

--	--

TO:	TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING ON MAY 5, 2015
FROM:	DOUG MACRAE, P.ENG. MANAGER, TRANSPORTATION PLANNING & DESIGN
SUBJECT:	WARRANTED SIDEWALK EVALUATION & FUNDING

The purpose of this report is to respond to an April 7th Transportation Advisory Committee request for information with respect to the criteria used when prioritizing the warranted sidewalk list and the associated funding.

Funding

The Warranted Sidewalk Program currently has an annual budget of \$230,000. This funding level has been consistent since 2005. Records indicate that the annual budget was \$180,000 prior to 2002 when it increased to \$200,000 followed by an increase to \$230,000 in 2005.

The April 7th report to the Transportation Advisory Committee included a complete list of locations currently planned to be addressed under the program. This list is revised each year. Some locations are implemented and removed from the list. Other locations are added to the list based on requests. The current list includes 89 different locations around the City with estimated costs which total \$5,374,700. With the current funding level of \$230,000, it would take 24 years to address all of the known locations.

A doubling of the current annual funding level to \$460,000 would permit a longer list of locations to be implemented each year and could address the currently identified locations in twelve years.

Alternatively an annual funding level of \$540,000 for the Warranted Sidewalk program would address the current list within ten years. This funding level would represent a 235% increase in budget.

A “complete streets” approach is now being applied to all City capital reconstruction projects. This will assist in promoting active transportation through the construction of sidewalks in individual projects at locations identified on this list or not.

Prioritization

The Warranted Sidewalk List of locations includes a rating score for each street which serves to define priorities. All of the locations are evaluated on the same basis through the standard Sidewalk Rating Form. The Sidewalk Rating Form is attached as Appendix A, and it has been developed by Transportation Division to take into consideration several factors such as: pedestrian demand, walking alternatives, street lighting, roadway alignment, traffic activity, connection to existing sidewalks with special attention being paid to those requests that serve schools and seniors.

The rating form was amended in 2001 to include the following factors:

- Item 5b) Confirmed speeding problems; and,
- Item 9) Would the sidewalk serve persons with disabilities?

--	--

Having regard for the availability of funding, the locations recommended for construction each year are prioritized according to their rating and coordination with other works in the vicinity.

The Griffith Street (Byron Baseline to Commissioners Rd) location was discussed with respect to prioritization based on the existence of a bus route. A review of the rating form for this section has confirmed that rating points have been assigned for close proximity to transit, as well as connection to existing sidewalks, serving people with disabilities and a light pedestrian usage rating. Most of the side street connections east or west of Griffith Street include sidewalks for pedestrian travel.

Attach: Appendix A - Sidewalk Rating Form

--	--

Appendix A Sidewalk Rating Form



London
CANADA

RATING SUMMARY RECORD Warranted Sidewalk Program

Rating Date (YYY/MM/DD)

Location	From	To	Side	Approx. Linear Metres

Item	Factors	Rating System	Points	Rating Points
1.	Daily Pedestrian Usage	Light (less than 100)	10	
		Heavy (more than 100)	20	
2.	Walking Alternatives	Curb & Gutter, <2m SHLD	15	
		>2m SHLD	5	
		Sidewalk one side of collector/local	--	
3.	Street Lighting	Yes	--	
		No	5	
4.	Roadway Alignment	Horizontal Curvature	Yes	5
			No	--
	Vertical Grade	Yes	5	
		No	--	
5.	a) Daily Vehicle volume	Less than 2000	5	
		2000 to 5000	10	
		More than 5000	20	
	b) Confirmed speeding problems – Measured as per policy 27(7)	Yes	5	
		No	--	
6.	Will connect sidewalk to existing system	Yes	15	
		No	--	
7.	Would sidewalk serve school or senior's facility	Yes	15	
		No	--	
8.	Close proximity to public transit	Yes	5	
		No	--	
9.	Would sidewalk serve persons with disabilities	Yes	10	
		No	--	
TOTAL				

Requested by:	

Comments:	