CITY OF WINDSOR AGENDA 07/27/2022

Environment, Transportation & Public Safety Meeting
Final Consolidated Agenda

Date: Wednesday, July 27, 2022
Time: 4:30 o'clock p.m.

Location: Council Chambers, 1st Floor, Windsor City Hall

All members will have the option of participating in person in Council Chambers or electronically and will be counted towards quorum in accordance with Procedure By-law 98-2011 as amended, which allows for electronic meetings. The minutes will reflect this accordingly. Any delegations will have the option of participating electronically or in person.

MEMBERS:
Ward 1 – Councillor Fred Francis

Ward 2 – Councillor Fabio Costante

Ward 4 – Councillor Chris Holt (Chairperson)

Ward 8 – Councillor Gary Kaschak

Ward 9 – Councillor Kieran McKenzie

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Item # Item Description

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

READING OF LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT
We [I] would like to begin by acknowledging that the land on which we gather is the traditional territory of the Three Fires Confederacy of First Nations, which includes the Ojibwa, the Odawa, and the Potawatomie. The City of Windsor honours all First Nations, Inuit and Métis peoples and their valuable past and present contributions to this land.

2. **DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST AND THE GENERAL NATURE THEREOF**

3. **ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES OF THE ETPS STANDING COMMITTEE**

3.1. Adoption of the Environment, Transportation & Public Safety Standing Committee minutes (Transit Matter Items only) of its meeting held June 22, 2022 **(SCM 174/2022)**

3.2 Adoption of the Environment, Transportation & Public Safety Standing Committee minutes (Excluding Transit Matter Items) of its meeting held June 22, 2022 **(SCM 174/2022)**

4. **REQUEST FOR DEFERRALS, REFERRALS OR WITHDRAWALS**

5. **COMMUNICATIONS**

6. **PRESENTATIONS AND DELEGATIONS**

PRESENTATION (10 minutes maximum)

6.1. Great Lakes Institute for Environmental Research regarding the Great Lakes Way Progress and Connecting Green Ways
a) John Hartig, Ph.D., Visiting Scholar, Great Lakes Institute for Environmental Research, University of Windsor (*via Zoom*)

DELEGATIONS (5-minute maximum)

8.1. Local Road Speed Humps Program - Initial Set of Locations - Wards 2, 6, 8, & 10 **(S 76/2022)**
a) Keith Simison, Ward 10 resident (*via Zoom*)
Clerk's Note: Adrian Van Velzen, Ward 8 resident, submitting an email dated July 19, 2022 as a written submission (***previously distributed***); Karen Bessette, area resident, submitting an email dated July 23, 2022 as a written submission (***attached***); John Dapoz, Windsor resident, submitting an email dated July 25, 2022, as a written submission (***attached***)

8.4. Pillette Road (Tecumseh to Plymouth) Traffic Calming - Wards 5 & 8 **(S 13/2022)**
a) Gloria Marion, area resident, (in person)

7. COMMITTEE MATTERS

7.1. Essex Windsor Solid Waste Authority Board Meeting Minutes June 7, 2022 **(SCM 188/2022)**

8. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

8.2. Matchett Road (Chappus Street to Sprucewood Avenue) Traffic Calming - Ward 1 **(S 81/2022)**
Clerk's Note: Jonathan Choquette, Wildlife Preservation Canada, submitting an email dated July 20, 2022 as a written submission (***previously distributed***); Hang Cui, Ward 2 resident, submitting an email dated July 22, 2022 as a written submission (***previously distributed***)

8.3. Vision Zero Action Plan Development - Progress Report #2 - City-wide **(S 87/2022)**

9. TRANSIT BOARD ITEMS

9.1. The Contributory Pension Plan for Employees of Transit Windsor - Actuarial Valuation as at December 31, 2021 - City Wide **(C 121/2022)**

9.2. The Contributory Pension Plan for Employees of Transit Windsor - Audited Financial Statements for the year ended December 31, 2021 - City Wide **(C 122/2022)**

9.3. Change to the Transit Windsor War Veteran's Transit Pass Program - City Wide **(S 84/2022)**

9.4. Request for Proposal - Transit Windsor Bus Tires - City Wide **(S 85/2022) (*previously distributed*)**

10. **ADOPTION OF TRANSIT BOARD MINUTES**

11. **QUESTION PERIOD**

12. **ADJOURNMENT**

July 27, 2022
Environment, Transportation & Public Safety Standing Committee
Item 8.1 – Written Submission

From: Karen Bessette
Sent: July 23, 2022 1:03 AM
To: Stuart, Kelly <kstuart@citywindsor.ca>
Subject: Re: Notice of Public Meeting - Local Road Speed Humps Program - Initial Set of Locations - Wards 2, 6, 8, & 10

Why do I need to attend a meeting about the speed bumps when I already voted against it in a survey, we are not a gated community, I'm sure this is another means of raising property taxes that people DON'T have the money for, because you know we'll have to pay for it somehow, and you'll, the city, will give reason not to clean our streets, which you don't do enough of now come winter

July 27, 2022
Environment, Transportation & Public Safety Standing Committee
Item 8.1 – Written Submission

From: John Dapoz
Sent: July 25, 2022 1:20 PM
To: clerks <clerks@citywindsor.ca>
Subject: Re: Speed Hump Dandurand Ave.

I would greatly appreciate for the Committee to review my report prior and express my concerns to making a decision at next Council meeting for July 27,2022 in regards to the Speed Hump project for Dandurand area.
I have resided in this street over 32 years and gone through many construction disruptions and inconveniences as the subdivision grew from one to over five city blocs of construction noises, traffic , but speeding has never been and still is not a major concern , the fact that we see many cars today with louder mufflers and performance exhaust systems that increases noise sound levels making it more realist to people think that they are over the speed limit , when actually they are not.
Previous year City of Windsor did a requested survey for this area and found very little supporting evidence , NO Police reports or complaints from residents on record for speeding , radar speed test was also done with no issues found, traffic volume is low ,therefore the request for speed humps was denied, now suddenly because a petition was signed with minimum of 60% this project is a go ???? This latest petition has been greatly "OVERSOLD" on this issue to residents and inaccurately performed since the project has been previously denied, I feel there are much better alternative measures that should first be in place before going to extremes like Road Humps that have NO supporting evidence of speeding issues in the area. As a taxpayer the cost of 40K plus ongoing maintenance should be placed in areas that need it the most!

Please find attached the objection report and thank you for your kindly taking the time to review my concerns.

Sincerely ;
John Dapoz

July 23,2022

To City of Windsor and Councellor Jim Morrison

Re: Local road speed humps program ward 10

SPEED HUMP OBJECTION

I have been a long term Windsor resident for over 32 years living in the Dandurand Ave. area ,I would like to express my concerns and objection to the requested speed hump on Dandurand , prior to proceeding approval of this project at City Council. Recently a city survey for speed hump was made at the request of one single resident in the area and the results failed to qualify since there is such a low volume of traffic , Police reports show no records or concerns from residents in this area about speeding , radar speed checks have been performed with NO issues in the area ,no car accidents in the area ,there may be the occasinal driver that does not follow the traffic rules but nothing out of the ordinary that you see at many other residential streets. I believe that the consultation processes for resident petition you received for this area has been inacurately performed , residents have been greatly “OVERSOLD” on the benefits of this petition as the majority of the residents have NOT been aware of tthe concequences in having speed bumps in their area. When the petition was signed residents have been misinformed , thinking that traffic calming is the only solution to a problem that rarely exits.

This area of Dandurand runs from Northwood to Piazza st. This covers nearly “five “city blocks area with NO STOP signs speed reduction signs or YELD signs , if speeding was a real concern why not install these traffic signs before speed humps??; that is a very long stretch for a residential street ! Recently this road has allowed one side street parking , this alone reduces traffic flow discourages speeding as the road is now narrower then before and makes it more difficult for on coming traffic .

I would kindly ask you to consider my suggestions and placing this pilot project on hold for this area in an effort to find a more suitable solution for such a concern that has very little evidence to support speeding traffic . Taxpayers dollars of 40K would be much better spent to areas that need it the most .

Speed humps have been introduced in the last few years in an attempt to reduce traffic accidents.There has also been a demand from local residents to “calm” their streets by the use of speed humps. Although it is not always obvious what “calming” means, it usually implies reduced noise and reduced traffic speeds with the objective of making the road more “pedestrian friendly”. Often though this demand is motivated by the general increase in traffic levels in recent years, which speed humps do nothing to reduce.Note that simply slowing traffic will not bring back the quiet roads of yesteryear.

What are the objections to speed humps? These can be summarised as follows:

1: They are uncomfortable, or indeed painful to many people. Unfortunately, many people who suffer from medical conditions such as ack problems (one of the most common medical complaints), recent bdominal surgery or other disabilities find them extremely painful.

2: Speed humps are a major problem for emergency vehicles such as ambulances and fire engines. Apart from the major discomfort to ambulance passengers, they also delay response times substantially. This can be as much as 10 seconds per device, and in a study done in the USA it was calculated that more deaths would arise from delayed arrival of ambulances than could ever be saved by any possible accident reduction.

3: They are a very blunt instrument. In fact, different vehicles respond very differently with heavy vehicles such as HGVs, buses and other public service vehicles being particularly prone to discomfort unless humps are traversed at very low speeds. It is simply impossible to design a speed hump that is negotiable comfortably at a reasonable speed by all vehicles and which is not painful to the occupants.

4: Speed humps have been known to cause accidents and injuries. For example

there was the case of the motorcyclist who hit a speed hump at a speed much less than 40 Km. He was ejected from the bike and suffered serious injuries from which he is now paralyzed from the waist down. Unfortunately there appears to have been no research undertaken on this issue, but clearly if a motorcyclist or cyclist hits a hump at speed and without seeing it in advance then they are likely to be ejected or diverted into the incoming traffic stream. This problem is particularly acute when there is snow on the ground as it can completely conceal speed humps and cushions, and their associated road markings.

5: They frequently cause damage to vehicles, even at normal speed levels, but it is legally very difficult to make a claim against a local authority as a result. This problem particularly affects older, heavier vehicles or those with low ground clearance. Again no research has been undertaken on this subject, although from anecdotal evidence it seems that suspension components are having to be replaced more often at considerable expense, and damage to front spoilers and other bodywork components is common.

6: Speed humps cause atmospheric pollution from the speeding up and slowing down of traffic between the humps . Reports of 59% increase in CO, about 50% increase in HC and about 25% in CO2 from petrol catalyst vehicles averaged over all types of traffic calming measures, with even higher numbers over more "severe" measures such as speed humps.

7: In addition the use of humps and cushions seems to encourage the use of larger vehicles which are more polluting. For example, wider track vehicles such as SUVs and larger saloons, can straddle cushions without difficulty so they do not have to slow down at all. One of the commonest types of vehicle that exceeds the speed limit in residential roads, the “white” delivery van, is often not slowed at all by these devices. In addition the longer the wheelbase and the larger the suspension travel (as in larger vehicles), the smoother the ride will be over speed humps. There is therefore a strong incentive to purchase larger and less environmentally friendly vehicles, and indeed this trend is apparent already in the car marketplace. Car design is also negatively influenced by speed humps as softer suspensions are introduced, ride heights increased and front spoilers reduced in size which all lead

to worse road holding and less safe cars.

8: Speed bumps can actually create additional traffic noise, although this tends to depend on the type of vehicle. HGVs and other goods vehicles would typically generate substantially more noise than before, while cars will generate less noise, although the variability of the noise level as vehicles slow down before bumps and accelerate afterwards can mean that the noise is more noticeable than before. Noise from goods vehicles tends to result from vehicle body or load shaking, and HGVs and buses generate road “thumps” from tyre impacts -

9: Speed humps create additional road maintenance costs because the road surface before and after a hump tends to develop potholes or subsidence after a couple of years. This results in much heavier maintenance costs than normal. In addition to fully resurface the road it is often necessary to remove and replace the speed humps, which also adds to the cost. These costs are rarely taken into account, and indeed there is little information on this subject available. City of Windsor Budget is in no position to have unnecessary increased costs.

10: Do speed humps actually reduce accidents? In reality there is very little evidence to support this. Where accident reductions have occurred it can mainly be attributed to diverting traffic (which can be as high as 50%). Most accidents are not caused by speed but by careless driving, or a multitude of other factors that are not affected by speed humps. Speed humps are a very poor accident prevention mechanism in terms of cost effectiveness, in comparison with other possible accident prevention approaches.

11: One good objection to speed humps is that people simply do not like them. Although residents of the streets in which speed bumps or cushions are installed sometimes show a majority in favour of them, this is usually the result of biased consultation processes and there is often a sharp division of opinion. In some particular schemes, they have even had to be removed because of local opposition. The numbers in favour also tend to be lower after installation than before, which shows they are often “over-sold” on the benefits of the scheme. Residents in surrounding roads are generally opposed, and even more so if a wider area is considered.

Ask yourself, whenever you're driving over speed bumps, where are you looking??

If you're like the majority of people, you're looking at the HUMP. If its a cushion, you're looking at the cushion, to position your wheels on either side of it.

Ask the council what they'd rather have - motorists watching the road and keeping an eye on the pavement, or motorists watching the tarmac and speed bumps, and paying little attention to the pavement.

Feel free to contact me

John Dapoz

Hoping to hear from you soon ;

Sincerely :

John Dapoz