagara Escarpment and Hamilton Harbour are physical barriers to active transportation.

- It is important to look at demographics when considering active transportation. Hamilton, like Ontario has an aging population. This aging demographic will have unique active transportation needs and in developing any type of active transportation network the needs of the aging population must be balanced with the typical infrastructure that is thought of when referring to active transportation.

- Developing safe networks is critical in developing an active transportation network that could be used by all road users, including children, adults and seniors. Defining what concepts promote a safe system would be helpful, given the broad term (Appendix B). This could imply education, neighbourhood awareness campaigns, effective use of protective equipment, etc, in addition to infrastructure, as well as improve active transportation safety content in driver education programs, driver handbooks, licensing exams.

- As an additional means to encourage and have people consider active transportation would be to include greater integration with recreational activities. For example aiding in developing additional linear parks, trails, and bike paths. For some people, traveling off main arterial streets may be a more favourable manner to move about. Furthermore, this initiative could be linked with community health and community services. Also, if people get into walking and biking for recreation, they may be inclined to use these facilities for commuting as well. The City of Hamilton is supportive of both an on-road and off-road integrated active transportation network (objective of the recently completed Recreational Trails Master Plan (2007)).

- There should be more emphasis in regards to the social and institutional changes need to take place to support Active Transportation, such as work from home opportunities,
flexible work hours, on-site day care, relaxed dress codes, on-site change/shower facilities, guaranteed ride home programs, etc.

- It is also important to focus on existing missing links in terms of the overall walking and cycling network and putting initial emphasis on completing these potential corridors.

- The document mentions that schools are generally within walking distance, however we believe that the present trend by the school boards is in opposition to this statement. The current funding formula of School Boards by the Province has resulted in many community schools in neighbourhoods being closed in favour of larger schools with larger catchment areas. As a result fewer children have the opportunity to walk or bike to school and there is increased use of cars, traffic congestion and safety concerns around the schools. Ideally decisions regarding school locations should consider the impact of active transportation.

- Provincial Policy may be required in order to ensure that facilities be located within neighbourhoods that would promote active transportation in these areas. Metrolinx can partner with local school boards and petition the Provincial government to adopt an alternative funding structure for schools, which would encourage active transportation. This can include incentives and disincentives e.g. limiting bussing, adding bike facilities at schools, and eliminate parking. Funding could be provided for urban schools that are walkable rather than subsidizing bussing in suburban areas.

- Another institutional barrier related to implementation of any school-based programming is that no policy exists to assess and implement school based travel initiatives. Specifically, School Boards should be adopting the Best Practice of School Travel Planning. This is a comprehensive approach to help maximize active transportation and its benefits one school at a time. It includes policies which can be enacted to address and implement active and safe modes of transportation for school-related travel. Currently, there is no School Travel Planning mandated by the Ministry of Education. A Canadian/Ontario School Travel Plan program will boost the breadth and depth of participation in our growing Safe Routes to School movement, and ensure the dedicated human, program and financial resources necessary to drive lasting behavior change are in place. The end result will be fewer cars around schools, cleaner air, safer streets, and more alert and healthy students. ("School Travel Planning Review & Recommendations", Green Communities Association, March 2007). If this were to be mandated, along with a revision of existing school funding, it would go a long way to increase the number of families using active modes of transportation for school-related travel.

- While there is general agreement that more active transportation should be given greater emphasis for moving people around, additional consideration should be given concerning enabling our vulnerable population (e.g. disabled, seniors) to move around the City better. Greater guidance/standards can involve urban braille and minimum requirements for sidewalks (e.g. widths).

- Additional space for sidewalks and bike lanes must be balanced with concern to overbuild such rights-of-way. Too many widenings may result in fewer opportunities for intensification. Additional documentation and design standards for achieving the proper balance contained within the transportation plan may prove valuable and effective. Furthermore, as Hamilton is an older City, it may be difficult to retrofit roads in older areas to accommodate additional bike lanes, wider sidewalks, and potentially higher order transit. Tradeoffs and/or priorities will need to be made in some areas in order to balance the needs of all road users within the ROW. In addition, the concept of road diets may not be appropriate in terms of narrowing the ROW, but rather determining how to most effectively utilize the existing ROW (sharing the infrastructure for multiple uses or each use having its own defined space). Develop policies and programs for traffic calming in and around key destinations for pedestrians and cyclists.
There is also the issue of balancing costs in terms of capital vs. operating. Municipalities may be able to build the infrastructure, but may not be able to maintain it, particularly during the winter season. Priorities need to be reviewed and each corridor or infrastructure function must be made visible in what can be done and where it is most effective. Give priority to maintenance and snow clearing of primary cycling streets, bicycle paths and sidewalks. The classification of streets should be consistent across the GTHA and could help in establishing priorities.

In terms of private sector involvement in encouraging active transportation, the provision of showers for employees, flexible work hours, secure facilities on site for bikes, general locker etc. would promote this type of transportation. Incentives or partnerships for the public sector may be required in order for them to provide amenities that support active transportation. What could these look like?

Section 2.1 - "...and reducing the risk of disease" should state: "... reducing the risk of chronic disease such as heart disease, type II diabetes, stroke, etc." For air quality—there is no mention of asthma or respiratory disease.

Additional information should be incorporated into the report to outline the benefits of active transportation. Active Transportation leads to healthier communities and multiple physical activity benefits. Research supports that physical activity helps to maintain health, reduce risk factors of chronic disease, supports the management of chronic disease and promotes healthy aging and independence. Active Transportation is a necessity and of particular benefit to the older adult and children. Regular walking maintains muscle and bone health in the aging population. This translates into a reduced incidence of falls and injury, chronic disease, health care utilization and supports independent living. Given the aging demographic in Hamilton and Ontario, providing safe accessible active transportation will improve the health status of this cohort. It is noteworthy that a higher percentage of older adults do not drive and are therefore dependent on walking and public transportation for all their utilitarian and social needs. Walking also helps maintain a healthy weight; “Each additional kilometer walked per day equals a 5% reduction in the likelihood of obesity.” Am J Prev Med 2004, 27(2) 87-90. Children using active transportation will continue this lifestyle as adults.

‘Accidents’ should be changed to crashes, incidents, or events, since the term accidents implies that they are NOT preventable.

Exhibit 9 should be updated with the following:
- Change Draft Trails Master Plan to Recreational Trails Master Plan (2007)
- Add Hamilton Transportation Master Plan (2007)
- Add Shifting Gears (1990) – update to take place 2008

Section 5.5 - the provincial sales tax exemption on bikes is noted however it does not mention that this exemption is also on helmets and other safety equipment. More importantly it does not state that the exemption finishes as of Nov 30, 2008. This should be a permanent program since bike helmets have been proven to reduce brain injury by up to 85%. Removing the tax is an incentive for more people to be able to afford helmets, thus affording them increased protection.

Section 8.7 - The statistic: "obesity in youth has increased by 50 per cent over the last 15 years..." source: Vail, S.E. (2001) is an older statistic. The Canadian Community Health Survey from Statistics Canada (2004) CCHS data is a much more recent and known data source. It was also measured and therefore more accurate. "The overweight/obesity rate of adolescents aged 12 to 17 more than doubled from 14% to 29%, and their obesity

APPENDIX A – Active Transportation

Hamilton Urban Structure

The Urban Structure is a high level plan that will implement the nodes and corridors approach adopted by the City’s Growth Related Integrated Development Strategy (GRID) – the City’s Growth Management Plan. The concept is a series of nodes and corridors, employment areas and neighbourhoods which are connected by transportation/transit routes. The attached map details the general concept of nodes connected by a series of corridors.

ATTACHMENT A (see Schedule A map)

Appendix B – Active Transportation

In addition to the comments on the Active Transportation Green Paper # 3, below is a list of items that should be considered when considering how to plan active transportation corridors. The aging population in Ontario must be considered more than what has been identified in the Green Paper to date.

Older Adults have special active transportation needs in their cities. In particular, high density senior areas would immediately benefit from changes. Evidence and surveys suggest that older adults:

- Need longer time to cross at signals (count-down lights are effective). Older adults may panic when the ‘don’t walk’ hand flashes when they are half way across the intersection because they are unable to hurry
- Need frequent crossings as they are unable to walk long distances; and as a result will cross where there is no crossing
- Need frequent street furniture for places to rest (some older adults cannot go out because there is no place to sit)
- Would appreciate strict enforcement of traffic rules and regulations with drivers giving way to pedestrians (e.g. are frightened and rushed by drivers turning right and left on pedestrian lights)
- Are frightened by aggressive drivers and excessive speed
- Do not like to share pathways with cyclists as they may be startled and fall
- Need island refuges on wide crossings
- Need snow removal on corners as they are unable to climb over snow banks
- Will avoid walking because they do not feel safe
- Will avoid walking if the neighbourhood is unsafe
- Need really good lighting and signage

Transportation: accessible and affordable public transportation is a priority for older adults. Age friendly research suggests:

- Discounted passes for non-peak hours (discounts and monthly passes usually cater to the daily commuter)
- A free companion pass is offered in some cities for those who accompany to assist an older adult
- Travel time is important; older adults are unable to negotiate long travel times and transfers
- Extra or direct transportation to ‘senior destinations’ e.g. seniors centres. This would increase their ability to participate in community activities
- Older adults are unable to stand in long queues
Transportation stops and hubs
- Safe walking access to hub
- Benches, shelter, good lighting and washrooms
- Limited stairs and railings on 3 or more stairs; escalators
- Very clear signage
- Taxi and car drop off zones that protect the pedestrian from traffic
- Direct taxi phones

Age-Friendly Vehicles:
- Modified buses (floor lowers) are important for accessibility for older adults
- Clearly displayed numbers and destinations on buses
- Verbal announcement of stops is very important to older adults as their vision changes
- Priority seating for older adults: some cities highly promote this and it has become a common courtesy
- Time to get safely seated before the bus moves (or they may fall)
- Driver training to increase sensitivity to the needs of older adults
NOTE: Map to be provided in a more legible format (on a presentation board) at the October 20, 2008, Public Works Committee Meeting.
Green Paper #4 - TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT

The following section outlines the City of Hamilton's comments on Green Paper #4 – Transportation Demand Management.

The preferred overall strategy of the City of Hamilton's Transportation Master Plan (HTMP - 2007) is to rely on transit and travel demand management (TDM), in combination with road capacity optimization to solve transportation problems, before looking to road expansion. As such, the strategies presented as part of this Green Paper are generally supported in theory, however there are a number of questions related to the fair and equitable implementation of the initiatives.

A key component of the successful implementation of TDM measures, similar to the implementation of Active Transportation measures, is to provide both the infrastructure as well as the education required in order to allow each road user to safely and efficiently co-exist with each other, while ensuring access to all modes to allow for a choice to be made by the user themselves.

- TDM includes elements of improving existing facilities as well as promoting alternative modes (i.e. transit, cycling etc). There should be more focus on improving existing networks for the various alternatives, including providing more frequent and efficient transit, additional and improved cycling networks etc as well as educational components in order to motivate people to rethink their travel patterns. Without this education, the provision of TDM alternatives is not enough, particularly where congestion is not the prime motivator (i.e. Hamilton).

- Land use planning comes into play as part of implementing sustainable travel choices. The shorter distances that must be travelled between home, school and work and the ability to acquire necessities easily as part of this travel will motivate changes as the daily routine becomes easier and more efficient. Consultation and buy-in from the development industry is required in order to implement many of the TDM strategies. Without education and the provision of specific amenities at the end destination, change will be difficult.

- One of the most effective tools for TDM would be to have more jobs in the cities where people live so that they do not have to travel to other regions for work. For example, additional employment in Hamilton would reduce out-migration to other regions, thus, reducing the impact of cross-boundary commuting and stopping the spread of the "rush hour" to more than the peak time periods in the morning and evening.

- Hamilton staff disagree that, with the exception of Toronto, parking is usually free in pedestrian-oriented commercial venues and other high-demand areas. Downtown Hamilton has paid parking, particularly during high demand time periods. Hamilton also has an employee transit pass program with Hamilton Health Sciences, which is a very successful existing TDM initiative that should be noted and the City also actively promotes cycling, which is evident through its recent release of its new Bike Routes, Trails & Parks map. Please ensure that the document reflects these items.

- Section 2.3 states "Promote realistic travel options", however, are lower density/low service areas not where we want to see change happen? Should we not focus on these areas? Perhaps programs should start with medium and high density areas but with the intent to focus on low density areas in the future.

- What should maximum parking ratios be and what impact does that have on travel patterns? Hamilton has lowered some parking requirements in the downtown, which may encourage more people to alter the manner in which they access the downtown, if
parking is scarce people may find alternative means of travel (cost of parking and parking congestion are factors that also drive the consumer to consider TDM alternatives). Also parking within developments can discourage the creation of additional parking lots.

- Table 6 should reference the City of Hamilton Transportation Master Plan, which includes goals of implementing a high order transit system and other TDM strategies. It should also be noted that the TDM coordinator position has been established.

- Under Section 3.3 additional clarity is required in terms of the intent of user pricing. Increasing user fees for transit would be discouraged, but rather should be focused more on the single occupancy vehicle users. On the other hand however, don’t tolls encourage more vehicle use for those who can afford to pay to do so and fostering inequality? While a user-pays approach may be effective, what options does this give lower income travelers if there are no other viable transportation alternatives? What is the impact on accessibility? Also, how will the goals of the RTP, in regards to fees in general (i.e. tolls, parking etc.) be achieved if not all GTHA municipalities participate and what are the implications of some measures (i.e. economics) being implemented in the GTHA, but not in the adjacent municipalities. This type of measure should be looked at on a provincial scale as Hamilton competes with communities outside the GTHA - like Kitchener-Waterloo, Brantford and Niagara. Changing the idea of legislating TDM programs to a bold scenario may address this matter on a Provincial level and not just for the GTHA (Table 15 & Table 19). Co-ordination of this type of program and monitoring can also be an issue in some areas. How will this be addressed? Where will the funds go and how will this be determined? Will Metrolinx oversee? What type of assurances will be in place to the public that will identify that funds collected will be returned to the system in terms of continued delivery of sustainable transportation options and further development of TDM programs?

- Assurance needs to be made that the Smart Card will not only be transferable across transit systems but will be easily incorporated into the various pass systems (discount) that exist within each transit entity and that it can be applied to employee discount systems in such a manner that will encourage transit ridership and not become cumbersome for either the transit entity, the potential employers that will offer such programs or the user.

- The report discusses the need to provide lower cost and more affordable transportation options. The City of Hamilton has recently launched a pilot project offering citizens who are employed, but whose incomes fall below LICO (working poor) a 50% subsidized bus pass. Due to the potential cost, we were not able to include those on social assistance (those in receipt of OW/DSP) in the pilot. We are continually being asked by these groups to expand the pilot program. It is unclear how municipalities would be able to offer these valuable programs without jeopardizing necessary revenue from transit fares.

- It should be noted that car-shares are not only for large cities as there are well established car-shares in Guelph and KW/Cambridge.

- In regards to the GTHA TDM Innovator: McMaster University U-PASS and TDM section, please note the following:
  - the TDM office at McMaster was branded the ACT Office (Alternative Commuting & Transportation). All references to ACT should be to "ACT Office"
  - the U-PASS is a cost to students, regardless if they use transit, this program has significantly increased ridership
  - the vote was 91% support for only those students who chose to vote - a small percentage of the student body. The resi chose not to vote.
  - Burlington Transit does not serve MAC
  - the ACT Office also worked with GO to establish the new GO terminal on campus.
- the ACT Office managed cycling infrastructure too - including various storage facilities including the introduction of bike lockers for lease and development of a more formal cycling network.

- Hamilton already has work from home policies, as do most GTA municipalities. Will there be program/incentives from other levels of government to encourage private employers to allow employees to work from home?

- In Table 16, Bold scenario, last bullet: full-cost pricing of parking (remove "when available"). Also consider this as more of an INCREMENTAL scenario and in Table 19 Bold scenario, last bullet: Perhaps this taxable benefit idea is more of an INCREMENTAL scenario. It might already be the case, simply not enforced. This may already be in place somewhere in Canada already (related to federal taxation). The issue may simply be "not being enforced".

- All OPTIONS FOR ACTION: TDM tables require buy-in from all levels of government and private sectors for these goals to be achievable in both the short, medium and long term. How does Metrolinx propose to do this if agencies or councils do not support? Education again is key to any TDM program. Beginning with young children promotes a healthy lifestyle which will continue into their future and will promote change from the bottom up.

- Additional space for sidewalks and bike lanes must be balanced with concern to overbuild such rights-of-way. Too many widenings may result in fewer opportunities for intensification. Additional documentation and design standards for achieving the proper balance contained within the transportation plan may prove valuable and effective. Furthermore, as Hamilton is an older City, it may be difficult to retrofit roads in older areas to accommodate additional bike lanes, wider sidewalks, and potentially higher order transit. Tradeoffs and/or priorities will need to be made in some areas in order to balance the needs of all road users within the ROW. In addition, the concept of road diets may not be appropriate in terms of narrowing the ROW, but rather determining how to most effectively utilize the existing ROW (sharing the infrastructure for multiple uses or each use having its own defined space). Develop policies and programs for traffic calming in and around key destinations for pedestrians and cyclists.

Appendix A
- CT12 and CT14 could have significant implications for municipalities
- ST12 should including staff parking, regardless of the industry
- PO3 who pays for this service? The developer?
- T15 and T18 are the same
- TP1 - support if they mean discount pricing for employee passes, etc.; but concerned if they mean different fares for distance traveled by HSR. I support different fares by GO because distances are vast, but not for transit provided by HSR.
- TP4 - how will these funds be distributed amongst the municipalities?
- LU4, LU11 and LU13 are the same and should read all new arterial roads include HOV lanes and existing arterial have HOV lanes created by converting existing lanes.
Green Paper #5 - MOVING GOODS AND DELIVERING SERVICES

The following section outlines the City of Hamilton’s comments on Green Paper #5 – Moving Goods and Delivering Services.

It is important to note that what, where and how consumers are making purchases and how and where manufacturers are doing business is changing. In general, it does not appear that this paper addresses this issue, but rather assumes the status quo.

- While the methods of goods movement are not likely to change in the near future, what will be the impacts of higher oil prices and a shortage of supply on goods movement? This is not addressed as part of this paper but rather assumptions are made that the status quo will remain. Is this realistic?

- The view of the environment is very limited and should be expanded to address more broad impacts (i.e. transference of invasive species in bilge water during shipping or through long distance trucking).

- In Section 2.3 there is a map showing freight centres. A table presented as an appendix detailing goods movement facilities (where, type and function) across the GTHA would be beneficial.

- Section 3.2 - Additional discussion should focus on other impacts of climate change and its potential effects on goods movement. For example lower lake levels may discourage marine activity. However, if lake levels remain at appropriate levels, Hamilton Harbour may have some potential for handling additional cargo coming into and out of the province - contingent on capabilities of the St. Lawrence Seaway. In addition, marine travel may become more attractive if peak oil continues.

- There is great potential to further enhance the amount of cargo coming in and out of Hamilton Airport. With limits to growth at Pearson airport, more focus should be placed on the Hamilton airport to increase the amount of cargo coming in and out. Furthermore, additional development of an inter-modal facility at or near the airport may facilitate seamless transition of transportation cargo.

- Table 3 uses the City of Hamilton as a case study. Please note that the airport area is referred to as the Airport Employment Growth District (AEGD) and the use of Dofasco is incorrect. It should read ArcelorMittal.

- The idea of truck only lanes is worth taking a more in-depth look at as well as regulations to limit deliveries during peak hours in congested areas. This would also help to improve in providing more efficient rapid transit within congested corridors during peak time periods.

- Can Metrolinx play an expanded role in collecting and analyzing data on goods movement? This can include documenting trends and changes and monitoring of goods movement rates.

- Design elements should have a greater role in goods movement, there should be some addition guidance on designing transportation facilities to increase efficiency of goods movement.

- Rail can be an efficient manner in which to move goods. In the U.S. double stacked rail cars have been used to increase the capacity of goods movement by rail. Would this be an option in the GTA as a means to minimize the amount of truck traffic on the roads? Will the Regional Transportation Plan promote this option as an alternative to other forms
of goods movement? It should be noted however, that much of the existing infrastructure, particularly as it relates to rail infrastructure does not allow for the double stacking of railcars on trains.

- Whose responsibility are the primary trade corridors under? Should the federal government be more involved in projects such as the Niagara – GTA Corridor?

- In general, the trend of moving goods and delivering services appears to be changing, partially in part to peak of costs, partially in part to the high Canadian dollar and partial due to a general change in thinking, wanting to be more environmentally conscious and trends towards buying locally to support the local economy. In the future, will the GTHA continue to be manufacturing based or will the trend of major manufactures to move south continue i.e. car suppliers/manufacturers? There is also a loss of local trucking companies having to shut their doors due increased costs. How are these trends going to be addressed?

- Appendix A LU 6 - "require all new manufacturing and industrial development to submit a 'freight impact study' as part of the approval process". Currently this is not required in Hamilton. Has the practice of requiring this type of approval been used elsewhere? Additional detail on requiring such studies should be provided before it is recommended to be accepted.
Green Paper #6 - ROADS & HIGHWAYS

The following section outlines the City of Hamilton’s comments on Green Paper #6 – Roads & Highways.

The preferred overall strategy of the City of Hamilton’s Transportation Master Plan (HTMP - 2007) reflects the goals of the Regional Transportation Plan in that it is looking to improve the existing transportation structure rather than rely on road expansion. As such, the strategies presented as part of this Green Paper are generally supported. Hamilton particularly agrees with the institutional challenges that municipalities are faced with in light of the needs of existing infrastructure and relationship to planning issues i.e. maintenance, planning in isolation without consideration of impact to TDM and Active Transportation initiatives or the impact of inter-regional transportation corridors i.e. Waterdown and Waterdown Road between Hamilton and Halton and looks forward to the opportunities for partnership that the RTP may bring.

- What is the role of Metrolinx in the planning process for interregional roads? Approval authority? Fundraising? Who will resolve disputes? Although these may be beyond Metrolinx’s control/jurisdiction at this time, the issue of inter-jurisdictional matters that impact the greater GTHA needs to be considered when developing plans in order to determine what will work and where partnerships can be implemented. This is important for a comprehensive RTP and its successful implementation in the GTHA. Partnerships and Education will be key in terms of Roads & Highways as they cross-jurisdictions and therefore involve many different levels and agencies. How will this be done and what will Metrolinx’s role be?

- Similar to active transportation, additional attention should be placed on making sidewalks required on main roads (where required).

- The challenge with improving highways will be to not send the message that we are encouraging more car use – however, improved highways are vital for goods movement and the enhancement of the super-region’s economy. Improving highways but installing additional HOV lanes may be a good compromise to get single occupancy vehicles off the roads.

- Roads and highways are still vitally important even for transit; to facilitate improvements to roads such as road widening for transit, sidewalks or bike facilities, regulatory requirements such as Environmental Assessments should be relaxed/relax-tracked.

- Roundabouts may facilitate traffic flow, but what is the impact on pedestrians? Do they act as a barrier to walkability? Relationship to Active Transportation and TDM must be further explored. Stronger ties are required between the theories and ideas of the Roads and Highways Paper and Transportation Demand Management paper as they are integrally related in terms of providing options to moving in and around the GTHA.

- Although a sustainable transportation system may be desirable in terms of environment and infrastructure, what if society truly does not want to change and object to measures such as road pricing? Some measures required for a truly sustainable transportation system may be considered excessive and intractable. If items such as tolls are to be implemented, there needs to be a viable alternatives in place, which is also true for TDM, people will only alter their travel patters if there are alternative transportation options available which are cost effective and efficient.

- Table 8 identifies the Benefits of Value Pricing, however it would only be prudent to mention the constraints of value pricing as well. It is anticipated that the idea of any type
of user fees will be controversial and has impacts beyond the transportation field i.e. social impacts etc.

- Define shadow tolling, bus bulges and naked streets, CFI, what identifies a large employer that would be responsible for the implementation of TDM practices etc. This refers back to the idea of a glossary as part of the RTP White Paper.

Conclusion

In summary, the City of Hamilton agrees with the guiding factors of the Regional Transportation Plan and the Green Papers that have been produced for comment. We hope that the comments provided above, by the City of Hamilton are useful and will be incorporated into the final White Papers. As part of the White Papers, the City of Hamilton hopes that recommendations will be made in such a manner that will provide guidance and identify support and potential funding opportunities, as well as form the basis for partnerships and open the door for continued inter-regional communication to move the RTP forward towards the implementation of sustainable initiatives that will benefit both the City of Hamilton and the GTHA as a whole.

Yours truly,

Jill Stephen, P.Eng.
Manager, Strategic Planning
Capital Planning & Implementation
Public Works, City of Hamilton
(905) 546-2424 ext 6392
jstephen@hamilton.ca
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July 10, 2008

Leslie Woo - General Manager, Transportation Policy & Planning
Regional Transportation Plan - White Papers
Metrolinx
20 Bay Street, Suite 901
Toronto ON
M5J 2N8

Dear Ms. Woo:

Subject: City of Hamilton – White Papers Staff Comments
Regional Transportation Plan

Overall, through the City of Hamilton’s review of the Metrolinx’s White Papers, it appears that the strategies and policies of the City of Hamilton are consistent with the direction Metrolinx is taking with regard to the development of a comprehensive Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The City appreciates and continues to welcome the opportunity to participate in this endeavour to improve transportation choices throughout the GTHA and wish to acknowledge the level of effort and comprehensive scope of the work done to date as part of this process, particularly as it relates to public and agency/stakeholder consultation.

The following General Comments relate to both of the published White Papers and the comments are offered for your consideration in the development of the Regional Transportation Plan.

GENERAL COMMENTS

- Overall the white papers were well laid out and easy to read. The information was presented clearly and many good ideas and directions were offered.

- Please clarify that maps are just concepts and not plans or options as we move forward until such time that the recommendations are released.

- What is the timeline for the implementation of the recommendations of the Regional Transportation Plan i.e. into municipal Official Plans?

- Generally however, the White Papers tend to have a greater focus on transit related issues and it is believed that there should be more focus on cycling as a low cost, zero GHG mode that should be emphasized both as a stand alone mode and as a transit feeder and part of a balanced transportation system.

- As noted in our comments on the Green Papers, care should be taken to ensure that terms and cross-references to each of the subject matters are consistent and that the inter-relationship between them are clearly stated and reflected. The intent of the RTP is to ensure that the planning of each of these important areas takes into consideration the others (TDM, Active Transportation, Transit, Mobility Hubs, Goods Movement, Roads & Highways), while ensuring a viable transportation network that meets the needs of all road users. There should also be more details on how to ensure connectivity of all transportation systems across municipal boundaries (inter-regional connectivity) from
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bike paths, to transit and goods movements (i.e. Hamilton has an on-going truck routes study and how the internal routing connects with external corridors).

- When considering inter-regional connectivity, consideration for Hamilton must also be given to its neighbouring municipalities that are not part of the GTHA i.e. Niagara, Brantford etc. Hamilton is a gateway into and out of the GTHA and there is no mention or consideration in the papers to reflect what implications this has on Hamilton in terms of competitiveness within the market or connectivity in terms of its transportation system.

- It is still unclear as to what the roles will be for Metrolinx, the Provincial Government, the Federal Government and municipalities? A listing of key players and a clear listing of roles and responsibilities should be provided in the draft RTP. What involvement has the Federal government had in the development of the RTP, particularly considering MoveOntario 2020 relies on 1/3 Federal funding?

- To take some of the focus away from the need for roads and road congestion, transit and cycling infrastructure should be required to be made available in developing areas before development begins so people become accustomed to other forms of transportation other than the automobile. Good, accessible transit that is readily available when people move into an area may help to alter travel patterns. In some areas, this may require that investment be in place prior to development. Metrolinx in partnership with the municipalities can be a transit and cycling leader and bring transit to the forefront through assisting in providing the tools to make it happen.

- Metrolinx may be able to produce a guideline document for creating transit first neighborhoods which could be considered when secondary plans are developed.

- Metrolinx can play a role with GO Transit in predetermining where new GO stations should be located and plan for expansion. All future GO and other transit centres should be predetermines before it is too expensive to acquire the land. These future plans should be shared with municipalities so that municipalities can actively pre-plan new developments around GO stations (co-ordination between all levels and agencies is key).

- There should be increased focus on accessibility and maintaining affordability for all modes of transportation, including subsidized transit - this can be incorporated into the goals and objectives. As main routes become more utilized and closer to self-sufficiency, subsidies can be applied to less busy areas to allow a wider range of people to access transit.

- Financial stability should be integrated into all objectives listed.

- Generally there appears to be too many indicators and there is repetition between each set of goals and objectives. This over abundance of indicators would require too much time and resources to monitor and effectiveness of this monitoring may come into question. The number of indicators should be reduced and consolidated significantly.

- One key component of the vision, goals and objectives that was missing was Goods Movement – as part of an overall transportation strategy there will need to be greater focus on a Goods Movement strategy. Metrolinx should work towards providing a directions paper for municipalities to implement a region wide strategy. When considering goods movement, it is also important to ensure that other agencies work is being taken into consideration. It terms of Goods Movement and economics, Hamilton, in collaboration with industry and senior levels of government prepared a Goods Movement Study (2005) as part of the GRIDS process (Growth Related Integrated Development Strategy) that developed strategies in meeting the needs of the trucking, rail, water and air industries.

- There should be more emphasis placed on the relationship of transportation and public health and the idea of transportation serving a utilitarian function. There should also be some emphasis put on transportation for the family and not just for the individual
commuter. For example, transit systems could better implement group or family rates and passes.

- The various Provincial Ministries should be encouraged to collaboratively develop transportation supportive policies. Provincial Policy may be required in order to ensure that facilities are located within neighbourhoods that would promote active transportation, particularly for schools and recreational facilities as well as changing existing Ministry of Transportation policies/guidelines as they relate to pedestrian and cycling facilities located within their Corridor Control Areas. In regards to where schools are located, Metrolinx can partner with local school boards and petition the Provincial government to adopt an alternative funding structure for schools, which would encourage active transportation. This can include incentives and disincentives e.g. limiting bussing, adding bike facilities at schools, and eliminating parking. Funding could be provided for urban schools that are walkable rather than subsidizing bussing in suburban areas. In regards to corridor control areas, Metrolinx can advocate on behalf of municipalities to resolve infrastructure planning issues that have typically been a road block for municipalities when trying to establish cycling and pedestrian networks that cross provincial highways and rail corridors.

- The word “accident” should be replaced with the word collision throughout the Regional Transportation Plan and its associated papers.

- Traffic safety is a topic that, although mentioned in passing, is not given much thought. Traffic safety should be integrated further into all topics.

- The papers lack information on who and how the indicators will be tracked/monitored and evaluated (Who is monitoring? How often is monitoring taken place? What are the targets? What happens if the targets aren’t achieved?). If the municipality is responsible for monitoring it will be important to establish early on how this is to take place and at what frequency to ensure consistency across the GTHA.

- The papers lack information on sustainable funding (capital and operating). This is extremely important in terms of a sustainable network as it is not important just to build a system, but to maintain and operate that system from its inception.

- With rising fuel costs, the Regional Transportation Plan should consider and address Peak Oil issues. How will the transportation system be impacted and changed if there is a shortage of oil or cost escalate further? How will the Regional Transportation Plan address this challenge?

**White Paper #1 – Vision Goals & Objectives**

The following section outlines the City of Hamilton staff comments on White Paper #1 – Vision, Goals & Objectives.

In general, the City of Hamilton staff agrees with the idea of developing clear principles in how to guide how decisions are made and identifying measures in which we can determine how successful we are in reaching defined targets as a metropolis (large region which requires consistency in measuring successes). Increasing transit ridership, reducing emissions and providing viable transportation choices for all road users are all part of the City of Hamilton’s Transportation Master Plan.

- **Page 4 Current and Future Challenges** - Our system will need to accommodate the needs of the aging population which will double in size by 2031 in the City of Hamilton. Many older adults are dependent on public transportation.

- **Page 6 Vision** – Health should be added as part of the vision statement i.e. An integrated transportation system for our Region that enhances prosperity, sustainability, health and
quality of life. It is also recommended that additional emphasis be added to the statement about public transit and how transit also supports walking and cycling trips (e.g., bike racks on transit; bikes allowed on trains; secure bike storage; walking/cycling is the front and back end of the trip).

- Table 3.1 High Quality of Life
  - Objective E – it is important to consider the transit nodes, however the corridors between those nodes should not be forgotten.
  - Objective F – change the word “fit” to “active” and reword to read “It will be the easy choice for all...”. Transit should also be added to this objective.
  - Objective G – reword to read “Parents will feel comfortable allowing and encouraging their children and youth to walk...”.
  - Objective #10 change “exercise” to “physical activity”
  - Objective #11 add cycling to this objective
  - Objective #13 change wording from “the disabled” to read “people with disabilities”

- The suggested order for Goals is C, F, G, A, D, B and for Objectives is 4, 9, 10, 12, 13... (people first)
- Table 4.1 Goals and Possible Indicators for a High Quality of Life
  - Objective #7 should also include indicators related to number of smog alert days. In regards to asthma levels/Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) rates (what rates will be used)? It should also be noted that not all air quality issues are directly related to the GTHA and there is minimal control over some of these causes.
  - Objective #10 the term youth should be added. Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) rates should be moved to #7 and an indicator related to measuring physical activity levels or rates (walking and cycling) in those who have chronic diseases e.g. heart disease added.

- Table 4.3 Goals and Possible Indicators for Strong, Prosperous and Competitive Economy
  - Objective #26 – Perhaps it will be necessary to simply accept congestion and focus on active transportation and transit to move people rather than to reduce traffic congestion on roads (although as AT, TDM and transit uses increase congestion will decease). Going forward, we may just have to accept some level of vehicle congestion and focus on improving transit congestion and providing viable alternatives.
  - Objective #30 (Table 4.3 and 3.3) – Does better reflecting the true cost of transportation services mean higher transit fares? This is not something that City of Hamilton staff would agree with as the affordability and accessibility of transit is important for all users of the system.

**White Paper #2 – Preliminary Directions and Concepts**

The following section outlines the City of Hamilton staff comments on White Paper #2 – Preliminary Directions and Concepts.

In general, the City of Hamilton staff strongly supports the initiatives outlined as part of this paper, particularly as they relate to optimizing the efficiency of the existing transportation system, promoting active transportation, building a comprehensive regional transportation network and building complete communities that are pedestrian, cycling and transit supportive. Attention
needs to be paid to making this system as user friendly as possible for all age groups, incomes, disabilities and communities. By doing this, not only will transportation and planning issues be better managed, but benefits will be experienced through improved individual and environmental health.

Section 2.1 - A System for Complete Mobility

- Page 7 - Direction 2
  - In addition to guidelines for how to implement TDM in OP policies, guidelines should also be developed for zoning by-laws.
  - Where it notes to identify a staff person as TDM coordinator, it should also note how i.e. if this position was subsidized by the Province it would ensure that a position can be created in every City.
- Page 8 - Direction 4
  - Hamilton Airport should be noted.
  - What is meant by on-demand transit? Does this mean timing local transit to GO transit?
- Page 8 - Direction 6
  - In order for Goods Movement to be efficient, employers need the space to accommodate logistics operations. These tend to be at densities lower than some of what the provincial growth targets are requiring.
  - What are examples of Goods Movement intensive land uses? Warehouses?
- Page 9 - Direction 7
  - Protect land for future transit terminals before land develops or reserving land for redevelopment should be a strategy for long term protection of lands. Connection corridors should also be protected for major highways and or transit linkages (i.e. connections to the Niagara – GTA corridor).
  - Metrolinx can play a role in coordinating the protection of strategic corridors that are outside of municipal control such as rail lines and hydro corridors – partnerships need to be formed so that corridors such as old rail lines do not get removed in case they can become viable again.
  - Existing ROW should be protected, but priority for these ROW should go towards active transportation and transit facilities even at the expense of cars. Some corridors can be a prestige corridor for bikes/walking etc. – Ultimately there will need to be some acceptance that congestion can not be alleviated completely.
- Page 10 - Old built up urban areas need to balance on street loading with transit and other road users. Loading areas can not be eliminated completely in older areas. On-street parking should also not be eliminated completely, this can serve as a traffic calming mechanism and act as a buffer for pedestrians and improve the appeal of a street.
- Page 10 - Direction 10 - Bike facilities such as racks and parking areas should be in place at all transit stations not just major hubs. Even smaller areas such as car pool lots can be an option for people who can bike from rural areas or even in some areas from urban residential areas to carpool lots. Bike facilities should be a standard no matter the size of the transit station/stop.
- Page 10 – Table add Pedestrian count-down signals at intersections (and increased pedestrian crossing time) as initiatives
- Page 11 – Table - Metrolinx/GO Transit could consider group rates for transit and generally to make it easier for groups of people and families to travel by transit together. Most options in the White Papers have considered the trip for the single passenger.
Reduced rates for groups would allow transit to compete with the automobile for non-work-based trips. In addition, discounted non-peak hour fares for all, especially seniors, children and youth could capture additional ridership.

- Page 11 - Direction 11 – Land should also be reserved for carpooling facilities to increase TDM options. Preferable parking should also be considered for hybrids or alternative fuel vehicles.

Place Making and Mobility Hubs

- Page 12 – Although the idea of providing sidewalks everywhere is a good concept, this must be balanced with the particular situation of a given area/political will. There is little use in sidewalks that are in place if they do not lead anywhere. Increasing overall connectivity should be part of the overall strategy for creating cycling and pedestrian supportive environments.

- Page 12 – Direction 2 The RTP should detail where and how the Places to Grow urban growth centres fit in with the role and function of the various hubs.

- Page 13 – Direction 4 What is the “optimal” type of development? Some example or a description to what would work would be helpful. Rather than reducing all the parking, can there be a provision in mobility hubs for carpooling and priority parking areas?

- Page 13 Direction 5 - Hamilton Airport should also be noted.

- Page 14 - Direction 6 - Another option would be to offer reductions in the amount of required parking detailed in zoning by-laws. There should also be a balance between no parking at all and an over abundance of parking. Some parking may be necessary for those that can not access higher order transit in other ways. Parking should be provided in the short and medium term until feeder transit routes are developed and established. One way to lower parking requirements is to place a maximum parking rate in the zoning by-law.

- Page 15 - Direction 2 - This is very important – a key reason people don’t take transit is a lack of contiguous service between GO and local transit, etc. This is well documented in Toronto.

Excellent Customer Service

- Page 14 - Customer Service Websites should have easy to read maps and simple trip planners.

- Page 15 – Additional service should be standard for major events such as sports events, festivals, concerts etc.

- Page 16 – Direction 3 - To increase the rates of travel on transit, fares should be harmonized across systems. The Presto card is a good start but there should be a reduced rates when traveling between systems rather than paying full fare for each. A reduction in local transit fares is offered now at some locations with reduced local transit fare when transferring from GO transit – this should be expanded to include all transit systems (even large ones) and when transferring from all modes of transit (not just rail).

- Page 17 – Direction 7 - Add reduced speed limits in dense areas, particularly with a high concentration of seniors or school children, in addition to additional enforcement and additional pedestrian safety measures at crossings.
• Page 17 – Metrolinx can strive for transit self-sufficiency this is a goal and not a fixed target. Subsidies should still be in place for newer transit routes and routes that serve underserved areas. In order to establish transit and make it a viable option, transit operators will likely need to subsidize transit when it starts up and also in areas with lower ridership.

• Page 18 Direction 3 - Free parking may be needed in short term at transit stations to encourage increased modal split. As transit evolves, parking requirements may be reduced. Parking should remain at key access points to higher order transit. The intent should not be to eliminate parking altogether but to have it in strategic locations and in right amounts.

• Future investments will need to be made with targets for making transit accessible to more people. As the number of people requiring accessible transit rises, the level of investment will also need to grow.

Innovation Through Research

• Page 20 - Direction 7 – How will public safety be implemented if “Naked Streets” are used? There will need to be a public education program to explain a concept which is foreign to most people.

• Direction 6 – Research and funding could go towards establishing local industry focusing on creating the next generation of rapid transit vehicles which can then be implemented within the region. If new transit lines are to be built, rather than sourcing the equipment from outside the region, there would be many benefits if they were researched, developed and built locally.

Partnerships and Decision Making

• Page 22 - Direction 4 Partnerships with higher education establishments – perhaps money could be applied to programs that coordinate related transportation research and implementation strategy specific to the GTHA context.

Test Concepts

• Concepts A and B in terms of including City of Hamilton primary corridors and Mohawk T route don’t match corresponding maps for “Other Rapid Transit”. Does concept A include City of Hamilton primary corridors or only B?

• Page 29 Table 3.1 – To ensure consistency, Metrolinx should define the “Downtown” area the same way that the Places to Grow Plan defines the Urban Growth Centre. The same boundaries should be applied to make direct comparisons.

• Page 30 - Comment on eliminating double fares is a key consideration and will be important to increasing ridership and making transit compete with the automobile. Subsidies or pooling of funds would likely reduce total fares required.

• Page 33 – In addition to the costs associated with building and maintaining all the transit systems, there should be some assessment on the potential savings that may be realized by the province and municipalities if a transit first approach is taken over more road construction and all costs are considered (e.g. environmental impacts, health impacts etc.).

• Page 37 – access to transit will become increasingly important with rising fuel costs.

• Page 38 – Increase in GHG should be counted in the “costs” section as well as factoring in potential savings.
• Page 40 – Energy Use if there is an increase in the amount of transit used, most of that increase will be powered by electricity. What type of impact will this have on the electricity supply in Ontario? Is there any feasibility to implement transit systems such as in Calgary that are powered by renewable energy such as wind?

• Page 44 Section 5.2 - Land Use Coordination - from a Metrolinx perspective and to ensure municipalities can fund their share of operating expenses, there may need to be some legislative requirement to conform to RTP.

• Page 45 - what is the funding formula exactly - how much does City of Hamilton pay - i.e. 25% minus senior government grants? What kind of planning role will Metrolinx play?

• The City of Hamilton strongly supports any initiatives that provide improved and efficient service and transportation options to the City of Hamilton, provided the means to construct, operate and maintain these systems are part of any recommendations of the RTP.

Conclusion

In summary, City of Hamilton staff supports moving beyond the test concept of business as usual. It is apparent that a change in planning and transportation needs to take place and we applaud Metrolinx in the development of the Green and White Papers and look forward to reviewing the draft Regional Transportation Plan. This initiative has significant implications for the future.

We hope that the comments provided above, by Hamilton staff are useful and will be incorporated into the draft RTP. The City of Hamilton hopes that recommendations of the RTP will be made in such a manner that will provide guidance and identify support and potential funding opportunities, as well as form the basis for partnerships and open the door for continued inter-regional communication to move the RTP forward towards the implementation of sustainable initiatives that will benefit both the City of Hamilton and the GTHA as a whole.

Yours truly,

Jill Stephen, P.Eng.
Manager, Strategic Planning
Capital Planning & Implementation
Public Works, City of Hamilton
(905) 546-2424 ext 6392
jillian.stephen@hamilton.ca

Cc. Bruce Mori – IBI Group
Gen Peace - City Manager
Scott Stewart – General Manager, Public Works
Joe Rinaldo - General Manager, Corporate Services
Jim Kay – General Manager (Chef), Emergency Services
Tm McCabe – General Manager, Planning & Economic Development
Joe-Anne Priel – General Manager, Community Services
Elizabeth Richardson (Dr.) – Medical Officer of Health
Gerry Davis - Senior Director, CP & I
Gary Moore – Director, Engineering Services
Don Hull – Director, Transit, Public Works
Christine Lee – Morrison – Manager, Environmental Planning
Hart Solomon – Manager, Traffic Engineering & Operations
Jim Dahms – Manager, Transit Planning & Customer Services
Lisa Zinkewich – Senior Project Manager, Strategic Services
Bill Janssen – Acting Director, Strategic Services – Special Projects
Ron Marini – Director, Downtown and Community Renewal
Paul Mallard – Director, Planning
Neil Everson – Director, Economic Development and Real Estate
David Cuming – Acting Manager, Community Planning and Design
Rc Martins – Planner II, Strategic Services – Special Projects
Rob Hall – Director, Health Protection Branch
Alison Bochsler – Physical Activities Specialist, Healthy Living
Carmen Bian – Senior Policy Analyst, Community Services
July 20, 2008

Leslie Woo - General Manager, Transportation Policy & Planning
Metrolinx
20 Bay Street, Suite 901
Toronto, ON
M5J 2N8

Dear Ms. Woo:

Subject: City of Hamilton - White Papers Staff Comments (Financial Component)
Regional Transportation Plan

Further to the City of Hamilton letter outlining staff comments on the White Papers, submitted
to Metrolinx dated July 10, 2008, please accept this secondary letter. This letter does not
replace the previously submitted comments, but rather complements them through
addressing the Financial Sustainability component of the White Papers and the ultimate
Regional Transportation Plan.

The City of Hamilton is a more mature community than most of its GTHA counterparts. The
recent loss of commercial and industrial assessment in part due to the inexpensive cost of
Greenfield development has to date, made Hamilton’s financial situation more tenuous than
it’s neighbouring regions (among other factors). The City of Hamilton is consistently among
the top communities in terms of it’s heavy residential property tax burden in addition to having
the lowest per capita income level in the GTHA. As a consequence, Hamilton’s ability to cost-
share with Metrolinx is very limited.

Hamilton’s issues in terms of Metrolinx funding options include:

Road Tolls

Hamilton City Council has in the past considered road tolls on the Lincoln Alexander Parkway
(LINC) and Red Hill Parkway to assist with the debt burden placed on the Tax Levy by these
two projects. At that time, the idea of tolling was rejected by City Council. In addition,
Hamilton’s residents and the development community have contributed 57.5% of the $439
million cost. If these roads are to be tolled, is there the question of equity with regards to
costs being realized in the GTHA. Have the residents in these other communities
contributed proportionately? Will Metrolinx be collecting toll revenues from these Hamilton
roads while Hamilton’s residents are still paying off the debt? What impact does this have on
the City of Hamilton directly?

Development Charges

Hamilton has been collecting development charges for GO Transit since 2006, as well as
contributing from the tax levy towards GO Transit Capital programs since 2001. Hamilton has
been advocating for changes to the 1996 Provincial Development Charges Act since 2001
regarding increased scope of eligible costs as well as options such as a GTHA-wide DC’s in
order to increase revenues from this source. To date, no action has been taken by the
Provincial Government. As part of the Regional Transportation Plan and Investment
Strategy, will the Development Charges Act be reviewed as well?

Hamilton Public Works - Providing services that bring our City to life!
Conclusion

Recent increases in transportation and energy costs have brought Public Transportation back into focus in terms of municipal priorities. The provision of transportation infrastructure (Light Rail Transit, Goods movement and other transit capital) is definitely within the City’s Capital Budget radar but Hamilton’s fiscal constraints will limit the City’s financial participation, unless there are measures put in place to address the above noted concerns and direct Provincial and Federal funding opportunities materialize, with minimal impact to the general tax base.

In the development of the Regional Transportation Plan and Investment Strategy, the City of Hamilton hopes that each municipality, their individual financial abilities and opportunities, will be considered as part of the overall recommendations. We hope that the comments provided above and in the July 10, 2006 letter are useful and will be incorporated into the draft RTP.

The City of Hamilton hopes that recommendations of the RTP will be made in such a manner that will provide guidance and identify support and potential funding opportunities, as well as form the basis for partnerships and open the door for continued inter-regional communication to move the RTP forward towards the implementation of sustainable initiatives that will benefit both the City of Hamilton and the GTHA as a whole.

Yours truly,

Jill Stephen, P.Eng.
Manager, Strategic Planning
Capital Planning & Implementation
Public Works, City of Hamilton
(905) 546-2424 ext 6392
jillian.stephen@hamilton.ca

Cc.  Bruce Mori – IBI Group
     Glen Peares – City Manager
     Scott Stewart – General Manager, Public Works
     Joe Rinaldo - General Manager, Corporate Services
     Jim Kay – General Manager (Chief), Emergency Services
     Tim McCabe – General Manager, Planning & Economic Development
     Joe-Ann Priel – General Manager, Community Services
     Elizabeth Richardson (Dr.) – Medical Officer of Health
     Gerry Davis - Senior Director, CP & I
     Gary Moore – Director, Engineering Services
     Don Hull – Director, Transit, Public Works
     Christine Lee – Morrison – Manager, Environmental Planning
     Hart Solomon – Manager, Traffic Engineering & Operations
     Jim Dahms - Manager, Transit Planning & Customer Services
     Lisa Zinkavich – Senior Project Manager, Strategic Services
     Bill Janssen - Acting Director, Strategic Services - Special Projects
     Ron Marin – Director, Downtown and Community Renewal
     Paul Mallard – Director, Planning
     Neil Everson - Director, Economic Development and Real Estate
     David Cuming - Acting Manager, Community Planning and Design
     Liz Martins – Planner II, Strategic Services – Special Projects
     Rob Hall – Director, Health Protection Branch
     Alison Bochsler – Physical Activities Specialist, Healthy Living
     Carmen Ban - Senior Policy Analyst, Community Services
## Appendix D - Chronology of Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Master Plan</td>
<td>Feb 2007</td>
<td>-Rapid Transit in the form of BRT endorsed by Council along three (3) City of Hamilton Corridors with long term vision of LRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoveOntario 2020 Plan</td>
<td>June 2007</td>
<td>-$17.5 billion plan for Rapid Transit in the GTHA, including two (2) corridors in Hamilton that had previously been identified in the TMP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Transit Feasibility Study (RTFS) (Phase 1)</td>
<td>Nov 2007 - May 2008</td>
<td>-Study to investigate the major considerations in route selection, technology (LRT or BRT) and the identification of opportunities and constraints of each type of system. -Discussions with the Province (Metrolinx) in regards to MoveOntario 2020 and what this means for Hamilton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Committee / Council</td>
<td>April 14 / April 25 2008</td>
<td>-Staff Report PW08043 endorsed. -Recommendation approved to release findings of the RTFS to the public and initiate public consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation (Phase 1)</td>
<td>April - June 2008</td>
<td>-Participation in Hamilton Light Rail Workshop on May 1 -Public Information Centres (PICs) held May 6 and May 8. -Extensive media coverage (print, radio and TV) -Stakeholder consultation (Chamber of Commerce, Hamilton Burlington Real Estate Association, BIA’s, Hamilton International Airport etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Committee / Council</td>
<td>June 16 / June 25 2008</td>
<td>-Staff Report PW08043a endorsed. -Recommendation to continue with Phase 2 of the RTFS with focus on LRT, continued public consultation and continued communication with Metrolinx in regards to their proposed 5-year Capital Budget (Nov 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Transit Feasibility Study (Phase 2)</td>
<td>June – Sept 2008</td>
<td>-Study to investigate alternatives to using James Mountain Road, focus on LRT, project priorities and staging. -Preliminary economic review of other municipalities and system development research. -Discussions with the Province (Metrolinx) in regards to MoveOntario 2020 and what this means for Hamilton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation (Phase 2)</td>
<td>June – Sept 2008</td>
<td>-Extensive outreach using the media for solicitation of public input (print and radio); surveys made available on-line, and at public offices, municipal service centres and public facilities. -June 2008 Newsletter Update to mailing list -Lunch &amp; Learn Sessions (July 24 &amp; July 25) -Lunch Public Information Sessions (July 28) -Attendance at Community Events and Fairs -Stakeholder consultation (HHHBA, Eastgate Square, Lime Ridge Mall, St. Joseph’s Health Care, BIA’s, Hamilton Roundtable for Poverty Reduction) -Continued media coverage (print, radio, TV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Transit Road Trip</td>
<td>Sept 2 – Sept 5 2008</td>
<td>-Rapid Transit Study Team and City Officials visit Charlotte North Carolina, Portland Oregon &amp; Calgary Alberta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Committee / Council</td>
<td>Sept 15 / Sept 17 2008</td>
<td>-Information Report PW08043b on Public Consultation - received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrolinx</td>
<td>Sept 26 2008</td>
<td>-Draft RTP and draft Investment Strategy released and approved by the Metrolinx Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Committee / Council</td>
<td>Oct 20 / Oct 29 2008</td>
<td>TODAY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix E - Why is Hamilton Ready?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Light Rail Transit Benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Vision 2020 1992**                          | - Guidelines, indicators and reports intended to lead Hamilton in its sustainable development  
- Applies to economic, social, and environmental aspects of the City’s development.  
- Aims to integrate sustainable development principles into the City’s plans, policies and operations.                                                                                                       | LRT helps to satisfy many of the goals of Vision 2020 which are community based, fiscally minded and sustainable. These include:  
- Local Economy: helps to create jobs, attract business and development, and improve accessibility to major city areas and services.  
- Consumes Less Energy  
- Improves Air Quality  
- Provides alternative modes of transportation  
- Changes land use in the urban area  
- Improves community health, well being and capacity building                                                                                                           |
| **Ontario Greenbelt Plan 2005**               | - Identifies a protected area around the Greater Golden - limiting urban development  
- Areas found in the Greenbelt Plan are deemed unsuitable for future urbanization.  
- The foundation on which Places to Grow was built.                                                                                                                                                                   | Can direct development along corridors suitable for intensification thereby drawing more people to these areas                                                                                                               |
| **Places to Grow Act 2005**                   | - Control growth and development in Ontario in such a way that “supports economic prosperity, protects the environment and helps communities achieve a high quality of life”  
- Helps develop regional growth plans which are used to guide government investments.  
- Designates Hamilton as an Urban Growth Centre.                                                                                                                                                                     | A tool to help achieve Hamilton’s existing intensification goals  
- Implements a system could help generate higher densities and mixed use developments, which in turn curb urban sprawl  
- Helps satisfy the goals of the Places to Grow Act                                                                                                                                                    |
- Identified growth structure of “Nodes and Corridors”;  
- Intensification as a tool to create complete communities of which Rapid Transit is a key component.  
- Identifies employment areas in the City including the Airport Employment Growth District. Transit is needed to access these employment areas.                                                                 | Construction can contribute to higher densities of population and employment along the corridors and in the vicinity of the station areas.  
- Quickly and conveniently connects nodes  
- Is supportive of the nodes and corridors land use planning concepts developed through GRIDS  
- Can spur economic development, attract businesses, increase land values and generate property taxes along transit corridors and at transit nodes.                                                                 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Light Rail Transit Benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Transportation Master Plan (TMP) February 2007 | • Policies and strategies for the transportation network to 2031  
• Preferred strategy is to rely on transit and transportation demand management in combination with road optimization measures. | • Can help reduce single occupancy vehicle use  
• Can help achieve HTMP targets of 20% reduction in vehicle kilometres travelled over current trends  
• Increases the transit modal share to 15%  
• Act as a catalyst for economic development and growth. |
| Public Works Strategic Plan 2007               | • Guides Public Works to 2017  
• Addresses issues and opportunities identified in a department-wide Employee Survey  
• Outlines specific activities that will direct Public Works in achieving their vision which is to be recognized as the centre of environmental and innovative excellence in Canada | • Addresses the priority for Public Works to be a leader in the greening and stewardship of the city.  
• Helps further information sharing since LRT requires expertise in a variety of disciplines and will require people to have multi-faceted knowledge.  
• Requires collaboration across a variety of divisions which will enable responsibility sharing throughout the City. |
| Residential Intensification Study February 2007 | • Identifies drivers and opportunities for residential intensification  
• Indicates that increased intensification can support transit including higher order transit.  
• For intensification to become more appealing, transit should be available | • Can facilitate intensification in areas such as downtowns and help with revitalization efforts.  
• LRT nodes promote dense residential and commercial development near stations. |
| Commercial Strategy Study February 2007       | • High level comprehensive planning study to inform and direct the development of a new approach to commercial land use planning for the City  
• Recommended commercial and mixed use areas be directed to “nodes” which can facilitate higher order transit. | • The provision of rapid transit can contribute to the success of mixed use commercial areas in a number of ways including:  
• Developing pedestrian oriented streetscapes  
• Encouraging dense and highly desirable development areas  
• Improve the accessibility of areas along the transit corridor which can improve employee and customer transportation convenience |
| Corporate Energy Policy November 2007         | • Facilitate the achievement of City-wide energy reduction targets  
• Address legislated reporting requirements  
• Provide for ongoing Energy Monitoring and Targeting of | • Does not depend depleting fuel sources such as diesel or natural gas.  
• May become more sustainable as its power supply shifts to renewable sources of energy (i.e. solar)  
• Eliminates dependence on oil which can save the City’s budget from high |
### Light Rail Transit Benefit

- Define policies related to energy procurement.
  - Policy calls for a 20% cut in the energy intensity of city-owned facilities and operations by 2020.

- Energy efficient and displaces automobiles from City roads, providing a two factor strategy to reduce energy dependence.

- Reduces the impact of fuelling public vehicles, since most areas of the City would be rail or rapid transit accessible.

### Air Quality and Climate Change Strategic Plan (AQ&CC) 2008

- Seeks immediate action on projects currently underway to mitigate the effects of climate change.
  - The report refers to transportation, the greening of the built environment and adaptive planning to prepare for climate change.

- Reduces reliance on automobiles (one of the largest contributors to climate change)

- Decreases energy requirements

### Corporate Strategic Plan 2008

**Vision:** To be the best place in Canada to raise a child, promote innovation, engage citizens and provide diverse economic opportunities

**Strategic Themes:** Image & Job Creation

**Focus Areas:**
- Skilled, Innovative and Respectful Organization
- Financially Sustainable
- Effective Intergovernmental Relations
- Growing our Economy
- Social Development
- Environmental Stewardship
- Healthy Community

### Draft Urban Structure Plan on-going

- Refines the Nodes and Corridors approach as outlined in GRIDS
  - Details the transportation function for each node – identifies nodes as important transit hubs for higher order transit

- Highlights opportunity for transit - higher order nodes also identified as transit hubs

- Encourages transit supportive land uses along corridors and nodes

- Nodes and corridors are directed to contain a mix of uses, both compliment and support higher order transit – densities in these areas also should be transit supportive

### Draft New Official Plan on-going

- New Official Plan will contain new transportation policies which are supportive of rapid transit in accordance with Urban Structure Plan
  - Specific subsection recognizing potential role of rapid transit and encourages further investigation and study

- Other Transportation policies encourage connectivity with other transportation modes including active transportation

- Overall direction with transportation policies is to provide improved mode choice

- Other land use policies supportive of higher order transit (i.e. densities in many areas will be supportive of Rapid Transit)