1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

(Added Items, if applicable, will be noted with *)

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

3.1 July 9, 2018

4. DELEGATION REQUESTS

4.1 Vic Durdjevic, Nikola Tesla Educational Corporation, respecting an Event at the Hamilton Steam and Technology Museum on August 26, 2018

(For the August 13, 2018 GIC)

4.2 Dr. Patrick Deane, President, McMaster University, to provide the Annual Address respecting McMaster University

(For the December 12, 2018 GIC)

*4.3 Pauline Kajiura, Information Hamilton, respecting a Request for Funding

(For a future GIC)
5. CONSENT ITEMS

5.1 Various Sub-Committee/Advisory Committee Minutes:

5.1.a Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board, March 22, 2018
5.1.b Business Improvement Area Advisory Committee, June 12, 2018

5.2 King West Business Improvement Area (BIA) Revised Board of Management (PED14258(a)) (Ward 2)

5.3 Stoney Creek Business Improvement Area (BIA) Revised Board of Management (PED16110(b)) (Ward 9)

5.4 Westdale Village Business Improvement Area (BIA) Revised Board of Management (PED16015(c)) (Ward 1)

5.5 Ottawa Street Business Improvement Area (BIA) Revised Board of Management (PED16062(b)) (Wards 2 and 3)

5.6 City of Music Logo - Delegated Authority (PED18146) (City Wide)

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS / DELEGATIONS

6.1 Giorgio Cotroneo, Stoney Creek Resident, respecting Suggestions as to How to Make Hamilton Greater (Referred to GIC by the Planning Committee on July 10, 2018) (no copy)

7. STAFF PRESENTATIONS

7.1 Mayor's Blue Ribbon Task Force on Skills Development - Progress Report and Update (PED15164) (City Wide)

8. DISCUSSION ITEMS

8.1 Advisory Committee for Persons with Disabilities Report 18-007, July 10, 2018
8.2 City Wide Transportation Master Plan Review and Update

8.2.a City Wide Transportation Master Plan Review and Update - Supplementary Report (PED18137(a)) (City Wide) 154

8.2.b City Wide Transportation Master Plan Review and Update (PED18137) (City Wide) (Tabled at the

Due to Bulk, Appendix “A” to Report PED18137 is available online only.

8.3 City Manager Recruitment Process (HUR18013) (CityWide) 342

8.4 Sports, Entertainment and Convention Venues Review (PED18168) (City Wide) 346

9. MOTIONS

10. NOTICES OF MOTION

11. GENERAL INFORMATION / OTHER BUSINESS

11.1 Amendments to the Outstanding Business List:

11.1.a Items to be Removed:

11.1.a.a REVISED: City Manager's 2017 Performance Review (Public and confidential portions of the Performance Review - No longer required)

11.1.a.b Recovery of the City of Hamilton Costs for the Implementation of Cannabis Legalization (Addressed as Item 6, GIC Report 18-015, FCS18052)

11.1.b Proposed New Due Dates:

11.1.b.a Feasibility of a Fashion Incubator at the Former Eastmount School Site (PED17114 TABLED pending additional information)

   Current Due Date: June 20, 2018
   Proposed New Due Date: January 16, 2019
11.1.b.b Former Eastmount Park Elementary School Site -  
Opportunities for Not-for-Profit Community Groups

Current Due Date: June 20, 2018

Proposed New Due Date: January 16, 2019

12. PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL

12.1 Closed Session Minutes, July 9, 2018

Pursuant to Section 8.1, Sub-sections (b), (c), (e) and (f) of the City's Procedural By-law 14-300; and, Section 239(2), Sub-sections (b), (c), (e), (f), (i) and (k) of the Ontario Municipal Act, 2001, as amended, as the subject matters pertain to personal matters about an identifiable individual, including City employees; a proposed or pending acquisition or disposition of land for City purposes; litigation or potential litigation, including matters before administrative tribunals, affecting the City; the receiving of advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose; a trade secret or scientific, technical, commercial, financial or labour relations information, supplied in confidence to the municipality or local board, which, if disclosed, could reasonably be expected to prejudice significantly the competitive position or interfere significantly with the contractual or other negotiations of a person, group of persons, or organization; and, a position, plan, procedure, criteria or instruction to be applied to any negotiations carried on or to be carried on by or on behalf of the municipality or local board.

12.2 Potential Litigation Relating to Sewer Damage  
(LS14035(c)/PW14114(c)) (Wards 10 and 11)

Pursuant to Section 8.1, Sub-sections (e) and (f) of the City's Procedural By-law 14-300, and Section 239(2), Sub-sections (e) and (f) of the Ontario Municipal Act, 2001, as amended, as the subject matter pertains to litigation or potential litigation, including matters before administrative tribunals, affecting the City; and, the receiving of advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose.
12.3 Partial Acquisition of Industrial Land - Rymal Road East (PED18176) 
(Ward 11)

Pursuant to Section 8.1, Sub-section (c) of the City's Procedural By-law 
14-300, and Section 239(2), Sub-section (c) of the *Ontario Municipal 
Act*, 2001, as amended, as the subject matter pertains to a proposed or 
pending acquisition or disposition of land for City purposes.

12.4 New Cellular Ground Tower Lease at Sherwood Park, Stoney Creek 
(PED18179) (Ward 10)

Report PED18179 and its Appendix "A" are public information.

Discussion of Appendix "B" to Report PED18179, would be pursuant to 
Section 8.1, Sub-section (c) of the City's Procedural By-law 14-300, and 
Section 239(2), Sub-section (c) of the *Ontario Municipal Act*, 2001, as 
amended, as the subject matter pertains to a proposed or pending 
acquisition or disposition of land for City purposes.

12.5 Waste Management System Development - Materials Recycling Facility 
Operations Contract (PW16059(e)/LS18047)

Pursuant to Section 8.1, Sub-sections (e) and (f) of the City's Procedural 
By-law 14-300; and, Section 239(2), Sub-sections (e), (f), (i) and (k) of 
the *Ontario Municipal Act*, 2001, as amended, as the subject matter 
pertains to litigation or potential litigation, including matters before 
administrative tribunals, affecting the City; the receiving of advice that is 
subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary 
for that purpose; a trade secret or scientific, technical, commercial, 
financial or labour relations information, supplied in confidence to the 
municipality or local board, which, if disclosed, could reasonably be 
expected to prejudice significantly the competitive position or interfere 
significantly with the contractual or other negotiations of a person, group 
of persons, or organization; and, a position, plan, procedure, criteria or 
instruction to be applied to any negotiations carried on or to be carried 
on by or on behalf of the municipality or local board.
*12.6  Chedoke Creek Contamination (PW18076/LS18049) (City Wide)

Pursuant to Section 8.1, Sub-sections (e) and (f) of the City's Procedural By-law 14-300; and, Section 239(2), Sub-sections (e), (f) and (k) of the Ontario Municipal Act, 2001, as amended, as the subject matter pertains to litigation or potential litigation, including matters before administrative tribunals, affecting the City; the receiving of advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose; and, a position, plan, procedure, criteria or instruction to be applied to any negotiations carried on or to be carried on by or on behalf of the municipality or local board.

13.  ADJOURNMENT
INFORMATION REPORT

TO: Mayor and Members
General Issues Committee

COMMITTEE DATE: August 13, 2018

SUBJECT/REPORT NO: City Wide Transportation Master Plan Review and Update - Supplementary Report (PED18137(a)) (City Wide) (Outstanding Business List Item)

WARD(S) AFFECTED: City Wide

PREPARED BY: Steve Molloy (905) 546-2424 Ext. 2975

SUBMITTED BY: Brian Hollingworth
Director, Transportation Planning and Parking Planning and Economic Development Department

SIGNATURE:  

Council Direction:

At the June 20, 2018 General Issues Committee meeting, the following motion was approved:

That Report PED18137, respecting the City Wide Transportation Master Plan Review and Update, be TABLED until such time as staff reports back to the General Issues Committee with a supplementary report that provides detailed listings outlining the following, with cost, regarding the projects outlined in the Transportation Master Plan:

(i) Which projects are covered under the Ten-Year Capital Strategy;

(ii) Which projects are covered under Public Transportation Infrastructure Funding (PTIF);

(iii) Which projects are dependent on funding from other levels of government; and,

(iv) Which projects do not have a funding source.

Information:

(i) In the Council approved 2018 – 2027 City Capital Forecast, staff has prioritized approximately $110 M of growth roads which the City’s ten-year financial plan
can support based on current growth patterns and revenue forecasts. Sixteen projects are identified within the current Ten-Year Capital Strategy (TYCS), as identified in Appendix “A” to this Report. In addition, there are 18 other projects that have been identified in the Development Charges (DC) Background Study, but are outside of the current TYCS. Funding for projects in the DC Background Study, but are outside of the TYCS, will depend on the City’s growth forecasts (GRIDS) being met. In some cases, costs to undertake pre-requisite Phases 3-4 Environmental Assessments (EA) are included in the TYCS. Once the EA requirements are fulfilled, some of these projects could potentially be incorporated into future iterations of the TYCS. These are also incorporated into Appendix “A”.

The Transportation Master Plan (TMP) also identifies a list of proposed Cycling Network Projects (CNP). CNP are funded through a combination of the Capital Budget and Provincial programs. Twenty-three projects in the Cycling Master Plan have been identified for completion by 2020, based on committed funding.

(ii) The Public Transit Infrastructure Fund (PTIF) was initially announced in August 2016. A second phase, PTIF Phase II, was announced on March 22, 2017. Reports FCS18048 and PW18054 provide details on the maximum amounts allocated to the City. The following projects have been identified for funding through the Public Transit Infrastructure Fund (PTIF) Phase I:

(a) Birch Avenue two-way conversion;
(b) Transit Maintenance and Storage Facility; and,
(c) Corridor Capacity (transit signal priority) on Upper James.

The identification of projects to be funded, as part of PTIF Phase II, will be presented to Council in a future report for consideration. Candidate projects include the balance of the Local Ten-Year Transit Strategy, enhanced shelters and amenities, fleet enhancements, and terminals.

(iii) A number of transit and bicycle projects currently benefit from funding from other levels of government.

(a) Transit Projects
   (i) Funded by Metrolinx (Provincial)
       1. B-Line Light Rail Transit (LRT); and,
       2. Frid Street extension (as part of LRT).

(b) Bicycle Network Projects
   (i) Partially funded by the Ontario Municipal Commuter Cycling (80%)
       1. SoBi Enhancement;
2. Bicycle Parking;
3. HSR Bus Racks;
4. Creighton Road;
5. Hunter Street;
6. Charlton Avenue;
7. Claremont Access/West 5th Street;
8. SoBi Expansion;
9. King Street @ Redhill Valley Parkway;
10. Limeridge Road;
11. Barton Street;
12. Highway 8;
13. Kitty Murray Lane;
14. Stonehenge Drive; and,
15. Hatt Street/Dundas Street.

The TMP identifies the need to be funding ready, as opportunities arise from higher levels of government and other funding sources.

(iv) There are 59 unfunded road network improvement projects identified in the TMP, as identified in Appendix “A” to the Report. The majority of these projects are growth related projects, with over 70% attributed to the Airport Employment Growth District.

Costs associated with other initiatives, such as the Hamilton Strategic Road Safety Program (HSRSP), and Vision Zero (VZ), road rehabilitations, intersection improvements, full completion of sidewalk gaps, and, full-build out of the remaining rapid transit network, are not included within the TMP as these initiatives will be presented to Council in the future. Some of these existing programs have associated funding sources. Costs for Provincial highway improvements, and any contributions that may be required by the City are also not included in the TMP. The policies within the TMP support these initiatives and it recognizes the need for additional transportation planning support and business-case analysis. The TMP also recognizes the financial constraints of the City and its peers’ and has identified the need to undertake a revenue tools study to identify what may be applicable and palatable to Council for use.

APPENDICES AND SCHEDULES ATTACHED

Appendix “A” - Network Improvement Projects

BH:SM:cr
# NETWORK IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference Document¹</th>
<th>10-Year Capital Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airport Access Route</td>
<td>URHVP</td>
<td>Hwy 6</td>
<td>New or defined route using existing roads</td>
<td>GMS</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Road</td>
<td>Terminal Access Road</td>
<td>East Cargo Road</td>
<td>Road Widening (two to four lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Road</td>
<td>Butter Road</td>
<td>Glancaster Road</td>
<td>Road Widening (two to four lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Service Road</td>
<td>Glancaster</td>
<td>Airport Road</td>
<td>New Road (four lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancaster New E/W Road (Trinity@Wilson Development)</td>
<td>Tradewind/Cormorant</td>
<td>Trinity Road</td>
<td>New Road (two lanes)</td>
<td>ATMP</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arvin Avenue</td>
<td>Jones Road</td>
<td>existing east end</td>
<td>New Road (two lanes)</td>
<td>SCUBE TMP/Arvin Ave EA</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arvin Avenue</td>
<td>McNeilly</td>
<td>Lewis Road</td>
<td>New Road (two lanes)</td>
<td>SCUBE TMP/Arvin Ave EA</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arvin Avenue</td>
<td>McNeilly</td>
<td>existing west end</td>
<td>New Road (two lanes)</td>
<td>SCUBE TMP/Arvin Ave EA</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binbrook Road</td>
<td>Fletcher Road</td>
<td>Binhaven Road</td>
<td>Road Widening (two to three lanes and urbanization)</td>
<td>BVTMP</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Road</td>
<td>Southcote Road</td>
<td>Highway 6</td>
<td>Road Widening (two rural to four lanes urban cross section)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burke Street</td>
<td>Dundas Street</td>
<td>Mountain Brow</td>
<td>New Road (four lanes)</td>
<td>WATMP/Waterdown Road EA</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Name</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference Document¹</td>
<td>10-Year Capital Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butter Road</td>
<td>Fiddler's Green Road</td>
<td>Airport Road</td>
<td>Road Widening (two to four lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Street</td>
<td>King Street</td>
<td>York Boulevard</td>
<td>two-way conversion</td>
<td>DTMP</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carluke Road East</td>
<td>Fiddler's Green Road</td>
<td>Glancaster Road</td>
<td>Road Widening (two to four lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Road 1E</td>
<td>Collector 6N</td>
<td>Dickenson Road</td>
<td>New road (north-south collector two-lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Road 1N</td>
<td>Southcote Road</td>
<td>Collector Road 2E</td>
<td>New road (east-west collector four-lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Road 1S</td>
<td>Fiddler's Green Road</td>
<td>Collector Road 9W</td>
<td>New road (east-west collector two-lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Road 2E</td>
<td>Collector Road 1N</td>
<td>Airport Boundary</td>
<td>New road (north-south collector two-lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Road 2N</td>
<td>Collector Road 7N</td>
<td>Smith Road</td>
<td>New road (east-west collector two-lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Road 2S</td>
<td>Fiddler's Green Road</td>
<td>Collector Road 9W</td>
<td>New road (east-west collector two-lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Road 2W</td>
<td>Garner Road</td>
<td>Collector Road 10N</td>
<td>New road (north-south collector two-lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Road 2W</td>
<td>Collector Road 10N</td>
<td>Dickinson Road extension</td>
<td>New road (north-south collector two-lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Name</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference Document</td>
<td>10-Year Capital Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Road 3E</td>
<td>Collector 12S</td>
<td>White Church Road</td>
<td>New road (north-south collector two-lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Road 3S</td>
<td>Collector 6W</td>
<td>Southcote Road</td>
<td>New road (east-west collector two-lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Road 4E</td>
<td>Collector 12S</td>
<td>White Church Road</td>
<td>New road (north-south collector two-lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Road 5E</td>
<td>Collector 12S</td>
<td>White Church Road</td>
<td>New road (north-south collector two-lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Road 5N</td>
<td>Fiddler's Green Road</td>
<td>Collector Road 8W</td>
<td>New road (east-west collector two-lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Road 6N</td>
<td>Glancaster Road</td>
<td>Collector Road 6E</td>
<td>New road (east-west collector four-lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Road 6N</td>
<td>Collector Road 6E</td>
<td>Collector Road 7E</td>
<td>New road (east-west collector four-lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Road 6E</td>
<td>Collector 6N</td>
<td>Dickenson Road</td>
<td>New road (north-south collector two-lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Road 6W</td>
<td>Collector 3S</td>
<td>Butter Road</td>
<td>New road (north-south collector two-lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Road 6S</td>
<td>Glancaster Road (north)</td>
<td>Airport Road</td>
<td>New road (east-west collector two-lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Road 6S</td>
<td>Airport Road</td>
<td>Glancaster Road (south)</td>
<td>New road (east-west collector two-lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Name</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference Document¹</td>
<td>10-Year Capital Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Road 7E</td>
<td>Dickenson Road</td>
<td>Collector 6N</td>
<td>New road (north-south collector two-lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Road 7E</td>
<td>Collector 6N</td>
<td>Upper James Street</td>
<td>New road (north-south collector four-lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Road 7N</td>
<td>Book Road</td>
<td>Southcote Road</td>
<td>New road (north-south collector two-lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Road 7N</td>
<td>Southcote Road</td>
<td>Collector Road 2W</td>
<td>New road (east-west collector two-lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Road 7S</td>
<td>Fiddler’s Green Road</td>
<td>Collector 9W</td>
<td>New road (east-west collector two-lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Road 8S</td>
<td>Fiddler’s Green Road</td>
<td>Collector 9W</td>
<td>New road (east-west collector two-lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Road 8W</td>
<td>Garner Road</td>
<td>Collector 5N</td>
<td>New road (north-south collector two-lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Road 9W</td>
<td>Garner Road</td>
<td>Carluke Road</td>
<td>New road (north-south collector two-lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Road 10N</td>
<td>Garner Road</td>
<td>Smith Road</td>
<td>New road (east-west collector two-lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Road 10N</td>
<td>Smith Road</td>
<td>Collector Road 2W</td>
<td>New road (east-west collector two-lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Road 12S</td>
<td>Collector 4E</td>
<td>Collector 5E</td>
<td>New road (east-west collector two-lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Name</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference Document</td>
<td>10-Year Capital Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Road 12S</td>
<td>Collector 3E</td>
<td>Collector 4E</td>
<td>New road (east-west collector two-lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartnall Road</td>
<td>Twenty Road</td>
<td>Dickinson Road</td>
<td>New Road (configuration pending phase 3-4 of EA)</td>
<td>RHBPS</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson Road</td>
<td>Glancaster Road</td>
<td>Upper James Street</td>
<td>Road Widening (two to four lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson Road extension</td>
<td>Southcote Road</td>
<td>Smith Road</td>
<td>Road Widening (two to four lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson Road extension</td>
<td>Smith Road</td>
<td>Glancaster Road</td>
<td>New Road (four lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundas Street</td>
<td>New north-south link</td>
<td>Hamilton Boundary</td>
<td>Road Widening (four to six lanes)</td>
<td>WATMP</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-West Road Corridor (Waterdown by-pass)</td>
<td>Hamilton Boundary</td>
<td>New Road</td>
<td>New Road (four to six lanes)</td>
<td>WATMP</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiddler's Green Road</td>
<td>Garner Road</td>
<td>Carluke Road</td>
<td>Road Widening (two to four lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frid Street</td>
<td>Longwood Road</td>
<td>Chatham Street</td>
<td>New Road (two lanes)</td>
<td>KNTMP/ LRT</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garth Street extension</td>
<td>Twenty Road</td>
<td>Dickinson Road</td>
<td>New Road (four lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garth Street extension</td>
<td>Dickinson Road</td>
<td>Collector 2E</td>
<td>New Road (four lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Name</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference Document¹</td>
<td>10-Year Capital Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garner Road</td>
<td>Fiddler's Green Road</td>
<td>Glancaster Road</td>
<td>Road Widening (two to four lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD/Garner-Garth EA</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garner Road / Wilson St / Hwy 2</td>
<td>Fiddler’s Green Road</td>
<td>Hwy 2</td>
<td>Road Widening (two to three/four lanes)</td>
<td>ATMP</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glancaster Road</td>
<td>Garner Road</td>
<td>Dickenson Road</td>
<td>Road Widening (two to four lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glancaster Road</td>
<td>Butter Road</td>
<td>White Church Road</td>
<td>Road Widening (to four lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glancaster Road</td>
<td>Dickenson Road extension</td>
<td>Collector 1N</td>
<td>Road Widening (two to four lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Dean Avenue (former Fruitland Road By-pass, Collector Road “A” in FWSP)⁵</td>
<td>Barton Road</td>
<td>Highway 8</td>
<td>New Road (configuration pending phase 3-4 of EA)</td>
<td>Fruitland Road EA</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hess Street N.</td>
<td>York Boulevard</td>
<td>Barton Street</td>
<td>two-way conversion</td>
<td>DTMP</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 5/6 interchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City’s portion includes service roads</td>
<td>MTO/FIP</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohawk Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hwy 403 WB on-ramp</td>
<td>ATMP</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Brow Road</td>
<td>Waterdown Road</td>
<td>New north-south link</td>
<td>Road Widening (two to four lanes)</td>
<td>WATMP</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Name</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference Document</td>
<td>10-Year Capital Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Street N.</td>
<td>York Boulevard</td>
<td>Barton Street</td>
<td>two-way conversion</td>
<td>DTMP</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Street</td>
<td>Cannon Street</td>
<td>Barton Street</td>
<td>Street conversion (one-way to two-way)</td>
<td>STMP</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkside Drive</td>
<td>Churchill</td>
<td>New north-south link</td>
<td>Road Widening (two rural to four urban lanes)</td>
<td>WATMP</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Road 56</td>
<td>Rymal Road</td>
<td>Terryberry Road</td>
<td>Road Widening (two to four lanes and urbanization)</td>
<td>ROPA 9</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rymal/Garner Road</td>
<td>Glancaster Road</td>
<td>Upper Paradise (was Garth)</td>
<td>Road Widening (two to five lanes)</td>
<td>SMATS/AEGD Garner-Garth EA</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rymal/ Road</td>
<td>Fletcher Road</td>
<td>Upper Centennial</td>
<td>Road Widening (two to five lanes)</td>
<td>ROPA 9</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCUBE TMP West (north-south collector) (Collector Road &quot;C&quot; in FWSP)²</td>
<td>Barton Road</td>
<td>Highway 8</td>
<td>New Road (configuration pending phase 3-4 of EA)</td>
<td>SCUBE TMP/FWSP</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCUBE TMP West (east-west collector) (Collector Road &quot;B&quot; in FWSP; revised to terminate at Jones Road)²</td>
<td>Fruitland Road</td>
<td>north-south collector (revised to Jones Road in FWSP)</td>
<td>New Road (configuration pending phase 3-4 of EA)</td>
<td>SCUBE TMP/FWSP</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCUBE TMP Central (north-south collector) (Collector Road &quot;F&quot; in FWSP; revised to connect to Lewis Road)²</td>
<td>eastern boundary (revised to Lewis Road in FWSP)</td>
<td>Arvin Road extension</td>
<td>New Road (configuration pending phase 3-4 of EA)</td>
<td>SCUBE TMP/FWSP</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Name</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference Document¹</td>
<td>10-Year Capital Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCUBE TMP Central (north-south collector)</td>
<td>McNeill Road</td>
<td>Lewis Road</td>
<td>New Road (configuration pending phase 3-4 of EA)</td>
<td>SCUBE TMP/FWSP</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Collector “E” in FWSP)²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCUBE TMP Central (east-west collector)</td>
<td>McNeill Road</td>
<td>eastern boundary</td>
<td>New Road (configuration pending phase 3-4 of EA)</td>
<td>SCUBE TMP/FWSP</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector “D” in FWSP)²</td>
<td></td>
<td>collector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith Road</td>
<td>Dickenson Road</td>
<td>Collector 1N</td>
<td>Road Widening (two to four lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith Road (excluding hydro corridor)</td>
<td>Garner Road</td>
<td>Dickenson Road</td>
<td>New Road (two lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith Road extension</td>
<td>Hydro corridor north</td>
<td>New Road (two lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crossing</td>
<td></td>
<td>crossing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southcote Road</td>
<td>Golf Links / Calder</td>
<td>Garner Road</td>
<td>Road Widening (two-rural to three-urban cross-section)</td>
<td>ATMP</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southcote Road</td>
<td>Garner Road</td>
<td>Twenty Road extension</td>
<td>Road Widening (configuration pending phase 3-4 of EA)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southcote Road</td>
<td>Twenty Road extension</td>
<td>Book Road</td>
<td>Road Widening (two to four lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southcote Road</td>
<td>Book Road</td>
<td>Collector 1N</td>
<td>Road Widening (two to four lanes)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Church Road</td>
<td>Harrogate Drive</td>
<td>Stonehenge Drive</td>
<td>Road Widening (two to four lanes)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Road</td>
<td>1km S. of Wilson</td>
<td>Hwy 403</td>
<td>Road Widening</td>
<td>AIP</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Name</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference Document</td>
<td>10-Year Capital Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty Road extension</td>
<td>Glover Road</td>
<td>Upper Red Hill Valley Drive</td>
<td>New Road (configuration pending phase 3-4 of EA)</td>
<td>RHBPS</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty Road</td>
<td>Glancaster Road</td>
<td>Aldercrest Avenue</td>
<td>Road Widening (two to four lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty Road extension</td>
<td>Southcote Road</td>
<td>Glancaster Road</td>
<td>New Road (four lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper James Street</td>
<td>Alderlea Avenue</td>
<td>Homestead Drive</td>
<td>Road Widening (four to six lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Red Hill Valley Parkway (previously Trinity Church Road)</td>
<td>Rymal Road</td>
<td>Dartnall Road extension</td>
<td>New Road (configuration pending phase 3-4 of EA)</td>
<td>ROPA 9/ RHBPS</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Wellington Street</td>
<td>Rymal Road</td>
<td>Stone Church Road</td>
<td>Road Widening (two to four lanes, LINC to S. Church only)</td>
<td>SMATS</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stone Church Road</td>
<td>South of LINC</td>
<td>Road Widening</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Avenue North</td>
<td>Ferrie</td>
<td>Burlington Street</td>
<td>two-way conversion</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Church Road</td>
<td>Glancaster Road</td>
<td>Highway 6</td>
<td>Road Widening (two to four lanes)</td>
<td>AEGD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Reference documents are identified in the TMP review and update (Reference List).

2 Cost sharing for collector/arterial roadways will be in accordance with the City's current Comprehensive Development Guidelines and Financial Policies Manual.

Note: The project list does not include projects such as road urbanizations, minor/major road rehabilitation, minor intersection improvements, stand-alone two-way-left-turn lane projects etc.
RECOMMENDATION

(a) That the City of Hamilton Transportation Master Plan (TMP) review and update, attached as Appendix “A” to Report PED18137, be approved;

(b) That the General Manager of the Planning and Economic Development Department be authorized and directed to file the City of Hamilton Transportation Master Plan (TMP) review and update with the Municipal Clerk for a minimum forty-five day public review period;

(c) That upon completion of the public review period the applicable unfunded City of Hamilton Transportation Master Plan (TMP) recommendations be submitted as part of the annual Capital Budget approval process;

(d) That the “Wards 1, 2 and 3 One-Way to Two-Way Street Study Group” be identified as completed and removed from the Public Works Committee Outstanding Business List;

(e) That Impacts of a Change in the 2007 City of Hamilton Transportation Master Plan (TMP) Recommended Policy be identified as completed and removed from the General Issues Committee Outstanding Business List;
(f) That the City of Hamilton Transportation Master Plan (TMP) be identified as completed and removed from the General Issues Committee Outstanding Business List.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The City of Hamilton Transportation Master Plan: City in Motion (TMP) is a comprehensive review and update of the 2007 TMP that continues to plan and build for the 2031 planning horizon and beyond. Ultimately, the City of Hamilton (the “City”) is working toward achieving positive outcomes that align with the City’s strategic plan and vision to be the best place to raise a child and age successfully. The TMP review and update is a long-range strategic policy document that establishes the framework (or lens) that future transportation-related projects should be viewed under.

The TMP review and update was undertaken according to the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process (Municipal Engineers Association (MEA), October 2000, as amended in 2007, 2011, and 2015) for Master Plans (Approach 1).

Council’s endorsement of the TMP review and update establishes the strategic policy direction and decision-making framework that guides the development of individual transportation-related projects within the City.

Since the previous TMP, the City has been changing. Population and employment growth, demographic shifts, and technological change continue to shape citizen values. Accordingly, through consultation with the public, a revised vision for transportation in the City was established that reflects the priorities of its citizens, the City’s strategic plan and objectives. It reads as follows:

“To provide a comprehensive and attainable transportation blueprint for Hamilton as a whole that balances all modes of transportation to become a healthier city. The success of the plan will be based on specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and programmed results.”

The revised vision identified in the TMP review and update is closely aligned with the City’s Strategic Plan. Three desired outcomes for the transportation system were identified through the TMP review and update process and relate to four of the seven City Strategic Plan priorities. Desired outcomes are as follows:

- A sustainable and balanced transportation system;

- Healthy and safe communities; and,

- Economic prosperity and growth.
The TMP includes seventy-two key specific actions focused on the achievement of these outcomes. These actions are summarized in Table ES.3 in the Executive Summary of the TMP (attached as Appendix “A” to Report PED18137) along with their timing and involvement of partners.

A number of future studies and initiatives were identified as part of the TMP review and update to investigate issues in further detail, which will be incorporated within Capital Budget submissions, including:

- Complete-Liveable-Better Streets Design Manual;
- Cycling Master Plan Review;
- Travel Demand Model model management;
- Escarpment Crossings (People Mover) Study;
- Goods Movement Study Review/ Update;
- Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Strategy; and,
- Lincoln Alexander Parkway (LINC) and Red Hill Valley Parkway (RHVP) Widening Feasibility;
- Multi-Modal Level of Service Guideline;
- Pedestrian Mobility Plan Review;
- Revenue Tools Study;
- TMP Review;
- Truck Route Master Plan Review;
- Highway 403 Connections Study.

The TMP review and update is provided as Appendix “A” to Report PED18137.

**Alternatives for Consideration – See Page 15**

**FINANCIAL – STAFFING – LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Financial: The work plan relating to future studies are identified within the TMP review and update and require future Capital Budget approval. Approval of this document provides direction to proceed with these requests within the timeframe identified. The outcomes of these studies will assist in refining the capital and operating costs of policy changes. An example of this is the development of a Complete-Livable-Better Streets manual. The change in the design approach to streets will have capital and operating impacts. Through the development of this manual, the potential Capital and Operating cost implications will be more accurately ascertained.
Road network improvements have been identified in the TMP review and update. The outcome of this plan validates the list of road network improvement projects identified in other sub-area studies within the City. Implementation of the improvements will be included in future Capital Budget submissions along with other City priorities. Similarly walking, cycling and transit improvements will continue to be included in future budget submissions based on their respective plans.

Staffing: No immediate staffing enhancements are being requested at this time. However, through continuous improvement, the consideration for the future re-allocation of staff and/or resources may be considered, or if necessary, additional staff through a future enhancement request.

Legal: N/A

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

In 2007, Council adopted the Hamilton Transportation Master Plan. Since that time, several initiatives have occurred, technological advances have taken place, and public attitudes and values have changed. Master plans are generally updated every five-years or when a change occurs that may trigger a review.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND LEGISLATED REQUIREMENTS

The TMP review and update is a long-range strategic policy document that establishes the framework (or lens) that future transportation-related projects and priorities should be viewed under. Therefore, approval of this document will influence the development of new plans as well as the review and update of other Municipal plans and initiatives. Likewise, the development of various Corporate plans, policies, and initiatives also influence the TMP review and update. They provide an opportunity to refine strategic policies based on a more detailed investigation of various issues. A summary of affected policy documents are identified below:

- Age-Friendly Plan;
- Asset Management Plan;
- Community Climate Change Action Plan;
- Corporate Energy Policy;
- Cycling Master Plan;
- Official Plans (Urban and Rural);
- Pedestrian Mobility Plan;
- Rapid Ready;
- Recreational Trails Master Plan;
- Smart Commute Hamilton (TDM);
- Corporate Strategic Plan;
• Economic Development Action Plan;
• Goods Movement Study;
• GRIDS;
• Hamilton Strategic Road Safety Program.

The TMP review and update was also developed in concert with Master Plan initiatives being undertaken by adjacent municipalities, as well as Provincial initiatives that provided inputs into the policy development contained within this document.

RELEVANT CONSULTATION

Public and stakeholder engagement was an important component of the TMP review and update. Extensive public engagement activities were undertaken across Hamilton throughout the study. The engagement approach applied went above and beyond the requirements of the EA process and embodied the eight core principles of public engagement identified in the City’s Public Engagement Charter. The engagement approach included three levels of participation: inform (providing the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problems, alternatives, opportunities and/or solutions); consult (obtaining public feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decisions); and involve (working directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered).

Throughout the study process, both internal City staff and external stakeholders were engaged. Many different opportunities, forms, and options for participating in the review of the TMP were offered. A summary of engagement activities is provided below:

• Project Webpage: The website obtained over 10,000 hits between April 2015 and February 2017, which was the peak period of community engagement process.
• Surveys: Three on-line surveys with over 1,018 respondents. Two stakeholder surveys relating to goods movement and small business represented by the Business Improvement Areas and larger employers.
• Traditional Meetings: Four stages of traditional PICs were held for a total of 14 meetings with 326 attendees. Notices were advertised in
the Hamilton Spectator (At Your Service Section) and the community newspapers consistent with City practice.

- Pop-Up Engagement: City staff attended 30 events and festivals (e.g. Ribfest) held throughout the City, which engaged approximately 1,500 people.

- Speaking Engagements: City staff attended seven events to discuss various transportation planning trends and the TMP specifically (e.g. Age-Friendly Symposium). Approximately 600 people were engaged in this manner.

Stakeholders, including Council sub-committees, were also engaged to provide feedback, as well as other internal and external stakeholder meetings. Approximately 150 people were engaged using this method.

A summary of the feedback from the community using these different forms of engagement is documented in the TMP. In addition to public engagement, extensive internal engagement was undertaken throughout the plan development.

- Staff: An internal multi-departmental project team consisting of staff members from across the City. The draft report was circulated across multiple Departments and Divisions for comments. Collaboration between other studies undertaken or in consultation with the City was an important part of the plan development. This was an important part of the plan to ensure message consistency and a unified strategic direction (e.g. Our Future Hamilton: Strategic Plan, Light Rail Transit B-Line Planning, and Metrolinx: Big Move review and update)

- Council: A presentation to Council was made at the initial stage of the TMP review and update process to confirm the scope of work and inform Council on the strategy to undertake the planning process. Information updates and one-on-one meetings were also included to inform Council on the progress and direction of the planning process.

- Communications: Social media was used during the plan development primarily as a method to inform the community on upcoming public meetings, engagement and on-line surveys. Information bulletins were also created during the period of the final report creation to simplify the messages within the TMP review and update document.
ANALYSIS AND RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

Catalysts of Change

Hamilton’s population and employment is anticipated to grow approximately 22.9% between 2016 and 2031, and employment is expected to increase by approximately 23.4% between 2011 and 2031. In addition, demographics will continue to change, travel patterns and preferences will evolve, and technology will increasingly influence travel choices and the operation of the transportation system.

Through consultation with the public in the initial stages of this TMP review and update, and consideration of the above influencing factors, a revised vision for transportation in the City was established. This revised vision reflects the priorities of its citizens and the City’s strategic plan and objectives. It reads as follows:

“To provide a comprehensive and attainable transportation blueprint for Hamilton as a whole that balances all modes of transportation to become a healthier city. The success of the plan will be based on specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and programmed results.”

Evaluation of Transportation System Alternatives

An evaluation of existing conditions is necessary to provide a baseline as a comparison to future performance. Analysis of existing conditions identified five areas of the network that present challenges to accommodating future growth and change:

- RHVP/Queen Elisabeth Way (QEW);
- Highway 403/ York Boulevard corridors;
- Highway 403/ Main Street West/ Wilson Street corridors;
- Downtown corridors; and,
- West Mountain escarpment crossings.

A “2031 Do Nothing” model scenario was run to gain a better understanding of the impacts if no further road network improvements were undertaken. Accordingly, the areas of concern identified under the existing conditions remained or expanded to affect other areas of the system. Further, additional areas of concern developed in locations primarily driven by expanded residential growth areas. Accordingly, it was determined that additional alternatives are required.
A “2031 Base Case” scenario was developed to incorporate previously approved and forecasted infrastructure improvements. These improvements were derived from sub-area plans; Council approved initiatives as well as the Capital Budget; and the modal split targets for transit and active transportation. The scenario results validate the need for the previously approved improvements. Notwithstanding these improvements, the analysis of the outputs from the City’s Travel Demand Forecasting (EMME) Model identified that there would still be capacity deficiencies and pinch points along strategic road links under the 2031 Base Case scenario. Alternative solutions to address these deficiencies were therefore identified.

Four alternatives were examined to determine how well they would meet the needs of the City’s transportation system to 2031. These included:

- Alternative A: Widen Highway 403/QEW;
- Alternative B: Localized Improvements (including increasing active transportation and strategic transit enhancements between the lower and upper City);
- Alternative C: Localized Improvements plus widening of LINC and RHVP to six lanes; and,
- Alternative D: Localized Improvements plus widening of LINC and RHVP to six lanes plus widening of Highway 403/QEW.

Since no single approach is likely to solve all transportation problems, Alternative D is the preferred long-term solution that the City should continue to work towards. However, this long-term solution is not without challenges. For example, improvements to the transportation system such as the expansion of the LINC and RHVP would not be effective without addressing pinch points associated with the Provincial freeway network (QEW and Highway 403). Any capacity gained through the LINC and RHVP expansion until these pinch points are resolved would be negated. Further investigation into the sustainability of future expansion should be undertaken, including the integration of high-occupancy lane alternatives. In addition, consideration of other mitigation techniques to management traffic on the Parkways would also be part of the solution before implementing additional lanes.

Other long-term and interim solutions to the transportation system that are within the City’s control regarding localized improvements were also explored. Additional sensitivity testing was undertaken regarding localized network improvements including the following:
• Scenario 1: Escarpment Crossings

Network performance at escarpment crossings is a key issue for residents as these routes provide access for all modes across the natural barrier to and from the Downtown core. The Escarpment crossing scenarios developed included:

a. Scenario 1a: Claremont Access as two lanes up, two lanes down;
b. Scenario 1b: Removal of peak-hour lane control system on Sherman Cut; and,
c. Scenario 1c: Combines Scenarios 1a and 1a.

• Scenario 2: Transit Needs and Opportunities

The purpose of this assessment was to determine the system impacts associated with the potential exclusive use of James Mountain Road by transit, walking and cycling modes. This assessment was also intended to assess the transportation system performance along transit route corridors, to determine which locations that would benefit from transit priority measures.

• Scenario 3: Street Conversions

The purpose of this assessment was to identify the system impacts associated with street conversions (one-way to two-way). This scenario was executed according to three scenario subsets specific to the impacts associated with Main Street, including:

a. Paradise Road North to the Delta;
b. Queen Street North to the Delta; and,
c. Wellington Street to the Delta.

Based on the outputs of the travel demand model for 2031, the following conclusions have been identified from a transportation systems perspective:

• Scenario 1 Conclusion

Although the Sherman Access appears to operate well, the system would benefit from maintaining the peak hour control system on the Sherman Cut and modernizing the system. Therefore, some further feasibility regarding the interaction and impact on operations and safety between the Sherman Access and the Sherman Cut may be undertaken. The conversion of a southbound lane on the Claremont Access to facilitate walking and cycling trips is acceptable and would increase the connectivity between the central upper and lower City by improving multi-modal options.
• Scenario 2 Conclusion

There are opportunities for transit priority measures along the BLAST network, primarily at locations intersecting the LINC, Escarpment crossings and through dense urban corridors (i.e. Downtown). In terms of James Mountain Road, there would be no benefit to the system if this Escarpment crossing was used exclusively for transit, walking and cycling. Further investigation for transit priority measures to focus on up and downstream efficiencies to improve transit access to James Mountain Road could provide more benefits.

• Scenario 3 Conclusion

The reconfiguration of the Highway 403 interchange ramps at King Street and at Main Street and the detailed impact analysis relating to the up and downstream operations along the mainline and associated costs rely on consultation and coordination with MTO and do not provide any benefit from a system operations perspective. Therefore, the feasibility of scenarios 3a and 3b are not realistic for the foreseeable future. However, scenario 3c does identify potential opportunities and should be examined in more detail to confirm the transportation system benefits. Further investigation into this opportunity, should reflect afternoon (PM) peak operations, and application of the decision-making framework for future conversions is identified later this Report.

Level-of-Service

Historically, the term Level of Service (LOS) implies a qualitative measure often focused on the performance of motor vehicle traffic on streets. Since no comparable LOS measures have been commonly institutionalized for other modes of travel, the balance (and trade-offs) between vehicle delay and its impacts on the quality of travel by other modes are often overlooked. Therefore, the typical outcome of improving LOS is wider roads (and/or intersections) with more travel lanes, higher vehicle volumes, and faster vehicle speeds. These network modifications often degrade conditions for other modes (e.g. walking and cycling), and this trade-off is not incorporated into the standard motor vehicle LOS indicator.

The concept of Complete Streets recognizes the need to provide more multi-modal streets and has marked a shift towards establishing performance measures for all modes: cycling, walking, transit, and vehicular. This all-in-one evaluation tool is referred to as Multimodal Level of Service (MMLOS) and will allow performance measurement on the quality for all modes provide guidance to practitioners on how to assess the various LOS for the different modes of transportation and what the specific target service levels for each mode should be given the location and context of the project.
The MMLOS tools are intended to be applied across a variety of projects that require detailed analysis of transportation impacts. In other words, whenever a project or study requires the completion of LOS analysis, MMLOS should be applied. Scenarios that require MMLOS evaluation may include transportation environmental assessments, corridor studies, neighbourhood traffic management studies, or development projects.

A scan of municipal practices was undertaken as part of the TMP review and update including a review of the LOS approach and is provided in Table 1 (below). Most comparable municipalities apply a LOS ‘D’ or better, which is consistent with Hamilton’s existing policy. Other municipalities are shifting to a LOS ‘E’ or adopting a multimodal approach to LOS as this is a more sustainable practice. To achieve sustainable and balanced outcomes, further investigation is required to create a MMLOS approach and associated guidelines to facilitate the evaluation and implementation of Complete-Livable-Better Streets in Hamilton.

Table 1: Summary Municipal LOS Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/Region</th>
<th>Level of Service Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Hamilton</td>
<td>Multi-modal approach (proposed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>Multi-modal: Further detail analysis if at LOS ‘E’ or greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton Region</td>
<td>Motor-vehicle based LOS ‘E’ or better at screenlines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Motor-vehicle based LOS ‘D’ or better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakville</td>
<td>Motor-vehicle based LOS ‘D’ or better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>Motor-vehicle based LOS ‘E’ or better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Motor-vehicle based LOS ‘D’ or better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara Region</td>
<td>Motor-vehicle based LOS ‘D’ or better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>Multi-modal: Varies by location/mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnipeg</td>
<td>Motor-vehicle based LOS ‘D’ or better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>Multi-modal: varies by mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>Motor-vehicle based for greenfield sites: LOS ‘D’ (10-15 year) and LOS 'E' in 30+ year horizon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complete-Livable-Better Streets

Complete-Livable-Better (CLB) Streets is an approach to right-of-way design (inclusive of streets) that balances the needs of all uses and users regardless of age, ability or mode of transportation in an equitable manner. A CLB streets approach represents a shift from traditional street design approaches with their primary focus on moving vehicular traffic and is rapidly gaining popularity across North America.
A Made in Hamilton version of Complete Streets that adopts a Complete-Livable-Better (CLB) streets approach was developed through the TMP Review and Update. This approach recognizes that no one-size fits all solution is appropriate for street design as different streets can have different priorities. CLB Streets calls for a range of design solutions depending on location, context and future role of the street. The development of a CLB Design Manual and MMLOS guidelines will guide the decision-making process and implementation of CLB streets in Hamilton.

Street Conversions (one-to-two way)

Since its creation there has been ongoing public conversation and debate regarding the impacts of maintaining the one-way street network versus converting those streets to two-way streets. A number of streets have been converted back to their original two-way operation with more streets awaiting conversion based on previously approved sub-area transportation plans and Council direction.

The CLB Streets paradigm and associated policy directions and inputs do not necessarily reflect a “one-design-fits-all” outcome. Streets should be designed and operated to balance the competing needs of all road users regardless of age and ability. It also suggests that streets can be either one-way or two-way, as long as the desired outcomes improve livability within the community. For example, increasing safety and walkability for transit users, in particular, has been highlighted as an important part of increasing transit ridership. As a whole, the CLB streets policies are aimed at raising the profile of other modes relative to the automobile and attaining health, social, economic, and environmental benefits through a more balanced approach to mobility.

The decision-making in regard to converting one-way streets to two-way streets in Hamilton should be informed by a holistic evaluation that addresses not only transportation considerations, but also matters such as: community liveability, street-oriented land use, and the quality and functionality of the pedestrian, cycling and transit environments. Accordingly, a two-stage decision-making framework to address future requests for street conversions was developed.

The first stage of the framework aims to evaluate individual conceptual road design alternatives against the following elements to determine whether a street conversion is preferred: level of comfort; directness of routing; road safety (risk of collision); travel time; emergency response impacts; capital cost impact; and operating cost impact. The second stage of the framework identifies how to prioritize street conversions based upon the City’s Strategic Plan and the TMP’s vision and goals. Application of the framework requires further refinement in collaboration with City staff and through public engagement.
Transportation’s Role within Health and the Built Environment

Health is influenced by determinants outside of the health sector such as the built environment, and social and economic factors, which are known as the determinants of health. The built environment consists of transportation systems, land use patterns, and urban design characteristics. The way it is planned, developed, maintained, and modified can influence health and quality of life. Consequently, collaboration across sectors with interconnecting mandates must be a priority to ensure policy and environments support health and well-being.

The integration of interdepartmental teams and projects to develop healthier built environments is a focus area of Hamilton’s Public Health Services, including sustainable physical activity opportunities, climate change resiliency mitigation and adaptation, and community safety, among others.

The provision of a balanced transportation system that focuses on public transit and active transportation will help facilitate healthy choices by making it an easy, default option through the creation of an environment that provides accessible, affordable, and appealing alternate choices. From the land use perspective, this can be achieved through the development of complete communities that are compact and healthy, providing opportunities to live, work, play, and learn. This will assist in achieving the desired outcome of providing healthy and safe communities.

Cycling Master Plan (review and update)

A review and update of the Cycling Master Plan 2009: Shifting Gears was undertaken as part of the TMP review and update. Between 2009 and 2016 approximately 135 centreline kms of cycling routes was implemented across all cycling facility types. This review primarily incorporates housekeeping changes and includes the following elements: preferred network; cycling facility types and selection considerations; assessment and monitoring; maintenance; supporting programs (e.g. bicycle parking); and implementation.

The intent of the preferred cycling network is to provide a blueprint for a connected system of cycling routes in the City. Maintaining the continuity and integrity of these routes is important to encourage cycling. However, through the implementation process, a refinement of route design and facility type selection is carefully undertaken to promote a connected and safe network. The implementation of a network of cycle tracks is an example that has occurred since 2009.

The existing cycling network has approximately 418 centreline kms of routes across all facility types. The preferred cycling network identifies approximately 972 centreline kms. The remaining 554 centreline kms of network has been identified to be
implemented in generally five different methods for the urban and rural areas of the City: road construction (84 kms urban/196 kms rural); multi-use recreational trails (39 kms urban/31 kms rural); through development (41 kms urban/0 km rural); stand-alone projects within existing infrastructure (123 kms urban/ 31 kms rural); and special projects (9 kms urban/0 km rural). Additional bicycle network can be provided through unbuilt roadways within developments and on roadways within MTO jurisdiction.

**Goods Movement**

The revised goods movement policy developed for the TMP review and update includes a state of the practice review, a review and update of supporting actions, a high-level review of the goods movement network, and consideration for the integration of goods movement with CLB streets and emerging technologies. In general, the review recommended that the 2007 policies be maintained and that several additional policies be added.

During the TMP review and update consultation, the differing needs between small businesses and large employers was identified. Each represents important contributions to Hamilton’s economy and each have their issues related to the movement of goods. This will be a consideration within a review of the goods movement sector strategy, which has been identified within the Economic Development Action Plan and the TMP review and update. In support of this, a review of the Truck Route Master plan study is also identified. Truck routes are one method of goods movement that supports economic development.

**Implementation Strategies**

The delivery approach of recommended studies, initiatives and projects in the TMP review and update is an important consideration. Council has the challenge of balancing many competing budget requests annually in striving to reach the City’s strategic vision. It is important to provide Council and City staff with a framework to assist in decision-making relating to the transportation system.

**Establishing Priorities**

Before a project or program is implemented, the process of prioritization must take place. The TMP review and update provides an influence on the policy direction regarding future capital budget submissions (which could also affect Operating Budget submissions) and scoping of individual projects.
Partnerships

Implementation requires partnerships. It is an integral part of delivering transportation services. Opportunities to work with partners can be a valuable part of the transportation service delivery model. Implementation can involve a combination of one or more partnerships.

State-of-Readiness

The City should be proactive and be prepared in anticipation of changes by being in a “state-of-readiness” for transportation projects and initiatives. This applies to all projects that already have allocated funding or are considered to be priority projects for which the City could expect partial or complete external funding.

Being prepared and leveraging our readiness to maximize the benefits of available funding sources is important (e.g. grant applications). One of the key directions is to prioritize all projects that are candidates for receiving Provincial or Federal funding. This will help to identify the current “state-of-readiness” of the City, and will identify gaps and the critical-path to improve the readiness for future funding opportunities. Potential funding sources should also be identified as part of this process. This will assist in understanding the potential application and implementation requirements, as well as identify any prior approvals that may be needed, such as allocation of matching funds.

Plan Monitoring/Evaluation

Performance measurement is necessary to gauge the effectiveness of the policies, programs and infrastructure improvements in achieving the TMP vision, goals, targets and recommendations identified. Generally, master plans should be reviewed every five years to determine the need for a detailed formal review and update.

The revised monitoring framework includes a number of performance indicators. Some of these indicators are also being considered as part of the City-wide performance dashboard now in development. The value of these performance measures is to identify the policies within the plan that contribute to positive manner consistent with the desired outcomes identified in the TMP review and update.

ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION

Three alternative solutions are identified below:

Alternative 1 - Accept portions of the TMP review and update.
The City could choose to support portions of the TMP review and update. This alternative is not recommended since it will not adequately address the breadth of transportation planning themes across the City of Hamilton. It may or may not contribute to achieving the desired outcomes consistent with the strategic plan.

Alternative 2 - Accept the TMP review and update with additional amendments.

The City could choose to accept the TMP review and update with additional amendments. This alternative is not recommended because it may require additional analysis and associated project budget to determine any impacts posed by the amendments. Future changes may occur during a five-year review of the Plan, which is consistent with the EA process and may be a more suitable course of action.

ALIGNMENT TO THE 2016 – 2025 STRATEGIC PLAN

Community Engagement and Participation
Hamilton has an open, transparent and accessible approach to City government that engages with and empowers all citizens to be involved in their community.

Economic Prosperity and Growth
Hamilton has a prosperous and diverse local economy where people have opportunities to grow and develop.

Healthy and Safe Communities
Hamilton is a safe and supportive city where people are active, healthy, and have a high quality of life.

Clean and Green
Hamilton is environmentally sustainable with a healthy balance of natural and urban spaces.

Built Environment and Infrastructure
Hamilton is supported by state of the art infrastructure, transportation options, buildings and public spaces that create a dynamic City.

Culture and Diversity
Hamilton is a thriving, vibrant place for arts, culture, and heritage where diversity and inclusivity are embraced and celebrated.

Our People and Performance
Hamiltonians have a high level of trust and confidence in their City government.
APPENDICES AND SCHEDULES ATTACHED

Appendix “A”: Transportation Master Plan Review and Update
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