ABOUT OGRA

1 Our History

The ‘Good Roads Movement’ began in Rhode Island in 1880. The movement was particularly strong in Ontario where wheelmen, riding clubs and manufacturers sought to protect their interests from legislative discrimination. At the same time, farmers, wanting to capitalize on exploding yields, were drawn to the movement in the hopes that better roads would get products to market faster.

In 2019, the Ontario Good Roads Association will be celebrating its 125th anniversary. During this time, our approach to roads and road building changed more than it had in all of history. It was the founders of OGRA who established the groundwork for Ontario’s modern road and highway network.

2 Our Mandate

The mandate of the Ontario Good Roads Association is to represent the transportation and public works interests of municipalities through advocacy, consultation, training and the delivery of identified services. This mandate translates into four main business objectives:

- To advocate the collective interests of municipal transportation and public works departments through policy analysis, assessment of legislation and consultation with partners and stakeholders.
- To provide affordable and accessible education and training services.
- To promote leadership with regard to infrastructure asset management.
- To develop plans, programs and partnerships for the delivery of services that meet the needs of municipal transportation and public works departments, while recognizing the contribution of the corporate sector.

3 Recent Accomplishments

OGRA has been involved in a number of recent key initiatives. These include:

- Lead the five-year review of the Minimum Maintenance Standard (MMS) regulation, which has been used successfully since 2002 to defend numerous claims against municipalities.
- Successfully advocated to have the government deem municipal asset management planning be a prerequisite for provincial funding.
- Participated in the development of the Asset Management Planning for Municipal Infrastructure Regulation (O. Reg. 588/17).
- In 2017, OGRA provided professional development to 2255 people through 68 specialized courses.
4 Membership

The OGRA Board of Directors is comprised of 15 municipal representatives from across the province. These positions are allocated as follows:

- 4 from Northern Ontario
- 3 from Eastern Ontario
- 2 from City of Toronto
- 3 from Southcentral Ontario
- 3 from Southwestern Ontario

Half of the Board Members are senior municipal staff, half are elected municipal officials.

5 Financial Picture

As OGRA enters its 125th year, the organization continues to enjoy good financial health. Almost 90% of OGRA’s annual revenue is derived from services that are provided to our membership. OGRA does not receive any provincial funding.
Creating a Dedicated Fund to Enhance Municipal Asset Management Planning

1 Issue

The Asset Management Planning for Municipal Infrastructure Regulation (O. Reg. 588/17) provides municipalities with the roadmap that is needed to make Ontario a world leader in infrastructure planning and stewardship. This regulation ensures that municipalities will be efficient and transparent guardians of public dollars when it comes to infrastructure investments. The Government of Ontario, the province’s municipalities, and taxpayers stand to benefit from collaboration that enhances the asset management planning capacity of municipalities.

2 The Challenge

The Asset Management Planning for Municipal Infrastructure Regulation (O. Reg. 588/17) creates new obligations for municipalities that enhance transparency, accountability and efficiency. There are costs associated with complying with the prescriptions of this regulation. The benefits far outweigh any costs.

For example, a typical small rural (Ontario Community Infrastructure Fund eligible) community is facing a 10-year cost of approximately $350,000 (not adjusted for inflation) to perform effective asset management on its road network and bridges/culverts. However, for approximately one quarter of municipalities, $20,000 or less equates to a one per cent increase on the property tax rate.

Many of these same communities manage a large number of assets across geographically expansive areas with relatively small populations and low property assessments. If a community has an average blend of assets (i.e., 325 centreline kms of roads, 80 kms of sidewalks and 35 bridges and 2 culverts), a 10-year asset management plan means the following:

2.1 Best Practices and Legal Obligations

- Roads – every 5 years (complete network) and spot survey (approx. 10% of the network) 3 years after the complete network
2.2 Scenario 1 – All Roads and Structures Inspected in a Single Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ($1,000's)</td>
<td>129.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>100.7</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Scenario 2 – Road and Structures Inspections Broken Up over Inspection Cycle Length (Balanced Approach)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ($1,000's)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ontario municipalities manage 150,943 centre lane kilometers of roads. Each five-year inspection costs municipalities $45.3M to complete. Ontario municipalities also maintain approximately 21,500 bridges and culverts. It costs $10.8M to inspect these assets every two years. Roads and bridges/culverts are but two of the more than 130 different classes of assets that municipalities maintain.

3 The Current State of Affairs for Ontario Municipalities

There are four challenges that are holding municipalities and the province back from realizing all the benefits of asset management planning. These are:

1. a lack of data standardization;
2. a shortage of human capacity/expertise;
3. outdated information technology capacity; and
4. legacy financial systems.

- 2 -
Ontario municipalities know that the performance of their infrastructure provides the foundation for economic development, competitiveness, prosperity, and quality of life. Effective asset management planning requires investments at key points in an asset’s life. Smaller investments at these key times increase an asset’s lifespan and results in major cost savings. The only way to know when to make such investments is to have in place a robust asset management plan. For cash strapped municipalities and their overburdened taxpayers, this is imperative.

Collaboration between the provincial and municipal governments that addresses these four constraints will be mutually beneficial. On the one hand, municipalities will benefit from local economic development, which in turn will signal to the private sector that Ontario’s municipalities are open for business. On the other hand, provincial decisionmakers will be equipped with the information necessary to select the right projects for funding. Both are good for hardworking Ontarians.

4  RECOMMENDATIONS

*That the Government of Ontario create a two-year dedicated matching entitlement-based fund that provides municipalities with the capital that they need to enhance their asset management plans.*

*That following the completion of the above fund, the Government commit to dedicating 0.05% of future infrastructure funding to asset management planning.*

*That the Government of Ontario begin the process of standardizing the data used in asset management planning.*
REFORMING JOINT AND SEVERAL LIABILITY

1 ISSUE

Joint and Several Liability needs to be reformed. Currently, joint and several liability unfairly disadvantages municipalities who are seen as a deep pocketed defendant in lawsuits.

2 WHAT IS JOINT AND SEVERAL LIABILITY?

Joint and several liability provides for a plaintiff to recover the entire claim for damages from one of several negligent defendants. This is established in the Ontario Negligence Act. When someone is considered to be harmed through the fault or neglect of several parties, the individual can collect his or her damage award from one or all of the parties. If one of the parties is 50% responsible for the loss, meaning his several liability is 50% but is unable to pay the damages, the individual can collect the entire loss from the remaining parties, who are "jointly" liable to the plaintiff for the loss.

3 BACKGROUND

At the 2018 AMO Conference, the Attorney General of Ontario, Hon. Caroline Mulroney, was asked if the government would agree to put “fair and reasonable limits on municipal liability”. The Attorney General replied “We are looking at it very closely. We understand how important it is for municipalities.”

Currently, joint and several liability unfairly burdens Ontario municipalities, who are seen as deep-pocketed defendants in lawsuits. As a result, municipal insurance premiums continue to skyrocket. This diverts municipal funds from other essential municipal services and programs, and forces councils to raise property taxes.

Despite numerous failed attempts to reform this aspect of tort law, to date, the Minimum Maintenance Standard (MMS) - Ontario Regulation 239/02 Minimum Maintenance Standards for Municipal Highways remains the only remedy on the books. However, the MMS has not been the ironclad solution that was hoped for when it was created. Since its inception, it has been under constant attack from defendants trying to circumvent the protection that it affords municipalities. Following the latest OGRA-led five-year revision of the MMS, when it was expanded to include bike paths and sidewalks, the review task force concluded that the MMS protection cannot be stretched any further.
4 Why Reform is Needed

Ontario’s accident benefits are the richest in the country and amongst the richest in the world. Changes to Ontario’s first party insurance benefits system are placing increased reliance on third party tort insurance. As a result, there is a noticeable judgment trend that is placing an undue onus on municipalities. Examples include:

Deering v Scugog

• A 19-year-old driver was driving at night in a hurry to make the start time of a movie. She was travelling on a Class 4 rural road that had no centerline markings. The Ontario Traffic Manual does not require this type of road to have such a marking. The driver thought that a vehicle travelling in the opposite direction was headed directly at her. She swerved, over-corrected and ended up in a rock culvert. The Court found the Township of Scugog 66.7% liable. The at-fault driver only carried a $1M auto insurance policy.

Fordham v Dutton-Dunwich

• A 16-year-old male driver who had consumed a couple of beers went through a stop sign on a gravel rural road. He lost control of his vehicle and crashed into a concrete culvert. He suffered a severe brain injury. The trial judge found that the municipality should have posted an additional sign because of the geometric design of the road. The municipality was found 50% at fault.

Ferguson v County of Brant

• An inexperienced 17-year-old male driver was speeding on a road when he failed to navigate a curve which resulted in him crossing the lane into oncoming traffic, leaving the roadway, and striking a tree. The municipality was found to have posted a winding road sign rather than a sharp curve sign. The municipality was found 55% liable.

Safranyos et al v City of Hamilton

• The plaintiff was leaving a drive-in movie theatre with four children in her vehicle at approximately 1 AM. She approached a stop sign with the intention of turning right onto a highway. Although she saw oncoming headlights she entered the intersection where she was struck by a vehicle driven 15 km/h over the posted speed limit by a man who had just left a party and was determined by toxicologists to be impaired. The children in the plaintiff’s vehicle suffered significant injuries. The City was determined to be 25% liable because a stop line had not been painted on the road at the intersection.

Mortimer v Cameron

• Two men were engaged in horseplay on a stairway and one of them fell backward through an open door at the bottom of a landing. The other man attempted to break the first man’s fall and together they fell into an exterior wall that gave way. Both men fell 10 feet onto the ground below, one of whom was left quadriplegic. The trial judge determined both men were negligent, but that their conduct did not correspond to the extent of the plaintiff’s injuries. No liability was
attached to either man. The building owner was determined to be 20% and the City of London was found to be 80% liable. The Court awarded the plaintiff $5 M in damages. On appeal, the City’s liability was reduced to 40% and building owner was determined to be 60% liable. The City still ended up paying 80% of the overall claim.

Any activity taking place in the public realm places risk on the municipalities. Knowing that they can be sued and found responsible for significant damages has caused a number of municipalities to curtail activities.¹

5 PRINCIPLES FOR REFORM

The principles contained in joint and several liability have long been established as tenets of Canadian law. OGRA therefore believes - as the Attorney General said - that there is room to reform joint and several liability while still maintaining it.

Building on the efforts of other reform initiatives in Canada, OGRA believes that any reform of joint and several liability should incorporate the following principles:

- proportionate liability where a plaintiff is contributorily negligent;
- proportionate liability where a defendant is a "peripheral wrongdoer" -- a defendant whose fault is limited and secondary when compared to that of other defendants; and
- the proportionate reallocation of the uncollected share of a damages award attributed to an insolvent defendant.

A reform predicated on these principles will ensure that the benefits of joint and several liability are retained. It will also align such a reform with the other significant precedents where joint and several liability was amended.

¹ Some of the better-known examples of this phenomenon are as follows:

- **Goderich Inukshuks**: The Town of Goderich demolished 150 inukshuks after having a $68,000 insurance claim filed after someone was injured leaning against one to take a picture. The town was notified by its insurance company that it would be fully liable for any future claims relating to the inukshuks.
- **Orangeville Tobogganing Ban**: Orangeville received significant media attention after it posted recently a large "No Tobogganing" sign on a hill specifically built for tobogganing. The ban on Murray's Mountain has been in place since the city bought the land from the school board 2009, but it's never been enforced. Its insurance company mandated the sign.
- **Hamilton Tobogganing Lawsuit**: A lawyer in Hamilton sued the City of Hamilton for $900,000 after he broke his back tobogganing down a steep slope at an estimated 31 km/h and hitting the "hidden hazard" of a snow-covered drainage ditch, sending him airborne. It was on city property where tobogganing is banned.
- **County of Bruce Mountain Bike Trail**: A 43-year-old experienced mountain biker, fell off one of the training obstacles on a trail and was left a quadriplegic. In the subsequent lawsuit, the County was determined to be 100 per cent responsible, even though it had been designed to the highest international standards and had warning signs detailing the risk.
6  Legal Precedents for Amending Joint and Several Liability in Canada

Although joint and several liability has been reformed significantly in the United States – it was abolished completely in Alaska, Arizona, Kansas, Utah, Vermont, Oklahoma and Wyoming – Canadians have been more reluctant to undertake reform. Nonetheless, joint and several liability has already been amended a few times in Canada. These reforms include:

The Saskatchewan Model

- This modification of joint and several liability was adopted in Saskatchewan in 2004. Under the Saskatchewan model, where there is a shortfall due to one defendant being insolvent and the plaintiff’s own negligence contributed to the harm, the shortfall is to be divided among the remaining defendants and the plaintiff in proportion to their fault. This model would apply to all types of defendants in all types of negligence claims.

The Canada Business Corporation Act

- Amendments were made in 2005 to this Act that provided every defendant and third party found responsible for a financial loss arising out of an error, omission or misstatement in financial information that is required under the Act or the regulations, would be liable to the plaintiff only for the portion of the damages corresponding to the defendant's and third party's degree of responsibility. Allocation of responsibility among the parties is provided for in the event one or more defendants/third parties are insolvent or unavailable. With these amendments, the joint and several liability regime continues to apply to the Crown, charitable organizations, unsecured trade creditors and individual plaintiffs whose investment in the corporation is worth less than a prescribed amount.

7  Recommendations

OGRA is asking the Attorney General to convene a working group – comprised of municipal and provincial stakeholders and representatives in good standing with the Law Society of Upper Canada (e.g. Ontario Trial Lawyers Association) – to examine options for reforming joint and several liability as it applies to Ontario municipalities and to report back to the Attorney General in due course.
IMPLEMENTING “VISION ZERO” ACROSS ONTARIO

1 ISSUE

Avoidable roadway fatalities and injuries continue to happen with far too much regularity across Ontario. Rather than accepting these tragedies as inevitable events, Ontario needs to adopt a Vision Zero framework to eliminate such events. The experiences of other jurisdictions, both domestically and internationally, demonstrate that when planners and advocates implement Vision Zero our roadways become safer and more inclusive. Most importantly, the number of tragedies declines. Significantly.

2 BACKGROUND

Vision Zero was launched in Sweden in 1997. Gradually, it spread to other jurisdictions across the globe. It differs from traditional road safety approaches in that it views all road fatalities and injuries as preventable. Vision Zero views the loss of life or injury as an unacceptable trade-off for other transportation system benefits. Central to Vision Zero is the notion that humans will make mistakes. As such, the fault for road fatalities or injuries lies with both road users and the design of the transportation system. Non-human actors such as road infrastructure, public policy, regulations, vehicle technology, and how victims are cared for all share responsibility.

How Ontarians use their road networks has been undergoing a rapid shift. The road infrastructure, emerging new vehicle technology, increasing active transportation, safety of vulnerable road users, and where Ontarians live have all been influential in this change.

3 JURISDICTIONAL ANALYSIS

In Canada, at the federal level, the Canadian Council of Motor Transportation Administrators (CCMTA) is the custodian of the Road Safety Strategy 2025 (RSS 2025). RSS 2025 encourages all road safety stakeholders to make Canada’s roads the safest in the world. RSS 2025 is a high-level strategy whose objective is to enable all jurisdictions in Canada to realize zero fatalities and serious injuries on roads nationwide.
4 Pro vincial Re sponse

British Columbia and Manitoba have developed Vision Zero plans. Other provinces and territories such as Alberta, Prince Edward Island, and the Northwest Territories have created road safety plans. However, they do not incorporate Vision Zero principles. None of the other provinces and territories have official road safety plans.

British Columbia (B.C.) released a ten-year road safety strategy in 2015 and revised it in 2016 to incorporate Vision Zero principles. The B.C. plan is predicated on the application of the Safe System approach. This approach recognizes the inevitability of human error, the limitations of the human body in withstanding force, and the responsibility of road and vehicle designers, policy makers, and road users to maximize safety in all aspects of design and maintenance of a road network. Importantly, the B.C. strategy also embraces the need to engage and collaborate with road safety stakeholders continuously. As a result, the B.C. government created a Road Safety Strategy Safe Roads and Communities Working Committee.

In Manitoba, the Provincial Road Safety Committee developed a zero-fatality road safety plan which adopts a Safe System approach and aligns with RSS 2025. The Safe System approach focuses on designing infrastructure that is forgiving of mistakes and protects vulnerable road users. To do this, road authorities are required to ensure that speed limits are safe and managed so that other parts of the system work as intended. Public education is a key plank of doing this.

5 M unic ipal U ptake

At the local level, a handful of municipalities in Ontario have Vision Zero plans.

- In 2017, the City of London formally adopted the Vision Zero principles of: no loss of life is acceptable; traffic fatalities and serious injuries are preventable; all road users make mistakes and are physically vulnerable when involved in motor vehicle collisions; and the elimination of fatalities and serious injuries is a shared responsibility between road users and those who design and maintain roadways.
- Similarly, the City of Toronto adopted its plan in 2017. The five-year action plan (2017-2021) has over 50 safety measures across six emphasis areas, and intends to prioritize the safety of the most vulnerable road users through a range of initiatives. The plan pledges to improve safety by using a data-driven and targeted approach, focusing on the locations where improvements are most needed.
- Other municipalities such as Kingston, Montreal, Mississauga, and Peel Region have pledged to adopt Vision Zero and are currently in the process of creating their plans.

New York City remains the highest profile local government to have wholeheartedly embraced Vision Zero. Mayor Bill de Blasio, who was elected in 2014, campaigned on Vision Zero. A plan was developed at the beginning of the mayor’s first term and $1.6-billion was allocated to it. The effort aims to use legislation, enforcement, education, and engineering to change behavior and make streets safer. The city’s efforts have paid off. Pedestrian deaths have fallen by 44 per cent since 2014 and overall traffic
fatalities are down by 27 per cent. The first half of 2018 has seen the fewest traffic-related fatalities in any six-month period ever measured.

6 Next Steps

OGRA is calling on the Government of Ontario to strike a working group to examine how a Vision Zero road safety approach could be implemented in Ontario. The examples provided by British Columbia and Manitoba provide a road map for what is possible.

7 Recommendations

*That the Minister of Transportation convene a stakeholder task force group to advise the government on how a Vision Zero strategy can be developed and deployed in Ontario.*
A majority of Ontarians say improving road safety is an important priority for them; seven in ten say they would support or somewhat support investing a greater share of tax dollars in road safety

OGRA Survey Summary

submitted by Nanos to Ontario Good Roads Association, November 2018
(Submission 2018-1316)
A majority of Ontarians say road safety is an important or somewhat important priority for them and seven in ten say they would support or somewhat support investing a greater share of tax dollars in road safety. Close to three in four Ontarians report the top way they use roads is as a driver of a vehicle.

- **Nine in ten Ontarians say improving road safety is an important or somewhat important priority for them** – A comfortable majority of Ontarians say improving road safety is an important (73%) or somewhat important (19%) priority for them, while under one in ten say it is an unimportant (four per cent) or somewhat unimportant (three per cent) priority for them. One per cent are unsure.

- **Ontarians most frequently say that roads in Ontario today are safer or somewhat safer than 10 years ago** – Asked their impression of current road safety compared to 10 years ago, Ontarians most frequently say that roads in Ontario today are safer (19%) or somewhat safer (28%) than 10 years ago, which is consistent with the findings of the 2017 study (22% safer, 27% somewhat safer). Over four in ten Ontarians say that roads in Ontario today are less safe (34%) or somewhat less safe (11%) than they were 10 years ago. Nine per cent are unsure.

- **Ontarians most frequently say adding bike lanes, paved shoulder and widening roads is needed to make roads safer** – Asked what they feel should be done to make roads safer for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians, Ontarians most frequently say add bike lanes and paved shoulders, widen roads (16%), followed by better enforcement and stricter rules or better road maintenance (15% each), more education (13%), reduce traffic and improve public transit (nine per cent) and reduce speed limits (five per cent). Twelve per cent are unsure.
Summary

70 per cent of Ontarians say they support or somewhat support investing a greater share of tax dollars in road safety.

• **Ontarians most frequently say the provincial government and road users should be responsible for ensuring that roads are safe** – Asked who should be most responsible for ensuring that roads are safe, close to three in ten Ontarians (29%) say the provincial government should be most responsible, while over one in four (27%) say road users such as drivers, pedestrians and cyclists should be most responsible for ensuring road safety, followed by the municipal government (18%), the police (13%), everyone (10%) and the federal government (one per cent). Three per cent are unsure.

• **A majority of Ontarians support or somewhat support investing a greater share of tax dollars in road safety** – Seven in ten Ontarians say they support (40%) or somewhat support (30%) investing a greater share of tax dollars in road safety, while close to one in four Ontarians say they oppose (17%) or somewhat oppose (seven per cent) this. Six per cent are unsure.

• **Ontarians are split on whether or not they would feel comfortable to allow a child to bike to school** – Just over half of Ontarians say they would be comfortable (29%) or somewhat comfortable (22%) allowing a child to bike to school, while over four in ten say they would be not comfortable (32%) or somewhat not comfortable (11%) to allow a child to bike to school. Six per cent are unsure.
Ontarians that say they would not be comfortable to allow a child to bike to school most often mention it is because roads are not safe, there is no infrastructure and there is too much traffic. Asked the reason for their comfort level to allow a child to bike to school, Ontarians that say they feel comfortable to do so most often mention it is because of conditions in the area or distance from school (24%) and roads are safe and have needed infrastructure (21%), while Ontarians that reported they would not be comfortable to allow a child to bike to school most often say it is because roads are not safe, there is no infrastructure and too much traffic (46%) and because of careless or unsafe drivers (30%).

Ontarians most frequently report using the road network in their community as a driver of a vehicle. Asked to rank the top two ways they personally use the road network in their community, close to three in four Ontarians (74%) report the first ranked way they use the road network in their community is as a driver of a vehicle, followed by as a transit user (eight per cent) and as a passenger in another vehicle or as a pedestrian (seven per cent each).

Nanos conducted an RDD dual frame (land- and cell-lines) random telephone survey of 501 Ontarians, 18 years of age or older, between October 22nd and 28th, 2018 as part of an omnibus survey. The margin of error for a random survey of 501 Ontarians is ±4.4 percentage points, 19 times out of 20.

This study was commissioned by the Ontario Good Roads Association and the research was conducted by Nanos Research.
Importance of improving road safety

Source: Nanos Research, RDD dual frame random telephone survey, October 22nd to 28th, 2018, n=501 accurate 4.4 percentage points plus or minus, 19 times out of 20.

**Net Score**

- Important: 73%
- Somewhat important: 19%
- Somewhat unimportant: 3%
- Unimportant: 4%
- Unsure: 1%

**Subgroups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>Important/Somewhat important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GTA (n=262)</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Ontario (n=239)</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (n=245)</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (n=256)</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 29 (n=77)</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 39 (n=64)</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 49 (n=86)</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 59 (n=101)</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 plus (n=173)</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Weighted to the true population proportion.

*Note: Charts may not add up to 100 due to rounding

**QUESTION** – Is improving road safety an important, somewhat important, somewhat unimportant or unimportant priority for you personally?
Change in Ontario road safety in the last ten years

Source: Nanos Research, RDD dual frame random telephone survey, October 22\textsuperscript{nd} to 28\textsuperscript{th}, 2018, n=501 accurate 4.4 percentage points plus or minus, 19 times out of 20.
Source: Nanos Research, RDD dual frame random telephone survey, January 25\textsuperscript{th} to February 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2017, n=500, accurate 4.4 percentage points plus or minus, 19 times out of 20.

*Note: Charts may not add up to 100 due to rounding

QUESTION – Would you say that roads in Ontario today are safer, somewhat safer, somewhat less safe or less safe than 10 years ago? [TRACKING]
Change in Ontario road safety in the last ten years

Source: Nanos Research, RDD dual frame random telephone survey, October 22nd to 28th, 2018, n=501 accurate 4.4 percentage points plus or minus, 19 times out of 20.

Net Score

+2.6

Unsure 9%

Safer 19%

Less safe 34%

Somewhat safer 28%

Somewhat less safe 11%

QUESTION – Would you say that roads in Ontario today are safer, somewhat safer, somewhat less safe or less safe than 10 years ago? [TRACKING]

Subgroups | Safer/ Somewhat safer
--- | ---
GTA (n=262) | 45.3%
Rest of Ontario (n=239) | 48.7%
Male (n=245) | 48.7%
Female (n=256) | 45.5%
18 to 29 (n=77) | 57.3%
30 to 39 (n=64) | 58.5%
40 to 49 (n=86) | 38.6%
50 to 59 (n=101) | 42.6%
60 plus (n=173) | 42.0%

*Note: Charts may not add up to 100 due to rounding

*Weighted to the true population proportion.
# Top actions to make roads safer

Source: Nanos Research, RDD dual frame random telephone survey, October 22nd to 28th, 2018, n=501 accurate 4.4 percentage points plus or minus, 19 times out of 20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top mentions</th>
<th>Frequency (n=501)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add bike lanes and paved shoulders, widen roads</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better enforcement and stricter rules</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better road maintenance</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More education</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce traffic and improve public transit</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce speed limit</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better road signs and more traffic lights</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUESTION** – What do you feel should be done to make roads safer for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians? [OPEN]
Responsibility for ensuring road safety

Source: Nanos Research, RDD dual frame random telephone survey, October 22nd to 28th, 2018, n=501 accurate 4.4 percentage points plus or minus, 19 times out of 20.

*Note: Charts may not add up to 100 due to rounding

QUESTION – Who should be most responsible for ensuring that roads are safe? [RANDOMIZE]
Increased invest of tax dollars in road safety

Source: Nanos Research, RDD dual frame random telephone survey, October 22nd to 28th, 2018, n=501 accurate 4.4 percentage points plus or minus, 19 times out of 20.

*Note: Charts may not add up to 100 due to rounding

**Net Score**

- **Support** 40%
- **Somewhat support** 30%
- **Oppose** 17%
- **Somewhat oppose** 7%
- **Unsure** 6%

**Net Score** +45.5

**Subgroups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>Support/Somewhat support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GTA (n=262)</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Ontario (n=239)</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (n=245)</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (n=256)</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 29 (n=77)</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 39 (n=64)</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 49 (n=86)</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 59 (n=101)</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 plus (n=173)</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Weighted to the true population proportion.

**QUESTION** – Would you support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose, or oppose investing a greater share of tax dollars in road safety?
Allowing a child to bike to school

Source: Nanos Research, RDD dual frame random telephone survey, October 22nd to 28th, 2018, n=501 accurate 4.4 percentage points plus or minus, 19 times out of 20.

**Net Score**

- **Comfortable**: 29%
- **Somewhat comfortable**: 22%
- **Somewhat not comfortable**: 11%
- **Not comfortable**: 32%
- **Unsure**: 6%

**QUESTION** – Would you be comfortable, somewhat comfortable, somewhat not comfortable or not comfortable to allow a child to bike to school?

**Subgroups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>Comfortable/Somewhat comfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GTA (n=262)</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Ontario (n=239)</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (n=245)</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (n=256)</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 29 (n=77)</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 39 (n=64)</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 49 (n=86)</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 59 (n=101)</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 plus (n=173)</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Weighted to the true population proportion.

*Note: Charts may not add up to 100 due to rounding*
### Top reasons for comfort level in allowing a child to bike to school

*Source: Nanos Research, RDD dual frame random telephone survey, October 22nd to 28th, 2018, n=500 accurate 4.4 percentage points plus or minus, 19 times out of 20.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top reasons</th>
<th>Comfortable (n=143)</th>
<th>Somewhat comfortable (n=109)</th>
<th>Somewhat not comfortable (n=54)</th>
<th>Not comfortable (n=162)</th>
<th>Unsure (n=30)</th>
<th>Total (n=500)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roads are not safe, no infrastructure and too much traffic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions in the area or distance from school</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careless or unsafe drivers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, young children lack good judgement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads are safe and have needed infrastructure</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good for child because they exercise and learn independence</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child has been taught road safety</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUESTION** – Why do you feel that way? [OPEN]
## Personal use of local road network

Source: Nanos Research, RDD dual frame random telephone survey, October 22nd to 28th, 2018, n=501 accurate 4.4 percentage points plus or minus, 19 times out of 20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role in the Community</th>
<th>Ranked first (n=501)</th>
<th>Ranked second (n=459)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a driver of a vehicle</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a transit user</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a passenger in another vehicle</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a pedestrian</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a cyclist</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUESTION** – From the following, please rank the top 2 ways that you personally use the road network in your community? [RANDOMIZE]