

MINUTES

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

2 FEBRUARY 1999

1:30 P.M.

PRESENT

Chair: D. Holmes

Members: M. Bellemare, W. Byrne, R. Cantin, L. Davis, C. Doucet, H. Kreling,
J. Legendre, M. McGoldrick-Larsen, M. Meilleur

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

That the Transportation Committee confirm the Minutes of the meeting of 15 December 1999.

CARRIED

REGULAR ITEMS

1. AUDIBLE PEDESTRIAN SIGNALS ADVISORY COMMITTEE -
PROGRESS REPORT - 1999
- Director, Mobility Services report dated 21 Dec 99

Doug Brousseau provided a brief overview of the background to this report, noting Ottawa-Carleton is among the most progressive municipalities in Ontario with respect to signals. He reviewed the staff recommendations contained in the report. With regards to the recommendation contained at Section 1b, staff believe there are a large number of accessibility issues to be addressed and as the Region amalgamates with other municipalities, there will be opportunities to address some of those issues. He advised that several municipalities have committees specifically assigned to examine accessibility issues and he felt it would be

-
- Note:
1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation approved by Committee.
 2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 9 February 2000 in Transportation Committee Report 53.

appropriate that all persons with disabilities get the same treatment. In this regard, he suggested that an Accessibility Committee could be created in the new city, with perhaps the amalgamation of existing committees.

With respect to the recommendation contained at Section 1(e), Mr. Brousseau advised that Chris Brinkman, Engineer, Operations, who works with the APS Advisory Committee, is also working with the Transportation Association of Canada (TAC) in a review of their standards. He believed there were opportunities to make some improvements, because anyone visiting from another community should expect to receive the same standard as they do in their own municipality. He acknowledged there will be financial implications associated with the adoption of the recommendation, including capital and maintenance costs. Mr. Brousseau stated that not all intersections recommended by the community for APS would be supported by staff because of safety considerations.

In reference to his last point, Councillor Legendre questioned how staff would establish a standard for suitability for installation, wondering whether it must be deemed to be perfectly safe, or, if the installation improves safety, but without safety being perfectly assured. D. Brousseau advised that staff will not recommend anything they feel may jeopardize the safety of anyone. He added that one concern that has been raised is that the sound of the signal has to be clear with respect to what it relates to and there will be intersections where this will not be the case. In this regard, staff would seek advice from the CNIB and the APS Advisory Committee, but cautioned there may not always be agreement following such consultation. He emphasized that staff would not recommend anything that would compromise the safety of sighted or blind people.

Councillor Cantin referred to the intersection of Grey Nun's and Jeanne d'Arc Boulevard, noting the traffic volumes change depending on the time of day and questioned whether the Department has the capability with the new signals to adjust the volume on the APS. D. Brousseau explained that the signals contain a device which measures ambient sound and he confirmed they can adjust the sound levels at different times of day.

Councillor Loney questioned whether the recent withdrawal of the province of Ontario from TAC will have any impact on these kinds of programs continuing and setting some standards across the country. The Environment and Transportation Commissioner advised that in the past, the provincial and federal governments have shared on a proportionate basis and 80% of the support for TAC comes from the provinces. He believed that if the other provinces and the federal government follows suit, it will require a total restructuring of TAC and would have to be picked up by the major municipalities. As a member of the Board of Directors on TAC, Councillor Loney believed that if it is not going to be representative across the country, it will make it exceedingly difficult to have national standards. He suggested the committee may wish to send some official communication to the province in this regard because this issue needs to be

addressed. M. Sheflin stated that it is truly tragic for the continued prosperity of this province that the area where the major amount of transportation of goods and services (urban areas) has been totally abandoned by the province.

Questions arose on the maintenance costs associated with the installation of APS. M. Sheflin advised that despite a significant increase in the number of signals, the maintenance of the system has been achieved through technology and skilled staff. He agreed this is an area where there is a need for more technology, but at the same time the Region is increasing the total plant so there is a limit to the increases in the number of signalized intersections and the number of devices at those intersections. With respect to APS devices, D. Brousseau explained that part of the challenge is the lack of good quality equipment being supplied by a limited number of manufacturers; staff have to be dispatched from time to time to inspect and repair the equipment.

Terry Keough, Orientation Mobility Instructor, Canadian National Institute for the Blind clarified the CNIB's role regarding the APS Advisory Committee and its role with respect to the blind and visually impaired community in Ottawa-Carleton. He advised that the CNIB does not intend or wish to be seen as speaking on behalf of *all* blind and visually-impaired persons; rather, the CNIB sees itself as a valuable team member in an ongoing process to encourage and facilitate dialogue and to assist in finding practical solutions to everyday mobility hazards and limitations e.g. sidewalkless streets and right-hand turning channels.

Lawrence Euteneuer explained that he walks back and forth to work each day and his goal is to be able make that journey as stress-free as possible. While there are not too many things that remind him of the fact he is blind, intersections cause particular problems for him and nearly every intersection he has to travel through to work and back presents a challenge. He explained that as a blind person, he must listen to when the traffic is in the direction he wants to move in to before he attempts to cross the street; while this is easily done when there is an even flow of traffic, in cases where a one-way road meets a two-way road there is confusion in the signals he receives. He agreed that canes, guide dogs and training can help blind people get across the road, but questioned what can be done to make it safer.

Mr. Euteneuer explained that it is difficult to cross signalized intersections when the pedestrian can only cross when they activate a walk signal. In these instances, it is difficult for him to have to reach for and find the pole with the button to activate the walk cycle. He suggested tactile indicators around the pole would assist, as would a sound being emitted from the pole so he locate it easily. Mr. Euteneuer recalled his experience living in Sweden where every intersection has an APS. Each pole emitted a clicking sound which had a slow beat when the light was red, but which emitted a faster beat when the light turned green. This made getting around the city very enjoyable and virtually stress-free. He encouraged the Region to keep moving ahead in

this technology and remain open to new ideas, with a view to better integration so that everyone can use and benefit from that technology.

When questioned how audible signals help him, Mr. Euteneuer explained that they tell him when the light is green and the sound provides some guidance for him so he knows when he is heading in the right direction. He added that for pedestrians in general, APS are another form of stimulation and if they can help pedestrians it would do the general public more good. When questioned what the most challenging intersection is for him on his way to work he indicated it was the yield lane on Laurier Avenue going towards Queen Elizabeth Driveway.

David Farough stated that despite the fact an intersection may be too complicated to provide APS, the fact remains that the blind do not have any other help to get around. He appreciated the fact that staff do not want to make things less safe than they are, but in some cases, they are not safe to begin with. Mr. Farough explained the difficulties he encounters travelling by bus through the Region and believed some attention must be paid to OC Transpo and how the visually impaired get around using transit. By way of example, he indicated that if he gets on the wrong bus, he must rely on the driver to help point him in the right direction so he can catch the right bus back to where he was wanting to go in the first place. In this regard, he emphasized the need to improve accessibility within bus stations. Mr. Farough believed that improvements can be made even beyond what is being proposed by the Advisory Committee.

Ray Barfitt explained that another hazard blind people are faced with are the proliferation of right-turn channelization lanes which he must cross even before he reaches the pole to activate the signal. On another note, when there is no APS, well-meaning motorists seeing him standing on the curb will call out to him that it is okay to cross; however, in most cases, he prefers to wait until a couple of cycles have passed in order to familiarize himself with the flow of traffic. This gives him a better indication of the direction in which traffic is flowing. Mr. Barfitt complained about the lack of adequate pedestrian access into shopping centres where the parking is generally located at the front of the complex.

Ian Martin wondered whether staff were aware of a traffic policy being conducted by the RCMP, Transport Canada and the OPP and most of the western provinces with respect to vehicle and pedestrian conflicts at intersections and the high rate of pedestrian fatalities. He noted that the right-hand turn channelization lanes along Jeanne d'Arc Boulevard are very dangerous for him and others who are visually-impaired because the ambient noise is so high he cannot hear the vehicles coming. Mr. Martin stated that APS are not the only aid to crossing the street, but they are an important sensory aid and give a sound that can be followed. Because of the difficulty posed by these and other hazards, he emphasized the anxiety and frustration that blind people have to deal with, even before they leave their homes.

Councillor Cantin questioned whether having a pole with a button on the sidewalk would help him to cross the channelized lane. Mr. Martin agreed it would provide some help but believed

the emphasis should be on motorists obeying laws. The councillor believed that a right-turn prohibition on red and a painted stop bar would provide additional crossing time at the same time keeping vehicles well back from pedestrians when they are crossing. Mr. Martin agreed it is a possible solution, but recognized it was also an issue of educating motorists to adhere to the stop line. He specifically asked that staff examine the right-turn channelized lane at Orléans and St. Joseph with a view to making improvements for the blind.

Councillor Cantin questioned whether there was anything in the Highway Traffic Act or MTO standards that would prevent the Region from having a stop bar further back and installing a signal at that point as well as at a drivers eye level. D. Brousseau believed there may be issues in the Highway Traffic Act about what an intersection is, but agreed it is a lot more complicated and will take some considerable review. The councillor suggested that is something staff should consider, because he thought it would be the solution for that intersection in particular. He proposed a Motion to that affect.

Valerie Collicott distributed copies of a letter from Kim Kilpatrick who was unable to attend the meeting. At her request, the Committee Chair read the letter which highlighted her main concerns about walking on sidewalkless streets and the difficulties this poses to her and her guide dog. This is a particular concern in the winter when there is snow build-up alongside the road and she is forced to move closer to the traffic.

On her own behalf, Mrs. Collicott indicated that left-turn phases at intersections, particularly complex ones, are very problematic for her as a blind person. Her home is located near the intersection of Tenth Line/Des Epinettes/Charlemagne which has the 'old style' APS (bells and buzzers) and she recently learned the Region is planning to install a left-turn at that intersection. She was aware that staff have been working at similar intersections with the new-sounding APS to time them in such a way that they do not conflict with the left-turning movement and she hoped the existing APS at this intersection can be adaptable because she did not like the new sounding APS (bird call sounds). She explained that these do not give blind people enough information at the intersection and at what stage the light cycle is at. She believed that the Region should hold back on left-turn phases because the visually impaired are not familiar with what intersections have them and which ones do not. She stressed that a lot of the issues come back to communication to pedestrians and believed there must be further consultation than there is now.

Further, Mrs. Collicott explained that right-turn lanes are hazardous to blind people and motorists do not observe the fact they must yield to pedestrians in these situations. She referred to the Leading Pedestrian Interval and opined this is almost the exact opposite to the advance left-turn phase for vehicles. It is a lead-in time interval for pedestrians to head off before the vehicles get their green signal and they have asked that staff look into that. She emphasized that

public consultation is important and recommended the Region continue to do more than just have committees to examine the issues.

Terry Green emphasized that the safety of people who are blind and other pedestrians must be taken into consideration when they have to cross a street. He indicated that blind people get their information from APS while sighted pedestrians get their information from the regular signals. He did not agree with the point made by staff that some intersections cannot be equipped with APS because it may pose a safety hazard. He stated that when there is no APS, then it is not safe for blind people to cross because no information is provided to them. He recognized there are some intersections that are much more complex than others and in those cases, what might be considered are some additional measures such as tactile surfaces which could indicate in which direction a person is supposed to be walking. He added that there are a number of intersections that are not equipped with APS and he has been bumped by cars as a result; many of those instances happen as a result of right-turn channelized lanes.

Mr. Green advised that at Bank and Walkley there is an island that pedestrians must reach by crossing a right-turn channelized lane and the difficulty here is that the island is flush with the street and is undetectable either by his feet or his guide dog. Therefore, when he attempts to cross to get to the island his dog often has difficulty even finding the island, especially during the winter months when there can be a build-up of snow. He suggested that replacing the yield signs with stop signs at right-turn channelized lanes would be more beneficial than a stop light as suggested previously by Councillor Cantin.

Chris Stark, Chair, APS Advisory Committee believed the delegations who have spoken to the committee have related powerful testimonies and given a brief glimpse of what it is like to be blind. He referred to a report previously distributed dated 25 January 2000 from the Advisory Committee, which was prepared in response to the staff report and which contains recommendations over and above those of staff and which encompasses all of the Advisory Committee's concerns. Of particular mention, however, is the provision of information to and consultation with blind people. He maintained that the visually-impaired should be given an opportunity to learn about accessibility amenities in the community. With respect to the proposal to conduct a survey of the blind community, he believed that following a consultation process it may be appropriate for surveys, but at this point the APS Advisory Committee cannot support that initiative because people who are blind will not be able to effectively participate in those surveys. He suggested perhaps producing a little 'tourist guide' booklet for the blind to assist them in their travel in and around the Region.

Mr. Stark indicated that at this time, the APS Advisory Committee wanted to do more work before going out to the blind community and raising expectations about what they can expect from this process. Once recommendations are adopted, they will be ready to start more involvement by persons who are blind in the community. As related in their latest report, Mr.

Stark believed that the Advisory Committee's work should move on to encompass broader areas of pedestrian safety because by doing one thing to help one person, another's access has been negated. He emphasized that whatever consultation takes place, it must be assured that there is a focal point on blindness-related access issues. He believed their committee's work should continue in a way that it contributes to pedestrian safety as a whole.

Councillor Legendre supposed that if APS were installed at a complicated intersection which makes it far from safe, it might send the wrong signals to blind people by leading them to believe they can use the intersection safely. He questioned whether in fact this will only make the situation worse for unsighted people. Mr. Stark replied that if the intersection is not safe for blind people, then it is not safe for anyone. He stressed that the same information should be provided for the blind as is done for everyone else to cross the street safely.

Terry Green added that if there is a traffic signal, but with no APS, it only provides information to sighted people i.e. when the light is green, they cross, but when a blind person needs to cross and there is no APS then the crossing is not as safe as when an APS is present. He suggested that in order to provide as much safety to a blind person, the Region should consider installing tactile markings to aid in the direction of walking. He reiterated the well-known fact that having something is better than providing nothing.

With respect to the mandate of the APS Advisory Committee, Councillor Legendre was of the opinion they should have the ability to consider whatever they want and that its mandate is not so restrictive that it cannot do so. The Commissioner advised that its mandate is whatever the Transportation Committee deems it to be; the Advisory Committee provides advice and it is up to the Transportation Committee to determine what type of advice it wants to receive. The councillor questioned whether there was something that precludes the Advisory Committee from doing more and Mr. Stark advised that in order for it to be their focal point, there needs to be involvement from others in the Transportation Department, over and above those who are already involved. He advised that there is nothing preventing the Advisory Committee from looking into other aspects other than APS, except from the precedent set in the original mandate. He explained that this is why the Advisory Committee believes the TAC should make a presentation to the Transportation Committee; if there is going to be a standard, there is a requirement for others to be involved.

Councillor Legendre proposed that the APS recommendation contained in their report dated 25 January 2000 with respect to its mandate be adopted.

With respect to the Advisory Committee's suggestion for an annual meeting, the Committee Chair inquired how they would like people involved. Mr. Stark advised that people should be given an opportunity to participate in a meeting and to learn about accessibility problems and at the same time making them aware of things they can ask the Region for. This public dialogue

will provide an opportunity for staff and the visually impaired to mingle and get some discussion initiated. As part of staff's deliberations with all people with disabilities, there can be a meeting with blind people to discuss the issues they would like to be addressed. The Committee Chair asked whether they were interested in assisting the Department in holding the meeting and Mr. Stark advised they are interested in working with staff, but that the Region should take the lead in organizing the meeting.

Lois K. Smith stated that quite often it is the design of the road itself that causes difficulty for the blind. For example, during a winter thaw, melting snow gathers in puddles around the curb and then freezes when the temperature drops. These icy patches are more dangerous for who cannot see than they are for those who are sighted. Also, crossings which are set at a 45 degree angle make it difficult for the visually impaired who may not be aware the crossing is at an angle. She referred to audible signals in other countries and believed there are a lot of innovative ideas that can help people. On a particular point, Ms. Smith suggested there be some form of identification where the bus stops are so people with impaired vision will know which stop they are standing at. She suggested a different "click" sound for each bus stop to identify the route would help to eliminate blind people from getting on the wrong bus.

The committee proceeded to consider the staff recommendations as set out in the report dated 21 December 1999.

Councillor Legendre proposed that the recommendation contained under the heading "Policy changes requested at the Region", which speaks to the mandate of the Advisory Committee, be amended by the words set out in the revised report submitted by the APS Advisory Committee dated 25 January 2000. He stated that while this amendment does not change the mandate, it does reaffirm it and sends a signal that committee wants the Advisory Committee to pursue this work in the areas mentioned.

1(a) Moved by J. Legendre

- 1. That the mandate of the Audible Pedestrian Signals (APS) Advisory Committee be continued, in order to carry on work as approved by the Transportation Committee and by Council in 1997, as set out by the Fulton brief (Annex B);**
- 2. That during the next 12 months the APS Committee continue to provide advice to the Environment and Transportation Department on APS related issues and begin focusing on other issues raised in the Fulton Brief (Annex B) namely, the broader issues of pedestrian safety and related issues for citizens who are blind, including design and operation of pedestrian facilities as they impact on the mobility of persons who are blind in consultation with the Mobility Management Branch;**

- 3. That the Mobility Management Branch take a lead role in the creation of strategies and initiatives to enhance pedestrian safety for persons who are blind and that consultation with the APS Committee be incorporated into this Branch's mandate with direction from the Transportation Committee for the Branch to assist the APS Committee in making the transfer from a single focus on APS to the broader focus of the Fulton Brief to ensure citizens who are blind will be involved in future Regional program development and implementation;**

CARRIED

That the Environment and Transportation Department continue to seek out advice from the APS Committee on audible pedestrian signal issues.

CARRIED

- 1(b) That individuals or groups be consulted in the development of strategies for persons with disabilities and these broader issues be addressed by the newly created Mobility Management Branch.**

CARRIED

- 1(c) It is recommended:**

- i) That all signalized intersections within the limits of capital road reconstruction projects be equipped with APS and the installation costs be borne by the capital project;**
- ii) That the installation of all new traffic control signals funded by a developer be equipped with APS and that the additional costs associated with both the installation and maintenance of the APS be funded by the developer;**
- iii) That APS be installed at signalized intersections undergoing major upgrade and/or rehabilitation work;**
- iv) That intersections identified for signalization through the Region's Annual Traffic and Pedestrian Signal Program be equipped with APS and the installation costs be borne by this capital budget;**
- v) That in rural areas with little or no pedestrian activity that the local councillor be consulted with regard to the need to install an APS and where installations**

are not made that the cost savings be applied to locations on the outstanding list of requests.

CARRIED

Moved by J. Legendre

That the staff recommendation contained at Section 1(c) (vi) be amended to read as follows:

- vi) **That the installation of APS in conjunction with recommendations i) to iv) noted above, only be carried out at intersections where it is technically feasible at this time. In such cases staff will continue to seek solutions for such intersections.**

CARRIED

In considering the staff recommendation at Section 1(d), Councillor Cantin felt that left-turn arrows have been productive in reducing collisions and the severity of injuries to people. He believed there should be a way of continuing with these and still meeting the needs of the visually challenged.

Moved by R. Cantin

- 1(d) **That the practice of installing left-turn arrow indications continue.**

CARRIED

- 2(a) **That the Environment and Transportation Department continue to consult with members of the visually impaired community to discuss future installations.**

CARRIED

- 2(b) **That staff maintain a record of requests for audible pedestrian signals.**

CARRIED

- 2(c) **That staff continue the existing practice of forwarding requests and cost estimates for APS at non-Regionally owned intersections to the appropriate agency for consideration.**

CARRIED

- 2(d) **That the APS Committee select one location per year to be marked by an inauguration ceremony and that staff notify the requester and the CNIB as to APS installation dates and that this information be posted on the Region's Web page.**

CARRIED

In considering the staff recommendation contained at section 2(e) of the report, Councillor Doucet proposed that the following Motion be approved in its place:

That staff develop a communication plan that identifies the target audience, communication objectives, communication instruments and that it be developed to manage the provision of information by the Region to persons who are blind, deaf-blind or have low-vision. And, that the survey recommended in the report not be undertaken.

The councillor recalled that the Advisory Committee do not believe a survey is an effective tool and he agreed there is a need to find a better way to reach blind people. The Commissioner indicated that staff need to work with the Advisory Committee to identify the target audience, but the question is how to find a mechanism of contacting those people and keeping in contact with them when issues arise. Councillor Doucet added however, that what is needed is a communication plan because some research needs to go into it.

Councillor Kreling wondered how different this Motion was from the staff recommendation, noting the latter does refer to a consultation plan (Annex L) which addresses a lot of aspects of that process and appears to be 'fuller' than the proposed Motion.

The Committee Chair asked members of the Advisory Committee to respond and Chris Stark advised that they would like a communication plan that identifies access not only for people who are blind, but for those that have different transportation and communication needs. He explained that one of their fears with a survey is that people who are blind will not be able to perceive the difference. The Advisory Committee would like to see a communication strategy that speaks to issues ranging from how a person makes an application for an APS, to how the Region communicates new installations of left-turn arrows.

Moved by C. Doucet

That staff develop a communication plan that identifies the target audience, communication objectives, communication instruments and that it be developed to manage the provision of information by the Region to persons who are blind, deaf-blind or have low-vision. And, that the survey recommended in the report not be undertaken.

CARRIED

YEAS: W. Byrne, R. Cantin, L. Davis, C. Doucet, D. Holmes, J. Legendre,
M. Meilleur...7

NAYS:M. Bellemare, H. Kreling....2

As a result of the above Motion, the staff recommendation contained at section 2(f) was deemed redundant.

2(g) **That the Region continue to supply information upon request in alternate format where ever possible.**

CARRIED

In considering the staff recommendation at Section 3(a), Councillor Legendre inquired whether this was the kind of improvement staff are looking for i.e. APS are activated when the signals are on. Mr. Brousseau advised that staff are working with the Advisory Committee to find devices that suit them. He further explained it is an issue of finding the button at *any* intersection and staff are examining other signals and when they find one that the Advisory Committee is satisfied with and which is durable through all seasons, then it can be installed. The councillor questioned whether staff could obtain a sample of the APS used in Sweden and D. Brousseau advised that it might be difficult to buy that type of signal in Canada if there is no market. He agreed to investigate this technology, but cautioned committee that it has to be compatible with the existing controllers. The Commissioner suggested that committee be mindful of the fact that Ottawa-Carleton's lifestyle is not the same as in Sweden and that must be taken into consideration.

Chair Holmes proposed that the recommendation be amended to read as follows:

3(a) *That staff and the visually impaired continue to identify, obtain, and test push button locator systems and select the preferred device with a cost estimate in time for the 2001 budget;*

D. Brousseau advised that it is a question of time because there is only one staff person working on this issue. He did not think there is a problem coming back in the 2001 budget and staff could advise of the progress at that time.

Moved by D. Holmes

- 3(a) **That staff and the visually impaired continue to identify, obtain, and test push button locator systems and select the preferred device with a cost estimate in time for the 2001 budget.**

CARRIED

Moved by C. Doucet

That a tactile path and tactile indicators be introduced in and around Regional Headquarters.

CARRIED

The Committee then considered the recommendations contained in the APS Advisory Committee report dated 25 January 2000.

In response to a query about recommendation 2(b), D. Brousseau indicated that staff are already experimenting with this at Churchill and Richmond Road and at King Edward and Rideau. He advised that one of the challenges is to educate the public and staff will be reporting back on how successful they have been.

With respect to recommendation 3(g) and the suggestion for indicators that detect canes, D. Brousseau did not know if such an indicator existed. He clarified that staff are not suggesting that APS cannot be installed at a number of locations, only that some locations cause concerns.

Chair Holmes questioned whether it was worth looking into, from a cost perspective, the suggestion made at recommendation 4(b) i.e. APS at only one street at a busy intersection. While he did not believe cost was an issue, D. Brousseau advised that the Department is more inclined to provide the best access wherever possible, which would mean on all corners. There would be savings in the number of speakers for APS, but the general consensus is to put them at all lights to make it universal.

Chair Holmes referred to recommendation 1 of Section B which speaks to the issue of holding a public hearing. She believed this recommendation should be approved.

Moved by C. Doucet

That following the public consultation and finalization of the criteria, the Transportation Department hold an annual public meeting with citizens to review applications and select intersections for APS installation in the following year.

CARRIED

That Transportation Committee recommend Council receive the progress report prepared by the ad-hoc Audible Pedestrian Signals Committee and approve the recommendations set out in this staff report.

CARRIED as amended

2. **NOISE BARRIER DESIGN STANDARD**

- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner report dated 21 Dec 99

Brendan Reid, Manager, Infrastructure and Project Planning provided a brief overview of the report and advised that Header Merza from S.S. Wilson and Associates was available to answer any questions.

Councillor Legendre requested clarification on the proposed 3-year guarantee and maintenance period and Mr. Merza advised that this applies to the installation as well as the material. A survey of manufacturers revealed that this is an average provided by those companies. The councillor believed three years appears to be too short a time to provide adequate testing for a sound attenuation system.

Nicholas Heins, Prestige Fence declared that he had no vested interest in whether or not this policy is approved because he can reduce or change his standards accordingly. However, he was concerned that the quality of sound barriers will suffer greatly if this proposal is adopted. He distributed copies of an independent engineers review of the Region's proposal which he contracted himself. His main concerns are summarized as follows:

1. The old guidelines are sound and do ensure that quality products are installed. Therefore, since these guidelines require building code on all heights of sound barriers, why would the Region need to lower the standards or worry about a monopoly.
2. If Section 4.2, (which addresses a reduction from the Bridge Code (OHBDC) down to the Building Code (OBC) on any fence or barrier under three metres), is adopted and sound barriers under three metres high are designed to just the OBC, then there would be more types of barriers similar to the ones along Hunt Club Road which have been

upgraded or removed in the last seven years to repair leaning and rotting posts, failing joints, et cetera. Had the barriers been designed to the bridge code, they would still be there today and the cost of repairs would not have had to be done.

3. Section 6.2 suggests the new standard will result in a higher quality system and lower capital and maintenance costs. However, he argued that this statement is false if the Region lowers the standard to the OBC. Sound barriers designed to the OHBDC will not only be of a higher quality, but will last longer and therefore have lower maintenance costs.

The backbone and most expensive components of any sound barrier is the footings and the posts. By reducing the standard, the footing size and depth will be reduced as will the post size. The resulting sound barrier will not be able to withstand the same wind pressures or snow loading that a sound barrier designed to the OHBDC can and therefore the barrier will begin to lean at an earlier stage. The costs of repairing any footings or posts is expensive and therefore it would be prudent for the Region to ensure sound barriers are built to a higher standard.

4. Section 3.7, refers to wood components and the recommended joints for the body of the fence. His company in the development of sound barriers, tested many of these different joints and the only one that was successful was tongue-in-groove because it allows the boards to expand and contract at the same time restricting them from moving in or out of the fence line. The board-on-board joints, which are recommended in this new policy, failed over a short period of time.
5. With respect to the proposal to build a barrier that can be maintained by the public, in his 14 years experience, Mr. Heins opined that most homeowners are not able or willing to do their own repairs. Although he agreed that a 20-year warranty on the complete product would be difficult, he felt that an expectation of a 20+ year lifespan with minimal maintenance should be fully expected.

In closing, Mr. Heins emphasized that the Region should be holding sound barrier manufacturers to the highest standard, which is the Ontario Highway Bridge Code and by doing so the public will be assured of a quality product.

Councillor Davis questioned whether there would be a significant cost increase to go with barriers that meet the OHBDC. B. Reid advised that in the retrofit standard policy, it is recommended that barriers be no more than 3 metres high and therefore staff believe it would be appropriate to go with the OBC. Staff believed that applying the bridge code was overkill, particularly given the circumstances in which barriers would be installed e.g. around homes. The councillor inquired what the lifespan would be of one of the fences depicted in the photographs

he distributed and Mr. Heins opined they would last twice as long as a wood post because his posts are aluminum and galvanized steel and will not rot.

Councillor Davis wondered whether it would be more cost effective to pay for a better product that lasts longer and staff advised they have not done a cost analysis. The Committee Chair questioned whether staff have talked to any residents along roads which are eligible for noise barriers, with respect to how the cost will affect them and whether going to a higher standard would prevent them from wanting a barrier installed. Mr. Reid advised that staff have not yet consulted on the retrofit policy

In response to the question of cost difference using the different building codes, Mr. Heins estimated it could be between 10 and 15% higher for the bridge code, depending on the actual installation site. He stated that the new proposal will be geared towards barriers that are under 3 metres high and anything over would have to meet the bridge code. B. Reid interjected that the Region can always modify its standard for unique situations and emphasized that staff would not design or erect an end product that would not be up to an appropriate standard. Generally speaking, for barriers between 2 and 3 metres high, it is believed the proposed policy standard is appropriate.

Councillor Bellemare believed it would be in the Region's best interests to adopt the highest standard possible. B. Reid reported that staff do not believe the standard being recommended will result in the negative situation depicted in the photograph supplied by the delegation and he maintained that the end product will be satisfactory enough. However, the councillor referred to the fact that this policy includes a 50/50 cost-sharing between the property owner and the Region for the initial installation and did not know if the committee wanted to adopt a set standard. Conversely, if the Region were to adopt a more co-operative approach and evaluate it on a case-by-case basis, he wondered if it would be feasible to develop alternate proposals - one under the OBC and another under the OHBDC. And, if the residents feel they would like to have a higher standard in order to avoid any need for future reconstruction, he wondered whether it would be a problem to obtain two sets of estimates and present two different packages to the residents. B. Reid advised that with the retrofitting policy it is the intention to have a degree of co-operation with residents, but he agreed the approach as suggested by the councillor could also be accommodated.

Councillor Bellemare suggested an amendment to Section 4.2 to add the words "with either the OBC or the OHBDC". Staff explained that there is the building code for anything built below 3 metres in height and the bridge code is applied for barriers exceeding that height. The councillor believed that since the majority of barriers to be erected will be under 3 metres high, the Region should provide both alternatives. B. Reid agreed that that flexibility could be worked into the policy.

Councillor Legendre was surprised there was such little difference in cost between barriers built under the two different codes, especially taken into consideration that the terms of warranty lifetime for barriers built to the bridge code was quite extensive. In light of the fact that almost all the companies listed in Annex B can provide fencing to the OHBDC, he maintained there would be plenty of suppliers and plenty of competition to provide barriers. The councillor asked Mr. Heins whether or not he believed another way of protecting the Region's longer-term interests would be to specify a longer guarantee maintenance period. Mr. Heins responded by stating the best insurance is to do it right from the start and not have to worry about it in the years to come.

Councillor Legendre questioned whether the proposed standard would allow non-tongue-in-groove wood panels and the staff indicated that the alternative to that would be the V-joints. It was confirmed that in the latter case, there is a sufficient overlap so when there is shrinking a gap does not occur. Mr. Reid confirmed that the policy does not promote anything that is not tongue-in-groove or not overlapping.

Lois K. Smith believed there is a need for a higher standard, and would recommend using the bridge code. She advised that wind can do a lot of damage to wood fences and vegetation at the bottom of a wooden sound barrier can cause moisture to build up thereby increasing the chance of rotting. Ms. Smith opined that the Region should approve fencing that is somewhat decorative to take away the otherwise bleakness of these fences. She would not recommend using overlapping fencing because noise can still filter through.

Councillor Cantin noted that barriers have been installed on private property and the property owner is responsible for maintaining the fence. B. Reid advised that in this proposal, the cost would be shared 50%50 for materials, installation and an appropriate estimate of the likely maintenance over a period of time. With regards to the proposed amendment to Section 4.2, the councillor stated that if the Region gets an estimate for a barrier which meets the OBC and an estimate for one that meets the OHBDC, he presumed there would be a higher cost attributed to the fence which meets the OBC standard because at some point in time, the fence posts will rot. He wanted to avoid approving a policy whereby staff feel the building code is sufficient but 10 years or more down the line, if maintenance is required to repair rotting posts or boards, taxpayers will have to subsidize someone else's repairs. He was of the opinion this scenario may not happen if the Region was to go with a higher standard. B. Reid reported that it would make life simpler if everything was designed to the OHBDC because that standard would apply to *all* noise barriers erected in Ottawa-Carleton, by developers or the Region itself.

Moved by M. Bellemare

That cost estimates for site-specific type, depth, size and shape of the foundations will be determined in accordance with both the OBC (Building Code) and the OHBDC (Bridge Code) for barrier wall heights not exceeding 3 metres, and presented for consideration by the Region and interested property owners.

LOST

YEAS: M. Bellemare, D. Holmes...2

NAYS: R. Cantin, L. Davis, C. Doucet, H. Kreling, J. Legendre....5

Moved by J. Legendre

That reference to the Ontario Building Code (OBC) standards be removed from the RMO's Design Standards for Noise Barriers.

CARRIED

(D. Holmes dissented)

As a result of the above Motion, it was clarified that the standard would apply to *all* noise barriers, whether they are new or retrofit.

Moved by D. Holmes

That soft landscaping that could include trees and vines be mandatory for all noise barriers.

CARRIED

It was clarified that the above Motion referred to landscaping on the *outside* of the barrier.

That the Transportation Committee recommend Council:

- 1. Adopt the "Proposed Noise Barrier Design Standard" attached at Annex "A";**
- 2. Adopt the provisional list of products and suppliers/manufacturers listed in Annex "B" to be acceptable for installation in ROC;**

3. **Allow staff to amend Annex "B" as they see fit subject to the presentation of appropriate evidence from new manufacturers/suppliers in accordance with the proposed noise barrier design standard at Annex "A".**

CARRIED as amended

3. NOISE MITIGATION RETROFITTING GUIDELINES

- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner report dated 7 Jan 00

Brendan Reid provided a detailed overview of the report.

Councillor Cantin made reference to the list of roads in the report which potentially qualify for noise attenuation and asked where the possibility would be for noise attenuation fencing along the section of Innes Road between Cyrville and Blair because there is very little space from the auxiliary entrance to the police station westbound to Stonehenge Crescent and many of the properties face the road. Mr. Reid advised that this table alerts committee to the fact there is some potential along this road for this policy to apply. Councillor Cantin suggested that Mary Jane Crescent, which runs parallel to Innes Road has probably a higher potential for sound attenuation than some of those on the list. Mr. Reid clarified that this is a provisional list and was done by scrutinizing the network as it is and was not meant to be a complete list. The councillor suggested staff examine the area of Innes Road just east of Boyer Road and Mr. Reid advised that if a section of the road is not on the list, it does not preclude the applicability of the policy.

Councillor Holmes had to leave the meeting and Councillor Legendre assumed the Chair for the remainder of the meeting.

Councillor Bellemare questioned what the advantage would be of going to a 50/50 cost sharing versus 75/25 and would that mean fewer locations could be retrofitted across the Region given the amount of funding being forecasted for 2001. Mr. Reid advised that the Region could install less fencing or increase the budget and ensure all requests are responded to. He cautioned that the \$500,000.00 identified in the budget could be fairly excessive, but could not confirm this until there has been a response from the public. Councillor Bellemare stated that moving to a 75/25 cost sharing could potentially affect the funding for other locations and he believed the money should be spread as widely as possible across the Region. He did not want to have a cost-sharing arrangement that is prohibitive for property owners. If a 50/50 cost sharing policy was adopted, it would not be known what the level of response would be and perhaps no property owner would want to make that level of investment.

Councillor Bellemare further commented that the minimum number of residences to be considered per barrier section is 5 continuous lots, but in cases where there are fewer houses

but perhaps large lots, he suggested that instead of rejecting a request for sound attenuation simply because the request does not meet the standard, efforts should be made to examine the request before a final decision is made. To this end, he proposed an amendment to Point 4 of Costs and Priority to add “unless circumstances warrant otherwise”.

In response, Mr. Reid advised that choosing five homes related to getting appropriate lengths of barrier that were reasonably sufficient. If barriers were erected across the front of one or just a couple of homes, it would be ineffective as a sound barrier. He also suggested this could lead to problems along properties where not all the residents participate. Councillor Bellemare requested clarification when it is mentioned that *all* property owners shall share equally between themselves and the Region. Mr. Reid confirmed that the barrier would be installed continuous along the properties and it would be up to the community to get the majority that is required to meet the legal requirements of the Local Improvement Act. He added that one or more property owners cannot prevent a noise barrier from being erected just because they do not support it.

Councillor Bellemare noted that the policy stipulates that the Region will cost-share 50/50 for 20 metres along the property; however, larger lots of 30 metres or more in width would not mean a difference in cost-sharing. Mr. Reid confirmed the Region would still only pay 50/50 for the first 20 metres of the fence. It would be the responsibility of homeowner to cover the cost of the remaining frontage.

Councillor Legendre commented that once the policy is adopted, home owners can appeal or petition the committee and make exceptions. Mr. Reid agreed that any petition received would be dealt with.

Councillor Kreling asked whether Table 3 was a complete list and included the most recent complaints received. Mr. Reid advised that it was not a complete listing and the list of complaints was only a sample of the number received. The councillor noted that he has received complaints referring to noise along Regional Road 174 and asked that if a petition was commenced how would the public be notified of retrofitting. Mr. Reid stated that literature as well as a video would be produced, providing detailed explanation of the policy once adopted.

Walter Blair advised the committee that as a long-time resident of Appleford Street in Gloucester, he has seen how growth in the area has affected the amount of traffic on Ogilvie Road which is adjacent to his home. He indicated that the noise from the traffic travelling past his home is so bad that he has to keep his windows closed just to get some peace and quiet. The bus stop beside his yard draws people waiting for the bus and he has no privacy in his yard as a result. He indicated that approximately nine buses stop every hour at this stop and while there is a cedar hedge along this section of his property, it does little to muffle the noise from the buses and the constant traffic. While noise is his ultimate concern, he has also complained to

OC Transpo about the garbage that accumulates around the bus stop and often ends up in his hedge and he does his best to clean up what he can. He has put in a request to move the bus stop to another location where it does not interfere with the privacy of homeowners. Mr. Blair requested that a sound barrier of some type be erected along the southeast side of his property. He added that this request is not new and that several others have been made by his wife over the years.

In response to Mr. Blair's concerns, B. Reid noted that Elmlea Drive/Ogilvie Road (one block east of Appleford) is listed as a potential candidate for retrofitting and suggested he solicit the support of his neighbours in order to meet the criteria for a sound barrier. Because his property is twice the size of that is proposed to be covered by the Region, Councillor Legendre stated that should Mr. Blair and his neighbours agree that a continuous fence between Appleford and Elmlea be built, he would end up paying for more than half the cost.

With respect to this cost-sharing arrangement, Mr. Blair opined that it was unfair of the Region to expect him to pay half or more of the cost, especially since much of the noise is caused by bus traffic alongside his property. When questioned whether other neighbours were interested in cost-sharing a noise fence, he explained that the closest neighbour is quite a distance from his yard and therefore, the notion of requiring 5 properties to be involved before noise attenuation is considered does not make sense in this circumstance.

On behalf of Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen, who had to leave the meeting, Councillor Bellemare put forward the following Motion:

That points 4 and 5 under the Costs and Priorities section be deleted.

On behalf of Councillor Doucet, who also had to leave the meeting, Councillor Meilleur agreed to put forward the following Motion:

That Havelock/Harvey Street be exempted from the policy and qualify as a candidate for retrofitting, even though the dominant noise source is the Nicholas Interchange as it affects a closely populated residential quadra angle and this situation was the inspiration for coming forward with a Regional Retrofit Policy.

Councillor Cantin could not support the Motion because then the Region would be doing something that rightly is the responsibility of the Ministry because of the location referred to in the Motion. He believed that if the councillor wants to pursue this further, then he should do so with the Ministry.

Councillor Kreling did not believe the latter Motion was in order in that it is part of the report. If he was asking that it be permitted under the terms of the Region's policy, Councillor Kreling opined that he should have identified sections in the policy that need to be amended in order for this street to then qualify.

Acting Chair Legendre believed the Motion does not seek to amend the policy but to exempt from the policy. He ruled the Motion in order.

Councillor Bellemare concurred with the comments voiced by Councillor Kreling and believed the Motion was out of order. He stated that this is a report that produces a snapshot across the Region where consideration might be given, but is not at the stage where such requests have been received and prioritized.

There was no challenge to the Chair's ruling.

Moved by M. Meilleur

That Havelock/Harvey Street be exempted from the policy and qualify as a candidate for retrofitting, even though the dominant noise source is the Nicholas Interchange as it affects a closely populated residential quadra angle and this situation was the inspiration for coming forward with a Regional Retrofit Policy.

LOST

YEAS: M. Meilleur, J. Legendre....2

NAYS:M. Bellemare, R. Cantin, H. Kreling....3

Moved by M. Bellemare

That points 4 and 5 under the Costs and Priorities section be deleted.

LOST

YEAS: M. Bellemare....1

NAYS:R. Cantin, H. Kreling, M. Meilleur, J. Legendre....4

In considering Councillor Bellemare's proposal to amend Section 4.2 of the draft policy, Councillor Cantin believed that any policy the Region has can be appealed; however, putting in such ambiguous language, he believed, will put staff in a difficult position. He added that if there is a request for fencing the request can be assessed on a one-by-one basis. He believed this would give the delegated authority to staff to approve or not approve specific requests.

Conversely, Councillor Kreling supported the Motion and agreed the Region needs certain flexibility. He believed there is a need for a certain length of fence in order to achieve the goal, but the Local Improvement Act requires that the Clerk or their designate certify the adequacy of that improvement and then present that to Council. Therefore, he did not think there is a lot of room for delegated authority.

Moved by M. Bellemare

That the minimum number of residences to be considered per barrier section be 5 continuous lots, unless circumstances warrant otherwise.

CARRIED

YEAS: M. Bellemare, H. Kreling, M. Meilleur, J. Legendre....4

NAYS:R. Cantin...1

That the Transportation Committee recommend Council approve the proposed draft noise barrier retrofitting policy attached at Annex "A".

CARRIED as amended

COUNCILLOR'S ITEMS

4. TAKING THE HIGH ROAD: SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORTATION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

- Councillor D. Holmes report dated 10 Jan 00

Since Councillor Holmes had left previously, Acting Chair Legendre advised that she had wanted this paper to be forwarded to local M.P's and M.P.P's for information.

Moved by M. Meilleur

That Transportation Committee recommend Council approve that this paper be sent to area MP's and MPP's for information.

CARRIED

INQUIRIES

Extending Light Rail to Hull

Councillor Legendre referred to an article in today's Le Droit which told about a meeting of elected representatives from the Region and members of the Société de transport de l'Outaouais (STO) and the NCC, with respect to the possibility of extending the light rail across to Hull. The councillor was excited that Hull did not reject the idea and are interested and were willing to discuss it further.

Encroachment

Councillor Doucet advised that a constituent wanted to use the public right-of-way at Bank and Grove for their store. He asked that staff report back on options for an encroachment at this location.

Trucks Carrying Toxic Waste in the Downtown and on Highway 417

Councillor Davis questioned what the status was of the move to trucks carrying toxic cargo through the downtown core. P. Sweet advised that a survey had been done jointly with the Outaouais and the NCC and Region was awaiting the data from the province because they are doing the compilation of that information. The councillor indicated that some truck drivers have been seen parked on the shoulder of Highway 417 and removing their hazardous cargo and questioned who is responsible for ensuring this does not happen. The commissioner advised that removing cargo on the highway is illegal and the OPP is responsible for such enforcement. He agreed to bring this to the attention of the Ministry.

On a similar note, Councillor Cantin stated that trucks are getting heavier, resulting in greater damage to the Queensway. D. Brousseau confirmed that staff had written to the Ministry about this and have had some positive response. The councillor further indicated that the weigh station in Perth never seems to be open and with no other checking conducted along the way, he was very concerned about such heavy vehicles, travelling on the same roads as people in private vehicles. He also wanted to know why some of these large trucks are being allowed to park on the side of the road. The Commissioner advised that staff have invited Ministry officials to a meeting of the Transportation Committee in the spring and they would convey these concerns to them for a response to the Committee at that time.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

The committee agreed to cancel the meeting scheduled for 15 March 2000 during March break.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

CO-ORDINATOR

CHAIR