EDMONTON TRANSIT SYSTEM ADVISORY BOARD
MEETING #4, MAY 2, 2011
HERITAGE ROOM, CITY HALL

PRESENT: Vaughan Hoy, Masood Makarechian, Elizabeth Johnston, John Doucette, John Hayes, John Vandenbeld, Leanne Landry, Gordon Smith, Ryan Orchard, Christopher Dulaba, Bruce Robertson, Brian Marcotte

ABSENT: Stu Litwinowich

ETS AND CITY STAFF: Adam Laughlin (Transportation Planning), Mary Ann McConnell-Boehm, Janet Chan, Larry Retzlaff (Planning and Development) Erum Afsar (Transportation Planning), Hank Goertzen (Marcomm Works Consultant), Dennis Nowicki, Vicki Luxton

1. CALL TO ORDER

- M. Makarechian called the meeting to order at 17:30 hr.

2. LRT ENGINEERING UPDATE (A. LAUGHLIN)

- *Preliminary Engineering, Staging and Land Requirements*
  - Southeast and West corridors have been approved by Council and have an approved concept plan as well. Concept detail for Southeast and West has been completed and we are now doing the next phase which is preliminary engineering.
  - The Downtown section concept plan has not been approved by Council but this report is going to TPW on May 25th and then Council on June 1st for approval.
  - The most recent report that went to Council was looking at the preliminary engineering component of this system and how it can be staged. Part of that staging is ways to finance it.
  - Stage I has been identified (the minimum needed to do) on the Southeast to West LRT system is from the Downtown to Whitemud/75 Street. There is a need to have the Downtown connecting to the existing system and in the South you need to have that connection to the maintenance facility. The location we sited for the maintenance facility is adjacent to the Whitemud/75 Street station. Council wanted to see how this could be staged/funded in stages:

Stage I	
WMD to Centre West	$ 1.5 B
(including the maintenance facility)	
Stage II	
WMD to Mill Woods Town Centre	$ 300 M
Stage III	
Centre West to 107 Street	$ 200 M
107 Street to 156 Street	$ 400 M
Stage IV	

156 Street to WEM	$ 500 M
Stage V	
WEM to Lewis Farms	$ 300 M
	$ 3.2 B

- It has also been identified that we would like to do preliminary engineering for the entire 27 kilometres. Although Stage I has been identified as the 'must do' we have identified that we should be doing that 30 percent preliminary engineering for the entire Mill Woods to Lewis Estates LRT system including the Downtown. The reason for this is the at concept level you are working with estimates that could be plus/minus 50 percent. We want to confirm these estimates so that when we do pursue funding from other orders of Government we have hard strong numbers to support them. We also want to confirm some of the land requirements and an element of this was asked by Council was to fund land acquisition on all of the Southeast line and a portion of the West line. We want to be able to respond to development needs when they arise so if we do need land from a property owner that is developing next to the LRT we are in a position with the preliminary engineering plan to identify exactly what that is and we have the dollars to go out and buy it.
- Another big element of the preliminary engineering is utility relocation. One of the biggest challenges we have with building LRT and roads is the conflicts we have with utilities and the delayed time it takes to get these utilities relocated. If this preliminary engineering is done we get that much more accuracy in some of those utility conflicts so that we can again line up the EPCORS, we can line up the pipeline companies and line up the ATCOs to make sure we can get those relocations done based on the staging we are going to have for the project.

- *Financing*
  - What has been identified for the West to Southeast preliminary engineering and land is roughly 200 million dollars to keep the project going.
  - 40 million dollars of that is for the preliminary engineering and we have identified 160 million dollars for land acquisition of which 115 million dollars is for the Southeast LRT. Because of securing the Green Trip funding for the NAIT line we have been able to free up some debt that we have created for the NAIT line. Our ask on Green Trip when we originally started was 415 million dollars based on the cost of the project and we have actually been approved for 496.7 million dollars. What this has done has freed up some of the debt we had identified previously and it also freed up some MSI (Municipal Sustainability Infrastructure) that was in the project previously as well. Between the two items: the debt and MSI we are getting closer to the 200 million dollars that we identified for the preliminary engineering and land acquisition that we identified in this report.
  - Through the CRB there are projects identified through Green Trip funding. The West and Southeast is a priority through the CRB for Green Trip funding. Basically 235 million dollars has been identified as available funding through the Green Trip program.
  - Council asked the question - what could we do for Stage I? Our finance people identified that through the reallocation of some future growth projects and taking on additional debt which needs to be considered with other projects such as the downtown arena, the quarters area and other major investments, we could

create approximately 800 million dollars of additional debt and with that some reallocation of growth projects that are identified in future years, coupled with the freed up MSI, tax, and the Green Trip funding we can basically afford 1.3 billion dollars. So based on Stage I being identified at 1.5 billion dollars, we are a bit short, but we are in that general vicinity in terms of what we would need to fund that project. Again, preliminary engineering would really define or clear up what is actually required to complete Stage I, II, III, all the way through. A supplemental question received from Council is if we have to stage it, how much could we get in order to build whatever that stage is? So in here we have identified 200 million dollars for preliminary engineering and land acquisition.

- We presented this at TPW looking for approval from Council on April 25th but it was pushed back to May 18th because Council really wanted to understand what some of the costs or some of the capital items are going to be coming forward and our Corporate Finance office is giving Council an update on those estimates so that on May 18th Council will be in a better position to understand what are some of those other requirements of the City going forward.

- <u>*Questions*</u>
  - *What is still on the table that ETSAB can debate and comment on with Council?* So as part of the LRT Concept plan approval that happened in January there were a number of supplemental reports that were requested of Council. One of them was tunneling and bridges in certain areas where intersections were failing and another one of them was what are the general costs of going underground or above ground in relation to at grade LRT. They were supplemental and what has been approved is the concept plan that was presented to you previously. So it does not have a grade separation other than at 170 Street. Anthony Henday Drive and the 75 Street areas and the tunnel to get us downtown. Nothing has been changed from that. What did happen on the report was some Councillors were hinting that maybe we should be revisiting the West again and so that is something that might still happen as a result of this report going back to Council. But at this point the West and the Southeast as approved are the approved concept plans. We have had no other direction from Council to change anything. So in terms of what you can comment on unless there is something from Council to look at differently in the West, the concept plan that is approved is the concept plan going forward. What you can comment on is how we fund this or should we be using these dollars to fund these elements? Should we be using dollars to fund preliminary engineering and land or should there be 800 million dollars of additional debt taken on to create that money to build LRT. These are the items that are up for debate and in fact are still being debated at Council. Also the staging, as we have not really done a detailed analysis of the staging because there is still an additional amount of work that has to happen with staging.
  - *Please outline something in Stage I. How much of Stage I is made up of the facility and the bridge?* The maintenance facility is anywhere between 200 to 250 million dollars, which includes land. The bridge is 150 million dollars and that includes a portion of the tunnel. Another big element is the actual LRVs and they are 200 million dollars. Another big ticket item is the bridge going across Argyll, the ravine and the railway tracks.
  - *What allows you to move the debt financing from NAIT, is it because you are getting Green Trip funding?* Green Trip and actually the Federal Government

increased their Build Canada fund amount from 50 to 100. So we got additional grant monies that we weren't anticipating when the original borrowing bylaw was set up for NAIT. And the MSI we were able to allocate because it was freed up from those additional sources. *That Green Trip money, is that confirmed that you are able to reallocate that money, because B. Marcotte thought the Green Trip money was going to the NAIT line?* No, so when the CRB developed the priorities for Green Trip, they had a number of other municipal projects in there. West and Southeast were identified as another priority within the list of the 750 million dollars that was identified for Edmonton Capital Region. West and Southeast and for a lack of a better term, seed money, was identified to the tune of that amount by the CRB. Whether we will get that immediately or whether that is a long term get, it is something the Province has identified as a funding source. Timing has not been asked and the priorities from the CRB have not been identified clearer other than NAIT. *All of your costs are in inflated dollars, right?* Yes, it has not been updated, it was all going back to the original 2016, if we wanted to build it in advance of EXPO, and this is what it costs. If we get direction to build it a different way, we need to redo those numbers, but until we know what that is, it is difficult to try and pin point what that year is. It is still representative of capturing escalation based on a construction window. And for construction rates we are seeing anywhere from a three-five percent increase from last year, so technically you could add three-five percent to that 3.2 billion. *You have identified you need 1.5 billion dollars, and you are still short, why build a maintenance facility and find another spot to build it and shorten the connector through the downtown and do whatever is needed to bring in a financial plan that would match Stage I?* Basing your budget numbers on a concept estimate is pretty risky, there are contingencies, and there are a lot of things that you are uncertain about that you do not know, so you add a contingency to it. Doing the preliminary engineering really refines that and you start to understand what the geotechnical implications are. You can get a really good understanding of the utility impacts which are two of the biggest impacts when building LRT. Our hope is that some of those contingencies in there can be eliminated based on the engineering that we are doing. A better way to look at that 1.5 billion dollars is it won't go over that 1.5 billion dollars, that is more of what that number means. It is not that it will cost 1.5 billion dollars. I don't think it will go over that 1.5 billion dollars based on the level of detail we have. *How locked in are you on the maintenance facility?* We looked at a number of locations. We looked in the West around Anthony Henday and we have other order of Government challenges with the footprint of Anthony Henday Drive and the TUC. And we have environmental challenges on the end of the line on the West leg. Everywhere in between it is very commercial/urban area. The only other location we looked at on the Southeast line was the Auction Mart and based on the geometry on how the rail comes through there we were having a tough time fitting it onto the Auction Mart site. We did look at something we could do there to take advantage of land that we had secured through opportunity purchase. It is just very difficult to fit it into that area because the rail is coming in elevated across Argyll. So the likely location and it fits into that setting is the industrial area right beside Whitemud and 75th street. I would suggest that that area is locked in and the exact location may move this way or that way based on the preliminary engineering.

- *How close is the City of Edmonton to their debt ceiling as described in the Municipal Government Act?* If committing to build the SLERT lines it is getting to a point where it is getting unmanageable so to speak. And you add the arena on top of that plus the airport land, so it is not something we are recommending. We were asked the question if Council wanted to build LRT what could you do to create the cash to do it and how much would that be? *I understand you are going to stage this, what are your thoughts on how you are going to fund the other stages?* This is something that Council and intergovernmental affairs need to start lobbying to try to get the Feds and the Province on board with this project. Not only this project but long term sustainable commitment to LRT development because this is 3.2, Northwest 1.5, extension to the South line to Heritage Valley is 600 million. These are big ticket items and are something the City can't do alone. I think this exercise alone showed we cannot do it alone, we basically tap ourselves to build one stage of the LRT line, so we need other orders of Government. One of the other items that were identified in this motion for this report was to "Government relations strategies" to fund the LRT network. Options for government relations strategies to secure funds to complete the LRT network in a timely fashion. This is something our intergovernmental affairs groups are looking at. How do we get the support from the other levels of government not only for this project but going forward? This is a really fair question, if you are committing to it, should the City be doing it alone?
- *There is another long term plan to put another maintenance facility in the south in Heritage Valley, is this correct?* It depends on where you expand next. At the time we were doing the preliminary engineering on the South line that was identified as potentially as the next extension. If it does not go ahead and the Northwest gets advanced before the South the maintenance facility will have to go on the Northwest. The current line if it is expanded anywhere beyond NAIT cannot accommodate all that rolling stock in the current maintenance facility. If we are building stages, the 200 million dollars identified for the maintenance facility that is based on building the 27 kilometres. If you do build this as a stage, that number would come down, because we would only build what is immediately needed, but would protect for the expansion. The network analysis that was done did identify the need for more than two maintenance facilities. All three do not need to be full maintenance facilities but there was a need based on the kilometers of track and rolling stock that there does need to be three maintenance facilities and they do not need to be DL MacDonald size but they do need that flexibility. So we could look at a smaller facility on the Southeast line that would accommodate a portion of the West and Southeast and the rest of the cars get shipped to other areas. You can interline the trains and get them on different tracks but they are talking different technologies. The larger maintenance facility would serve the bigger network but would have to be able to service both the high and low floor technology. *Is there no room to expand an existing facility?* We did look at Cromdale and retrofitting something there, which is possible. That is something they looked at if the NAIT line came on board but at the end of the day they made DL MacDonald work with the NAIT expansion, but any further expansions they may look at the Cromdale option again.
- *What does MSI stand for?* The Municipal Sustainability Infrastructure fund.

This is a grant program from the province that identifies improving infrastructure in municipalities. Calgary gets a portion, Edmonton gets a portion and surrounding municipalities get a portion that can be drawn on for the next ten years for the cities. *Preliminary engineering is this for Stage I?* Preliminary engineering that is identified in this most recent report is all of the way from Lewis Estates to Mill Woods. We would like to do a minimum preliminary engineering on the whole line. *Have there been any discussions about P3?* This is what started all of this. We were asked to do an assessment of delivery methods for this next priority set by Council, so a business case was done and the result of the business case was from Mill Woods to Lewis Estates, P3 was a good alternative. The minute you break it into chunks it becomes less desirable because the challenges that are associated with that maintenance and operation side.

- *What degree of the debt with the LRT expansion is competing with the arena project, would that change the landscape of the LRT?* It does, and is a consideration that Council has to make. Again, the information presented on slide 2 is what could we get in terms of funding to build LRT? The answer to that was we could borrow to this amount and this is what we could get based on debt, reallocating funding from other projects and the money that has already been committed through other projects. The minute you include the arena, airport lands/quarters in this discussion and you want to fund it through debt than that 800 million dollars gets smaller and smaller. That is something that Council really needs to decide, do they commit to something like this just for LRT or do they take a different approach for this project. One of the alternatives is we ask for a larger tax levy and in previous reports we have introduced a levy to help that amount of borrow. There are alternatives out there and Council must evaluate what those are. This does not need to be decided definitely because you need to let the engineering happen so that number 1 you get the better numbers and number 2 have the information made available so you can lobby the Province and Federal Governments saying this is why you should invest in LRT.
- *Is the Green Trip money guaranteed annually?* No, part of what gets lost in there is we would actually do short term borrowing and then get pay backs through the Green Trip to pay off that short term borrowing to cover the costs. We are not getting 497 million dollars from the province for the NAIT line as soon as we start construction; we are still working out how we get that and what it would look like. It may take 10 to 15 years to get all of that money into the City coppers.
- *The reallocation from growth products, what does that mean?* Every time we do a capital budget we do a ten year and we get our approval of three. In the last ten years we identified 175 million dollars of capital projects funded by fuel tax that we deemed could be deferred in place of LRT. We had monies available for 50 Street, improvements from Sherwood Park freeway and route would be deferred indefinitely and that money would be relocated to LRT. So we went through that exercise of what could be deferred, what is not absolutely required and that goes back to when we did the previous ten year plan we did not have the TMP in place. *Are they all road projects or would some of them be LRT projects?* One the projects we identified out of the West was bus lane improvements on Stony Plain Road so that was a project if you are building

LRT on Stony Plain Road you would not do those bus lane improvements. However, if Southeast is staged that is something we would have to reassess. *In terms of funding alternatives could you elaborate on what might be an alternative for funding models that we put on the table to make Stage I happen?* A tax levy or a ticket levy as well. There could be an additional tax levy across the City to fund LRT. There could be a combination of both. There are a number of different options and they all come back to additional levies on something, someone. There is a previous report that can be sent to D. Nowicki that detailed the levies in more detail.

- *When you went to staging in terms of construction Stage I makes a lot of sense but makes very little sense to moving masses of people that connects the east end of downtown to industrial area half ways between Mill Woods and the Southeast side. Is there anyway you envision Stage I actually being built as a stage or is it just a financial construct with Stage II attached?* No, I don't think we would want to stage this but to get something in the ground; this is what you need to do. In the downtown we do actually go a little bit further, we actually take it to Centre West, we take it one station past Churchill, right in front of Centre West Mall. Eastern edge of the station is right on 103 Street and the western edge is on 102 Street and 102 Avenue. *If staging is possible will you envision creating some kind of Park 'n Ride at Whitemud from Mill Woods or would it become a bus feeder kind of a transfer point.* Preferable it would be the bus feeder from Mill Woods, but we do have a regional Park 'n Ride identified at Whitemud and 75 Street, 1500 to 2000 stalls, so there will be a fairly large Park 'n Ride at that location. Primarily because it is right on Whitemud.
- *Say there is no money from the Province or the Federal Government, is the Centre West/Whitemud the best way for the City to spend 1.3 billion dollars?* There are people who would say the south extension to Heritage Valley would be a better investment than the Southeast if you cannot get to where you want to get to. The other way you could look at it, if it is 1.5 billion, it will not go over 1.5 billion, you could also look at different ways of affording that. It is something that is happening in the states, that is not ideal but it is a fact of money available. They reduce the service, instead of having five minute frequency, you have ten minute frequency, and therefore you have fewer cars and reduce the cost. You do not build certain stations. Perhaps the Muttart is one that does not make sense right off the bat. My hope is that we have been cautious enough in our concept leveling engineering estimate that by the time we get to preliminary, 1.2 or 1.3 is more likely for that Stage I. It includes the adjacent roadway improvements, so on the Southeast it includes the improvements to 75 Street because you need to do those as part of the project.
- *What are you recommending to Council?* What we are recommending is we need money for preliminary engineering and land acquisition in order to get us into position where we can start to answer some of those questions, more definitely. That is all we are asking at this point.
- *Realistically the 800 million is not honored, the City has already committed to the arena in principal and so some debt is going to be incurred. In reality I cannot see any additional money coming from either the Province or the Federal Government, as the Province has committed to Green Trip over a ten year MSI they are done. The Federal Government if the Conservatives win is dead as well in terms of any major infrastructures programs. They are trying to*

get the deficit under control, so I personally think you should flag that 800 million dollars and saying this is taking all of the available debt left and assigning it to the LRT which is not likely realistic given the list of other projects – the Quarters, the arena, the airport land that are going to require debt financing and cut it in half that will require some debt financing and life with about a billion. Financing is breaking that out and am not sure when it is making it to Council. *There is lots of money being spent on other transportation projects, if I was the Province I would tell the City to take a harder look at road projects that are still planned to complete in the next five to ten years and back off some of those projects further.* That is approximately the 175 million dollars and the last three years has been very rich in terms of road investment. In the next seven years identified in that ten year plan we are not. There is a shift in the priorities from roads especially in the south and the TMP and MDP are helping that happen. The next budget cycle discussion will have priorities based on those plans, so it is changing. We were road rich as recent as a couple of years ago and in saying that, there are some absolutes that have to get done based on what others are doing. Henday is a perfect example, and one other one is the 41 Avenue interchange. We get compelled to contribute funding to those things because they are regional improvements. Do we need to do 50th Street, probably not? But in saying that the TMP still identifies goods movement as an important component of the City. Investments in roads that you will see are investments are in goods movement corridors.

- *Is the concept plan for only one billion dollars spent for the next ten to fifteen years? Is there an opening to view the concept plan? Is there going to be transit funding for the decade or two decades, what else could be done transit wise rather than sticking to the staged concept plan?* I do not think that there is an interest in revisiting the concept plan; I think there would be a reassessment of priorities. If we cannot afford West or Southeast, I think one of the obvious is the south extension to Heritage Valley gives you your permanent Park 'n Ride, allows something to happen south of Ellerslie that are transit supportive. It really comes down to what is your best bang for your buck? *Ridership?* The challenge with ridership that is long term you cannot accommodate the ridership we are anticipating in the Southeast on the South line. That is one of the big reasons why that concept was abandoned is that based on today the ridership we are getting on the south line. If you add in the thirty thousand opening day and the long term we are expecting in the Southeast that becomes very difficult to accomplish on the south line. Especially if you are still talking about something going to Heritage Valley. That is something you could do, but the system does not operates effectively when you do it.

3. TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINESPRESENTATION (M.-A. MCCONNEL-BOEHM, J. CHAN)

- *The Way Ahead:*
  - The Planning and Development and Transportation Departments are working on developing Transit Oriented Development (TOD) guidelines to better plan land use and development around LRT stations. So as development occurs around LRT stations and future LRT stations these guidelines will set future land use expectations and guide development

proposals and the creation of station area plans.
  - The Draft Integrated and Transit Land Use Framework was put together to support Council's discussion on the alignments of the LRT corridors in 2009. At that time Council was told that work was required to refine the draft and further consultation was necessary. So in 2010 we renamed the project Transit Oriented Development Guidelines and they were prepared.
- *What is Transit Oriented Development? (TOD)*
  - TOD is urban development that is planned and integrated with an LRT station. It concentrates housing, shopping and employment along a network of walkable and bikeable streets within a five minute walk of an LRT station or transit centre.
  - The station hub is within 200 mitres or two minutes of the station and this is the area where we would like to see the greatest concentration of trip generated retail employment or service uses.
  - The station neighborhood is within 400 miters and a five minute walk of the station and it is critical because it generates 70 to 80 percent of the station's walkup ridership.
  - The area within 800 mitres or ten minute walk that influences the character of the station neighborhood and provides additional ridership.
- *Why are we doing this?*
  - We can enhance the return on the investment we plan to make into LRT. Most of our LRT routes and stations are established focusing growth around can significantly increase ridership and planning for the right mix of land use at various stations along LRT lines can improve ridership in both directions setting the parameters for the type of development we want to see happening over the next thirty years.
  - With TOD people can have the option to reducing the number and length of their automobile trips.
- *Economic Assessment*
  - Economic assessment was done and findings were higher density development currently works just in certain places and really is not necessarily associated with transit at all. New residential development right now is primarily attracted to our suburban green field locations. There are some changing demographics on the horizon which will likely result in a case demand for TOD.
- *Four Building Blocks for Successful TOD*
  - Street Grid
  - Complete Streets
  - Station Hub
  - Station Neighborhood
- *Project Intent*
  - The TOD guidelines are intended to set the future land use expectations around LRT stations and transit centres, guide development proposals and form the creation of station area plans.
- Who will use Guidelines?
  - These guidelines will be taken to Council for approval in the fall and we expect they will be used by land owners and developers when they are considering development proposals, city administration and Council when reviewing or approving rezoning applications. Developers and City

administration to inform the preparation of statutory plans near LRT stations and City Council will use them in considering approval of new plans or plan amendments.
  - On the rezoning side we would look at the area within 400 meters of an LRT station and apply the guidelines in that area. We would also look at the area within 400 meters of a transit centre and apply the guidelines.
- *Edmonton's Future Urban Style LRT*
  - Will be focused on connecting people and places. The planned LRT lines will add more than 40 stations to the current system linking a greater number of destinations to compact urban centres.
- *Seven Station Area Types*
  - Three Residential Area types:
    1) Neighborhood
    2) New neighborhood
    3) Enhanced neighborhood

    4) Centre employment
    5) Institution
    6) Recreation
    7) Downtown
- *Overview of How the Guidelines are organized in the document*
  - Four Sections:
    1) Land use and intensity guidelines which are specific for each station area type,
    2) Building and site guidelines,
    3) Public realm guidelines, and
    4) Urban design and crime prevention through environmental design principles.
  - The last three are universal guidelines for all the station area types.
- *Station Area Plans*
  - A station area plan provides the framework for private sector development or redevelopment and public realm improvements within 800 mitres of an LRT station. They may be implemented through our Statutory Planning Structure.
  - We would expect that the station area plans would be informed by guidelines and may also meet or exceed the guidelines to realize the greatest TOD potential.
  - Station area plans are developed to increase transit ridership, establish a clear station and neighborhood identity, provide transit-supportive of land use and densities, ensure safe and convenient bicycle access and establish a comfortable attractive and vibrant public realm.
- *Implementation*
  - TOD ties into the City's vision and further implementation of the guidelines will be accomplished by several actions and these include:
    1) The City undertaking two station area plans a year,
    2) Revising our zoning regulations to incorporate the building and site design guidelines into our current zoning and;
    3) Ensuring that capital funding is provided at the right time to implement station plans.

- *Next Steps*
  - We are providing awareness through the month of May about the City's vision and TOD. Once we have heard from you and revised the guidelines we will be taking the guidelines to Council for approval in the fall.
  - Website and email are available if you would like to get more information.
- *Questions/Answers*
  - *Has the City encoded in their guidelines the fact this is a northern city with very low sun in the winter time and the stations seem to be in a pyramid. The height transition should be more gradual if you are south.* First this is the guideline level so it is fairly conceptual in nature and we are talking about transitions there is an acknowledgement. And this is also aligned with the residential guidelines, so we are mirroring them in the transition piece between the heights and they did a lot of sun/shadow work to determine the transition piece but the specifics of this are not in that, so that is a good point from the sun/shadow and the height of our sun. Thank you.
  - *How does this impact the existing LRT stations such as Belgravia/McKernan station?* We have identified Belgravia/McKernan as a neighborhood station which means we are looking for very moderate increases in density. A lot of it has to do with the current situation. A lot of the neighborhood stations are primarily single family dense 50 foot lot neighborhoods. Those are not the big density uptake stations. In order to get more there, someone has to work very hard (consolidate many lots to get a large site). You can do more on larger areas of redevelopable land such as older shopping centre sites and you are going to get more of the full outcome in that situation.
  - Belgravia/McKernan really when you look at it, there might be one surplus school site someday and there is one RA7 site that the developer decided to go with the current zoning. There really is not a lot more unless we want to be very aggressive and that is not our intent. Our intent is to think thirty years out and think in every station where is the opportunity to see some of that change and with some locations there is much more opportunity. The ethic of this is to provide the opportunities where they arise. *In terms of defining the future line, for example, if you had a Belgravia/McKernan situation on the Southeast line the option would be just to not build the station?* Build the station because you do get that walk-up traffic, it is within in that 400/800 meters. 400 meters you are getting the walk-up and 800 meters you are getting the bicycle reidership, you are influencing a pretty large area. Maybe as A. Laughlin was saying some of those stations are not going to be built because the pickup might be bigger at a different type of station. In a thirty year view, you would want stations at all of those stations because they are all part of the way they are interconnected.
  - *If you build it will people come? I have been east out to Clareview and there is a lot of open space and it was not until the very last slide that you showed the development around stadium to be something different and I was pleased to see that because there is a lot of vacant land and around Clareview. There is land out there that should be developed, because that line has been in service for quite some time. What is the normal vent date of the population in an urban area versus what you propose to this 100 radius meter kind of thing? Do you build the line and hope people will come?* My

understanding from a colleague is that the south line when they went past the University Health Centre station once it arrived within a few months they were at the ten year number expected projection for ridership. So the pickup was much, much more than anticipated. The Northeast line, which is an example of that slide that shows when you don't think about development around an LRT station that is what we got. We are trying to do this differently this time which is a learning curve

- *Your sources were primarily American, do you have any Canadian sources for this because I can tell you where the bigger pickup comes from, as Americans will not walk more than 200 yards and Canadians will walk a couple of miles. That is why there is a bigger pickup, because people are walking from much further away than projections say they will. I think in many ways you would do better by looking in Vancouver for TOD than looking at say Portland or somewhere even more road bound than that.* I was in Vancouver talking to people who are doing the land use piece around the county line, so it is not exclusively American. If you are looking at places like Edmonton it is Minneapolis which is similar in winter and urban style train. We have looked elsewhere, not just at the Americans. You are right, Canadians will walk/cycle further. When we are talking about the 400 meters and the five minute walk, we are thinking winter. In the summer we could have much more walk/bikeup traffic, than in the winter.
- *These guidelines are all good, but in the end they are just guidelines, it is a bidding exercise unless you have some way to influence developers to follow these guidelines. How do you do that when you have already pointed out that all the developers did not come. How do you get them to come?* There are different pieces here. One is when I said we needed capital funding to implement station plans. The station plan is what you would really like to do, we have stepped up to the city and we are going to do two a year, so these station plans will be in place. *What do you mean doing two a year?* Our department will initiate and hopefully take a year to develop two station area plans of particular stations along the line. *You are still going to require developers to come in and say, yes I agree with that.* Yes, if the City is investing their money and we are doing a plaza beside a station, we are providing that amenity, if you as a developer are thinking about putting money here or money there, they could be swayed to put their money where future buyers are much happier. We are a very market driven City. We can provide amenities, and again when you look at other places, the City provide amenities, the development chooses to go there. The amenity is a pull to a certain location so that is what we feel we can provide. With the rezoning, what we did in the guidelines identifies the current zones we have, the building and design guidelines we would like to get into our zones so that it is a given. If you are building here, this is what you expect. The community knows what they should see and the developer knows what they can provide. So certainty hopefully makes it easier to develop and better for developers. We wait for the developers to come usually, we are thinking if we can provide amenity, we are going to be providing the more popular locations. They know how much an amenity an LRT station is.
- *Density bonusing?* Edmonton is an interesting city and we provide a lot of opportunity already. We do not think density bonusing will work in our

development market context. *In the current LRT corridor plans approved right now we have 4 sites that are considered real TOD?* A lot of the stations are neighborhood stations, there is a little bit of opportunity and we would not want to preclude that, but we don't see ideal TOD. Ideal TOD opportunities can occur on much larger sites where you can get a lot of mixed uses and higher intensity.

- *Are you going to zone this in such a way to say to developers that you need to have x number of units per hectre, say 40 or are you going to say we really want you to build 40 but if you want to build single family houses, that is okay?* We will not be upzoning land around stations. The guidelines are triggered when a land owner wants a change in the existing land use. We are going to say we want to see row houses; we want to see three-storey townhouses. The Planning and Development Department will make recommendations to Council based on the TOD Guidelines for applications within 400 meters of LRT stations and transit stations, but City Council are the ultimate decision makers on development proposals. *Is this going to be a Thou shalt not?* Yes, for that one it will be a Thou shalt not. We have already been doing that in neighborhoods in south Edmonton.
- *In the first draft there was a suggestion there be a guideline which would guide Council decision and administration review and there would be a set of regulations as well. Detailed things like 75 meter block space. Have these regulations been currently abandoned from this project?* The building and site design guidelines, these are regulations we want to get into our zones, so you have certain building setbacks, front entrance to the street. We want those to be a given. These are not in the zoning bylaw today and if they are approved by Council we want to implement them by getting the building and site guidelines into our zones. You were also talking about block sizes. That is where you get into the public realm. The public realm guidelines apply when you have a large site development or you are doing a plan. *Based on the current line East/Southwest line and the 40 stations that were mentioned how many stations of that 40 are likely to trigger a station plan and major redevelopment all around that station.* We are in the midst of debating the first two station plans, the locations of them and we are influenced by the transit piece so existing transit provision is good or near our term and we are discussing things with A. Laughlin. In about five to ten years, there actually will be other future pieces, we presume. If you are looking at a large site like a shopping mall kind of site, a five to eight year planning window is not a bad thing. There are some locations where there is a large parcel of City owned land so that might have a higher potential for a plan as well. *Is there a sense of how many opportunities on that 40 station plan?* At this point we say about ten opportunity stations and some rise further to the top for various reasons.
- *Can you tell me the status of the Stadium LRT TOD?* It required capital investment and is actually one of the learnings from that project. Part of the Stadium station issue and a lot of those sites on the Northeast, are very big parcels and you need to cut them down, you need the grid, you need a smaller development site. You need something that isn't such a massive block. In the Stadium station we are cutting a road through and putting in greenways and cutting down the block sizes. The property acquisition and

selling back the land is the way we are going and is a big capital piece. It is a good plan and it is closer to downtown and does have higher density and it is a transformation from an industrial use to a residential use and because it is close to the new recreation centre, Commonwealth, it could have a lot of vitality.

- *We talked a lot about LRT, early on you talked about transit centres as well. There is way more flexibility in moving transit centres around. They do not actually have to go on the tracks; you can move them a few blocks here or there. So you can move the transit centres to suit TOD, much more efficiently than you can move railway lines. Has there been any work on this?* They are identified in the guidelines as areas of focus where we want to see these guidelines applied and that is because of our transportation partners. Their interest is the fact that they have put money into concrete fix transit centres and they do not see them moving. *WEM and Lewis Farms are examples. Lewis Farms is a terrible place for development because it is in the middle of the transit corridor and Leger is in the middle of the field surrounded by a developmentally impossible area. There is no development there because it is all pool and recreation centre. They seem to be putting them in places where TOD is impossible as opposed to thinking there is an empty block, if you put buses there then build around it.* We will bring this back to our Transportation colleagues. They may not have been thinking TOD in previous decisions.
- *Station Area Plans, what is the capital budget for these?* It is in the Planning Department's operating budget and it has been allocated a million dollars a year. We have actually put a request into to the upcoming capital budget for the very first time this year, for capital to actually implement a station plan. This is for the public amenity side of things. *That mature neighborhood station, is part of the TOD is the City going to encourage garden suites and secondary suites?* Secondary suites were approved but not garden suites.
- *The Stadium station and stations similar to that where there is a lot of land around, it was mentioned by J. Vandenbeld that there may be single residences in that area, is it your recommendation that you would take land locations like that and make them exclusively for three/four/five storey at the exclusion of single family houses?* It depends on the station area type. I would ask you to read the station area type areas in the neighborhood and the corresponding land use and intensity guidelines. If you are a land owner and you never do anything, nothing ever changes on your property. But if somebody is interested in changing the use on a property, the guidelines identify what is acceptable. In some stations it is duplexes and row houses and four storey apartments on arterial roads. In other stations it is four storey apartments or six storey apartments. You can have a mix of unit types in areas and they can be mixed up and it is okay. But if a land owner does not want to do anything, nothing will change. It is market driven and a lot of streets in Edmonton may not look a lot different over time if no one takes any action, even under these guidelines.
- *Are you able to tell us which two stations you are looking at? Are they existing stations?* We are considering existing stations and future stations.
- *Question about roads? My concern that your TOD guidelines are great but*

I still sense the Transportation Department are still planning roads that are far too big and do not fit with the TOD situation at all? A. Laughlin did intimate there is something happening, as tomorrow Council is looking at the capital budget for the first time. So we will see how they react to everything. The other thing, the capital budget exercise which is what we need money for, we're prioritizing where the money goes based on the TMP and MDP for the first time ever. I cannot tell you what will come out at the other end but that is a totally different way of doing things then we have ever done before. Currently you are right, you are seeing the old ways because the capital budget spending was based on the three year ago decision. I hope it would be different outcomes this time. *Why don't your TOD guidelines specially exclude staging around six or eight lane arterial streets? You show us these pictures, but none of those streets are any more than four lanes wide in each direction.* You want those bigger roads beside your centre stations and your employment stations because your employees and your consumers are coming to those locations by road and by transit. *Does Edmonton not want to force people to use transit and the way to do that is you reduce the size of your road system?* It is going to take time to get people to shift their travel patterns.

- *Is the City going to have a program as part of their station area planning to go along with property acquisition, is that advantageous?* We have not actually gotten that far in exacting the program but I could see that being part of what we would use capital for.

- *More ETSAB Feedback* — Agenda Approved
  - This is the window of opportunity to comment as a group or when it goes to Council in the fall. There will be a non-statutory public hearing because it is not a regulation. If you want to be informed on the progress sign up to their email address – tod@edmonton.ca

4. AGENDA REVIEW

- No changes were made to the May 2, 2011 agenda.

MOVED: by J. Doucette/J. Hayes to approve the May 2, 2011 agenda. **CARRIED**

5. REVIEW OF MARCH 28th MEETING MINUTES

- Under DATS Report – replace "no report" with Customer Satisfaction Survey and the Annual Report from DATS.

MOVED: by V. Hoy/J. Doucette to approve the amended March 28th, 2011 minutes. **CARRIED** — Amended Minutes Approved

5. TASK GROUP PRESENTATIONS

- *DATS Efficiency Task Group (G. Smith)*
  - This task group will be meeting with Lorna Stewart on Wednesday May 4, 2011. There will be a full update on this meeting at the next Board meeting.
  - G. Smith did ride on the bus from Leduc to the Airport and will have comments for the next Board meeting.
- *Fare Policy Task Review Group (M. Makarechian)*

- Two weeks ago, L. Landry and M. Makarechian met but J. Doucette is, for the time being, withdrawing from this task group because of his busy schedule.
- L. Landry and M. Makarechian would like to ask that two additional members come forward to join this task group as two members is just not enough of the representative of the voice for ETSAB. Hopefully this group can meet with J. Davidson this month. B. Robertson has volunteered to join this group.
- A request was made of D. Nowicki to set up a meeting with J. Davidson sometime in the middle of May.

- *LRT Task Group (B. Robertson)*
  - There will be a meeting next week of this task group.
- *Bylaw and Mandate Review Task Group (V. Hoy)*
  - This group had a great first meeting. There should be a second meeting before June 21st possibly in late May.
  - It was decided to hold the next meeting on Wednesday, May 25, 2011 from 5:30 pm to 7:30 pm.

6. MANAGER'S REPORT

- *Highlights*:
  - *Scona Road Detour*
    - A number of different changes made to the Scona Road Detour. Check the web site. Scona Road detour was delayed by a week, plus there were a couple of additional routes inserted – 390, 391, 92, 93.

7. INFORMATION SECTION

- TPW Luncheon – This will be deferred to a date after the next meeting.
- Board Leadership Training (M. Makarechian)
  - B. Robertson and M. Makarechian attended this leadership training on April 9, 2011. It was useful but would like to make a suggestion that there be an experienced attendee section for people who come year after year and maybe beginner board leadership training in the morning.
- Youth Summit (M. Makarechian)
  - An email was sent out by V. Gudelj to all volunteers from ETSAB.
- 2010 ETSAB Annual Report (M. Makarechian)
  - The 2010 Annual Report made it to TPW meeting on April 12, 2011. Councillor Leivovici asked some questions about the concerns ETSAB had raised regarding the lack of resources and the inability to obtain copies of reports earlier than the normal timeline. There was an acknowledgement of the concerns raised but not much of a solution emerged from that brief conversation. Councillor Henderson said that discussion in more detail will follow at the June 21st Council meeting on how boards are functioning.
- Community Fair (May 28, 2011 at West Edmonton Mall, Phase I)
  - D. Kirkpatrick was talking to J. Vandenbeld regarding ETSAB's participation in the Community Fair.
  - J. Vandenbeld sent out an email looking for volunteers. It is a great opportunity for ETSAB members to meet with the community.

8. TOPIC(S) OF THE NIGHT

- V. Hoy will communicate to TPW that ETSAB received two interesting presentations at their May 2, 2011 meeting.

MOVED:	by G. Smith/E. Johnston to adjourn the May 2, 2011 ETSAB Meeting at 20:02 hours. **CARRIED**	Motion Approved

Next meeting: Monday, May 30, 2011 in the Room A – Scotia Place Conference Centre