



MEMO

TO : David Ferguson (City of Hamilton)

COPY TO : n/a

FROM : Soroush Salek (CIMA+)

DATE : January 16, 2019

SUBJECT : RHVP Road Safety Review – Advanced Draft Report Comment Log
(CIMA+ File: B001014)

The purpose of this memorandum is to respond to the comments provided in your email from January 11, 2019 with respect to the “Roadside Safety Assessment – Red Hill Valley Parkway” Advanced Draft Report, dated December 2018. **Table 1** lists the comments provided by the City and CIMA+’s responses.

Table 1: RHVP Roadside Safety Advanced Draft Comment Log

City Comment	CIMA+ Response
<i>Page 1, last line stated “exceeding the design of the road (110 km/h) in the north bound and southbound direction.” As we know from the report the design speed per new standards is only 90 km/h.”</i>	The wording in this section comes from the 2015 report. At that time we did not have the design speed information and assumed it based on operational speed. We modified the wording and added a footnote to provide context.
<i>Page 2 indicates “ The present study takes into account the findings and recommendations of the previous studies, inorder to confirm or expand the recommendations to reduce the roadside related collision...” I do not recall seeing a section where you were validating or expanding the recommendations from the past.</i>	We considered the previous recommendations as part of our review, but worded the recommendations in the report (Section 3.4) independently from the previous study. We note that the collision patterns remain similar to the previous study, therefore those recommendations remain valid. We note that, throughout Section 3 – Collision History Review we make reference to collision patterns being consistent the with previous studies. No modifications were made to the report.
<i>Page 18, Section 3.4. second bullet is calling for conducting regular speed enforcement,</i>	No action required by CIMA+.

City Comment	CIMA+ Response
<p><i>Ensure that Police Services are informed on this.</i></p>	
<p><i>Page 18, Section 3.4, third bullet states "Immediately after the resurfacing is complete, and provided that adequate wet weather skid resistance is achieved, remove all "Slippery When Wet signs and monitor collisions". This seems to be rather vague. How do we determine what is adequate skid resistance and how long should this be monitored? Who will be doing this monitoring? Also when and who is installing the Slippery when Wet sign?"</i></p>	<p>Adequate skid resistance should be determined based on technical standards. We assume that the contract for the resurfacing work stipulates that the contractor is responsible for delivering pavement surface that complies with all applicable standards.</p> <p>Monitoring of collisions should be done yearly on an ongoing basis and Slippery When Wet signs should be installed if/when the OTM Book 6 conditions are present.</p>
<p><i>It was not possible to open the GIS Shape file mentioned in the report and as such not all locations where improvements were recommended could be reviewed. Traffic Section to help identify the priority locations where changes have to be incorporated into the upcoming tender.</i></p>	<p>We note that the file is not a single shape file, but a geodatabase with multiple layers and should be loaded as a geodatabase. If necessary, we can provide assistance via a phone call to help City staff open the file. If this still does not work, we can send an Excel and a KMZ file (can be opened with Google Earth).</p>
<p><i>Page 28, paragraph 3, states that "However these requirements are based on Provincial highway projects...Given that RHVP is not a Provincial....City may consider adopting a different criteria...." The request was for CIMA to analyse the performance and standards of RHVP against MTO and TAC standards. May be this statement is not required that City has the option of adopting a different criteria.</i></p>	<p>It is our understanding that the City will not be moving forward with the crossover locations. As such, we modified the wording in this section to a more definitive recommendation not to build the median crossovers.</p>
<p><i>Page 30, Section 8 regarding access to wastewater facilities. The analysis could not be completed as it requires survey and design and also involves considerable fill. It is important to inform Hamilton Water that their request for access cannot be accommodated at this time so that the expectations are clear. Grading changes and changes to access points will require thorough analysis. Given the timeframe for tender by February 2019, this additional work will not be possible. Also</i></p>	<p>No action required by CIMA+.</p>

City Comment	CIMA+ Response
<i>grading requires permit from Conservation Authority.</i>	
<i>The only additional comment I had was the review of considering installation of side mounted reflectors rather than the use of in-road reflectors. Our preference at this point is to use the side mounted reflectors so as to insure the integrity of the pavement once it is resurfaced. If you zoom in on this link, you should be able to see what I am referring to on the sides.</i>	We added wording to the report with respect to maintaining pavement integrity. We note that the link provided refers to a U.S. highway and the reflectors have a different shape (vertical rectangle) from the standard delineators used in Ontario (diamond). We recommend that the reflectors be installed in accordance with OTM Book 11 and OPSS.PROV 721 (Construction Specification for Steel Beam Guide Rail and Cable Guide Rail).