1. CRIME PREVENTION THROUGH ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AS AMENDED

That the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Transit Commission approve that \$10,000 be provided to the Women's Action Centre Against Violence (WACAV) for safety audits of already constructed transitway stations in 2000.

DOCUMENTATION

- 1. General Manager, OC Transpo's report dated 19 Jan 00 is immediately attached.
- 2. Extract of Minute, Transit Services Committee of 26 Jan 00, follows the above noted report and includes a record of the vote.
- 3. Extract of Draft Minute, Transit Services Committee of 22 Mar 00 follows the Minute Extract of 26 Jan 00 and includes a record of the vote.

Our File/N/Réf. Your File/V/Réf.	
DATE:	19 January 2000
TO/DEST:	Co-ordinator, Transit Services Committee
FROM/EXP:	General Manager
SUBJECT/OBJET:	CRIME PREVENTION THROUGH ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION

That the Transit Services Committee receive this report for information.

BACKGROUND

An enquiry was tabled by Commissioner Byrne at the November 24 meeting of the Transit Services Committee about the possibility of establishing a partnership with the Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design Division of the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Services and the Women's Action Centre Against Violence (WACAV) to improve security in Transitway stations.

Commissioner Byrne's enquiry was triggered by her involvement in a highly successful review of Lincoln Fields Transitway Station by a team consisting of Constable Bill VanRyswyk, Len Blakely of OC Transpo security and Karine Gauvreau of WACAV (Appendix A).

In addition, Commissioner McGoldrick-Larsen has also been concerned with security at Lincoln Fields station as a result of a service change, introduced in August 1999, which required residents from Barrhaven to make a transfer there to get to Bayshore. She has also proposed some improvements to enhance security at the station (Appendix B).

DISCUSSION

a) Lincoln Fields Station

This station is one of the oldest in the Transitway system. Since it was opened in 1983 there have been many improvements in station design, including enhancements in security. The station was scheduled for an upgrade in signage in 1999 but this was delayed due to the pressure on resources caused by the work associated with the very large service changes in 1999. Signage will be upgraded in March or April 2000 to bring it to the standard of recent stations (e.g. Place d'Orleans).

Constable VanRyswyk's report on Lincoln Fields station was very helpful and reasonable. A work plan has been developed in response to the report which covers the implementation of many of the recommended changes over the next few months. This is shown in Appendix C. The major items included in the plan are a lighting upgrade at the entrance to the Carling Avenue overpass, additional emergency phones on platforms 1 and 2, and the trimming of shrubs and trees to enhance sight lines within the station.

2) Ongoing Program

We are currently undertaking a systematic lighting survey of Transitway stations and pathway connections. This will be complete by May 2000, and will be an important input to a more general security audit.

We have had discussions and are in the process of obtaining agreement from Regional Police Services to participate in an ongoing program of station audits. The station reviews will be carried out at a rate of one or two a month in an order which reflects need. A list will be prepared prioritizing stations. We will also discuss with WACAV how they can participate in the security review.

In the short-term, the next two stations we will be covering will be Lees and Westboro stations.

Approved by Gordon Diamond

Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service 245 Greenbank Road, Nepean, Ontario K2H 8W9

Service de police régional d'Ottawa-Carleton

245. chemin Greenhank, Nepean, (Ontario) K2H 8W9

November 15, 1999

Mr. Kerry O'Leary Ottawa-Carleton Regional Transit Commission 1500 St. Laurent Blvd. Ottawa, Ontario K1G 0Z8

Dear Mr. O'Leary:

REFERENCE: Lincoln Fields Transit Station

Audit Performed: November 10, 1999

Present: Karine Gauvreau - Women's Action Centre Against Violence Leonard Blakely - OC Transpo Todd Sloan - OC Transpo Wendy Byrne - Regional Councillor Constable Bill VanRyswyk - O.C.R.P.S.

Thank you for inviting me to perform a C.P.T.E.D. audit on Lincoln Fields Transit Station. C.P.T.E.D. stands for Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design. It basically means making the building safe by its design. The comments I will put forward in this letter are suggestions only, and it is up to the Commission whether these suggestions are to be followed. There is no onus to comply and full utilization of these suggestions will not guarantee that crime will not occur in your building.

The three main elements of CPTED are Surveillance, Access Control, and Territoriality. Many of the suggestions I will make are guided by these elements. Although not recognized as a main element, Activity Support can be considered as the fourth element and possibly one of the more important ones. A number of the suggestions will be grouped into general headings for they affect different areas.

Working together for a safer community / La sécurité de notre communauté, un travail d'équipe Tel./Tél. (613) 236-1222 Fax/Téléc. (613) 829-8484

JAN 19 '00 10:52

613 741 7359 P.02 APPENDIX A Page 1 of 6

Interior of the Main Platform

<u>Signage</u>

Signs are often the first indicator people have as to who is allowed to make use of the property and for what reasons. Signage can also indicate a desired path or direction. Signs will also portray ownership and pride in a property. It is important when new signs are erected at all the entrances that they portray these qualities.

The style of signs used in many areas does not conform with the standard. The signs themselves are in black and white lettering which prevents easy identification and lengthens the time it takes to locate information. Most of the signs were grouped above the entrance and exit doors resulting in a higher than normal viewing range.

The signs used to indicate the emergency call boxes are small and cannot be identified unless you are near them. I would suggest these signs be changed to show a red undertoned picture of a phone since red is usually associated to an emergency.



This picture was taken from approximately 10 yards away. I had to be within a few yards to recognize that the yellow and black sign on the wall had a downward arrow indicating an emergency call box.

Surveillance

It is important to maintain as much visual surveillance as possible in a public area. Even if a building is illuminated to daylight conditions, if there is no one to offer common surveillance the lights are of no benefit. The exterior walls of the main stop are constructed of glass which allows surveillance from others. This benefits the passengers both inside and outside, the employees working the ticket office and the bus drivers waiting on or near their buses.

The telephones are located under the stairwell and away from the visual surveillance of most passengers and bus drivers. The teledon has also been located in a comer positioned in a manner that forces the user's back toward the main area. I would suggest that the phones and teledon be relocated to a central area to increase visual surveillance and eliminate any perception of fear by the users. I was advised that there is also a direct line to OC Transpo security via the payphones. This is a great idea; however, there were no signs indicating this.





Canteen

The canteen is an excellent idea to incorporate into the main stop. By placing a friendly activity in a potentially unfriendly environment, it reduces the perception of fear, improves visual surveillance and increases legitimate users. There were, however, a few problems with how the canteen has been positioned.

The exterior windows of the canteen were cluttered with shelving and cooling equipment. This eliminates the visual surveillance that the employee has toward the outside and that the passengers, bus drivers and law enforcement have of the store employee. If the employee was to be robbed, unless it was observed from inside the main stop, the anonymity of the suspect would be preserved. I would suggest that the store area be increased to accommodate additional shelf space and allow some of the window space to be cleared. Glass alarm contacts and/or protective glass covering can be installed to deter any break ins.



If there was additional space, the merchandise on the outer shelves could be turned inwards to prevent theft. Even with convex mirrors, it would make it very difficult for the store employee to observe theft, especially if there is more than one customer waiting for service.

Ticket Office

The security safety features built into the ticket office are advantageous to the employees. There are mirrors, talk boxes and surveillance cameras. There are not many suggestions I can make with respect to this area. The only suggestion I can provide is to increase the surveillance from the office. The employee has the ability to survey the inside of the main platform but cannot see directly outside toward the doors leading to platforms 1 & 2. I would suggest that windows be installed in the north wall of the office allowing surveillance from inside and out.

The use of lighting inside the main platform was excellent. I was unable to locate any areas with shadows.

Overpass Leading to Carling Avenue

The overpass was neat and clear of debris. There was an emergency call box at the entrance from Carling Avenue. The lighting at the entrance was low and did not enable a person to readily identify others waiting in the shelter. I would suggest that these lights be upgraded.

The report submitted by Karine Gauvreau suggests that a surveillance camera be installed to deter this area from becoming a potential entrapment site. I also feel that due to the high volume of passengers using this passage way, a camera be installed with appropriate signage advising everyone that they are present.

There was a foot path that led from under the overpass of Carling to the bus shelter. It was quite evident that there is a substantial amount of foot traffic making use of this path. The path is steep and may present a danger to those using it. OC Transpo will have to decide if the use of this pathway is permitted and what purpose it serves. It may be difficult to prevent the use of this pathway and consideration should be given to developing the area into an official stairway to the bicycle/foot path below.



Platforms 1 & 2

In general, the overpasses to platforms 1 & 2 were clean and neat. There was some graffiti present in the landing of the overpass at platform 1. This should be cleaned immediately. It is important for all users to identify the transitway as an area for which OC Transpo has great pride and care. By leaving graffiti unattended, a message is sent to others that they too can perform acts of vandalism. Some graffiti indicates 'tagging' by youth gangs which marks their territory. It is important that these youths are aware that the transit station is 'no one's territory'. Graffiti also gives others the perception that the transit station is unsafe and is an area for gangs to gather.

The emergency call boxes were located at each end of the platforms. There is a considerable distance between them and thought may be given to additional call boxes.

Consideration may be given to increasing the number of convex mirrors in the stainwells leading to the platforms in order that the presence and identity of others can be detected around corners.

Outside Surveillance

The tinted glass used throughout the station reduces the availability of surveillance. Is the glass tinted for looks or is it due to sun radiation? The design of the station allows for a person at the main platform to look out at platform 2. In the evening hours, when the passenger traffic is usually lower and the lights are on inside the platform, the tinted windows make it difficult to identify others.

It is important to keep all shrubs trimmed to a height no greater than three feet and the trees trimmed up to a height of four feet. This eliminates the opportunity for concealment. It also provides the opportunity for visual surveillance by passengers, employees and passing motorists. It is particularly important for a person leaving a building to know and feel that the area is safe and that there is no one hiding in the bushes waiting for a victim to assail.

The shrubs and trees between platform 2 and the main platform restrict the site lines. I would suggest that these shrubs be trimmed down. It may be cost effective to eliminate a number of these shrubs to reduce maintenance. The shrubs at the entrance of the overpass from Carling are also overgrown. The trees and shrubs along Carling Avenue need to be trimmed.





Pedestrian-scaled light fixtures should illuminate the sidewalk evenly along the length of the path, and should not create dark areas along the path or areas of darkness immediately adjacent to the path. A light level of 4-5 foot candles is recommended. I found the lighting of the pathways leading to platforms 1 & 2 was sufficient.

Bicycle Lock Up

There were no signs present at the bicycle lock up. There was also insufficient lighting in this area. It is important to make people aware of the regulations regarding the lock up of bicycles and that OC Transpo is not responsible for theft or vandalism.

Concluding Comments

The condition of the transit station and appearance of the property goes a long way in portraying ownership and care. Crimes often take place because they are crimes of opportunity. If a property has the appearance that it has not been maintained or cared for, it also presents itself as an area of opportunity. A past study has shown that a building with a broken window left

unattended will soon invite people to break the other windows. The same study also showed that replacing the window immediately was a deterrent in having future windows broken. It is important that all employees also take pride and care of the area. This is portrayed through employees picking up debris or reporting vandalism to the security department.

On November 10, I arrived at Lincoln Fields transit station approximately an hour prior to performing the audit. I was interested in observing the students arriving from school. I spoke to a number of passengers in regards to their perception of safety during this time. I received only positive comments; however, one gentleman was able to provide personal accounts of acts of crimes committed between the youths. I found that the location was used as a hang out and that the kids were in no hurry to leave or catch their bus if, in fact, they had a bus to catch. It is important that ongoing education be performed by your employees through the youth and schools. Using the transitway is a privilege and it is important for them to realize that if they commit acts of violence, vandalism or loiter that the privilege can be revoked. I would suggest that routine patrols by your security continue and that the youth be asked to move on. In accordance with this request, it should be evident by means of posted signs that loitering is not permitted.

Another crime prevention tool may be to incorporate a program similar to Crime Stoppers. There are a number of emergency phones that may be used by legitimate passengers to report vandalism or other crimes in progress. If this program is promoted by the media and signage, it may also act as a deterrent to those committing the crimes. They would fear losing their anonymity.

It is also beneficial to know what the problems or perceived problems are. I would suggest that the method of interviewing passengers for their perception is important. I would also be aware of all the crimes or calls for police service in the past.

I hope that these suggestions will benefit any decisions that are to be made in the future. I would also like to thank Karine Gauvreau for offering her perspective regarding the safety audit. If there are any points that require clarification or if there are other questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

William VanRyswyk, Constable Regional Coordinator of the Crime Free Multi-Housing Program C.P.T.E.D. Instructor/ Practitioner 236-1222 ext 2351

31913;

JAN 11 2000

MEMORANDUM REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON NOTE DE SERVICE MUNICIPALITÉ RÉGIONALE D'OTTAWA-CARLETON

Our File/N/Réf. Your File/V/Ref.

DATE

7.

Mr. Gordon Diamond TO/DEST. General Manager, OC Transpo Councillor Wendy Byrne

Molly McGoldrick-Larsen FROM/EXP. Councillor, Bell-South Nepean

,

Security Audit of Lincoln Transit Station SUBJECT/OBJECT

January 10, 2000

The following is a summary of security issues raised by residents of South Nepean about Lincoln Station.

Councillor Byrne, this report is intended as input to the work that you have underway concerning safety issues at Lincoln Station.

Mr. Diamond, I would ask that staff report back on these concerns either directly through Councillor Byrne's process or to me, whatever would be most efficient.

Please contact me if you would like to discuss this matter further.

inte harson

Molly McGoldrick-Larsen

c.c. Councillor Al Loney, Chair, Transit Commission Helen Gault Kim Hunton, Manager, Risk Management and Corp Security Kerry O'Leary

moc.memo.octranspo.diamond

Background

In the fall of 1999, bus route 173 was rescheduled to travel from Barrhaven to Lincoln Heights station, which eliminated a direct route to Bayshore for residents of South Nepean. The change resulted in a number of complaints, received by myself and OC Transpo.

One concern raised by residents was the safety issue. Many said that they did not feel that Lincoln Station was a safe environment for themselves and even more for teenagers.

Because of this, OC Transpo suggested that residents participate in a Security and Safety audit of the station. The audit was conducted by Kerry O'Leary on October 23, 1999.

Concerns/Issues

The following is a list of issues and comments that were raised. I have also included one survey that was completed.

In regards to signage, audit participants felt that in general, there was insufficient signage at the station.

*There is no signage to the elevator visible from the transit platform.

*Voyageur bus stop is not advertised well. None of the residents were aware that the service existed.

*Route numbers are needed on platform signage.

*Signage is needed to direct customers to teledone screen, which is currently against the back wall in the southwest corner. It was suggested that the screen be moved to the southeast corner of the station so that customers are facing the platform rather than having their back to the platform and possibly miss their bus.

*When exiting from the elevator on the second floor, the signage with directions to Carling Avenue is not visible.

*Push/pull signs should be installed on all doors.

*Signage is needed to inform customers that a supervisor is on duty (similar to store signs that indicate store is open/closed). This would be one more bolster for the feeling of safety and security.

Other comments participants had:

Schools need to be informed of the availability of Safety Audits. The student in attendance was not aware that such a program existed. Perhaps when OC Transpo attends schools in the fall to photograph the students for bus passes, a display advertising the program could be set up.

Participants were not aware of Drop off/Pick up. OC Transpo needs to better advertise this possibility across the system.

A covered walkway is needed from Lincoln Station to Lincoln Heights Gallery.

The telephone should be relocated from under the staircase for both security reasons and convenience to somewhere that is visible from the platform, so that customers can use the phone while watching for the bus.

The sidewalk on Carling Avenue is not wide enough. Residents did not feel safe walking to and from the station.

The transit station should be cleaned in the evening, which would provide more personnel in the station at night.

.

B. LIGHTING Impression of lighting: very goodboorsatisfactorygood too bright Is the lighting even?yes no How many lights were out? Is the lighting obscured by trees or bushes?yes no How well does the lighting illuminate the signs and maps? very poorly poorly satisfactory wellvery well C. <u>SIGNS</u> Are there signs identifying where you are?yes no Are there signs giving directions (ie. North, South, to Downtown) yes no Are there signs showing you where to get emergency assistance? yes no Coverall impression: no signs not enough signs hard to understand, to readgood signs	ATE: October 23 99	TIME: 1.10 p.m.
What 5 words best describe the place: <u>firty black cold no clear</u> <u>clanage for busrowtes</u> B. LIGHTING Impression of lighting: <u>very poor</u> poor satisfactory good <u> very good</u> too bright Is the lighting even? <u> yes</u> no How many lights were out? <u></u> Is the lighting obscured by trees or bushes? yes no How well does the lighting illuminate the signs and maps? very poorly poorly <u></u> satisfactory well very well C. <u>SIGNS</u> Are there signs identifying where you are? yes no Are there signs giving directions (ie. North, South, to Downtown) yes no Are there signs showing you where to get emergency assistance? yes no Overall impression: no signs not enough signs hard to understand, to read good signs	FIRST IMPRESSIONS	
SIGNAGE for busroutes B. LIGHTING Impression of lighting: very goodpoorsatisfactorygood very goodtoo bright Is the lighting even?yes no How many lights were out? Is the lighting obscured by trees or bushes?yes no How well does the lighting illuminate the signs and maps? very poorly poorly satisfactory wellvery well C. <u>SIGNS</u> Are there signs identifying where you are?yes no Are there signs giving directions (ie. North, South, to Downtown yes no Are there signs showing you where to get emergency assistance? yes no Coverall impression: no signs not enough signs hard to understand, to readgood signs	our gut reactions: <u>Isolated</u> ,	not clean
SIGNAGE for busroutes B. LIGHTING Impression of lighting: very goodpoorsatisfactorygood very goodtoo bright Is the lighting even?yes no How many lights were out? Is the lighting obscured by trees or bushes?yes no How well does the lighting illuminate the signs and maps? very poorly poorly satisfactory wellvery well C. <u>SIGNS</u> Are there signs identifying where you are?yes no Are there signs giving directions (ie. North, South, to Downtown yes no Are there signs showing you where to get emergency assistance? yes no Coverall impression: no signs not enough signs hard to understand, to readgood signs		
SIGNAGE for busroutes B. LIGHTING Impression of lighting: very goodpoorsatisfactorygood very goodtoo bright Is the lighting even?yes no How many lights were out? Is the lighting obscured by trees or bushes?yes no How well does the lighting illuminate the signs and maps? very poorly poorly satisfactory wellvery well C. <u>SIGNS</u> Are there signs identifying where you are?yes no Are there signs giving directions (ie. North, South, to Downtown yes no Are there signs showing you where to get emergency assistance? yes no Coverall impression: no signs not enough signs hard to understand, to readgood signs	Mat 5 words best describe the p	lace: <u>Pirty bleak cold no clear</u>
<pre>Impression of lighting: very poorpoorsatisfactorygood very goodtoo darktoo bright Is the lighting even?yesno How many lights were out? Is the lighting obscured by trees or bushes?yesno How well does the lighting illuminate the signs and maps? very poorly poorly satisfactorywellvery well C. <u>SIGNS</u> Are there signs identifying where you are?yes no Are there signs giving directions (ie. North, South, to Downtown yes no Are there signs showing you where to get emergency assistance? yes no Cverall impression: no signs not enough signs hard to understand, to read good signs</pre>	•	signage for busroutes
<pre>very poor poor satisfactory good too bright Is the lighting even? yes no How many lights were out?</pre>	B. <u>LIGHTING</u>	
Is the lighting even?yes no How many lights were out? Is the lighting obscured by trees or bushes?yes no How well does the lighting illuminate the signs and maps? very poorlypoorlysatisfactorywellvery well C. <u>SIGNS</u> Are there signs identifying where you are?yes no Are there signs giving directions (ie. North, South, to Downtown yesno Are there signs showing you where to get emergency assistance? yesno Cverall impression:no signsnot enough signs hard to understand, to readgood signs		
Is the lighting even?yes no How many lights were out? Is the lighting obscured by trees or bushes?yes no How well does the lighting illuminate the signs and maps? very poorlypoorlysatisfactorywellvery well C. <u>SIGNS</u> Are there signs identifying where you are?yes no Are there signs giving directions (ie. North, South, to Downtown yesno Are there signs showing you where to get emergency assistance? yesno Cverall impression:no signsnot enough signs hard to understand, to readgood signs	very poor poor very good too dark	satisfactory good too bright
Is the lighting obscured by trees or bushes?yesno How well does the lighting illuminate the signs and maps? very poorlyvatisfactorywellvery well C. <u>SIGNS</u> Are there signs identifying where you are?yesno Are there signs giving directions (ie. North, South, to Downtown) yesno Are there signs showing you where to get emergency assistance? yesno Overall impression:no signsnot enough signs hard to understand, to readgood signs		
How well does the lighting illuminate the signs and maps? very poorly poorly satisfactory well very well C. <u>SIGNS</u> Are there signs identifying where you are?yes no Are there signs giving directions (ie. North, South, to Downtown) yes no Are there signs showing you where to get emergency assistance? yes no Overall impression: no signs not enough signs hard to understand, to readgood signs	How many lights were out? $_$ $\underline{\mathscr{O}}$	
very poorly poorly satisfactory well very well C. <u>SIGNS</u> Are there signs identifying where you are?yes $ no$ Are there signs giving directions (ie. North, South, to Downtown) yes $ no$ Are there signs showing you where to get emergency assistance? yes $ no$ Overall impression: no signs not enough signs hard to understand, to read good signs	Is the lighting obscured by tree	s or bushes? yes no
C. <u>SIGNS</u> Are there signs identifying where you are?yes \checkmark no Are there signs giving directions (ie. North, South, to Downtown) yes \checkmark no Are there signs showing you where to get emergency assistance? yes \checkmark no Cverall impression:no signsnot enough signs \checkmark hard to understand, to readgood signs	How well does the lighting illum	linate the signs and maps?
Are there signs identifying where you are?yes \checkmark no Are there signs giving directions (ie. North, South, to Downtown) yes \checkmark no Are there signs showing you where to get emergency assistance? yes \checkmark no Overall impression:no signsnot enough signs \checkmark hard to understand, to readgood signs	very poorly poorly sa	tisfactorywellvery well
Are there signs giving directions (ie. North, South, to Downtown) yes $$ no Are there signs showing you where to get emergency assistance? yes $$ no Overall impression:no signsnot enough signs hard to understand, to readgood signs	C. <u>SIGNS</u>	
_ yes √ no Are there signs showing you where to get emergency assistance? _ yes √ no Overall impression: no signs not enough signs √ hard to understand, to read good signs	Are there signs identifying when	te you are? yes _√ no
Are there signs showing you where to get emergency assistance? yes \sqrt{no} nonot enough signsnot enough signs	Are there signs giving direction	is (ie. North, South, to Downtown)
yesno Overall impression:no signsnot enough signs hard to understand, to readgood signs	_yes 🖌 no	
Overall impression: no signs not enough signs hard to understand, to read good signs	Are there signs showing you when	re to get emergency assistance?
hard to understand, to read good signs	yes no	/ ···
hard to understand, to read good signs	Overall impression: no sign:	not enough signs
What signs should be added? Sign to ELEVATOR	\checkmark hard to understand, to read	good signs
	What signs should be added?	-LINCOLN FIELES SHOPPING
		- TRANSIT WAY - TELE PHONJE 12

- 2 -

D. SIGHTLINES
Can you see clearly what's up ahead?yes no
If not, why?
If yes, where? Around posts
What would make it easier to see? <u>Mirrors in corners</u>
E. ISOLATION - EYE DISTANCE
How many people are at the station (that you see)?
At the time of your Audit, does the area feel isolated? $$ yes no
Why?
F. <u>ISOLATION - EAR DISTANCE</u>
How far away is the nearest person to hear a call for help? $5+$
Can you see a telephone, or a sign directing you to emergency assistance? 🟒 yes no
If yes, how far away? 9ft.
G. MOVEMENT PREDICTIONS
Is it easy for someone to predict your movements?
<pre> very easily somewhat easily no</pre>
H. <u>POSSIBLE ENTRAPMENT SITES</u>
Are there areas where someone could hide and wait for you? yes no
Examples:
/3

613 741 7359 P.13 Page 6 of 6

- 3 -

Are there locations where you would be hidden from view? ____yes $-\frac{J}{2}$ no Examples: How easy would it be for an assailant to disappear? __ very easy /_ easy ___ not very easy How easy would it be for you to escape from here? ____ very easy $\underline{\checkmark}$ easy ____ not very easy I. NEARBY LAND USES What is the surrounding or nearby area used for? _ schools __ don't know FACTORS THAT MAKE THE PLACE MORE HUMAN J. Is the access route well maintained? \underline{J} yes ____ no Is there evidence of vandalism? _ yes $4 \leq 1 \leq n_0$ Is there graffiti on the walls? __yes $\frac{1}{2}$ no K. OVERALL DESIGN Your impression of the design and layout of the area? __ very good 🖌 good __ satisfactory __ poor __ very poor If you were not familiar with the area would it be easy to find your way around? ____yes Do you feel comfortable using this station? ____ yes If not, why? IMPROVEMENTS L. What safety & security improvements would you like to see? igns; video cameras; huttons to opendoors

hand upped (strollers; washroom facility Colleen Olive

JAN 19 '00 10:57

705

APPENDIX C

Lincoln Fields Transit Station (Audit performed November 10, 1999)

Response to Security Audit

Item	Status	Completion Date
Signage	 Regional Police to provide CPTED recommendations re signage Review and update of all station signage by Public Info 	January 2000 March/April 2000
Surveillance	 Pay phones and Teledon to be relocated to more visible area. (Public Info/Plant) Canteen area will be reviewed re window clutter by security 	February 2000 February 2000
Overpass Leading to	• Entrance lighting upgrade (Plant)	March 2000
Carling Avenue	 Surveillance camera feasibility and costing by Security 	February 2000
	 Barricade path leading from upper level to Transitway (Plant) 	Temp snow fence/ formalize in May 2000
Platforms 1 and 2	• Graffiti Removal / paint over (Plant)	Ongoing
	 Installation of Emergency call boxes by Plant on East and West platforms Install additional convex mirrors 	May 2000
	(review by security to identify locations)	February 2000
Outside Surveillance	 Tinted glass to be replaced by clear glass as need arises (Region) Plant to trim all shrubs (max 3 feet 	To be reviewed with Region
	ht.) and trees (4 feet from ground)	Spring , as per seasonal recommended trimming

01/18/00

Extract of Minute Transit Services Committee 26 January 2000

3. <u>CRIME PREVENTION THROUGH ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN</u> - General Manager's report dated 19 Jan 00

Commissioner D. Holmes said she was pleased to see this item on the agenda and the involvement of the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service (OCRPS)in this process. She asked about the amount of funding budgeted in 2000 for the cost of retrofits. The Director, Planning and Development, Dr. H. Gault, indicated that, while there is no specific budget for the program, \$100,000 has been set aside for safety and environmental issues, including the provision for closed circuit monitors in transitway stations. The General Manager, G. Diamond, indicated that staff will provide additional information to Commissioners on this matter.

Commissioner Holmes proposed that funds be provided to the Women's Action Centre Against Violence (WACAV) to perform safety audits. Commissioner Holmes called this a legitimate expenditure and she expressed the hope the Police Service will continue its involvement in the safety audits.

Commissioner W. Byrne proposed that this report be circulated to both the Accessible Transit Advisory Committee and the Regional Transit Advisory Committee for comment, since input from these groups would tie-in with the ongoing work of safety audits. In reply to a question from Commissioner Byrne, Dr. Gault indicated that the Police Service has not charged OC Transpo for its part of the safety audit work to-date.

Commissioner J. Legendre inquired whether the safety audit at the St Laurent Station will be undertaken this year. Dr. Gault replied in the affirmative. She added that staff would like to do one to two stations each month and, in order to do so, the stations will need to be prioritized from a security perspective.

Commissioner Legendre expressed interest in being involved in the St Laurent audit, and also at seeing the partnership agreement to ensure no elements are missed.

The Committee Chair, A. Loney, asked whether safety concerns are part of the process in the design and construction of new stations. Dr. Gault indicated this was the case and that Constable VanRyswyk, of OCRPS participates in the process. Commissioner M. McGoldrick-Larsen suggested that Constable VanRyswyk be part of the Environmental Design Team, along with representatives from WACAV.

Extract of Minute Transit Services Committee 26 January 2000

Commissioner Holmes expressed the view OC Transpo has to be more aggressive in its dealings with the Regional Transportation Department, to ensure there is a philosophical change to the Department's approach to this matter. The General Manager, G. Diamond, replied that there is good dialogue between the Region and OC Transpo when it comes to improving security measures.

At this point, the Committee considered the following Motions:

Moved by W. Byrne

That the Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design report and Action Plan be circulated to the Regional Transit Advisory Committee (RTAC) and the Accessible Transit Advisory Committee (ATAC) for comment and that staff report back to Committee at it's February 2000 meeting.

CARRIED

Moved by W. Byrne

That Constable VanRyswyk of the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service (OCRPS) and (a representative) from the Women's Action Centre Against Violence (WACAV) be part of the design team for any future stations and also review for comment and recommendation the plans of new stations currently in the process of being built.

CARRIED

Moved by D. Holmes

That \$10,000 be provided to the Women's Action Centre Against Violence (WACAV) for safety audits of transitway stations in 2000.

CARRIED

Extract of Draft Minute Transit Services Committee 22 March 2000

INQUIRIES

3. Minutes of 26 January 2000

Commissioner Holmes referred to Item 3 of the Minutes of the Transit Services Committee of 26 January 2000 in which she had proposed the following Motion: That \$10,000 be provided to the Women's Action Centre Against Violence (WACAV) for safety audits of transitway stations in 2000. While the Committee approved the Motion, it had not been forwarded to the Commission for consideration, which she believed should have happened. She thought there may have been some confusion with another Motion approved during consideration of the same item, which addressed the issue of a specific police constable being part of the design team for future transitway plans, but not to do safety audits of presently constructed stations. She asked that the Motion be placed on the Commission Agenda for consideration and that the Committee re-approve the Motion accordingly. She emphasized that the Motion deals with safety audits of presently constructed transitway stations, not of new plans of future stations and it is much easier to use police officers from the local districts who will be policing those stations to do the safety audit with residents, rather than with the specialist, Constable Van Ryswyk.

Chair Loney understood that staff were going to meet with the parties involved to map out what stations would be done and to continue accordingly. Dr. Gault confirmed that the money has been identified in the transitway budget. It was her understanding that the program would be developed jointly with the Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design Division of the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Services and OC Transpo's own security staff and with WACAV to do audits of current transitway stations. She indicated that there is a proposal to do all the stations within the next two years.

Commissioner Holmes explained that it was never her intention to have a "specific" police officer involved in the presently constructed stations because she believed it was better to train the officers working in that area and have them go through those audits with the residents. Dr. Gault advised that the Constable is actually providing a training course on a widely spread basis and they will find a way to do a systematic audit of the stations.

Extract of Draft Minute Transit Services Committee 22 March 2000

> Commissioner Holmes believed, however, that the best training comes from spending time with transit station users and the residents about what problems have been identified.

> Commissioner Byrne suggested that perhaps it should be run by the police officers in that area as to whether or not they feel comfortable doing that unless they have the training and the Staff Sergeant's approval to take on that responsibility. She believed the police themselves should be a part of that discussion as to who actually does the audit.

Moved by D. Holmes

That the Transit Services Committee recommend that the Commission approve that \$10,000 be provided to the Women's Action Centre Against Violence (WACAV) for safety audits of already constructed transitway stations in 2000.

CARRIED