

Type of Decision									
Meeting Date	Tuesday, Jan. 23, 2018				Report Date	Wednesday, January 2, 2018			
Decision Required		Yes	x	No	Priority	X	High		Low
Direction		Information Only		x	Type of Meeting	X	Open		Closed
Clerk's - Report #23/01/18/801- A									

Subject: County meeting – Algonquin Trail – January 18, 2018

1. Attended by Crystal and Melinda. The following is a brief summary.
2. The introduction was quite similar to information that council will find/has found in the presentation Tuesday evening.
3. The acquisition is proceeding on a piece by piece basis as clear title is determined as per the abandoned rail policy of the county dated 1997.
 - a. The trail will not be transferred in one contiguous piece as was first desired.
 - b. CP didn't want to deal with individual municipalities so the partnership was formed.
 - c. Amendment from previous reports – HCM's section is approximately 50.43 km and not 35 as outlined in a previous map.
4. The main purpose of the meeting was to discuss the application of funds received from various municipalities under the provincial Commuter Cycling project although it has been determined that the goal is to have a multi-use trail. (The question about how cycling trails would not be destroyed by ATVs was not addressed.)
5. A slide outlining the costs per kilometer for various activities based on construction completed in 2017 was presented and explained by Anthony Hobbs of the County Forestry Department.
6. Jason Davis confirmed that the trail will ultimately be signed with 911 signs and potentially mile markers as well for safety and emergency purposes.
 - a. He and Craig Kelley also spoke to how "most get stolen right off the mark" and that others "have been shot up too" when discussing the signage along the K&P Trail.
 - b. Lake and other directional signs are regularly stolen as well.
 - c. Gates get destroyed; locks get cut, not anything new, deal with this on an annual basis.
7. Anthony spoke to the depth of culverts and amount of work required to repair them.

8. They discussed the draft management plan, how the language needed to be strengthened and that a by-law will be passed to increase enforcement abilities. It should be circulated later in February but if anyone had concerns that they should forward them now.
9. They spoke to how the OFSC clubs spend considerable money to improve trails that they lease.
10. The agenda item listed as “motorized vs. non-motorized use” was skipped.
11. At the Q& A section questions were asked about alternate use and alternate trails:
 - a. It was discussed that some municipalities have already passed by-laws that prohibit ATVs and snowmobiles within their communities, on their streets and the county will have to work with individual municipalities to come up with solutions;
 - b. ATVs and snowmobiles – if municipalities don’t want them in certain sections, the county will help with signage and barricades to prevent them from using the trail through those sections.
 - c. When asked what the responsibility of the municipalities was in respect to the maintenance etc. of the alternate routes – we were told to map them out; that the County can’t control the “alternate” routes. That we all have alternate routes, roads, pipeline etc. map it out.
12. Jim Hutton spoke to long term leases for alternate uses supported by a resolution of the county. Costs of alternate routes will be up to each municipality. They will work with lower tiers to determine where, how through committee and council. Yes, this will work. Alternative is to work with the municipalities. They can designate alternate routes – not too far off the rail trail – out and back. Each situation will be different. County Council passed the resolution; details need to be worked out here.
13. Craig – spoke to issues along K&P – plead to group to let them try it, see how it works. There are resolutions to garbage, noise, dust, speed, please let us try. We are working with you; tried to get to each of you over the past year...we are going to open the trail,
14. Dean Sauriol – deadline for suggestions for alternate routes?
 - a. Craig - section not open yet, have discussions started yet?
15. Sue Klatt – encroachment issues
 - a. Craig – don’t know how/what mechanism will work yet; we currently don’t have total ownership, will need to work with municipalities on that.
 - b. Jason – explained the asset transfer agreement and the letter sent to property owners directing them to not assume rail corridor property as the sale was imminent.
 - c. Jim – have an issue on K&P with survey line going through a front porch – each will be different but dealt with in a similar fashion.
 - d. Craig – need to work with setbacks now as a recreational corridor and not railroad.
16. Lauree Armstrong – subdivisions and concern with buffering, storm water management natural drainage to the river, under rail bed...

- a. Craig acknowledged issues, setbacks required, noise abatement walls, fencing etc.
 - b. Jason – long process, won't get a quick answer because everything goes from Direction to committee to County Council for approval/decision.
17. Annette Louis– farmer's fields, same drainage concerns
- a. Craig – may not be able to respond quickly...same process
18. Dan Scissons – you've mentioned new crossings; will they be subject to lease agreements and fees? If you're holding onto the old ones? If not waive our fees.
- a. Will work it out.
19. ? Concerns with safety a trail/road crossings with high volumes
- a. Jason – OFSC lease they have guidelines, high volumes will have gates. Stop signs should be regulation sized not the small trail signs.
 - b. Advance warning signs on roads on 17 and other municipal roads?
 - c. Jason – the cost of signs for us is small, will work with municipalities on costs for sure.
20. Melinda – municipal roads and road allowances – legal ownership if your charging for crossings are you willing to pay leases to cross municipal roads?
- a. Jason – we're not 100% sure yet. What we've seen so far is that the railroad was here first, so they own roads. Those we've transferred show CP ownership transferred to County.
21. Melinda - We have legal opinion that states that the ownership was CP when federal lands but not once regular ownership; revert to municipal roads.
- a. Jason – we don't know yet.
22. Melinda – what about insurance and indemnification where the trail crossed municipally owned roads or unopened road allowances. Our insurer suggests we should be listed as a named insured, is the county prepared to do that.
- a. Craig – this hasn't come up before, we're not sure how to proceed. Can if that's something that's important to you.
23. Melinda – it is important, last year there were two accidents on the trails where they cross municipal roads.
- a. Craig – if they were on the trail, they were trespassing
 - b. Jason – no it was leased to the snowmobile club, your road allowances won't be signed.
24. Jim - Thank you, excellent opportunity to work together with you on an excellent project for many many years to come. We need to look 20-25 years into the future and what it can be.
25. Bob Sweet – We have a long road ahead but it's important to grow for economic development for our area.