

THIS LETTER HAS BEEN FORWARDED
TO THE EIGHT AREA CLERKS



The Regional
Municipality
of Durham

Corporate Services
Department
Legislative Services

605 Rossland Rd. E.
Level 1
PO Box 623
Whitby, ON L1N 6A3
Canada

905-668-7711
1-800-372-1102
Fax: 905-668-9963

durham.ca

Don Beaton, BCom, M.P.A.
Commissioner of Corporate
Services

October 27, 2021

F. Lamanna
Clerk
Township of Brock, P.O. Box 10
1 Cameron St. E.
Cannington ON L0E 1E0

Dear Fernando Lamanna:

**RE: Proposed Study of the Current Policy/Practice for
Streetlighting on Regional Roads (2021-W-36), Our File:
T02**

Council of the Region of Durham, at its meeting held on October 27, 2021,
adopted the following recommendations of the Works Committee:

- “A) That the Draft Terms of Reference outlined in Report #2021-W-36 of the Commissioner of Works for a Consultant Study of the Current Policy/Practice with respect to Streetlighting on Regional Roads, be circulated to the Durham Local Area Municipal Councils for endorsement no later than December 10, 2021; and
- B) That the Current Policy/Practice with respect to Streetlighting on Regional Roads (Attachment #1 to Report #2021-W-36) continue to prevail until the proposed Consultant Study is completed and any changes on a consensus basis are approved and implemented”.

Please find enclosed a copy of Report #2021-W-36 for your information.

As noted in the resolution please endorse the Draft Terms of Reference outlined in Report #2021-W-36 no later than December 10, 2021.

Ralph Walton

Ralph Walton,
Regional Clerk/Director of Legislative Services

RW/sg

c: S. Siopis, Commissioner of Works

If this information is required in an accessible format, please contact 1-800-372-1102 ext. 3540.



The Regional Municipality of Durham Report

To: Works Committee
From: Commissioner of Works
Report: #2021-W-36
Date: October 6, 2021

Subject:

Proposed Study of the Current Policy/Practice for Streetlighting on Regional Roads

Recommendation:

That the Works Committee recommends to Regional Council:

- A) That the Draft Terms of Reference outlined in this report for a Consultant Study of the Current Policy/Practice with respect to Streetlighting on Regional Roads, be circulated to the Durham Local Area Municipal Councils for endorsement no later than December 10, 2021; and
 - B) That the Current Policy/Practice with respect to Streetlighting on Regional Roads (Attachment #1) continue to prevail until the proposed Consultant Study is completed and any changes on a consensus basis are approved and implemented.
-

Report:

1. Purpose

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide details of the Current Policy/Practice governing Streetlighting on Regional Roads (SLRR) and outline a Draft Study Terms of Reference for a review of the Policy/Practice. The report also seeks approval for the circulation of the Draft Terms of Reference to all Local Area Municipal (LAM) Councils for comments and endorsement no later than December 10, 2021.

2. Background

- 2.1 The purpose of streetlighting on a roadway is to increase the visibility of roadway and sidewalk users during hours of darkness, including motorists, cyclists, and pedestrians, and thereby improve road safety. There is widespread industry consensus and statistical evidence that streetlighting substantially decreases night-time collision rates. Streetlighting is therefore a valuable countermeasure in achieving the Regional Municipality of Durham's (Region) and LAM's Vision Zero aspirations.
- 2.2 In Durham, as per Current Policy/Practice, LAMs are primarily responsible for SLRR. This includes the planning, design, operation, construction and maintenance of all related assets. The basis for the Current Policy/Practice is the original 1975 Regional policy, subsequently amended in 1991 and 1996 to introduce Regional cost-sharing and to clarify operating and maintenance responsibilities for SLRR installations in rural locations. An outline of the Current Policy/Practice is provided in Attachment #1.
- 2.3 In recent years, the LAMs have requested a review of the Current Policy/Practice and specifically for the Region to assume increased levels of responsibility for SLRR. The request is driven by the following perspectives:
- Streetlighting is a benefit to all users of the Regional road, including motorists, cyclists, and pedestrians, leading to the notion that the Region should assume increased responsibility for SLRR.
 - Streetlighting assets on the Regional road allowance cater solely to users of the Regional roadway.
 - The growing public demand for streetlighting on all roads including Regional roads is causing increasing financial burden on the LAMs' financial resources.
- 2.4 In response to LAM requests, as part of the 2017 Durham Transportation Master Plan (TMP) study, the Current Policy/Practice was reviewed albeit in a cursory manner. Specifically, the TMP study reviewed and compared municipal practices and jurisdiction for streetlighting on upper-tier roads throughout the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH). The review found that a majority of the lower-tier municipalities continued to maintain responsibility for streetlighting on their upper-tier roads, however, acknowledged that the practices were evolving and discussions under way to rationalize jurisdictional responsibilities. The TMP study concluded that there was no rationale at that time for considering any changes to the Region's Current Policy/Practice.

3. LAM Request for Review of the Current SLRR Policy/Practice

- 3.1 In early 2019, through the forum of Region/LAM Chief Administrative Officers (CAOs), there were further requests of the Region to review the Current Policy/Practice. In response, the Region advanced discussions with LAM staff to gain an understanding of the LAM inventory of SLRR and their areas of concern with the Current Policy/Practice.
- 3.2 Although not all LAMs were able to provide the same level of information with respect to SLRR, it is estimated that together they operate and maintain approximately 10,000 luminaires on Regional roads, in addition to the approximately 50,000 luminaries on their local roads. Approximately 80% of these luminaries are low-energy consuming LED fixtures.
- 3.3 To assess LAM requests, in 2019/20, a brief survey of the ten upper-tier municipalities in the GGH (Counties of Dufferin, Northumberland, Peterborough, Simcoe and Wellington, and the Regions of Halton, Peel, Niagara, Waterloo and York) was conducted about their practices pertaining to streetlighting on the upper-tier roads. The survey showed that all upper-tier municipalities in the GGH share responsibility for some aspect of streetlighting with their lower-tier jurisdictions.
- 3.4 Design is the responsibility most often shared by upper-tier municipalities, with about 75% of them dividing up the task and/or cost. This typically depends on which jurisdiction is leading the capital project. By contrast, only half of the upper-tier municipalities share responsibility for assessing need with their lower-tier jurisdictions. The construction of streetlighting is a shared responsibility in most two-tiered municipalities, although the lead agency and/or cost apportionment varies. The jurisdiction responsible for the capital project typically takes the lead, with the other municipality reimbursing for all or a portion of the cost.
- 3.5 Some of the GGH Regional Municipalities appear to have (Halton, Waterloo, and Peel) or are working towards (Niagara) assuming sole responsibility for streetlighting on their roads. Counties tend to share the responsibility more, likely due to the more isolated instances of streetlighting consistent with the rural character of their communities.
- 3.6 The Current Policy/Practice on streetlighting in place with the Region appears more detailed than others, with more specific provisions for cost sharing.

4. Discussion

- 4.1 The Municipal Act does not define jurisdictional responsibility for streetlighting. Whereas, sidewalks, for example are defined as a lower-tier responsibility regardless of whether they are on an upper-tier or lower-tier road allowance, unless the municipalities agree otherwise.
- 4.2 There is no reliable estimate of the current SLRR asset inventory or its replacement value. Capital costs would depend on new streetlighting requirements, replacement needs and extent and locations of the Region's road capital programs. This cost is estimated to be in the \$3-5M range annually. Current annual operating and maintenance costs for SLRR appear to be in the \$2-3M range depending on the confirmed size of inventory, their energy efficiencies and third-party (e.g. utility companies) cost obligations. Based on community requests for additional streetlighting and lagging investment history, there is conceivably a latent demand for additional SLRR which has the potential to further increase planning, capital, operating and maintenance cost obligations.
- 4.3 Primary LAM sources of current financing for SLRR include development charges (capital) and property taxes (capital, operations, maintenance). Transfer of all or any increased level of responsibility for SLRR to the Region would therefore result in financial, staffing and related logistics implications at the Regional level. Therefore, a decision to alter the Current Policy/Practice to any significant level requires careful due diligence.

5. Recommended Next Steps

- 5.1 Based on discussions between the Regional and the LAM CAOs, it is recommended that a Study of the Current Policy/Practice be undertaken to:
- thoroughly examine the current jurisdictional responsibilities at the LAM and Regional levels, as per the Current Policy/Practice;
 - propose and document potential changes to the Current Policy/Practice based on larger community interest and the financial impact at the LAM and Regional levels; and
 - if appropriate, develop an implementation plan that provides for a transition from the Current Policy/Practice towards an updated "who does what" framework.

5.2 The proposed Study shall examine the following alternatives:

- Continuation of the Current Policy/Practice, which would result in further documentation as necessary to clarify the Regional and LAM roles, ownership, responsibilities, and obligations with respect to planning, design, construction, operations, maintenance, asset management, financing and risk management of liabilities associated with all aspects of SLRR;
- Variations to the Regional and LAM roles as per the Current Policy/Practice;
- Variations in delivery models and levels of service, taking into consideration the broader interest to avoid duplication of services between the Regional and LAM levels:
 - (a) LAM delivery (status quo)
 - (b) Regional delivery (in-house; outsourced to vendors; outsourced to LAMs; hybrid)
 - (c) Other (e.g. outsource all);
- Distinction in Regional and LAM roles for inside and outside the urban boundaries; or
- Combinations of the above models

5.3 The proposed Draft Terms of Reference for the Study include:

- Engagement of Regional and LAM staff to compile the necessary background SLRR data for the evaluation of alternatives, including but not limited to asset quantities and categories, replacement values, annual operating and maintenance costs, development charges or other funding set aside for SLRR, asset history, asset condition and estimates of current (latent) and future demands;
- Based on a gap analysis, gathering and collection of missing data as necessary to effectively complete the analysis of alternatives;
- Development and evaluation of potential alternatives through best practices review, and analysis of legal implications (Municipal Act, case law), financial implications, road user and safety impacts, risk management considerations, taxpayer impacts, cost-effectiveness, and business efficiencies;

- Conducting interviews with Regional and LAM staff as required to evaluate the alternatives, including the assessment of business implications of related changes to the Current Policy/Practice;
- Recommending the preferred alternative; and
- Developing a plan for the implementation of the preferred alternative, including transition provisions as required.

5.4 It is recommended that the proposed next steps acknowledge and be guided by the following principles:

- Any recommended changes to the Current Policy/Practice that could emerge from the Study should remain cost-neutral to the overall Regional tax base.
- The estimated time for the completion of the proposed Study and implementation of any changes to the Current Policy/Practice is 1-2 years. It is anticipated that any substantive changes that may require significant realignment of the current Regional and/or LAM roles would get the timeframe closer to the upper end of this estimated duration.
- The Study shall be led jointly by the Region and the eight LAMs.
- The preferred alternative should emerge from this Study through an objective review. It is therefore recommended that an independent external consultant be engaged for the Study.
- The consultant engagement should include expertise in legal/risk analysis, finance, management, and transportation/traffic engineering.
- The estimated cost for the consultant Study is in the range of \$150-200K. The actual cost will depend on the data gaps, and complexity (or simplicity) involved in the implementation of the preferred alternative.
- The actual incurred cost of consulting services shall be shared between the agencies (Region and the LAMs), with adequate resources and Legal/Finance/Works staff representation committed to the Study from all agencies.
- The Current Policy/Practice for SLRR will continue to be honoured until the Study is completed and any changes are approved and implemented on a consensus basis.
- The Study will consider road rationalization (i.e., transfer of candidate road segments from/to the Region to/from LAMs, as per Attachment #2- Report #2018-INFO-138) as appropriate in the transition and implementation of the preferred alternative for SLRR. Notwithstanding the timing of the Study,

discussions on road rationalization between the Region and LAMs would continue actively with a view to advancing priority road transfers.

6. Preliminary Timeline

6.1 Following is an estimated preliminary timeline for the completion of the proposed Study and the implementation of the preferred alternative:

- Regional Council approval for circulation of this report to LAM Councils for comments and endorsement of the Terms of Reference (October 27, 2021)
- Comments and endorsement provided to Regional Council from all LAM Councils (no later than December 10, 2021)
- Establishment of a Regional/LAM Study Working Group (December 2021)
- Procurement of consultant services (January 2022 – May 2022)
- Consultant Study completion (June 2022 – December 2022)
- Changes to Current Policy/Practice come into effect (mid-2023, earliest)

6.2 It should be noted that the estimated (targeted) mid-2023 timeframe for any changes in the Current Policy/Practice to come into effect is subject to the Study advancing and being able to inform and influence the 2023 Regional and LAM budget deliberations in a timely manner, including any Regional/LAM Council approvals as may be required, as well as addressing any Development Charges implications.

7. Financial Implications

7.1 The completion of the proposed Study would require engaging external consultant services at an estimated total Regional/LAM cost of \$150-200K.

7.2 Once LAM Council comments/endorsement are received, staff will report back on the status and as necessary at that time seek authorization for the Region's financial contribution to the Study.

8. Conclusion

8.1 The Current Policy/Practice assigns the responsibility for SLRR primarily to LAMs. In response to the LAMs' request for a review of this Policy/Practice, this report outlines potential next steps and process towards the completion of an external and independent Consultant Study that would recommend a preferred option for future delivery of the SLRR function.

- 8.2 This report outlines a Draft Terms of Reference and a process for the proposed Study. It is recommended that a copy of this report be circulated to all Durham LAMs for comments and endorsement back to the Region no later than December 10, 2021.
- 8.3 This report has been reviewed by the Legal Services – Corporate Services and the Finance Department.
- 8.4 For additional information, please contact Ramesh Jagannathan, Director, Transportation and Field Services, at 905-668-7711, ext. 2183.

9. Attachments

Attachment #1: Streetlighting on Regional Roads – Current Policy/Practice

Attachment #2: Report # 2018-INFO-138 (September 28, 2018 CIP)

Respectfully submitted,

Original signed by:

Susan Siopis, P.Eng.
Commissioner of Works

Recommended for Presentation to Committee

Original signed by:

Elaine Baxter-Trahair
Chief Administrative Officer

Streetlighting on Regional Roads – Outline of Current Policy/Practice

1. New Light Installations

- 1.1 All new light installations inside the Urban Boundary (as per the Regional Official Plan), excluding those mounted on Regional traffic signal poles, are 100 percent paid for by the Local Area Municipalities (LAM).
- 1.2 With respect to new light installations outside the Urban Boundary (i.e. Rural Areas, as per the Regional Official Plan):
 - a. Installations on Regional approaches at intersections controlled by Regional traffic signals are 100 per cent paid for by the Regional Municipality of Durham (Region). Installations on LAM approaches at intersections controlled by Regional traffic signals are 100 per cent paid for by the LAM. At intersections controlled by LAM traffic signals, costs are 100 per cent paid for by the LAM.
 - b. Installations along Regional roads are 100 per cent paid for by the Region at locations where the Regional Warrant criteria are satisfied (limited to partial lighting only).
 - c. Installations along Regional roads at locations requested by LAMs that do not meet Regional Warrant criteria are 50 per cent cost-shared by the Region, subject to a proven safety benefit.

2. Light Replacements/Relocations

- 2.1 Replacements/Relocations due to the impacts of a road construction project initiated by the Region are cost shared at 50 per cent of labour and labour-saving devices as per the PSWHA. In essence, streetlighting assets on a Regional road allowance are treated like other third-party utilities on the Regional right-of-way.
 - a. Replacements/Relocations due to the impacts of hydro pole replacements/relocations initiated by the utility company are 100 per cent paid for by the LAM.

3. Operating and Maintenance Costs

- 3.1 LAMs cover all operating and maintenance costs (with the exception of a few sites where the lights are mounted on Regional traffic signal poles that are powered with a metered service, in which case the Region pays for the streetlighting hydro consumption).

4. Other Implementation Elements

- 4.1 LED conversions are paid 100 per cent by the LAM.
- 4.2 On Regional Capital Projects, roadway lighting design is paid for by the Region as part of the design assignment, and the Region recovers 10% of the LAM's share of capital construction cost to cover a portion of the design and contract administration costs.

If this information is required in an accessible format, please contact 1-800-372-1102 ext. 3540.



The Regional Municipality of Durham Information Report

From: Commissioner of Works
Report: #2018-INFO-138
Date: September 28, 2018

Subject:

Road Rationalization Discussions with Local Area Municipalities – Status Update

Recommendation:

Receive for information

Report:

1. Background and Purpose

- 1.1 In March 2018, Information Report #2018-INFO-31 (Attachment #1) was issued to update Regional Municipality of Durham (Region) Council on the findings to date of the Region-wide Road Network Rationalization Study. On the basis of sound transportation planning principles, the report identified candidate road segments for jurisdictional transfer in the short-term (i.e. preliminary recommendation being “transfer candidate”) and highlighted segments recommended for future consideration (i.e. preliminary recommendation being “no transfer, reconsider in the future”). Candidates were identified in all Local Area Municipalities (LAM’s), with the exception of the Township of Uxbridge (Uxbridge). The report acknowledged that transfer opportunities in each LAM have unique considerations that will require further discussion.
- 1.2 Report #2018-INFO-31 had identified the transfer of Regional Road 7 (Island Road) to the Township of Scugog (Scugog) as the only candidate for the short-term. Discussing the Region’s report in May 2018, Scugog Council stated its opposition to this transfer and asked this be re-assessed in future road rationalization discussions. Considering potential changes in traffic volume levels and patterns due to the proposed expansion of the Great Blue Heron Casino which could influence the role of Island Road in the future, Regional staff deemed

it reasonable to defer this to future road rationalization discussions. There were no candidates identified for transfer to the Region in the short term.

- 1.3 Over the last few months, Regional staff met and exchanged correspondence with staff representatives of the six impacted LAM's to specifically discuss the feasibility, mutual interest and possible timing for the transfer of road candidates that Report #2018-INFO-31 identified for the short-term. At a high level, LAM staff expressed consensus with the short-term candidates, therefore the meetings and exchanges predominantly focused on implementation considerations. The purpose of this report is to update Regional Council on these meetings/exchanges and place on public record a summary of staff level views and consensus elements on the proposed short-term transfers.

2. Town of Ajax

- 2.1 Table 1 details the short-term candidates that were identified in the Town of Ajax (Ajax).

Table 1: Ajax – Road Transfer Candidates

| Regional Road # | Road | From | To | Length (km) | Lane (km) | Urban/Rural Area | Preliminary Recommendation |
|-------------------|---------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|------------------|----------------------------|
| 31 | Westney Road | Harwood Avenue | Bayly Street | 2.7 | 9.5 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | Rossland Road | Pickering/Ajax Boundary | Lake Ridge Road | 7.2 | 14.3 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |

- 2.2 To advance discussions, Ajax will be preparing a letter to the Region this fall proposing a framework and key milestones for the two proposed transfers.

3. Township of Brock

- 3.1 Table 2 describes the short-term candidates identified in the Township of Brock (Brock).

Table 2: Brock – Road Transfer Candidates

| Regional Road | Roads | From | To | Length (km) | Lane (km) | Urban/Rural Area | Preliminary Recommendation |
|-------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-------------|-----------|------------------|----------------------------|
| 47 | Shoreline Road | Mara Road | Simcoe/Durham Boundary | 2.1 | 4.3 | Rural | Transfer Candidate |
| 50 | Portage Road | Highway #12 | Regional Highway #48 | 4.3 | 8.8 | Rural | Transfer Candidate |
| 51 | Talbot Road | Reg. Rd. #50 | Simcoe/Durham Boundary | 0.1 | 0.2 | Rural | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | Simcoe Street | Brock Concession #14 | Regional Highway #48 | 15.5 | 31 | Rural | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | Thorah Concession Road 1 | Highway #12/48 | Simcoe St. | 6.8 | 13.7 | Rural | Transfer Candidate |

3.2 Brock staff advised/reminded Regional staff of their current boundary road agreement for Simcoe Street with the City of Kawartha Lakes who would need to be engaged in related transfer discussions.

3.3 Brock staff also expressed specific concerns about implications to their road maintenance obligations in relation to Minimum Maintenance Standards (MMS). In order to advance the Township's further consideration of the three Region-to-Local transfer candidates, the Region has provided additional information including Average Annual Daily Traffic volumes (AADT), MMS Service Class, Pavement Condition Index (PCI), structure conditions, and snow plow routes.

4. Municipality of Clarington

4.1 Table 3 describes the short-term candidates identified in the Municipality of Clarington (Clarington).

Table 3: Clarington – Road Transfer Candidates

| Regional Road | Road | From | To | Length (km) | Lane (km) | Urban/Rural Area | Preliminary Recommendation |
|-------------------|-------------|--------------|---------------------|-------------|-----------|------------------|----------------------------|
| 17 | Main Street | Winter Road | Taunton Road | 3 | 6.6 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | Holt Road | Highway #401 | Regional Highway #2 | 3.2 | 6.3 | Rural | Transfer Candidate |

| Regional Road | Road | From | To | Length (km) | Lane (km) | Urban/Rural Area | Preliminary Recommendation |
|-------------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-----------|------------------|----------------------------|
| Local to Regional | Boundary Road | Highway #35 | Highway #115 | 1.8 | 3.6 | Rural | Transfer Candidate |

4.2 Clarington staff advised/reminded Regional staff of their current boundary road agreement for Boundary Road with the City of Kawartha Lakes who would need to be engaged in related transfer discussions.

4.3 The Region has provided additional information to Clarington for further consideration of the Main Street transfer, including AADT, MMS Service Class, PCI and structure conditions. Clarington staff will be reporting to their Council on their assessment of the proposed transfers.

5. City of Oshawa

5.1 Table 4 describes the short-term candidates identified in the City of Oshawa (Oshawa).

Table 4: Oshawa – Road Transfer Candidates

| Regional Road | Road | From | To | Length (km) | Lane (km) | Urban/Rural Area | Preliminary Recommendation |
|-------------------|---|-------------------------|----------------------|-------------|-----------|------------------|----------------------------|
| 2 | Simcoe St. | Harbour Road | Wentworth Street | 1.0 | 3.6 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| 3 | Winchester Road East/ Grandview Street North | Harmony Road | Columbus Road | 2.6 | 5.7 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| 35 | Wilson Road. | Bloor Street | Taunton Road | 6.2 | 17.7 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| 52 | Boundary Road | Wentworth Street W | Philip Murray Avenue | 0.9 | 2.5 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| 54 | Park Road | Bloor Street | Rossland Road | 4.3 | 15.8 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | Harmony / Columbus Road | Winchester Road | Grandview Street | 2.6 | 5.2 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | King Street (West) | Oshawa/ Whitby Boundary | Centre Street | 2.7 | 11.3 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | Bond Street (West) | King Street | Centre Street | 1.8 | 6.1 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | King Street (East) | Ritson Road North | Townline Road | 3.4 | 14.3 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | Bond St.(East) | Ritson Road North | King Street East | 1.7 | 4.8 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |

5.2 Oshawa staff advised they will be reporting to their Council acknowledging support in principle for the candidates identified for short-term transfer. It should be noted that as a correction the previously referenced candidate (Region-to-Local) of Townline Road South from Gord Vinson Avenue to Bloor Street (0.25 km in length) in Report #2018-INFO-31 was removed from further discussion as this segment is already in the City's jurisdiction.

6. City of Pickering

6.1 Table 5 describes the short-term candidates identified in the City of Pickering (Pickering).

Table 5: Pickering – Road Transfer Candidates

| Regional Road # | Road | From | To | Length (km) | Lane (km) | Urban/Rural Area | Preliminary Recommendation |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|---|--------------------------|-------------|-----------|------------------|----------------------------|
| Previously Reg. Rd. 1 | Mowbray Street | North limit of Highway #407 | Brock Road | 1.3 | 3.5 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| Previously Reg. Rd. 5 | 9th Concession | Regional Road 5 / Concession Road #9 | Lake Ridge Road | 0.1 | 0.2 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| 24 | Church Street | Bayly Street | Pickering/Ajax Boundary | 0.9 | 2 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| 38 | Whites Road | 0.6 km South of Oklahoma Drive | Bayly Street | 0.9 | 2.6 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | Third Concession Road | Pickering/Ajax Boundary | West of Valley Farm Road | 1.7 | 3.4 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | Whitevale Road | 200m West of Future Rossland Road Extension | Brock Road | 1.7 | 3.4 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | Sideline 26 (South) | Taunton Road | Whitevale Road | 2.1 | 4.1 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | Sideline 26 (Middle) | Whitevale Road | Highway #7 | - | - | Urban | Transfer Candidate |

6.2 The transfer of Sideline 26 (South) to the Region was approved by Pickering in June 2018. It was also noted that Pickering has drafted a Report to their Council regarding the transfer of Third Concession Road (as per above table) to the Region. To advance discussions, Pickering will be presenting a position paper early next year to the Region on the transfer candidates.

7. Town of Whitby

7.1 Table 6 describes the short-term candidates identified in the Town of Whitby (Whitby).

Table 6: Whitby – Road Transfer Candidates

| Regional Road # | Road | From | To | Length (km) | Lane (km) | Urban/Rural Area | Preliminary Recommendation |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------|-----------|------------------|---------------------------------|
| 22 | Victoria Street (old alignment) | 0.7 km West of Thickson | 0.4 km West of Thickson Road | 0.3 | 0.6 | Urban | Transfer Candidate ² |
| 43 | Cochrane Street | Dundas Street | Rossland Road | 2.1 | 6.1 | Urban | Transfer Candidate ¹ |
| 45 | Henry Street | Victoria Street | Burns Street W | 1.2 | 3.3 | Urban | Transfer Candidate ¹ |
| 45 | Henry Street | Burns Street W | Dundas Street | 0.9 | 2.6 | Urban | Transfer Candidate ¹ |
| 46 | Brock Street | Water Street | Victoria Street | 1.0 | 2.7 | Urban | Transfer Candidate ¹ |
| 46 | Brock Street | Victoria Street | South Limit of Highway #401 | 0.3 | 1.5 | Urban | Transfer Candidate ¹ |
| Former 23 | Lake Ridge Road (North) | Almond Avenue | Cresser Avenue | 0.3 | 0.6 | Urban | Transfer Candidate ³ |
| Former 23 | Lake Ridge Road (South) | 0.65 km N of Victoria Street | 0.88 km N of Victoria Street | 0.2 | 0.6 | Urban | Transfer Candidate ³ |
| Local to Regional | Rossland Road | Lake Ridge Road | Cochrane Street | 2.9 | 8.9 | Urban | Transfer Candidate ¹ |
| Local to Regional | Dundas Street | Fothergill Court | Cochrane Street | 5.8 | 23.2 | Urban | Transfer Candidate ¹ |
| Local to Regional | Dundas Street | Garden Street | Whitby/Oshawa Boundary | 2.9 | 14.4 | Urban | Transfer Candidate ² |

¹ candidates for first phase of transfers

² candidates for second phase of transfers

³ segments are under MTO's ownership/jurisdiction since 2012; to be dealt with through discussions with MTO

- 7.2 A 2017 staff report to Council by Whitby staff on road rationalization interests provided good guidance for our meetings and discussions. Whitby staff have suggested the candidates identified in that report combined with a few other strategic candidates can be advanced as the first phase of transfers (see footnote 1 in above Table), leaving the other segments that are influenced by pending events (e.g. completion of Victoria Street realignment and planning studies for Bus Rapid Transit on Dundas Street) to a subsequent second phase.
- 7.3 It should be noted that Champlain Avenue from future Stellar Drive to the Whitby/Oshawa Boundary has been revised for reconsideration in the future to match the recommendation for Champlain Avenue in Oshawa.

8. Conclusion and Next Steps

- 8.1 At the staff level, Local Area Municipalities are generally in agreement with the candidates identified for transfer in the short-term in Report #2018-INFO-31. As anticipated, Local Area Municipal staff recognize and acknowledge that the timing for these transfers should take into consideration implementation considerations.
- 8.2 Upon receipt of comments from the participating Local Area Municipalities, specific to their candidates identified for transfer in the short-term, Regional staff will report back on a recommended implementation plan and timeline for the transfers.

9. Attachments

Attachment #1: Information Report #2018-INFO-31 dated March 2, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

Original signed by R. Jagannathan for:

S. Siopis, P.Eng.
Commissioner of Works

If this information is required in an accessible format, please contact 1-800-372-1102 ext. 3540.



The Regional Municipality of Durham Information Report

From: Commissioner of Works
Report: #2018-INFO-31
Date: March 2, 2018

Subject:

Road Rationalization – Interim Report

Recommendation:

Receive for information.

Report:

1. Purpose

1.1 In January 2016, Regional Council authorized staff to retain a consultant to work with Regional and local area municipal staff to undertake a region-wide Road Network Rationalization Study (“Study”) and develop a comprehensive Road Network Rationalization Plan. The consulting firm of HDR was retained to complete the study with direction and oversight provided by means of a joint team consisting of staff from both the Works and Finance Departments. The purpose of this report is to update Regional Council on the Study findings to date and to promote further dialogue between the Region and the Local Area Municipalities with respect to the current status and next steps.

2. Background

2.1 The Regional Municipality of Durham (Region) has been involved in road rationalization reviews through inter-agency discussions since 1997 and the Who Does What (WDW) initiative in 2002. The WDW was a cooperative effort between the Region and Local Area Municipalities (LAMs) that identified roads and/or road sections suitable for transfer.

2.2 Since the WDW initiative a limited number of transfers have been successfully completed.

2.3 The 2016 Transportation Servicing and Financing Study (S&F) identified a preliminary list of Regional and local roads as potential transfer candidates and recommended the Study.

2.4 This report details the objectives, methodology and findings of the Study to date.

3. Study Methodology

3.1 The scope of the Study is outlined below:

- Review and confirm proposed road rationalization criteria as well as Regional and Local Area Municipal road transfer candidates.
- Identify current and future capital as well as the maintenance and operational needs of transfer candidates and related cost estimates.
- Establish a conditional schedule for transfers.

3.2 Guiding principles for the Study were established to define the limitations and assumptions to support the decision-making process. The following principles provided a framework for the study:

- Establish criteria to evaluate the function and character of candidate roads for transfer.
- Conduct a systematic and objective analysis based on 2031 planning and forecast conditions in anticipation of major regional growth.
- Consult with the LAMs throughout the process.

3.3 Collaboration between the Region and LAMs provided regular opportunities for discussion on the Study process, evaluation criteria, potential candidate roads for transfer and draft Study findings.

3.4 Table 1 summarizes the meetings with LAMs. Meetings were supplemented with ongoing email and telephone communications.

Table 1: Consultation Overview

| Local Area Municipality | Date | Purpose |
|--------------------------------|-------------|--|
| Town of Ajax | 21-Apr-16 | Initial discussions |
| Town of Ajax | 09-May-16 | Discussion of preliminary results |
| Township of Brock | 05-May-16 | Initial discussions |
| Township of Brock | 17-May-16 | Discussion of preliminary results |
| Municipality of Clarington | 27-Apr-16 | Initial discussions |
| Municipality of Clarington | 20-May-16 | Discussion of preliminary results |
| City of Oshawa | 21-Apr-16 | Initial discussions |
| City of Oshawa | 10-May-16 | Discussion of preliminary results |
| City of Pickering | 18-Apr-16 | Initial discussions |
| City of Pickering | 11-May-16 | Discussion of preliminary results |
| Township of Scugog | 20-Apr-16 | Initial discussions |
| Township of Scugog | 17-May-16 | Discussion of preliminary results |
| Township of Uxbridge | 20-Apr-16 | Initial discussions. Subsequently indicated no further interest in transfers |
| Town of Whitby | 26-Apr-16 | Initial discussions |
| Town of Whitby | 06-May-16 | Discussion of preliminary results |

- 3.5 An initial list of candidate roads for transfer from local to Regional jurisdiction and from Regional to local jurisdiction was sourced from the 2016 Transportation S&F Study report. Through consultations with the LAMs, new road transfer candidates were identified and added to the list. The resulting road transfer candidates are discussed later in this report.
- 3.6 Information sources from the Region and LAMs included:
- Official Plans and staff reports
 - Road characteristics and condition reports
 - Bridge and culvert inspection reports
 - Storm sewer network maps
 - Pavement management system bench mark costs
 - 2016 Transportation S&F Study report
 - Presentation from Regional Council education session on road rationalization (April, 2011)
 - Capital project and maintenance budgets
 - Life cycle cost estimates (where available)
 - Development charge background studies
- 3.7 The Region's Transportation Model was used to forecast future traffic volumes and determine trip type attributed to the proposed road transfer candidates.

4. Criteria

- 4.1 The road rationalization process is supported by a set of criteria that describe the role and function of the road within the context of the overall network, growth management, and support for economic growth throughout the Region. These criteria, described below, were subsequently confirmed through the recent approval of the Transportation Master Plan (Section 6.4.3. – Regional Road Definition).
- 4.2 Draft evaluation criteria were shared with the LAMs to obtain comments and suggestions. Based on input received, the evaluation criteria were revised. Transfer candidates were evaluated on a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 representing complete local function and character and 10 representing complete regional function and character. Each criterion is discussed in more detail below.
- a) Road segment connects with provincial and/or inter-regional network
- One of the most important functions of a Regional road is to provide regional and inter-regional connectivity. Therefore, the road transfer candidate's connectivity to the provincial or inter-regional road network was considered to be an important criterion in assessing the road function.

- The road transfer candidate's level of connectivity to the current and future provincial/inter-regional highway networks (2031 conditions, considering the Highway 407 ETR extension project) formed the basis of scoring this criterion.
- b) Road segment carries high volume of inter-municipal and regional traffic
- Another criterion relating to a road transfer candidate's significance in providing regional connectivity is the extent and magnitude of inter-municipal and inter-regional travel that it accommodates. This was determined by running select link assignments for each road transfer candidate using the Durham Regional Transportation Model.
- c) Road segment attracts significantly higher volumes of traffic than adjacent roads
- The relative volume of road transfer candidates to parallel roads (typically within 3 km) of similar character and/or function was also used as a criterion in the scoring system (using the Durham Regional Transportation Model). The logic behind this criterion relates to facilitating one route through an area to a regional standard (speed, volume, access control) and have local parallel roads serving local or intra-municipal traffic.
- d) Road segment's level of access control
- Considering that Regional roads tend to carry higher volumes and allow higher speed limits than local roads, they typically require higher levels of access control. A candidate road's level of access control was considered to be another criterion in the scoring system. The Region's Official Plan (OP) which outlines the network's future road classifications was used to assess expected levels of access control.
- e) Road segment supports regional goods movement/aggregate hauling network
- Another important function of Regional roads is the movement of goods, as goods movement travel tends to be of a regional and inter-regional nature. Whether a road segment is well-positioned to accommodate goods movement travel was considered to be a criterion in the scoring system. The Regional OP's Strategic Goods Movement Network and the Regional Structure which indicates major employment areas was utilized for this assessment.
- f) Road segment supports major transit route and/or planned rapid transit route

- In light of the Region's Long Term Transit Strategy (LTTTS) which aims to achieve a transportation system that is focused on rapid transit to provide excellent connections between the Region's municipalities and neighboring municipalities, corridors were scored based on the level of support for these significant transit routes.
- g) Road segment supports region-wide economic and growth objectives
- Roads providing access to regional and urban growth centres are expected to experience higher traffic volumes. The provision of access to such areas by road transfer candidates was also considered to be a criterion.
- h) Road segment affects corridor planning or planning of downtowns or mature urban areas
- This criterion was identified as a result of consulting with LAMs.
- During consultation sessions with LAMs, concerns were raised regarding the ability to plan and achieve a downtown vision should a road segment currently serving a downtown area be transferred to the Region. This applied in particular to Highway 2 in downtown Whitby, Oshawa, Bowmanville, and Newcastle. As a result this criterion was added.
- i) Road segment's environmental and community impact due to change in road function
- Similarly, this criterion was added to the list as a result of consultation with LAMs to reflect concerns of environmental and/or community impacts that could result from a local to Regional transfer. Such impacts might include higher traffic volumes, increased truck traffic, and/or the need for road widening (which can have negative impacts on existing homes and environmental features).

5. Road Transfer Candidate Evaluation

- 5.1 The product of the criteria evaluations resulted in a final overall score between 0 and 10 for each road candidate. Overall scores in the low end of the range (for example, 0 to 3) represent roads with strong local function and character, while scores in the high end of the range represent roads with strong Regional function and character.

5.2 The consultations with LAMs confirmed the need to distinguish road transfer candidates between those in urban areas and those in rural areas of the Region.

- **Urban area road candidates** – For roads in urban areas, all nine criteria apply, resulting in scores as high as 10 for those candidates with the highest potential as Regional roads. Strong local road candidates for transfer to the Region scored in the high end of the 0 to 10 range (for example, from 7 to 10).
- **Rural area road candidates** – For roads in rural areas Criteria # 5, 6 and 7 generally do not apply resulting in scores for road transfer candidates being capped around 7. Scores for strong local rural road candidates for transfer to the Region, therefore, are in the high end of the 0 to 7 range (for example, 5 to 7).

5.3 The above criteria and thresholds capture the technical aspects of a road's function and character. The results of the analysis are summarized below by LAM (in alphabetical order). The criteria and thresholds provide a good indication of candidates for jurisdictional transfer on the basis of sound transportation planning principles. It is however recognized that non-technical considerations (e.g. financial impacts, resource constraints, etc.) will influence the final recommendations and the timing of potential transfers.

6. Town of Ajax – Road Transfer Candidates

6.1 Table 2 details the road transfer candidates and preliminary recommendations in the Town of Ajax based on the evaluation.

Table 2: Ajax – Evaluation of Road Transfer Candidates

| Regional Road # | Road | From | To | Length (km) | Lane (km) | Urban/Rural Area | Preliminary Recommendation |
|-------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------|------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 31 | Westney Road | Harwood Avenue | Bayly Street | 2.7 | 9.5 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | Rosland Road | Ajax/ Pickering Boundary | Ajax/ Whitby Boundary | 7.2 | 14.3 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | Salem Road | Taunton Rd | Ajax/ Pickering Boundary | 2.1 | 4.2 | Urban | No transfer, reconsider in the future |

6.2 Region to Local Transfer

- **Westney Road (Harwood Avenue to Bayly Street)** – Recommended for transfer to Town of Ajax. This segment of Westney Road does not connect Regional roads and does not provide a Regional function.

6.3 Local To Region Transfer

- **Rossland Road (Ajax/Pickering boundary to Ajax/Whitby boundary)** Recommended for transfer from the Town of Ajax to Regional jurisdiction. Rossland Road through Ajax is part of an important east-west arterial across southern Durham Region and, as such, functions as a key Regional east-west arterial road
- Rossland Road is part of the Town's Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan. Accommodation of future cycling facilities needs consideration if Rossland Road is transferred to the Region.
- **Salem Road (Taunton Road to Ajax/Pickering boundary)** – Not recommended for transfer at this time from the Town of Ajax to the Region. The justification for transfer can be re-evaluated during a future road rationalization review and may be dependent on a future 407 interchange.

7. Brock Township – Road Transfer Candidates

7.1 Table 3 details the road transfer candidates and preliminary recommendations in the Township of Brock based on the evaluation.

Table 3: Brock Township – Evaluation of Road Transfer Candidates

| Regional Road | Roads | From | To | Length (km) | Lane (km) | Urban/Rural Area | Preliminary Recommendation |
|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|-------------|-----------|------------------|----------------------------|
| 47 | Shoreline Road | 23-Mara Road | Simcoe/ Durham Boundary | 2.1 | 4.3 | Rural | Transfer Candidate |
| 50 | Portage Road | Highway #12 | 76- Highway #48 | 4.3 | 8.8 | Rural | Transfer Candidate |
| 51 | Old Highway 12 | 50-Portage Road | Simcoe/ Durham Boundary | 0.1 | 0.2 | Rural | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | Simcoe Street | Brock Concession 14 | Regional Highway 48 | 15.5 | 31 | Rural | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | Thorah Concession | Highway 12/48 | Simcoe St. | 6.8 | 13.7 | Rural | Transfer Candidate |

| Regional Road | Roads | From | To | Length (km) | Lane (km) | Urban/Rural Area | Preliminary Recommendation |
|-------------------|------------------------|------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|------------------|----------------------------|
| | 1 | | | | | | |
| Local to Regional | River Road (extension) | Highway 12 | Highway 2 | 7.1 | 14.2 | Rural | No transfer |

7.2 Region To Local Transfer

- **Shoreline Road (Regional Road 57 between Mara Road and Simcoe/Durham boundary)** – Recommended for transfer from the Region to Brock Township, reflecting its local function.
- **Portage Road (Regional Road 50 between Highway 12 and Highway 48)** – Recommended for transfer to Brock Township, reflecting its local function.
- **Old Highway 12 (Regional Road 51 between Portage Road and Simcoe/Durham boundary)** – Recommended for transfer to Brock Township, reflecting its local function.

The Township expressed concern with the maintenance and capital costs associated with any additional lane kilometres and made specific comment on the ability to deal with the capital needs of the structures within these road segments.

7.3 Local To Region Transfer

- **Simcoe Street (between Brock Concession 14 and Highway 48)** – Recommended for transfer from Brock Township to the Region. Simcoe Street south of Concession 14 is already under Regional jurisdiction. The transfer of the segment of Simcoe Street between Concession 14 and Highway 48 would provide a continuous north-south Regional route to Highway 48.
- Brock Township currently has a boundary agreement for Simcoe Street with Kawartha Lakes, and that Kawartha Lakes would therefore have to be part of the discussion if the Simcoe Street segment is to be transferred to the Region.
- **Thorah Concession 1 (between Highway 12/48 and Simcoe Street)** – Recommended for transfer from Brock Township to the Region, either now or after a future road rationalization review. It is a candidate for transfer to Regional jurisdiction, as it is a continuation of Highway 48 to Simcoe Street, is classified as a Type B Arterial in the Regional Official Plan, and would provide an alternative route for traffic to bypass. There are significant costs associated with both Simcoe Street and Thorah Concession 1 to Regional standard.
- **River Road extension from Highway 12 to Simcoe Street** – Not recommended for transfer from Brock Township to Regional jurisdiction, as its low score reflects a local function.

8. Municipality of Clarington – Road Transfer Candidates

8.1 Table 4 details the road transfer candidates and preliminary recommendations in the Municipality of Clarington based on the evaluation.

Table 4: Clarington – Evaluation of Road Transfer Candidates

| Regional Road | Road | From | To | Length (km) | Lane (km) | Urban/Rural Area | Preliminary Recommendation |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------|------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 17 | Main Street/ Manvers Street | Winter Road | 04-Taunton Road | 3 | 6.6 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | Pebblestone Road | Townline Road | Courtice Road | 2.9 | 5.7 | Urban | No transfer, reconsider in the future |
| Local to Regional | Holt Road | Highway 401 | Regional Highway 2 | 3.2 | 6.3 | Rural | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | King Street (Bowmanville) | Regional Road 57 | Haines St. | 3.1 | 12.4 | Urban | No transfer, reconsider in the future |
| Local to Regional | King Street (Newcastle) | Baldwin Street | Arthur St. | 0.8 | 3.2 | Urban | No transfer |
| Local to Regional | Darlington Clarke Townline (#2) | Taunton Road | Future Highway 407 Interchange | 2.0 | 4.0 | Rural | No transfer, reconsider in the future |
| Local to Regional | Boundary Road | Highway 35 | Highway 115 | 1.8 | 3.6 | Rural | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | Trulls Road | Taunton Road | Bloor St | 6.4 | 12.8 | Urban | No transfer |

8.2 Region To Local Transfer

- Main Street / Manvers Street (Regional Road 17 from Winter Road to Taunton Road)** – Recommended for transfer to the Municipality of Clarington. This road is serving a local function. Under local jurisdiction, there would be a greater ability to achieve a “downtown” vision.

8.3 Local To Region Transfer

- **Holt Road (from Highway 401 to Highway 2)** – Recommended for transfer from the Municipality of Clarington to Regional jurisdiction. With its existing Highway 401 interchange, Holt Road serves a Regional function, connecting Highway 401 with Highway 2, as well as serving Darlington Nuclear Generating Station.
- **Boundary Road (between Highway 35 and Highway 115)** – Recommended for transfer from the Municipality of Clarington to Regional jurisdiction. It has a Regional function in connecting these two provincial highways. The Municipality of Clarington currently has a boundary agreement for Boundary Road with Kawartha Lakes; Kawartha Lakes would therefore have to be part of the discussion if this road segment is to be transferred to the Region.
- **King Street in Bowmanville (between Regional Road 57 and Haines Street)** – Not recommended for transfer at this time. The impetus for transfer to Regional jurisdiction may be future enhanced transit service on Highway 2 extending to downtown Bowmanville. Since enhanced transit is a long-term initiative, there is less need for transfer at this time.
- The Municipality expressed concerns about transferring downtown King Street to the Region, considering the various streetscaping and visioning plans for the downtown, as well as seasonal road closures that the Municipality implements for community events.
- In future road rationalization reviews, consideration should be given to segmenting this part of King Street to distinguish the downtown core (between Scugog Street and Liberty Street), so that future reviews can separately evaluate the portions of King Street west and east of downtown Bowmanville, as well as downtown Bowmanville.
- **Darlington-Clarke Townline (from Taunton Road to future Highway 407 interchange)** – Not recommended for transfer at this time. It should be reconsidered during a future road rationalization review.

The remaining candidates are not recommended for transfer from local to Regional jurisdiction. Future road rationalization reviews may revisit these and other candidates as needed.

9. City of Oshawa – Road Transfer Candidates

9.1 Table 5 details the road transfer candidates and preliminary recommendations in the City of Oshawa based on the evaluation.

Table 5: Oshawa – Evaluation of Road Transfer Candidates

| Regional Road | Road | From | To | Length (km) | Lane (km) | Urban/Rural Area | Preliminary Recommendation |
|-------------------|--|-------------------------|----------------------|-------------|-----------|------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 2 | Simcoe St. | Harbour Road | 60 Wentworth Street | 1.0 | 3.6 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| 3 | Winchester Road East/ Grandview Street North | 33-Harmony Road | Columbus Road | 2.6 | 5.7 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| 16 | Ritson Road | 60-Wentworth Street | 22-Bloor Street | 0.8 | 3.6 | Urban | No transfer, reconsider in the future |
| 35 | Wilson Road. | 22-Bloor Street | Taunton Road | 6.2 | 17.7 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| 54 | Park Road | 22-Bloor Street | 28-Rossland Road | 4.3 | 15.8 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| 25 | Champlain Avenue | Oshawa/ Whitby Boundary | Stevenson Road | 1.3 | 2.6 | Urban | No transfer, reconsider in the future |
| 52 | Boundary Road | Wentworth Street W | Philip Murray Avenue | 0.9 | 2.5 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| 55 | Townline Road South | Gord Vinson Avenue | Bloor Street | 0.25 | 0.5 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | Harmony / Columbus Road | Winchester Road | Grandview Street | 2.6 | 5.2 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | Adelaide Avenue | Oshawa/ Whitby Boundary | Thornton Road | 0.01 | 0.1 | Urban | No transfer, reconsider in the future |
| Local to Regional | Rossland Road | Harmony Road | 300m East of Harmony | 0.3 | 0.9 | Urban | No transfer, reconsider in the |

| Regional Road | Road | From | To | Length (km) | Lane (km) | Urban/Rural Area | Preliminary Recommendation |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-------------|-----------|------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | | | Road | | | | future |
| Local to Regional | King Street (West) | Oshawa/Whitby Boundary | Centre Street | 2.7 | 11.3 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | Bond Street (West) | King Street | Centre Street | 1.8 | 6.1 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | King Street (Middle) | Centre Street | Ritson Road North | 1 | 4 | Urban | No transfer, reconsider in the future |
| Local to Regional | Bond Street (Middle) | Centre Street | Ritson Road North | 1.1 | 4.1 | Urban | No transfer, reconsider in the future |
| Local to Regional | King Street (East) | Ritson Road North | Townline Road | 3.4 | 14.3 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | Bond St.(East) | Ritson Road North | King Street East | 1.7 | 4.8 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | Thornton Road (new alignment) | Taunton Road | Winchester Road | 4.2 | 8.4 | Urban | No transfer, reconsider in the future |

9.2 Region To Local Transfers

- **Simcoe Street (Regional Road 2 from Harbour Road to Wentworth Street)** – Recommended for transfer to the City of Oshawa, reflecting its local function and character.
- **Winchester Road (Regional Road 3) and Grandview (from Harmony Road to Columbus Road)** – Recommended for transfer to the City of Oshawa, reflecting their local function and character. This transfer from the Region to the City would mirror the transfer of Harmony Road and Columbus Road from the City to the Region.
- **Wilson Road (Regional Road 35 from Bloor Street to Taunton Road)** – Recommended for transfer to the City of Oshawa, reflecting its local function and character.
- **Park Road (Regional Road 54 from Bloor Street to Rossland Road)** – Recommended for transfer from the Region to the City of Oshawa, reflecting its local function since the deletion of the Highway 401 interchange.

- **Boundary Road (Regional Road 52 from Wentworth Street to Philip Murray Avenue)** – Recommended for transfer to the City of Oshawa. This short stub does not serve a Regional function. If this road is transferred to local jurisdiction, then it may be subject to a boundary agreement between the City of Oshawa and the Town of Whitby.
- **Townline Road (Regional Road 55 from Gord Vinson Avenue to Bloor Street)** – Recommended for transfer to the City of Oshawa, reflecting its local function, especially with the realignment of Bloor Street. If this road is transferred to local jurisdiction, then it may be subject to a boundary agreement between the City of Oshawa and the Municipality of Clarington.
- **Ritson Road (Regional Road 16 from Wentworth Street to Bloor Street)** – Not recommended for transfer. Although it has received a relatively low evaluation score, Ritson Road provides the only grade-separated crossing of the CN mainline between Simcoe Street (Regional Road 2) and Farewell Street (Regional Road 56). It is recognized that the numerous driveways on this part of Ritson Road (similar to other parts of Ritson Road) detract from its Regional function. It can be reconsidered in the future as a candidate for transfer.
- **Champlain Avenue (Regional Road 25 from Whitby/Oshawa Boundary to Stevenson Road)** – Not recommended for transfer but should be reconsidered during a future road rationalization review.

9.3 Local To Region Transfers

- **Harmony Road / Columbus Road (from Winchester Road to Grandview Street)** – Recommended for transfer from the City of Oshawa to Regional jurisdiction. Despite its low score, this portion of Harmony Road is a continuation of Regional Road 33 and has an interchange with Highway 407, while Columbus Road is a continuation of Regional Road 3 connecting with Harmony Road. This transfer from the City to the Region would mirror the transfer of Winchester Road and Grandview Street from the Region to the City.
- **King Street and Bond Street** – The City of Oshawa outlined its planning and urban design goals for King Street and Bond Street through downtown Oshawa, and its desire to lead the planning efforts for these two streets. From the Region’s perspective, King Street and Bond Street are an important part of the Long-Term Transit Strategy for Durham Region, as they are planned to support high order transit service. Through the consultation process with the City, King Street and Bond Street were divided into three segments for evaluation purposes:
 - (a) **King Street and Bond Street (from Whitby/Oshawa boundary to Centre Street)** – Recommended for transfer from the City to Regional jurisdiction, reflecting their importance as east-west arterials and planned high order transit corridor.
 - (b) **King Street and Bond Street (from Centre Street to Ritson Road)** – Not recommended for transfer from the City to the Region. Can be reconsidered in a future road rationalization review.

- (c) **King Street and Bond Street (from Ritson Road to Townline Road)**
– Recommended for transfer from the City to Regional jurisdiction, reflecting their importance as important east-west arterials and planned high order transit routes.
- **Thornton Road (from Taunton Road to Winchester Road)** – Not recommended for transfer but should be reconsidered during a future road rationalization review after the deferred 407ETR interchange is implemented.
 - **Adelaide Avenue (from Oshawa/Whitby Boundary to Thornton Road)**
– Not recommended for transfer but should be reconsidered in conjunction with the construction of the Manning/Adelaide interconnection.
 - **Rossland Road (from Harmony Road to 300 m east of Harmony Road)**
– Not recommended for transfer but should be reconsidered in conjunction with the construction of the Rossland Road extension to Townline Road.

10. City of Pickering – Road Transfer Candidates

10.1 Table 6 details the road transfer candidates and preliminary recommendations in the City of Pickering based on the evaluation.

Table 6: Pickering – Evaluation of Road Transfer Candidates

| Regional Road # | Road | From | To | Length (km) | Lane (km) | Urban/Rural Area | Preliminary Recommendation |
|-----------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|-----------|------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Previously RR1 | Mowbray Street | North Limit of Highway 407 | Brock Road | 1.3 | 3.5 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| 5 | 9th Concession | Concession Road 9 | Lake Ridge Road | 0.1 | 0.2 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| 24 | Church Street | 22-Bayly Street | Ajax/Pickering Boundary | 0.9 | 2 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| 38 | Whites Road (South) | 0.6 km South of Oklahoma Drive | 22-Bayly Street | 0.9 | 2.6 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| 38 | Whites Road (North) | 300 m North of Third Concession Road | Taunton Road | 1.3 | 4.4 | Urban | No transfer, reconsider in the future |
| 29 | Liverpool Rd | Highway 2 | Finch Avenue | 1.2 | 3.9 | Urban | No transfer |

| Regional Road # | Road | From | To | Length (km) | Lane (km) | Urban/Rural Area | Preliminary Recommendation |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------|------------------|---|
| Local to Regional | Third Concession Road | Ajax/ Pickering Boundary | West of Valley Farm Road | 1.7 | 3.4 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | Whitevale Road | 200m West of Future Rosland Road Extension | Brock Road | 1.7 | 3.4 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | Sideline 26 (South) | Taunton Road | Whitevale Road | 2.1 | 4.1 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | Sideline 26 (Middle) | Whitevale Road | Highway 7 | - | - | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | Sideline 26 (North) | Highway 7 | Concession Road 7 | 2.2 | 4.4 | Urban | No transfer |
| Local to Regional | Seventh Concession Rd. (East) | Westney Road | Lake Ridge Road | 4 | 8 | Urban | No transfer, reconsider in the future |
| Local to Regional | Seventh Concession Rd. (West) | Sideline 26 | Brock Road | 3.3 | 6.6 | Urban | No transfer |
| Local to Regional | Salem Road | Fifth Concession Road | Seventh Concession Road | 5.2 | 10.4 | Urban | No transfer, reconsider in the future |

10.2 Region To Local Transfer

- **Mowbray Street (from north limit of 407 to Brock Road)** – Recommended for transfer from the Region to the City of Pickering. No longer part of Brock Road.
- **9th Concession (from 9th Concession to Lake Ridge Road)** – Recommended for transfer to the City of Pickering. This short section is no longer part of Regional Road 5.

- **Church Street (Regional Road 24 from Bayly Street to Ajax/Pickering boundary)** – Recommended for transfer to the City of Pickering. It has a local function and is only a short segment of Regional Road. Should the Durham Live proposal require a partial interchange at Highway 401, this could be reconsidered.
- **Whites Road (south) (Regional Road 38 from 600 m south of Oklahoma Drive to Bayly Street)** – Recommended for transfer to the City of Pickering. It has a local function and terminates within a neighborhood.
- **Whites Road (north) (Regional Road 38 from 300 north of Third Concession to Taunton Road)** – Not recommended for transfer to the City. After the new Whites Road is constructed, it may continue to function as a key route from south Pickering to Toronto and York Region. This segment may be a possible candidate for future road rationalization, contingent on lower traffic volumes.
- **Liverpool Road (Regional Road 29 from Highway 2 to Finch Avenue)** – Not recommended for transfer to the City. Its Regional function is enhanced by its interchange with Highway 401 and its access to the Pickering Urban Growth Centre.

10.3 Local To Region Transfer

- **Third Concession (from west of Valley Farm Road to Ajax/Pickering boundary)** – Recommended for transfer from the City of Pickering to the Region. Third Concession is the extension of Rossland Road and will be an important arterial to serve the Seaton Community.
- **Whitevale Road (from 200 west of future Rossland Road Extension to Brock Road)** – Recommended for transfer from the City of Pickering to the Region. It will be an important east-west arterial serving the Seaton Community.
- **Sideline 26 (south) (from Taunton Road to Whitevale Road)** – Recommended for transfer from the City of Pickering to the Region. It will be part of the future Whites Road extension (Regional Road 38) serving the Seaton Community.
- **Sideline 26 (middle) (from Whitevale Road to Highway 7)** – Recommended for transfer from the City of Pickering to the Region. It will be part of the future Whites Road extension (Regional Road 38) serving the Seaton Community. This section is currently unopened road allowance.
- **Sideline 26 (north) (from Highway 7 to Concession Road 7)** – Not recommended for transfer from the City to the Region. It is located in the future Pickering Airport lands.
- **Seventh Concession (from Westney Road to Lake Ridge Road)** – Not recommended for transfer from the City of Pickering to the Region. Should be re-examined in a future road rationalization study, after the deferred 407ETR interchange is constructed.

- **Seventh Concession (from Sideline 26 to Brock Road)** – Not recommended for transfer from the City to the Region. It is located in the future Pickering Airport lands.
- **Salem Road (from Fifth Concession to Seventh Concession)** – Not recommended for transfer at this time from the City to the Region. Should be re-examined in a future road rationalization study, after the deferred 407ETR interchange is constructed.

11. Township of Scugog – Road Transfer Candidates

11.1 Table 7 details the road transfer candidates and preliminary recommendations in the Township of Scugog based on the evaluation.

11.2 Table 7: Scugog – Evaluation of Road Transfer Candidates

| Regional Road | Road | From | To | Length (km) | Lane (km) | Urban/Rural Area | Preliminary Recommendation |
|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------|-----------|------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 7 | Island Road | Highway #7A | Carnegie Beach Road | 11.6 | 24.1 | Rural | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | Scugog Line 12 | 23-Lake Ridge Road | Simcoe Street | 13.4 | 26.8 | Rural | No transfer |
| Local to Regional | Scugog Line 14 | 23-Lake Ridge Road | Highway 7/12 | 6.7 | 13.4 | Rural | No transfer |
| Local to Regional | Ashburn Road | Townline Road | Scugog Line 4 | 5 | 10.1 | Rural | No transfer |
| Local to Regional | Marsh Hill Road | Scugog Line 4 | 21-Goodwood Road | 1.1 | 2.3 | Rural | No transfer |
| Local to Regional | Scugog Line 6 | Highway 7A | 23-Lake Ridge Road | 9.6 | 19.2 | Rural | No transfer |
| Local to Regional | Scugog Line 2 | Highway 7/12 | Simcoe Street | 3.6 | 7.2 | Rural | No transfer, reconsider in the future |

11.3 Region To Local Transfers

- **Island Road (Regional Road 7 from Highway 7A to Carnegie Beach Road)** – Recommended for transfer to the Township of Scugog. Island Road does not serve a Regional function.

Similar to comments from other municipalities, Scugog staff expressed concern with the maintenance and capital costs associated with taking on additional lane kilometres.

11.4 Local To Region Transfers

- There are no candidates recommended for transfer from the Township of Scugog to the Region.
- Scugog Line 6 (from Highway 7A to Lake Ridge Road) has the potential to function as a Regional Road, however, it is adjacent to major Regional Roads on each side (Reach Street or Regional Road 8 and Goodwood Road or Regional Road 21), and it would therefore be redundant.
- Scugog Line 2 (from Highway 7/12 to Simcoe Street) has the potential to be a continuation of Shirley Road (Regional Road 19) could be reconsidered as a candidate for transfer from the Township to the Region in a future road rationalization review.

12. Town of Whitby – Road Transfer Candidates

12.1 Table 8 details the road transfer candidates and preliminary recommendations in the Town of Whitby based on the evaluation.

Table 8: Whitby – Evaluation of Road Transfer Candidates

| Regional Road # | Road | From | To | Length (km) | Lane (km) | Urban/Rural Area | Preliminary Recommendation |
|-----------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------|------------------|----------------------------|
| 22 | Victoria Street (old alignment) | 0.7 km West of 26-Thickson | 0.4 km West of 26-Thickson Road | 0.3 | 0.6 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| 43 | Cochrane Street | Dundas Street | 28-Rossland Road | 2.1 | 6.1 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| 45 | Henry Street (South) | 22-Victoria Street | Burns Street W | 1.2 | 3.3 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| 45 | Henry Street (North) | Burns Street W | Dundas Street | 0.9 | 2.6 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| 46 | Brock Street (South) | Water Street | Victoria Street | 1 | 2.7 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| 46 | Brock Street (North) | Victoria Street | South Limit of Highway 401 | 0.3 | 1.5 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| Former 23 | Lake Ridge Road (North) | Almond Avenue | Cresser Avenue | 0.3 | 0.6 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |

| Regional Road # | Road | From | To | Length (km) | Lane (km) | Urban/Rural Area | Preliminary Recommendation |
|-------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|-----------|------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Former 23 | Lake Ridge Road (South) | 0.65 km N of Victoria Street | 0.880 km N of Victoria Street | 0.2 | 0.6 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| 36 | Anderson/Hopkins Street | Rossland Road | Consumers Drive | 3.7 | 13.7 | Urban | No transfer |
| 26 | Thickson Road | Victoria Street | Wentworth St Whitby/ | 0.9 | 3.3 | Urban | No transfer |
| 60 | Wentworth Street | Thickson Road | Oshawa Boundary | 1.3 | 6 | Urban | No transfer |
| 25 | Champlain Avenue | Future Champlain Ave. | Whitby/Oshawa Boundary | 1.3 | 3.1 | Urban | No transfer |
| 58 | Manning Road | Brock Street | Garrard Road | 3.5 | 16 | Urban | No transfer, reconsider in the future |
| Local to Regional | Rossland Road | Ajax/Whitby Boundary | Cochrane Street | 2.9 | 8.9 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | Dundas Street (West) | Fothergill Court | Cochrane Street | 5.8 | 23.2 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | Dundas Street (Middle) | Cochrane Street | Garden Street | 1.7 | 6.7 | Urban | No transfer, reconsider in the future |
| Local to Regional | Dundas Street (East) | Garden Street | Whitby/Oshawa Boundary | 2.9 | 14.4 | Urban | Transfer Candidate |
| Local to Regional | Columbus Road | Whitby/Pickering Boundary | Whitby/Oshawa Boundary | 7.4 | 14.7 | Urban | No transfer, reconsider in the future |
| Local to Regional | Hopkins Street (2031 road extension scenario) | Consumers Drive | North limit of Highway 401 | 1.8 | 4 | Urban | No transfer, reconsider in the future |

12.2 Region To Local Transfers

- **Victoria Street (old alignment west of Thickson Road)** – Recommended for transfer to the Town of Whitby, as it will be replaced by the new alignment of Victoria Street.
- **Cochrane Street (Regional Road 43 from Dundas Street to Rossland Road)** – Recommended for transfer to the Town of Whitby, reflecting its local function and character.
- **Henry Street (Regional Road 45 from Victoria Street to Burns Street)** – Recommended for transfer to the Town of Whitby. This short section of Regional road has a local function and character.
- **Henry Street (Regional Road 45 from Burns Street to Dundas Street)** – Recommended for transfer to the Town of Whitby. This short section of Regional road has a local function and character.
- **Brock Street (Regional Road 46 from Water Street to Victoria Street)** – Recommended for transfer to the Town of Whitby. This short section of Brock Street has a local function in the Port of Whitby area.
- **Brock Street (Regional Road 46 from Victoria Street to South Limit of Highway 401)** – This is an extremely short segment of road and thus should be considered for transfer to the Town of Whitby for practical reasons if the transfer of the southern portion of Brock Street is implemented.
- **Former Lake Ridge Road (north and south segments; Almond Avenue to Cresser Avenue; north of Victoria Street)** – Recommended for transfer to the Town of Whitby, as they have local function and character.
- **Manning Road (Regional Road 58 from Brock Street to Garrard Road)** – This segment is not recommended for transfer to the Town of Whitby, but it should be re-examined in a future road rationalization study.

No other roads are recommended for transfer from the Region to the Town of Whitby.

12.3 Local To Region Transfers

- **Rossland Road (from Ajax/Whitby boundary to Cochrane Street)** – Recommended for transfer from the Town of Whitby to the Region. Rossland Road is an important east-west arterial serving southern Durham Region.
- **Dundas Street** – The Town of Whitby has advanced planning and urban design goals for Dundas Street through downtown Whitby, and has expressed its desire to manage the planning and design efforts for Dundas Street. From the Region's perspective, Dundas Street is an important part of the Long-Term Transit Strategy, as it is planned to support high order transit service. For the purpose of this analysis and based on consultation with the Town, Dundas Street was divided into three segments:

- (a) **Dundas Street (from Fothergill Court to Cochrane Street)** – Recommended for transfer from the Town of Whitby to the Region, reflecting its importance as an east-west arterial and high order transit corridor.
- (b) **Dundas Street (from Cochrane Street to Garden Street)** – Not recommended for transfer at this time, as the segment traverses Town’s downtown core. The transfer opportunity should be re-examined in a future road rationalization review.
- (c) **Dundas Street (from Garden Street to Whitby/Oshawa boundary)** Recommended for transfer from the Town of Whitby to the Region, reflecting its importance as an east-west arterial and high order transit corridor.

13. Current Status and Next Steps

- 13.1 As noted earlier in this report, there were two rounds of meetings and ongoing communications with the LAMs to facilitate the sharing of information, including:
 - refinement of the criteria;
 - preliminary evaluation results;
 - structure condition data;
 - confirmation of road condition data; and
 - annual maintenance costs and capital needs.
- 13.2 Technical evaluations of road segments identified through discussions with the LAMs using the criteria described earlier in this report have resulted in the list of roads for potential transfer.
- 13.3 Several LAMs have expressed an interest in pursuing transfer opportunities for specific road segments consistent with the candidates list developed through this process. However, the possible transfer opportunities in each municipality have unique considerations and will require further discussion to determine all of the specifics related to the possible transfer opportunities.
- 13.4 It is recognized that the timing of potential transfers could be influenced by resourcing implications. The allocation of staff, equipment and funding are all considerations that may impact the timing of a transfer. A phased in approach that allows for funding and resources to be allocated may be appropriate in specific situations. In other situations transfers in the near future may be appropriate.
- 13.5 It is anticipated that each LAM will review and respond with comments, specific to the preliminary recommendations for each of the road segments identified in the report to allow for focus on early transfer opportunities for transfers.
- 13.6 Upon receipt of comments regarding the road transfer candidates from the LAMs, staff will report back on progress made for potential near term transfers and next steps for a phased approach on future transfers.

- 13.7 As a longer term principle, the list of potential road transfers will be reviewed on a regular basis (i.e. every five years) recognizing that there will be changing conditions and circumstances such as future planning applications.

14. Conclusion

- 14.1 To date, open dialogue with the LAMs has resulted in the sharing of detailed information requesting potential road transfers, collaboration on evaluation criteria that respects the various and unique characteristics of some road segments and a mutual understanding of concerns in specific situations. The process to date has provided the basis for continued dialogue on specific near term transfers as well as the development of a plan for phasing in the longer term transfers.

Respectfully submitted,

Original signed by

S. Siopis, P.Eng.
Commissioner of Works

Original signed by

G.H. Cubitt, MSW
Chief Administrative Officer