

Report TR-CC-55-15

To: Warden Eccles and County Councillors
From: M.J. Kelly, Director of Transportation Services
Randy Scherzer, Director of Planning
Meeting Date: July 7, 2015
Subject: **Transportation Master Plan – Recommended Priority Action
Items and Summary of Comments Received**
Status: Recommendation adopted by Council as amended per Resolution
CC94-15; Also see resolutions CC91-15 and CC92-15 for direction

Recommendation(s)

WHEREAS Council awarded a contract to Cole Engineering to complete a Transportation Master Plan which is an action item in the County’s Corporate Strategic Plan;

AND WHEREAS a draft Transportation Master Plan has been completed and shared with local municipalities, other stakeholders and members of the public;

AND WHEREAS a Municipal Information Session and Public Meeting were held on March 6, 2015 to obtain input on the draft Transportation Master Plan and County Council’s preliminary recommendations;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Report TR-CC-55-15 be received which provides a summary of the comments received on the draft Transportation Master Plan and also contains recommended priority action items and alternative options for Council’s consideration;

AND THAT Council hereby receives the Transportation Master Plan;

AND THAT Council directs staff to prepare a detailed work plan for moving forward with the recommended priority actions items as contained in Report TR-CC-55-15 and as directed by Council.

Background

County Council awarded a contract to Cole Engineering to complete a Transportation Master Plan. The completion of a Transportation Master Plan is an action item identified in the County Strategic Plan.

The Transportation Master Plan (TMP) is a strategic plan that directs policies and infrastructure initiatives in Grey County (the County). It is developed within the context of the existing transportation system and travel characteristics in the County. The TMP considers development growth within the County and potential improvements to ensure viable travel into the future. The TMP will shape the transportation system, and direct policies and infrastructure plans, which may include roads, transit service, bicycle and pedestrian connections, and travel by air, rail or water.

The TMP addresses short, medium, and long- term transportation needs for all modes of travel and will provide input to future environmental assessments and official plan updates. Goals of the TMP are listed below:

Goal #1: Create a vision for all modes of transportation in Grey County, with a particular focus on encouraging active transportation options (cycling, walking/running).

Goal #2: Identify transportation network constraints and opportunities, as well as required infrastructure improvements/expansions to ensure the continued safe and efficient movement of people and goods to the year 2036.

Goal #3: Ensure that the TMP is fully aligned with the County's vision and goals identified in the County Corporate Strategic Plan and other County plans/strategies.

Goal #4: Establish solutions reflective of the present economic climate and future conditions.

Goal #5: Coordinate and establish partnerships with public and private agencies.

Purpose of TMP

Ensure the transportation system is designed to attract people to live, visit and work in Grey County.

Principles of the TMP

- Action Item identified in the County Strategic Plan
- Economic Development is essential to all of Grey County

- Transportation is essential to maintain existing and promoting future development
- Must consider the long and short term needs of all transportation modes for economic development.
- The County Road System is not sustainable with the current funding.
- The County recognizes that the local municipalities have significant financial pressures and do not wish to assume additional costs.
- The distribution of County Roads should be fair and equitable for all municipalities.
- Must view as a whole and not separate pieces

Process to Date

The following is a summary of the process that has been completed for the TMP:

- **April 2013** – Information Sessions held throughout the County to receive initial input from the community
- **Summer/Fall 2013** – Comments summarized and draft strategies and options prepared
- **November 26, 2013** – Council provided input/comments on draft strategies and options
- **January 31, 2014** – Local Municipal Staff provided input/comments on draft strategies and options
- **Between February and March, 2014** – received some further comments from some of the local municipalities
- **Spring/Summer of 2014**– Staff and Consultant prepared the draft TMP and draft Action Plan
- **July 2014** – presented draft TMP and draft Action Plan to Steering Committee
- **Summer 2014** – revised draft TMP based on comments from Steering Committee
- **Fall 2014** – draft TMP and action plan presented to Committee/Council
- **November 2014** – draft TMP and draft Action Plan circulated
- **December 2014** – Presentation provided to Council to update them on the TMP
- **February 2015** – Draft Priority Action Items presented to Council
- **March 2015**- Public Information meeting for Municipalities and the public to discuss draft recommendations and obtain input.

Recommendation Categories

The TMP contains Recommendations and options for the following components:

- Transit
- Active Transportation

- Community Traffic
- Road Rationalization
- Bridge Rationalization
- Goods Movement
- Connecting Links
- Other Strategies

Next Steps

To enable staff to proceed with these initiatives direction is required from County Council as to the option they wish the staff to pursue. It must also be recognized that each one of these initiatives may require a significant amount of resources and as a result they should be prioritized. The following provides a description of the action items presented at the municipal and public meetings held on March 6, 2015 as well as staff recommendations and other possible alternatives. Staff recommendations and a suggested priority list are summarized starting on Page 17 of the report. The suggested priority list will allow staff to schedule and allocate resources to each initiative. Staff suggest that once direction is provided by Council on each category they wish staff to pursue, that a work plan be prepared and presented for Council's consideration.

Transit

Draft recommendations presented at Municipal and Public Information Meetings

- Implement the recommendations contained in the Rural Transit Study – the 2015 budget includes funds to begin this process
- Apply for Provincial Grant Funding to expedite implementation of the Rural Transit Study recommendations – an application was submitted and funding was granted to the County.

Staff Recommendations

- **Continue work on implementing the recommendations contained in the Rural Transit Study by utilizing the grant funds provided by the Province as well as the funds provided by Council in the 2015 budget.**
- **The following is a link to a presentation on the Rural Transit Study:**
[Attachment to SSR-SS-01-15 Rural Transportation Study Lough Barnes October 7 County Council](#)

Summary of comments received from Municipal and Public Information Meetings

Local Municipal Comments on Transit

| Municipality | Comments |
|--------------------------------|---|
| City of Owen Sound | Support the development of a County Rural Transit Strategy that includes consultation with the City as it pertains to the integration with the City’s transit system and including considerations for intercity transit |
| Town of The Blue Mountains | Requests that the County continue moving forward with a Rural Transit Study |
| Municipality of Meaford | Supports the County taking a coordinated approach to transit and supports the concept of developing partnerships amongst the providers through a collaborative model, as well as continuing to move forward with the Rural Transit Study recommendations. |
| Township of Southgate | Supports the Transit Strategy |
| Municipality of Grey Highlands | Rural Transit needs to be a County priority and all local municipalities and stakeholders should be involved in a “summit” process to establish criteria and consistency. |

Public Comments on Transit

- No concerns expressed at the Public Meeting
- Transit stops should be accommodated on County roads
- Include transit stops on the planning requirements for new developments
- Consider investment and funding models to support existing transit operations and future transit opportunities
- Consider the new sharing economy as it relates to potential technological transit solutions (e.g. Uber, Lyft)
- Need a rural transit system, particularly to support seniors

Other Options

- Do nothing
- Proceed with a different course of action as directed by Council
- Direct staff to prepare a policy/standards to allow transit stops on County roads
- Direct staff to prepare draft Official Plan policies to include transit stop considerations as part of the planning requirements for new developments
- Implement public transportation throughout the County

Active Transportation

Draft recommendations presented at Municipal and Public Information Meetings

- Develop an updated Paved Shoulder Policy/Program - strategically locate paved shoulders based on policies/standards with better alignment with Tourism Cycling Routes, etc. (meetings have already commenced)
- Explore opportunities to improve trail user experience (e.g. parking facilities, signage, etc.)

Staff Recommendations

- **Same as above**
- **Identify connectivity of routes throughout the County**
- **Develop a layered map of all roads in Grey County (Local Municipal and County) that provides information that will permit active transit participants to select appropriate routes for their needs and skill level as well as local facilities.**

Summary of comments received from Municipal and Public Information Meetings.

Local Municipal Comments on Active Transportation

| Municipality | Comments |
|----------------------------|--|
| City of Owen Sound | Supports the development of a paved shoulder policy that has regard to the City's Active Transportation and Trails Master Plan, Transportation Master Plan and Official Plan. These County policies should reflect the City's permissible uses of public thoroughfares within the City. |
| Town of The Blue Mountains | Requests that the County undertakes the recommendations in the Transportation Master Plan with respect to Active Transportation. |
| Municipality of Meaford | Support the interim and comprehensive actions plans however note that active transportation should be a coordinated effort with local municipalities to avoid duplication. The Plan should also promote the multi-use of trails such as snowmobile use of trails such as the Georgian Trail. Meaford also supports and offers their assistance in developing an updated Paved Shoulder Policy/Program and to improve the trail user experience (e.g. parking facilities, signage, etc.). |

| Municipality | Comments |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Township of Southgate | Supports the active transportation strategy with the recommendation that the study consider connections to neighbouring Counties. |
| Municipality of Grey Highlands | Supports the implementation of an active transportation strategy subject to local engagement as each community is different. |

Public/Agency Comments on Active Transportation

- Often conflict between cyclists and motorists
- Suggested that education be provided for cyclists and drivers regarding ‘rules of the road’ (e.g. share the road concept)
- Improve connectivity of paved shoulders between roads or sections of roads as well as improving trail connectivity
- Coordinate paved shoulder program with local and neighbouring municipalities and construct paved shoulders on known cycling routes
- Grey Bruce Health Unit – encouraged by the active transportation and paved shoulder recommendations.

Other Options

- Do nothing
- Pave all County Road shoulders
- Provide separate bicycle lanes adjacent to some or all County Roads
- Pave all trails
- Construct Parking lots and other facilities to accommodate Active Transportation users throughout the County.

Community Traffic

Draft recommendations presented at Municipal and Public Information Meetings

- Develop principles and policies of assessing Community Traffic Calming Measures identified in the TMP

Staff Recommendations

- **Develop a variety of options, principles and policies of assessing Community Traffic Calming Measures to be considered in various communities to assist in appropriate speeds in municipalities.**
- **Determine appropriate speed zones and modify speed zones if applicable.**

Summary of comments received from Municipal and Public Information Meetings.

Local Municipal Comments on Community Traffic

| Municipality | Comments |
|--------------------------------|--|
| City of Owen Sound | Supports the development of a policy for community traffic calming measures that has regard for principles adopted in the City’s Transportation Master Plan. |
| Town of The Blue Mountains | Requests that the County develop principles and policies of assessing Community Traffic Calming Measures. |
| Municipality of Meaford | Supports the recommendation to develop principles and policies of assessing Community Traffic Calming Measures for speed management in transition zones. |
| Township of Southgate | No comment. |
| Municipality of Grey Highlands | No comment. |

Public Comments on Community Traffic

- Community traffic safety concerns and suggestions for improving safety, particularly as it relates to Kimberley
- Suggestions regarding improved signage, setbacks from the road, installing flashing lights, decreasing speed limits, etc.
- Suggestion to increase speed limits on certain County roads
- Recommend that a sidewalk be installed on Grey Road 4 in Hanover/West Grey near the Canadian Tire and Crabby Joes

Other Options

- Do nothing
- Develop traffic calming and implement in existing speed zones.

Road Rationalization

Draft recommendations presented at Municipal and Public Information Meetings

- Postpone for at least 2 years the recommended transfers until further data/information is collected (e.g. Asset Management Plans have been completed)
- Use the Road Rationalization to create a Functional Classification (i.e. Road Hierarchy) and develop appropriate standards/policies based on hierarchy

- Further investigate moving forward with the Goods Movement Road transfers where there are ‘even length’ trades to create immediate efficiencies in the County Road Network

Staff Recommendations

- Use the Road Rationalization to create a Functional Classification (i.e. Road Hierarchy) and develop appropriate standards/policies based on hierarchy.
- Postpone transfers except for ‘even-trade’ exchanges that will enhance the County transportation network for at least four years and determine if the Functional Classification is successful.
- Further investigate moving forward with the Goods Movement Road transfers where there are ‘even length’ trades to create immediate efficiencies in the County Road Network

Summary of comments received from Municipal and Public Information Meetings.

Local Municipal Comments on Road Rationalization

| Municipality | Comments |
|----------------------------|--|
| City of Owen Sound | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Opposed to assuming full responsibility for Grey Road 5 and Grey Road 15 within the City, including bridges and culverts on these roads without a full investigation of costs (operating and capital), benefits of transfer, service levels, and any efficiencies which may accrue as a result of the transfers. 2. Supports the transfer of 28th Avenue/10th Concession from the City of Owen Sound/Municipality of Meaford, and that the City of Owen Sound encourage the County to initiate discussions between the parties at an early juncture given the advanced state of deterioration of the road. |
| Town of The Blue Mountains | Requests that the County transfer all County Roads in The Blue Mountains to the Town of The Blue Mountains. |
| Municipality of Meaford | Cannot support the County’s initiative to reduce its significant backlog of road needs by reducing their road system as it will result in further pressure on Meaford’s own backlog of road needs. The fabric and density of County Roads is quite reasonable and logical in its present form. Meaford’s geographical location puts it at a disadvantage when applying the |

| Municipality | Comments |
|--------------------------------|--|
| | <p>scoring for rationalization for a County road (e.g. located next to Georgian Bay and at the terminus of most roads). Meaford is inclined to either support the “Do Nothing” option or accept all County roads along with the appropriate financial resources and compensation. Other than some ‘even length’ trades, Meaford supports the fabric and density of County roads that presently exist in Meaford. If the decision is made to move forward with road rationalization, then Meaford supports the proposal to postpone the recommended transfers for at least 2 years until further data/information is collected.</p> |
| Township of Southgate | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All Grey County roads maintenance operations be devolved to the lower-tiers to eliminate duplication of efforts and redundancies to gain lower costs and achieve operational efficiencies in the areas of road management, patrol, winter and summer maintenance operations. 2. That the County of Grey provide engineering services to lower-tier road departments to provide oversight and support of the maintenance efforts by: ensuring major transportation corridors are rehabilitated and/or reconstructed on a timely basis; completing the traffic studies; annual inspections and signage analysis of designated County roads; manage and maintain weather monitoring and remote road closure equipment in consultation with police services and lower-tiers. 3. Develop a collaborative funding model and process to transfer all County roads. This model shall include: evaluation and ranking of each County road and its present condition; a capital compensation or reconstruction/rehabilitation plan prior to transfer of any road to the lower tiers; and transfer of permanent maintenance funding on a per km basis. |
| Municipality of Grey Highlands | <p>Supports remaining status quo on the roads rationalization and no further discussion should occur unless the following is undertaken: an overall assessment and review is undertaken from a ‘who does what’ perspective between the County and local municipalities; and a financial model that would take into account growth, economic development and tourism.</p> |

Public/Agency Comments on Road Rationalization

- Consider winter maintenance/weather, topography (i.e. hills and valleys) and safety prior to transferring roads
- County should look after construction of roads and municipalities should look after maintenance of roads
- Are other counties considering road transfers?
- Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority – the TMP is acceptable subject to further review or detailed reports/plans for any road works that stem from the TMP
- Niagara Escarpment Commission (NEC) - development permits are required for any new roads and road improvements within the NEC
- Support for transferring County roads and bridges in the Town of The Blue Mountains to the Town
- Suggestion to implement “The Discovery Loop” in the north west section of the Municipality of Meaford (which would involve road infrastructure being reconstructed and transferred) to aid residential construction, assist agri-business growth and encourage tourism expansion.
- Grey County should keep all the current Grey County roads and bridges

Other Options

- Status Quo
- Local Municipalities assume all the County Roads
- Local Municipalities assume all the County Roads and County completes engineering and construction.
- All Grey Roads that do not meet criteria be transferred to the local municipalities
 - At once
 - Over the next ten years
 - With some compensation
 - With no compensation
 - When the road is upgraded it is transferred to the local municipality.

Bridge Rationalization

Draft recommendations presented at Municipal and Public Information Meetings

- Develop Bridge Classification Criteria based on principles of when a bridge should be replaced or closed

- Postpone any consideration of transfers until there is more data/information (e.g. Asset Management Plans have been completed)
- Develop criteria to transfer bridges in the future.

Staff Recommendations

- **Develop Bridge Classification Criteria based on principles of when a bridge should be replaced or closed for County and local municipality structures.**
- **Evaluate the options to transfer County owned structures on local municipal roads in three years.**
- **Review and report back on the feasibility of establishing a bridge crew for the use of local municipalities (under the direction of the County) to complete maintenance repairs to extend the life of the structures.**

Summary of comments received from Municipal and Public Information Meetings.

Local Municipal Comments on Bridge Rationalization

| Municipality | Comments |
|----------------------------|--|
| City of Owen Sound | The City is opposed to the transfer of the 7 th Avenue West Boundary Bridge over the Pottawatomi River to the City of Owen Sound without a full investigation of costs (operating and capital), benefits of transfer, service levels, and any efficiencies which may accrue as a result of the transfers. |
| Town of The Blue Mountains | Requests that the County transfer all bridges in The Blue Mountains to the Town of The Blue Mountains. |
| Municipality of Meaford | It appears that the County is leaning toward addressing their backlog of bridge needs by reducing their bridge network. Although there is merit to the concept that structure ownership should follow road ownership, this represents a huge shift in available finances. It has been an expectation that both the County and municipalities have been planning and saving toward replacement and rehabilitation of their respective bridge needs. It is not a simple matter of transferring County bridges on current and former municipal boundaries to the local municipality. Meaford supports the recommendation for possibly closing a structure. Meaford recommends that any consideration of transfers be postponed until there is more data/information as well as supporting the recommendation to develop criteria to transfer bridges in the future. |

| Municipality | Comments |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Township of Southgate | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ownership of the bridges within the County of Grey should not change (i.e. status quo). 2. Southgate recommends that the County provide engineering and construction services for all lower-tier and upper-tier bridges that includes the following activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual bridge inspection and reporting • Recommendations for bridge remediation work such as restoration, repair or upgrades • Maintaining a bridge rehabilitation and maintenance crew whereby the bridge crew could work for the County from April to October and for the lower-tier during the winter months as seasonal operators. 3. All Grey County bridges should be annually maintained by the lower tier municipalities with consistent procedures and/or recommendations from the County to complete the necessary maintenance such as bridge washing, painting or surface metal, deck surface pavement patching, etc. |
| Municipality of Grey Highlands | Status quo remains on the bridge rationalization in that the ownership of bridges in the County should not change and the County provides engineering and construction services for all bridges in the County. |

Public Comments on Bridge Rationalization

- County should keep all bridges and the County should hire a bridge engineer to be shared by all local municipalities
- Support for transferring County roads and bridges in the Town of The Blue Mountains to the Town
- Grey County should keep all the current Grey County roads and bridges

Other Options

- Status Quo
- County assumes all the structures (County and Municipal roads)
- County provides the engineering for all structures and the municipalities assumes the ownership of structures on municipal roads
- Local Municipalities assume all the bridges
- All County bridges on municipal roads be transferred to the local municipalities
 - At once
 - Over the next ten years

- With some compensation
- With no compensation
- When the structure is upgraded it is transferred to the local municipality.

Goods Movement

Draft recommendations presented at Municipal and Public Information Meetings

- Further investigate moving forward with network improvements where there are 'even length' trades to create efficiencies in the County road network

Staff Recommendations

- **Investigate the cost to exchange 'even length ±' of road sections with municipalities to create efficiencies in the County road network and provide information to local municipalities and to County Council for direction.**

Summary of comments received from Municipal and Public Information Meetings.

Local Municipal Comments on Goods Movement

| Municipality | Comments |
|--------------------------------|---|
| City of Owen Sound | Supports the transfer of 28 th Avenue/10 th Concession as noted previously. |
| Town of The Blue Mountains | No comment. |
| Municipality of Meaford | Fully support the recommendations of the network changes, pavement design and road design that will better accommodate truck traffic throughout the County. Meaford supports further investigation toward moving forward with network improvements where there are 'even length' trades to create efficiencies in the County road network. It is proposed that 10 th Concession Road in Meaford be assumed as a County road as an alternative to Grey Road 11, which will be transferred to the Municipality. Although this is not an exact 'even length' trade, Meaford supports this recommendation. |
| Township of Southgate | Supports the Goods Movement strategy |
| Municipality of Grey Highlands | No comment. |

Public Comments on Goods Movement

- No comments.

Other Options

- Status quo
- Upgrade pavement designs for truck usage
- Develop signage for truck operators

Connecting Links

Draft recommendations presented at Municipal and Public Information Meetings

- Develop connecting link principles and funding criteria for the maintenance and construction of connecting links
- Develop a connecting link agreement template
- Present funding model and connecting link agreements to Council

Staff Recommendations

- Same as above

Summary of comments received from Municipal and Public Information Meetings.

Local Municipal Comments on Connecting Links

| Municipality | Comments |
|--------------------------------|--|
| City of Owen Sound | The City is in favour of the development of a 'connecting link' template for County roads subject to negotiation and report to and approval of the template by City Council. |
| Town of The Blue Mountains | Requests that the County provide further financial information on connecting link programs. |
| Municipality of Meaford | Meaford supports the recommendation to develop connecting link principles and funding criteria that would be presented to Council. |
| Township of Southgate | Supports connecting links. |
| Municipality of Grey Highlands | Connecting link remains status quo and is revisited at a later date. |

Public Comments on Connecting Links

- Overall support for investigating connecting links further

Other Options

- Status quo
- Transfer urban roads to municipalities with or without compensation.

Other Strategies

Draft recommendations presented at Municipal and Public Information Meetings

- Develop design standards to address the requirements of the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA)
- Incorporate the Policy Recommendations with respect to Harbours, Airports and Rail Corridors in the County Official Plan

Staff Recommendations

- Same as above

Summary of comments received from Municipal and Public Information Meetings.

Local Municipal Comments on Other Strategies, etc.

| Municipality | Comments |
|----------------------------|---|
| City of Owen Sound | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports the development of AODA design standards and that the City participates where applicable with the County in the development of these standards. 2. Supports the incorporation of policies into the County's Official Plan with respect to Harbours, Airports and Rail Corridors and that the City be consulted as it relates to this infrastructure that pertains to the City of Owen Sound. |
| Town of The Blue Mountains | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No comments regarding the AODA or Harbours, Airports and Rail Corridors. 2. Requests that the County respond to the Town's comments within ninety days of receipt (Town comments received May 5, 2015) |
| Municipality of Meaford | No comments. |
| Township of Southgate | No comments. |

| Municipality | Comments |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Municipality of Grey Highlands | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the County should retain ownership of rail corridors. 2. That the County take on a more active role in Engineering services on behalf of lower-tiers 3. That the County actively include and engage lower-tier municipalities in a consultative structure which includes municipal council representation, appropriate municipal and County staff and other representatives as required – the purpose of which is to study issues related to transportation and to make recommendations to the County. |

Public/Agency Comments on Other Strategies, etc.

- NEC – development associated with the airports not related to aeronautics would require a development permit
- Comments received on the importance of the Warton Keppel International Airport
- Comments also received regarding the importance of the rail trail corridors
- Grey Road 19/21 intersection should be a roundabout
- Concerned that municipal budgets with respect to road improvement capital expenditures may be under stated based on impacts to roads and bridges caused by industries such as the Aggregate Extraction Industry, Solar Farms and Wind Turbines and that this will result in increased taxes paid by the public.
- Question as to why municipalities are considering a levy fee of 40 cents per tonnes of aggregate when the Quebec extraction rate is set at 50 cents per tonne paid to the local municipality where the operation is located to improve municipal roads.
- Suggestion that municipalities must consider other methods to create a user fee that recoups road improvement costs from the Aggregate Industry (e.g. development agreements).
- Municipalities should consider the cumulative effects from gravel truck traffic by considering the gravel truck traffic from neighbouring municipalities.
- Grey County Transportation must consider the following recommendations:
 - Support Municipalities’ Development Agreements for haul routes on municipal roads as well as haul routes on Grey County roads
 - Work with Municipalities to create within the Municipalities’ Application for Rezoning to Aggregate Resources Extraction an Affidavit requiring the Applicant and Municipality to enter into a Development Agreement before Zoning By-Law Approval

- Work with Township Public Work Staff to develop a “Aggregate Resources – Road Improvement Costs Form” for exit and entrances, turning lanes, culverts, drainage ditches, widening of roads etc. which would be presented in a Staff Report for information before approval of a Zoning By-Law.
- Township Public Work Staff and Public Liaison Committee review the Aggregate Resources – Road Improvement Costs Form before approval of a Zoning By-Law
- Ensure Municipal Policy is consistent by applying the same procedure and criteria to other industries using municipal and county haul routes such as Solar Projects
- Ensuring the Aggregate Industry continues to share with the Public the cost of transportation services through “development charges” as a non-statutory participant until the Provincial Government establishes an increase in the levy fee.

Other Options

- As directed by Council

Summary of Staff Recommendations and Recommended Priority List

| Initiative (staff recommendations) | Summary of Staff Recommendations | Department lead | Priority |
|---|--|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Transit | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue work on Rural Transit Study | Social Services | Very High |
| Active Transportation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop an updated Paved Shoulder Policy/Program • Explore opportunities to improve trail user experience (e.g. parking facilities, signage) • Identify connectivity of routes • Develop an informative map that will allow active transportation participants to plan appropriate routes | Transportation Services | High |
| Community Traffic | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop options, principles and policies of assessing Community Traffic Calming Measures • Determine appropriate speed zones and modify zones if | Transportation Services | Low |

| Initiative (staff recommendations) | Summary of Staff Recommendations | Department lead | Priority |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| | applicable | | |
| Road Rationalization | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a functional classification (hierarchy) and develop standards and policies based on hierarchy. • Postpone transfers for at least four years and determine if functional classification is successful • Investigate moving forward with the Goods Movement Road transfers/ 'even-length' trades | Transportation Services | High |
| Bridge Rationalization | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop bridge classification criteria based on principles of when a bridge should be replaced or closed – both County and municipal structures • Evaluate options to transfer County owned structures on local roads in three years • Review and report back on the feasibility of establishing a bridge crew for the use of local municipalities | Transportation Services | High |
| Goods Movement | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investigate the cost to exchange 'even-length' road sections with municipalities to create efficiencies in the County road network | Transportation Services | Medium |
| Connecting Links | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop connecting link principles and funding criteria for the maintenance and construction of connecting links • Develop a connecting link agreement template • Present funding model and connecting link agreements to Council | Transportation Services | Very High |
| Other Strategies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop design standards to address the requirements of the AODA • Incorporate policy | Transportation Services Planning | Medium |

| Initiative (staff recommendations) | Summary of Staff Recommendations | Department lead | Priority |
|------------------------------------|--|-----------------|----------|
| | recommendations with respect to Harbours, Airports and Rail Corridors in the County Official Plan. | | |

Financial / Staffing / Legal / Information Technology Considerations

Following direction from Council, staff can prepare a more detailed work plan for Council's consideration which would include estimated timelines and any associated costs for moving forward with the action items as directed by Council.

Link to Strategic Goals / Priorities

Action Item 4.3 of the Corporate Strategic Plan indicates that the County should develop a county-wide Transportation Master Plan that identifies capital priorities, embraces active transportation principles, and is innovative in its support of economic development and healthy community strategies.

Attachments

[Municipal Information Session Minutes Transportation Master Plan March 6 2015](#)

[Public Meeting Minutes Transportation Master Plan March 6 2015](#)

[March 2015 Transportation Master Plan Presentation](#)

[Draft Appendices Transportation Master Plan - Cole Engineering - September 2014](#)

[Draft Transportation Master Plan - Cole Engineering - September 2014](#)

Respectfully submitted by,

M.J. Kelly
Director of Transportation Services

Randy Scherzer
Director of Planning