



City of  
**Peterborough**

---

**To:** Members of the General Committee

**From:** W.H. Jackson, Director of Utility Services

**Meeting Date:** March 26, 2018

**Subject:** Report USDIR18-002  
Transportation Planning and The Parkway

---

## **Purpose**

A report to recommend the next steps to move forward with issues related to Transportation Planning and The Parkway

## **Recommendations**

That Council approve the recommendations outlined in Report USDIR18-002 dated March 26, 2018, of the Director of Utility Services, as follows:

- a) That staff be directed to implement Option C as described in Section 5.3 of Report USDIR18-002,
- b) That the CAO be authorized to approve the creation of one permanent Transportation Planner position to implement Option C, funds for which will come from the Capital program as described in Section 10 of Report USDIR18-002;
- c) That approved uncommitted capital funding for The Parkway Corridor Extension be reassigned as described Table 2 of Report USDIR18-002;
- d) That staff be directed to include the recommended distribution of Parkway funding in the next Development Charge Bylaw update; and
- e) That staff be directed to improve the condition of two of the houses purchased for The Parkway so that they may be rented, and the condition of the third house be evaluated from a risk based perspective and if appropriate, be offered for relocation, failing that, the house will be demolished.

---

## Budget and Financial Implications

Approval of this report will redistribute available Parkway funding as described in Table 2.

Future Capital Budget documents will include funding necessary to implement the recommendations and conclusions of the various studies documented in this report to allow the transportation planning priorities to move forward.

The creation of a Permanent Transportation Planner position is anticipated to cost an average of \$130,000 per year until completion of the recommended studies (approximately 5 years). These costs have been included in the specific task estimates shown in Table 2. After completion of the process, the annual costs for this position will be included in the annual operating budget documents.

Funding to renovate two of the properties purchased at an estimated \$75,000 each for future rental and to potentially demolish a third building at an estimated cost of \$45,000 have been included in the redistribution of existing Parkway funds as shown in Table 2.

The recommended distribution of Parkway funding will be included in the next Development Charge By-law update.

It is proposed to utilize the remaining Parkway funding to begin the installation of new traffic signals that are more adaptive to changing traffic conditions upon completion of the Traffic Signal Update Study.

## Background

There is significant background to The Parkway discussion. This report is only dealing with the latest work.

### 1. Prior to Submission of The Parkway Corridor Class EA

City Council, at its meeting of November 14, 2011 (Report USTR11-006) endorsed the Comprehensive Transportation Plan Update (CTPU) authored by Bassam Hamwi of Morrison Hershfield.

The CTPU identified the long-term transportation network (roadway, cycling and transit) projects necessary to maintain the efficiency of the City's Transportation System accounting for anticipated vehicular growth, growth in transit ridership and increased bicycle and pedestrian usage. The City still relies on the transportation modal share targets identified in the CPTU.

Included in the CTPU was a widening of Fairbairn Street from Parkhill Road West to The Parkway right-of-way and construction of a new two-lane arterial road in The Parkway right-of-way from Fairbairn Street to Cumberland Avenue.

Both Fairbairn Street and the new Two-Lane Arterial Road project have a strong and obvious connection to the long-term plan of the future Parkway and, accordingly, staff felt these projects should be combined into a single Class Environmental Assessment, looking at the entire Parkway Corridor to avoid charges of piecemealing the entire Parkway. Council approved the consolidation of these projects on April 2, 2012 (Report USDIR12-002).

The resultant Environmental Study Report for The Parkway was submitted to the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) on March 24, 2014.

## **2. After Submission of The Parkway Corridor Class EA**

On February 5, 2016 the City received the first Order from the Minister of the Environment and Climate Change (the “Minister”). In this Order, the Minister acknowledged that significant time had lapsed since the filing of the Notice of Completion and, consequently, he required the City ensure the preferred alternative and environmental mitigation measures proposed were still valid in the current planning context. The Minister provided the City with 60 days to respond. The City completed its review and submitted the response to the Minister on April 4, 2016 confirming the conclusions reached during The Parkway Class EA remained valid.

On September 16, 2016 the Minister issued a second Order requiring the City to comply with Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act (the “EAA”).

At its meeting of October 2, 2017 City Council, in considering Report USDIR17-009, requested staff to report back on potential next steps related to The Parkway.

Subsequently, on October 30, 2017 the Mayor and City Staff met with the Minister, staff from the MOECC Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch and MPP Jeff Leal. At this meeting the Minister and MOECC staff confirmed their expectations for an Individual EA but indicated they would support a ‘focused’ study.

## **3. Current Context**

Since completion of The Parkway Corridor Class EA and Council’s endorsement of the recommendations, there have been many contextual changes to the environment in which The Parkway Corridor was planned. These include:

- Approval of the Lily Lake Secondary Plan
- Initiation of CleanTech Commons at Trent University
- 2014 Provincial Policy Statement
- Initiation of the Official Plan Review
- Amendment 2 to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe
- Improvements in the local Active Transportation network
- Awareness and commitments for sustainability
- Indication by City Council that the bridge over Jackson Park could be abandoned from future planning under certain circumstances, and

- Order to comply with Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act in regards to The Parkway Corridor Project

The last two points are significant and have broad and long-lasting implications. Through several discussions with the MOECC, Staff have come to understand that the Ministry expects the City, if we choose to move forward with The Parkway Extension, to assess the entire corridor irrespective of whether or not the City intends to proceed with all segments of The Parkway. Further, any examination of problems that were considered in The Parkway Corridor Class EA, also irrespective of whether or not any works in The Parkway right-of-way were planned, would require an Individual EA. For clarity this means that any alternative to The Parkway would also require an Individual EA.

While Council may choose to remove the bridge over Jackson Park from the future high capacity arterial network shown in the Official Plan, this does not eliminate the requirement for an Individual EA for The Parkway (or an alternative). Likewise, because the current safety and congestion problems in the south end of the project area were specifically considered in the Problem Statement for The Parkway Corridor Class EA, Ministry Staff have indicated that planning of any solutions to those problems will require an Individual EA, regardless of whether or not The Parkway right-of-way is involved. For example, widening Clonsilla Avenue to provide dedicated turn lanes, or the addition of turning lanes at the Sherbrooke Street/Clonsilla Avenue intersection would both address immediate safety concerns. As these same concerns were part of The Parkway study, these different improvements would still require an Individual EA. Essentially, even though the Province is fully aware of the our immediate needs and they understand the seriousness of these specific concerns, they have indicated there is no way in which the City can address these problems quickly and efficiently that does not contradict the Minister's Order regarding The Parkway.

The current corporate work plan includes some interesting undertakings regarding transportation in the City. The City is planning to begin a Downtown Transportation Hub and Route Review study regarding the City's Transit Service. The City is also planning to begin a City-wide Traffic Operations Study, assessing several key transportation corridors and numerous intersections, looking to improve current operations and safety. As well, the City is also planning a program to select and install an upgraded Traffic Signal Control system and pending 2019 budget approval, the City will be also undertaking a Cycling Network Update study to assess the City's active transportation network.

The awareness and clarity of the Ministry expectations, the current context and the current corporate work plan result in a much improved understanding about transportation planning moving forward. With this better understanding of what study requirements will be expected by the MOECC, and what changes have occurred within the study area since the inception of the Master Transportation Plan Update, various Options have been developed as described in Section 5 but, before the Options are described, it is important to better understand what an Individual EA involves.

---

#### **4. What an Individual EA Involves**

In considering the available options a high level understanding of the Individual EA process is helpful. Every Individual EA begins with the development of the Terms of Reference (the “TOR”) by the proponent. The TOR identifies what the EA will study, where the limits of that study are and how it will be studied. The TOR is required to be developed incorporating public and agency consultation and must be approved by the Minister before the Individual EA can begin. The TOR will involve significant background study work to establish the problems being addressed and the breadth of solutions to be considered. The TOR will also involve substantial public and agency consultation to establish the study parameters going forward. After the City submits the TOR for approval, the Minister has 12 weeks to make a decision on the TOR. It is anticipated that with a study of this nature, the Minister will return the TOR to the City for further development and reconsideration prior to issuing approval.

After the TOR is approved the City is free to proceed with the Individual EA. The study must follow the process laid out in the approved TOR. It is anticipated the study will involve extensive field works, (natural environment surveys, geotechnical investigations, etc.) and significant engineering studies (preliminary designs, noise assessments, etc.) to respond to all aspects of the Ministers Order. Through out the study there will be considerable agency and public consultation. After completion of the study, the reports are provided to the Ministry for their review. The Ministry will offer the study for public consultation, complete their review, publish the findings of their review for consultation and then make a recommendation to the Minister for eventual approval by Cabinet.

The guiding documents indicate the Ministry consultation, review and decision will be completed within 30 weeks, however, regardless of the Ministry’s best intentions, throughout the Province it appears significantly more time is required by the Province to make a decision. For example, looking at the City’s own experience with MOECC and Minister reviews of our projects, the Harper Road and Crawford Drive Realignment Class EA took 51 weeks for the Minister to provide a decision on those appeals and The Parkway Corridor Class EA took nearly 30 months for a decision. Projects of other municipalities generally also seem to require significant amount of time beyond the 30 weeks for the Minister to complete their review and issue decisions.

#### **5. Options**

Reliance on The Parkway for future transportation uses, at this time is uncertain. It is therefore critical that moving forward the City must maintain all options possible when considering new or redevelopment applications. It may be necessary in the future for the City to consider connecting existing streets and roads to improve connectivity and distribute traffic, reclassify or widen existing roads to increase their capacity.

Three primary options have been developed. All of the Options, if completed through to implementation, will include such things as project need, solutions, effects and mitigations measures, costs, etc.

---

### **5.1 Option A: Individual EA for The Parkway**

This Option follows the Minister's Order to undertake an Individual EA for The Parkway Project. MOECC staff has suggested a focused Individual EA for The Parkway could be completed for this project to reduce timelines; however, City staff believe this is not reflective of the municipal approval processes, the expectations of Parkway opponents, nor the TOR process plus the consultation expectations or the detailed studies required by the Ministers Order. A realistic timeframe would be to expect the Minister's decision to take more than one year after the City submits the completed EA for approval.

At best, this Option will take a minimum of four years to complete an Individual EA for the entire corridor and receive a decision by the Minister. Five years is a more realistic expectation.

Costs for an Individual EA for The Parkway are difficult to estimate in advance of the TOR. A preliminary estimate is somewhere between \$2.5 million and \$4.5 million depending on level of scoping permitted. Regardless of the scoping permitted, there is still a significant amount of work required especially around the consultation aspects of an Individual EA that could drive the costs higher.

As with both other Options, Council could choose to remove all or a portion of, The Parkway right-of-way from future considerations as a transportation corridor.

### **5.2 Option B: Undertake a Transportation Master Plan as an Individual EA**

In Option B, the primary objective would be to prepare a new Transportation Master Plan following the process for an Individual EA. This could potentially result in every identified project receiving EA approval through the Master Plan process rather than following up with separate Class EA's as the need arises. While this broader study would address transportation needs City wide, it would also seek approval for The Parkway extension, or alternative project(s).

The main difficulty with this Option is the changes that have occurred since the last Transportation Master Plan Update as listed in Section 3. Some of those changes will be accounted for in the development of population/employment figures for modeling purposes. Other questions that have been raised by those opposed to The Parkway will need to be addressed through the study which could, on its own, be an expensive and time consuming exercise.

Again, without a confirmed Terms of Reference, estimating costs and timelines is difficult. A best estimate is that such a program could cost between \$4 million and \$7 million and take at least six years to complete. This program could benefit from input from the current work plan studies (previously described). Unfortunately, the focused, short-term oriented nature of those studies will limit their value for broader transportation planning.

---

### **5.3 Option C: Update Transportation Master Plan and Other Studies to Inform the Transportation Plan**

This Option differs significantly from the other approaches. Options A and B focus primarily on completing an Individual EA in some fashion so that approval of The Parkway (or an alternative) is sought as expeditiously as possible. Option C lays the framework for a more inclusive and responsive Transportation Plan that thoroughly assesses transportation needs to accommodate growth. This is done by expanding a number of different studies to better inform the City's transportation planning moving forward.

In consideration of annual capital budgeting challenges, this option is designed to leverage current capital budget commitments and available Parkway funding to enhance the current work plan or support new initiatives to establish a basis for long term transportation planning going forward.

One such new study would be a Management Plan for Jackson Park to clearly establish the full extent of the Park and define sensitive areas within the Park. This study would also identify where and how any future infrastructure corridors could cross the Park or pass immediately adjacent to the Park or sensitive features. Any future transportation planning would then abide by this plan when establishing the future transportation network.

At the same time, the Downtown Transportation Hub and Route Review study would be expanded to include a long term transit growth strategy to identify, plan and establish realistic and attainable future transit use targets and the methods necessary to achieve those targets.

Thirdly, a City wide Traffic Operations Review will identify short term fixes to improve traffic flow and a fourth study, the Signal System Update Study, will assess and provide input on upgrading the City's traffic signal network to a smart control system. The scope of those initiatives will be expanded to include optimized signal settings for key transportation corridors, additional intersection assessments and the installation of a more adaptive signal control system including upgrading infrastructure in the field as well as in the control centre.

Lastly, the fifth study will update the City Cycling Network. This would, like the long term transit growth strategy, inform the Transportation Plan Update on the potential for reduced vehicular trips via an improved active transportation network.

Many aspects of the above work are unknown at this time so, estimating costs is difficult. Certain parts of this option are already funded or partially funded but, to ensure these programs are relevant to the subject of this Report, some scope changes will be required. A high level, long term estimate for the studies, and EA's associated with this option would place the study related costs at about \$4 million. Each study will recommend a number of actions that could be implemented in the short term, subject to

future budget approvals. There is currently about \$1.25 million available in approved funding for elements of this option.

The information, recommendations, and policy updates resulting from the above five studies would feed into a new Transportation Master Plan (TMP). The TMP would establish new or updated priority projects for the City's transportation network, setting the stage for broader transportation needs, including The Parkway or alternatives as well as more localized improvements. Following completion of the TMP, new Class EA's and/or Individual EA's could be undertaken to seek Provincial approval to proceed with implementation of the various recommended transportation improvements.

Table 1 provides the estimated costs and implementation timelines for the entirety of Option C:

**Table 1: Costs and Timelines for Option C**

Task	Cost (\$000's)	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022														
Jackson Park Management Plan	\$ 325				Implement															
Transit Hub and Route Review and Long Term Growth Strategy	\$ 460				Implement															
City Wide Traffic Operations Review	\$ 650				Implement															
Cycling Network Update	\$ 325				Implement															
Signal Control Upgrade Program	\$ 645				Implement (cost estimated at \$3.6 million)*															
Transportation Master Plan	\$ 825				Input														Implement	

\* Installation costs for upgraded signals and controls has been estimated based on experiences of other municipalities. Implementation costs of other projects can be estimated once study outcomes are known.

## 6. MOECC Guidance

MOECC staff has advised that regardless of whether a bridge over Jackson Park is ruled out by order of Council it is still expected that the City will study the entire corridor at one time. If Council were to determine a portion of the project was not to be constructed, that would need to be reflected in the Terms of Reference for an Individual EA and in the development of alternatives. However, any future plan to 'reinstate' removed portions would need further EA study following the same process.

City staff had suggested the bridge portion be removed from further consideration as a transportation corridor if the MOECC would be agreeable to allowing the City to conduct an Individual EA to address immediate needs in the south end of the City. Removing



the bridge portion comes with significant implications to the City's future transportation system requiring additional road widenings. It was hoped such a drastic change would permit the City to address immediate needs at the most dangerous intersections in the south end, through a shorter Individual EA focused on the south end, which may or may not involve The Parkway right-of-way. Ministry Staff indicated that if the problem statement for this new Individual EA covered any of the same issues the problem statement for The Parkway Class EA covered, then development of any solutions in the new EA would fall under the requirements of the Ministers Order and would have to study the entire corridor. In other words, not much would be gained by removing the bridge and trying to solve the south end problems in a new EA.

MOECC staff also offered some advice that any project the City undertakes to assess high volume and long term north-south traffic movements that could be considered an alternative to The Parkway project should also be planned following the Individual EA process. Simply abandoning The Parkway outright and studying alternate means to move high volumes of traffic north-south will still require an Individual EA, again not much has been gained in this regard.

During the discussions, staff did clarify with the Ministry that many of the road segments making up portions of alternatives to The Parkway (such as the West By-pass or improvements to County Road 19) are not owned by the City and fall under the jurisdiction of Selwyn Township or County of Peterborough. The Ontario Municipal Board, in a 2003 ruling regarding a transportation plan by the City of London that planned facilities in the County of Middlesex, determined that a Municipality can not plan a transportation facility in the jurisdiction of another authority without the consent of the other authority. This includes planning exercises that utilize the EA process. If the City were to abandon The Parkway, and undertake an EA for the West By-pass for example, we would need to obtain clear consent from Selwyn Township and County of Peterborough. During The Parkway discussions, staff from the County and Township both indicated that their preferred alternative was construction of The Parkway because this would afford the best transportation option to their residents.

## **7. Consideration of Options**

The following factors should be considered when recommending which option to pursue:

- Transportation Needs
- Timeline
- Costs
- Outcome

Each of these factors is discussed in detail below.

---

## 7.1 Transportation Needs

The Parkway project is a long-term plan intended to address traffic generated by new growth. At the same time The Parkway also provided relief and solutions to current and emerging localized traffic problems. At a minimum, it will take four years of intensive Environmental Assessment and Consultation to receive a decision from the Province regarding an Individual EA for the entire Parkway. Given the number of unknowns related to this option, it would be more appropriate to assume a decision is likely more than five years away and, this decision may not necessarily be a decision to build The Parkway.

This also means that should we proceed with an Individual EA for the entire corridor, localized traffic solutions for current challenges that were addressed by The Parkway project are more than five years away. The City could attempt to develop very localized, minimalistic solutions to specific problems at key intersections; however, there is a risk that these small projects could be conceived as the City attempting to somehow circumvent the EA requirements for The Parkway or the localized solutions could be challenged because a better alternative exists (i.e. The Parkway) that was not considered. For example, if one or two houses are required to be removed to make room for the widening of an intersection, the property owners could, conceivably, object given The Parkway solution may not have required the removal of their houses.

The Jackson Park Management Plan that is suggested to be part of Option C would at the outset establish the proper boundary of Jackson Park. The Plan would then identify any sensitive areas within the Park from different perspectives (e.g. Natural Areas or high use recreational areas, etc.). The Management Plan is envisioned to identify areas within the Park that warrant enhanced protection, identify other areas (if any) that could be crossed or impacted by municipal infrastructure; and establish minimum design standards and constraints for that infrastructure. With intense development planned for the north end of the City, resolving these issues around Jackson Park and securing this resolution via a Council mandate would, it is believed, better inform the network alternatives available to the City to deal with existing and future transportation needs as well as other municipal infrastructure challenges.

The City's CTPU was last updated in 2012 and The Parkway has major implications on this plan. As well, the increased growth forecast for the City (Places to Grow Act, Amendment 2) and new the City's sustainability program will also affect the projects recommended in the CTPU.

## 7.2 Timeline

The time to assess The Parkway Corridor through an Individual EA will be lengthy and must be completed before the project can proceed. Even at the conclusion of this work, there is no guarantee The Parkway Corridor solutions will received Minister approval.

Unless the City wants to plan and implement different small scale measures to improve safety and congestion conditions at known locations of concern (the Clonsilla,

Goodfellow and Sherbrooke areas for example) outside of the EA process and risk prosecution by the Province, solutions to those problems will be dependent on the outcome of The Parkway Corridor EA and also may face challenges as described above. Also, proceeding with an Individual EA now for The Parkway will mean an updated or revised Transportation Master Plan will not necessarily reflect the results of that Parkway EA. Given the time required to settle The Parkway issue, it will be necessary to proceed with an updated or new Transportation Master Plan before the Individual EA study is completed.

### **7.3 Costs**

No matter whether the City undertakes an Individual EA specifically for The Parkway or for a new TMP, costs will be significant. To begin an Individual EA now, an increase in available funding of up to \$1.5 million may be required, likely in 2019 for Option A and significantly more for Option B to complete additional background studies and expedite an update to the Comprehensive Transportation Master. Option C delays the need for this additional funding, though it will be required after the TMP is completed.

### **7.4 Outcome**

Approval of an Individual EA for The Parkway or other projects is not a certainty. The Order issued by the Minister was a result of the controversy associated with the project, rather than any concern for the specific study deficiencies noted in the Order. Ministry staff, in fact, recommended the Minister deny the Part II Order Requests and grant approval for the project with conditions that were consistent with commitments made during the Class EA.

## **8. Assessment of Options**

All the options available to the City will require one or more Individual EA's. Option A is a straightforward planning exercise for The Parkway Project. Option B is a new Transportation Master Plan that is undertaken following the Individual EA process. In these options, solutions to current and emerging traffic issues will not be planned and approved until the Individual EA's are completed, likely a delay of up to five years. Option A and B may not provide sufficient rigour to the assessment and evaluation of non-roadway solutions to address the concerns previously expressed by Parkway opponents. They would also not afford Council the opportunity to determine their level of support for these measures. It is likely a number of "feeder" studies included in Option C would also be required for either Option A or B. This would be determined during the development and approval of the Terms of Reference. If these "feeder" studies are required, the costs and timelines for those options would increase.

Option C, takes a different approach. It moves to protect Jackson Park in the long term by developing a Management Plan for the Park. This Plan would also direct where and how any future transportation facilities could cross or encroach on the Park or adjacent natural areas.

At the same time as the Jackson Park Management Plan is underway, the City would enhance the Downtown Transit Hub and Route Review to be a full fledged planning exercise to identify, assess and recommend ways to increase transit ridership and establish future mode share targets along with a budget for implementation. Further, a Traffic Operations Study would be completed, assessing localized intersection improvement needs and optimizing signal timing in key arterial road corridors. The City would also source the software necessary to upgrade the City traffic signal system to smart control and begin implementing these upgrades in the field. Lastly, the City would undertake a Cycling Network review project. The long term transit growth strategy, Jackson Park Management Plan, Traffic Operations Study, Signal Improvement Study and the Cycling Network study would all then feed into a new Transportation Master Plan, which would determine whether The Parkway or alternate corridor should still be considered as part of the City's future high capacity arterial network.

Council approval of these "feeder" studies would also answer the questions from opponents of The Parkway that not enough effort has been given to alternative, less capital intensive, solutions. Only after the need is confirmed would a larger Individual EA be undertaken to plan the future north-south/east-west high capacity arterial network.

With respect to costs, Option C over the long-term may be the most costly, though that depends on the recommendations of the new Transportation Master Plan. Option C has the benefit of spreading out the incurred costs over many years, whereas Options A and B will require a significant increase in funding in the next two years, which could reasonably be expected to increase further as those projects advance. It is worth noting that irrespective of Council's decision on this report, there will be a need to prepare a new TMP and begin implementation of those recommendations in the not so distant future.

Option C will eventually require more funding to implement the recommendations of the new Transportation Master Plan and other plans. Future funding needs can be established as part of the annual budget process as is standard for all master plans and policies. Upgrading the signal control system will increase annual operating costs, but that program is intended to proceed regardless of decisions regarding The Parkway project.

All options leave the immediate challenges in the south end and at specific locations unimproved until completion of at least the new Transportation Master Plan and subsequent EA.

With regard to satisfying the requirements of the Order, it is believed all of the options presented will be sufficient (though changes to the approaches may occur as they advance).

---

## **9. Recommended Approach**

Considering the factors described above, staff believe that Option C, is the most comprehensive approach from the outset, something that will be critical to receiving MOECC approval upon completion of an Individual EA.

This belief is based primarily on the fact Option C takes a new, comprehensive look at transportation planning in the City going forward. This option provides an updated assessment and recommendations to address long term transportation needs in the City before undertaking any new EA work. It is also believed to be the best approach to ensuring the major themes of the objections to The Parkway Corridor project receive a fresh look.

## **10. Moving Forward**

Continuation of Environmental Assessment Study work related to The Parkway Corridor Study and especially the increased work scope of planned projects along with an increased emphasis on completing these projects has not been factored into staff's work program for 2018 or beyond. Accommodating the additional work program and accelerated scheduling of supporting studies of the preferred option or of any of the other options will require additional staff positions. For now, it is suggested that one permanent Transportation Planner position be created. This new position would be responsible for administering the various consulting assignments, ensuring firms completing the work are coordinating, ensuring schedules are maintained and work scopes are completed. The Transportation Planner would also be responsible for circulating reports internally, providing and coordinating City reviews and comments, and managing the day-to-day needs of each assignment. Initially costs for this position will be funded through the capital budgets being established for these projects. After completion of the TMP (approximately five years from now) the new position will be funded through the annual Operating Budget process and will provide day-to-day support to the Transportation Division, including implementing the various study recommendations, subdivision review, report review and preparation and design support.

While the City moves forward to seek a resolution to The Parkway and develop new transportation plans for the long-term future, the City will continue to grow. When considering Report USDIR17-009 dated September 25, 2017, Council lifted development caps linked to The Parkway. Given the uncertainties related to The Parkway and transportation planning and inasmuch as a full resolution to the Transportation Network plan is a minimum of 5 to 7 years away, Council should be aware that development applicants, particularly in the north end of the City, may need to incorporate measures into their development plan to support the potential future road network requirements to provide flexibility for a wide range of potential improvements such as extending, connecting, widening or building new streets either through new developments or in existing neighbourhoods.

---

## **11. Funding for Option C**

There currently remains approximately \$4.6 million in uncommitted funds in The Parkway project. It is recommended this funding be reassigned as described in Tables 1 and 2. It is expected that regardless of how the City precedes, the long-term implications of the Minister's Order will require significant funding increases to move forward with either The Parkway Corridor or some alternative(s). As the scope of work becomes clear and project needs are identified, budget requirements will be updated to reflect the best available information. Unused Parkway funding would be reassigned to fund installation of new traffic signals in accordance with the recommendations of the Traffic Signal Enhancement study.

All of the works recommended as Part of Option C are intended and believed necessary to establish an up-to-date long-term transportation plan to support and accommodate future growth. The plan will either support The Parkway or identify alternatives and means to implement those alternatives. City Staff are of the opinion the uncommitted Parkway funding, including Development Charges, should most appropriately be used for implementation of Option C

**Table 2: Redistribution of Parkway Funding for Studies Required for Option C**

<b>Project</b>	<b>Estimated Cost (000's)</b>	<b>Approved Funding (000's)</b>	<b>Parkway Funding Distribution (000's)</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Properties Renovation and Maintenance	\$250	Nil	\$250	To improve building conditions so they may be rented, and demolish one facility if it is most appropriate from a liability and safety perspective
Jackson Park Management Plan	\$350	Nil	\$350	To hire a qualified and experienced consulting firm capable of developing a Park Management Plan as discussed in this report
Transit Hub and Route Review and Long Term Growth Strategy	\$500	\$200	\$300	Add an origin destination survey, develop a transit model and identify and test means to improve ridership and overall modal share in the longer term
Traffic Signal Enhancement	\$600	\$600	Nil	Funding is in place to assess needs, identify software and hardware needs, and purchase main operating system.
City Wide Traffic Operations Assessment	\$700	\$449	\$251	An expanded scope would see an additional main corridor and intersections studied for possible enhancement and functional design
Cycling Network Study	\$350	Nil	\$350	Assess the current network, identify gaps and recommend future projects to improve use
Transportation Master Plan	\$900	Nil	\$900	This project will be required irrespective of The Parkway. Funding the project now will expedite transition from the feeder studies to the TMP and avoid stressing future capital budgets. Understanding the critical aspects of this plan builds a more robust evaluation and assessment of projects and impacts.
Staffing	included in above costs	\$Nil	included in above costs	The additional transportation studies proposed and condensed schedule require creation of one Permanent Transportation Planner position to be initially funded from project funding
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$3,650</b>	<b>\$1,249</b>	<b>\$2,401</b>	It is suggested \$300,000 be reserved for contingency funding

## 12. Properties Purchased for The Parkway

The City has purchased five houses along The Parkway route that would be demolished if The Parkway were to proceed. At this time, it is premature for the City to divest itself of these properties; however, ongoing costs related to ownership of these properties will continue to accrue.

Of the five properties, two are currently rented, generating annual revenue of \$18,000 each. Two of the other properties could be brought up to rentable standards with an investment of up to \$75,000 each. One property (813 Fairbairn Street) is considered to be in very poor condition and could not be rented without significant cost. Given the timeframes proposed to proceed with The Parkway or alternatives, it would be appropriate to consider demolition of this one property rather than upgrading to make it rentable. The two currently vacant properties should be renovated so that they may be rented to help offset ongoing costs.

In addition to the benefit of increasing the available housing supply, it is estimated that renovation and rental of two of these properties of the five year study period will offset any maintenance costs and generate a slight profit to the City. The funding necessary for the renovations and demolition have been included in the redistribution of existing Parkway funding shown in Table 2.

## Summary

Various options have been presented to move the matter of transportation forward in the City of Peterborough. Option C has been recommended that will see many “feeder” studies undertaken as input to an updated Master Transportation Plan. This Master Transportation Plan together with the various feeder studies will provide the City with an up-to-date Transportation Plan that will have considered, in detail, the concerns expressed during The Parkway EA and will provide the City with a well rounded and documented move forward scenario.

Submitted by,

W. H. Jackson, P. Eng.  
Director Utility Services

Contact Name:  
Robert Dunford  
Senior Project Manager  
Utility Services Department  
Phone 705-742-7777 ext 1867  
Toll Free: 1-855-738-3755  
Fax 705-876-4621  
E-mail address: [rjdunford@peterborough.ca](mailto:rjdunford@peterborough.ca)