The third meeting of the Route 90 Public Advisory Group was held on June 5, 2018.

## ATTENDANCE:

### PAC Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claire</td>
<td>Mahoney</td>
<td>Carpathia Housing Co-op</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Turton</td>
<td>Carpathia Housing Co-op</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td>Carpathia School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica</td>
<td>Eno</td>
<td>Seasons - Outlet Winnipeg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Cohoe</td>
<td>Bike Winnipeg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jolene</td>
<td>McKay</td>
<td>SAM Property Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Academy Biz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daedvid</td>
<td>Ramey</td>
<td>École Assiniboine Parent Advisory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamara Rae</td>
<td>Biebrich</td>
<td>Winnipeg Arts Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WSP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grantley</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Senior Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Christiansen</td>
<td>Senior Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Tebinka</td>
<td>Manager, Manitoba Transportation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### City of Winnipeg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vaibhav</td>
<td>Banthia</td>
<td>Bridge Projects Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brett</td>
<td>Andronak</td>
<td>Public Engagement Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gord</td>
<td>Chappell</td>
<td>Real Estate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Blueprint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Etoile</td>
<td>Stewart</td>
<td>Community Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Kuly</td>
<td>Community Engagement Lead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regrets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gayle</td>
<td>Waxman</td>
<td>Rady JCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>Dolyniuk</td>
<td>Manitoba Trucking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Sobkowicz</td>
<td>Access Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Mathieson</td>
<td>St. James Biz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The purpose of the meeting was to:

- Review the June public engagement campaign and project in more detail, discuss and gather feedback in small group discussions on key aspects of the project design.

1) Welcome and introductions
Blueprint welcomed the group and thanked Gordon from Carpathia School for the meeting room and accommodating the PAC meeting once again. Blueprint thanked PAC members for assisting with the planned June engagement campaign to date.

Blueprint welcomed two new PAC members attending for the first time, Daevid Ramey (École Assiniboine Parent Advisory) and Jolene McKay (SAM Property Management).

Blueprint reviewed the session purpose and walked the group through the meeting agenda. PAC was advised that the meeting would focus on the June public engagement campaign materials and approach, gather feedback and ideas on key areas for input for project team consideration, and identify any additional important aspects to prepare for upcoming targeted stakeholder meetings.

2) Project Update
WSP updated the PAC that the functional design phase is complete and that preliminary design is now underway. WSP alerted the PAC that making any changes to the design will be relatively easier at this point, rather than further down the road. Preliminary design will be completed in the new year.

WSP reviewed Phase 1 project milestones and Blueprint provided an overview of engagement to date:

- Phase 1 of engagement is complete
- Phase 1 summary of public engagement and PAC 1 and 2 meeting notes will be posted on the project website, winnipeg.ca/route90
- Phase 2 of engagement is underway and will gather feedback to incorporate into preliminary design, where appropriate, including key aspects of how design interacts with neighbourhoods in the project area, e.g. AT, crossings, access, and integration of remnant lands along the route.
3) Group discussion; key areas for input

WSP began with a brief overview of key design elements addressed in the functional design and opportunities for input to be incorporated into the preliminary design. WSP reminded PAC that Route 90 is going to be six lanes in total. The 2012 study showed AT access on the west side of Route 90 only, however, the current study is accessing two AT options, a multi-use path on both sides of Route 90 and a protected on-street cycling lane. The study team is also assessing a street-level pedestrians and cyclists crossing and a pedestrians and cyclists overpass bridge at Lockston Avenue.

PAC was asked to consider the following area-specific items:

- Pedestrian and cyclists crossings
- Active transportation (AT) facilities along the route
- Neighbourhood changes - landscaping and land use
- Local access changes
- Transit improvements
- Construction phasing
- Property needs/use

A brief overview of the property acquisition process the City uses for major projects was provided by the City. The City prefers to acquire private property by way of purchase and sale whenever possible. In cases where project timelines do not allow the City and landowner to reach a mutual agreement, the City may elect to acquire private property by way of expropriation.

A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document pertaining to property acquisition was provided in hard copy at the meeting and is available at [http://www.winnipeg.ca/ppd/CityProperty/LandAcquisition.stm](http://www.winnipeg.ca/ppd/CityProperty/LandAcquisition.stm). Homes along the project route may be affected however the extent of impacts are still being determined. With respect to the Kapyong lands, the City indicated that the City doesn’t have authority to expropriate lands held by Treaty 1, the Province or Canada so any acquisition would need to be done by mutual agreement/sale.
The PAC provided the following questions, which were answered (as noted) or recorded by the project team:

**Q:** Does the City ever do right of first refusal?  
**A:** This is hard to do without the project being funded. City staff doesn’t have authority to enter into agreements until project is approved by Council and funded.

**Q:** When will funds be available to buy the properties needed? Is there a specific timeline for when houses will be purchased?  
**A:** Funds won’t be available until after Council approves and funds the project. Timelines are still to be determined.

The PAC then broke into two small groups to review the area-specific considerations. WSP indicated that it was also important to know about proposed changes to key access points on Route 90.

Each small group included project team members. PAC members were asked to consider the following questions:

**Spaces along the route**
- What would you most like it to look like in the future? How should neighbourhood heritage and character be reflected in these spaces?

**Active transportation along the route – on-street protected bike lanes with traditional sidewalks, combination walking/biking path off the street**
- Which options would make you more likely to want to bike down Route 90? Or walk?

**Pedestrian crossings – pedestrian bridge, enhanced street-level crossing**
- How safe would you feel using a pedestrian bridge? An enhanced street-level crossing? How easy/convenient would these two options be to use? How would you rank the following criteria to determine the most appropriate crossing? Safety? Convenience? Construction costs? Maintenance?
Transit improvements

- What kind of improvements to Winnipeg Transit would make you consider taking the bus more often on Route 90?

Local access

- Proposed changes in local access are intended to help improve traffic flow and safety along the route and reduce “cut through” traffic on local streets. However, in some cases local trips may be a bit less convenient. How would your local use change based on the proposed changes to local access?

These discussions were facilitated to ensure everyone had a chance to participate and provide input. Following the small group discussions, one PAC member from each group was asked to recap to the full group.

Recap from PAC Group #1

Pedestrian crossings

- Tenants living at south end of Route 90 do not feel safe crossing the street. A half-signal at that location would be good.
- Mixed views on pedestrian bridge crossing at Lockston. Generally, a pedestrian bridge crossing would be safer; right now kids cross with a crossing guard during school hours but after school hours they must cross alone.

Traffic design

- Proposed long turning lane capacity is good.
- Can the design of the intersections discourage loitering and panhandling? Construct deterrents at lights to deter people on medians.
- It seems like Portage Avenue will get more backed up by the turning lane on to Route 90. Would be helpful to clarify rationale for design here and how turn lane would operate and reduce traffic congestion.

Transit

- Proposed islands for buses are great; should also include priority lights.
- Do not use diamond lanes because it will reduce the available travel lanes.
Active Transportation (AT)

- People feel safer off the street. If on-street AT path is chosen, separation is very important.
- Consider how will bikes connect to Wellington Crescent and Empress St.
- AT connections under St. James bridge should be improved.

Neighbourhood edges, open spaces

- Don’t replicate chain-link and backyards fronting the street like we currently see north of Ness on Route 90.
- Instead, where there is enough space along the route, build multifamily housing in new vacant spaces, combined with a mix of walls, berms, landscaping along route.

Local access

- Safety is a concern currently at local access points along Route 90. Sightlines are poor in several places.

Construction phasing

- Rady JCC, Safeway and Tuxedo shops, and Carpathia School are key local (east-west) destinations – access for pedestrians and vehicles will be important to consider as part of construction phasing/planning.

Recap from PAC group #2

Pedestrian crossings

- Half-signals along the route are supported. Locations of crossings makes sense; needed to deter jaywalking.
- Elements to encourage crossing at lights/intersections were discussed: Public art on medians, curved design etc.
- Would be great to depress Route 90 at Lockston Ave. to allow for a shallower bridge and shorter travel distance along the ramps.
- Safety and convenience are priorities however maintenance is critical, and snow MUST be cleared in order to be convenient.

Transit

- Transit is a hot topic. Shelters are a must. Rush hour diamond lanes that could reduce number of lanes are more of a long-term/future measure.
- Cutaways for buses to stop and priority signals important.
Active Transportation (AT)

- AT needs to be buffered from the truck route, off-street, must be protected given that Route 90 is a truck corridor.
- Walkways must be big enough for snow clearing.

Neighbourhood edges, open spaces

- Would like to see a mix of art, berms, landscaping, etc.

Local access

- Discussion focused on traffic flows improvements on Route 90, and how/if that will deter left turns/cut-throughs into neighbourhoods.
- Local access changes should deter cut through traffic.

Additional discussion

WSP asked the PAC to consider what multifamily development could look like, including size and number of stories. PAC agreed with concept of maintaining current look, feel and height in existing community e.g. 2-4 stories and that the scale should conform to the existing neighbourhood.

The PAC provided detailed feedback on information and maps that would be used online and in community engagement events in June – how clarity could be increased and information to include. Changes included:

- Captions for images
- Simplify legend; include legend in multiple places on the map
- Clarify description, rationale of the new southbound turning lane from Portage Ave to Route 90
- Show where existing roads will be closed more clearly

Proposed changes were incorporated into the revised versions of materials following the PAC 3 meeting.

4) June Public Engagement

Blueprint walked the PAC through the engagement for the project and the following opportunities to participate in-person and online:

- Updated webpage, online survey
- Pop ups at Outlet Collection Winnipeg mall
• Property owner meetings
• Community meetings

The PAC was advised of local events in their area and asked to review the draft promotional materials provided. The PAC was asked to confirm local events and opportunities to promote public engagement, and/or quantity of printed promotional materials for distribution at their own events and to their networks throughout the engagement period.

One PAC member asked if there was any chance of meeting with businesses on Academy Road. This request was noted and will be added to the project tracker.

PAC identified the following opportunities for promotion through their networks:
• Bike Week Winnipeg, multiple stops
• Tuxedo Community Centre AGM
• Family Picnic - St James - Assiniboine Parent Coalition
• Ciclovia w/ Bike Winnipeg
• Corydon Community Centre AGM
• Herzing College Canada Celebration
• River Heights Farmers Market
• Family Fun Day
• Academy Street Festival
• Ecole Assiniboine - Family BBQ
• Carpathia Housing Coop AGM
• Bourkevale AGM
• Discovery Centre Family BBQ
• Ikea staff
• Assiniboine Park Conservancy

Each individual PAC member completed the draft online survey; each question was discussed in small groups.

4) Next steps, adjourn

Project team will provide PAC with digital copies of promotional materials to circulate to
their networks following engagement campaign launch on June 13.

PAC meeting 4 will be scheduled later in the fall to review the updated project design.