OBJECTIVES OF TONIGHT’S MEETING

- Review existing conditions
- Present alternative solutions and evaluation process
- Present recommended alternative solutions
- Answer questions and receive feedback
- Discuss next steps
STUDY PURPOSE

To address issues relating to:

- deteriorating road conditions
- traffic
- pedestrian safety
- road drainage problems
- basement flooding

Measures that improve stormwater quality and reduce storm runoff will also be incorporated.
STUDY PROCESS

Study is being carried out according to the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process

1. Identify Problem or Opportunity
2. Identify Alternative Solutions
3. Evaluate Alternative Solutions
4. Consult on Recommended Solution(s)
5. Select Preferred Solution(s)

Complete Final Report (30 Day Review Period)

*PIC - April 22, 2013
*PIC - November 19, 2013

We Are Here
Feedback received at PIC#2 identified three priorities:

1. Reduce Basement Flooding
2. Improve Pedestrian Safety
3. Limit Impact to Urban Greenspace/Recreational Uses
EXISTING CONDITIONS: BASEMENT FLOODING
A separate set of alternatives was developed and evaluated for the **partially separated** and **separated areas**.
ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS: BASEMENT & SURFACE FLOODING

Partially Separated Area
• 2 alternatives were considered:
  I. Alternative 1 – Increase Conveyance
  II. Alternative 2 – Provide Offline Storage

Fully Separated Area
• 3 alternatives were considered:
  I. Alternative 1 – Increase Conveyance
  II. Alternative 2 – Provided Inline Storage
  III. Alternative 3 – Increase Conveyance and Provide Inline Storage

Surface flooding addressed through alternatives on road cross-sections – urban/rural cross-section
RECOMMENDED ALT. SOLUTIONS: PARTIALLY SEPARATED AREA

- Downspout disconnection
- Adding storm sewers to provide adequate capacity on St. Leonards Avenue, Glengowan Avenue and Dundurn Road (total length = 830 m)
Downspout disconnection

Sealing of sanitary manholes in low lying areas

Replacement of 1,020 m of sanitary sewers with larger sewers on Bayview Wood, Rochester Avenue, Wood Avenue, Bayview Avenue and Valleyanna Drive

Construction of a 1,100 m$^3$ underground storage facility on Valleyanna Drive
TRAFFIC SIGHT LINES

- Locations with a potential lack of sight distance were identified and examined
- Recommendations include:
  - Remove or relocate stone wall for Blythwood Road / Strathgowan Crescent
  - Undertake minor works (trimming of tree branches) at Mount Pleasant Road / Lawrence Crescent and Mount Pleasant Road / St. Leonards Avenue
TRAFFIC INFILTRATION & SAFETY

- A traffic study was undertaken to understand the study area travel patterns and to highlight infiltration across the study area.
- The findings showed that traffic volumes on internal roads are relatively small, with the exception of Mildenhall Road, which is a collector road.

**Recommendations:**

- Consideration of turning restrictions at the Blythwood Road and Daneswood Road intersection to reduce traffic volumes through the area
- Clearly defined pedestrian spaces such as sidewalks and pavement markings
- Consistent approach for traffic sign designs and application of parking regulations, speed limits and warning signs
- Appropriate use of traffic control measures such as stop signs and traffic control signals
EXISTING CONDITIONS: STATE OF GOOD REPAIR ON ROADS

Legend
- Full Depth Reconstruction
- Full Depth Asphalt Removal
- Partial Depth Asphalt Removal
- Routine Preventive Maintenance
EXISTING ROAD WIDTHS
Priority is on creating pedestrian linkages to key destinations in the neighbourhood and connecting existing sidewalks.
FACTORS IMPACTING SIDEWALK INSTALLATION

- Presence of pedestrian generators (school, parks)
- Right-of-Way road width
- Impact on trees and vegetation
- Technical feasibility, cost, impact on utilities (e.g. hydro poles)
City Policy for Local Residential Roadway requires:
• 8.5 m paved surface, concrete curb and 1.7-2.0 m sidewalk on one or both sides

A local residential roadway must account for the following:
• Emergency and service vehicle access
• Space for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles
• Safe two way traffic flow
• Width for winter road maintenance
• Parking
• Width for underground structures
ROADWAY CROSS SECTION
• Tree inventory completed for the study area

• Data for each tree included:
  • location
  • species
  • diameter at breast height
  • biological health
  • condition
  • preservation priority
There are approximately 2600 healthy street trees within the municipal right of way across the whole study area; less than 100 street trees were found to be of a low priority.

Number of street trees that would require removal was determined for each alternative for each street.

Average percentage removal for all alternatives considered, ranged from 10-80%, depending on the width of construction impacts, the existing road width and the locations of the existing trees.

- An urban cross section, with a 7.2m road width, and with no sidewalk results in the least impact to street trees.
At PIC #2, a preferred road width of 8.5 m with 1 or 2 sidewalks for local roads was presented

As a result of public input, the study team reconsidered the above

Alternative Solutions evaluated include:

**Local Roads**
- Urban or rural cross sections
- 7.2 or 8.5m roadway widths
- 0 or 1 sidewalks
- Identification of sidewalks that create priority linkages

**Collector Road**
- Urban cross sections
- 8.5 or 9.5m roadway widths
- 1 or 2 sidewalks
  - Mildenhall Road, south of Lawrence Ave E
Roadway cross-sections developed and evaluated only for streets which have issues with respect to the existing road width, drainage or lack of sidewalks.
ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS: ROAD CROSS SECTION

- Fixing roads with existing cross-sections will not address the existing problems/opportunities
  - Roads under 7.2m are insufficient for emergency/operational vehicles
  - Lack of pedestrian infrastructure
  - Direct replacement would not provide for regrading and would not fully address issues of storm drainage

- Fixing streets with their existing cross-section would have an impact on trees similar to a 7.2m urban cross-section

- No alternatives provide for zero impact
EVALUATION PROCESS: CRITERIA

Socio-Cultural
- Pedestrian Safety
- Impact on Urban Greenspace / Recreational Use (Trees, Parks, Open Spaces)

Technical
- Technical Effectiveness
  - Surface and Basement Flooding
    - Stormwater Quality Improvement
    - Pavement Structural Conditions
    - Pedestrian Connectivity
    - Accessibility for Maintenance & Emergency Vehicle

Economic
- Capital Costs

* Pedestrian Safety, Impact on Urban Greenspace and Surface/Basement Flooding assigned higher scoring factor based on community input
RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS

7.2 m width, no sidewalk, urban cross section

7.2 m width, 1 sidewalk, urban cross section

8.5 m width, 1 sidewalk, urban cross section
RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS: LOCAL ROAD

7.2 metre road + 1 sidewalk + urban cross section

7.2 metre road + urban cross section

- 7.2m road width would have parking limited to one side of road
- Location of sidewalk determined during detailed design stage
RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE SOLUTION: MILDENHALL ROAD (S of Lawrence Ave E)

8.5 metre road + 1 sidewalk + urban cross section

- Location of sidewalk determined during detailed design stage
- Existing parking restrictions would remain
EVALUATION PROCESS

- Recommended Alternative Solutions are selected based on the highest score.
- In cases where two highest scoring alternatives are within 1 point of each other, a qualitative assessment of the two alternatives was conducted to select the preliminary recommended solution.
# EVALUATION PROCESS: SCORING

Street Assessment Group ID: 1 – Mildenhall Road South (EXAMPLE 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Alternatives</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
<th>Alternative 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socio-Cultural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Safety</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Urban Greenspace / Recreational Use (Street Trees, Parks, Open Spaces)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical - Technical Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Flooding</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Quality Improvement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Structural Conditions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Connectivity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility for Maintenance &amp; Emergency Vehicle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Costs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**EVALUATION PROCESS – Example 1**

Street Assessment Group ID: 1 – Mildenhall Road South (EXAMPLE 1)

---

**MILDENHALL ROAD** - From Lawrence Avenue East to Blythwood Road

**URBAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Road Width</th>
<th>Sidewalks</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5 metre road width</td>
<td>2 x 1.7 m</td>
<td>2 x Sidewalks</td>
<td>7.0M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5 metre road width</td>
<td>2 x 1.7 m</td>
<td>2 x Sidewalks</td>
<td>6.4M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alternative #1: Do Nothing (Score = 22)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Road Width</th>
<th>Sidewalks</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.5 metre road width</td>
<td>1 x 9.5 m</td>
<td>1 x Sidewalk</td>
<td>6.8M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preferred Alternative (Score = 44)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Road Width</th>
<th>Sidewalks</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.5 metre road width</td>
<td>1 x 8.5 m</td>
<td>1 x Sidewalk</td>
<td>6.2M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Alternative 5 has been identified as the Preliminary Preferred Alternative for following reasons:

- Results in the least impact to street trees
- A sidewalk is included because this is a collector road. It will provide a priority pedestrian linkage to key destinations in the neighbourhood
- Surface flooding is addressed by providing a storm drainage system to prevent ponding
- Meets the requirements for an improvement of roadway structure, improvement in stormwater quality and ability to provide safe conditions for emergency and operational vehicles
EVALUATION PROCESS – Example 1

Street Assessment Group ID: 1 – Mildenhall Road South (EXAMPLE 1)

Existing Conditions
- Surface flooding and insufficient ditched drainage system
- Poor quality road structure and pavement widths ranging from 7m - 9m
- Approximately 340 mature trees within public right-of-way
- No sidewalks

Alternatives to Address the Problems/Opportunities
The study team evaluated 4 Alternative Roadway Cross Sections:
- 9.5m road width + 2 sidewalks + urban cross-section
- 9.5m road width + 1 sidewalk + urban cross-section
- 8.5m road width + 2 sidewalks + urban cross-section
- 8.5m road width + 1 sidewalk + urban cross-section

Preliminary Preferred Alternative

8.5 metre road with 1 sidewalk and an urban cross-section

Preliminary Preferred Alternative:
- Results in the least impact to street trees
- Includes a sidewalk helping to establish a pedestrian linkage to key destinations in the neighbourhood
- Addresses surface flooding by providing a storm drainage system to prevent ponding
- Meets the requirements for an improvement of roadway structure, improvement in stormwater quality and ability to provide safe conditions for emergency and operational vehicles
## EVALUATION PROCESS: SCORING

Street Assessment Group ID: 5 – St. Leonards Avenue (EXAMPLE 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socio-Cultural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Safety</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Urban Greenspace / Recreational Use (Street Trees, Parks, Open Spaces)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical - Technical Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Flooding</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Quality Improvement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Structural Conditions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Connectivity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility for Maintenance &amp; Emergency Vehicle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Costs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The scores for Alternative 5 and Alternative 9 are closely matched and were further compared.

Alternative 5 has been identified as the Preliminary Preferred Alternative for following reasons:

- Results in the moderate impact to street trees
- A sidewalk is included as this will provide a priority pedestrian linkage to key destinations in the neighbourhood
- Surface flooding is addressed by providing a storm drainage system to prevent ponding
- Meets the requirements for an improvement of roadway structure, improvement in stormwater quality and ability to provide safe conditions for emergency and operational vehicles
Street Assessment Group ID: 5 – St. Leonards Avenue (EXAMPLE 2)

Existing Conditions
- Surface flooding and insufficient ditched drainage system
- Poor quality road structure and pavement widths ranging from 6m - 8m
- Approximately 100 mature trees within public right-of-way
- No sidewalks

Alternatives to Address the Problems/Opportunities
The study team evaluated 8 Alternative Roadway Cross Sections:
- 8.5m road width + 1 sidewalk + rural cross-section
- 8.5m road width + 1 sidewalk + urban cross-section
- 7.2m road width + 1 sidewalk + rural cross-section
- 7.2m road width + 1 sidewalk + urban cross-section
- 8.5m road width + 0 sidewalk + rural cross-section
- 8.5m road width + 0 sidewalk + urban cross-section
- 7.2m road width + 0 sidewalk + rural cross-section
- 7.2m road width + 0 sidewalk + urban cross-section

Preliminary Preferred Alternative
7.2 metre road with one sidewalk and an urban cross-section

Preliminary Preferred Alternative:
- Results in the moderate impact to street trees
- Includes a sidewalk helping to establish a pedestrian linkage to key destinations in the neighbourhood
- Addresses surface flooding by providing a storm drainage system to prevent ponding
- Meets the requirements for an improvement of roadway structure, improvement in stormwater quality and ability to provide safe conditions for emergency and operational vehicles
### EVALUATION PROCESS: SCORING

**Street Assessment Group ID: 17 - Fidelia Avenue (EXAMPLE 3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socio-Cultural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Safety</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Urban Greenspace / Recreational Use (Street Trees, Parks, Open Spaces)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical - Technical Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Flooding</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Quality Improvement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Structural Conditions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Connectivity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility for Maintenance &amp; Emergency Vehicle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Costs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EVALUATION PROCESS – Example 3

Street Assessment Group ID: 17 - Fidelia Avenue (EXAMPLE 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RURAL</th>
<th>8.5 metre road width</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>Alternative #1: Do Nothing (Score = 22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.5 m</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.5 m</td>
<td>1 Sidewalk $3.2M $21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7 m</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.8M</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5 m</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.8M</td>
<td>$21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.2 m</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.7M</td>
<td>$13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternative 9 has been identified as the Preliminary Preferred Alternative for following reasons:

- Results in the least impact to street trees
- Meets the requirements for an improvement of roadway structure, improvement in stormwater quality and ability to provide safe conditions for emergency and operational vehicles
Street Assessment Group ID: 17 - Fidelia Avenue (EXAMPLE 3)

Existing Conditions
- Insufficient ditched drainage system
- Poor quality road structure and pavement widths 6m – 8m
- Approximately 90 mature trees within public right-of-way
- No sidewalks

Alternatives to Address the Problems/Opportunities
The study team evaluated 8 Alternative Roadway Cross Sections:
- 8.5m road width + 1 sidewalk + rural cross-section
- 8.5m road width + 1 sidewalk + urban cross-section
- 7.2m road width + 1 sidewalk + rural cross-section
- 7.2m road width + 1 sidewalk + urban cross-section
- 8.5m road width + 0 sidewalk + rural cross-section
- 8.5m road width + 0 sidewalk + urban cross-section
- 7.2m road width + 0 sidewalk + rural cross-section
- 7.2m road width + 0 sidewalk + urban cross-section

Preliminary Preferred Alternative

7.2 metre road with no sidewalk and an urban cross-section

Preliminary Preferred Alternative:
- Results in the least impact to street trees
- Meets the requirements for an improvement of roadway structure, improvement in stormwater quality and ability to provide safe conditions for emergency and operational vehicles
MITIGATION MEASURES

- During detailed design we can more accurately identify the # of tree’s impacted.
- Tree removal counts are based upon a preliminary assessment using the *existing center point of the roadway*.
- Localized road narrowing and/or the use of non-standard construction techniques will be applied where feasible to reduce the impacts.
- A new street tree will be planted for every tree removed.
QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED IN THE OPEN HOUSE

1. Do you agree with the preliminary results of the evaluation? Why or why not?
2. What concerns, if any, do you have about potential impacts the preliminary preferred alternative could have on your street? On adjacent streets or the broader Lawrence Park Neighbourhood?
3. Do you have other feedback on any other aspect of the evaluation or study?
• Opportunity tonight to view evaluation and recommendations
• Display boards showcase the alternatives and scoring for individual streets
• Comment sheets provided to gather feedback
NEXT STEPS

• Opportunity to provide comments on preliminary recommended solutions
• All comments will be reviewed by project team and consultation summary report to be issued and posted on website
• Study to be completed with final report made available for 30-day public review period
NEXT STEPS

- If no Part II Orders received the City will:
  - prioritize projects in accordance with funding availability and cost benefits
  - plan and coordinate the timing of project detailed design and construction
  - include projects in the capital budget process
THANK YOU AND QUESTIONS