

MINUTES

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

2 AUGUST 2000

1:30 P.M.

PRESENT

Chair: D. Holmes

Members: M. Bellemare, W. Byrne, L. Davis, C. Doucet, H. Kreling, J. Legendre,  
M. Meilleur

REGRETS R. Cantin, M. McGoldrick-Larsen

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

**That the Transportation Committee confirm the Minutes of the meeting of 5 July 2000.**

CARRIED

- 
- Note:
1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation approved by Committee.
  2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 9 August 2000 in Transportation Committee Report 67.

## ROADWAY MODIFICATIONS/PUBLIC HEARINGS

### 1. MODIFICATIONS TO PRINCE OF WALES DRIVE TO ACCOMMODATE THE CHAPMAN MILLS AREA 4 SUBDIVISION

- Director, Mobility Services and Corporate Fleet Services report dated 13 Jul 00
- Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen's memo dated 2 Aug 00

John Buck, Manager, Safety and Traffic Studies advised that this development is situated in an area shown in the Transportation Master Plan as being part of the greater urban area. In response to the suggestion by Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen in her memorandum dated 2 August that sidewalks be provided in this area, he advised that the developer will provide a recreational path between the ditch and the development to the west of Prince of Wales Drive, which staff believe will satisfy the pedestrian requirements.

With respect to the provision of a sidewalk on the east side of the road, Mr. Buck noted that while the recently-adopted policy on providing sidewalks in the greater urban area recommended the provision of sidewalks in the rural areas, this development, which had been under negotiation for some time, was caught in the transition and therefore no plans were made to provide for a sidewalk on that side of the road. Ultimately, however, when the road is widened to four lanes (in at least 10 years), he maintained that there will be an opportunity for the proper provision of sidewalks and by that time, the area will reflect the more urban character and the demand for sidewalks will be there.

In response to a question posed by Councillor Legendre, staff advised that residents in the development will access the recreational area on the east side of Prince of Wales Drive via the pathway to be constructed by the developer, which will lead to the signalized intersection where they will be able to cross.

*William Sutter* did not support the installation of signals on a road that is supposed to move traffic. He suggested that a ramp crossing over to the east side of Prince of Wales Drive would be a safer alternative and would not slow down the flow of north/south traffic.

**Having held a public hearing, that the Transportation Committee recommend Council approve the installation of traffic control signals at the intersection of Prince of Wales Drive (Old Highway 16) and Waterbridge Street (Winding Way) and the construction of associated roadway modifications as described in the report and illustrated in Annex B, subject to the proponent, Minto Developments Incorporated:**

1. **funding the total cost for the roadway modifications and the associated utility relocations which would include paying the total cost for the traffic control signal installation and their annual maintenance costs until such time as the**

**signals meet the Ministry of Transportation of Ontario installation warrants and Council approves the assumption of the costs; and,**

- 2. executing a legal agreement with respect to the above.**

CARRIED

2. MODIFICATIONS TO INNES ROAD AND BLAIR ROAD INTERSECTION TO ACCOMMODATE THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE INNES CENTRE

- Director, Mobility Services and Corporate Fleet Services report dated 14 Jul 00

Following a brief overview of the proposed modifications, Councillor Bellemare explained that residents, whose homes front onto Innes Road, are concerned about noise and he wondered whether there will be any widening on the north side of the road. Staff advised there is nothing proposed for that side of the road as part of this modification. The councillor noted that the site plan agreement will not be signed until Canril Corporation becomes the property owners. Presently the National Capital Commission (NCC) owns the lands and there is a dispute between the tenant and the NCC as to whether or not these lands should revert back to the tenant. When asked about the status of the ownership of the land and the impact on the outcome of this project, Fred Cogan representing Canril Corporation, advised that the land is under contract to purchase by Canril from the NCC and they expect to complete the transaction by the end of August. He confirmed that the dispute between the NCC and the tenant will not affect Canril's purchase of the land.

Councillor Legendre referred to the radius of the curves as illustrated at Annexes B and C and John Buck, Manager, Safety and Traffic Studies confirmed that the same radius (12 metres) would be used at Blair as is at Stonehenge; he reminded members this is only a functional design and that staff want as tight a radius as possible in order to provide as short a crossing distance across Innes Road for pedestrians. The councillor indicated that the Region does not have a clear policy in its Transportation Master Plan about these kinds of issues and he opined that in future, developments are going to have to start using short-bodied trucks that can handle these tighter accesses. Mr. Buck advised that the roadway design has to accommodate the types of vehicles that are associated with the site.

*Councillor Patricia Clark, City of Gloucester*, referred to the overall reconstruction and widening of Innes Road and suggested that the sooner that can be done, the less impact it will have on the residents abutting this area, noting they have already been subjected to increased noise and pollution with the original widening of Innes Road and the development that occurred to the east. As part of the proposed development, she hoped the crossing time at Stonehenge Crescent east will be modified accordingly when the extra lanes are implemented, to ensure

residents have ample time to cross the road to the bus stop on the opposite side. She noted that residents of the small condominium fronting onto Stonehenge have access from Innes Road through a median break so they can get out and make a left turn onto Innes. When it became difficult for them to do so because of traffic backing up on Innes waiting to turn left onto Blair, the Region painted hatch marks on the road to ensure their egress was not blocked. She wanted assurance that those markings would be reinstated following the roadway modification. The councillor also referred to a very small break in the median on Innes which had been provided for a resident and given that its location is directly opposite the access to the new development, she wondered what would prevent motorists from using that break to get in and out of the site.

In response to her concerns about the reinstatement of the roadway markings for the residents of the condominium, Mr. Buck advised these will be reviewed as part of the detailed design. The median access currently provided to the resident would also have to be addressed, since the proposal calls for a right-in/right-out only with no median break. He acknowledged that the break may be removed in the final design and that that design could go out for some public consultation. With regards to the overall reconstruction of Innes Road, Brendan Reid, Manager, Infrastructure and Project Planning explained that the longer-term widening to six lanes between Blair Road and Highway 417 is referred to in the Region's Official Plan, noting the capacity improvements both here and to the east are listed as Priority 1 projects, suggesting that they should be in place before 2006. In anticipation of that being able to occur, staff are currently undertaking an Environmental Assessment Study (EAS) to determine what the details of those widenings should be.

In response to the latter comment, Councillor Clark believed this present development will have a negative impact on the already-failing intersection of Innes and Cyrville and given the overall extent of development in the area, she opined that the ultimate widening of Innes should be done sooner than 2006. As an additional comment, the councillor expressed her disappointment that cycling facilities were not taken into consideration when Cyrville and Blair were recently overlaid. She noted these are important corridors for residents coming from Orléans, Blackburn Hamlet and from the southern end of Pineview to get through into the Montreal/Ogilvie Roads area.

In discussing the report before committee, Councillor Bellemare acknowledged the fact that the Region's role is limited to ensuring safe access to the site, including improved pedestrian and cycling amenities, and ensuring its road system is not compromised. He believed this was being achieved through the staff recommendations. He believed what was important to confirm today is that these road modifications are compatible with the projected road widening of Innes to the south which is the commercially-developed side of the road. Further, it respects the north curb line of the residential area north of Innes Road, as do the road widening options being developed under the EAS. He noted that the widening raises air quality, noise and vibration

levels concerns for residents and all of those will need to be assessed as part of the EAS. In closing, he noted there will be more public meetings in the fall as part of the EA process and he looked forward to receiving feedback from the local councillor and area residents on this matter. He urged committee members to support the report.

**Having held a public hearing, that the Transportation Committee recommend Council approve the modifications to the traffic control signals at the intersection of Innes Road at Stonehenge Crescent east and Innes Road at Blair Road and associated roadway modifications along Innes Road between Stonehenge Crescent west and Blair Road as illustrated in Annexes B and C, subject to the owner, Canril Corporation:**

- 1. funding the total cost for the roadway modifications, the associated utility relocations and existing traffic control signal modifications; and,**
- 2. executing a legal agreement with respect to the above.**

CARRIED

REGULAR ITEMS

3. LITTER/RECYCLING BINS - PILOT PROJECT  
- Director, Infrastructure Maintenance report dated 4 Jul 00

The committee received a detailed presentation by Lorne Ross, Manager, Surface Projects who highlighted the major points in the report. He indicated that it costs the Region \$330,000 every year to maintain city receptacles. The bins to be used in this pilot are larger for collecting recyclables, therefore furthering opportunities to recycle and get revenues through that program. The bins will also help reduce costs associated with disposing of recyclables which are often in city litter bins and which would normally end up in the Region's landfill. Staff recommend that the pilot be endorsed until the end of the year, following which an evaluation report will be prepared for the new city committee and council the next year. With respect to the types of advertising that could be placed on these bins, Mr. Ross referred to the guidelines in the report which safeguard against any inappropriate advertising. Coloured photographs of the bins were distributed to give committee members an idea of how they will look on city and regional roads.

Councillor Davis stated there is currently advertising at some bus-stops (shelters and benches) and she believed that the addition of these new bins, would be too visually overpowering. She questioned how the Region can ensure they are not placed where there is already an over-abundance of advertising. Willy Dunn, Manager of Road Operations at the City of Ottawa, responded by stating these bins would not be installed beside a bus stop which already has a

bench with advertisement. He confirmed that this has been discussed this with OC Transpo and they are keeping them involved. He referred to the list of 100 proposed locations for these bins and it was requested that the list be made available to all councillors.

Councillor Legendre advised that he had been told by an advertising company that they had not been notified about this proposal. Mr. Dunn advised that the city had put out a call for proposals and suggested that the company may have missed the original notice. The councillor questioned whether the advertising standards to be used in this pilot are the same as were adopted for the OC Transpo bench advertising program and Mr. Dunn confirmed they were. The councillor did not believe this program could compare to OC Transpo's program because under that contract, the company installs and maintains the benches and empties the waste receptacle at each location; in this proposal, it will be city and regional staff involved in placing and emptying the bins. Mr. Dunn suggested that while the bus-stop receptacles are helpful in reducing the amount of litter on the street, they do nothing about the recycling problem and the goal is to get more waste receptacles and recycling containers on the street.

When asked by Councillor Meilleur what she had to gain from this pilot, Mr. Dunn advised that there will be less litter on the streets and there would be cost-savings from having more bins because there would be less resources needed to service the waste receptacles all the time. He stated that there are currently not enough waste bins to go around and many times they are overflowing before they are emptied. The councillor was concerned these bins will only add to the proliferation of boxes on the sidewalks, including newspaper vending boxes and mail boxes and with advertisements currently at every bus shelter, she wondered what the downtown would look like if these new bins were added to the blight.

The councillor questioned that if there is already a shortage of waste containers on the streets, will they all have to be as proposed in this pilot. Mr. Dunn advised that there will be a combination of what presently exists plus the new containers. The councillor surmised, therefore, that the savings will not be as great as anticipated since the bins will not be all over the place. Mr. Ross advised that the savings would depend on how many existing garbage receptacles would have to be replaced. In response to a concern voiced by the councillor, Mr. Ross advised that the municipality would have the right to move the bin or to perhaps replace it with a standard-type waste receptacle. Staff will not allow these bins to interfere with pedestrians or traffic, and he confirmed they will only be installed in locations that are safe for everybody. Mr. Dunn added that of the 100 bins, 60 will be placed at existing locations and 40 will be at new locations.

Councillor Bellemare inquired when the bins would be removed and Mr. Dunn advised that the original plan is to have them taken up on 31 December 2000. However, if the pilot is successful, staff are hoping it could be extended a couple of months to ascertain what the winter months will be like. The councillor questioned whether the bins will remain until such time as the new City of Ottawa Council decides to continue or not and Mr. Dunn replied they would be removed until

that decision is made. In terms of evaluating the pilot project and receiving the public's reaction to see if it is feasible to reduce litter vs adding to the visual blight, the councillor wondered whether or not it would be to the Region's advantage to maximize the number of new bins during the pilot in order to get appropriate feedback from the public. Mr. Dunn reiterated that it is a pilot and staff will weigh the materials collected in the bins and examine and evaluate the pros and cons of the program, including conducting some public consultation. He further explained that rather than spending money to purchase new waste receptacles, when staff learned of this program, which has been operating successfully in Toronto, they decided to introduce it to the City of Ottawa. He believed the pilot will provide the information for the new City of Ottawa Council to weigh the pros and cons on litter reduction vs visual blight of the bins.

Councillor Doucet inquired whether there had been any complaints about garbage problems in the Glebe. Mr. Dunn advised there has been some because many people use the street bins for their household waste and this has become a real problem. The councillor echoed previous concerns about the size of these receptacles and the amount of space they will require, noting this will be a concern on some of the more narrow sidewalks in his area. While he was willing to proceed with the pilot, he did not think it would receive support from residents or businesses.

Councillor Davis asked if there was an approval process for the vending boxes currently on city and regional streets. Mr. Ross advised that there is a staff person assigned to approving their installation on the Region's right-of-way. Mr. Dunn added that if the box does not have the blue permit sticker displayed, the box is removed and the company must pay a fine in order to get it back. The councillor advised that there was a newspaper box in front of a fire hydrant outside the Mountain Equipment Co-op on Richmond Road which should be relocated. Mr. Dunn agreed to investigate.

*Peggy Ducharme, Rideau BIA* indicated that she constantly calls in complaining about the problem of inappropriate garbage being put into bins in the Rideau Street area. Since this is such a reoccurring problem, she believed there was a lack of enforcement to ensure the bins are emptied regularly. In looking at the proposal before committee, Ms. Ducharme opined that much of the garbage she sees in the existing bins, would not fit through the narrow slots of the new receptacles and she feared it would just end up the sidewalk. With respect to the advertising component of this program, she indicated that small businesses already have to compete with other interests on the sidewalks and the BIA believes these bins would only add to that competition. She maintained that this proposal is advertising-driven, not service-driven and opined there will not be many put in locations where they are really needed because they would be in such high traffic areas, the advertising would not get exposure. Based on these problems and their concerns associated with the additional proliferation of things on the sidewalks and the hazards that poses, Ms. Ducharme asked that the Rideau BIA be excluded from this pilot.

Having reviewed the list of locations where these bins are to be located, Councillor Doucet noted there are 16 proposed in his ward, predominantly in business areas and those most jammed by pedestrians and the most in demand for advertising space. Based on the cost of this program, he did not believe the Region is asking enough for advertising in such prime space. As stated by Ms. Ducharme, he noted there is an issue of fairness to business owners who have to compete with other interests in front of their store and he requested that Bank Street between Holmwood Avenue and First Avenue be exempted from the pilot project.

While he was somewhat concerned about the size of the bins, Councillor Kreling was willing to put them on the street in an effort to see how visually-obtrusive they would actually be and what the public reaction will be. He suggested the results of the pilot be submitted to the new city committee and council before they decide whether or not to continue the program.

Councillor Legendre understood there was a clause in the OC Transpo contract that gives them first pick on regional roads where there are bus stops. He asked Legal staff to review that and provide input when this item is before Council, because this would be another limiting factor as to where these litter/recycling receptacles can be placed. When asked whether the signage on the new bins will correspond to current signage used by the Region for its recycling program, Mr. Dunn did not believe it did, but agreed it was a good idea to be consistent.

Since there was some discussion about areas being exempted from this pilot, Councillor Davis suggested that the ward councillor be given the option to approve or reject a location where a bin is to be located. She did not want to see the exempted bins put just anywhere and suggested that involving the councillor will give them the opportunity to raise it with their ward councils and for their communities to provide input.

Councillor Meilleur indicated she would support the pilot, but requested that the streets included in the Rideau BIA, such as Rideau, George, Sussex, King Edward, Daly, et cetera, be exempted from the pilot.

Chair Holmes asked that staff provide her with a copy of the contract for her review. She stated that one of the problems she sees with existing newspaper vending boxes, is that they are sometimes placed on the outer boulevards which is often greenspace. She concurred with the concerns expressed and while she understood how the city wants to implement this program because of the revenue it will generate, she believed there was a total lack of urban design in the bins themselves and believed they would be unsightly on city streets. She felt some of the locations being recommended for installation would not be acceptable and proposed some options to address the concerns raised today.



Moved by C. Doucet

**That Bank Street between Holmwood Avenue and First Avenue be excluded from the pilot project.**

CARRIED

Moved by M. Meilleur

**That the Rideau BIA streets be excluded from the pilot, with the exception of DND at the Mackenzie King Bridge and the Rideau Centre at the Mackenzie King Bridge.**

CARRIED

Moved by L. Davis

**That any additional locations of pilot project litter/recycling containers not identified in the list presented to the Transportation Committee, must receive approval through the ward councillor for the area, prior to installation.**

CARRIED

Moved by D. Holmes

**That the City have 10 bins with no advertising, for City purposes.**

CARRIED

Moved by D. Holmes

**That any revenues generated from this project will be returned to the Environment and Transportation Department to offset and/or enhance the City's cost for litter control.**

CARRIED

Moved by D. Holmes

**That the following amendments be made to Key Principle 2 of the Request for Proposal (Document 1):**

- a. That the second sentence be amended to read as follows: “The City reserves the right to choose *and or remove* the locations at which litter/recycling bins with an advertising component will be placed.”;**
- b. That the following point be added: “That bins be removed following a request from a councillor.”.**

CARRIED

Moved by D. Holmes

**That an additional Key Principle 24 be added to the Request for Proposal (Document 1) to read as follows: “Litter bins will not be allowed to preclude any tree-planting locations.”.**

CARRIED

Moved by H. Kreling

**That the detailed report on the operation of the pilot program be presented to the City Committee and Council early in 2001 to decide on the program’s continuation or cancellation.**

CARRIED

**That the Transportation Committee recommend Council approve participation in a pilot project for the placement and servicing of litter/recycling bins on City Streets and Regional Roads as outlined in this report.**

CARRIED as amended

4. ASSUMPTION OF MAINTENANCE AND OPERATING COSTS  
FOR TRAFFIC CONTROL SIGNALS

- Director, Mobility Services and Corporate Fleet Services report dated 13 Jul 00
- Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen's memo dated 2 Aug 00

John Buck, Manager of Safety and Traffic Studies advised that as a result of requests from developers and municipalities, there are many locations where unwarranted signals have been approved. He noted that traffic counts are conducted each year to determine if the unwarranted signal meets the warrants and if so, a report is submitted to Committee and Council recommending the assumption of costs for those signals by the Region. Currently, annual traffic counts at unwarranted locations are only done so at the request of a developer.

Mr. Buck explained that on 28 September 1999, a request was received from Cumming Coburn Limited to analyze three locations (West Hunt Club, Merivale and Cleopatra) to determine if the warrants were met and two of them did satisfy the warrants (Recommendation 2a and b). In addition, the signals at the Stafford Shopping Centre in Bell Corners (Recommendation 2c) were also deemed to meet the warrants. He advised that the annual operating and maintenance costs of these signals is \$3500/location; however, based on the fact the departmental budget is determined in October for the following year, the analysis of the locations was not included, thus leaving a shortfall in the operating budget of \$10,500.

Mr. Buck noted, however, that if the counts are done in the summer and the location is deemed to meet the warrants, the costs could then be incorporated into the budget. Staff therefore propose an amendment to the existing policy to recommend that the municipality assume those costs effective January 1<sup>st</sup> the following year (Recommendation 1). Effective immediately, he proposed that developers currently paying for unwarranted signals, be advised that staff are prepared to do a traffic count on their behalf this summer, at a cost of \$300/location. If the signal is found to be warranted, the developer would not be financially responsible for the cost of the traffic count and staff would include that as a line item in the departments operating budget for the following year. If the signal is found to be unwarranted, the Department would attempt to recover the \$300 from the developer. Mr. Buck was hesitant to get into a situation where staff have to count every unwarranted signal each year because of the substantive costs if it is not necessary to collect that data and, as suggested by Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen in her memo to committee, this could be included under delegated authority.

Chair Holmes agreed with staff's suggestion about sending a letter to each developer and asking that they reply within the Region's budget timeframe. Mr. Buck added that staff could also indicate they are prepared to do it on an annual basis, provided they notify staff by 1 May each year, for example.

*Michael Polowin, representing Melron Property Enterprises Inc., expressed general agreement with the staff's position; however, in the situation involving the traffic count taken at Merivale and West Hunt Club Road, he advised it was carried out at the cost of the developer, and although the signals did meet the warrants, they have still received an invoice for the costs associated with those signals. He suggested that in order for this policy to work, developers should be given a deadline by which requests must be submitted in order to meet the 1st of January of that year. In respect to the signals referenced at Recommendation 2 (a) and (b), the request from the developer for the traffic count was submitted on 28 September 1999 and, since the signals were determined to be warranted, the committee should rightly recommend to Council that they be assumed by the Region as of 1 January 2000.*

When questioned what an appropriate phase-in date would be, Mr. Buck suggested it should be 1 September 2000 for this year only, and that developers would be made aware of this. For subsequent years, the date should be 1 May. The committee agreed to this suggestion.

Councillor Legendre agreed the policy should be changed, but in light of the presentation made by the delegation, he suggested the Region should assume the costs associated with the signals listed at Recommendation 2 this year.

Moved by M. Meilleur

**That Recommendation 1 be amended to include “and that this be done under delegated authority.”**

CARRIED

Moved by J. Legendre

**That Recommendation 2 be amended to read: That the RMOC assume the annual maintenance and operating costs effective 1 January 2000 of the traffic control signals at:**

- a. Merivale Road (Regional Road 17) at 170 m north of Hunt Club Road (Regional Road 32) (Annex A);
- b. West Hunt Club Road (Regional Road 32) at 210 m west of Merivale Road (Regional Road 17) (Annex A); and,

- c. **Richmond Road (Regional Road 36) at Stafford Shopping Centre Access/ Northside Road (Annex B).**

CARRIED

Moved by J. Legendre

**That the revised policy be amended to say that unwarranted signal supporters, i.e., those requested by developers, be advised that any requests for warrant counts be received by May 1<sup>st</sup> of each year.**

CARRIED

**That Transportation Committee recommend Council approve that:**

1. **the existing policy be revised to reflect that “when a developer installed traffic control signal becomes warranted, the annual maintenance and operating costs of the traffic control signal will be assumed by the Municipality on the 1<sup>st</sup> of January of the next year”;**
2. **the New City of Ottawa assume the annual maintenance and operating costs effective 01 January 2001 of the traffic control signals at:**
  - a. **Merivale Road (Regional Road 17) at 170 m north of Hunt Club Road (Regional Road 32) (Annex A);**
  - b. **West Hunt Club Road (Regional Road 32) at 210 m west of Merivale Road (Regional Road 17) (Annex A); and,**
  - c. **Richmond Road (Regional Road 36) at Stafford Shopping Centre Access/ Northside Road (Annex B).**

CARRIED as amended

## INQUIRIES

### Restricting Access During Beerfest

Councillor Doucet stated that the walkway between Lisgar and Laurier is used as a public access between the two streets. Closing this access off in an erratic and arbitrary way creates frustration and inconvenience to residents. He asked:

1. Why was it necessary to close it off?
2. Why was there no signage to warn people that it was being closed off?

He asked staff to give him some assurances that this will not happen in the future. It is more important to preserve the public thoroughfare for residents than to raise revenue for a beerfest.

### Pedestrian Crosswalk - McArthur and Enfield

Councillor Meilleur noted that a pedestrian crosswalk was to be provided at the above location when McArthur Avenue was rebuilt. In the three large condominium complexes at this intersection, almost half of the residents are seniors and they have great difficulty getting to the church on the other side of the street. She asked staff to advise her why the crosswalk was not built and to review the situation.

### Pan Handlers at St. Patrick/Murray/King Edward

Councillor Meilleur stated that pan handlers are approaching stopped motorists at the above-noted intersection, creating a dangerous situation. While the police are aware of the situation, anything the RMOC could do to alleviate the situation would be appreciated. Staff agreed to contact the police to discuss the issue.

### Provincial Funding for Rail

Councillor Legendre referred to an e-mail he received from staff which included an attachment describing what was in the provincial budget this past spring. There appeared to be an opening for provincial funds for rail renewal and he questioned whether there was an opportunity for the Region to tap this program to assist with its Light Rail Pilot Project. The Commissioner of Planning and Development Approvals advised that the funds for rail were in the federal budget and he indicated the Region is following up with the idea of a potential VIA station at the Fallowfield Transit Station in Barrhaven.

With respect to the provincial funding, there were three types of funds co-ordinated by the Superbuild Fund and currently, that corporation is developing criteria and will be putting out a call for proposals. Whatever is put forward by a municipality will be evaluated according to that criteria. In this regard, staff have retained consultants to look at some potential projects, so the Region will be ready whenever the call for proposal comes forward.

Capacity of Roundabouts

Councillor Legendre requested staff to provide committee members with some analysis and evaluation of the capacity of roundabouts. He referred to the literature he had on this and wondered if there could be some assessment on these for the new City of Ottawa in the future. Staff agreed to report back in a couple of months.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

---

CO-ORDINATOR

---

CHAIR