

Civic Works Committee

Report

13th Meeting of the Civic Works Committee
September 24, 2019

PRESENT: Councillors P. Squire (Chair), S. Lewis, S. Lehman, E. Pelozo
ABSENT: M. van Holst, Mayor E. Holder
ALSO PRESENT: Councillors J. Helmer, S. Turner; J. Bunn, M. Bushby, S. Chambers, M. Fontaine, D. MacRae, S. Maguire, S. Mathers, K. Oudekerk, M. Ridley, K. Scherr, S. Spring, J. Stanford, D. Turner, B. Westlake-Power

1. Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest

That it BE NOTED that no pecuniary interests were disclosed.

2. Consent

Moved by: S. Lewis
Seconded by: S. Lehman

That consideration of Item 2.4 BE DEFERRED to later in the meeting, following In Closed Session.

Yeas: (4): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, and E. Pelozo

Absent: (2): M. van Holst, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (4 to 0)

Moved by: E. Pelozo
Seconded by: S. Lehman

That Items 2.1 to 2.3, 2.5 and 2.7 to 2.13, BE APPROVED.

Yeas: (4): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, and E. Pelozo

Absent: (2): M. van Holst, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (4 to 0)

2.1 8th Report of the Transportation Advisory Committee

Moved by: E. Pelozo
Seconded by: S. Lehman

That the 8th Report of the Transportation Advisory Committee, from its meeting held on August 27, 2019, BE RECEIVED.

Motion Passed

2.2 Amendments to the Traffic and Parking By-law

Moved by: E. Pelozza
Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Environmental and Engineering Services and City Engineer, the proposed by-law, as appended to the staff report dated September 24, 2019, BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on October 1, 2019, for the purpose of amending the Traffic and Parking By-law (PS-113). (2019-T08)

Motion Passed

2.3 Update on the Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Expansion of the W12A Landfill

Moved by: E. Pelozza
Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Environment, Fleet and Solid Waste, the staff report dated September 24, 2019, with respect to an update on the Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Expansion of the W12A Landfill, BE RECEIVED. (2019-E07A)

Motion Passed

2.5 Wastewater Treatment Operations Environmental Assessment – Master Plan Study Initiation

Moved by: E. Pelozza
Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Environmental and Engineering Services and City Engineer, the staff report, dated September 24, 2019, with respect to the initiation of the Wastewater Treatment Operations Environmental Assessment Master Plan Study, BE RECEIVED. (2019-E03)

Motion Passed

2.7 Award of Contract (RFP 19-29) – Sixteen (16) Tandem Axle Trucks with Dump Boxes and Plow Equipment

Moved by: E. Pelozza
Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Environmental and Engineering Services & City Engineer, the following actions be taken with respect to the award of contract (RFP 19-29):

a) the submission from Team Truck Centers Inc., 795 Wilton Grove Road London, Ont. N6N 1N7, BE ACCEPTED for the supply and delivery of sixteen (16) tandem axle dump trucks and plow equipment at a total purchase price of \$3,753,430 (\$234,589.38 per unit), excluding HST;

b) the Civic Administration BE AUTHORIZED to undertake all the administrative acts that are necessary in connection with this purchase;

c) approval hereby given BE CONDITIONAL upon the Corporation entering into a formal contract or having a purchase order, or contract record relating to the subject matter of this approval; and,

d) the funding for this purchase BE APPROVED as set out in the Source of Financing Report appended to the staff report dated September 24, 2019. (2019-L04)

Motion Passed

2.8 Appointment of Consulting Engineer – Upgrading of Powell Drain (Northbrook Valley) and Upland North Outlet Culverts (RFP 19-46)

Moved by: E. Pelosa

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Environmental and Engineering Services and City Engineer, the following actions be taken with respect to the appointment of a Consulting Engineer for the Upgrading of Powell Drain (Northbrook Valley) and Upland North Outlet Culverts (RFP 19-46):

a) Ecosystem Recovery Inc. BE APPOINTED Consulting Engineers to complete detailed design and construction administration for remediation works to Powell Drain and the Upland North Outlet Culverts in accordance with the estimate, on file, at an upset amount of \$244,677.54, including 10% contingency (excluding HST), in accordance with Section 15.2(d) of the City of London's Procurement of Goods and Services Policy;

b) the financing for the project BE APPROVED in accordance with the "Sources of Financing Report" appended to the staff report dated September 24, 2019;

c) the Civic Administration BE AUTHORIZED to undertake all the administrative acts that are necessary in connection with this project;

d) the approvals given herein BE CONDITIONAL upon the Corporation entering into a formal contract; and,

e) the Mayor and the City Clerk BE AUTHORIZED to execute any contract or other documents, if required, to give effect to these recommendations. (2019-E03)

Motion Passed

2.9 Construction Partnership with the Ministry of Transportation – Old Victoria Road Resurfacing

Moved by: E. Pelosa

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Environmental and Engineering Services and City Engineer, the following actions be taken with respect to the Old Victoria Road resurfacing project:

a) the City of London financial contribution of \$78,650.00 (excluding HST), representing the estimated cost for repaving a portion of Old Victoria Road north and south of the bridge over Hwy 401, as part of an Ontario Ministry of Transportation project, BE APPROVED; it being noted that it is included in an approved City budget and the method of procurement is in accordance with the Procurement of Goods and

Services Policy 14.4 (g) and (i), covering purchases with another public body;

b) the financing for this project BE APPROVED as set out in the Sources of Financing Report appended to the staff report dated September 24, 2019; and,

c) the Civic Administration BE AUTHORIZED to undertake all the administrative acts that are necessary in connection with this approval. (2019-T05)

Motion Passed

2.10 Dundas Street Cycle Track Design – Appointment of Consulting Engineer

Moved by: E. Pelosa

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Environmental and Engineering Services and City Engineer, the following actions be taken with respect to the appointment of a Consulting Engineer for the Cycle Track Design of Dundas Street from Wellington Street to Adelaide Street, and William Street from Dundas Street to Queens Avenue:

a) WSP Canada Group Limited BE APPOINTED Consulting Engineers to carry out consulting services in the amount of \$532,742.41 (excluding HST), in accordance with Section 15.2(d) of the City of London's Procurement of Goods and Services Policy;

b) the financing for this appointment BE APPROVED in accordance with the Sources of Financing Report appended to the staff report dated September 24, 2019;

c) the Civic Administration BE AUTHORIZED to undertake all the administrative acts that are necessary in connection with this appointment;

d) the approvals given herein BE CONDITIONAL upon the Corporation entering into a formal contract with the consultant for the project; and,

e) the Mayor and the City Clerk BE AUTHORIZED to execute any contract or other documents, if required, to give effect to these recommendations. (2019-T05)

Motion Passed

2.11 Agreement Extension with Trojan Technologies for the Use of the Decommissioned Westminster Wastewater Plant

Moved by: E. Pelosa

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Environmental and Engineering Services and City Engineer, the proposed by-law, as appended to the staff report dated September 24, 2019, BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on October 1, 2019, to:

a) authorize and approve the Agreement between The Corporation of the City of London and Trojan Technologies Group ULC; and,

b) authorize the Mayor and the City Clerk to execute the above-noted Agreement. (2019-E03)

Motion Passed

2.12 All Terrain, Turf and Golf Utility Vehicles – Contract Award Based on Irregular Tender Result

Moved by: E. Pelosa

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Environmental and Engineering Services and City Engineer, the following actions be taken with respect to a contract award based on irregular tender results for All Terrain, Turf and Golf utility vehicles:

- a) the Civic Administration BE AUTHORIZED to engage in a single source contract negotiation as per the Procurement of Goods and Services Policy Section 19.4 c) with Hyde Park Equipment, 2034 Mallard Rd, London, Ont. N6J 1G4, for the supply and delivery of three (3) All-Terrain Utility Vehicles (Kubota model RTV-X1100C) at a total purchase price of \$87,561.39 (\$29,187 per unit) excluding HST;
- b) the Civic Administration BE AUTHORIZED to engage in a single source contract as per the Procurement of Goods and Services Policy Section 19.4 c) with Podolinski Equipment Ltd. 6057 Petrolia Line, Petrolia Ont. NON 1R0, the supply and delivery of two (2) Turf Utility Vehicles (John Deere Progator model 2030A) at a total purchase price of \$73,190 (\$36,595 per unit) excluding HST; and the supply and delivery of five (5) Golf Utility Vehicles (John Deere Turf Gator) at a total purchase price of \$57,995 (\$11,599 per unit) excluding HST;
- c) the Civic Administration BE AUTHORIZED to utilize this tender result and single source approval to engage these vendors directly for future replacements of vehicles in these classifications for a contract period of two (2) years with two (2) additional option years, subject to performance and pricing;
- d) the Civic Administration BE AUTHORIZED to undertake all the administrative acts that are necessary in connection with this purchase;
- e) approval hereby given BE CONDITIONAL upon the Corporation entering into a formal contract or having a purchase order, or contract record relating to the subject matter of this approval; and,
- f) the funding for this purchase BE APPROVED as set out in the Source of Financing Report appended to the staff report dated September 24, 2019. (2019-R05D)

Motion Passed

2.13 Removal and Replacement of Underground Fuel and Oil Tanks

Moved by: E. Pelosa

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Environmental and Engineering Services and City Engineer, and with the support of the Managing Director, Corporate Services and City Treasurer and Chief Financial Officer, the following actions be taken with respect to replacing the fuel and oil storage tanks at A.J. Tyler Operations Centre and Adelaide Operations Centre:

- a) the action taken by the Managing Director, Environmental and Engineering Services and City Engineer in accordance with Procurement of Goods and Services Policy, Section 4.3 d. "Triggering Event" BE RECOGNIZED; it being noted that the actions taken required immediate

attention in order to be in compliance with the Liquids Fuel Handling Code (2017) Technical Standards & Safety Authority (TSSA) and is in the best financial, legal and environmental interests of The Corporation of the City of London;

b) the City of London's current fuel system maintenance and service vendor, Phoenix Petroleum Ltd., complete the required work in order that the storage tanks are in compliance with the 2017 Liquids Fuel Handling Code at an estimated price of \$970,252 which includes a 10% contingency (excluding HST), BE APPROVED in accordance with section 14.4 (d) and (e) of the Procurement of Goods and Services Policy;

c) the financing for this project BE APPROVED as set out in the Sources of Financing Report appended to the staff report dated September 24, 2019;

d) the Civic Administration BE AUTHORIZED to undertake any ancillary items outside of the scope identified in the project arising from unforeseen elements that may arise including: dewatering/shoring, damaged or poor condition equipment not identified, fuel sludge removal, contaminated materials; and,

e) the Civic Administration BE AUTHORIZED to undertake any final negotiations and all administrative acts that are necessary in connection with this matter and the Agreements referenced herein. (2019-E17)

Motion Passed

2.4 Landfill Gas (LFG) Utilization – Next Steps in the Development of a Renewable Natural Gas (RNG) Facility

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Environmental and Engineering Services and City Engineer, and on the advice of the Director, Environment, Fleet and Solid Waste, the following actions be taken with respect to potentially supplying FortisBC Energy Inc. with Renewable Natural Gas (RNG) created from landfill gas from the W12A Landfill:

a) the Civic Administration BE AUTHORIZED to release a Request for Proposals to develop a RNG facility to convert landfill gas from the W12A Landfill to RNG; and,

b) the Civic Administration BE AUTHORIZED to undertake all administrative acts that are necessary in connection with this project. (2019-E07)

Yeas: (4): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, and E. Pelozo

Motion Passed (4 to 0)

2.6 Automated Speed Enforcement Contract Award

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: E. Pelozo

That, on the recommendation of the Managing Director, Environmental and Engineering Services and City Engineer, the following actions be taken with respect to the Automated Speed Enforcement Program:

a) Redflex Traffic Systems (Canada) Limited, BE AWARDED the contract for the provision of Automated Speed Enforcement Services for a

five (5) year period, starting when the contract is executed, in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Request for Approvals executed by the City of Toronto on behalf of the City of London and other participating Automated Speed Enforcement municipalities in accordance with Section 14.4 (g) of the Procurement of Goods and Services Policy, noting that there is an option to extend the contact at the discretion of the City of London for an additional five (5) years;

- b) the Civic Administration BE AUTHORIZED to enter into an agreement with the City of Toronto to undertake centralized municipal processing of Automated Speed Enforcement offence notices;
- c) the Civic Administration BE AUTHORIZED to enter into an agreement with the Ontario Ministry of Transportation related to the operation of the Automated Speed Enforcement Program;
- d) the Civic Administration BE AUTHORIZED to undertake all administrative acts that are necessary in connection with this program;
- e) approvals given herein BE CONDITIONAL upon the Corporation entering into a formal contract with Redflex Traffic Systems (Canada) for the work;
- f) the Mayor and the City Clerk BE AUTHORIZED to execute any contract or other documents, if required, to give effect to these recommendations;
- g) the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to bring forward the necessary Traffic and Parking By-law amendments to designate Automated Speed Enforcement areas as Community Safety Zones;
- h) the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to place the net revenue from the Automated Speed Enforcement Program in the automated enforcement reserve fund; noting that any revenue shortfalls will be funded from this reserve fund, if necessary; and,
- i) the above-noted Program BE IMPLEMENTED with warning notices being sent for the first thirty (30) days of the program. (2019-T08)

Yeas: (4): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, and E. Pelozza

Absent: (2): M. van Holst, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (4 to 0)

3. Scheduled Items

3.1 8th Report of the Cycling Advisory Committee

Moved by: E. Pelozza

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That the 8th Report of the Cycling Advisory Committee, from its meeting held on August 21, 2019, BE RECEIVED; it being noted that a verbal delegation from C. Linton, Chair and R. Henderson, Vice-Chair, of the Cycling Advisory Committee and the attached presentation from R. Henderson, was received with respect to this matter.

Yeas: (4): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, and E. Pelozza

Absent: (2): M. van Holst, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (4 to 0)

3.2 Area Speed Limit Program

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That the staff report dated September 24, 2019, with respect to an Area Speed Limit Program, BE REFERRED back to the Civic Administration in order to consult with the London Transit Commission and report back at a future meeting of the Civic Works Committee regarding the effect a change to speed limits would have on transit service;

it being noted that the attached presentation from S. Maguire, Division Manager, Roadway Lighting and Traffic Control, with respect to this matter, was received;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter the individuals indicated on the attached public participation meeting record made oral submissions regarding this matter. (2019-T07)

Yeas: (3): P. Squire, S. Lewis, and S. Lehman

Nays: (1): E. Peloza

Absent: (2): M. van Holst, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (3 to 1)

Voting Record:

Moved by: E. Peloza

Seconded by: S. Lehman

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (4): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, and E. Peloza

Absent: (2): M. van Holst, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (4 to 0)

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (4): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, and E. Peloza

Absent: (2): M. van Holst, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (4 to 0)

4. Items for Direction

4.1 Parking Changes – Councillor S. Lewis

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to bring forward a report to a future meeting of the Civic Works Committee with details on potential impacts and recommendations on implementing the following changes to parking restrictions:

- a) the overnight parking ban program be amended to be in force from November 1st until April 30th annually;
- b) the issuing of overnight parking permits during the ban period be expanded to allow residents to purchase additional passes beyond the current 15 free uses for a fee; and,
- c) the current 12hr limit on occupying a specific on street non metered parking location be amended to 18hrs;

it being noted that a communication, dated September 12, 2019, from Councillor S. Lewis, was received with respect to this matter. (2019-T02)

Yeas: (4): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, and E. Pelosa

Absent: (2): M. van Holst, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (4 to 0)

Voting Record:

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

Motion to approve that the Civic Administration report back with respect to the potential to repeal the by-law prohibiting homeowners from parking a vehicle in their driveway parallel to the road way.

Yeas: (2): P. Squire, and S. Lewis

Nays: (2): S. Lehman, and E. Pelosa

Absent: (2): M. van Holst, and E. Holder

Motion Failed (2 to 2)

5. Deferred Matters/Additional Business

5.1 Deferred Matters List

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That the Deferred Matters List as at September 16, 2019, BE RECEIVED.

Yeas: (4): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, and E. Pelosa

Absent: (2): M. van Holst, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (4 to 0)

6. Confidential

Moved by: E. Pelosa

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That the Civic Works Committee convene, In Closed Session, for the purpose of considering the following:

6.1. Labour Relations / Employee Negotiations

A matter pertaining to labour relations or employee negotiations, including communications for that purpose.

6.2. Position, Plan, Procedure, Criteria or Instruction for Negotiation Purposes

A matter pertaining to a position, plan, procedure, criteria or instruction to be applied to negotiations carried on by the municipality, including communications for that purpose.

Yeas: (4): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, and E. Pelosa

Absent: (2): M. van Holst, and E. Holder

Motion Passed (4 to 0)

The Civic Works Committee convened, In Closed Session, from 6:13 PM to 6:34 PM.

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:41 PM.

12 years of motorist – bicyclist collision data in London, ON (2006 - 2017)

Motorist speed & bicyclist injury

Rebecca Henderson, MSc, PhD candidate
 Faculty of Health Sciences, Western University
rhende9@uwo.ca
 Twitter: @rhubike

page
01

12 years of motor vehicle – bicycle collision data in London, ON (2006 – 2017)




Figure 1




Figure 2

page
02

Area Speed Limits



Civic Works Committee – September 24, 2019



Area Speed Limits



- New legislations allows municipalities to set a speed limit lower than 50 km/h for defined areas.
- Collisions involving vulnerable road users from 2015 to 2017
 - 161 on minor residential streets; and
 - 86 on major downtown roads.

Goals

- Improve safety in residential areas and areas with high volumes of vulnerable road users; and
- Support community building by making walking and cycling more appealing.



Pedestrian and Cyclist Collisions (2015 to 2017)



Rate of Speed

Factors impacting the rate of speed:

- Roadway classification (minor vs. major)
- Roadway geometry (horizontal and vertical);
- Left-turn & right-turn lanes;
- Roadway width;
- Pedestrian/cyclist volumes and facilities;
- Vehicle volumes;
- Land use;
- Intersection spacing;
- Driveway spacing; and
- On-street parking.

Rate of Speed (cont'd)


A rate of speed of 40 km/h is appropriate for residential roads and some major roads in the downtown:

- Narrow residential roads;
- Intended use of the road;
- Frequent driveways; and
- High volume of vulnerable road users.

A speed limit lower than what drivers perceive as appropriate could result in significant non-compliance, greater speed differentials and increased enforcement resources.

- Speed differentials can result in pedestrians, cyclists and other drivers misjudging the speed of approaching vehicles.

Area Speed Limit Get Involved London Survey





Proposed Area Speed Limit Program

1. Reduce the speed limit in residential areas and at high vulnerable user volumes in the downtown to 40 km/h by area;
2. Implement Community Safety Zones as the speed limit is reduced to 40 km/h;
3. Maintain the speed limit in school zones at 40 km/h and review the potential to reduce the speed limit to 30 km/h; and
4. Invest approximately \$1,000,000 over four years for 2,000 sets of signs to implement the above.



PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.2 Area Speed Limit Program

- R. Henderson – indicating that there are other municipalities in Ontario that have thirty kilometer speed limits, Toronto's East York committee councillors voted unanimously to reduce the speeds on residential streets to thirty, Hamilton has neighbourhood projects (different neighborhoods have voted for thirty), Ottawa has voted in neighbourhoods for thirty, there are many examples across Ontario specifically that have voted neighbourhoods or for the entire neighborhoods and residential streets.
- D. Hall, London Cycle Link – stating that he had the privilege of attending the Ontario bike summit in April, and one of the keynote speakers was a Dutch mobility expert, and he came to speak to a room full of people who want to see more bikes; indicating that he asked the speaker what can be done in North America to improve cycling and encourage more people to cycle and the response was to reduce your speed limits to thirty km/h in neighborhoods; stating that this is one of the top priorities as London Cycle Link, because it really does change the game for encouraging people to share space; indicating that on a lot of our neighborhood streets we are not going to see protected bike lanes and it does not make sense in a lot of contexts; stating that when we reduce the speed of heavy vehicles, suddenly it feels like the right speed to bike alongside and it is the right speed to let our kids play outside in the front yard; noting that there are lots of reasons why this is an important thing; indicating that we have a Cycling Master Plan that wants five percent mode share of cycling trips and we are only at 1.7% right now; stating that we need to do things to be bold in getting there and this is one of those decisions that can be bold to help us get there; noting that, with respect to the survey, he thinks it was impressive that there was that many responses to the survey, however, when asking people if they agree with forty or below forty km/hr it is really important to know who we are asking; stating that, for the most part, people experience the neighbourhood street through the windshield or behind the windshield of their car and when you drive through neighbourhood streets you feel confident and in control at fifty km/h, and especially at forty km/h and it feels slow behind the wheel of a car, but if your vantage point is on the sidewalk or your vantage point is on a bike, suddenly that forty or fifty km/h feels really fast; that that when you are walking with your kid, it feels very different, that speed, when you are beside traffic verses 'I am traffic'; stating that he would just like to ensure everybody is being surveyed; indicating that he thinks this is an important point that we have a chance to make something truly transformational in London and that this is a decision that can change the game to make our streets safer, to make it more enjoyable to use our front yards; indicating that it will reduce noise in our neighborhoods and it will reduce your inbox complaints about all the speeding you hear about; noting that signage alone will not be the answer, we cannot just put up signs and sit back and watch everyone slow down, that is not going to happen; indicating that photo radar will help but we need to also supplement that with traffic calming, and he knows that it will be the really expensive part of this but he thinks to have the goal be thirty km/h is the really important part; indicating that to say that we want traffic to be slow but let's not worry about compliance or non-compliance, let's set the right goal, and to say we want safe streets, let's have that be the goal and work toward it; stating that we know how to do it, we know how to design a road to get people to drive thirty km/h; stating that it will take some re-working, re-design and possibly some more money; indicating that we should use this opportunity in front of us and make a bold decision to make our streets safer, to encourage cycling, to encourage walking; stating that we do not have to go all at once, say thirty km/h in our whole city, we could do pilot projects, we can do thirty km/h on bike routes, there are lots of ways to implement this and test and approve before we maybe make a sweeping city-wide decision.

- T. Young – indicating that he is against the changing proposal for forty and thirty km/h; stating that he believes that the city has many issues already with traffic, the train downtown, King Street, which has gone from three lanes to now one when buses are stopped, with the new BRT certain areas are actually blocking traffic as opposed to getting off and diverting or having some sort of enclave that they can get out of the way; indicating that he believes that the city needs to move faster and more efficiently and he believes that we have lost a chance of having a ring road, that was done twenty years ago; noting that traffic, as it is right now, is not moving as efficiently as it should, and the vast majority of people are still driving, especially in winter and bicycles are not on the road as much; indicating that he drives for a living as he is a paramedic, so he sees the people who get hurt in these accidents, but he also drives around these people, and, this is anecdotal, but the people being picked up on these calls, he hates to say, but it ends up being the cyclists fault; stating that he feels that maybe education towards these cyclists might help; noting that he knows people who cycle for a living and are a part of associations would know these rules, but there is a vast majority people that drive downtown and bike downtown that are actually causing major problems and he thinks maybe too much onus is put on these drivers when a lot of it could actually be put back on the people who were in the accident in the first place.
- S. Miller, 32 Upper Avenue – indicating that she is speaking on behalf of the Oxford Park Community Association where she lives; expressing appreciation for having this important and overdue discussion on reducing speed limits in London; indicating that, like all neighbourhoods across our city, indeed, our country, increasing levels of vehicles speeding and the associated rates of injury and death is a growing public health crisis but we seem to shrug our shoulders as if the dangers associated with our car-centric lives are simply collateral damage, not something that can be avoided by thoughtful public policy and collective responsibility; stating that, in April 2018, one London Free Press article noted that the city research states that about a third of drivers in neighbourhoods speed over the limit, and the poll associated with the article asked, “Do drivers speed in your neighborhood?” and more than 90% responded ‘often’ or ‘sometimes’; noting that was more than fifteen hundred respondents; indicating that her local community association did a survey last year and 55% of the respondents in the neighborhood of over three hundred houses listed neighbourhood speeding as their number one concern; stating that this confirmed a 2017 safety audit that was done where participants also had numerous concerns regarding speeding; indicating that, despite these findings, traffic engineering staff have told their community that, according to their studies, our neighborhood does not have a speeding problem, and so, therefore, traffic calming measures are not being considered; enquiring as to why there is such a disconnect; indicating that, perhaps because speed limits are already too high for residential neighborhoods, and our roads are designed to enable – indeed, encourage – speeding, even above and beyond those limits; stating that, according to their research, London currently has no designed speed standards in its transportation design manual below sixty kilometers an hour; stating that this means that traffic engineering staff who are designing roads for fifty kilometers speed limit posting, they know that people are going to drive sixty kilometers or even faster; noting that we do not even notice it as drivers because our brains tell us that the road is designed to go that fast and that it is safe for us, when in fact we are driving a dangerous speed for neighbourhood roads; indicating that her neighborhood, Oxford Park, is going to be undergoing a long anticipated infrastructure renewal, including the water mains, new sewers and new roads and they are excited about this opportunity as it is long overdue; stating that they are really excited about addressing the root problem of speeding, which is outdated, dangerous and car-centric street design; stating that they have offered to collaborate with engineering staff and consultants on designing our new streets using progressive, safe street design as championed by organizations like the National Association of City

- Transportation Officials, the Center for Active Transportation and Love30Canada; indicating that they have offered to serve as a pilot model neighbourhood for progressive street design best practices but, unfortunately, those offers and requests have been declined; stating that they have also asked city staff to make a general presentation to residents on safe street design, but that has also been declined; indicating that they are now going to be working with a professor, Jason Gilliland, at Western University, who is going to come and speak to their association and talk to the neighbours and help educate them on what they can and should ask for when they see the city's proposed street designs later this fall; stating that the Oxford Park Community Association strongly supports reduced speed limits in residential and school areas throughout the city and they urge the Committee to adopt thirty km/h limits with enforcement using photo radar and police; indicating that thirty km/h, as other people here this evening have said, is an acknowledged safe street standard in many progressive jurisdictions around the world and, in conjunction and arguably even more importantly, they urge councillors to work with staff to ensure that all relevant road design standards and policies are updated as quickly as possible to reflect safe street design best practices; noting that these updates can begin to make effective changes on road reconstruction projects in existing residential neighborhoods and in all new subdivisions; stating that the conventional '3 Es' approach of engineering, education, and enforcement does not provide the guidance we need to design 21st century transportation and we must look beyond traditional professional disciplines across conventional boundaries to make our streets safe for everyone; noting that the new 'Es' of ethics, equity, and empathy should guide every urban designer, engineer; stating that, as citizens involved in shaping our city, we must embrace these values if we are to change the status quo and create a transportation system that is safe, efficient, equitable and sustainable; indicating that we cannot justify designs for speed and increased vehicle capacity on one hand while promising to deliver vision zero with the other.
- G. Hopcroft – stating that he would like to urge the Committee and staff to reconsider, in particular, part one of the recommendation, and that is applying the forty kilometer default speed limit on local and collector streets and residential areas throughout the city; indicating that he is prepared to agree and, he thinks most people are, that forty km/h is an appropriate speed limit in some places, and in other cases much lower depending on the number of driveways, the amount of conflicts in terms of other traffic in the area, and so on; noting that, as he reads it, this would apply to areas without driveways as well as those with driveways and he will harken back to Mr. Maguire's comment earlier, which he has heard in this Chamber and other rooms in this building many times that there needs to be acceptance of whatever rules command, there needs to be a public consensus before people will willingly comply with whatever by-laws this Committee and Council see fit to pass; stating that applying a 'one size fits all' approach is not the appropriate way to approach this, and he does not think it is a way that most Londoners would accept as an appropriate way of dealing with it; noting that there are a lot of streets where the existing speed limit – "it ain't broke, so why fix it?", fix those where speeding is a problem and where the speed limit is a problem and he would differentiate between the two; stating that an issue dealing with the speed limit enforcement issue, and in his experience, many people complaining about speeding in our neighborhoods are not complaining about the speed limit – they are complaining about people that consistently exceed the speed limit on those streets; stating that he does not belittle the fact that in some cases the speed limit is as well too high, but it is the enforcement issue which has always been an issue and the photo radar is a solution in terms of those that do not see fit to comply for other reasons; noting that he thinks it would be a huge mistake to take a cookie cutter, one size fits all approach to the streets around this city, and that this should be done on a street by street basis; noting that it is hard work, but do we want compliance and do we want to

- address the real problems, or do we want to create a regulatory environment where most Londoners don't see fit to comply because they see so many cases where the regulations are excessive; indicating that we have seen, time and time again, when they get that sense, they are more likely not to comply, not just in those areas where they are not warranted in their view, but also in those areas that they may be unfamiliar with where it is warranted; stating that if we want to promote peoples compliance on a voluntary basis, he thinks that the street by street approach and the classification of those streets is the right way to go; noting that there is a lot of data in this report and he would like to ask a few questions in terms of that that data; stating that, first of all, there has been a lot of data in here about collision statistics but there is nothing about injuries or the severity of those injuries and tying that to the speed involved in the collision or the speed limit on that street; noting that he really does not find the collision data that helpful in terms of understanding what it is we are trying to fix; noting that the second issue is that he does not see any reference in the report, and he is assuming that is because there is no reference, there has not been any consultation with emergency services; noting that he would like at least one other person in this room have some experience in the provision of emergency services, and we all know that reduced speed limits reduce ambulance response times; enquiring as to whether EMS was consulted about this and what is the impact on response times in our community; indicating that another question he has is with respect to the London Transit Commission, and he knows that they are moving into an environment where they are trying to have better compliance with route schedules and on-time performance and he sees nothing in here that is going to help them maintain what they have, what is the cost to that, and what is the impact on the routes that would be affected by the regulations that are proposed here; stating that he urges the Committee to seek the answers to those questions and to take a considered approach to this, and addressing this where it needs to be addressed, rather than applying something across the city which may not be needed.
- L. Patricio, London Cycle Link – stating that he has a couple of comments; indicating that he heard two presentations, one from Ms. Henderson and she had social, economic and health arguments to support the thirty kilometers limit, and he heard another presentation, and the main argument there is that, because drivers will not obey this limit, this will be dangerous; stating that he heard some concerns, as well, on the sense that we need to make sure that whatever regulations we have, we do have people respecting those regulations, and he thinks this is inverse logic; stating that if you do not have respect, we should not keep the speed limits high; indicating that if we know that this is the safest approach, we should make sure that those people, they will be voluntarily following the limits because this is the way our roads are designed; noting that, interestingly, we did not hear an argument about the efficiency or the health benefits if you keep our limits at forty or fifty kilometers, because the people who understand what transportation and road design is, they know that this is not the case; stating that addressing the concerns about efficiency and health, the car in any city is the most inefficient mode of transportation; stating that if you create a city where we promote and encourage cycling and walking and transit, we will have a more efficient transportation system, and we will have less injuries and fatalities.
 - C. Linton – stating that he is speaking as a public citizen, not as Chair of the Cycling Advisory Committee; indicating that he would generally support the reduction of speed limits, as proposed by staff, or even to the thirty km/h as well; indicating that a couple of the points from the people who oppose this actually kind of make the case for people who are wanting to try cycling and they are riding on the sidewalk; noting that they will feel safer if they are riding on a street where the speed limit is posted lower and traffic speed is going lower, so they feel more safe so they are going to be off the sidewalk and where they should be on the road; stating that there were a couple of points that he took out of there that were actually reasons to lower the speed

limit, not keep them where they are; indicating that, as a motorist, if we want to keep the city moving, the best thing for that is to get more people on bikes and on transit, because the fewer cars there are on the road to begin with, the better that traffic is going to flow.

- M. Moussa, 155 Thornton Avenue – stating that there is a very over-arching issue here that has not been addressed with the reduction in the speed limit, on April 23rd, 2019, this Council adopted a climate emergency by-law - or motion, where you asked for tangible ways of battling greenhouse gases and our carbon footprints; stating that this speed limit, if it is reduced from fifty to thirty km/h, you are increasing greenhouse gases; noting that it is settled in un-controverted science from Virginia Tech and European studies; indicating that he understands where you are coming from with trying to do this, but reducing the speed limit is not going to slow people down from speeding; noting that enforcement is the only way; stating that he understands that you need community safety zones in order to put the automated speed enforcement stuff in place, but if you keep it at 50 km/h and ticket everybody who does fifty-two, someone like me is going to drive forty-five; stating that the person who is going to get that ticket is going to get it regardless whether it is thirty or fifty there; noting that the gentleman who is not here right now said that the report did not show much about the severity of injuries, and I do not want to put a price or anything on safety - safety is very important -but we really need the hard statistics for this; indicating that it is a solution looking for a problem; noting that he has said that before on other issues; indicating that, in this case, we have not even addressed this increased enforcement, absolutely; noting that, with respect to the ASE's, it is putting the cart ahead of the horse, it is putting the cart ahead of an unborn horse, being that the regulations in Ontario have not even been updated to allow for that yet; referencing a pilot project in Toronto, and, if he is assuming correctly, possibly other places; indicating that we do know what PC provincial governments like to do with what has come before them; stating that one other thing he did not see in here is when all the BRT discussion was going on, there was a value of time saved that was addressed in those; noting that, in this case here, there is nothing that shows value of time lost; stating that he knows it might be grasping at straws, possibly, but this will reduce peoples time; indicating that a by-law will not remove us from a car-centric culture and if that is the intention of the by-law, it is not going to work; stating that people are still going to need to use their vehicles; noting that the main, salient point he wants to bring across here is that we are actually doing less for the environment by reducing the speed limit in this zone, in this thirty to eighty zone; stating that, ideally, for a gas engine, the ideal for the least fuel consumption is between sixty and eighty km/h; stating that he is not saying that we should increase limits to sixty km/h, but we have not even looked at this issue here and he does not think this is going to push people to walk more, bike more.