



## County of Peterborough Policy Manual

---

<b>Department:</b>	Engineering & Design
<b>Policy No.:</b>	PPW-ED-07
<b>Subject:</b>	Road Rationalization
<b>Approved by Leadership Team:</b>	TBD
<b>Originally Approved by Council:</b>	TBD
<b>Revised by Council:</b>	
<b>Approved by:</b>	TBD

---

### **Purpose:**

To establish a protocol for evaluating the rationale for the jurisdiction of roadways within the municipal road system serving the County of Peterborough (the County) in collaboration with the Lower-tier Municipalities. Jurisdiction reviews should focus on specific road sections or subareas; a system-wide review is not recommended at this time as the jurisdiction for most roads in the current municipal road network serving the County appears consistent with their intended role and function.

### **Scope:**

This policy covers the evaluation of the rationale for the jurisdiction of the candidate road(s) within the County. It includes both transfer of a roadway or road section from the County to a Lower-tier Municipality, and from a Lower-tier Municipality to the County. The County or the Lower-tier Municipality can initiate this policy.

Road rationalization shall be conducted on the following principles, which are intended to define the objectives of the County Road network and differentiate a County Road from a Lower-tier Municipal Road:

- County Roads are primarily transportation corridors and should offer a high degree of connectivity (particularly between communities and often over longer distances), accommodate a range of users consistent with their function (including truck traffic, where appropriate), and provide a good level of service.
- County Roads should be capable of being upgraded to a reasonable standard (i.e., horizontal/vertical alignment, number/width of lanes, shoulders) consistent with their function and service role.
- County Roads should be direct and intuitive.
- County Roads should not serve a redundant role in the overall road system where alternative parallel routes exist.

- County Roads should complement and connect to the Provincial Highway system (Highways 7, 7A, 28, and 115), particularly at freeway interchanges.
- County Roads within Settlement Areas, as identified in the County Official Plan, should principally serve through traffic and/or provide travel service.

In addition, if the evaluation concludes that there is a rationalization for the transfer of a roadway or road section, this policy also covers the procedure for putting in place such transfer which shall include consultation with the Lower-tier Municipality.

**Definitions:**

For the purpose of this policy and associated procedures, the following words shall have the meaning ascribed herein:

**“Alternate Detour Route”**, means a detour route other than a designated basis that is either used on a relatively frequent basis or would be expected to be used as a result of an emergency. This would include, but are not limited to, truck detour routes (based on physical limitations of the roadway) and connections between various sections of Emergency Detour Routes (EDR).

**“Average Annual Daily Traffic”**, abbreviated to AADT, means the approximation of the daily number of vehicles that travel on a road.

**“Barrier”** means a physical obstacle that restricts the road network, including, but not limited to, rivers, lakes, freeways, rail lines, etc.

**“Barrier Service”** means a roadway that provides access around, over, under, or through a barrier (including, but not limited to, rivers, lakes, freeways, rail lines, cliffs, valleys, etc.)

**“Candidate Road”** means the roadway or road section being evaluated.

**“County Council”** means the Council of the County of Peterborough.

**“County”** means the Corporation of the County of Peterborough.

**“County Road”** means a roadway over which the County of Peterborough has jurisdiction.

**“Emergency Detour Route”**, abbreviated EDR, means a detour route for a major Provincial highway as designated by the Ministry of Transportation Ontario (MTO).

**“Highway Traffic Act”** means Highway Traffic Act, 1990, R.S.O. 1990, c H.8, as amended or any successor legislation.

**“Lower-tier Municipality”** means one of the Townships within the County of Peterborough.

**“Lower-tier Municipal Road”** means a road over which one of the Townships has jurisdiction.

**“Municipal Act, 2001”** means Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c25, as amended or any successor legislation.

**“Rehabilitated Condition”** means that the remaining service life (with regular and routine maintenance) of a road or roadway exceeds 15 years as determined by a qualified engineering professional.

**“Road”** or **“Roadway”** means a highway as defined in the Highway Traffic Act.

**“Road Rationalization”** means the evaluation of a roadway or a road section to determine the most appropriate jurisdiction.

**“Single-tier Municipality”** means a municipality, other than an upper-tier municipality, that does not form part of an upper-tier municipality for municipal purposes

**“Transferee”** means the municipality that would receive jurisdiction of a Candidate Road which is being considered for transfer.

**“Transferor”** means the municipality that currently has jurisdiction of a Candidate Road which is being considered for transfer.

**“Trucks”** means vehicles Class 4 or higher on the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Vehicle Category Classification System.

**“Truck Traffic”** means the number of trucks per day on the candidate road.

**“Upper-tier Municipality”** means a municipality of which two or more Lower-tier municipalities form part for municipal purposes

**“Urban Centre”** means Settlement Area as identified on Map A of the County Official Plan, The City of Peterborough, or any Settlement Area (or equivalent) identified in the Official Plan of an adjacent municipality.

**Policy:**

The County will engage with the Lower-tier Municipality (or municipalities) throughout the rationalization process. The process for road rationalization review and transfer (if applicable) shall follow a seven-step methodology, as follows:

**1. Identification of Candidate Road(s)**

Identify the County Roads and Lower-tier Municipal Roads being considered for potential transfer. Candidate Road(s) must be identified by way of a written request by either County or Lower-tier Municipal staff, and both parties must be in agreement that consideration for potential transfer should be given.

Roads that vary in role, function, traffic volume, context, and/or any other condition over their length should be divided into distinct sections for assessment. Sections would typically extend between built-up areas or intersections with other County Roads and/or Provincial Highways.

Existing County Roads with an AADT  $\geq$  1,500 and existing Lower-tier Municipal Roads with an AADT  $\leq$  500 should not be considered.

## 2. Scoring of Candidate Road(s)

County staff shall apply the 9 criteria and weightings summarized in Tables 1 to 9 in assessing County Roads and Lower-tier Municipal Roads identified as potential candidates for transfer.

Table 1: Urban Centre Connector Weightings

Connection	Points
Road connects two Settlement Areas	3
Road connects a Settlement Area to a County Road or Provincial Highway	2
Road connects to a Settlement Area	1
Road does not connect to a Settlement Area	0

Table 2: Provincial Highway/County Road Connector Weightings

Description	Points
Road received points under Urban Centre Connector	0
Road is not 5 km or longer (considering the overall length of road and the individual road section(s))	0
Road does not connect to Other County Roads, Adjacent Upper-tier Municipal Roads and/or the Provincial Highway system	0
Road connects to Other County Roads, Adjacent Upper-tier Municipal Roads and/or the Provincial Highway system and is 5 km or longer	2

Table 3: Heavy Industrial Service Weightings

Truck Traffic Volume (Trucks per day)	Points
≥ 750	2
500 to 749	1.5
250 to 499	1
100 to 249	0.5
< 100	0

Table 4: Barrier Service Weightings

Description	Points
Road provides services across and/or around a barrier	2
Road does not provide services across and/or around a barrier	0

Table 5: Traffic Speed Weightings

Description	Points
The predominant posted speed limit is 80 km/h	2
The predominant posted speed limit is less than 80 km/h	0

Table 6: Traffic Volume Weightings

Traffic Volume (AADT, Vehicles per day)	Points
≥ 5,000	6
4,000 to 4,999	5
3,500 to 3,999	4.5
3,000 to 3,499	4.0
2,500 to 2,999	3.5
2,000 to 2,499	3.0
1,500 to 1,999	2.5
1,000 to 1,499	2
500 to 999	0.5
< 500	0

Table 7: Continuity within County Weightings

Description	Points
Road provides continuous upper-tier travel service through the County	2
Road does not provide continuous upper-tier travel service through the County	0
<p>Note: For this criterion, additional commentary on continuous upper-tier travel service (or continuity) is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Applicable to longer trips within or through the County</li> <li>b) From the trip origin, the Lower-tier Municipal Road(s) would provide access to County Road and/or Provincial Highway Network(s)</li> <li>c) Once on the County Road and/or Provincial Highway Network(s) the traveller should be able to remain on these Upper-tier Roads, to near their destination, where they would use the Lower-tier Municipal Road(s) to reach their destination</li> <li>d) Routes should be efficient and direct</li> </ul>	

Table 8: Connection to Upper-tier Road in Neighbouring Jurisdiction Weightings

Description	Points
Road provides a connection to a neighbouring upper-tier road network	1
Road does not provide a connection to a neighbouring upper-tier road network	0
Note: For this criterion, the following shall also be considered as a connection to neighbouring Upper-Tier Roads: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Connection to an arterial road of a neighbouring Single-tier Municipality; or</li> <li>b) In the case a neighbouring Upper-tier Municipality that has transferred <b>all of their roads</b> to the Lower-tier Municipalities within their boundaries, connection to any roadway which was under the jurisdiction of said Upper-tier Municipality prior to such action.</li> </ul>	

Table 9: Emergency Detour Route Connector Weightings

Description	Points
Road provides a connection to a designated Emergency Detour Route (EDR) for a Provincial Highways	1*
Road does not provide a connection to a designated Emergency Detour Route (EDR) for a Provincial Highways	0
Note: Consideration for awarding the 1 point may be made for other non-EDR designated routes (alternate detour route).	

### 3. Review of Scoring Results

The results of the road rationalization score shall be reviewed to determine the appropriate next step(s).

Generally, a minimum threshold of 6 points is recommended to warrant consideration as a County Road. However, the assignment of jurisdiction based on the objectives of County Roads and Lower-tier Municipal Roads (alike) may not always align with the road rationalization scoring matrix. As such, additional consideration should be made for scores between 5 and 6.5 (inclusive) to confirm whether or not the candidate road or road section(s) meets the objectives of a County Road as identified above.

The following are the next steps, based on existing jurisdiction and the results of the scoring.

Table 10: Road Rationalization Scoring Result Outcomes

Road Rationalization Scoring Result	Existing County Road	Existing Lower-tier Municipal Road
≤ 4.5	Recommend Transfer – Proceed Directly to Step 5	Remain Under Current Jurisdiction – Proceed Directly to Step 5
5.0 to 6.5	Continue Review – Proceed to Step 4	Continue Review – Proceed to Step 4
≥ 7.0	Remain Under Current Jurisdiction – Proceed Directly to Step 5	Recommend Transfer – Proceed Directly to Step 5

**4. Application of Other Considerations**

Assess other considerations to determine if the roadway is a candidate for transfer. While the criteria assessment (Step 2) provides a comprehensive evaluation, some road sections identified for transfer should remain under their current jurisdiction after considering their unique setting and circumstances. Conversely, some road sections will satisfy the criteria to remain part of their current road network but should be considered for transfer given other pertinent factors. In both cases, other mitigating factors deserve special consideration.

Although the criteria already capture some of these factors, the extent of their potential impact could vary depending on the road, and thus influence the road rationalization decision.

The additional factors to consider may include:

- Unique constraints/limitations due to geography and/or topography;
- The desire for continuity of jurisdiction (to avoid varying jurisdiction between consecutive road sections along the same road);
- Road maintenance needs and resulting programming/scheduling;
- Elimination of (or need for) parallel or alternative travel routes/corridors;
- Provision of major municipal infrastructure (bridges, watermain and sanitary sewer) within the road allowance;
- Variability in seasonal/monthly traffic volumes;
- Planned/proposed future development along or close to the road; and
- Location within a Settlement Areas.

**5. Reporting**

Upon completion of Steps 1 through 4, County staff shall prepare a road rationalization review record, that will summarize the evaluation scoring/ratings of the candidate road, identify any additional factors that were considered, and the recommendations related to the transfer of the candidate road (i.e., whether or not to transfer the road).

A copy of the record will be provided to the staff of the Lower-tier Municipality (or Municipalities).

Upon request, a consensus meeting between County and Lower-tier Municipality staff may take place to discuss the scoring/ratings and recommendations.

Upon receipt and review of the road rationalization review record and following the consensus meeting (if required), the Lower-Tier Municipality staff shall provide County staff with written acknowledgement/acceptance of the recommendations. Depending on the protocols of the Lower-tier Municipality, this acknowledgement/acceptance of the recommendation may also be in the form of a council resolution to proceed with the development of conditions of a transfer (Step 6)

If the recommendation for a candidate road is that it should remain under its current jurisdiction, the road rationalization review will terminate for this candidate road.

If the recommendation for a candidate road is that jurisdiction should be transferred, the road rationalization review should continue to Step 6. Proceeding with Step 6 should only occur once the County and the Lower-Tier Municipality are in agreement that the candidate road should be transferred.

#### **6. Development of Conditions of a Transfer**

Determine the needs to be addressed prior to the transfer of road(s) to the Lower-tier Municipality or the acceptance of road(s) by the County, as it relates to road condition (i.e., rehabilitation, expansion) and the associated cost implications, including potential compensation. The plans should include implementation recommendations considering factors such as the need for road improvements, extent of improvements, responsibility for costs, relevant standards, and priorities. Most situations are unique and involve several factors. Different implementation strategies should be considered if needed to reach mutually agreeable terms, including transferring road(s) in a fully rehabilitated state, or transferring road(s) with financial concessions.

The applicable municipal standards, based on road classification will be determined by the Transferee and may include lane width, shoulder width, pavement structure, vertical or horizontal alignment, etc.

An estimated cost to upgrade the candidate road to the municipal standards of the Transferee and/or restore it to a fully rehabilitated condition shall be obtained. This cost estimate may be prepared by County or Lower-tier Municipal staff, or by a qualified engineering professional (as agreed upon by all parties). If retained, the



cost for the services of the qualified engineering professional should be paid by the Transferor.

Where multiple roads are being considered for transfer at the same time (i.e., the County transfers a road to a Lower-tier Municipality, and the same Lower-tier Municipality transfers a road to the County) the financial concession to be paid shall be the net financial concessions.

Note, that the timing for executing the transfer, implementation of road upgrades and/or improvements, payment of financial concession, etc. shall be determined in consultation with the Lower-tier Municipality (or Municipalities).

## **7. Implementation of Transfer**

Prepare to transfer County Roads that primarily provide local service to Lower-tier Municipalities, and Lower-tier Municipal Roads that principally serve through traffic to the County.

Following Step 6, staff (of the respective Parties) will report back to their respective Council with all financial implications and impacts, and will request that a Council Resolution be provided to engage legal representatives to commence and complete the road transfer.

The cost for outside services required for the transfer of the Candidate Road (i.e., legal costs, survey costs, etc.) should be paid by the Transferor. Any internal or staff costs, shall not be included within the transfer costs, and shall be the responsibility of the respective Party. If determined that each Party will have their own legal representation, each Party shall pay their own respective legal costs.

Once legal representatives have been engaged and the transfer is ready to be initiated, staff (of the respective Parties) shall report back to their respective Council to obtain any necessary By-law(s) to formalize the transfer.

Staff (of the respective Parties) should amend any of their impacted planning documents (e.g., Official Plan appendices).

### **Review Cycle:**

This policy shall be reviewed, as required, by the County's Engineering & Design department.