

Windsor Accessibility Advisory Committee

Meeting held May 25, 2023

A meeting of the Windsor Accessibility Advisory Committee is held this day commencing at 10:00 o'clock a.m. via Zoom video conference, there being present the following members:

Sally Bennett Olczak, Co-Chair
Peter Best, Co-Chair
Councillor Fred Francis
Surendra Bagga
Danica McPhee
Riccardo Pappini
Nicholas Petro
Caleb Ray

Guest in attendance:

Crystle Butler (as an observer)

Also present are the following resource personnel:

Gayle Jones, Accessibility, Diversity Officer
Wadah Al-Yassiri, Manager Parks Development
Laura Ash, Supervisor Parks Projects
Shawna Boakes, Executive Director Operations
Ian Day, Traffic Operations
Jeff Hagan, Transportation Planning Senior Engineer
Jen Knights, Executive Director Recreation and Culture
Prem Patel, Manager Traffic Operations
Juan Paramo, Transportation Planning Engineer
Shannon Deehan, Transportation Planning Coordinator
Mark Keeler, Human Resources Assistant
Karen Kadour, Committee Coordinator

1. Call to Order

The Committee Coordinator calls the meeting to order at 10:05 o'clock a.m. and the Committee considers the Agenda attached hereto, matters which are dealt with as follows:

2. Election of Chair

The Committee Coordinator calls for nominations from the floor for the position of Chair. Surendra Bagga nominates Sally Bennett Olczak and Peter Best as Co-Chairs, seconded by Councillor Francis. The Committee Coordinator asks if there are further nominations from the floor for Chair. Seeing none, the Committee Coordinator asks Sally Bennett Olczak and Peter Best if they accept. Sally Bennett Olczak and Peter Best accept the position of Co-Chairs.

Moved by Surendra Bagga, seconded by Councillor Fred Francis,
That Sally Bennett Olczak and Peter Best **BE ELECTED** Co-Chairs of the Windsor Accessibility Advisory Committee.
Carried.

Addition to the Agenda

Moved by Caleb Ray, seconded by Councillor Fred Francis,
That Rule 3.3 (c) of the Procedure By-law 98-2011 be waived to add the following addition to the Agenda:
Item 5.5 Concerns with speed humps on streets with no sidewalks.
Carried.

3. Declaration of Conflict

None disclosed.

4. Adoption of the Minutes

Moved by Peter Best, seconded by Nicholas Petro,
That the minutes of the Windsor Accessibility Advisory of its meeting held November 1, 2022 **BE ADOPTED** as presented.
Carried.

5. Business Items

5.1 Facility Accessibility Design Standards (FADS)

Gayle Jones and Mark Keeler provide the following information and update relating to the Facility Accessibility Design Standards for the City of Windsor:

- FADS is all about the “accessible built environment” and relates to adopting specifications that the City of Windsor will use going forward with new buildings, new sidewalks and so on.
- The City of London has been the leader in developing the FADS standards and the document that the City of Windsor’s original FADS was based upon. The City of London adopted their new FADS in 2022.
- The WAAC Committee upon detailed review of the new City of the London FADS and numerous updated FADS from other municipalities in 2022, chose the City of London as their preferred choice as the basis for Windsor’s FADS. The City of London authorizes communities to use their FADS in whole or part as long as proper acknowledgements are provided in the document.
- The City of London FADS will be broken down into individual sections and will be reviewed chapter by chapter by a WAAC subcommittee by noting what has changed since 2006 and what has not. These changes will be reviewed and recommendations made by a WAAC subcommittee and then appropriate members of administration.
- The City of Windsor will be one of the only municipalities with an accessible version of FADS (approximately 300 pages.)

Gayle Jones notes they are looking for a subcommittee to review the FADS document, i.e. Windsor’s old FADS and what improvements have been made. She adds the municipalities of Oakville, Markham and Kingston are 3 communities that have also revised their FADS and best practices can be reviewed in those documents as well. Also included in the review will be appropriate members of administration from a variety of areas. She indicates that Riccardo Pappini, and Surendra Bagga have volunteered to sit on this Subcommittee. Peter Best, Danika McPhee, Caleb Ray and Nicholas Petro also volunteer.

5.2 Accessible Pedestrian Signals

Gayle Jones advises that Shauna Boghean, Orientation & Mobility, Vision Loss Rehab Ontario is unable to attend today’s meeting but has provided the following concerns via e-mail:

1. The volume levels of the initial APS beacons must be louder in order for the traveler to find it initially, and then to “aim” towards the target beacon on the opposite side while crossing the street
2. Asks if there is any way to add the name of the street when the APS signal is saying ‘safe to cross’ – is the technology available with the present APS systems the City is now using?

Gayle Jones indicates that there are approximately 27 audible accessible pedestrian signals and adds that Shauna Boghean along with Peter Best have visited the 27 audible pedestrian signals sites.

Shawna Boakes advises that there are two aspects to the pedestrian signals - the push button settings (there are no specific requirements) which will be discussed. A summary will be presented regarding what the settings are; the capabilities of the push buttons along with Administration's recommendations as to what the settings should be. She remarks that Administration is working on the development of the physical layout standard and adds that the City of Windsor's standards will be based on the City of London's standards.

Ian Day indicates the two manufacturers for the pushbuttons are the POLARA Pushbutton and the Campbell Pushbutton. He indicates he has had discussions with Shauna Boghean regarding issues at some of the intersections. He notes there is no standard or consistency across Ontario other than the Canadian melody for the east/west crossing and the cuckoo for the north/south crossing.

Prem Patal, Manager Traffic Operations provides an overview of the document entitled "City of Windsor Traffic Signals" – Proposed Field Settings for POLARA Pushbuttons and for Campbell Pushbuttons, **attached** as Appendix "A".

Gayle Jones states that WAAC members know what they need from a physical perspective, as persons with lived experience, and asks if a Campbell Pushbutton and a POLARA Pushbutton could be set up at two busy intersections at some point so WAAC can see if there are any issues.

Ian Day agrees to set up two intersections of choice by WAAC; one with POLARA and one with Campbell. He adds that a site visit by the subcommittee would be appropriate in order to come to a consensus on site and what changes are required.

Danika McPhee asks for a document that outlines the various settings identified in the "City of Windsor Traffic Signals" as some of the terms require clarification, i.e. "volume over ambient".

Ian Day explains that volume over ambient means that the louder the intersection the more traffic is in the intersection, the device is able to detect that level and then increase the volume by a percentage over it. So, as the intersection gets noisier, the beacons and locator sounds get louder.

Riccardo Pappini remarks that POLARA and Campbell have quite a few different models and asks if there is a particular model that you are looking for from each manufacturer so that we can review on our own.

Ian Day states moving forward, they will be using the POLARA. As the Campbell's fail, they will be replaced with POLARA and adds that their new installations are all POLARA as the POLARA is the superior system.

Surendra Bagga indicates that there are concerns regarding when the person locates the pushbutton does it go straight through or does it need a corridor so they do

not go astray. He asks when the person is walking is the vibration loud enough for that person to hear in the instance that an individual is hearing and vision impaired.

Ian Day indicates that is why they are looking to develop their own design standards for the intersection to help guide people across the intersection. The placement of the devices need to be standardized for the city.

Peter Best states that the presentation by Traffic Operations acknowledges the need for the blind and visually impaired individuals to be able to cross streets. He states that there are only 27 out of the 293 corners with traffic signals. He invites WAAC members to join himself and Shauna Boghean to visit an intersection (will provide special glasses that takes away total sight) and will help the members cross the street.

Ian Day indicates that 11 intersections will be done and brought up to the new standard between this construction season and the next construction season. He adds that many intersections in the City of Windsor do not have the geometrical alignment or the actual real estate to try to make things fit into the new standard.

Gayle Jones thanks Prem Patal, Ian Day and Shawna Boakes for their input and to Peter Best and Shauna Boghean for their review of the intersections.

Moved by Nicholas Petro, seconded by Peter Best,

That the verbal report provided by Shawna Boakes, Executive Director Operations, Ian Day, Traffic Operations and Prem Patal, Manager Traffic Operations regarding the Accessible Pedestrians Signals **BE RECEIVED.**

Carried.

5.5 Concerns with Speed Humps on Streets with no Sidewalks

Jeff Hagan, Transportation Planning Senior Engineer advises they are making great strides with traffic calming in the city and adds perhaps members have received petitions regarding speed humps on their streets. The issue of accessibility arises with successful petitions especially on streets with no sidewalks and they do not want to create a barrier to people who are depending on moving along the roadway to get where they need to go. The standard speed hump layout is approximately 85 millimeters tall and the speed hump has to taper on the side. They recognize that may be an issue for some people with mobility devices trying to navigate over that space. The other potential concern that has been flagged is the detectability of a speed hump for people with low vision. In order to address those concerns, they are proposing a few changes to their standard speed hump layout. The first would be increasing the width of the gap, and asks WAAC to comment on how best to address the detectability for people with low vision. They are hoping to put together a modified speed hump design for these streets without sidewalks (including the committee's input); trial that at a handful of locations that they can put in this year and then report back to WAAC as well as to the Environment and Transportation and Public Safety Standing Committee with the results (as a one year pilot

project). He notes that Juan Paramo will be showing a diagram that provides a wider gap at the speed hump to allow a level walking surface for people to use.

Juan Paramo, Transportation Planning Engineer provides a drawing entitled “Draft Speed Hump Accessibility Option”, which shows the treatment for streets without a sidewalk, **attached** as Appendix “B”.

Gayle Jones indicates that her initial comments prior to the new speed hump design are as follows:

“Upon visiting a few speed humps, it was observed that the slope is not consistent between different speed humps and the cross slope at the end can be a bit too extreme. If there are no sidewalks, then persons will have to navigate these with assistive devices and also with their white canes for low vision and blind. If they are not designed thoughtfully with gradual slopes and cross slopes that are consistent with the exact specs, then they can potentially become significant barriers to the travel and independence of individuals with certain types of disabilities. Going forward there should be an alternate way for persons to get to their destination and avoid the speed hump as some individuals with certain disabilities can find these extremely painful and are debilitating to cross. If accessibility concerns are noted during the consultation phase, it is suggested that another traffic calming measure be used.”

Gayle Jones states she believes what Transportation Planning is attempting to do is to make a larger gutter area to create better space for individuals to be able to get over the hump successfully.

Jeff Hagan responds that accessibility concerns raised in their speed hump surveys are taken seriously but also realize these are permanent measures (the life of the pavement is 20 years).

Danika McPhee advises as a manual wheelchair user, she finds the humps to be a minor annoyance but imagines that a power wheelchair would potentially bottom out and be costly to repair.

Riccardo Pappini remarks that many of the residential roads in the city have curb and gutter and the gutter does not come out .08 meters so if someone is going through this space, there may be potential for one wheel on the concrete gutter and then the other wheel on asphalt which could be uneven. He suggests that in the .08 meter space, that a consistent material face the curb to the edge of that hump, i.e. concrete.

Jeff Hagan responds there is opportunity as these speed humps are being put in to address any issues where there is a lip between the curb and the pavement.

Shawna responds that it is not possible when they do the bottom of the gutter to extend that concrete out in that section. That being said, when those speed humps are put in, the contractor and maintenance can work together to ensure that it is a consistent

level.

Peter Best agrees that traffic calming is essential, however, putting in a speed hump is a barrier and becomes a liability for someone with a white cane or power chair as the speed hump ages. There is a need to extend through the curb with a passage that is safe and consistent.

Nicholas Petro adds his concern relates to the elevation changes and asks how ice buildup (for those with low vision) is handled during the winter months.

Moved by Riccardo Pappini, seconded by Peter Best,
That the information provided by Transportation Operations regarding concerns with speed humps on streets with no sidewalks **BE RECEIVED**.
Carried.

5.3 WAAC Operating Budget

Gayle Jones advises that the balance of the WAAC 2023 Operating Budget is \$12,476.39.

5.4 ODA Capital Fund

Gayle Jones reports that the balance of the ODA Capital Fund was at \$535,000 on the most recent report she received .

Discussion ensues regarding potential projects and use of the WAAC 2023 Operating Budget.

The Chair suggests that a discussion regarding the WAAC 2023 Operating Budget be added to the next Agenda.

6 Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held at the call of the Chair.

7. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting is adjourned at 12:02 o'clock p.m.