

MINUTES
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

4 NOVEMBER 1998

1:30 P.M.

PRESENT

Acting Chair: J. Legendre

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

REGRETS L. Davis, D. Holmes

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

That the Transportation Committee confirm the Minutes of the meeting of 21 October 1998.

CARRIED

1. AUDIBLE PEDESTRIAN SIGNALS ADVISORY COMMITTEE - PROGRESS REPORT
- Audible Pedestrian Signals Advisory Committee report dated 29 Sep 98

Moved by R. Cantin

That this item be considered by the Transportation Committee In Camera pursuant to Subsection 11(1b) of the Procedure By-law being “personal matters about an identifiable individual, including staff.”

CARRIED

Note: 1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation approved by Committee.
2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 12 and 25 November 1998 in Transportation Committee Reports 23 and 24.

Moved by R. Cantin

That the Transportation Committee move Out of Camera and resume in open session.

CARRIED

Councillor Cantin expressed some concerns he had with respect to specific aspects of the report recommendations. Specifically, he did not believe there were funds or the resources available to provide ongoing staff support, as requested in Recommendation 2. He referred to Recommendation 5 in which funds are recommended to be allocated for scientific research for audible signals and indicated there has been a proposal prepared by professors at the University of Ottawa, which will be before committee for consideration.

Dr. Ed Foohey, Vice Chair, APS Advisory Committee indicated that with the increase in the volume of traffic, wider roads, more complex intersections and less respect for traffic laws, it has given rise to a rapid increase in the need for audible signals; currently there are 52 intersections which have been requested be installed with these types of signals. He emphasized that blind individuals must depend on the parallel traffic obeying the laws in order for them to cross safely, but what is really required is audible information to alert them to the fact they should or should not attempt to cross the road. He went on to state that blind individuals would be content with the current technology, rather than waiting for possibly a better technology in the indefinite future. He recalled that in November 1992, the first "bird call" signals, according to the Transportation Association of Canada (TAC) standard, were introduced in the Region and since that time there have been almost as many new installations as replacements. He noted there are still 16 locations that have the "bell and buzzer" signals and he has never heard any complaints about them; 12 of those have been replaced with the new bird calls which leaves 38 audible signals in total and the blind community are prepared to wait for a signal to wear out before replacing it with a new signal according to whatever standard the Region decides to use. He did not know whether it was possible to find a standard suitable for all of Canada, especially given different climate changes and policies with respect to bilingualism. Although the APS Committee has made considerable progress, he believed they would have made more headway if they had an allocation of staff time and in closing, he thanked those staff members who have assisted the APS.

Councillor Doucet asked Dr. Foohey to expand on the point of contention with respect to continuing to install audible signals now or waiting for the TAC standard. Dr. Foohey indicated that TAC has struck a committee to develop the standard and consequently their work is bound to be slow and the fear of the APS Committee is they would have to wait a considerable amount of time to reach a standard. He emphasized that the priority is to get more audible signals.

Councillor Cantin stated that this issue originated after some individuals indicated to the committee they were not happy with the new TAC standard. The APS committee

considered the information provided by Drs. Laroche and Giguère from the University of Ottawa, and believed that they should receive some funds for part of their research. Further, a member of the Environment and Transportation Department, Chris Brinkman, has been appointed to chair the TAC committee reviewing this national standard and has been given permission to use users in the Ottawa-Carleton Region as an advisory committee.

Chris Stark, member, APS Advisory Committee recognized and thanked the staff resources who put in a great deal of time and effort over the past year. He was of the opinion that the Region should not wait while a national standard is determined before installing more audible signals at signalized intersections. He was disappointed that their work over the past year has not resulted in any more signals being installed and explained that he originally came before committee last fall because an audible signal in his community was being replaced with the new standard (bird call) and he felt there were many people who needed new signals, more than his needed to be replaced and he came before committee with that consideration in mind. He noted that audible signals help the visually impaired to cross an intersection safely and that deciding on the sound is not the only issue at hand. He urged committee to put this issue at the top of the priority list and to strive for a continuing partnership with the APS committee in consideration of matters such as whether or not to install audible signals, whether or not there is a need for a communication strategy to involve all blind people, and whether or not there is a need for other measures at street corners to help the visually impaired.

Councillor Kreling questioned whether other issues such as button placement and improving access across right turning channelization areas were considered by the committee and whether there was agreement on how to address those types of technical issues. Mr. Stark advised these had been briefly considered, however, such issues were not within the mandate of the committee and their focus was specifically on the signals. The councillor subsequently inquired of staff whether there is a better perspective on the design, engineering et cetera of these types of impediments and the Acting Commissioner, Doug Brousseau advised that TAC has a standard they have set for one part of this issue, but the councillor is referring to something that goes well beyond the mandate of the APS committee. He acknowledged there are other initiatives that could be examined, but expected the CNIB (Canadian National Institute for the Blind) to bring forward any such concerns to the attention of staff.

The Acting Chair stated that in Ottawa-Carleton there are two types of audible signals (bells and buzzers and bird calls) and he questioned whether the delegation has had occasion to use both types and whether the fact there are two types is an obstacle to him. Mr. Stark indicated it was not, but clarified that the information he needs from the signal is when he can step into the street. A sound can also give him some idea of where the other side of the road is and therefore acts as an orientation device as he is crossing. The sound also lets him know when the crossing cycle is completed and by changing the tone through intermittent beeps, it lets him know either to hurry up if he is in the midst of crossing, or to not start crossing if he has just arrived at that intersection. With respect to specific

sounds, he believed bird call signals are reasonably adequate in a built-up area where roads are only a couple of lanes wide; however, in the suburbs for example, the signal should be more distinct so it can guide him safely across several lanes of traffic. In the interim, the common “bell and buzzer” audible signal suits his needs, until such time as they break and need to be replaced. He concluded by stating there may be sounds that are better than others but any sound is appreciated.

Lois K. Smith explained that as a past member of the APS Committee, she recognized the importance of this issue. She pleaded with committee to continue the work begun by the APS Advisory Committee and improve the situation to make it easier for the visually impaired to move around within their communities.

Dr. Chantal Laroche, University of Ottawa referred to the Experimental Protocol distributed to committee members. As a Professor at the University of Ottawa, she specializes in localization abilities of people with normal hearing or hearing disorders. She has been involved in a project earlier this year on audible signals and was asked by the Institut Nazareth et Louis-Braille to study a new melody that has been installed in Montreal because it was felt the national standard was not appropriate for blind people. She has analyzed the acoustical characteristics of the signal and proposed a modification to the melody in question. However, they did not have enough time and money to look at the aspect of localizing sound source in noisy surroundings, such as those in an intersection. She explained that the Experimental Protocol will examine the new alternating melody and look at noise surroundings. Further, the Protocol also suggests that they study the actual signals proposed in the Canadian standard to verify if the feelings of people are adequately addressed. She was optimistic that within one year they should be able to obtain results and propose two new signals to TAC to modify, if necessary, the national standard.

Councillor Doucet asked Dr. Laroche that if the Region continues to install signals, does she envision this as a technical problem. Dr. Laroche advised that the RMOC is using systems from Novax whose device is based on electronics and therefore, if it is just a matter of changing the sound signals without touching the main installation, it should not be an expensive undertaking. D. Brousseau cautioned committee that before it proceed with this direction, they should seek the sanction of TAC for this research so that the result can serve as a model for the national standard. Councillor Cantin believed that TAC is counting on the work of Chris Brinkman and the advisory committee in this regard and he believed the Region should do the research and present it to TAC.

Councillor Byrne made reference to the \$50,000 in the budget for signal installation and believed approximately half of that total would be required for the scientific research. She questioned whether the 52 outstanding requests have to be compared to the criteria set out in Recommendation 4 and staff advised they have done some initial assessments but the criteria needs some work in terms of how it will work in the field. The councillor questioned how long the evaluation and testing would take to complete and staff advised there are a number of factors involved that could make individual locations more time

consuming than others, so they were prioritized based on criteria they found they could work with quite readily. The councillor stated that once it is accepted, the criteria has to be tested and evaluated and she questioned how long that process would take. D. Brousseau advised they would test it on several locations to see how workable it is, refine it and then apply it to the remaining locations. He indicated it could involve a site visit to each location and confirmed there could be a pilot project on a few installations to test the criteria, but he was not sure how long that would take. In response to further questions about the current system, C. Brinkman confirmed that the Novax system can be adjusted to emit a different sound.

Councillor Byrne referred to Recommendation 2 and questioned what support is provided to advisory committees. D. Brousseau advised that committees of Council get support from the Clerks Department, but stated there is no budget and no provision by way of a policy to support advisory committee's at this time, although staff can and do attend the meetings. The Regional Clerk, Mary Jo Woollam confirmed that at the present time, the Clerk's Department does not provide support to any advisory committee because council does not have a policy on this.

The Acting Chair questioned the meaning of Recommendation 6 and staff advised there was an impression among some members of the APS Advisory Committee that it was Council policy to install audible signals at every location, which is not the case.

Councillor Doucet stated this is not just an issue of whether signals are audible or not, because even the visual signals can be confusing to some people. He suggested staff might have to look at this issue at some point in time. With respect to audible signals, he recognized that for the blind this can be a life and death issue as outlined by Mr. Stark and he was supportive of the report but did not want to wait to put up signals until there is a national standard. He urged committee not to keep the blind community waiting and believed the Region should continue to install these signals as funds are available.

Councillor Cantin strongly felt there should be a member of council on the APS committee and given the fact that he has stepped down as chair of that group, suggested Councillor Doucet be nominated to that position. The Acting Chair believed the role of the Regional councillor on that committee would best serve its members in an observer or advisory capacity.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen believed the committee should proceed and not wait for further research to be done on getting standardized auditory systems. While she agreed with the proposal for some research into standardization, she believed the Region should not be doing it in isolation and that it should be done through a nation-wide transportation organization rather than Ottawa-Carleton taking on this role on its own. With respect to the criteria, she believed it should be tested and work towards the end goal of having a system that is uniform across Canada. She believed the Region should continue to try to get more intersections signalized in order to assist the visually impaired.

Councillor Meilleur did not know if the Committee should recommend continuing to install signals, especially when there is some obvious confusion about the new standard being implemented. D. Brousseau clarified that while staff install the national standard, there are still some of the old signals in place. He reminded committee that the issue was that there was some discomfort with the national standard and in this regard, staff are working with TAC to try and change that standard. In the interim, if committee and Council decide to proceed with installations, they will be the national standard. The councillor opined however, that if the national standard is not a preferred choice, the Region should proceed with its research, as recommended, to ensure the concerns of those residents are addressed.

With respect to Recommendation 5, Councillor Byrne preferred that the amount be specific as to what is necessary for the research project. D. Brousseau was not clear whether Council policy will allow the committee to take this unsolicited proposal and suggested the committee may have to go to a request for proposal (RFP). Councillor Cantin clarified that the number of people that do this type of research are extremely limited and he felt the committee would be wasting time going to an RFP. The Solicitor advised it would be appropriate for this committee to recommend to Council that if it is going to spend the money on research, then this specific proposal could be recommended to be accepted.

The Acting Chair supported continuing the installation of audible signals. While TAC standards are not perfect, he opined that what is most confusing is an intersection in the absence of any audible signal. He was comfortable knowing that whatever is installed would be easily modifiable, as suggested by staff. With respect to the research, he believed TAC should be involved but not in the sense that they would promise to take the results of that research.

The committee considered the staff recommendations with amending Motions as follows:

- 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);**

CARRIED

Moved by R. Cantin

That Councillor Doucet be appointed to the APS Advisory Committee in an observer/advisory capacity.

CARRIED

Moved by R. Cantin

That Recommendation 2 be amended to include the words “subject to budgetary consideration”.

CARRIED
(M. McGoldrick-Larsen
dissented)

2. **That RMOC staff provide support to the APS Committee by co-ordinating meetings and public consultation, providing technical support, and drafting policy and procedure subject to budgetary consideration**

LOST

YEAS: R. Cantin....1
NAYS: M. Bellemare, W. Byrne, C. Doucet, H. Kreling, J. Legendre,
M. McGoldrick-Larsen, M. Milleur....7

3. **That the APS Advisory Committee present a report to the Transportation Committee by September 1999.**

CARRIED

Moved by W. Byrne

That Recommendation 4 be amended to read as follows:

4. **That the Draft Localization Prioritization Criteria, as set out in Annex E of the report be tested and evaluated by the Environment and Transportation Department, supported by the APS Committee in a pilot project of up to three installations and that the criteria and resulting priority lists be presented for public review and comment.**

CARRIED

To clarify Recommendation 5, Councillor Cantin suggested it be amended to read as follows:

- 5. That the proposal for a research project as presented by Drs. Laroche and Giguère and Ph.D. Candidate Tony Leroux be accepted and awarded and that the findings of the research team come back to the Transportation Committee.**

CARRIED
(M. McGoldrick-
Larsen dissented)

With respect to Recommendation 6, the Acting Chair reiterated the fact that there is no policy of signalizing all intersections in the Region in any way, visual or otherwise. D. Brousseau added that staff will install the audible signals based on the priority established by the new methodology and that will be the policy.

- 6. That the RMOC practice of providing audible pedestrian signals at signalized intersections be clarified.**

CARRIED

The Committee noted that Recommendation 7 was covered by the amended Recommendation 5 and was therefore declared redundant.

Councillor Bellemare indicated that if committee is looking at having a policy on signalized intersections across the Region he wondered whether the APS Committee has reviewed this issue or perhaps is something staff should examine on an ad hoc basis. With respect to new intersections, he questioned whether the Region should have a policy of installing audible signals, especially where they are paid for 100% by the developer. D. Brousseau did not know if it was a good suggestion to install audible signals every time a signal is installed and advised that staff would seek the advice of the visually impaired community and the CNIB in this regard. Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen suggested staff also consult with the local municipalities and the development industry because this would be one more cost added to the lower tier municipality and the development industry.

2. **BASELINE ROAD - SOUTH SIDE BUS BAY CLOSURES**
- Director, Engineering Division report dated 23 Sep 98

The committee received a letter dated 3 November 1998 from Councillor Lee Farnworth of Nepean requesting the committee's consideration of reopening the bus bay at Baseline and Farlane.

Doug Brousseau, Acting Environment and Transportation Commissioner reminded members it has been Council's policy for the last four years not to install bus bays and staff are creating a priority list of locations where these facilities will be removed.

Councillor Kreling stated that although there have been no difficulties with the temporary filling of the bus bays over the past four years, he indicated his willingness to support the Nepean councillor's request.

Councillor Hunter advised that residents of Fisher Heights want the bus bay reopened at Farlane because not only would it offer shelter for buses from the flow of traffic, it would provide motorists an opportunity to merge safely and easily into that traffic on Baseline. He stressed the fact that this is an extremely busy road, with traffic usually travelling in excess of the 60 km/h posted speed, thereby creating difficulty for motorists wanting to turn. Consequently, he did not believe the request was a departure from the policy which stipulates that bus bays on roads where the posted speed limit is 60km/h and under will not be reinstated. He indicated the policy also states that bus bays will remain where clear visibility is in question and pointed out in the overhead, the growth of small trees along Baseline which effectively block the motorists' view from oncoming traffic as they exit from Farlane, thus forcing them quite far out onto Baseline. He referred to the comments by the Regional Cycling Advisory Group and did not understand how they contend that the removal of bus bays would be safer for cyclists, because if a bus is stopped, the cyclist would either have to stop behind the bus or pull out into the next lane with other traffic which is speeding along. He urged committee to support the Motion.

Councillor Bellemare inquired whether the intersection of Baseline and Farlane was warranted for traffic signal installation and staff advised that the most recent review revealed that it did not meet the warrants. The councillor agreed with the ward councillor that it is safer to merge with traffic when the bus bay is there, but questioned whether the Region should be encouraging this use of a bus bay because he believed it to be contrary to the Highway Traffic Act. He suggested this point be clarified.

Councillor Doucet questioned the rationale for Council's policy on the removal of bus bays and the Acting Commissioner advised that when staff originally brought forward the policy, it was presented as a transit priority measure. Councillor Hunter interjected that there are not a lot of buses that use this route so although closing the bus bay permanently will assist a small portion of the transit service, it presents a major amount of inconvenience to motorists.

The Acting Chair, Councillor Legendre made reference to the use of the bus bay as an acceleration lane and questioned whether these were designed for such a use. The Acting Commissioner confirmed these facilities were not designed to be acceleration lanes because they are not constructed long enough to enable a motorist to get up enough speed to merge with the high speed travelled. The Solicitor confirmed this would be an illegal use of the bus bay.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen supported the Motion proposed by Councillor Kreling because as a frequent driver of that area, she believed there was a need to accommodate the community in their request. She indicated that she has used bus bays to drop off her kids so they can connect to their bus and went so far as to suggest that such use should be

encouraged because it might increase transit ridership. She recognized that even though roads are designed for certain purposes sometimes they can fulfil other purposes they were not intended for and in this instance, the safety and security of both drivers and pedestrians should be considered.

Councillor Doucet stated that while this appears to be an issue of creating safer access onto Baseline Road, if the bus stop was moved to the western corner, he questioned whether there would still be a requirement for such access. He indicated his willingness to bring forward a Motion to that affect. The Acting Chair suggested that Motion should be referred to the Transit Services Committee.

With respect to this Motion, Councillor Cantin was concerned a bus stop before the intersection may impede the travel of motorists that are attempting to turn right at Farlane and envisioned a greater potential for rear-end collisions. He did not support the elimination of bus bays and suggested the Region lobby the province for priority for transit as the province of Quebec has done. He preferred that if the Motion is to be forwarded to the Transit Services Committee, it should include options that if the bus bay is not closed, this is what is proposed, et cetera.

Councillor Byrne noted there were three other locations referred to in the report which have already been closed and inquired when this took place. Staff advised it was done last summer in consultation with the ward councillor. Councillor Hunter advised he had consulted with the community with respect to those locations and they had no concerns about those; however, this particular location can serve more use to motorists, as previously stated. Councillor Byrne believed the public hearing process would provide an opportunity for the public to examine some of the options being suggested today. She stated that based on the facts in the report that removal of bus bays improve transit service without measurable safety or delay consequences to other traffic, and the fact that the temporary fillings have been in place for four years, she did not see a justifiable reason at this point in time to make an exception to Council's policy.

In speaking to his Motion, Councillor Kreling suggested this is a situation where the community felt there was a reasonable opportunity within the existing policy to ask for this exemption. They have identified this location as a difficulty for them and he felt the arguments put forward were reasonable and in his view, would not constitute that much of a variation in the existing policy and would not jeopardize the integrity of the road system.

Councillor Bellemare suggested that staff examine the feasibility of creating a bonefide acceleration lane at that intersection and, in conjunction with OC Transpo, consider moving the bus stop to another location. In this regard, staff should also determine what costs would be involved and how much longer the lane would need to be, et cetera. While Councillor Hunter was sure the community would be receptive to a full acceleration lane, he thought they might be concerned about the extra monies required for such an extensive modification, when all they are really seeking is a little bit of comfort.

The Acting Chair questioned what the cost would be of making this bus bay into a full acceleration lane vs a signalized intersection. The Director of Engineering, Jim Miller indicated an acceleration lane would be about as expensive as signals (\$100,000) and staff would have to examine what the length of such a lane should be, which would involve some detailed work. The Acting Chair indicated that bus bays are not intended to be acceleration lanes and that the whole purpose of closing the bus bays was to determine if it gave more comfort to bus drivers.

Moved by H. Kreling

That the bus bay at Farlane Boulevard and Baseline Road be reopened.

LOST

YEAS: C. Doucet, H. Kreling, M. McGoldrick-Larsen....3

NAYS: M. Bellemare, W. Byrne, J. Legendre....3

Moved by C. Doucet

That the Transit Services Committee consider moving the bus stop at Farlane and Baseline to the west corner from the east corner.

CARRIED

(H. Kreling and M. McGoldrick-Larsen dissented)

Moved by M. Bellemare

That staff examine the feasibility of creating a bonafide acceleration lane at the intersection of Baseline and Farlane and consider moving the bus stop to another location.

CARRIED

(W. Byrne and J. Legendre dissented)

That the Transportation Committee recommend Council:

- 1. approve the preliminary design for the permanent closure of the bus bays at the intersections of Baseline Road and Farlane Boulevard, Zena Street and Marson Street as illustrated on Drawing No. RT-2353;**

2. **authorize the initiation of the Public Hearing process as required by Sections 297 and 300 of the Ontario Municipal Act.**

CARRIED as amended

3. MODIFICATIONS TO OGILVIE ROAD AND CITY PARK DRIVE TO ACCOMMODATE THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE TRINITY CITY CENTRE
- Director Mobility Services and Corporate Fleet Services report dated ~~20~~Oct 98

Councillor Bellemare commented that the bulb-out feature proposed for Ogilvie Road would be the first design of it's kind for intersections in the region and felt that it was important to have the City of Gloucester's input with respect to this design. He also stated that the analysis in the report is based on the year 2006 projections and shows that with the modifications and implementation of traffic control signals at this site, it will operate at an acceptable level of service. However, he questioned whether the design would maintain an acceptable level of service in the year 2023, the end of the Official Plan horizon.

The Acting Environment and Transportation Commissioner, Doug Brousseau explained that the acceptable level of service for this design is "E", which is in keeping with the Region's Official Plan, but indicated that it would be very difficult to predict it's status 20 years from now. John Fraser, Senior Review Engineer, Environment and Transportation Department indicated that those traffic projections are to "build-out" of the project. With respect to questions about the bulb-out, he indicated that constructing a third lane across the entire frontage without such a facility gives the road the opportunity to be driven as three lanes and essentially, the bulb-out feature allows for the heavy turn movements into and out of the development. He explained the reason for the design is to address concerns of the Regional Cycling Advisory Group (RCAG) as they would prefer cyclists to be outside of that lane, between the right turn lane and the through-lane of traffic. Mr. Brousseau adds that this design assists pedestrians as well, as they don't have to walk as far to cross the street.

Bill Holzman, Trinity Development Group explained that the addition of this lane was required about six years ago, and part of the lane was then constructed by the Shenkman Corporation. A large block of land was then purchased by the Trinity Development Group to continue construction. In response to the questions posed by Councillor Bellemare, he explained that the year 2006 projection is based on standard practice which projects traffic flow five years following the completion of the project. At that time, he advised that the level of service will be "C". He added that the developer is under a tight schedule for construction and would like approval by January 1999.

In response to these statements, Mr. Fraser clarified that Planning and Development Approvals Department provided the calculations with respect to the level of service for the projected volumes in 2006 and staff conducted its own analysis, taking into consideration some aspects which were not considered by the consultant. The conclusion of that

analysis is that in 2006, the Blair and Ogilvie intersection would be operating at a level of service "E", the Ogilvie/City Park East intersection would operate at a level of service "D" and the Bathgate/City Park intersection would be at a level of service "C".

That the Transportation Committee recommend that Council:

1. **Approve the installation of traffic control signals on Ogilvie Road at the proposed north site access (approximately 185 metres east of Bathgate Drive/City Park Drive intersection), and the construction of associated roadway modifications along Ogilvie Road as illustrated in Annex B, subject to the owner, Riotrin Properties (Gloucester 2) Inc.;**
 - a) **funding the total cost of the proposed road works and traffic control signal installation, including paying the annual maintenance costs for the traffic control signals until such time as they meet the Ministry of Transportation of Ontario installation warrants and Council approves the assumption of the costs;**
 - b) **executing a Legal agreement with respect to (a) above;**
2. **Authorize the initiation of the public hearing process as required by Sections 297 and 300 of the *Ontario Municipal Act***

CARRIED

4. **PROPOSED NEW INTERSECTION OF RIVER ROAD AND REALIGNED ARMSTRONG ROAD - RIVERSIDE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

- Director Mobility Services and Corporate Fleet Services report dated 10 Oct 98

That the Transportation Committee recommend that Council approve:

1. **the construction of the roadway modifications to River Road as described in the report and illustrated in Annex 'B', subject to the City of Gloucester funding the total cost of the proposed road works;**
2. **the initiation of the public hearing process as required by Sections 297 and 300 of the *Ontario Municipal Act***

CARRIED

INFORMATION PREVIOUSLY DISTRIBUTED

1. MOBILITY MANAGEMENT BRANCH
 - Acting Deputy Commissioner, Environment and Transportation Department
report dated 29 Sep 98
 - deferred on 21 Oct 98

The Acting Commissioner provided a brief summary of the report and the new positions to be created.

2. FOREST RENEWAL PROGRAM
 - Director, Infrastructure Maintenance Division report dated 20 Oct 98

INQUIRIES

Standardized Commercial Signs

Councillor Cantin indicated that many people do not realize there is a business district in Blackburn Hamlet because of the By-Pass and he has received a request from one of the companies to install a commercial sign on the Regional road at both entrances of the By-Pass, which they would be responsible for. He asked that staff review this request and report back to committee with respect to having a standardized type of sign for such businesses.

Warning Signs for Motorists

Councillor Doucet indicated that many students of Carleton University cross Bronson Avenue from a paved pathway that cuts across a field near the campus. However, the lack of signs warning motorists about these pedestrians is causing serious safety concerns and he asked staff to examine the possibility of erecting warning signs to indicate to motorists that it is a crossing.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

CO-ORDINATOR

ACTING CHAIR