MEDIA RELEASE: Friday, April 13, 2012, 4:30 p.m.

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO
PLANNING AND WORKS COMMITTEE
AGENDA

Tuesday, April 17, 2012
8:45 A.M.
Regional Council Chamber
150 Frederick Street, Kitchener, Ontario

1. MOTION TO GO INTO CLOSED SESSION
   a) THAT a closed meeting of the Planning and Works Committee be held on
      Tuesday, April 17, 2012 at 8:30 a.m. in the Waterloo County Room, in
      accordance with Section 239 of the Municipal Act, 2001, for the purposes of
      considering the following subject matters:
         a) proposed or pending acquisition of land in the City of Kitchener
         b) proposed or pending acquisition of land in the City of Kitchener
         c) receiving of advice subject to solicitor-client privilege and potential
            litigation related to a matter before an administrative tribunal

2. MOTION TO RECONVENE IN OPEN SESSION

3. DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST UNDER THE MUNICIPAL
   CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT

4. DELEGATIONS – 9:00 a.m.
   a) E-12-029, Class Environmental Assessment, Recommended Design Concept for
      Fountain Street:
         (Staff Presentation)
         i) Lyn Townsend
         ii) Martin Wiens
         iii) Eamille Aterche
         iv) John Doherty
         v) John Cole & Darlene Patterson
         vi) Tony Waring

5. REPORTS – TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
   DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION
   a) CR-RS-12-019, Authorization to Expropriate Lands (1st Report) for Weber Street West
      Grade Separation and Road Improvements (Phase 2 - Wilhelm Street to Guelph
      Street), in the City of Kitchener

   b) E-12-029, Class Environmental Assessment, Recommended Design Concept for
      Fountain Street – King Street Improvements, Shantz Hill Road to Eagle Street, City of
      Cambridge (staff presentation)
c) Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road Reconstruction, Petersburg, Township of Wilmot - Information Package in advance of Public Consultation Centre

RAPID TRANSIT

d) E-12-051, Region of Waterloo Rapid Transit Project : Hydro One Corridor

TRANSPORTATION

e) E-12-030, 60KM/H Maximum Speed on Fairway Road (Regional Road 53) Between Lackner Boulevard (Regional Road 54) and Zeller Road, City of Kitchener

f) E-12-032, Live Snow Fence Project

g) E-12-049, Regional Road 53 (Fairway Road) Extension

WATER

h) E-12-031.1, Water Efficiency Master Plan Progress, 2007 – 2011

i) E-12-042, Water Research Foundation Proposal for the Development of a Quantitative Microbiological Risk Assessment Model (QMRA)

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL REPORT

j) CA-12-002.1/E-12-017.1, Region of Waterloo International Airport – Program Review 2011-2012

REPORTS – PLANNING, HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

COMMUNITY PLANNING

k) P-12-044, Monthly Report of Development Activity for March 2012

l) P-12-045, Proposed Amendment to the 1995 Regional Official Policies Plan Thomasfield Homes Ltd., Breslau Rural Settlement Area, Township of Woolwich

m) P-12-046, Referral of Deferral No. 3a of the City of Kitchener’s Official Plan to a Current Ontario Municipal Board Appeal

n) P-12-047, Fourth Annual Report of the Laurel Creek Headwaters Environmentally Sensitive Landscape Public Liaison Committee

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

o) P-12-049, Grand River Transit 2012 Fare Change Public Consultation

6. INFORMATION/CORRESPONDENCE

a) Memo from Community Planning re: Update on the Central Transit Corridor Community Building Strategy

7. OTHER BUSINESS

a) Council Enquiries and Requests for Information Tracking List

8. NEXT MEETING – May 8, 2012

9. ADJOURN

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Works Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning and Works Committee</td>
<td>Council Chamber 2nd Floor, Regional Administration Building 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 8, 2012</td>
<td>9:00 A.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 29, 2012</td>
<td>9:00 A.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Council Chamber 2nd Floor, Regional Administration Building 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning, Housing and Community Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed., April 18, 2012</td>
<td>4:00 P.M. – 8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>2012 Transit Fare Change Proposal Public Consultation Centre</td>
<td>Front Lobby - Regional Administration Building 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thur., May 17, 2012</td>
<td>8:00 A.M. – 4:30 P.M.</td>
<td>Stakeholder Forum Sustainable Solutions – A Concept Facility for Soil and Material Management</td>
<td>Holiday Inn 200 Holiday Inn Drive Cambridge, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, May 1, 2012</td>
<td>5:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Notre Dame Drive and Snyder's Road Reconstruction, Petersburg, Township of Wilmot - Information Package in advance of PCC</td>
<td>Rebel Creek Golf Course Meeting Room 1517 Snyder’s Road Petersburg Township of Wilmot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATION:

THAT The Regional Municipality of Waterloo direct and authorize the Regional Solicitor to take the following actions with respect to the expropriation of lands for the reconstruction of Weber Street West between Wilhelm Street and Guelph Street, in the City of Kitchener, in the Region of Waterloo as detailed in report CR-RS-12-019 dated April 17, 2012:

1. Complete application(s) to the Council of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, as may be required from time to time, for approval to expropriate land, which is required for the reconstruction of Weber Street and described as follows:

Fee Simple Partial Taking:

1. Part of Lot 8, Plan 373 being Parts 4 and 5 on 58R-17416, City of Kitchener, PIN 22332-0021 (LT) (306 Guelph Street, Kitchener);
2. Part of Lot 8, Plan 373 being Part 6 on 58R-17416, City of Kitchener, PIN 22325-0009 (LT) (307 Guelph Street, Kitchener);
3. Part of Lot 8 Plan 373 being Part 11 on 58R-17416, City of Kitchener, PIN 22326-0174 (LT) (26 Blucher Street, Kitchener);
4. Part of Lot 8, Plan 373 being Part 2 on 58R-17416, City of Kitchener, PIN 22332-0019 (LT) (340 Weber Street West, Kitchener);
5. Part of Lot 8, Plan 373 being Part 10 on 58R-17416, City of Kitchener, PIN 22326-0175 (LT) (311 Weber Street West, Kitchener);
6. Part Lot 8, Plan 373 being Part 9 on 58R-17416, City of Kitchener, PIN 22326-0176 (LT) (315 Weber Street West, Kitchener);
7. Part of Lot 8, Plan 373 being Part 8 on 58R-17416, City of Kitchener, PIN 22326-0177 (LT) (319 Weber Street West, Kitchener);
8. Part of Lot 8, Plan 373, being Part 3 on 58R-17416, City of Kitchener, PIN 22332-0020 (LT) (336 Weber Street West, Kitchener);
9. Part of Lot 8 Plan 373, being Part 7 on 58R-17416, City of Kitchener, PIN 22326-0167 (LT) (295 Guelph Street, Kitchener); and


Fee Simple Full Taking:

1. Part Lot 17, Plan 131, City of Kitchener, PIN 22326-0203 (LT) (225-227 Weber Street W, Kitchener);

2. Part Lot 20, Plan 131, City of Kitchener, PIN 22326-0198 (LT) (249 Weber Street West, Kitchener);

3. Lot 24, Plan 131, City of Kitchener, PIN 22326-0193 (LT) (269 Weber St W, Kitchener);

4. Part Lot 8, Plan 373, City of Kitchener, PIN 22331-0095 (LT) (296 Guelph Street, Kitchener);

5. Part Lot 8, Plan 373, City of Kitchener, PIN 22331-0100 (LT) (357 Weber Street West, Kitchener);

6. Part Lot 28-29, Plan 131, City of Kitchener, PIN 22326-0182 (LT) (281 Weber Street West, Kitchener);

7. Part Lot 8, Plan 373, City of Kitchener, PIN 22331-0096 (LT) (341 Weber Street West, Kitchener);

8. Part Lot 8, Plan 373, City of Kitchener, PIN 22331-0097 (LT) (345 Weber Street West, Kitchener);

9. Part Lot 8, Plan 373, City of Kitchener, PIN 22331-0098 (LT) (349 Weber Street West, Kitchener); and

10. Part Lot 8, Plan 373, City of Kitchener, PIN 22331-0099 (LT) (353 Weber Street West, Kitchener).

2. Serve notices of the above application(s) required by the Expropriations Act;

3. Forward to the Chief Inquiry Office any requests for a hearing that may be received;

4. Attend, with appropriate Regional staff, at any hearing that may be scheduled;

5. Discontinue expropriation proceedings or any part thereof, in respect of the above described lands, or any part thereof, upon the registration on title of the required documentation to complete a transaction whereby the required interests in the lands are conveyed; and

6. Do all things necessary and proper to be done, and report thereon to Regional Council in due course.

SUMMARY: NIL
REPORT:

Regional Council approved the reconstruction of the Weber Street West (Regional Road 8) corridor from College Street to Guelph Street and grade separation of Weber Street at the CN Railway Tracks (GEXR), in the City of Kitchener (the “Project”). The Environmental Assessment was approved by Council in June 2011 and by the Ministry of Environment in August 2011. This study investigated the need to widen Weber Street West from 2 lanes to 4 lanes and looked at the need for a grade separation at the CN Railway Tracks (GEXR).

The detailed design of the project is presently underway. Construction will be undertaken in two phases. Phase 1 from College Street northerly to Wilhelm Street, including the grade separation, will be constructed in 2013/2014. Phase 2 from Wilhelm Street north to Guelph Street, will be constructed in 2014. Funding for both phases of the project is shown in the Region’s 2012 ten year Transportation Capital Program. Regional staff are presently in the process of acquiring all required lands for both phases of the project which, for Phase 2 entails either full buyouts or partial takings from 20 properties. To date, negotiations are on-going with one transaction fully completed. Any transactions which have not been completed have been included in this 1st Report to authorize expropriation of the required lands. Should a negotiated settlement be reached with any of the property owners and a conveyance of the required acquisition be completed before the expropriation process is complete, the expropriation process will be discontinued by the Regional Solicitor in respect of such property(ies).

All of the affected property owners, or their representatives, have been contacted by Legal Services Real Estate staff by one or more of the following means: in-person meeting, telephone, written correspondence and/or email, to discuss the required land acquisitions and all have been informed of the Region’s intention to proceed with the expropriation process, including this Report going forward, to ensure project time lines are met. All property owners have been provided with the Region’s Expropriation Information Sheet explaining the expropriation process. A copy of the Expropriation Information Sheet is attached as Appendix “B”. The owners have further been advised it is the Region’s intent to seek a negotiated settlement prior to completion of the Expropriation process and that the process has been commenced only to ensure possession of the required lands by the date set by Project staff in order to meet the project timeline.

The expropriation of the lands is on an “as is” basis and upon acquisition the Region assumes all responsibility for the lands.

The Project Area is shown attached as Appendix “A”.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

One of the focus areas of the Corporate Strategic Plan is to develop greater, more sustainable and safe transportation choices.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Transportation and Environmental Services staff advises that the 2012 Transportation Capital Program includes $10,500,000 in 2012 for this project to be funded from the Development Charges and Roads Capital Levy Reserve Funds.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Transportation and Environmental Services staff have been consulted in the preparation of this Report.
ATTACHMENTS

Appendix “A” – Project Area
Appendix “B” – Copy of Expropriation Information Sheet

PREPARED BY:  Tom Penwarden, Manager, Real Estate Services
                Fiona McCrea, Solicitor, Property

APPROVED BY:  Kris Fletcher, Acting Commissioner, Corporate Resources
                Debra Arnold, Regional Solicitor, Director of Legal Services
Appendix “A”

Phase 1 of Weber St W Project College St to Wilhelm St.

Phase 2 of Weber St W Project Wilhelm St to Guelph St.
The following information is provided as a general overview of the expropriation process and is not legal advice. For complete information, reference should be made to the Ontario Expropriations Act as well as the more detailed information in the Notices provided under that Act.

Expropriation Information Sheet

What is Expropriation?

Governmental authorities such as municipalities, school boards, and the provincial and federal governments undertake many projects which require them to obtain land from private property owners. In the case of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, projects such as the construction or improvement of Regional Roads sometimes require the purchase of land from private property owners. In many cases, the Region of Waterloo only needs a small portion of the private property owner’s lands or an easement for related purposes such as utilities, although in certain instances, entire properties are required.

Usually the governmental authority is able to buy the land required for a project through a negotiated process with the affected property owners. Sometimes, however, the expropriation process must be used in order to ensure that the land is obtained within a specific timeline. Put simply, an expropriation is the transfer of lands or an easement to a governmental authority for reasonable compensation, including payment of fair market value for the transferred lands, without the consent of the property owner being required. In the case of expropriations by municipalities such as the Region of Waterloo, the process set out in the Ontario Expropriations Act must be followed to ensure that the rights of the property owners provided under that Act are protected.

IMPORTANT NOTE: The Region of Waterloo tries in all instances to obtain lands needed for its projects through a negotiated agreement on mutually acceptable terms. Sometimes, the Region of Waterloo will start the expropriation process while negotiations are underway. This dual approach is necessary to ensure that the Region of Waterloo will have possession of all of the lands needed to start a construction project on schedule. However, it is important to note that Regional staff continues to make every effort to reach a negotiated purchase of the required lands on mutually agreeable terms while the expropriation process is ongoing. If agreement is reached, expropriation proceedings can be discontinued and the land transferred to the Region of Waterloo in exchange for payment of the agreed-upon compensation.

What is the process of the Region of Waterloo under the Expropriations Act?

- Regional Council considers a request to begin an application under the Expropriations Act to obtain land and/or an easement for a specific Regional project. No decision is made at this meeting to expropriate the
land. This step is simply direction for the Region of Waterloo to provide a “Notice of Application for Approval to Expropriate” to affected property owners that the process has started to seek approval to expropriate the land.

- As stated in the Notice, affected property owners have 30 days to request a Hearing to consider whether the requested expropriation is “fair, sound and reasonably necessary in the achievement of the objectives” of the Region of Waterloo. This Hearing is conducted by a provincially-appointed Inquiry Officer. Prior to the Hearing, the Region of Waterloo must serve the property owner with a Notice setting out its reasons or grounds for the proposed expropriation. **Compensation for lands is not determined at this Hearing.** The Inquiry Officer can order the Region of Waterloo to pay the property owner up to $200.00 as compensation for the property owner’s costs in participating in this Hearing, regardless of the outcome of the Hearing.

- If a Hearing is held, a written report is provided by the Inquiry Officer to the property owner and the Region of Waterloo. Council must consider the Report within 90 days of receiving it. The Report is not binding on Council and Council may or may not accept the findings of the Report. After consideration of the Report, Council may or may not approve the expropriation of the land or grant approval with modifications. A property owner may wish to make written and/or verbal submissions to Council at the time that it is considering the Report.

- If no Hearing is requested by the property owner, then Council may approve the expropriation of the land after expiry of a 30 day period following service of the Notice of Application for Approval to Expropriate.

- If Council approves the expropriation then, within 3 months of this approval, the Region of Waterloo must register a Plan at the Land Registry Office that describes the expropriated lands. The registration of this Plan automatically transfers title of the lands to the Region of Waterloo, instead of by a Deed signed by the property owner.

- Within 30 days of registration of the Plan, the Region of Waterloo must serve a Notice of Expropriation on the affected property owner advising of the expropriation. Within 30 days of this Notice, the property owner may serve the Region of Waterloo with a Notice of Election selecting the valuation date under the *Expropriations Act* for calculation of the compensation.

- In order to obtain possession of the expropriated lands, the Region of Waterloo must also serve a Notice of Possession setting out the date that possession of the land is required by the Region of Waterloo. This date has to be 3 months or more from the date that this Notice of Possession is served on the affected property owner.

- Within 3 months of registration of the Plan, the Region of Waterloo must provide the affected property owner with payment for the full amount of the appraised fair market value of the expropriated land or easement and a copy of the appraisal report on which the value is based. If the property owner disagrees with this amount, and/or claims other compensation and/or costs under the *Expropriations Act*, the compensation and/or costs matter may be referred to a provincially-appointed Board of Negotiation in an effort to reach a mediated settlement and/or an appeal may be made to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) for a decision. In any event, the Region of Waterloo continues in its efforts to reach a negotiated settlement with the affected property owner prior to the OMB making a decision.
REGION OF WATERLOO
TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
Design and Construction

TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
DATE: April 17, 2012
FILE CODE: T04-20, 5337

SUBJECT: CLASS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, RECOMMENDED DESIGN CONCEPT FOR FOUNTAIN STREET – KING STREET IMPROVEMENTS, SHANTZ HILL ROAD TO EAGLE STREET, CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to the Class Environmental Assessment for Fountain Street – King Street Improvements, Shantz Hill Road to Eagle Street, City of Cambridge:

a) Approve the implementation of a realigned intersection at Fountain Street/Shantz Hill Road, conventional intersection improvements at King Street/Fountain Street and at King Street/Eagle Street, and other road improvements in the City of Cambridge as presented as Recommended Design Concept 3A in Report E-12-029.

b) Direct staff to file the Notice of Completion for this Class Environmental Assessment by means of advertisements in the local newspapers and mailings to the adjacent property owners, tenants, and agencies and place the Environmental Study Report on the public record for a period of 30 days.

c) Amend the Consulting Services Agreement with Stantec Consulting Ltd. (Stantec) of Kitchener, Ontario to authorize an increase of $307,200 to the upset limit fee for the detailed design phase for this project with contract administration and construction inspection to be paid on a time basis.

d) Direct staff to commence a Class Environmental Assessment Study, in conjunction with the City of Cambridge, to explore the feasibility of an off-road multi-use trail with new pedestrian/cycling bridge across the Speed River and trail connection from Fountain Street South to the City of Cambridge Linear Trail.

SUMMARY:

The Region of Waterloo is undertaking a Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) Study to consider road improvements on Fountain Street from Shantz Hill Road to King Street and on King Street from Fountain Street to Eagle Street in the City of Cambridge. The Fountain Street – King Street Class Environmental Assessment was initiated to examine traffic congestion and higher than expected collisions on the Fountain Street – King Street corridor. The project limits are indicated in Appendix A – Key Plan. The Class EA Study is being guided by a Project Team consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo and the City of Cambridge; Regional Councillor Jane Brewer and City of Cambridge Councillors Donna Reid and Karl Kiefer.

There was extensive public involvement, which included two Public Consultation Centres, one Public Input Meeting, two presentations to City of Cambridge Council, and presentations to the Region of Waterloo Heritage Planning Advisory Committee (HPAC), the Regional Cycling Advisory Committee, the City of Cambridge Public Works Committee, and the City of Cambridge Planning and Works Committee.
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Committee (RCAC) and the City of Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC). This Class EA approach involved the development, presentation, and evaluation of nine alternative solutions and seven alternative design concepts.

With the exception of the “Do-Nothing” alternative, the seven alternative design concepts consisted of various combinations of intersection improvements, local widening or addition of through lanes where required, active transit priority features, sidewalks and consideration of on-road cycling lanes or multi-use trails.

In February, 2011, staff presented a Recommended Design Concept which included a roundabout at the Fountain Street/King Street intersection. In response to concerns expressed by delegations, the Committee deferred a decision on the recommendation and referred the matter back to staff to address concerns expressed by the delegations. Staff investigated the concerns, obtained additional information, and then developed and assessed modifications to two of the Alternative Design Concepts to address concerns of large impacts on existing and potential business properties. After comparing these 2 modified Design Concepts to the other Design Concepts developed for this Class EA, a majority of the Project Team concluded that new Design Concept 3A was the best solution for this project.

Design Concept (3A) consists of a realigned intersection at Fountain Street/Shantz Hill Road and conventional intersection improvements at King Street/Fountain Street and at King Street/Eagle Street. Implementing Design Concept 3A would reduce delays for vehicles and would greatly reduce delays for transit vehicles. Concept 3A would provide operational improvements that will lead to reductions in the expected collisions at several locations. Design Concept 3A would provide cycling facilities via a multi-use trail connection on Fountain Street from Shantz Hill Road to King Street and on King Street from Eagle Street to Fountain Street to provide connections to the City's Riverside Park and the Linear Park facilities.

In developing Design Concept 3A, staff reassessed the value of providing on-road cycling facilities within project limits and concluded that severely constrained road allowances significantly impair the Regions ability to provide on-road cycling facilities on both Fountain Street and King Street within and beyond the project limits. In recognition of this staff are recommending that the Region commence a Class Environmental Assessment Study, in conjunction with the City of Cambridge, to explore the feasibility of an off-road multi-use trail with new pedestrian bridge across the Speed River and trail connection from Fountain Street South to the City of Cambridge Linear Trail.

As a result of the large increase in project scope and the long delay in moving forward with this Class EA Study, the region’s consultant for the project, Stantec, submitted a detailed work plan for completing the design phase of the project, together with a request for additional fees. After thoroughly reviewing Stantec's work plan, staff has negotiated a $307,200 increase to Stantec's upset fee as a fair and reasonable amount for consulting services require to complete the design phase of this project. Staff is therefore recommending that the existing consulting services agreement with Stantec be amended to authorize a $307,200 increase to the upset fee for Stantec to complete the design phase of project. The 2012 Transportation Capital Budget includes sufficient funds in 2012 to accommodate this increase in consulting fees.

Design Concept 3A is estimated to cost $13 million - $14 million and is scheduled for construction in 2015 as per the Region's Ten year Transportation Capital Plan.
REPORT:

1. Background

1.1 Existing and Future Conditions

The Fountain Street – King Street corridor functions as a significant link between two heavily used arterial roads crossing Highway 401: Fountain Street North and Shantz Hill Road. There are three signalized intersections within the study area: Shantz Hill Road at Fountain Street; Fountain Street at King Street; and King Street at Eagle Street. These intersections experience traffic congestion and delays, and this congestion is projected to increase in the future as planned developments in north and west Cambridge are completed. Of these three signalized intersections, only Fountain Street at King Street was identified as having higher than expected numbers of vehicular collisions.

Collision and traffic safety assessments, summarized in Appendix B - Summary of Collisions and Traffic Safety Assessment, identify the intersection of Fountain Street and King Street as the 2nd worst ranked intersection in 2010 for higher than expected collisions. Much higher than expected collisions are also identified at all mid-block sections with the exception of King Street between Chopin Drive and Eagle Street. These mid-block collisions are associated with unexpected stops for queues, left-turns, and weaving/lane-changing.

Fountain Street, King Street, and Eagle Street have been identified in the Regional Cycling Master Plan as core on-road cycling routes. Currently, no dedicated cycling facilities exist on these roads. As such there is a need to address and improve cycling facilities through the corridor. The corridor also has discontinuous stretches of sidewalk along Fountain Street and King Street, and improvements are required to facilitate pedestrian movement through and beyond the study area.

The need for traffic capacity improvements through the corridor has previously been identified in a number of Cambridge area traffic and transportation studies, including: Cambridge Area Routes Selection Study (2000); Detailed Transportation Network Review (2004); and Regional Transportation Master Plan (2010). The 2010 Regional Transportation Master Plan identified the need for "Enhanced Transit" through the King Street – Fountain Street – Shantz Hill Road corridor; confirming a clear need to improve public transit operations within the study limits.

1.2 Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

As a result of the existing traffic conditions, collision history, projected growth and existing deficiencies in pedestrian, cycling and transit facilities, the Region of Waterloo is undertaking a Schedule “C” Class Environmental Assessment Study to consider road improvements on Fountain Street from Shantz Hill Road to King Street and on King Street from Fountain Street to Eagle Street, to improve the movement of people through the study area to a horizon year of 2023. In January 2005, Council approved the recommendation of Report E-05-004, to hire Stantec Consulting Ltd. (Stantec) to provide engineering services for the Class EA, detailed design, contract administration and construction inspection for this project. This study is being guided by a Project Team consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo, and the City of Cambridge, Regional Councillor Jane Brewer and City of Cambridge Councillors Donna Reid and Karl Kiefer.
1.3 Solutions and Design Concepts Developed by the Project Team

The Project Team developed nine Alternative Solutions to address the congestion and safety problems and the deficient cycling and pedestrian facilities. These Alternative Solutions were “high-level” and included “Do Nothing,” road improvements within the study limits as well as consideration of adding road capacity/ new roads outside of the study area. Please refer to Appendix C for a complete listing of the Alternative Solutions developed for this project. The Project Team evaluated the Alternative Solutions in terms of their abilities to address the transportation needs of this study to determine which solutions, singularly or in combination with other solutions, best address the problems for this project.

The study area has significant constraints which limit the range of transportation improvements that can be accomplished. Constraints include the location of numerous heritage resources, steep slopes abutting the right-of-way, and the Speed River/Regional Flood Plain. Additionally, due to capacity constraints in the transportation network adjacent to the study limits, the potential of the project to create significant corridor capacity improvements is limited. Based on these constraints, the Project Team concluded that only intersection improvements and minor road widenings would be viable solutions for this Class EA Study.

The Project Team then developed a set of seven Alternative Design Concepts for the Intersection Improvement Solution, (including “Do-Nothing”) for further review and assessment. Please refer to Appendix D for detailed descriptions and plans illustrating the details of proposed intersection improvements for all seven Alternative Design Concepts.

1.4 Public Consultation and Initial Project Team Recommendation

There has been extensive public consultation conducted as part of this Class EA study, including two Public Consultation Centres, a Public Input Meeting before Regional Council and various other meetings with City of Cambridge Council, both the local and Regional Heritage Advisory Committees, the Regional Cycling Advisory Committee and individual property owners. Please refer to Appendix E for a complete listing of public consultation meetings, comments received and Project Team responses.

Based on all the public input received and the technical assessments conducted, the Project Team initially identified Design Concept 6 (realigned intersection at Fountain Street/Shantz Hill Road, roundabout at Fountain Street/King Street and conventional intersection improvements at King Street/Eagle Street) as the Recommended Design Concept. The Recommended Design Concept 6 was presented to the Region of Waterloo Planning and Works Committee on February 15, 2011. At the February 15, 2011 meeting, a number of delegations were received that expressed concerns regarding the Recommended Design Concept. Most of the delegations expressed concerns about the negative impacts on private properties, including adverse impacts to existing businesses and potential future land uses associated with Recommended Design Concept 6. The Committee deferred a decision and referred the matter back to staff to address the concerns expressed by the delegations and then to report back to Committee.
2. Public Concerns Raised at the Planning and Works Committee
   February 15, 2011

To address property owners and delegations’ concerns, staff met with some of the delegations to identify the full extent of their concerns. The concerns of the delegations and responses by the Project Team to those concerns are summarized below:

2.1 John Doherty, Representing 255 King Street Inc./Faisal Susiwala:

John Doherty gave a brief overview of the property at the north-east corner of the King/Fountain intersection and his client’s development plan for a major hotel and convention centre at this location, and the adverse impacts of the proposed roundabout to his client’s proposed development. He advised that too much of the land would be taken to widen King Street and Fountain Streets to build a roundabout, the property’s street access would be reduced, and as a result, the development planned for the land would not be feasible. He said that Design Concept 2, which does not include a roundabout, would be preferable and proposed that if a roundabout should be built, it should be shifted farther away from his client’s property.

Project Team Response to Mr. Susiwala’s Concerns:

Project staff met with the property owner, Faisal Susiwala and his Consultant, Victor Labreche, to hear the concerns in more detail and to discuss potential impacts to his property of the various Design Concepts. Mr. Susiwala advised that the portion of the property required for a roundabout would directly and adversely impact his intended building envelope at 255 King Street. Staff noted that the roundabout (Design Concept 6) would provide as good or better street access in comparison to the other Design Concepts such as Design Concept 2 (realigned King-Fountain intersection). Based on a concept sketch provided by Mr. Doherty, the Region prepared a new Design Concept 6A (shifted roundabout), which would reduce by 38% the amount of his client’s land (needed for the roundabout) by moving the intersection away from it; however, moving the roundabout in that way would require relocation of a City of Cambridge sewage pumping station and result in a greatly increased cost, far outweighing the value of the benefits of this change. Staff also prepared a new Design Concept 3A which would reduce the adverse impact on the delegation’s property (by reducing the impact on the intended building envelope) and avoid major impacts on other properties near the King-Fountain intersection. Please refer to Section 3 of this report for additional information on the development and assessment of new Design Concepts 3A and 6A. Staff noted during the discussion that of the total 1286 square metres required of Mr. Susiwala’s property to accommodate Design Concept 3A, 673 square metres of that land is included in the Regional Official Plan, designated road allowance width of Fountain Street and King Street.

2.2 John Doherty Representing Mr. and Mrs. Huntley, the Owners of 246 Fountain Street S. and 275 Abraham Street,

John Doherty questioned the need for sidewalks on both sides of Shantz Hill Road and Fountain Street South. He expressed his clients’ concern with increased public access to the road beside their properties and with the increased landscaping and maintenance for the enlarged boulevard area on Shantz Hill Road. He asked the Committee to defer this project pending further studies.
Project Team Response to Mr. and Mrs. Huntley’s Concerns:

The Region’s Corridor Design Guidelines identify sidewalks on both sides of the road as necessary. New Design Concept 3A would not provide a new sidewalk on the Fountain Street South frontage of the Huntleys’ properties. A new sidewalk is still proposed for the north side of Shantz Hill Road which includes the Huntleys’ frontage. This sidewalk will give pedestrian access for the large residential building owned by Mr. and Mrs. Huntley near the bottom of the hill and several homes at the top of the hill across from Preston Parkway. One owner of a home on Shantz Hill Road requested that the Class EA provide a sidewalk access for his home. The boulevard area on the north side of Shantz Hill Road would be wider than the existing boulevard and it would be landscaped and maintained by the City to the Region’s standards.

2.3 Martin Wiens on Behalf of his Family Who Own Property at 319 Shantz Hill Road:

Martin Wiens, appeared on behalf of his family who own property at 319 Shantz Hill Road. He stated that their property will be adversely impacted due to the proposed realignment and widening of Shantz Hill Road as part of Alternative Design Concept 6 (and also included in Alternative Design Concept 3A). Mr. Weins’ specific concerns were that Design Concept 6 would shorten and steepen his driveways and result in loss of some trees, shrubs and retaining walls and make parking and driveway access to the rear portions of the property more difficult. He also noted that Shantz Hill was not part of the original study.

Project Team Response to Mr. Wiens’ Concerns:

Staff met on-site with Mr. Wiens to discuss his concerns – notably the impacts of the widening of Shantz Hill Road on driveway ramps and parking and how the road widening/property impacts may affect the opportunity for future access to the rear of his property. At the site meeting staff reviewed with Mr. Wiens the various areas of impact and explained potential mitigation options for addressing his concerns. Staff said that they will adjust the design to ensure reasonable driveway grades are provided, restore entrances in useable form and restore landscaping through the detailed design and property negotiation process. Mr. Wiens expressed satisfaction with these commitments by Regional staff. Since meeting with Mr. Wiens, the Design Concepts have all been revised to reduce the adverse impact on 319 Shantz Hill Road.

2.4 Bob McMullen, 258 Hamilton Street, Cambridge, ON:

Bob McMullen’s concerns were with the streetscape and pedestrian impacts of this project. He stated that more pavement and lanes don’t benefit pedestrians and that this project is too automobile focused. He specifically cited the proposed widening of King Street to accommodate a transit queue-jump lane on King Street at Eagle Street and questioned how the queue-jump lane would be terminated.

Project Team Response to Mr. McMullen:

To reduce the pedestrian impact of the proposed widening of King Street at Eagle Street, the Project Team advises that the crosswalks at this location will be realigned such that the overall crossing distances are minimized. In addition, before completing the construction phase of this project, the Region will review the timing of the signals at this location to ensure that they will provide adequate cross-walk times for the wider intersection. Subsequent to the February 15, 2012 Committee meeting, the Project Team revised the exhibits of all Design Concepts to show a taper to end the queue-jump lane between Eagle Street and Dover Street.
3. Re-Assessment of Alternative Design Concepts on the Project Environment

In light of the property impact concerns at the King/Fountain intersection raised by the delegations at the February 15, 2011 Planning and Works Committee meeting and in recognition that the potential property impacts at that location are a major factor in the assessment of the best solution at that intersection, staff undertook an in-depth, comprehensive reassessment of the potential property impacts all of Design Concepts at the King/Fountain intersection. This reassessment fully examined the impacts to the existing businesses and the potential impacts on the future viability of re-developing the vacant property at 255 King Street West. The property impact reassessment took several months to complete and gave the Project Team more comprehensive information to assist in the re-assessment of Alternative Design Concepts for this project.

In order to address adverse impacts on the vacant development property at 255 King Street West, the Project Team developed a modified version of Alternative Design Concept 6, called Design Concept 6A which included a roundabout shifted further onto 115 Fountain Street, and operating as “The Pines.” (Please refer to Alternative Design Concept 6A in Appendix E). The shifted roundabout in Design Concept 6A requires an additional $1.8 million relocation of an existing City of Cambridge sewage pumping station at 100 King Street West and as a result, the shifted roundabout Design Concept 6A was not supported by the Project Team.

The Project Team also developed a new Design Concept 3A that would significantly reduce adverse property impacts at the King/Fountain intersection. New Design Concept 3A is similar to Design Concept 3 in that it consists of conventional intersection improvements including additional through and turning lanes while maintaining traffic signals at the intersection; however, the difference between Design Concept 3A and the original Design Concept 3 is that Design Concept 3A does not include a sidewalk on the west side of Fountain Street between King Street and Shantz Hill Road. In addition, Design Concept 3A does not include on-road cycling lanes on any of the roads within the project limits. The result of these proposed changes is that the total road width at the Fountain Street/King Street intersection is narrower. One benefit of Design Concept 3A is that the narrower road width avoids significant adverse impacts on both “The Pines” property and the existing designated heritage building, formally known as the Del Monte Hotel. The total area of land required from 255 King Street would be reduced by 218 square meters; however, another benefit of Design Concept 3A is it requires much less land acquisition near the Fountain-King intersection than does the roundabout, Design Concept 6. This provides positive benefit to 255 King Street West because it impacts far less severely the proposed building envelope of this proposed development site.

Design Concept 3A includes provision in the boulevard for a 3.0 metre wide multi-use trail on the east side (river side) of Fountain Street and on the north side (Riverside Park side) of King Street; however, the Project Team notes this design concept does not include on-road cycling lanes as per the Region’s Cycling Master Plan. The Cycling Master Plan includes future plans to extend on-road cycling facilities beyond the study limits on Fountain Street north and south of this project; however after comprehensive review beyond the project limits, the Project Team realized that the feasibility of providing a continuous on-road cycling facility beyond the study limits on Fountain Street south of Shantz Hill Road is unfeasible because of severe road allowance and topographic constraints in the area adjacent to the project limits. To explore the viability of providing cycling continuity and connectivity within this area of the city, the Project Team is recommending that a separate Class EA study be undertaken (in consultation with the City of Cambridge) to study the feasibility of an off-road multi-use trail with a new bridge for pedestrians and cyclists across the Speed River. This would provide a connection from King Street and Riverside Park to Fountain Street South near Preston Parkway via Chopin Drive and the City of Cambridge Linear Park Trail. A conceptual sketch is provided in Appendix F.
The City of Cambridge’s staff raised a concern with the potential adverse impact of the project on Heritage properties at 101, 149 and 126 King Street West. The City of Cambridge has requested designation as a protected heritage site of 126 King Street which is owned by P&H Milling. The City’s concern was that all of the Alternative Design Concepts that include a signalized intersection at the Fountain Street/King Street intersection also include greater widening on King Street West compared to the Roundabout Design Concept 6. This widening of King Street would result in the road for Design Concept 3A approximately 1 metre closer to the listed heritage resource buildings at 101 and 149 King Street West than with Design Concept 6. Staff met with City planning and engineering staff and P&H Milling representatives as requested concerning the potential for conflict between the Region’s road widening needs and the P&H Milling plans to demolish and redevelop 126 King Street to improve Mill operations and greatly reduce conflict with King Street traffic resulting from Mill operations.

Since the February 15, 2011 Planning and Works Committee meeting, the Project Team has conducted a full re-evaluation of all the Alternative Design Concepts developed to date, including new Design Concepts 3A and 6A. Please refer to Appendix G for a summary of the full evaluation. After much consideration of how each Alternative Design Concept would address the transportation needs in comparison to their potential environmental impacts, the Project Team determined the two best alternatives are Design Concept 3A and 6. Highlighted in the following table, the Project Team notes the advantages/disadvantages of Design Concept 6 when compared to Design Concept 3A:

Table 1: Alternative Design Concept 3A vs. Alternative Design Concept 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits of Design Concept 3A</th>
<th>Benefits of Design Concept 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66% reduction in delay.</td>
<td>77% reduction in delay, shorter queues at Fountain/King intersection, than 3A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some reduction in injury collisions</td>
<td>Better reduction in injury collisions vs. Concept 3A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some reduction in noise idling/air pollution</td>
<td>Better reduction in noise idling/air pollution vs. Concept 3A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for continuous pedestrian and cycling trail connectivity to existing and proposed facilities</td>
<td>Continuous sidewalks and on-road cycling lanes but limited potential to connect beyond the project limits on Fountain Street South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No “buyouts” of businesses; lowest property requirement of all Design Concepts</td>
<td>Requires “buyout” of 2 businesses and 45% more property than Concept 3A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower impact on development potential of 255 King Street West.</td>
<td>Higher impact on development potential of 255 King Street West.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No removals or alterations of designated or inventoried Heritage buildings and maintains traditional street pattern, but higher impacts on heritage properties on King Street West</td>
<td>No removals or alterations of designated or inventoried Heritage buildings but alters traditional street pattern at Fountain/King.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower total Initial cost = $13.1 M</td>
<td>Higher total Initial cost = $14.9 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Project Team Recommended Design Concept

Based on a review of the technical information gathered for this project, and in consideration of the evaluation of the environmental impacts and benefits/opportunities of the alternatives, as well as a thorough review of all public comments received, a majority of the Project Team members has assessed Alternative Design Concept 3A – Realigned Intersection at Fountain Street/Shantz Hill Road, and Conventional Signalized Intersection Improvements at King Street/Fountain Street and at King Street/Eagle Street, as the Recommended Design Concept for this Class EA Study. It is noted that a full consensus was not reached by the Project Team in identification of the Recommended Design Concept. There was one Project Team member who preferred a Design Concept that would provide continuous sidewalks and cycling lanes on both sides of the corridor. Please see Appendix H - Recommended Design Concept (3A) for a schematic of the Design. During deliberations, the Project team recognized that while the roundabout (Design Concept 6) at Fountain/King would perform better than the traffic signals (Design Concept 3A) from a traffic delay and a safety perspective, it was difficult to justify the significant property impacts associated with the roundabout despite the operational and safety benefits.

The Recommended Design Concept (Concept 3A) would provide much needed operational improvements within the study limits, including a 66% reduction of peak hour delays for motorists in the study area in the 2031 forecast year. The Recommended Design Concept would reduce the number of injury collisions in the corridor as compared to the Do-Nothing Alternative. The Recommended Design Concept includes a realignment of the curve on King Street West between the Speed River Bridge and the Dover Flour Mill. This will enhance safety by increasing the existing horizontal radius and visibility for all users of the roadway.

The Recommended Design Concept includes a raised centre median on King Street at Chopin Drive to prevent left-turns at that location. This median would also restrict one of two driveways at 172 King Street East to right-in and right-out movements. This removal of left turn operations would mitigate the left-turn collisions occurring at this location. The raised centre median would also serve as a mid-block pedestrian refuge and would provide for improved traffic capacity along King Street by reducing “side friction” associated with existing left-turn movements.

Increased active transportation and in particular increased transit use is vital to reduction of congestion in the study area and in the Region’s transportation network. To achieve higher transit use in the Region and in the study area, effective enhancement of transit service is necessary. The Recommended Design Concept provides transit priority at Shantz Hill Road approaching Fountain Street, at King Street eastbound approaching Eagle Street and westbound approaching Fountain Street in the form of queue-jump lanes and signal priority for transit vehicles. These transit enhancements are expected to reduce delay for public transit vehicles in the study area; however, in some cases this will be at the expense of travel delay for other vehicles. More extensive transit priority measures could not be achieved without significant adverse impact on heritage resources and greatly increased property requirements.

Implementing the Recommended Design Concept (3A) would not provide continuous sidewalks and on-road cycling lanes along both sides of Fountain Street and King Street; however sidewalks or multi-use trails would be provided on both sides of all roads within the project limits except on the west (Shantz Hill) side of Fountain Street south of King Street.
The proposed multi-use trail on King Street would connect with existing and proposed facilities on Fountain Street North and in Riverside Park and connect with the Linear Park Trail.

It is recognized that while the Recommended Design Concept would have the least number of property impacts, it would still require significant property at all intersections and would shift the road improvements closer to and in some cases onto Cultural Heritage Properties. Implementing the Recommended Design Concept would not require the full “buyout” of any existing business property.

In conclusion, all members of the Project Team agreed that both Design Concepts 3A and 6 are technically feasible alternatives; however a majority of the Project Team members are recommending Concept 3A as the Recommended Design Concept for this project.

5. **Project Cost**

The capital cost for the Recommended Design Concept 3A is estimated to be in the range of $13 million to $14 million. The final cost will be further refined as part of the detailed design phase and will depend on costs for relocation of utilities and property acquisition.

6. **Next Steps**

All members of the public who have expressed an interest in this project have been notified directly of the opportunity to comment before a final decision is made for this project.

Subject to Regional Council approval of the Recommended Design Concept, the Environmental Study Report (ESR) documenting the planning and decision process for the Project will be completed and a “Notice of Study completion” will be ‘filed’ in the public record for a 30 day review period. This filing will be advertised by mail-outs and notices in newspapers. During this filing period, anyone concerned that the study did not fully follow the appropriate requirements of the Class EA process or address all of the issues, may request that the Minister of Environment order the Project to a more detailed environmental assessment, referred to as a Part II Order request. The Minister of Environment must receive such requests in writing, with a copy sent to the Region’s Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services. The Minister will determine if a more detailed environmental assessment is required and the Minister’s decision will be final. If there are no significant unresolved objections following the 30 day review period, the project will be considered approved and proceed to detailed design and construction. It is anticipated that construction of the improvements will occur in 2015. This schedule is considered aggressive and depends on fast tracking for property acquisition and co-ordination of utilities.

Staff, in consultation with City of Cambridge and Grand River Conservation Authority staff will initiate a Class EA study for a potential off-road multi-use trail with a new pedestrian/cycling bridge across the Speed River.

7. **Revised Fees for Consulting Engineering**

In January 2005, The Region of Waterloo entered into a consulting services agreement with Stantec Consulting Ltd. (Stantec) to provide engineering services for the Class EA, detailed design, and services during construction at an upset limit fee of $408,350 for professional services to complete the Class EA and final design phases of the project. At that time the detailed design phase of the consulting fees was estimated at $181,250. The detailed design fees were based on a very limited scope of construction, limited to minor turning lane improvements at selected locations with a total estimated project cost of only $2.7 million. The Recommended Design Concept 3A involves a significantly greater scope of construction with a completely new alignment for 350 metres of Shantz Hill Road, widening for transit queue-jump lanes at three intersections and impacts on approximately 28 properties with associated
requirements for acquisition and accommodations for grading and access. The construction cost is currently estimated at $9.2M. In addition whereas the original upset fee was prepared with the assumption that the design work would be concluded in 2006, the current schedule will require the design work to occur in 2012 and 2013. As a result of the additional scope of design services and the long delay in moving forward with the detailed design of the project, Stantec submitted a revised work plan for the detailed design, together with a request for additional fees.

After thoroughly reviewing Stantec’s work plan, staff has negotiated a $307,200 increase to Stantec’s upset fee as a fair and reasonable amount for consulting services required to complete the design phase of this project. Based on the estimated construction cost of $9.2 million, the consultant’s ($488,450) total fee for detailed design services represents approximately 5% of the estimated construction cost for this project. This engineering cost is within the normal fee range for a project of this type and complexity. Therefore, staff recommend that the existing consulting services agreement with Stantec be amended to authorize a $307,200 increase to the upset fee for Stantec to complete the design phase of this project.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The Fountain Street – King Street Improvements between Shantz Hill Road and Eagle Street, when complete will support Focus Area 3 – Sustainable Transportation by optimizing existing road capacity to safely manage traffic and Focus Area 2 – Growth Management and Prosperity by optimizing infrastructure to meet current and projected needs.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The capital cost of the Recommended Design Concept is estimated to be between $13 million and $14 million. The 2012 Transportation Capital Program includes $16 million in the years 2012 – 2016 for this project to be funded from the Region Development Charges and the Roads Capital Levy Reserve Funds. There are sufficient funds in the 2012 project budget for the additional consulting work needed to complete the design.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

The Transportation Planning Division of the Planning, Housing and Community Services Department was consulted in the preparation of this Report.
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Appendix A – Key Plan

Figure A1:  Key Plan of Study Area
Appendix B – Summary of Collisions and Traffic Safety Assessment

Fountain Street at King Street is the only signalized intersection in the study area to have experienced higher than expected collisions in the past 5 years (2006-2010). Fountain Street at King Street experienced 103 collisions where 28 were expected based on the Region’s Collision Prediction Model. Of the 103 collisions, 53 were turning-type collisions where 8 were expected and 23 were sideswipe collisions where 0 were expected.

To address turning-type collisions at the Fountain Street and King Street intersection, staff installed a “signal your turn” sign on northbound Fountain Street on January 20, 2004. A review of turning collisions (2 years before versus 2 years after implementing this countermeasure) involving northbound/southbound vehicles indicates that turning collisions reduced from 18 to 10 collisions.

To address sideswipe collisions involving westbound dual left-turning motorists, staff re-marked the westbound dual left-turn lanes and guidance markings with durable pavement marking material June 3, 2003. In 2002 there were 7 sideswipe collisions involving westbound turning vehicles. Following the re-marking utilizing durable material, there were only 10 sideswipe type collisions in four years (2003-2006) involving westbound turning motorists.

King Street at Eagle Street experienced 31 collisions where 44 collisions were expected based on the Region’s Collision Prediction Model. In 2008 King Street at Eagle Street was supplemented with special ladder crosswalk treatments to address unusual pedestrian/vehicle collisions. Since then, there have been no pedestrian collisions at this intersection.

There are no other unusual collisions patterns at this intersection.

Shantz Hill Road at Fountain Street experienced 44 collisions where 35 collisions were expected based on the Region’s Collision Prediction Model.

King Street between Fountain Street and the entrance to Riverside Park experienced 46 collisions where 10 were expected based on the Region’s Collision Prediction Model. Of the 46 collisions, 17 were sideswipe type collisions where 0 were expected and 9 collisions were single-motor-vehicle collisions where 1 was expected. This midblock section of road is ranked 6th in the Region for most unexpected sideswipe collisions.

King Street at Rogers Drive experienced 3 collisions where 5 collisions were expected based on the Region’s Collision Prediction Model.

King Street at Chopin Drive experienced 35 collisions where 6 collisions were expected based on the Region’s Collision Prediction Model.

Fountain Street between King Street and Shantz Hill Road experienced 31 collisions where 11 collisions were expected based on the Region’s Collision Prediction Model. Of the 31 collisions, 15 were rear-end collisions where 4 were expected.

King Street between Rogers Drive and Chopin Drive experienced 25 collisions where 6 collisions were expected based on the Region’s Collision Prediction Model. Of the 25 collisions, 9 were rear-end collisions where 2 were expected. There were also 7 sideswipe collisions where 0 were expected.

King Street between Chopin Drive and Eagle Street experienced 8 collisions where 5 collisions were expected based on the Region’s Collision Prediction Model.
Appendix C – Alternative Solutions

Nine Preliminary Alternative Solutions were presented to the public at the first Public Consultation Centre (PCC #1) held on April 23, 2009. These Solutions were assessed for consideration in addressing the transportation needs along King Street and Fountain Street to determine which solutions singly, or in combination with other solutions, best address the problems in the study area. The nine Preliminary Alternative Solutions are described and evaluated by the Project Team as follows:

- “Do-Nothing” - Carried forward as a baseline for comparison
- Traffic Operations Improvements – Consider only as part of other solutions
- Access Management – Consider only as part of other solutions
- Intersection Improvements – Carried forward for detailed evaluation
- Roundabouts – Carried forward for detailed evaluation
- Widening of Roadways – Consider only as part of other solutions
- Off Road Cycling Lane – Consider only as part of other solutions
- Diversion and Improvements to Alternative Transportation Routes – Rejected
- Develop Alternative Routes Within the Study Area – Rejected – discussion is provided below:

To develop alternative routes within the study area would require additional road allowances within or around the study area. This would be a local solution with applications and impacts within and outside the study area. As one of these alternative route solutions, a new bridge crossing of the Speed River at Shantz Hill Road at Fountain Street, to connect to local roads leading to Eagle Street and King Street, was reviewed in some detail. The Project Team concluded it would not fully address the traffic problems in the study area, would have significant property impacts on local streets, and would still require Fountain Street and King Street improvements within the study corridor. In addition, this alternative would have significant environmental impacts (crossing of Speed River), and significant capital cost (for new bridge). It would also significantly increase traffic on local roads between the Speed River and Eagle Street in addition to significant private property purchases on local roads.

This “new bridge” solution was re-examined at the request of City of Cambridge staff, but not to divert traffic totally from the existing corridor. The Project team found that an extension of Shantz Hill Road across the new Speed River Bridge, on a new alignment between the east bank of the River and Chopin Drive to connect to King Street, west of Chopin Drive would not increase traffic on local roads between the Speed River and Eagle Street since the proposed new road would connect only to the Regional Roads.

This version of the “new bridge” solution would greatly reduce traffic and congestion on King Street between the Shantz Hill Drive extension and Fountain Street; however, a detailed traffic analysis found that the total reduction in delay through the study area and capacity improvements to the transportation network for this “new bridge” solution, would only be comparable to those achieved with intersection improvements within the existing corridor, but at substantially greater cost, and greater natural environment and social impacts. As a result, the Project Team confirmed its initial assessment that the “new bridge” alternative was not viable as a solution for the Class EA study.

Therefore, the Project Team concluded as a result of its evaluation and considering input from PCC #1, that only intersection improvements, including a roundabout at the King/Fountain intersection would be evaluated further as a potential solution for this Class EA study.
Appendix D - Alternative Design Concepts

The “DO-NOTHING” Alternative

For all Class EA studies, the Do-Nothing alternative is used as a baseline for comparison purposes. This alternative normally consists of maintenance of existing conditions as presently planned and minor improvements at specific locations that would have little to no effect on addressing the overall study needs. The Region’s base program of normal maintenance and reconstruction would require reconstruction of the pavement on the Regional Roads. At that time existing sidewalks would be reconstructed and on-road cycling lanes would need to be added to the roads. The estimated cost of the "Do-Nothing" design concept is $9.5 million for reconstruction, property acquisitions, utility relocations and engineering.

Alternative Design Concept 1 Conventional intersection improvements at all three intersections of Fountain Street/Shantz Hill Road, King Street/Fountain Street and King Street/Eagle Street.

Alternative Design Concept 2 Realigned intersections at Fountain Street/Shantz Hill Road and King Street/Fountain Street, with Conventional intersection improvements at King Street/Eagle Street.

Alternative Design Concept 3 Realigned intersection at Fountain Street/Shantz Hill Road, with Conventional intersection improvements at King Street/Fountain Street and King Street/Eagle Street.

Alternative Design Concept 4 Conventional intersection improvements at Fountain Street/Shantz Hill Road, realigned intersection at King Street/Fountain Street, and conventional intersection improvements at King Street/ Eagle Street.

Alternative Design Concept 5 Conventional intersection improvements at Fountain Street/Shantz Hill Road, roundabout at King Street/Fountain Street, and conventional intersection improvements at King Street/ Eagle Street.

Alternative Design Concept 6 Realigned intersection at Fountain Street/Shantz Hill Road, roundabout at King Street/Fountain Street, and conventional intersection improvements at King Street/Eagle Street.

Two Additional Alternative Design Concepts were introduced since February 15, 2011 as follows:

Alternative Design Concept 3A is the same as Alternative Design Concept 3 except that a 3 metre wide multi-use (Pedestrian/cycling) trail would be located on the east (Speed River) side of Fountain Street and the north (Riverside Park) side of King Street and there would be no sidewalks on the west (Shantz Hill) side of Fountain Street, where they do not currently exist.

Alternative Design Concept 6A is the same as Alternative Design Concept 6 except the roundabout is shifted further away from the vacant development land at 255 King Street West by relocating the City of Cambridge sewage pumping station currently located at 100 King Street West.
Figure D1: Conventional Intersection Improvements At King Street/Eagle Street (All Concepts)
Figure D2: Conventional Intersection Improvements at King Street/Fountain Street (Concepts 1 & 3)
Figure D3: Conventional Intersection Improvements at King Street/Fountain Street (Concepts 3A)
Figure D4: Conventional Intersection Improvements at Fountain Street/Shantz Hill Road (Concepts 1, 4 & 5)
Figure D5: Realigned Intersection Improvements at King Street/Fountain Street (Concepts 2 & 4)
Figure D6: Realigned Intersection Improvements at Fountain Street/Shantz Hill Road (Concepts 2, 3, 3A* 6 & 6A)

*Concept 3A excludes Sidewalk on the west side of Fountain Street North of Shantz Hill Road; refer to Appendix H.
Figure D7: Roundabout at King Street/Fountain Street (Concepts 5 & 6)
Figure D8: Roundabout at King Street/Fountain Street (Concept 6A)
Appendix E – Public Consultation

The following is a summary of the public consultation process for this study. All Comments received and the Project Team responses will be included in the Final Class EA Study Report for the study.

Public Consultation Centre (PCC) #1, April 23, 2009

At the first PCC the Problem Statement, Evaluation Criteria and Preliminary Alternative Solutions to be considered as part of the study were presented to the public for review and comments. A total of approximately 70 attended the meeting and 51 written comments were received. In general the comments and suggestions recognized the current traffic congestion and operational difficulties and supported the need for improvements on Fountain Street/King Street, as well as identified a need for better accommodating pedestrians and cyclists. Other comments questioned the need for corridor improvements, instead suggesting redirecting traffic, especially trucks, to alternative roads, and expressed concerns with hydro-geological issues, traffic operations impact of the Dover Flour Mills operations, support, and opposition for roundabouts and potential property and access impacts.

Nine Preliminary Alternative Solutions were presented to the public at the first Public Consultation Centre (PCC #1) held on April 23, 2009. These Solutions were assessed for consideration in addressing the transportation needs along King Street and Fountain Street to determine which solutions singly, or in combination with other solutions, best address the problems in the study area. The nine Preliminary Alternative Solutions are described and evaluated by the Project Team as in Appendix “C”.

Therefore, the Project Team concluded as a result of its evaluation and considering input from PCC #1, that only intersection improvements, including a roundabout at the King/Fountain intersection would be evaluated further as a potential solution for this Class EA study.

Public Consultation Centre (PCC) #2, March 9, 2010

The Seven (7) Design Concepts were presented to the public at a Public Consultation Centre (PCC) #2 on March 9, 2010 from 5:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. at the King Street Baptist Church, 361 King Street East, Cambridge, Ontario. Alternative Design Concept 6 was presented as the Project Team’s Preliminary Preferred Design Concept. In advance of the meeting approximately 500 notices were sent to property owners/occupants within the Study Area; in addition notices were also placed in the local newspapers the week prior to the meeting and advisory signs were set up along Fountain and King Streets to advertise the meeting.

One Hundred and Fifty-two (152) persons signed in at the PCC and it is believed that another 10 to 15 persons attended the meeting but either declined to sign in or was unaware of the sign-in request.

A PCC Information Package was distributed at the meeting and provided by request to those who indicated an interest in the project but were unable to attend. The Information Package described in detail the project, the Alternative Design Concepts, and included a comment sheet at the back that asked several questions and gave room for public comments and suggestions.

Thirty (31) responses were received at the PCC session itself or subsequently by submission of the comment sheets by mail or email. A total of 7 respondents indicated the Preliminary Preferred Concept No. 6 was the best design concept. A total of 13 respondents indicated Alternative Design Concept 6 was not the best, with 4 indicating Concept 2 was best, 2 indicated Concept 5 was best, 2 indicated Concept 4 or Concept 4 with some modifications was best, and one indicated Concept 3 was best. The remaining respondents did not indicate a preference for any of the presented design concepts.
The following summarizes the main issues brought forward by the public at the second PCC and the Project Team responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE E1: COMMENTS AND RESPONSE FROM PCC #2, March 9, 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundabout won’t work – The issues raised ranged from the roundabout will be avoided as people are “afraid of them”, it will not solve the traffic issues, and are unsafe for pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12 Responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street and Fountain Street is only problem area, as signals installed at Fountain Street and Shantz Hill is working fine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4 Responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collisions and access difficulties at the Riverside Park entrance should be addressed – turn lanes, access modifications or signals should be installed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3 Responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns about impacting The Pines necessitating it to close.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3 Responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The traffic problems only occur at peak hours and are fine the rest of the day, therefore no improvements are required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 Response)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These improvements will change the character of Downtown Preston.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 Response)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed solutions are only short term and not for the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide, or divert traffic to alternate routes from the Maple Grove Business Park and Highway 401.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks are not required everywhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling lanes are not required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The intersection improvements at Shantz Hill/Fountain should be designed to take more property from vacant lot at southwest corner to minimize impacts to homes and businesses in other quadrants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Kressview Condominiums near King/Fountain should be addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A new river crossing at the bottom of Shantz Hill should be constructed to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE E1: COMMENTS AND RESPONSE FROM PCC #2, March 9, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>connect to King Street near Eagle. (1 Response)</td>
<td>twice as much (approximately $20million more) than the Preferred Design Concept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other river crossings elsewhere in Cambridge should be constructed to help divert traffic away from this area (2 Responses)</td>
<td>Additional river crossings throughout central Cambridge have been considered in past studies and eliminated from further consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Left Turns at King Street at Chopin Drive to address collisions and problems with access at Chopin Drive. (6 Responses)</td>
<td>This has been reviewed by the Project Team, and turning movements will be restricted at the Chopin Drive/King St Intersection by means of installing a centre median island on King Street at Chopin Drive. Meetings with business owners will be set up to review the impacts on their properties. City of Cambridge staff is in favour of restricting left turns at Chopin Drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed roundabout at King/Fountain should be relocated closer to The Pines to reduce impact on vacant developable property on corner. (2 Responses)</td>
<td>Moving the roundabout further onto The Pines/Heat Place is limited by standard/safe roundabout alignments and the sewage pumping station. Moving the roundabout further into The Pines property will also limit the re-use of the building by the current owners. However moving the roundabout will be reviewed by the Project Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns about the loss of the current free flow right turn lane at Shantz Hill/Fountain making traffic backup more. (1 Response)</td>
<td>The intersection design is such that the realigned intersection will operate at an acceptable level of service without the free-flow right turn. The Preferred Design Concept replaces the existing single right turn lane with through lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover Flour Mills operations should be modified so that truck loading/unloading does not impact traffic on King Street. (1 Response)</td>
<td>Dover Flour Mills attempts to restrict their loading times to off-peak hours. Changing the loading areas is impossible without significant renovations to their building and site beyond the scope of this study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More turn lanes required at Eagle Street. (2 Responses)</td>
<td>The number of lanes at the King/Eagle intersection is restricted by a number of properties with heritage interest. The preliminary preferred concept arrangement of lanes is the maximum possible without removing and heritage buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure future traffic volumes from the proposed expansion of Conestoga.</td>
<td>Impacts of proposed developments have been included in the traffic analysis. The Regional model does not include projections.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE E1: COMMENTS AND RESPONSE FROM PCC #2, March 9, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College are included in traffic projections.</td>
<td>from the Conestoga College expansion proposal because it is too recent to have been included in the land use forecast. However, the land use forecast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>does incorporate growth at Conestoga College. While the exact impact of the proposed expansion has not been incorporated into the Region’s model, the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 Response)</td>
<td>expected difference is not great.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Additional Consultations were undertaken as follows:

- Presentation to City of Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC), February 18, 2010
- Presentation to Region of Waterloo Heritage Planning Advisory Committee (HPAC), March 11, 2010
- Presentations to Regional Cycling Advisory Committee (RCAC), March 23, 2010 and March 27, 2012
- Project staff met with several property owners directly impacted by additional land needs

Public Input Meeting (PIM), June 8, 2010

On June 8, 2010, a special evening public meeting of the Region of Waterloo, Planning and Works Committee was held for this project at King Street Baptist Church in Cambridge. Alternative Design Concept 6 - Realigned intersection at Fountain Street/Shantz Hill, Roundabout at King Street/ Fountain Street, and Conventional intersection improvements at King Street/Eagle Street, was presented as the Project Team’s Preferred Design Concept for this Class EA Study.

Ten delegations appeared and presented their input at the PIM. A summary of those presentations and responses prepared by the Project Team is provided in Table E2: Summary of Comments and Responses from PIM, June 8, 2010.

Table E2: Summary of Comments and Responses from PIM, June 8, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Jerry Van Dyke:  
  - A Bypass is the best option  
  - A new bridge would allow for less property impacts and wouldn’t interfere with traffic  
  - Toyota traffic and Dover Flour truck traffic are major problems |  
  - A Bypass is a network level concept that is addressed by the RTMP review.  
  - A new bridge to extend Shantz Hill Road across the Speed River to King Street was reviewed by the Project Team  
  - The City of Cambridge had previously attempted to negotiate a land exchange with Dover Flour, for relocation of the business but this initiative was rejected by the property owner. |
| 2. Al Junker o.b.o. Heritage Planning Advisory Committee:  
  - Should not impact Heritage structures  
  - Fountain/King intersection should be considered a cultural heritage landscape  
  - Should consider Design Concepts 2 and 3 and not concept 6 |  
  - The impacts on the identified heritage properties in the area have been evaluated in the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) and Design Concepts 2, 3 and 6 were identified as having the least direct impact.  
  - The consideration of a Cultural Heritage Landscape has been addressed in the revised CHIA.  
  - Design Concept 6 provides the greatest benefits from a traffic, congestion and safety perspective. |
### Table E2: Summary of Comments and Responses from PIM, June 8, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Victor Labreche, o.b.o. 255 King Street West property owners:</strong></td>
<td>At 255 King Street West, approximately 1496.46 sq.m. (0.37 acres) would be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concept 6 property taking (4 acres) would adversely affect property</td>
<td>• Approximately 1.5 hectares (3.7 acres) would be required. Compensation would be in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>owner and City.</td>
<td>accordance with Regional policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Roundabout is not in keeping with intent of City O.P.</td>
<td>• Roundabouts are approved for Regional Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prefers Design Concept 2</td>
<td>• Design Concept No. 2 would result in reduced impact on delays and injury collisions,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>approx. 2 more properties impacted and 12.5% less property taking than Design Concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No 6. Capital costs for #2 and #6 are approximately the same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. John Waring, o.b.o. Kressview Condo, (also Robert Wall):</strong></td>
<td>The existing signal does not create gaps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concerned that a roundabout would eliminate gaps in traffic flow</td>
<td>Approaching drivers now yield only when they approach a red signal. With a roundabout,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and make left-turns in and out more difficult</td>
<td>approaching drivers have no need to reach the green signal and can yield at any time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A second entrance from Fountain Street N. should be added</td>
<td>Also a small protected left-turn entry will be created on King Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The second entrance would benefit all affected properties but it requires support of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>property owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. John Duncan:</strong></td>
<td>Any approved design concept would facilitate safer operations for large vehicles. This</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Roundabout @ Fountain/King will make Fountain Street N. a “truck-</td>
<td>would benefit all travelers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friendly route” with increase in truck volumes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Brad Hallman:</strong></td>
<td>This study would recommend provision of sidewalks on both sides of streets in the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 40 homes on Fountain Street, are outside the project limits and do</td>
<td>area. Additional sidewalks on Fountain Street South are identified as a deficiency to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not have sidewalks on the street. Safety concern with increase in</td>
<td>be addressed in the Regions 2010 – 2019 Transportation Capital Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traffic volumes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Derek Bowman:</strong></td>
<td>All 3 points are carried forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pleased that no new Speed River Bridge is proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pedestrian safety should be addressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A roundabout at King/Fountain should have a heritage look.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. John Cole:</strong></td>
<td>No major change is proposed for the 149 King Street W. location. Traffic growth will be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Difficult left-turn egress from property with increased traffic flow</td>
<td>modest due to increased transit mode share.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Off-road collisions at 101 King Street w. request traffic calming</td>
<td>• The study will investigate possible improvements to the road alignment and operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prefers Concept #2 due to less property impact</td>
<td>measure to address off-road and turning collisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There are less property impacts at 101 &amp; 149 King Street S. for Design Concept # 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(See also response No. 3 above.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Bruce Langlade:</strong></td>
<td>Request is carried forward to detail design stage of project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concern with loss of 10 ft. widening</td>
<td>• The concrete curb and sidewalk would be moved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Would like input to standard of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restoration for wall and fence</td>
<td>approximately 2 m closer to the house</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Jen Montague:
- Request public information that businesses in the construction zone will not be closed and are “open for business”.
- In correspondence to property owners/residents, reference will be made to construction occurring in 2015 and that access will be maintained during construction.

11. The evaluation result is questionable because the project cost and property impacts are excessive for a small benefit.
- Design Concept No. 2 would result in less reduction in delays and injury collisions, approx. 2 more properties impacted and 12.5% less property taking than Design Concept No. 6. Capital costs for #2 and #6 are approximately the same.

12. King Street at Rogers Road/Riverside Park realignment should be considered.
- The parking at 126 King Street E. which is the Admin. Office for the flour mill and extension of the Mill race culvert would be impacted to improve the road alignment. The property impact has been presented to Dover Flour.

13. Concern that the proposed roundabout will fail to handle traffic and back-up to Shantz Hill Road.
- The proposed roundabout would offer the greatest capacity to prevent the backup from occurring when compared to alternatives which were considered.

14. Greg Hood-Morris, email June 9, 2010:
- Roundabout will eliminate opportunities for parking at the Preston Springs Hotel
- Relocate Fountain Street, Behind “The Pines”
- Roundabout provides better access for the Preston Springs Hotel property than all other alternatives.
- Relocation has been considered. The location behind “The Pines” is unacceptable because of impacts on the regulatory flood plain, natural environment, sanitary pumping station and property impacts.

15. Neil Palmer, after the PIM, June 8, 2010:
- Suggest additional WB lane on Shantz Hill Road to receive Fountain Street NB left-turn traffic so that both Fountain Street SB right-turns may be free-flow.
- The current single lane free flow right turn lane for SB to WB traffic to go up Shantz Hill Rd is being replaced with a double through lane controlled by signals. This arrangement will reduce overall queues for this movement at the intersection.

16. Tim Bowman, email May 31, 2010:
- Construction will result in a reduction of accessibility for business and decrease in business.
- The Region’s project will be planned to avoid road closures wherever possible and to keep the reduction of capacity for traffic of all types to a minimum during construction.

17. Kayla Peckford, email September 21, 2010
- Concerns with shifting Shantz Hill/Fountain onto vacant land as well as implementation of a roundabout
- Concerns with property required to implement a sidewalk
- Roundabout will not solve traffic problems as Dover Mills trucks unloading will cause delays through a roundabout
- Widen Fountain St to King St would eliminate some of the traffic delays, and cut some of the costs by eliminating a
- The implementation of a realigned intersection and shifting to the south at Fountain/Shantz Hill provides the best traffic solution at this intersection such that the heaviest traffic movements are now the “through” movement.
- Deficiencies in pedestrian routes require elimination of gaps in the sidewalks. Sidewalks are required on both sides of the road, in particular in areas where crossing opportunities are limited due to large distances.
- The proposed roundabout would offer the greatest capacity to prevent the backup from occurring when compared to alternatives which were...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>roundabout</td>
<td>considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Simply widening Fountain Street does not improve the capacity at the King/Fountain intersection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Bob McMullen</td>
<td>• Not widening Fountain and King Streets was considered as part of the Region Transportation Master Plan which recommended widening/improvements within the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cost of project is too high for traffic problems that only occur for 2 hours daily during the week.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• One lane roads just outside study limits will be more congested with improvements in the study area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Congestion created by improvements (outside study limits) will increase smog. Smog monitoring stations should be installed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Congestion in this area is created by lack of overall network approach/facilities for traffic in Cambridge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do-Nothing within study limits and traffic will find other routes due to congestion - delay decision until after the new Fairway Rd bridge is constructed, as this will have impacts on how many people use this intersection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Carol Thorman</td>
<td>• The traffic study includes a parameter that 20% of the travelers in the study area will be using transit, in accordance with the new Region Transportation Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Delays during construction will be a concern based on the impacts experienced with truck rollover in July 2010.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Roundabout at King/Fountain will provide little improvement within the study area and it is not worth spending money on this solution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• As part of detail design the project will be staged to keep traffic and access within the study limits open as much as practically possible. In addition, the evaluation of alternatives took into account the reduction of the larger than expected number of collisions within the study area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There will be substantial reduction in injury collisions and expected reduction in delays vs. the “Do-Nothing” alternative. In addition, improvements to cycling and pedestrian facilities are included in the project justification and cost.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Letter dated July 21, 2010 from John Doherty on behalf of Delos and Margaret Huntley</td>
<td>• Improvements to roads outside the study area were considered and would not provide a solution to the problems of congestion and serious collisions in the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improvements to the Transportation network outside the study area and Development pressures outside the study area should be considered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sidewalk design alternatives were not considered. There are other barriers to pedestrians and no demand for sidewalks on the east side of Shantz Hill or the north side of Fountain Street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Our clients property will be adversely affected by:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Property taking</td>
<td>• The Regional Transportation Master Plan update has examined the role of the study area roads in the Region’s transportation network. Please also refer to response to No. 18 above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Recommended Design Concept would provide continuous sidewalks on both sides of the Regional Roads. This is required to promote and encourage active transportation in the Region. This is consistent with the Regional Transportation Master Plan and the Pedestrian Charter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Deficiencies in pedestrian routes require</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E2: Summary of Comments and Responses from PIM, June 8, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Tree and slope stability impacts</td>
<td>elimination of gaps in the sidewalks. Sidewalks are required on both sides of the road, in particular in areas where crossing opportunities are limited due to large distances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Large increase in Region owned boulevard area</td>
<td>• The Region’s project team has included an evaluation of property impacts in the study decision process. Information on the Region’s property acquisition process was provided as part of the public information and was also mailed to concerned property owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Access and nuisance issues during construction</td>
<td>• The Project Team has addressed GRCA concerns, and impacts on trees and steep slopes will be addressed and mitigated during detail design in accordance with GRCA permit requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• As part of the detail design the project will be staged to keep traffic and access within the study limits open as much as practically possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Presentation to City of Cambridge, Council, June 21, 2010

At the June 21, 2010, General Committee meeting of City Council, Alternative Design Concept 6 - Realigned intersection at Fountain Street/Shantz Hill Road, Roundabout at King Street/Fountain Street, and Conventional intersection improvements at King Street/Eagle Street, was presented as the Project Team’s Preferred Design Concept for this Class EA Study.

Comments received were not documented in the minutes of the Council meeting; however, the following concerns were expressed: that the study may have underestimated the future traffic volumes and; that the project cost and property impacts are excessive for a small benefit and; that the potential to realign the King Street/Rogers Road intersection alignment was not fully explored. A summary of those comments and responses prepared by the Project Team is provided in Table E3: Summary of Comments and Responses from Cambridge Council, June 21, 2010.

Table E3: Summary of Comments and Responses from Cambridge Council, June 21, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Numerous comments mentioned the need to divert traffic from the Maple Grove Business Park and Highway 401 to alternate routes.</td>
<td>The Project Team has assessed that there is no practical way of diverting drivers to use other routes. Presumably traffic from this area still finds the study area to be the best route for their particular destination.  The Ministry of Transportation (MTO) has completed an EA study proposing direct ramps connecting Hwy 401 (to/from London) with Hwy 8 (to/from Kitchener/Waterloo). This would lead to reduced use of Fountain Street to access westbound 401 from the Maple Grove Road/Fountain Street area. In addition, staff undertook additional analysis with respect to diverting traffic from the King/Fountain study area to Speedsville Road. The Project Team assessed that even with both the new Hwy 8 ramps and diversion of traffic to Speedsville Road, roadway operational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E3: Summary of Comments and Responses from Cambridge Council, June 21, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| improvements would still be required within the King/Fountain study area. An alternate route from Highway 401 to south Cambridge has been identified in the 2010 Regional Transportation Master Plan, Moving Forward 2031. The route identified in the Master Plan begins in the north with Dickie Settlement Road, from Fountain Street to Roseville Road, then along Roseville Road to Edworthy Side Road, then along Edworthy Side Road to Alps and along Alps to Spragues Road. The need for this route is identified for the 10-20 year time frame. The southern portion of this route will eventually connect with a proposed Cambridge South Link which will cross the Grand River and connect Spragues Road and Water Street in Cambridge. Staff have assessed that this long-term network improvement will not address the existing or future needs in the Fountain Street/King Street study area. At the request of the City of Cambridge, a new bridge to extend Shantz Hill Road across the Speed River to King Street was reviewed in detail by the Project Team, which concluded that the benefits of increased safety and reduced delay for such a bridge would be comparable to those achieved with intersection improvements within the existing corridor but at an additional cost of $20 million and with greater natural environment and social impacts. The new bridge alternative was therefore screened out from further consideration.

Some residents of the Kressview Condominiums expressed concerns that a roundabout at the Fountain Street/King Street intersection would eliminate gaps in traffic flow and make left-turns in and out more difficult at the existing entrance of the Kressview Condominiums, and that to best solve this problem, a second entrance from Fountain Street North should be provided.

Currently, the existing signal at Fountain/King does not create gaps. Drivers approaching on King Street from the direction of Eagle Street now yield to condominium residents wishing to access King Street only when the King Street drivers approach a red signal. With the recommended roundabout, the Project Team believes the condo entrance will be more convenient and safer with:

Reduced vehicle speeds on King Street
Drivers on King Street will not be concerned that they will “miss the green light” and will be able to yield to residents as necessary
Left-turn exits onto King Street from Kressview Condominiums can become right-turn with a U-turn through the roundabout
Also Alternative Design Concept 6 will include a small protected left-turn entry to the Kressview Condominiums from King Street. This protected left-turn entry cannot be provided with any of the other alternatives considered. The second entrance from Fountain Street North requires land be obtained from...
### Table E3: Summary of Comments and Responses from Cambridge Council, June 21, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>PROJECT TEAM RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a neighbouring property and requires the support of that property owner in order for that entrance to be provided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F – Potential Off-Road Trail Connection
Appendix G – Re-Assessment of Alternative Design Concepts

The Alternative Design Concepts were screened by the Project Team as to how they address the traffic and transportation needs in comparison to their potential environmental impacts.

The evaluation criteria and the evaluation of the remaining six Alternative Design Concepts are shown in Summary Evaluation Matrix and summarized as follows:

Traffic Capacity, Operations & Safety

Design Concepts 2, 3, 3A, 6 and 6A provide for existing and future traffic/transportation objectives which are local operational needs only, since increased network capacity is not achievable. It is expected that Alternative Concepts 2, 3 and 3A with a signalized intersection at Fountain/King would experience approximately 65% less travel delays within the corridor as compared to the Do-Nothing Alternative. Further, it is expected that Alternative Concepts 6 and 6A with a roundabout intersection at Fountain/King would experience 75% less travel delays along the corridor compared to the Do-Nothing Alternative.

Design Concepts 6 and 6A with a roundabout at Fountain/King would result in 75% fewer injury collisions at that intersection and shorter crossing distances for pedestrians when compared to fully signalized corridor concepts.

The Do-Nothing Alternative does the least to address weaving/left-turn issues. Concepts 2, 6 and 6A best address the weaving issues and would result in fewer mid-block collisions.

Design Concept 3 and 3A have the same traffic performance; however, the pedestrian and cycling facilities would not be continuous in Concept 3A.

Design Concept 6 and 6A would generally perform the same; however, Design Concept 6A’s deviation in approach lane alignment results in operational deficiencies due to poor alignment of the traffic lanes entering the roundabout.

Staff identified concerns that the Alternative Design Concepts under consideration are not proposing to provide pedestrian and cycling facilities that are continuous through and connected beyond the project limits. The sidewalks and multi-use trails that are proposed in the alternative Design Concepts with the exception of Design Concept 3A would not connect to sidewalks on both sides of Fountain Street south of Shantz Hill Road or on Fountain Street north of King Street. The on-road cycling lanes would not connect to on-road cycling lanes on either side of Fountain Street south of Shantz Hill Road or north of King Street they would not connect to on-road cycling lanes beyond this project on either King Street or Eagle Street.

Staff has assessed the feasibility of extending on-road cycling lanes and sidewalks on both sides of Fountain Street beyond the limits of this project. Several Homes must be removed and major retaining walls constructed to permit construction of on-road cycling lanes and sidewalks on Fountain Street South between Shantz Hill Road and Preston Parkway. Any of the design concepts under consideration would benefit from an off-road trail connection to bypass the section of Fountain Street between Shantz Hill Road and Preston Parkway.

There is insufficient space between “The Pines” building at 115 Fountain Street South and the old hotel building at 102 Fountain Street South to construct four driving lanes, and sidewalks and on-road cycling lanes on both sides of the road. Removal of a portion or all of the pines would permit construction of all of the required facilities, with considerable impact and expense. Alternative Design Concept 3A was developed to provide as much continuity as possible without altering either of the buildings at 102 and 115 Fountain Street South and provide a multi-use trail on one side of the road in the boulevard.
Natural Environment

The “Do-Nothing” alternative has the least impact on the natural environment; however, it does not address the traffic operational needs. All of the Alternative Design Concepts reviewed are expected to have minor negative impact on the natural environment associated with culvert extensions, some valley slope re-grading and some removal of some roadside trees. Mitigation and regulatory approval requirements for all identified impacts will be provided for in the detailed design and construction phases of the project.

Social Environment

Alternative Design Concepts 1, 4 and 5 would all require demolition of an inventoried heritage structure at 285 Fountain Street South - Jerry Van Dyke Travel. Concepts 1, 4 and 5 were therefore screened out for further consideration, as having an unacceptable impact with no other clear advantages over the remaining Concepts.

Alternative Design Concepts 6 and 6A would both require the least widening of King Street West and as a result, the sidewalk would not be as close to two significant heritage properties at 101 and 149 King Street West as compared to all other Alternative Design Concepts that were developed in this study. No other structures designated under the Ontario Heritage Act (or listed on the City of Cambridge Heritage Properties Registry) would be directly impacted by any of the Design Concepts reviewed; however, all Alternative Design Concepts would require some property to be acquired from properties with built heritage features. A draft Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment was prepared and presented to both the City of Cambridge Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee and the Region of Waterloo Heritage Planning Advisory Committee—both committees advised the Project Team that they are not in favour of a roundabout or other significant changes in the historic streetscape.

Design Concepts 3, 3A, 5, 6 and 6A would require a major property taking from the vacant property at 255 King Street W. Design Concepts 3, 5, 6 and 6A would require major property takings from “The Pines” at 115 Fountain Street North including removal of a portion of the building, while Design Concepts 2 and 4 would require less of the building but greater impact (reduction) on parking spaces. While all Design Concepts would require removing parking spaces from 250 King Street West, Design Concepts 5, 6 and 6A would have the largest impact. While the property impacts at both 250 King Street W. and The Pines may require full purchase, there are opportunities in the design process to maintain one or both properties with significant site and or building modifications.

The total property requirements range from a minimum of 0.14 hectares for “Do-Nothing” to a maximum of 1.0 hectares for Concepts 6 and 6A. Concept 3A would require a total of 0.71 hectares of property. Refer to Appendix “I” for further information on the property acquisition process.

Costs

The capital costs for the seven Alternative Design Concepts range from an estimated $9.5 million for the “Do-Nothing” Alternative to an estimated $16.5 million for Alternative Design Concept 6A. The capital cost for Design Concept 3A is estimated at $13.1 million.
## Alternative Design Concepts Summary Evaluation Matrix

### Table G1 – Evaluation Matrix

**NOTE! OPTIONS 1-6 INCLUDE TRAFFIC OPERATIONS IMPROVEMENTS, ACCESS MANAGEMENT & WIDENED ROADS WHERE APPROPRIATE, ENHANCED TRANSIT PRIORITY, ON ROAD CYCLING FACILITIES AND SIDEWALKS, UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Traffic Capacity, Operations, Safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecasted (2023) Traffic/Transportation Network</td>
<td>King/Eagle</td>
<td>King/Eagle</td>
<td>King/Eagle</td>
<td>King/Eagle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the alternative efficiently and safely handle the forecasted traffic?</td>
<td>AM: Overall LOS C, v/c 0.92 PM: Overall LOS C, v/c 0.91 Max. Queue 220 m EB left</td>
<td>AM: Overall LOS C, v/c 0.81 PM: Overall LOS C, v/c 0.94 Max. Queue 215m WB Thru</td>
<td>AM: Overall LOS A, v/c 0.59 PM: Overall LOS B, v/c 0.86 Max. Queue 121m WB Thru</td>
<td>AM: Overall LOS A, v/c 0.43 PM: Overall LOS A, v/c 0.68 Max Queue 39 m WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Queues</td>
<td>Shantz Hill/Fountain AM: Overall LOS C, v/c 0.87 PM: Overall LOS C, v/c 0.98 Max. Queue 250 m EB Left</td>
<td>AM: Overall LOS B, v/c 0.88 PM: Overall LOS C, v/c 0.91 Max. Queue 143 m NB Thru</td>
<td>AM: Overall LOS B, v/c 0.88 PM: Overall LOS C, v/c 0.91 Max. Queue 143 m NB Thru</td>
<td>AM: Overall LOS A, v/c 0.43 PM: Overall LOS A, v/c 0.68 Max Queue 39 m WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person Delays</td>
<td>(does not account for failure of King/Fountain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall PM Peak Hour Delays (person – hrs) = 60.0</td>
<td>Overall PM Peak Hour Delays (person – hrs) = 64.7</td>
<td>Overall PM Peak Hour Delays (person – hrs) = 43.4</td>
<td>Overall PM Peak Hour Delays (person – hrs) = 43.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collisions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the alternative address identified traffic safety issues and collisions along the corridor or at specific locations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing traffic safety issues and collisions are not addressed and will continue to increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV of 20 year injury collisions at Fountain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King = $1.6M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addresses SBLT collisions at King/Fountain with realigned approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced weaving in SB lanes which both lead to Shantz Hill Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PV of 20 year injury collisions at Fountain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King = $1.6M (-25% Reduction factor= $1.2M)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addresses SBLT collisions at King/Fountain to some degree with protected left turn phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced weaving in SB lanes which both lead to Shantz Hill Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PV of 20 year injury collisions at Fountain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King = $1.6M (-25% Reduction factor= $1.2M)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addresses SBLT collisions at King/Fountain to some degree with protected left turn phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced weaving in SB lanes which both lead to Shantz Hill Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PV of 20 year injury collisions at Fountain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King = $1.6M (-25% Reduction factor= $1.2M)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addresses SBLT collisions at King/Fountain as left turns are no longer required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With fewer conflict points the roundabout would significantly reduce the severity of collisions at King/Fountain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced weaving in SB lanes which both lead to Shantz Hill Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PV of 20 year injury collisions at Fountain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King = $0.4M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table G1 – Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Management</td>
<td>Congestion will continue to occur and access to and from driveways will continue to be difficult.</td>
<td>Some access removal/ relocation implemented near intersections to prevent unsafe turn movements.</td>
<td>Some access removal/ relocation implemented near intersections to prevent unsafe turn movements.</td>
<td>Some access removal/ relocation implemented near intersections to prevent unsafe turn movements.</td>
<td>Some access removal/ relocation implemented near intersections to prevent unsafe turn movements.</td>
<td>Some access removal/ relocation implemented near intersections to prevent unsafe turn movements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Operations</td>
<td>There are currently delays being experienced by Grand River Transit (GRT). GRT expects to increase number of routes and frequency of service in this area. With no improvements, transit service will deteriorate further.</td>
<td>Improves transit use by reducing delays and implementing transit priority features such as queue jump lanes and signal priority</td>
<td>Improves transit use by reducing delays and implementing transit priority features such as queue jump lanes and signal priority</td>
<td>Improves transit use by reducing delays and implementing transit priority features such as queue jump lanes and signal priority</td>
<td>Improves transit use by reducing delays and implementing transit priority features such as queue jump lanes and signal priority</td>
<td>Improves transit use by reducing delays and implementing transit priority features such as queue jump lanes and signal priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling Facilities</td>
<td>Adds on-road cycling lanes to address cycling needs, except on Fountain Street South of King Street. No connectivity beyond study area.</td>
<td>Adds on-road cycling lanes to address cycling needs. No connectivity beyond study area.</td>
<td>Off-road trail under separate Study plus multi-use trail to address cycling needs but less than other options. Improved connectivity.</td>
<td>Adds on-road cycling lanes to address cycling needs.</td>
<td>Adds on-road cycling lanes to address cycling needs. No connectivity beyond study area. Slower motor vehicle speeds an advantage in the roundabout.</td>
<td>Adds on-road cycling lanes to address cycling needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Facilities</td>
<td>Adds sidewalks in all locations. (Property is required.)</td>
<td>Adds sidewalks in all locations.</td>
<td>Adds sidewalks in all locations.</td>
<td>Adds sidewalks in all locations.</td>
<td>Adds sidewalks in all locations.</td>
<td>Adds sidewalks in all locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td>Emergency Services response times will deteriorate as congestion and delays increase.</td>
<td>Should improve emergency response time as delays will be reduced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: OPTIONS 1-6 INCLUDE TRAFFIC OPERATIONS IMPROVEMENTS, ACCESS MANAGEMENT & WIDENED ROADS WHERE APPROPRIATE, ENHANCED TRANSIT PRIORITY, ON ROAD CYCLING FACILITIES AND SIDEWALKS, UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
Table G1 – Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL TRAFFIC EVALUATION</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVALUATION LEGEND:</td>
<td>= lowest benefit</td>
<td>= lower benefit</td>
<td>= medium benefit</td>
<td>= higher benefit</td>
<td>= highest benefit</td>
<td>= highest benefit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Natural Environment

**Aquatic Habitat, Fisheries, and Surface Water**
How does the alternative affect the Speed River and aquatic life and aquatic habitats contained therein?

- No improvements implemented at the River and Creek crossings. Therefore no aquatic habitat or fisheries are affected.

- Mill race culvert widening similar all alternatives.

- Bridge near King/Fountain – total 12.0 m widening.

- Bridge near King/Fountain – total 11.0 m widening.

- Bridge near King/Fountain – total 11.0 m widening.

- Bridge near King/Fountain – total 10.0 m widening.

- Bridge near King/Fountain – total 10.0 m widening.

- All impacts can be mitigated.

**Terrestrial Habitat (Natural)**
How would the alternative affect existing terrestrial animals and birds and their habitat within the project area?

- No habitat is disturbed, but increasing congestion and resultant pollution will disrupt terrestrial habitat.

- Some landscaping trees would have to be removed but these can be replaced and enhanced with new trees

- Woodland impact at 319 Shantz Hill Road and 278 Fountain Street South

**Floodplain**
What effect would the alternative have on the Speed River flood plain in the area of the project?

- No impacts to existing floodplain features

- Some minor impacts on floodplain at Mill Race Bridge and culvert at tributary near Fountain Street. However all impacts can be mitigated

**Wetlands**
What impacts does the alternative have on any evaluated wetlands within the project area?

- No wetlands exist within the study area

- No wetlands exist within the study area

**Valley Slopes**
Is GRCA permit required?

- No GRCA permit required with no improvements being undertaken.

- GRCA Valley Slope Permit Required for King/Shantz Hill work

**Trees (Landscaping)**
Are there any impacts to existing tree plantings and tree canopy within the project area?

- No impacts to existing trees, however increased pollution due to increased congestion will affect health of existing trees.

- Trees that need to be removed can be replaced during construction. Opportunities for enhanced streetscaping as part of improvements

**OVERALL NATURAL ENVIRONMENT EVALUATION**

- ☐

- ☐

- ☐

- ☐

- ☐

- ☐

- ☐

- ☐

- ☐

- ☐

- ☐

- ☐

- ☐

- ☐

- Roundabout provides location for “Entrance Feature”.
### Table G1 – Evaluation Matrix

**NOTE! OPTIONS 1-6 INCLUSIVE INCLUDE TRAFFIC OPERATIONS IMPROVEMENTS, ACCESS MANAGEMENT & WIDENED ROADS WHERE APPROPRIATE, ENHANCED TRANSIT PRIORITY, ON ROAD CYCLING FACILITIES AND SIDEWALKS, UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Social Environment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archaeological Impacts</strong></td>
<td>What impact does the alternative have on Archaeological Resources?</td>
<td>No impacts to Archaeological features.</td>
<td>High potential at site of P.E. Shantz foundry and all locations outside of current road alignment. A Stage 2 archeological assessment is recommended.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Heritage Features</strong></td>
<td>What impact does the alternative have on: individual Cultural Heritage features?</td>
<td>No impacts to existing Built Heritage features, Although not assessed in detail, incremental improvements to pedestrian, cycling and transit priority facilities may eventually have impacts similar to those of Option 3. Impact total = 0</td>
<td>9 Context changes, 8 encroachments and structure at 134 Fountain St. N is impacted. Impact total = 59</td>
<td>10 Context changes and 7 encroachments. Impact total = 50</td>
<td>10 Context changes and 7 encroachments. Impact total = 50 (to be confirmed)</td>
<td>12 Context changes and 5 encroachments. Impact total = 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Cultural Heritage Landscape Impacts On:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Relationships</td>
<td>Maintain association with Huron Road. Maintains Spa Resort association. Maintains Mill association.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Built Heritage</td>
<td>Contextual relationships maintained.</td>
<td>Encroachment on 10 resources alters relationships. Damage to structure at 134 Fountain St. N. alters relationships.</td>
<td>Encroachment on 10 resources alters relationships.</td>
<td>Less than 10 (to be confirmed)</td>
<td>Most relationships maintained (encroachment on 5 resources)</td>
<td>Most relationships maintained (encroachment on 5 resources)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Circulation Patterns</td>
<td>Maintains the most traditional road pattern</td>
<td>Alters alignment of 2 intersections.</td>
<td>Alters alignment of 1 intersection.</td>
<td>Alters 2 intersections- one with addition of a roundabout &amp; alters alignment of 1 intersection.</td>
<td>Alters 2 intersections- one with addition of a roundabout &amp; alters alignment of 1 intersection.</td>
<td>Alters 2 intersections- one with addition of a roundabout &amp; alters alignment of 1 intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Landscapes – Views and vistas</td>
<td>No impact on existing Vies and vistas</td>
<td>Views to Hotel altered. Fountain Street is realigned so the view is on an angle, not straight.</td>
<td>Slight change from present as street width/angles will change.</td>
<td>Views to Hotel altered because of increased open space to be provided near roundabout.</td>
<td>Views to Hotel altered because of increased open space to be provided near roundabout.</td>
<td>Views to Hotel altered because of increased open space to be provided near roundabout.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table G1 – Evaluation Matrix

**NOTE! OPTIONS 1-6 INCLUSIVE INCLUDE TRAFFIC OPERATIONS IMPROVEMENTS, ACCESS MANAGEMENT & WIDENED ROADS WHERE APPROPRIATE, ENHANCED TRANSIT PRIORITY, ON ROAD CYCLING FACILITIES AND SIDEWALKS, UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.**

|---------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Cultural & Recreational | Are there any cultural or recreational institutions within the project area that would be affected by this alternative? | • Less congestion may improve access to Riverside Park and cultural heritage resources within study area.  
• New on-road cycle lane will increase exposure to cultural heritage resources within study area. | • Less congestion may improve access to Riverside Park and cultural heritage resources within study area.  
• Improved connection to off-road trails | • Less congestion may improve access to Riverside Park and cultural heritage resources within study area.  
• New on-road cycle lane will increase exposure to cultural heritage resources within study area. |
| Neighbourhood Fabric | Will there be traffic infiltration into local neighborhoods? Increased congestion will encourage traffic infiltration into local neighborhoods. | Less congestion should reduce traffic infiltration into existing neighborhoods | | |
| Commerce | • How will businesses be affected?  
• What is the future development potential | • Increased congestion will hamper access to existing businesses.  
• Without traffic improvements development potential is hampered. | • Less congestion may improve access to businesses.  
• Will be disruption during construction but access will be maintained during construction.  
• Future Development opportunities reduced somewhat due to property purchases, but design accounts for future development traffic (not including potential turn lanes for new development access.) | • Vacant property on southeast corner of King/Fountain is impacted due to least significant property purchase. (566 m²)  
• Vacant property on southeast corner of King/Eagle is impacted due to more significant property purchase. (1,286 m²)  
• Vacant property on southeast corner of King/Eagle is impacted due to more significant property purchase. (1,504 m²)  
• Vacant property on southeast corner of King/Fountain is impacted due to less significant property purchase. (931 m²)  
• PetroCan – Property required close to pumps. | • The Pines buyout  
– 30 Parking spaces lost  
– “larger” corner of building lost.  
• The Pines buyout  
– Impact or buyout  
– 22 Parking spaces lost  
– “small” corner of building lost.  
• The Pines  
– 0 Parking spaces lost with rearrangement.  
– reduces building setback to zero  
• The Pines buyout  
– 15 Parking spaces lost  
– “larger” corner of building lost.  
• The Pines - buyout  
– more than 15 Parking spaces lost  
– “largest” corner of building lost.  
• Fireplace Store – All front parking gone, possible buyout  
• Old Hotel Site – 14.9 m² Property frontage required. |
| Option 1 | Do nothing | Reconstrcut pavement, add missing sidewalk and on road cycle lanes. | | | |
**Table G1 – Evaluation Matrix**

**NOTE! OPTIONS 1-6 INCLUSIVE INCLUDE TRAFFIC OPERATIONS IMPROVEMENTS, ACCESS MANAGEMENT & WIDENED ROADS WHERE APPROPRIATE, ENHANCED TRANSIT PRIORITY, ON ROAD CYCLING FACILITIES AND SIDEWALKS, UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Property Purchases</td>
<td>How does the alternative impact the residential and commercial properties along the corridor?</td>
<td>Approximately 9 properties required to have property purchased and approximately 1,350 m² of private property needs to be purchased.</td>
<td>Approximately 39 properties required to have property purchased and approximately 9,150 m² of private property needs to be purchased.</td>
<td>Approximately 39 properties required to have property purchased, and approximately 8,394 m² of private property needs to be purchased.</td>
<td>Approximately 33 properties required to have property purchased, and approximately 7,148 m² of private property needs to be purchased.</td>
<td>Approximately 40 properties required to have property purchased, and approximately 9,590 m² of private property needs to be purchased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscaping</td>
<td>Can the alternative incorporate streetscoping features to maintain and enhance the character of the community?</td>
<td>Limited opportunities to enhance streetscaping as no additional property is obtained.</td>
<td>Additional opportunities for streetscaping available in roundabout and at 255 King Street W.</td>
<td>Additional opportunities for streetscaping available in roundabout and at 255 King Street W.</td>
<td>Additional opportunities for streetscaping available in roundabout and at 255 King Street W.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality &amp; Noise</td>
<td>What effect does the alternative have on air quality and noise within the project area?</td>
<td>Increased congestion will adversely affect air quality due to additional idling vehicles. Noise may increase due to additional traffic volumes, but congestion will slow speeds resulting in reduced noise at times.</td>
<td>Air quality should be improved due to less congestion and more transit use. Noise may increase due to additional vehicles, but increased transit use should reduce number of vehicles compared to “Do-Nothing”.</td>
<td>At Roundabout, expect reductions in fuel consumption and emissions due to fewer delays compared to signals. Noise may be reduced due to less stopping and starting for trucks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT EVALUATION**

- •
- •
- •
- •
- •
- •
### Table G1 – Evaluation Matrix

**NOTE! OPTIONS 1-6 INCLUSIVE INCLUDE TRAFFIC OPERATIONS IMPROVEMENTS, ACCESS MANAGEMENT & WIDENED ROADS WHERE APPROPRIATE, ENHANCED TRANSIT PRIORITY, ON ROAD CYCLING FACILITIES AND SIDEWALKS, UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION CRITERIA</th>
<th>DO NOTHING</th>
<th>OPTION 2</th>
<th>OPTION 3</th>
<th>OPTION 3a</th>
<th>OPTION 4</th>
<th>OPTION 5</th>
<th>OPTION 6</th>
<th>OPTION 6a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RECONSTRUCT PAVEMENT, ADD MISSING SIDEWALK AND ON ROAD CYCLE LANES.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHANTZ HILL/FOUNTAIN – REALIGNED, KING/FOUNTAIN – REALIGNED, KING/EAGLE – CONVENTIONAL.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Capital Cost:</td>
<td>$0.4 M</td>
<td>$4.4 M</td>
<td>$4.5 M</td>
<td>$3.0 M</td>
<td>$4.8 M</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6.4 M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Property acquisition/decommissioning cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Utility Relocations</td>
<td>$0.6 M</td>
<td>$0.7 M</td>
<td>$0.7 M</td>
<td>$1.0 M</td>
<td>$0.7 M</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.7 M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Construction</td>
<td>$8.5 M</td>
<td>$9.5 M</td>
<td>$9.3 M</td>
<td>$9.2 M</td>
<td>$9.3 M</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9.3 M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Initial Cost</td>
<td>$9.5 M</td>
<td>$14.6 M</td>
<td>$14.5 M</td>
<td>$13.2 M</td>
<td>$14.8 M</td>
<td></td>
<td>$16.4 M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Life Cycle Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.V of annual Injury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collisions (%reduction vs “Do-Nothing”)</td>
<td>$1.6 M</td>
<td>$1.2 M</td>
<td>$1.2 M</td>
<td>$1.2 M</td>
<td>$0.4 M</td>
<td>$0.4 M</td>
<td>$0.4 M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n/a)</td>
<td>(-25%)</td>
<td>(-25%)</td>
<td>(-25%)</td>
<td>(-25%)</td>
<td>(-75%)</td>
<td>(-75%)</td>
<td>(-75%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$11.1 M</td>
<td>$15.8 M</td>
<td>$15.7 M</td>
<td>$14.4 M</td>
<td>$15.2 M</td>
<td></td>
<td>$16.8 M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL COST EVALUATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL PROJECT EVALUATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL TRAFFIC EVALUATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL NATURAL ENVIRONMENT EVALUATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT EVALUATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL COST EVALUATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL PROJECT EVALUATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGEND:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= lowest benefit</td>
<td>= lower benefit</td>
<td>= medium benefit</td>
<td>= higher benefit</td>
<td>= highest benefit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*Options above exclude $1 M cost allowance for Off-road trail)
Appendix I - Property Acquisition Process

Information Sheet
(Projects requiring Class Environmental Assessment Approval)

The following information is provided as a general overview of the property acquisition process and is not legal advice. Further, the steps, timing and processes can vary depending on the individual circumstances of each case.

Once the Class Environmental Assessment is complete and the Environmental Study Report outlining the Recommended Design Concept has been approved, the property acquisition process and the efforts of Regional Real Estate staff will focus on acquiring the required lands to implement the approved design. Regional staff cannot make fundamental amendments or changes to the approved design concept.

Property Impact Plans
After the project has been approved and as it approaches final design, the project planners will generate drawings and sketches indicating what lands and interests need to be acquired from each affected property to undertake the project. These drawings are referred to as Property Impact Plans (PIP).

Initial Owner Contact by Regional Real Estate Staff
Once the PIPs are available, Regional Real Estate staff will contact the affected property owners by telephone and mail to introduce themselves and set-up initial meetings to discuss the project and proposed acquisitions.

Initial Meetings
The initial meeting is attended by the project engineer and the assigned real estate staff person to brief the owner on the project, what part of their lands are to be acquired or will be affected, what work will be undertaken, when, with what equipment, etc and to answer any questions. The primary purpose of the meeting is to listen to the owner and identify issues, concerns, effects of the proposed acquisition on remaining lands and businesses that can be feasibly mitigated and/or compensated, and how the remaining property may be restored. These discussions may require additional meetings. The goal of staff is to work with the owner to reach mutually agreeable solutions.

Goal – Fair and Equitable Settlement for All Parties
The goal is always to reach a fair and equitable agreement for both the property owner and the Region. Such an agreement will provide compensation for the fair market value of the lands and address the project impacts (such as repairing or replacing landscaping, fencing, paving) so that the property owner will receive the value of the lands acquired and the restoration of their remaining property to the condition it was prior to the Project.

The initial meetings will form the basis of an initial offer of settlement or agreement of purchase and sale for the required lands or interests.

Steps Toward Offer of Settlement or Agreement of Purchase and Sale
The general steps towards such an offer are as follows;

1) the Region will obtain an independent appraisal of the fair market value of the lands and interests to be acquired, and an appraisal of any effect on the value of the rest of the property resulting from the acquisition of the required lands and interests;
2) compensation will be estimated and/or works to minimize other effects will be defined and agreed to by the property owner and the Region;
3) reasonable costs of the owner will be included in any compensation settlement;
4) an offer with a purchase price and any other compensation or works in lieu of compensation will be submitted to the property owner for consideration; and
5) an Agreement will be finalized with any additional discussion, valuations, etc as may be required.

Depending on the amount of compensation, most agreements will require the approval of Council. The approval is undertaken in Closed Session which is not open to the public to ensure a level of confidentiality.
Expropriation
Due to the time constraints of these projects, it is the practice of the Region to commence the expropriation process in parallel with the negotiation process to insure that lands and interests are acquired in time for commencement of the Project. Typically, over 90% of all required lands and interests are acquired through the negotiation process. Even after lands and interests have been acquired through expropriation an agreement on compensation can be reached through negotiation, this is usually referred to as a ‘settlement agreement’.

Put simply, an expropriation is the transfer of lands or an easement to a governmental authority for reasonable compensation, including payment of fair market value for the transferred lands, without the consent of the property owner being required. In the case of expropriations by municipalities such as the Region of Waterloo, the process set out in the Ontario Expropriations Act must be followed to ensure that the rights of the property owners provided under that Act are protected.

For information on the expropriation process, please refer to ‘Expropriation Information Sheet’.
REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO

NOTRE DAME DRIVE AND SNYDER’S ROAD
RECONSTRUCTION
Petersburg
Township of Wilmot

INFORMATION PACKAGE

Public Consultation Centre
Tuesday, May 1, 2012
5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

LOCATION:

Rebel Creek Golf Course
Meeting Room
1517 Snyder’s Road
Petersburg

There is a Comment Sheet at the back of this package. If you wish, please fill it out and deposit it in the designated box provided at this Information Centre.
1. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS PUBLIC CONSULTATION CENTRE?

The Region of Waterloo plans to reconstruct the main streets in the community of Petersburg in 2014. The project limits include Notre Dame Drive from the Railway crossing to the north limit of the Highway 7 and 8 interchange, as well as Snyder’s Road from the east village limit (approximately 300 metres east of Notre Dame Drive) to the west village limit (approximately 350 metres west of Notre Dame Drive) for a total combined distance of approximately 2,000 metres. Please refer to Appendix A for a key plan of the Project Area.

Required roadway improvements for both Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road include: replacement of the existing deteriorated pavement; new curb and gutters, new sidewalk on both sides of the road, minor road profile adjustments and installation of storm sewers to improve drainage; on-road cycling lanes; and some sections of on-street parking for vehicles. As well, there will be relocation or upgrading of various utilities incorporated into the project where required to accommodate these improvements.

This Public Consultation Centre (PCC) is a forum for you to:

1. Review the proposed designs for both Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road;
2. Ask questions of staff of the Region of Waterloo, Township of Wilmot and our engineering consultant, MTE Consultants Inc.; and
3. Provide any comments you may have on the design under consideration.

We kindly request that you fill out the Comment Sheet attached to the back of this Information Package and place it in the box at this PCC or send it to the address indicated on the Comment Sheet prior to Monday May 14, 2012. Your comments will be considered by the Project Team in conjunction with all other relevant information in confirming the proposed design for road improvements to Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road.

2. WHO IS DIRECTING THIS PROJECT?

This project is being directed by a Project Team consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo and the Township of Wilmot, and Township of Wilmot Councillor Peter Roe.

3. WHY ARE WE CONSIDERING ROAD IMPROVEMENTS?

There are a number of needs driving this project. The following sections describe these needs and the proposed improvements to address these needs:

**Deteriorated Road Condition**

The pavement condition on many sections of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road is fair to poor. In general, the deterioration is simply due to the age of the asphalt combined with areas of poor roadway drainage. As part of this project, the existing road platform would be fully replaced to provide an improved riding surface.

**Curb and Gutter**

Although a few limited sections of curb and gutter exist near the intersection of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road, the majority of the roadway currently has paved...
shoulders, which are used from time to time for on-street parking. The proposed design provides for new concrete curb and gutter to replace the paved shoulders along both Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road within most of the project limits. New curb and gutter is proposed to improve the collection of stormwater runoff and to better define the edge of the roadway. In addition, it will improve the aesthetics along the roadway as curb and gutter will allow for various boulevard treatments such as grassed boulevards (with trees where space permits) which will enhance and beautify the streetscape within both of these road corridors. By adding curb and gutter and removing the paved shoulders, changes to the current parking arrangements are proposed which are discussed in Section 6 of this Information Package.

Pedestrian Needs

Currently, there is no sidewalk on Notre Dame Drive or on Snyder’s Road. Sidewalk will be constructed as part of this project to provide continuous pedestrian facilities along both sides of both streets, within the built up areas within the village limits. Snow removal on all sidewalks is the responsibility of the abutting landowners as per Township of Wilmot By-Law 84-72.

Cycling Needs

Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road are not designated cycling routes in the Regional Cycling Master Plan. The Township has, however, requested consideration of cycling facilities for these roads and preliminary results from the Walk Cycle Study (Active Transportation Master Plan) show that adding these routes to the network is logical to completing missing cycling network gaps in the area.

To accommodate cyclists, it is proposed that the reconstruction of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road include a reserved lane for bicycles (1.25 metres in width) on each side of the road.

Cross-section views have been developed to illustrate what the proposed improvements would look like. Typical cross-sections are found in Appendix B.

Storm Sewer

There are some existing storm sewers on both Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road which in many instances appear to have been installed to address localized drainage or flooding issues. It is proposed to install new storm sewers and associated catch basins throughout the project limits to provide consistent road drainage. The installation of the catch basins, storm sewer and curb and gutter will also address some of the current issues with road drainage flowing onto driveways and private properties that are lower than the road elevation.

The new storm sewer system will replace the existing “sporadic” storm sewer system which in most cases is undersized, in poor condition and does not match into the new road cross section. During replacement of the storm sewer, any existing private drains that are encountered during the construction will be reconnected to the new storm sewer provided they conform to the Region of Waterloo’s Sewer Use By-Law. Under Regional By-Law Number 1-90 (Sewer Use By-Law), private connections are permitted to storm sewers if the discharges meet the quality criteria as outlined in Section 7 of the By-Law.
NOTE:
If residents are aware of private storm sewer connections from their property to either the existing storm sewers or the existing road ditches (i.e. sump pump discharges, foundation drains etc.) you are encouraged to make this information known to the Region’s Project Manager so that by-law conformance can be confirmed well in advance of construction.

4. WILL THERE BE ANY CHANGES TO THE MUNICIPAL DRAIN?

The existing municipal drain crosses Notre Dame Drive just north of Snyder’s Road, then runs parallel to Snyder’s Road to the North of the existing homes and crosses Snyder’s Road near the west limit of the project. The municipal drain will remain essentially intact. No new storm sewers will connect into the Municipal drain, but the culvert on Snyder’s Road will be modified slightly to repair the existing deteriorated headwalls, and to modify the natural bottom to provide enhanced flow and wildlife movements.

5. ARE ANY CHANGES PROPOSED AT THE NOTRE DAME AND SNYDER’S ROAD INTERSECTION?

Currently the intersection of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road operates with traffic signals. These traffic signals will remain in place, but may be relocated and modernized to match the new road reconstruction details and the Region’s current signalization standards.

Based on a detailed traffic analysis, no turn lanes are warranted at the intersection. Snyder’s Road currently has short right turn lanes in each direction, that essentially function as either a right turn lane or a “bypass” lane when vehicles are stopped to turn left. The intention of this project is to continue to provide sufficient area on Snyder’s Road for through vehicles to pass left turning vehicles. No new turn lanes are proposed for Notre Dame Drive.

6. WHAT CHANGES ARE PROPOSED TO ON-STREET PARKING?

Existing Conditions:
Currently on-street parking is prohibited in the vicinity of the Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road Intersection, as follows

**Snyders Road:**
- No parking anytime on both sides of Snyder Road between Notre Dame Drive and 66 metres east of Notre Dame Drive.
- No stopping anytime on both sides of Snyder’s Road between Notre Dame Drive and 40 metres west of Notre Dame Drive.

**Notre Dame Drive:**
- No parking anytime on both sides of Notre Dame Drive from Snyder’s Road to 90 metres south of Snyder’s Road.
Parking Demand Study

The Region of Waterloo undertook a Parking Demand Study in Petersburg on Saturday, February 4, 2012 and on Wednesday, February 8, 2012. This Parking Demand Study was undertaken to identify the on-street parking usage on a typical weekday and weekend. The study identified the location and number of vehicles which parked on both Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road within the project limits. The results of this study suggest the following:

- On the west leg of Snyder’s Road and the north leg of Notre Dame Drive there is minimal parking.
- On the south leg of Notre Dame Drive parking occurs mostly during weekends. Parking occurs mainly on the west side during all periods.
- On the east leg of Snyder’s Road parking occurs mainly on the north side and is similar for both week-ends and week-days.
- On the west side of the south leg of Notre Dame Drive the majority of parking is short term (15 minutes or less), with longer term parking (greater than 60 minutes) occurring on the weekend.

Proposed Parking

In determining where proposed parking spaces are to be provided, the Project Team reviewed the parking demand study, the physical or grading limitations of the proposed design, the existence of “double” or “single” lane private driveways, and the length of driveways. The proposed “on-street” parking spaces are located between the curb line and the new sidewalk.

Based on the criteria noted above, a summary of the proposed on-street parking is as follows:

- **Snyder’s Road East Leg** – Eight parking spaces provided on the north side only. No parking spaces on the south side due to grading limitations resulting from properties being significantly lower than the road and the close proximity of some residences to the road.
- **Snyder’s Road West Leg** – Five parking spaces provided on the south side only.
- **Notre Dame Drive South Leg** – Two parking spaces provided on the west side only.
- **Notre Dame Drive North Leg** – Between Snyder’s Road and Cecil Kennedy Court/Deerfield Avenue, Three parking spaces provided on the east side. North of Cecil Kennedy/Deerfield, in the vicinity of the Community Park, parking will be available on the paved boulevard (west side) and paved shoulder (east side) of Notre Dame Drive to accommodate overflow parking during special events at the Park. Parking will encroach into the shared cycling facility in this area during these occasional short-term events.

Parking spaces will be cleared of snow by the Region of Waterloo as time permits, and will likely not coincide with the initial main snow clearing operations on the roads. Other than the parking spaces proposed above, on-street parking would be prohibited on Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road.
7. WHAT CHANGES ARE PROPOSED TO ENHANCE THE BOULEVARD AREAS OF PETERSBURG?

The proposed new boulevard areas between curb and sidewalk will be planted with grass, and where possible new trees are proposed to be planted in the boulevard areas.

In the vicinity of the Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road Intersection, the boulevard area between the curb and sidewalk will be coloured patterned concrete, to provide a reduced maintenance surface and improve road aesthetics.

8. WILL A NEW WATERMAIN OR SANITARY SEWER BE INCLUDED IN THIS WORK?

As the community of Petersburg does not have a municipal watermain or sanitary sewer network or treatment facility, construction of watermains and sanitary sewers on Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road is not being considered as part of this project.

NOTE:
If residents are aware of private water systems, drilled or dug wells or private septic systems that are in front yards adjacent to the road allowance, you are encouraged to make this information known to the Region’s Project Manager so this information can be shown on the construction plans and provisions made to protect these systems during construction.

9. HOW DOES THIS PROJECT ADDRESS THE REGION OF WATERLOO’S TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN?

The Region of Waterloo Transportation Master Plan incorporates an auto reduction strategy which emphasizes maximizing the use of the existing transportation system; and, assuming a more than doubling in transit, pedestrian and cycling trips, targets reduction in the percentage of future total trips made by autos by the year 2021. This auto reduction target is considered to be aggressive and will be accomplished through Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies focusing on public transit enhancements, cycling and pedestrian facilities and TDM supportive land uses.

As part of this project, the Project Team is incorporating improved cycling facilities and sidewalks toward meeting the auto reduction goal and the objectives of the Region’s Transportation Master Plan.

10. IS ANY PRIVATE PROPERTY REQUIRED TO COMPLETE THE WORK?

Some property acquisition will be required for this project and these property acquisitions are highlighted on the plans presented at this evening’s Consultation Centre. When property is required for a Regional project, the owner would be reimbursed at fair market value. An independent appraisal would be completed based upon recent local sales to determine fair market value. For further information please see the Property Acquisition Process Information Sheet in Appendix C.
11. **WHEN WILL CONSTRUCTION OCCUR?**

Following this PCC, the Project Team will be compiling the public comments before making a final recommendation to Regional Council for project approval in 2012. Following project approval, detailed design will be completed and utility relocations undertaken. Tenders are scheduled for late 2013/early 2014 and the earliest construction start would be Spring 2014. Both Snyder’s Road and Notre Dame Drive will be completed under the same construction contract. Both roads could be worked on at the same time, but the construction contract will be structured to avoid significant disruptions on both roads at the same time in order to minimize inconvenience to the local residents and travelling public.

Prior to construction, another Public Information Centre will be held to provide more information on specific construction details and timing. The following sections (12 – 18) provide a summary of some of the more common construction questions that arise.

12. **WILL THE ROADS BE CLOSED AND WILL THERE BE DETOURS?**

The work will involve deep excavations for the storm sewer replacement and for roadbase reconstruction. It may be necessary to close the roads to all but local traffic when construction is occurring. Detours will be put in place for through traffic. Signs would be erected to detour this through traffic around the construction area via adjacent Regional and Township Roads. The Fire Department, Waterloo Regional Police and Ambulance Service, as well as school boards for bus routing, will all be advised of the traffic restrictions and detour routes during the construction period.

In order to confine the work area and to minimize the amount of time work is happening at any one location, work requiring a full road closure will only occur on one leg of the four legs of Snyder’s Road and Notre Dame Drive at a time.

During the construction, local access to individual properties will be maintained at all times over temporary gravel surfaces.

As is customary when Regional Road detours are required, motorists will be advised of the construction timing and traffic restrictions through advance signage, the Region’s web site, and radio and newspaper notices.

13. **HOW WILL ACCESS BE MAINTAINED TO PROPERTIES DURING CONSTRUCTION?**

Access to private driveways will be maintained at all times to the greatest extent possible. The Contractor will, however, be required to temporarily block access into and out of all driveways on Snyder’s Road and Notre Dame Drive and side streets when completing any deep excavations across each driveway/side street. Where a disruption to your driveway is expected, the Contractor will be required to hand-deliver a notice at least 48 hours in advance advising you of the time and duration of the driveway disruption.

For commercial properties, access for customers will be maintained at all times. If an alternate, secondary access is not available, the Contractor will complete the work across your driveway one ½ at a time, while maintaining the other ½ for customer access to your property. For commercial properties within the construction zone, “Name
of Business” signage will be provided during construction to direct customers to the businesses. The Region does not give tax relief or compensation to businesses within the work zone. The Region makes all reasonable efforts to mitigate the impact to properties and businesses during construction.

For residential properties, it may be necessary to block driveways for up to one day at various times. If necessary, alternate parking arrangements will be made on side streets or outside the immediate construction area.

Property and business owners are asked to contact the Region’s supervisor if they have any concerns in relation to access, signage or other issues during the project so it can be determined if reasonable changes or modifications can be made.

Special attention will also be given to ensure access is maintained for emergency vehicles during and after construction hours.

**Pedestrian Access**

Pedestrian access will be maintained on at least one side of both Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road for the duration of the construction. Where the pedestrian area is close to deep excavations, it will be separated from the work area by plastic fencing. Pedestrians may be required to cross Notre Dame Road and Snyder’s Road at mid-block locations on some occasions to use the opposite side of the street.

**14. HOW WILL TREES, DRIVEWAYS AND LAWNS BE AFFECTED?**

It is expected that a small number of trees will have to be removed during construction to accommodate the proposed improvements. The plans presented at the Public Consultation Centre show trees that likely will require removal. It is the Region’s practice to plant two replacement trees for each tree removed as a result of any road projects. There will be some work required at private driveways and front yards to tie into new curb and gutter and sidewalk. Restoration to driveways will be done using materials which match those which are existing (asphalt will be replaced with asphalt, etc). However, all driveway aprons (portion between sidewalk and curb) will be completed in concrete. Any grassed areas disturbed during construction will be repaired to equal or better condition with topsoil and sod.

**15. HOW WILL GARBAGE / RECYCLING BE COLLECTED DURING CONSTRUCTION?**

During construction we will ask that you continue to place your garbage and blue boxes at the end of your driveway for pick-up as usual. When work is occurring in front of your home and garbage collection vehicles do not have access to your driveway, our Contractor will deliver your garbage and recyclables to an adjacent side street and return the empty containers afterwards. We ask that all residents mark their containers with their address for easy identification.
16. **WHAT ABOUT DUST DURING CONSTRUCTION?**

The Region will be monitoring the amount of dust generated by construction activities on a daily basis. When necessary, the Region will ensure that the contractor uses proper dust suppression measures (i.e. the application of water and/or calcium chloride) in accordance with the construction documents and specifications.

17. **WILL THERE BE ANY IMPACTS TO THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT?**

Normal erosion and sediment controls will be put in place as part of the work during any construction activity. All vegetated areas disturbed as part of this project will be reinstated to equal or better condition than what existed before construction.

18. **WHAT ABOUT WORKING HOURS?**

In general, construction working hours will be from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. There may be occasions where the contractor requests or is required to complete a critical work item after normal hours. In these special cases, this type of work outside normal working hours must be agreed to by the Region and the Township of Wilmot and must be proven to be critical to the requirements of the project or to lessen a public inconvenience associated with the work.

19. **WILL THE POSTED SPEED LIMIT BE INCREASED?**

The Region will retain the existing posted speed limits of 60 km/hr on Notre Dame Drive and Snyder's Road following construction.

20. **WHAT IS THE ESTIMATED COST OF THIS PROJECT AND HOW WILL IT BE FUNDED?**

The Region of Waterloo is funding the road improvements on this project and the total budget for the proposed Notre Dame Drive and Snyder's Road improvements is $4,580,000.00.

21. **WHAT IS THE NEXT STEP BEFORE FINALIZING THE DESIGN?**

Prior to finalizing the final recommended design concept for Notre Dame Drive and Snyder's Road for Regional Council's approval, the Project Team is asking for the public's input on the proposed work. This Public Consultation Centre is your opportunity to ask questions, provide suggestions, and make comments. Once your input is received, it will be used by the Project Team, in conjunction with all other relevant information, to finalize the recommended design. Prior to construction, another Information Centre will be held to advise residents and property owners regarding specific timing and detour requirements.

22. **WHEN WILL FINAL DECISIONS BE MADE FOR THIS PROJECT?**

The Project Team will review the public comments received from this evening’s Public Consultation Centre and use them as input for recommending a final Design Concept for the Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road Reconstruction project. This Final Recommendation will be presented to Regional Planning and Works Committee and
Council in the Fall of 2012 for approval. In advance of these meetings, letters will be sent to all adjacent property owners and tenants (as well as to all members of the public specifically registering at this Public Consultation Centre) so that anyone wishing to speak to Committee or Council about this project can do so before final approval.

23. **HOW CAN I VOICE MY COMMENTS AT THIS STAGE?**

   In order to assist us in addressing any comments or concerns you might have regarding this project, we ask that you please fill out the attached Comment Sheet and leave it in the box provided at the registration table. Alternatively, you can mail, fax or e-mail your comments to the Region of Waterloo not later than Monday May 14, 2012.

   We thank you for your involvement and should you have any questions or concerns, please contact:

   Mr. Bob Wheildon, P.Eng.
   Senior Project Manager
   Regional Municipality of Waterloo
   150 Frederick Street, 6th Floor
   Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3
   Phone: 519-575-4757 x 3103
   Fax: 519-575-4430
   Email: rwheildon@regionofwaterloo.ca
Appendix B
Typical Cross Sections

TYPICAL ROAD SECTION WITH SIDEWALK

Note: Curb will transition to barrier, curb & gutter at the intersection and where the boulevard is hard surface.
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Appendix C

Property Acquisition Process Information Sheet

(Projects requiring Class Environmental Assessment Approval) The following information is provided as a general overview of the property acquisition process and is not legal advice. Further, the steps, timing and processes can vary depending on the individual circumstances of each case.

Once the Class Environmental Assessment is complete and the Environmental Study Report outlining the Recommended Design Concept has been approved, the property acquisition process and the efforts of Regional Real Estate staff will focus on acquiring the required lands to implement the approved design. Regional staff cannot make fundamental amendments or changes to the approved design concept.

Property Impact Plans

After the project has been approved and as it approaches final design, the project planners will generate drawings and sketches indicating what lands and interests need to be acquired from each affected property to undertake the project. These drawings are referred to as Property Impact Plans (PIP).

Initial Owner Contact by Regional Real Estate Staff

Once the PIPs are available, Regional Real Estate staff will contact the affected property owners by telephone and mail to introduce themselves and set-up initial meetings to discuss the project and proposed acquisitions.

Initial Meetings

The initial meeting is attended by the project engineer and the assigned real estate staff person to brief the owner on the project, what part of their lands are to be acquired or will be affected, what work will be undertaken, when, with what equipment, etc and to answer any questions. The primary purpose of the meeting is to listen to the owner and identify issues, concerns, effects of the proposed acquisition on remaining lands and businesses that can be feasibly mitigated and/or compensated, and how the remaining property may be restored. These discussions may require additional meetings. The goal of staff is to work with the owner to reach mutually agreeable solutions.

Goal – Fair and Equitable Settlement for All Parties

The goal is always to reach a fair and equitable agreement for both the property owner and the Region. Such an agreement will provide compensation for the fair market value of the lands and address the project impacts (such as repairing or replacing landscaping, fencing, paving) so that the property owner will receive the value of the lands acquired and the restoration of their remaining property to the condition it was prior to the Project. The initial meetings will form the basis on an offer of settlement or agreement of purchase and sale for the required lands or interest.
Steps Toward Offer of Settlement or Agreement of Purchase and Sale

The general steps towards such an offer are as follows:

1) the Region will obtain an independent appraisal of the fair market value of the lands and interests to be acquired, and an appraisal of any effect on the value of the rest of the property resulting from the acquisition of the required lands and interests;

2) compensation will be estimated and/or works to minimize other effects will be defined and agreed to by the property owner and the Region;

3) reasonable costs of the owner will be included in any compensation settlement;

4) an offer with a purchase price and any other compensation or works in lieu of compensation will be submitted to the property owner for consideration; and

5) an Agreement will be finalized with any additional discussion, valuations, etc as may be required.

Depending on the amount of compensation, most agreements will require the approval of Council. The approval is undertaken in Closed Session which is not open to the public to ensure a level of confidentiality.

Expropriation

Due to the time constraints of these projects, it is the practice of the Region to commence the expropriation process in parallel with the negotiation process to insure that lands and interests are acquired in time for commencement of the Project. Typically, over 90% of all required lands and interests are acquired through the negotiation process. Even after lands and interest have been acquired through expropriation an agreement on compensation can be reached through negotiation, this is usually referred to as a “settlement agreement”.

Put simply, an expropriation is the transfer of lands or an easement of a governmental authority for reasonable compensation, including payment of fair market value for the transferred lands, without the consent of the property owner being required. In the case of expropriations by municipalities such as the Region of Waterloo, the process set out in the Ontario Expropriations Act must be followed to ensure that the rights of the property owners provided under the Act are protected.
COMMENT SHEET
REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO

NOTRE DAME DRIVE AND SNYDER’S ROAD RECONSTRUCTION
Petersburg
Township of Wilmot

PUBLIC CONSULTATION CENTRE – Tuesday May 1, 2012

Please complete and hand in this sheet so that your views can be considered for this project. If you cannot complete your comments today, please take this home and mail, fax or e-mail your comments by Monday May 14, 2012 to:

Mr. Bob. Wheildon, P. Eng.
Senior Project Manager,
Design and Construction Division
Regional Municipality of Waterloo
Facsimile: 519-575-4430

6th Floor, 150 Frederick Street
Kitchener, ON N2J 4G3
email: rwheildon@regionofwaterloo.ca

Are you in favour of the Project Team's proposed changes?  ☐ Yes  ☐ No

Comments or concerns regarding this project:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Name: ____________________________
Address: __________________________
Postal Code: ________________________
Phone Number: _____________________

COLLECTION NOTICE

Personal information requested on this form is collected under the authority of the Municipal Act and will be used to assist the Region of Waterloo in making a decision on this project. Any personal information such as name, address, telephone number, and property location included in a submission from the public may become part of the public record file for this matter. Questions regarding this collection should be forwarded to the staff member indicated above.”
REGION OF WATERLOO
TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
Rapid Transit

TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: April 17, 2012

FILE CODE: A02-30/PW

SUBJECT: REGION OF WATERLOO RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT: HYDRO ONE CORRIDOR

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into an agreement with Hydro One to prepare tender documents, manage the tendering process, and deliver Class A cost estimates to remove and relocate Hydro One infrastructure underground between Courtland Avenue and Fairview Park Mall, at an upset fee limit of $530,000 plus applicable taxes.

SUMMARY:

Nil

REPORT:

The Region continues to plan for population and employment growth over the next two decades. Recognizing this challenge, Council approved rapid transit as the preferred transportation mode to move people and to shape urban form.

With project approval in place, the construction is planned to commence in 2014 and system operations beginning in 2017. To execute the project within this schedule there are a number of key decision points and major milestones that will have to be met before 2014. Adherence to the project schedule is critical because delays to the project schedule have the potential to result in scope creep and increased costs.

One of these key decisions involve removing the existing Hydro One overhead circuit and towers, and replacing them with buried infrastructure, beside the approved rapid transit route alignment, between Courtland Avenue and Fairview Park Mall. The general study area is shown in Appendix A.

Staff have been coordinating with Hydro One in advancing this work and have been advised that in order to achieve this, a number of activities need to commence immediately. These tasks will be managed by Hydro One staff, with regular input from the Region, and will include:

- Undertaking technical studies (e.g. geo-tech soil testing, soil thermal resistivity testing);
- Consulting with the Region and other agencies;
- Preparing engineering drawings;
- Developing engineering specification for the underground cable tender;
- Preparing contract tender for the underground cable work;
- Issuing the tender and managing the tender process; and
- Developing Class A construction cost estimates.
In light of the above, staff recommend that the Region enter into an agreement with Hydro One to undertake the above noted tasks at an upset fee limit of $530,000 plus applicable taxes. This early relocation will save the Region time and money by reducing the possibility of construction delays and allowing the constructor of the LRT a clear construction site.

Following the completion of this assignment, staff will review the tender submissions with Hydro One and prepare recommendations for Council approval to execute the contract to undertake construction.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The report supports Focus Area 3.1 of Council’s Strategic Focus: Develop an implementation plan for light rail transit including corridor and station area planning.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The approved 2011 Regional budget for rapid transit provides the necessary funding resources for the entire Rapid Transit project and would cover the funds being requested. The estimated total cost to relocate the Hydro One towers is $20M. This amount is included in the Rapid Transit project budget for this task.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

This report was prepared with input from Transportation and Environmental Services and Finance.

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix A – Study Area
Appendix B – Cost Summary

PREPARED BY: Darshpreet Bhatti, Acting Director, Rapid Transit
APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services
Study Area
## Cost Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical Studies</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Specifications</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (excluding tax)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$530,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: April 17, 2012

FILE CODE: T01-20/53

SUBJECT: 60 KM/H MAXIMUM SPEED ON FAIRWAY ROAD (REGIONAL ROAD 53) BETWEEN LACKNER BOULEVARD (REGIONAL ROAD 54) AND ZELLER ROAD, CITY OF KITCHENER

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo amend Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended following the completion of construction of Fairway Road (Regional Road 53) from Zeller Drive to Fountain Street (Regional Road 17), to:

a) Remove from Schedule 18, 60 km/h maximum speed, Fairway Road (Regional Road 53) from 120 metres east of Old Chicopee Trail to Lackner Boulevard (Regional Road 54); and

b) Add to Schedule 18, 60km/h maximum speed, Fairway Road (Regional Road 53) from 120 metres east of Old Chicopee Trail to 50 metres east of Zeller Drive,

in the City of Kitchener, as outlined in Report E-12-030, dated April 17, 2012.

SUMMARY:

NIL

REPORT:

The Region of Waterloo is currently completing the final stage of the Fairway Road extension from Zeller Drive to Fountain Street. This section of Fairway Road is expected to be complete in October 2012. Figure 1 below shows the existing and recommended maximum posted speed limits along Fairway Road.

Fairway Road between Lackner Boulevard and Zeller Drive is primarily backlotted with few access points to Fairway Road. The road environment of this section of Fairway Road is similar to the section of Fairway Road between Old Chicopee Trail and Lackner Boulevard which is currently posted at 60 km/h.

To create a speed limit transition zone along Fairway Road, Transportation Division staff is recommending increasing the current 50 km/h maximum posted speed limit between Lackner Boulevard and Pebble Creek Drive to 60 km/h and that this increase be posted following the completion of Fairway Road between Zeller Drive and Fountain Street. This recommendation will create a continuous 60 km/h maximum posted speed limit from 120 metres east of Old Chicopee Trail to 50 metres east of Zeller Drive and will reduce the number of different speed zones on Fairway Road between Old Chicopee Trail and Kossuth Road from 3 to 2. The remaining section of the newly constructed Fairway Road extension will be posted at 80 km/h.
The section of Fairway Road east of Zeller Drive changes from an urban environment to a more rural surrounding. It is anticipated that motorists travelling eastbound along Fairway Road will increase their travel speeds as they leave the built up area east of the Zeller Drive and those motorists travelling westbound approaching the built up area will likely reduce their travel speeds west of Zeller Drive when entering the roundabout.

**Figure 1 Proposed Fairway Road Extension**

Transportation staff placed information signs along Fairway Road requesting comments on the proposed changes from the public through the Region’s website or via telephone; an internet questionnaire was setup to receive comments and a phone number was provided. As a follow up to the web survey, 35 questionnaires were hand delivered to residents fronting and backing onto Fairway Road between Lackner Boulevard and Pebble Creek Drive also requesting comments on the proposed changes.

A total of 17 responses were received which show that 82% (14 of 17) are in favour of the proposed 60 km/h speed limit from 120 metres east of Old Chicopee Trail to 50 metres east of Zeller Drive. Those residents in opposition of the proposed 60 km/h speed limit are concerned that increasing the maximum rate of speed to 60 km/h will increase the travel speed on Fairway Road.

City of Kitchener staff supports this recommendation and interested parties have been informed of this report and scheduled meeting.
CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This report addresses the Region’s goal to implement proven roadway safety strategies and education to enhance the safety of our roadways (Strategic Objective 3.3.2).

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The cost to implement the relevant signing is approximately $1,500 and is provided for in the 2012 Transportation Capital Program for the construction of the Fairway Road extension.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

The Design and Construction Division was consulted in the preparation of this report.

The Council and Administrative Services Division will be required to prepare the amending by-law.

ATTACHMENTS:

NIL

PREPARED BY:  Mike Jones, Engineering Technologist (Traffic)

APPROVED BY:  Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services
REPORT:

Background

Managing drifting snow on Regional roads can be very challenging at times and requires significant resources to minimize, monitor and clear. Drifting snow can result in slippery road surfaces, white-out conditions, road closures, etc and requires additional road plowing and salting. According to the Ministry of Transportation of Ontario (MTO), drifting snow is responsible for up to 30% of the annual plowing, salting and sanding activities for roads with a rural cross-section adjacent to open areas with little or no ground cover account.
The Region currently installs and removes temporary snow fences at over 100 sites adjacent to Regional roads on an annual basis to help reduce the amount of snow that blows onto our roadways which in turn decreases the amount of salt and plowing required. The temporary snow fences are installed in the fall at these selected locations and removed in the spring at the end of winter season prior to the growing season. Occasionally snow fence cannot be installed in preferred locations due to weather and/or soil conditions, land use changes, landowners operations, etc. Permanent snow fence or windbreaks (e.g. fencing, earth-berms, landscaping/live snow fences, etc) can in some instances replace the higher cost of installation, maintenance and removal associated with temporary snow fences. There are various permanent and temporary snow fence strategies that can be used to minimize the amount of wind-deposited snow on the roadway.

Live Snow Fence

Regional staff in-conjunction with the TWEEC, an 11-member committee established by Township Council to improve the quality of the natural environment in Woolwich Township, would like to develop a living snow fence on a private property along Regional Road 85, to complement the Region’s existing temporary snow fence program.

A traditional live snow fence consists of a row or rows of trees, usually one type of conifer, planted to provide a wind barrier and trap snow. All too often, such windbreaks consist of same-aged trees of a single species which eventually decline and die off at more or less the same time. They must then be replaced, and it may take several years until the new trees reach sufficient size to fulfill their role effectively. The Region’s largest example of a live snow fence or windbreak is located north of Linwood along the west side of Manser Road between the Line 86 and William Hastings intersections. Officially known as the Macton Regional Forest, the northernmost parcel of this windbreak is a 21.5 hectare tract of White Spruce acquired by the former County of Waterloo in 1945 and planted to prevent snow blowing onto the adjoining road.

The proposed live snow fence would be located on existing private land and would cover an area of approximately 2 acres (0.57 hectares) of farmland in a 15 by 500 m strip, offset 15 to 30 m from the road right-of-way. To ensure control over the land, a permanent easement agreement between the Region and landowner is recommended. Security of tenure is required to improve the long-term safety of the road by allowing the live snow fence to remain in place permanently and thereby protect the initial capital investment of this project. It is anticipated that the mixed vegetation strip will also help to minimize soil erosion, improve drainage of the land, and increase crop yields. An agreement is also recommended between the Region and TWEEC that outlines TWEEC’s involvement in the design, planting, monitoring, and maintenance of the naturalized area. It is expected that this will help reduce overall installation and maintenance costs associated with this site as well as promote local knowledge of and participation in this project.

Regional staff working with TWEEC will select a locally appropriate mixture of native species of trees, shrubs, and herbaceous species suitable for planting in a live snow fence. Special care would be taken to selecting a diversity of native tree, shrub, and grass species to ensure longevity and stability by minimizing risk of disease (e.g. Dutch Elm Disease), insect infestations (e.g. Emerald Ash Borer), enhancing resilience to fire (e.g. native prairie grasses have deep roots) and not allowing structures on easement (e.g. a sugar shack). By pursuing this approach, the Region would optimize the sustainability of the new trees planted.

A live snow fence may take a few years to become fully functional and it is recommended that the initial planting include a substantial proportion of conifers such as White Spruce and White Cedar which are effective at trapping blowing snow. Shrub species, such as dogwoods and serviceberry, which have multiple stems and/or branches lower than trees and that provide a larger surface area for slowing down wind-blown snow, will be planted. Some larger specimens of these species can be
spaded in to accelerate the establishment of the snow fence until smaller deciduous trees and shrubs grow to such a size that they contribute to the effectiveness of the snow fence.

Regional staff will set up a monitoring program to determine the effectiveness of this project. If the results of this project are positive Regional staff will consider the establishment of a live snow fence program for consideration for other locations adjacent to Regional roads. Program signage will be developed for this project. It is planned that the live snow fence would be constructed in the fall of 2012.

**Regional Partnership with TWEEC and Landowner**

Region staff has initiated discussions with the private landowner for the acquisition of an easement over the land required for the living snow fence. The landowner is interested in conveying such an easement to the Region provided that a mutually satisfactory purchase price can be negotiated that compensates for the lost income from the removal of the land from crop production.

The 11-members of TWEEC consist of Councillor Mark Bauman, 1 township staff, 4 members of Woolwich Healthy Communities, and 5 members of the public. The group has initiated, promoted and participated in several tree planting activities and are eager to help through all phases of this project including discussions with the landowner, designing, planning, planting, and maintenance. Regional staff has met several times with Township staff and Woolwich councillor Mark Bauman to discuss this project. Design considerations were also discussed with the Region’s Environmental and Stewardship Planner.

A maintenance agreement between the Region and TWEEC would outline the tasks required and the responsibilities of both parties.

**CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

This proposed project aligns with Focus Area 1 (Environmental Sustainability) of the Region’s Strategic Plan:

Strategic Objective 1.1, (Integrate environmental considerations into the Region’s decision-making) applies to this project as the Region plans to provide funding to support this community based initiative.

Strategic Objective 1.2, which is to reduce greenhouse gases and improve air quality, is accomplished by planting native species which act as natural forms of carbon storage and by decreasing fuel usage and associated air emissions form the reduction in the need to plow and install and remove traditional snow fences on an annual basis.

Strategic Objective 1.4, refers to our goal to protect the quality and quantity of our water sources and applies to this project in terms of protecting our water quality by reducing the salt required to treat snow covered roads, as indicated in our Salt Management Plan.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

It is estimated that the initial site preparation, plantings, signage and cost to acquire a permanent easement is approximately $50,000. The 2012 Transportation Capital Program under the salt management project includes sufficient funding for this project. The ongoing maintenance costs, such as watering will be covered under the existing Road operations maintenance budget.
It is expected that the cost of planting a live snow fence/windbreak in this area will be similar to the overall long term costs of annually installing and removing the temporary snow fence. Drainage, reduced erosion, and increased crop yields are expected benefits of a windbreak to the farmer.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Legal Services and Community Planning have been consulted on this project.

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix A - Live Snow Fence Location and View

PREPARED BY:  *Dave Lukezich*, Winter Maintenance Specialist, Transportation Operations

APPROVED BY:  *Thomas Schmidt*, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Live Snow Fence Location and View

Approximate location of snow fence easement shown as shaded area.
View of the proposed live snow fence easement.

View of existing wind break just south of the Macton tract.
REGION OF WATERLOO
TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
Transportation

TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: April 17, 2012

FILE CODE: T01-20/53

SUBJECT: REGIONAL ROAD 53 (FAIRWAY ROAD) EXTENSION

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo pass a by-law to amend Road Consolidation By-law 01-059 (Regional Road System) to:

a) Effective upon passing of the by-law assume Woolner Drive, from Pebblecreek Drive / Upper Mercer Street to Old Zeller Drive (described as Part 13 on reference Plan 58R-16364) from the City of Kitchener and add to the Regional Road System to form part of Regional Road 53 (Fairway Road).

b) Effective upon passing of the by-law assume a portion of Old Zeller Drive, (being Part of PIN 22713-3863 of Part 14 on the reference plan to be deposited at the land registry office) from the city of Kitchener and add to the Regional Road System to form part of Regional Road 53 (Fairway Road).

c) Effective upon passing of the by-law establish and open as part of Regional Road 53 (Fairway Road) the lands as described below:

- Part 1, Part of Block 172, R. P. 58M-331, PIN 22713-2599, on reference plan 58R-16364;
- Part 2, Part of Lot 8, R. P. 591, PIN 22713-2688, on reference plan 58R-16364;
- Part 3, Part of Block 37, R. P. 58M-449, PIN 22713-3860, on reference plan 58R-16364;
- Part 4, Part of Block 37, R. P. 58M-449, PIN 22713-3860, on reference plan 58R-16364;
- Part 6, Part of Lot 117, G. C. T and Part of Lot 9, R. P. 591, PIN 22713-3863;
- Part 31 Part of Lot 13, R. P., 591, PIN 22713-2695 on reference plan 58R-16364; and
- Part 1, Lot 8, PIN 22713-2688, on reference Plan 58R-14717.

d) Effective at 12:01 a.m. on October 1, 2012 establish and open as part of Regional Road 53 (Fairway Road) of the Regional Road System the lands as described below:

- Part 8, Part of Lot 9, R. P. 591, PIN 22713-4566, on the reference plan to be deposited at the land registry office;
- Part 9, Part of Lot 9, R. P. 591, PIN 22713-4566, on the reference plan to be deposited at the land registry office;
- Part 10, Part of Lot 9, R. P. 591, PIN 22713-4566, on the reference plan to be deposited at the land registry office;
- Part 6, Part of Lot 14, R. P. 591, PIN 22713-2424, on reference plan 58R-16576;
- Part 7, Part of 14, R. P. 591, PIN 22713-2424, on reference plan 58-R-16576;
• Part 8, Part of Lots 14 and 16, R. P. 591, PIN 22713-2424, on reference plan 58R-16576;
• Part 9, Part of Lot 16, R. P. 591 and Part of Lot 117, G. C. T, PIN 22713-2424;
• Part 24, Part of Lot 116, G. C. T., PIN 22713-0918, on reference plan 58R-16369;
• Part 26, Part of Lot 116, G. C. T., PIN 22736-0010, on reference plan 58R-16369; and

e) Effective at 12:01 am on October 1, 2012 assume a portion of Riverbank Drive (described as Part 25, Part of Lot 116, G. C. T., PIN 22736-0001, on reference plan 58R-16369) from the City of Cambridge and add to the Regional Road System to form part of Regional Road 53 (Fairway Road).

f) Establish and open as part of Regional Road 31 (Kossuth Road) of the Regional Road System the lands as described below:

• Part 30, Part of Lot 126, G. C. T., PIN 22736-0010, on reference plan 58R-16369.

SUMMARY:

NIL

REPORT:

In 2011, a road system expansion project was commenced to extend Regional Road 53 (Fairway Road) from Pebblecreek Drive/ Upper Mercer Street in the City of Kitchener across the Grand River to Regional Road 17 (Fountain Street) in the City of Cambridge. As part of this project there was a requirement to acquire several parcels of land for the new road. Since the construction will be completed this year there is a requirement for Council to approve a by-law to establish these lands as a road in order for the Region to be protected under the Municipal Act. These parcels of land are described above in the recommendation.

Figure 1 below illustrates the sections of road that will be added to the Regional Road system that will form Regional Road 53 (Fairway Road). Appendix A includes a letter from the City of Cambridge agreeing to the transfer of a section of Riverbank Drive to the Region. As well, based on discussions between Region and City of Kitchener staff, the City is in agreement with the transfer of a section of Woolner Drive to the Region.

It should be noted that the construction of Fairway Road from Fountain Street to Old Zeller Drive has an anticipated construction completion date of October 31, 2012, and this section of road is anticipated to be opened on November 1, 2012. This by-law is being dated October 1, 2012 in the event the construction completion date is earlier than anticipated. The construction of Fairway Road from Pebblecreek Drive / Upper Mercer Street to Old Zeller Drive is almost complete and is anticipated to be opened upon passing of this by-law (April 25, 2012).
Figure 1 Illustrates the sections of road that will be added to the Regional Road system to form Regional Road 53 (Fairway Road)

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The recommendation of this report addresses the Region’s focus area, Growth Management and Prosperity and Strategic Objective 2.2: develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The total mileage of the Regional Road System will be increased by approximately 6.64 lane kilometers and will require a $61,700 base adjustment to the Transportation Operations Budget in 2013 for the maintenance and operation of this road and bridge structure.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Corporate Resources staff will be involved in the preparation of the by-law amendments and planning staff will undertake any amendments required to the Regional Official Policies Plan.

The Design and Construction Division was consulted in the preparation of this report.
ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix A - Letter from the City of Cambridge agreeing to transfer of a section of Riverbank Drive to the Region.

PREPARED BY:  Andrea Buckley, Senior Project Manager, Transportation Infrastructure

APPROVED BY:  Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Region of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street, 6th Floor
Kitchener, ON
N2G 4J3

Attention: John Stephenson, M.Eng., P.Eng., P.E.

Dear Sir,

Re: Fairway Road Extension – Road Allowance Adoption

April 5, 2012

This letter is to acknowledge that the City of Cambridge Transportation and Public Works Department acknowledges that a parcel of land identified as Part 25, Plan 58R-16369, currently part of the Riverbank Drive road allowance (abandoned), is intended to be transferred to the Region of Waterloo, to become part of the Fairway Road allowance subject to, and in accordance with formal approval requirements.

If you have any questions regarding the above, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours Truly,

[Signature]

George Elliott, P.Eng.
Commissioner of Transportation and Public Works

DB/

Cc George Forhan, Director, Realty & Corporate Property Services Division
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: April 17, 2012

FILE CODE: C06-60/P&W/WS.12/E07-80

SUBJECT: WATER EFFICIENCY MASTER PLAN PROGRESS, 2007 - 2011

RECOMMENDATION:

For information

SUMMARY:

The Region of Waterloo has exceeded the 2015 Water Efficiency Master Plan water saving target for the residential, commercial, industrial and institutional sectors by 42 per cent. From 2007 to 2011, these programs achieved cumulative water savings of 8,504 m³ per day, which is enough water to supply the drinking water needs of 11,339 households. The Water Efficiency Master Plan target for this time period was 5,988 m³ per day. An estimated average of 795 m³ per day is also saved through the Region’s Outdoor Water Use Reduction Program.

This report was reviewed and discussed by the Water Efficiency Advisory Committee (WEAC) on March 28, 2012.

REPORT:

The Regional Municipality of Waterloo has implemented water efficiency programs since 1974. The Region’s first “Water Efficiency Master Plan” (WEMP) was approved in 1998, followed by the current master plan update, which was approved in 2006. The current WEMP, covering the period 2007 – 2015, has set a cumulative water savings target of 8,146 m³ per day or 1.8 million gallons per day (MGD) by the year 2015. This target focuses on additional water savings to be achieved, and does not take into account water savings achieved through programs delivered prior to 2007.

The Water Efficiency Section, Water Services Division, delivers a variety of programs under the following WEMP categories:

- Public Education and Marketing
- Outdoor Water Use Reduction
- Efficient Toilet Replacements
- Commercial, Industrial and Institutional (CII) Efficiencies
- Municipal Leak Reduction
- Research and Development

This report summarizes the program accomplishments and water savings achieved between 2007 and 2011. This information will be provided as background information to potential consultants as Water Services embarks on a WEMP update beginning in 2013. The update is expected to be completed in 2014 and implemented beginning in 2015.
Public Education and Marketing

The Water Efficiency Section delivers several key messages to the Region of Waterloo. The target audiences for these communications range from the general population to specific segments of the community, depending on vehicles used and outcomes desired. Key populations targeted include school children; homeowners; business leaders; and commercial, industrial and institutional (CII) facility managers.

The main objectives of Water Efficiency Communications are:

- to promote the intrinsic value of water as a resource to be conserved and protected
- to educate audiences about water conserving behaviours
- to educate audiences about Region-specific plans/programs/incentives available
- to trigger actions that result in measurable water savings

It is recognized that the most powerful way to communicate is through direct, person-to-person contact. For this reason, Water Efficiency staff communicates with an average of 3,427 people per year through public speaking, school programs, special events, displays and home shows.

Telephone Communications

Water Efficiency staff receives the bulk of telephone calls from the public through two main telephone numbers. Toilet Replacement Program and general program enquiries come to 519-575-4021, and the Water Conservation By-Law calls come to 519-575-4495. Call totals through these extensions have declined slowly from over 10,000 per year in 2009 and earlier, to 8,255 in 2011. The downward trend in calls is attributed to residents’ increasing familiarity with Water Efficiency Programs and the Water Conservation By-Law, and the fact that more people are accessing program information through the internet and email.

Award-Winning Marketing Communications

The Water Efficiency Section provides program information and interactive games and graphics on the Region web site and offers a wide array of literature and curriculum resources to schools and the public. The Ontario Water Works Association recognized the Water Efficiency Section with a Public Education Award for its “Thrills ‘n’ Spills” interactive board game for children in 2010.

Annual marketing initiatives have included delivering the “Environews” newsletter to each household twice per year, and targeted advertising campaigns to promote rain barrel distributions, the Water Conservation By-Law, Toilet Replacement Program, Naturescaping Seminars and other activities.

Water Use Reduction from Public Education and Marketing

Measuring the exact water savings achieved through public education and marketing is difficult. The current WEMP assumes that effective public education and marketing will generate water savings of five litres per capita per day, which is an approximate three per cent reduction.
Outdoor Water Use Reduction

The Region of Waterloo has delivered an aggressive outdoor water use reduction program during the past five years. The program was included in the master plan to achieve the following objectives:

- ensure water is available to fight fires and supply emergencies
- reduce drinking water treatment and energy costs
- extend the useful lifespan of existing infrastructure
- minimize the environmental impacts of a growing community
- reduce peak season drinking water demands

The main elements of the outdoor water use reduction program have been:

- the promotion of low water use Naturescaping (landscaping)
- Rain Water Harvesting (Rain Barrel distribution)
- Water Conservation By-law

Naturescaping Seminars

The Region of Waterloo has delivered a series of six naturescaping seminars each spring since 2007. The seminars have featured a variety of topics around lawn alternatives and water efficient plant ideas. Hosted by community partners, including garden centres, municipal facilities and community centres, the series has been offered for free and has seen a steadily increasing attendance level each year, with waiting lists established. The venues each accommodate between 50 and 100 attendees. There are no direct water savings credited to the seminars, but they are popular in the community and support other aspects of water conservation both outdoors and in general.

Rain Barrel Distributions

Water Services has successfully purchased and distributed 200 litre rain barrels in Waterloo Region for 11 consecutive years. A total of 25,000 rain barrels were distributed to residents at the subsidized cost of $20 each from 2001 to 2005, 15,000 rain barrels were distributed for $30 each from 2006 to 2010, and 3,000 rain barrels were distributed at a cost of $40 each in 2011.

In addition to water savings, rain barrel distributions benefit the community by:

- Increasing public awareness about the importance of water conservation;
- Encouraging and supporting participation in the Water Conservation By-Law;
- Promoting a conservation ethic that leads to other water saving practices.

During the master plan reporting period of 2007 to 2011, the 14,823 rain barrels distributed are estimated to be saving 17,788 m³ per season of drinking water. The water saved would serve the annual drinking water needs of 70 households.

Water Conservation By-Law 07-069 (and amendments)

The outdoor water use reduction program was designed to promote water conservation during the summer months when discretionary water use could potentially drive peak demands for drinking water to the limits of capacity. The most effective aspect of the program has been the Water
Conservation By-Law, which limits lawn watering to once per week, outlines a schedule for other water use activities, and prohibits wasting of water at all times. The Region-wide by-law automatically comes into effect from May 31 to September 30 each year.

The Water Conservation By-Law has been vigorously enforced by Water Efficiency staff working in concert with Licensing and Regulatory Services. Each year three Water Efficiency students patrol settlement areas to monitor compliance, educate the public and issue warning notices as necessary. As many as six By-Law Enforcement Officers also support the conservation by-law enforcement and are called upon to lay charges when necessary. As detailed in Table 1, an average of 236 warnings and eight charges has been issued annually.

Table 1 – Water Conservation By-Law Warnings and Charges, 2007 - 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warnings</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Water Conservation By-Law Water Savings

In the early 2000s, maximum day demands were exceeding 227 million litres per day (MLD) in the Integrated Urban System (IUS), which includes the tri-cities, Elmira and St. Jacobs. Since 2005 when the Water Conservation By-law came into effect, maximum day demands have stayed well below the desired ceiling of 227 MLD. Table 2 illustrates maximum and average day demands since 2007.

Table 2 - 2007 - 2011 Integrated Urban System Average/Max Day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Ceiling</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Day</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Day</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the current WEMP does not have cumulative or annual water savings targets established for the Water Conservation By-Law, Water Services staff has employed a variety of methods to quantify what the affect has been. These methods use historical weather and consumption data to predict what water consumption would have been if the by-law were not in place. The indicators show that the by-law has reduced peak summer demands every year except 2009. Conservative estimates detailed in Table 3 show outdoor water conservation reduced maximum demands by 12 per cent during the hot, dry summer of 2007 and zero during 2009. During the very hot, dry month of June 2007, the Conservation By-Law reduced water consumption by an estimated 630,977 m³ compared to a month with similar weather in 2001 that had no by-law in effect. See attachment A for more detail.
Toilet Replacement Program

The Region of Waterloo led Canada to its first efficient toilet rebate program in 1994 when it offered to subsidize the replacement of toilets flushing 13 litres or more with 6 litre per flush toilets. Since then, the Toilet Replacement Program (TRP) has provided 73,778 rebates to residential and business property owners. The program now provides $20 rebates for toilets being replaced with 4.8 litre “high efficiency toilets” (HETs) that meet stringent WaterSense performance standards.

Toilet Replacement Program Water Savings

The TRP has consistently outperformed WEMP targets since the program began. A total of 29,282 toilets have been rebated through the program during the last five years, and estimates are they save a cumulative 4,866 m$^3$ per day of water. The TRP water savings is ahead of target by 2,143 m$^3$ per day. Table 4 summarizes targets/actuals.

Table 4 - TRP Targets/Actuals, 2007 - 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Annual # of Toilets</th>
<th>Total cumulative m$^3$/day water savings**</th>
<th>Toilet Replacement Prog. Target m$^3$/day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Does not include 2,201 Public Housing toilets replaced through federal stimulus grant
Commercial, Industrial and Institutional Efficiencies & Municipal Leak Reduction

Developing consultative relationships with the commercial, industrial and institutional (CII) sectors has been a growth area for the Water Efficiency Section since 2007. In 2007 the newly-branded “Water Efficient Technology” (WET) funding program was launched to achieve greater CII water savings. Another aspect of this program was to work directly with Public Works departments to detect and repair water main leaks in local infrastructure.

The WET Program employs best management practices for auditing both infrastructure and commercial processes to measure water consumption before and after conservation measures are put into place. In many cases, a Water Efficiency Technologist will conduct on-the-spot water use reviews, install data-logging equipment, and replace inefficient small fixtures. For larger projects, the Region will fund up to 50 per cent of the costs for water audits and consulting associated with water saving measures. There is also funding available at $0.40 per litre per day of water saved to assist CII facilities implement water saving measures that have a payback of more than two years.

The WET program has completed several projects during the period 2007 to 2011, including:

- 133 water use reviews,
- 9 large facility water audits, and
- 7 district metered area (DMA) municipal leak detection audits.

The long term focus of the WET program is to encourage clients to act on recommendations for long-term water savings. A cumulative 578 m$^3$ per day of water savings has been achieved through the program during the last five years, which is 37 m$^3$ ahead of target. WET funding of $109,759 has been paid to 10 participating organizations.

WET funding recipient City of Waterloo will receive an innovation award from the Ontario Water Works Association in 2012 for its rainwater harvesting system at RIM Park soccer fields. The $5 million soccer field project was completed in 2011 and will save an estimated 4,000 m$^3$ per year of drinking water.

Water Services has far exceeded expectations with the municipal leak reduction project during the last five years. Total funding of $72,800 was provided for seven District Metered Area (DMA) audits in settlement areas within Kitchener and the surrounding townships. The methodology helped municipalities target repairs that resulted in cumulative water savings of 554 m$^3$ per day. This is three times higher than the 2011 target of 173 m$^3$ per day.

Research and Development

Water Services has participated in several research projects during the past five years that has helped to advance water efficiency. Funding has been directed to toward municipal consortium projects that help establish performance benchmarks for items like flush valve toilets, humidifiers, showerheads, taps, pre-rinse spray valves and rainwater harvesting. The two major research projects currently being funded by the Region of Waterloo are the Water Softener Study, and the American Water Works Association Water Research Foundation’s Residential End Uses of Water Study.

During the last three years, the Water Efficiency Section has designed and built an automated test rig in Waterloo to test the performance of locally-available residential water softeners. The
water softener study results are now posted on an educational web site, watersoftenerfacts.ca, financed and created jointly by the Region and City of Guelph. The next step is to establish higher performance benchmarks for water softeners that will promote reduced salt and water consumption.

The Region of Waterloo has become a funding partner in a North American study to quantify residential water use. The “End Use Study” includes water use surveys and water billing analyses across the continent, plus more detailed analyses and data logging in approximately 11 municipalities. As “Level 1” participants the Regions of Waterloo and Peel will be the two Canadian municipalities that will have more detailed audits, along with data logging in 100 households. The project began in 2011 and will continue through 2013. The End Use Study results will provide valuable baseline information for the next WEMP Update.

Next Steps

The Region of Waterloo recognizes that water efficiency and conservation is important in maintaining a sustainable community. Water conservation will help:

- extend the lifespan of current infrastructure and postpone expansions
- postpone or avoid the need to switch to a new water source
- reduce non-fixed operating costs
- help municipalities capture lost revenue through infrastructure leak reduction
- help maintain source groundwater levels
- reduce the risks of low water during droughts

The Region is required to have a water efficiency plan and associated programs under Ontario’s Permit to Take Water regulations, and it is also encouraged to do the same under the 2010 Water Opportunities and Water Conservation Act. A water conservation plan may also be required as part of the Region’s Water Sustainability Plan under the Ontario Clean Water Act.

The current Water Efficiency Master Plan (WEMP) will reach maturity by 2015, and staff plans to begin an update to carry the Region beyond 2015. In 2012, Water Services will appoint a project team that will scope the project and hire one or more consultants as needed. In 2013 the project team will work through WEAC and other stakeholders to develop a draft WEMP. Following public input and revisions, the WEMP is expected to be approved by Council in 2014, with new program implementation to begin in 2015.

March 28, 2012 Water Efficiency Advisory Committee Review

Members of the Water Efficiency Advisory Committee (WEAC) reviewed this report (E-12-031) with staff and discussed various aspects of the information presented at a meeting held March 28, 2012.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

Implementation of the Water Efficiency Master Plan relates to the Strategic Objective 1.4, to “Protect the quality and the quantity of our drinking water sources.” Action 1.4.3 states the Region of Waterloo should “Update and continue to implement the Water Efficiency Master Plan.”
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS: Water Efficiency Program Target, Actual, Costs

By 2011, the base residential and CII program achieved water savings of 8,504 m\(^3\) per day, which is 42 percent ahead of the target 5,988 m\(^3\) per day. In fact, the drinking water savings achieved to date has already exceeded the 2015 target of 8,146 m\(^3\) per day. As detailed in Attachment A, the cumulative cost to deliver these water conservation measures was just over $5 million, which equates to a cost of $0.59 per litre per day of water saved. This compares favourably with the 2006 estimated cost of $2 per litre per day for the Ayr Drinking Water Supply Expansion.

Water savings associated with the Outdoor Water Use (OWU) Program is more difficult to quantify. The conservative estimates detailed in Appendix A show average water savings of 795 m\(^3\) per day, at an annual cost of $177,500. The average annual OWU program cost on a per litre per day basis is estimated at $0.22.

Reducing water consumption in the Region of Waterloo also means reduced energy consumption associated with treating and pumping drinking water. In 2009, an estimated 0.16 tonnes of carbon was released into the atmosphere per million litres of drinking water produced. Using the 2009 formula, the Water Efficiency Program was reducing carbon emissions by an estimated two tonnes per day or 729 tonnes in 2011.

Funding for water efficiency initiatives comes from the Water Reserve Fund and Regional Development Charges.

Despite a growing population, the Region of Waterloo has experienced an overall decrease in water demands of nine per cent in the past five years. The success of the water efficiency initiatives is partly responsible for the decline, but variable weather patterns and the loss of several large industries due to the downturn in the economy have also played a large part. As a result of the overall decline in water demands, the need for additional water capacity in the Region has been reduced, and approximately $100 million in growth related water capital projects have been deferred from the first five years of the 10-year capital budget plan. There is no doubt that a decline in water demand puts significant upward pressure on water rates, however, due to the large capital deferrals, we have been able to maintain the same rate projections as presented in the 2010 budget. Staff continues to monitor water demands closely and will continue to adjust operating and capital budgets as necessary.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE: Nil

ATTACHMENT:


PREPARED BY: Steve Gombos, Manager, Water Efficiency, Water Services

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program/Sector</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Public Education Target m³/day*</td>
<td>2,429.45</td>
<td>2,459.63</td>
<td>2,489.80</td>
<td>2,519.98</td>
<td>2,550.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Public Education Actual m³/day</td>
<td>2,372.36</td>
<td>2,404.03</td>
<td>2,433.90</td>
<td>2,467.36</td>
<td>2,505.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet Replacement Program Target m³/day</td>
<td>640.80</td>
<td>1,201.50</td>
<td>1,762.20</td>
<td>2,242.80</td>
<td>2,723.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet Replacement Program Actual m³/day**</td>
<td>722.14</td>
<td>1,398.07</td>
<td>2,533.39</td>
<td>3,709.58</td>
<td>4,866.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CII Target m³/day</td>
<td>46.96</td>
<td>133.05</td>
<td>269.14</td>
<td>405.23</td>
<td>541.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CII Actual m³/day</td>
<td>23.58</td>
<td>183.49</td>
<td>344.90</td>
<td>415.00</td>
<td>577.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leak Reduction Target m³/day</td>
<td>43.18</td>
<td>86.36</td>
<td>129.55</td>
<td>172.73</td>
<td>172.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leak Reduction Actual m³/day</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>468.00</td>
<td>554.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Target m³ per day</td>
<td>3,160.39</td>
<td>3,880.54</td>
<td>4,650.69</td>
<td>5,340.74</td>
<td>5,987.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Actual m³ per day</td>
<td>3,118.08</td>
<td>3,985.59</td>
<td>5,360.18</td>
<td>7,059.94</td>
<td>8,504.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Costs, excluding Outdoor Water Use***</td>
<td>$767,839</td>
<td>$827,416</td>
<td>$1,093,089</td>
<td>$1,116,008</td>
<td>$1,244,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Costs, excluding Outdoor Water Use</td>
<td>$767,839</td>
<td>$1,595,255</td>
<td>$2,688,344</td>
<td>$3,804,352</td>
<td>$5,048,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Per Litre Per Day Saved</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*estimated savings of 5 litres per capita, per day, which is 3% reduction

**2010 TRP savings does not include 2,201 Public Housing toilets replaced through federal stimulus grant

*** Significant cost increase from 2009 - 2011 due to much higher number of toilet rebates
## Estimated Seasonal Outdoor Water Use Reductions and Costs (m³ per day annualized)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Number Rain Barrels Distributed</td>
<td>2977</td>
<td>5960</td>
<td>9090</td>
<td>12075</td>
<td>14823</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rain Barrel savings @ 1.2 m³ season/barrel</td>
<td>3,572</td>
<td>7,152</td>
<td>10,908</td>
<td>14,490</td>
<td>17,788</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rain Barrel Savings m³/day</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Comparable Weather With No By-Law (Max Month only)</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Reduction From By-law (actual vs comparison year)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri Cities Max By-Law Month Demand m³</td>
<td>5,258,145</td>
<td>4,835,824</td>
<td>4,661,261</td>
<td>4,661,293</td>
<td>5,083,566</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri Cities Max By-Law Month Water Saved m³</td>
<td>630,977</td>
<td>338,508</td>
<td>(46,613)</td>
<td>372,903</td>
<td>101,671</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri Cities Max By-Law Month Savings as m³ per day</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>(128)</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Annual m³/day Saved, Rain Barrel &amp; By-Law</td>
<td>1,738.49</td>
<td>947.01</td>
<td>(97.82)</td>
<td>1,061.35</td>
<td>327.28</td>
<td>795.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Program Cost</td>
<td>$163,422</td>
<td>$179,651</td>
<td>$239,272</td>
<td>$187,295</td>
<td>$118,152</td>
<td>$177,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Cost Per Litre Per Day Saved</td>
<td>$0.09</td>
<td>$0.19</td>
<td>$0.18</td>
<td>$0.36</td>
<td>$0.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Program Cost</td>
<td>$163,422</td>
<td>$343,073</td>
<td>$582,345</td>
<td>$769,640</td>
<td>$887,792</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5- year all programs combined cumulative water savings m³ per day: 12,481

5-year all programs combined cumulative total cost: $5,936,680
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
DATE: April 17, 2012
FILE CODE: C06-60/P&W/WS.12
SUBJECT: WATER RESEARCH FOUNDATION PROPOSAL FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A QUANTITATIVE MICROBIOLOGICAL RISK ASSESSMENT MODEL (QMRA)

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo provide one-time co-funding of $50,000 to support the Water Research Foundation Tailored Collaboration Proposal for the development of a Quantitative Microbiological Risk Assessment (QMRA) probabilistic model to estimate annual risk of illness and disability adjusted life years (DALYs) based on source water pathogen concentrations and treatment barriers.

SUMMARY: NIL

REPORT:

At a national level, current Canadian drinking water quality guidelines encourage the adoption of a multi-barrier approach to produce a reliable supply of clean and safe drinking water. This includes assessment of the entire drinking water system, from the watershed/aquifer and intake through treatment and distribution to the consumer, to assess potential impacts on drinking water quality and public health.

Indicators such as bacteria (e.g. E. coli and total coliforms), turbidity and disinfectant residuals are used in the multi-barrier approach to verify the quality of the treated drinking water. Although important, these indicators do not provide any quantitative information on pathogens or the potential disease burden in the population that would be associated with drinking water of a given quality. It is important to note that even water of an acceptable quality carries some risk of illness, although it is extremely low.

QMRA uses source water quality data, treatment barrier information and pathogen-specific characteristics to estimate the burden of disease associated with exposure to pathogenic micro-organisms in treated drinking water. QMRA is the approach recommended in Canadian guidelines for assessing microbiological risk in drinking water systems. This approach is supported by our Public Health in the attached report PH-12-007, C-Enternt Collaboration Update, dated March 20, 2012. This approach is also supported by the Grand River Source Protection Committee.

The objective of this project is development and application of a general quantitative microbial risk assessment (QMRA) tool for analysis of pathogen risks from drinking water exposure. We anticipate that this model will be used by utilities for risk management, regulatory compliance (in Canada and perhaps elsewhere), and as a plant design and assessment tool. The proposed work builds upon a tool that has been developed in a prior research effort and has generated significant interest within the Canadian drinking water community, where it has been used to benchmark plant performance against risk-based goals for protozoan and enteric virus removal.
This study entails application of the QMRA model to four water utilities and conducting research activities targeted to improve the tool’s performance and maximize its utility to eventual industry and regulatory agency users. Plant-specific QMRA models will be developed for the participating utilities using plant engineering and performance data developed in consultation with the utilities and site-specific pathogen monitoring data collected and analyzed as a component of the project. The pathogen monitoring suite includes key protozoa, viruses, and bacteria.

Outcomes of the study will be:

- a guidance document describing the use of the QMRA tool;
- a database of source water pathogen densities and recoveries for each participating utility;
- an updated QMRA model and tool;
- risk assessment reports prepared for each participating utility;
- peer reviewed publications for at least two research focuses of the study; and
- Technology transfer to the community via a workshop and AWWA/CWWA conference presentations.

Health Canada and the University of Toronto are partners in the project. Participating utilities are the City of Ottawa, Toronto Water, Metro Vancouver, and Region of Waterloo Water Services. The budget for the proposed work includes a request to the Foundation of $175,000, third party cash contributions of $200,000 and third party in-kind contributions of $126,150. The anticipated project duration of three years was selected to allow sufficient time for data collection and use of all data in research and analyses. Each participating municipality, including the Region of Waterloo has a proposed commitment to the Water Research Foundation proposal as a major partner for $50,000 for the three year program.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This initiative supports the strategic goal to protect the quality and the quantity of our drinking water sources.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The Region’s Operating Budget includes funding ($50,000) for participation in this research study. There would be no impact on the Region’s Water and Wastewater User Rates.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Public Health collaborates with Water Services in the development and use of this model.

ATTACHMENT:

ATTACHMENT A – Report PH-12-007 – C-Enternet Collaboration Update (The relevant paragraph is highlighted with a border.)

PREPARED BY: Olga Vrentzos, Manager, Water Operations and Maintenance

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo:
(a) enter into a further agreement with the Government of Canada for the continuation of the C-EnterNet program subject to terms and conditions that are agreeable to the Medical Officer of Health and Regional Solicitor; and
(b) direct staff to report back, as needed on a regular basis, in relation to pertinent developments or other updates concerning the C-EnterNet program;

AND THAT a copy of this report be sent to the Chief Medical Officer of Health for the Province of Ontario and the provincial scientific agency Public Health Ontario, to inform them of the results of these C-EnterNet initiatives.

SUMMARY:

The existing C-EnterNet agreement between the Regional Municipality of Waterloo and the Government of Canada is in place until March 31, 2012. The Region is in the process of negotiating the final terms and conditions of the next agreement with the goal that the term of the agreement will be April 1, 2012 to March 31, 2013, and renewable each year thereafter. This report provides an update on the accomplishments of the collaboration, focusing on three initiatives in particular:

(1) Research that informed provincial guidelines on recreational water and confirmed the excellent level of protection provided by the Regional Mannheim Water Treatment Facility

A C-EnterNet study on recreational water risks helped support development of provincial guidelines entitled Operating Procedures for Non-Regulated Recreational Water Facilities Guidance Document. As a result, in 2011, all spray/ splash pads in the Region that use re-circulated water have ultraviolet light (UV) as a treatment step to protect users from cryptosporidiosis. In addition, an assessment of the Mannheim water treatment facility indicated that the risk for cryptosporidiosis through consumption of treated tap water in the Region is essentially non-existent and highlighted the excellent level of treatment that the Mannheim water treatment facility delivers.

(2) Research that illustrated the importance of travel as a source of gastro-intestinal illness

C-EnterNet found that more than 25 percent of reportable enteric illnesses in Waterloo Region were related to travel abroad. Locally, this helps to validate that counselling travellers in the prevention of enteric diseases should continue to be an important consideration of travel consultations.
(3) Results from a Healthy Control Study conducted in Waterloo Region that demonstrates that raw milk is a significant risk factor for certain enteric illnesses

A Healthy Control study conducted by C-EnterNet identified raw milk as a significant risk factor for E. Coli O157, Campylobacter and Cryptosporidium infections in the Region. As a result of this information, educational materials were developed in consultation with C-EnterNet and the University of Guelph that describe the risks associated with the consumption of raw milk and raw milk products.

REPORT:

Background

As outlined in the Community Services Report, PH-05-008, C-EnterNet is a federal initiative designed to support the active surveillance of enteric diseases in humans and their exposure to pathogens (disease causing microorganisms) through food, water, and animals. The framework is based on enhanced surveillance activities within a set of sentinel communities in Canada. C-EnterNet integrates human, agri-food and water data, through enhanced typing procedures (molecular testing), to provide a comprehensive understanding of the link between food and waterborne pathogens and human health outcomes in Ontario, British Columbia and, ultimately, throughout Canada. The Regional Municipality of Waterloo is the first pilot sentinel site in Canada and has been instrumental in informing the expansion of C-EnterNet in Canada. The second sentinel site for C-EnterNet is located within the Fraser Health Region in British Columbia and was launched in June 2010.

Region of Waterloo Public Health and the Public Health Agency of Canada’s C-EnterNet team have worked together to enhance and strengthen the work of front-line public health in the tracking and control of infectious enteric diseases in the community. Expert consultations, questionnaire development, training workshops, research, conference presentations and publishing findings are among the many activities initiated. Since C-EnterNet’s inception in 2005, Region of Waterloo Public Health has been recognized by the Government of Canada and by Provincial Ministries of Health for their leadership and expertise in these areas.

C-EnterNet Annual Reports

Since its launch in June 2005, seven reports have been released to the public which include Annual Reports from 2005 through to 2008. In addition, C-EnterNet recently released the 2009 Short Report, with the 2009 Long Report to follow. These annual reports provide results from human, agri-food and water surveillance activities in the Region of Waterloo. The annual reports serve as a benchmark for the ongoing monitoring of trends in enteric pathogen movement, behaviour and prevalence in the Region of Waterloo. These reports also highlighted the integrated microbiological and epidemiological data, providing new insights into the importance of travel and enteric disease, as well as the likely sources of exposure for some of the endemic (non-travel related) cases.

C-EnterNet Accomplishments

The following three C-EnterNet initiatives have been highlighted as significant contributions and accomplishments:
(1) **Research that informed provincial guidelines on recreational water and confirmed the excellent level of protection provided by the Regional Mannheim Water Treatment Facility**

Surveillance data from the Region of Waterloo indicated that the Region had higher rates of cryptosporidiosis than the national or provincial incidence rates. This illness is caused by a parasite that causes diarrhea, abdominal discomfort, nausea, vomiting, and weight loss and is typically spread via contaminated water or by contact with contaminated feces. Public Health agencies throughout Canada and the U.S. are struggling to better understand how to prevent *Cryptosporidium* infections, because it is widespread in the environment and because chlorine alone does not kill the parasite. Through C-EnterNet’s surveillance data on exposure behaviour, as well as through surveillance reports from other parts of Canada and the U.S., recreational water facilities are identified as a potential transmission zone for *Cryptosporidium*. A C-EnterNet study focusing on recreational water risks (based on the enhanced public health data collected in collaboration with Region of Waterloo Public Health) helped support the development of the Ontario Ministry of Health and Long Term Care’s *Operating Procedures for Non-Regulated Recreational Water Facilities Guidance Document* (April 2010), which recommends treating water with ultraviolet light before it enters spray/splash pads. As a result, in 2011, all spray/splash pads in the Region that use re-circulated water have ultraviolet light (UV) as a treatment step to protect users from cryptosporidiosis.

One of the tools to help understand the integrity of a community water supply and identify upstream sources and treatment processes to reduce public health risk is the quantitative microbial risk assessment tool (QMRA). In collaboration with Region of Waterloo Water Services, C-EnterNet developed a quantitative microbial risk assessment tool to evaluate the water treatment processes delivered via the Regional Mannheim Water Treatment Facility. The QMRA process is advocated both nationally and internationally as a method to better understand the robustness of water treatment and how properly treated water can prevent illness. Using the QMRA model, it was found that the risk for cryptosporidiosis through the consumption of treated municipal drinking water in the Region of Waterloo is essentially non-existent. Review of the routine treatment practices confirm that there is no link between the drinking water supplied from Mannheim and the Region’s experience with a higher incidence rate of cryptosporidiosis. The process was successful at highlighting the excellent level of treatment that the Mannheim Water Treatment Facility delivers, and the degree of public health protection afforded to local residents.

(2) **Research that illustrated the importance of travel as a source of gastro-intestinal illness**

A new Canadian study from C-EnterNet published in the *Journal of Travel Medicine* suggests that travel abroad accounts for a large proportion of domestic enteric illness. Researchers investigated 1,773 reported cases of disease caused by enteric pathogens such as *Salmonella*, *Campylobacter* and verotoxigenic *Escherichia coli* (*E. coli*) in the Region of Waterloo from 2005 to 2009. C-EnterNet and Region of Waterloo Public Health found that more than 25 percent of reported cases were related to travel. *Campylobacter* and *Salmonella* were significantly more frequent among travel-related cases. These travel-related cases of diseases caused by enteric pathogens represent a significant proportion of total gastrointestinal infections.

Nationally, the results of C-EnterNet’s research will help the Public Health Agency of Canada assess the actual risks related to travel for each subgroup of travellers and plan appropriate prevention and control strategies for all Canadians. C-EnterNet is one of the only mechanisms in Canada to gather this type of information and this information is then made available to policy
makers to improve public health guidelines and future policy. Locally, travel research such as this helps to validate that counselling travellers in the prevention of enteric diseases should continue to be a prime objective of travel consultations.

(3) Results from a Healthy Control Study conducted in Waterloo Region that demonstrates that raw milk is a significant risk factor for certain enteric illnesses

A Healthy Control study of residents in the Region of Waterloo was conducted between August 2009 and July 2010. The study was designed to collect risk factor data on healthy individuals, to compare to those having enteric disease. Identical standardized questionnaires used by health unit staff to interview ill cases were used to interview healthy individuals. Questions in the survey were identical to allow for subsequent case-control analyses. The purpose of the survey was to provide information to quantitatively assess statistically significant risk factors for enteric illness to inform public health policy and reduce the burden of enteric disease in Canada.

One of the interesting results of the case-control survey was that the enhanced surveillance data of non-travel associated cases of enteric illness between 2005 and 2010 identified raw milk as a significant risk factor for E. Coli 0157, Campylobacter and Cryptosporidium infections in the Region of Waterloo. Demographic characteristics showed that drinking unpasteurized milk was significantly more prevalent among rural residents (9.0%) than among urban residents (0.4%).

The consumption of raw milk contributes to the Region of Waterloo’s burden of enteric illness. Development of education and promotional materials are a part of Region of Waterloo Public Health’s effort to raise public awareness of the risks associated with the consumption of raw milk. As a result educational materials were developed, in consultation with C-EnterNet and the University of Guelph, that describes the risks associated with the consumption of raw milk and raw milk products.

Conclusion

The C-EnterNet federal-local collaboration with Region of Waterloo Public Health has contributed to increased capacity and knowledge at the local, provincial and national levels. These benefits support the Region of Waterloo Public Health’s commitment to citizen-centered service, effective and efficient service delivery and dissemination of information that incorporates a culture of transparency and evidence-based decision-making.

It is recommended that Regional Municipality of Waterloo endorse the continuation of the C-EnterNet agreement between the Regional Municipality of Waterloo and the Government of Canada renewable thereafter at a staff level by the parties on a year to year basis. Public Health will continue to provide regular updates in relation to pertinent developments or other updates concerning the C-EnterNet program.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

Focus Area #2: To enhance community health and social well being.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

With additional 100% funding provided by the Public Health Agency of Canada, these activities are carried out within the existing base budget of the Public Health Department. The funding covers the costs associated with 1 Full Time Equivalent Public Health Inspector position in the Health Protection Investigation Division.
OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Legal Services, Water Services

ATTACHMENTS

NIL

PREPARED BY: Nancy Sittler, Public Health Inspector/C-EnterNet Site Coordinator
   Barbara Marshall, Public Health Agency of Canada, C-EnterNet, Enteric
   Surveillance and Population Studies
   Chris Komorowski, Manager, Food Safety, Recreational Water Programs
   and Cambridge & Area Team

APPROVED BY: Dr. Liana Nolan, Commissioner/Medical Officer of Health
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: April 17, 2012
FILE CODE: A10-20, A35-01

SUBJECT: REGION OF WATERLOO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT – PROGRAM REVIEW 2011-2012

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo endorse the recommendations and proposed actions of the Region of Waterloo International Airport Program Review 2011-2012 as noted in Report CA-12-002.1/E-12-017.1 Appendix “A” dated April 17, 2012, including the change of the one contract administrative position to a permanent position, all at a decrease of approximately $15,000 to the 2012 Airport operating budget.

SUMMARY:

NIL

REPORT:

In 2011, the Internal Auditor together with the Transportation Division initiated a comprehensive program review to ensure services and operations at the Region of Waterloo International Airport (herein referred to as “Airport”) are managed and delivered effectively and efficiently. A specialist consulting firm, with experience at airports of all sizes across Canada and around the world, was retained to help assess good value for resources invested for the Region, its residents, airlines, airport customers and end-users. A detailed assessment of processes was undertaken in four distinct areas at the Airport. These include (1) Operations, (2) Security and Safety, (3) Finance and Administration, (4) Marketing. A review of this nature was timely given the Airport’s administration and operations program areas have assumed significant additional responsibilities and duties since the approval of the Master Plan in 2000 with the addition of passenger and charter scheduled services, ongoing increasing regulatory requirements, additional tenants, etc. The program review provided the opportunity to optimize the manner in which the Airport’s services and operations are delivered and to maximize the achievement of divisional objectives for the Transportation Division.

The results of the review indicated that overall, the services and operations are being managed and delivered effectively and efficiently. However, there are opportunities to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the Airport’s services and operations. There are a number of recommendations contained in the report that, when implemented, will help the Airport meet its objectives and also optimize the efficiency and effectiveness of the operations.

The Airport Program review report was presented to the Region’s Audit Committee on February 28, 2012, and that report (including minor revisions to address Audit Committee Questions), is attached to this report as appendix A. The Audit committee endorsed the recommendations and proposed actions of the Region of Waterloo International Airport Program Review 2011-2012 and it is being recommended that Regional Council endorse these recommendations. Staff will report back to
Council on the various stages of implementing the recommendations from this Program Review through the development of an annual reporting process. Staff will track the various implementation actions and report on the actual costs and benefits. The first report should be anticipated by the end of 2012.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The completion of the study was done in keeping with Focus Area 5.3: Ensure Regional programs and services are efficient and effective and demonstrate accountability to the public.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

It is expected that the implementation of the actions that are to be completed in 2012 will have an annual savings of approximately $85,000 to the Airport operating budget through more efficient use of staff and improved business processes, however the change of the one administrative staff position from a contract to a permanent FTE, at an annual cost of approximately $70,000, would result in a net reduction of approximately $15,000. The four contract positions that have now been eliminated were funded for the past several years from one-time funding approved by Council in an annual amount of approximately $248,000 and this funding is no longer required. The implementation of the actions noted beyond 2012 is expected to result in additional savings to the Airport operating budget.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

In addition to the staff from the Airport who participated in this program review staff from Corporate Resources, Legal Services, Finance, and Human Resources were directly involved in this review through interviews or workshops.

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix A: Region of Waterloo International Airport Report - Program review 2011-2012 to Audit Committee February 28, 2012

PREPARED BY: David A. Young, Manager, Internal Audit
John Hammer, Director, Transportation
Chris Wood, General Manager, Region of Waterloo International Airport

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Michael L. Murray, Chief Administrative Officer
Appendix A: Region of Waterloo International Airport Report - Program review 2011-2012 to Audit Committee February 28, 2012

REGION OF WATERLOO
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATOR
Internal Audit
TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
Transportation

TO: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Audit Committee
DATE: February 28, 2012
FILE CODE: A10-20, A35-01
SUBJECT: REGION OF WATERLOO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT - PROGRAM REVIEW 2011-2012

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Audit Committee endorse the recommendations and proposed actions of the Region of Waterloo International Airport Program Review 2011-2012 as noted in Report CA-12-002/E-12-017 dated February 28, 2012, including the change of the one contract administrative position to a permanent position, all at a decrease of approximately $15,000 to the 2012 Airport operating budget.

SUMMARY:

In 2011, the Internal Auditor together with the Transportation Division initiated a comprehensive program review to ensure services and operations at the Region of Waterloo International Airport (herein referred to as “Airport”) are managed and delivered effectively and efficiently. A specialist consulting firm, with experience at airports of all sizes across Canada and around the world, was retained to help assess good value for resources invested for the Region, its residents, airlines, airport customers and end-users. A detailed assessment of processes was undertaken in four distinct areas at the Airport. These include (1) Operations, (2) Security and Safety, (3) Finance and Administration, (4) Marketing. A review of this nature was timely given the Airport’s administration and operations program areas have assumed significant additional responsibilities and duties since the approval of the Master Plan in 2000 with the addition of passenger and charter scheduled services, ongoing increasing regulatory requirements, additional tenants, etc. The program review provided the opportunity to optimize the manner in which the Airport’s services and operations are delivered and to maximize the achievement of divisional objectives for the Transportation Division.

The results of the review indicated that overall, the services and operations are being managed and delivered effectively and efficiently. However, there are many opportunities to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the Airport’s services and operations. There are a number of recommendations contained in the report that, when implemented, will help the Airport meet its objectives and also optimize the efficiency and effectiveness of the operations. The areas for improvement are centered on three key themes:

Need for Increased Automation: Management systems to automate data and reports are suggested in a variety of areas (e.g. financial, safety, operations, etc.). The efficiencies of streamlining workflow and implementing new tools to reduce paper reports will ultimately help enable management decisions, and improve staff efficiency and effectiveness.
- **Clarify Roles, Structures and Communications:** The scale and complexity of operations at the Airport would benefit from a renewal of organizational structure and interaction with stakeholders. With a larger number of tenants and new requirements from the regulator, there is a greater need for clearly defined roles, structures and effective communication both within the organization and externally with stakeholders, community and the federal government.

- **Long Term Capital/Operations Planning:** An airport the size of the Region of Waterloo International Airport needs a cohesive set of plans that can meet long-term ambitions for the Airport.

**REPORT:**

**Background and Overview of Operations:**
Transportation and Environmental Services is made up of six Divisions:
- Design and Construction
- Rapid Transit
- Transit Services
- Waste Management
- Water Services
- Transportation

Within the Transportation division operates the Region of Waterloo International Airport.

The Region of Waterloo International Airport has been owned and operated solely by the Regional Municipality of Waterloo since 1996. In the last 14 years, the Airport has served an ever-increasing role as a community airport. Today, the Airport is a modern full service international airport with well-established general and corporate aviation activity. In 2011, for example, the Airport hosted approximately 101,000 passengers travelling both outbound from, and inbound to, the Waterloo Region. This is expected to increase to approximately 125,000 inbound and outbound passengers in 2012.

The Program Review focussed on the effectiveness and efficiency of the Airport’s operations, maintenance, safety and security, finance and administration, marketing and communications. The review also evaluated staffing, planning and administration of all Airport services to ensure that they are efficient and effective. The review also identified opportunities for improvement and a strategy for optimizing service delivery and organizational value while making the best use of resources.

**Purpose of the Program Review:**
Program reviews are intended to provide an objective assessment of the extent to which a program is achieving its intended results, the proficiency with which resources are administered, and the manner in which associated risks have been managed. In this case, risk means the activities and events that could potentially prevent programs from achieving defined goals. Program reviews support the strategic objective of ensuring that all Regional programs and services are responsive, efficient, effective, and accountable to the public. In 2011, Internal Audit together with Transportation Management determined that a program review would be helpful in determining what improvements, if any, could be made to processes supporting the achievement of the Region of Waterloo International Airport’s objectives.
The Region of Waterloo International Airport was selected for a program review for the following reasons:

- Since the Airport became a municipally owned and operated airport in 1996, the growth and use of the Airport by the community has steadily increased.
- The Airport administration and operations program areas have assumed significant additional responsibilities and duties since the approval of the Master Plan in 2000 with the addition of passenger and charter scheduled services, increasing regulatory requirements, additional tenants, etc.
- The responsibilities of these program areas will continue to grow and it was recommended that a program review of these areas be completed in 2011 with the purpose of identifying the most effective and efficient way of organizing the program area and achieving some operational efficiencies.

The scope of the review and the work plan were developed to provide a framework to:

- Assess whether administrative policies and procedures contribute to achieving the Airport’s goals and objectives, i.e., is the program effective and “doing what it is supposed to do”?
- Assess whether the resources used to achieve the Airport’s objectives are appropriate to the services being provided, i.e., is the program operating efficiently and achieving good value for the resources invested;
- Assess whether policies and procedures are in place to assist in complying with applicable legislation and regulations and to ensure continued compliance;
- Assess the risks and interdependencies associated with the Airport and evaluate the effectiveness of the Division’s risk management.

**Findings and Discussion of the Report:**

Overall, most of the feedback from the four areas reviewed was generally positive in the way the Airport is run. The consultant team found that:

- The Airport is delivering quality services that are consistent with industry standards and best practices.
- Some practices at the Airport exceeded the norm found at other Canadian airports, such as in the quality of documentation and relationship with federal regulators.
- The provision of specialized airport maintenance on site and technical maintenance throughout the Airport appears to be working efficiently.

Major findings from the interviews, review of documentation and other practices identified the following:

- Technical drawings (e.g. “as-built” computer aided design files) are not currently and consistently kept up to date.
- A number of Airport committees exist, which may have a potential for duplication or overlap.
- There is a greater need for clearly defined roles, structures and effective communication within the organization.
- Lack of quality of service indicators for reviewing the contracted groundside snow removal.
- Airport tenant community is not actively engaged with the overall safety and security plan at the Airport.
- Overuse of manual data collection processes.
- A relatively recent Business Plan 2009-14 for the Airport, but an outdated Master Plan from 2000 that is limited in relevance to guiding capital planning processes.
The process for calculating tenant utilities and lack of common area maintenance fee is highly labour intensive for the Airport to administer, particularly with a growing number of land tenants.

- Some cash handling processes need greater audit trail.
- Lack of automated management reporting regarding landing fees and other revenue.
- Insufficient funds budgeted to address passenger leakage concerns.
- Inadequate attention given to Airport blogging and social media, particularly as it relates to competitive dynamics of airports industry.

**Recommendations:**
The recommendations parallel the findings and will affect most areas of the Airport as well as other program areas.

The Program Review consultant developed twenty-four recommendations for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the Airport:

**Airport Operations:**
1. Strengthen Technical Drawing Management
2. Evaluate Airport Committees for Future Growth
3. Clarify Reporting Roles and Relationships
4. Develop Quality of Service Standards and Periodically Review Contractors
5. Review Current Groundside Layout
6. Continue Public Parking Improvements

**Safety & Security:**
7. Develop an Airport Community-Wide Communication Strategy on Safety and Security
8. Incorporate Long-term Planning in Safety and Security
9. Automate Data Collection

**Finance & Administration:**
10. Remove Duplication of Efforts in Tracking Administration and Operations Data
11. Develop a Long-Range Plan to Guide Capital Plans
12. Utilize Region’s Financial Reporting System
13. Address Concept of Common Area Maintenance Fees
14. Resolve Onerous Calculation of Tenant Utilities and Property Taxes
15. Implement Lease Management System
16. Improve Handling of Cash Deposits
17. Address Cash Reconciliation Process
18. Develop Automated Management Reports
19. Improve Documentation for Aviation-Related Revenue Management System and Processes
Marketing:

20. Fill Vacancy in Marketing/Communications
21. Renew Approach for Airport Website/Social Media Marketing
22. Add Budget for Catchment Area Marketing
23. Maximize Blogging by Posting Various Topics
24. Maximize Billboard Opportunities

The benefits to implementing the recommended changes will materialize in different ways:

- Improved long-term management of the Airport towards a solid business strategy and industry-standard Master Plan approach
- Greater degree of staff effectiveness through more automated data-intensive review of operations and incidents
- Net financial savings through improved efficiencies in business processes and reduction of staff time to handle day-to-day operations
- Avoidance of future costs through greater quality of financial, operational and technical information about the Airport
- Maximization of marketing efforts to realize the potential of the Airport for air traffic generation

In summary, implementation of Program Review recommendations will assist the Airport to become more effective and efficient, relative to comparable airports. The delivery of these recommendations will lead to net financial savings and help the Airport further grow into the additional land development and fully meet its economic and social role for the Region of Waterloo.

The following recommendations and action items have been grouped based on the areas review: Operations, Security and Safety, Finance and Administration, Marketing.

Discussion of Recommendations and Proposed Actions

Airport Operations:

a) Recommendation 1
Strengthen Technical Drawing Management
One of the findings of the Program Review was that technical drawings (e.g. “as-built” computer aided design files) are not currently and consistently kept up to date. “As-built” drawings are critical to new structures (e.g. apron layouts and buildings). As the pace of development increases, it will be important to maintain updated drawings to reflect any changes and aid in the orientation of new aprons. The risk for not having adequate document management is the potential conflict of new proposed builds with existing structures (e.g. underground utilities). For example, other airports where inadequate drawing management has occurred, they have been exposed to lost time and increased expense for delays in development, or exposure to safety issues associated with unforeseen location of existing electrical wiring.

Recommendation 1 proposes strengthening the process for maintaining up to date technical drawings as well as scheduling a target time period to clear out the backlog of drawings to be filed electronically and accessible for future use.

Action:
Airport staff has recognized this as an issue and have enlisted the support of the Design & Construction Division to manage all of the existing drawings, and help convert them to AutoCAD. Airport staff expects that all of the drawings will be converted, sorted, catalogued and stored electronically before the end of 2012. Going forward Design and Construction Technical Services staff will manage and create all Airport technical drawings.

b) Recommendation 2
**Evaluate Airport Committees for Future Growth**
One of the findings of the program review was that a number of committees are currently in use at the Airport: Airport Operations, Health & Safety / Safety Management Systems, Noise Management, NAV CANADA, Emergency Response, Air Terminal Building Fire Wardens and Security.

Recommendation 2 proposes that an evaluation of committees be undertaken to ensure that the mandate and agenda for each committee, their specific objectives and interconnectivity are appropriate to support growth at the Airport. By ensuring there is no duplication of effort by committees it will improve the efficiency and use of Airport resources. The Airport will also benefit from the sharing of information between committees.

**Action:**
A complete review of Airport committees, including terms of reference, membership, Chairperson appointments and schedule has recently been completed, resulting in a streamlined set of meetings, eliminating some duplication, and providing a better focus on communication with the stakeholders. Some of the changes implemented include merging the Air Terminal Fire Wardens meeting with the Airport Safety Committee, better aligning the Safety Management System & Occupational Health & Safety meetings and eliminating the Airport / Airline Operations Committee. The airlines have been invited to the Airport Operations Committee meetings, which are held quarterly.

c) Recommendation 3
**Clarify Reporting, Roles and Relationships**
One of the key findings of the program review is that there is currently a lack of clarity regarding reporting roles, relationships and responsibilities at the Airport. In addition, the chain of command at the Airport was found to be generally understood, but not perfectly clear. This lack of clarity is susceptible to risks of miscommunication as supervisors and shift schedules change frequently.

Recommendation 3 proposes to clarify, communicate and document, to staff, day-to-day operations and chain of command.

**Action:**
The Airport has implemented an organizational change with respect to emergency response in response to this recommendation by providing the existing Airfield Maintenance Lead Hands with additional responsibilities and specific training related to these responsibilities. This change has helped clarify the chain of command, as well as streamlined reporting roles and responsibilities. Additional organizational changes are being implemented in the Airport administration and finance areas to clarify roles and responsibilities.

d) Recommendation 4
**Develop Quality of Service Standards and Periodically Review Contractors**
One of the findings of the program review was that there was some dissatisfaction reported by the Airport and tenants related to level of service of the contracted groundsie snow removal. However, there was no indication of dissatisfaction regarding other contracted services.

Recommendation 4 proposes that quality of service indicators be created and implemented to review contracting of groundsie snow removal. This will improve response time and service levels from the
snow removal contractor. In addition, other service standard related contractors could benefit in performance review through the recommended approach.

**Action:**
The Airport contracts with many third parties to provide certain services, such as security, groundside snow removal and wet well pumping services. During 2012, the Airport will endeavor to proactively look at key performance indicators, and design a tool to better evaluate the many contractors of the Airport, with the input of stakeholders.

e) Recommendation 5 & 6
   **Review Current Groundside Layout and Continue Public Parking Improvements**
   One of the findings from the program review relating to groundside facilities was the current groundside layout, while not a problem at current traffic levels, will become sub-optimal as passenger traffic increases. This includes challenges to access points, the loop road configuration and terminal frontage/curb operations. Recommendation 5 proposes a review of potential traffic and reconfiguration options based on projected passenger growth which will improve access to the terminal and enhance passenger service and satisfaction levels. Also, addressing needs early on will help avoid future issues with air traffic growth and provide sufficient lead time to manage future terminal access problems.

   The other finding related to groundside facilities was related to the Airport public parking. Improvements to public parking have been identified by management as a requirement and plans are being developed to address this issue. The current parking fee collection system is based on a “Pay and Display” process which requires a certain amount of voluntary compliance by the Airport’s customers. While a business case for a gated system has not shown sufficient benefits to outweigh costs, the status quo is not the most efficient and effective parking fee collection system. Recommendation 6 proposes to conduct a comprehensive review of parking layout and payment method. A business case for replacing the “pay-and-display” parking system with a gated system should be further reviewed to ensure that a longer-term solution towards paying for parking is instituted. The benefit of this recommendation is a potential for increased parking revenues to the Airport and improved parking access to the terminal, thus improving customer service and satisfaction levels.

   **Action:**
   An engineering consultant was hired in 2011 to help Airport staff come up with appropriate concepts for a new groundside design as well as a gated parking barrier system. The initial budget estimate of this project shows this work can be completed within the existing capital budgets. The business case for such a system is currently underway and it is expected that the capital payback of the new system will be approximately 5 years with the additional revenues generated from short and long term parkers.

   **Safety & Security:**

   f) Recommendation 7
   **Develop an Airport Community-Wide Communication Strategy on Safety and Security**
   The Airport is fully compliant with current Transport Canada security regulations. Transport Canada is currently reviewing and amending security regulations. Meeting these new requirements changes will require more involvement from tenants at the Airport and the general aviation community. The program review identified that currently the culture of safety and security with some of the tenants and general aviation will require change to meet the new requirements (tenants have generally taken a more independent view of safety and security and the new regulations will require a more holistic approach requiring coordination and cooperation with the whole airport community). The program review recommends that the Airport, tenants and general aviation community should work more
closely together to increase awareness of safety and security issues and to implement processes to address those issues. Recommendation 7 proposes increased focus on education and awareness by developing a communication strategy. This recommendation also includes using the established security committee as a mechanism to assist with communications to tenants and other airport users.

**Action:**
The Chair of the Airport’s Security Committee will add this item to the standing agenda and it is expected that by the end of 2012 the Committee will come up with an appropriate education and awareness campaign for Airport tenants.

g) Recommendation 8

**Incorporate Long-term Planning in Safety and Security**

While the Airport has strong operational processes in safety and security, the long-range planning process for safety and security needs should be augmented based on the anticipated tools needed to increase safety and security effectiveness. For example, incremental upgrades to systems such as closed-circuit television could provide added capabilities and quality of meeting surveillance needs over time.

Recommendation 8 proposes that long-term needs should be projected to increment operational/capital solutions in safety and security. Both areas of managing security and safety are moving into greater demands on technology, data gathering and performance measurement. With a rapidly changing set of techniques and tools used in both areas, ensuring that solutions are scalable to different operating environment in safety and security over the long term is needed to augment the effectiveness of staff in this area. The benefit of this recommendation is that long-range costs will be better managed to ensure that solutions and capital built to support safety and security roles are incremental to a long-term view.

**Action:**
The tenants of the Airport have enjoyed many years of unfettered access to their hangars and the entire airside complex. However, as the Airport grows and the airline operations become more frequent and complicated, General Aviation security will have to become more of a focus at the Airport, and restrictions may be placed upon tenants and the General Aviation community. Transport Canada has already informed the airport community that in the very near future, there will be a large focus placed on General Aviation safety at airports. This may have impacts for the airport operators to secure the entire tenant community, and possibly have security check points and guards 24 hours a day. It is unknown at this time what the new regulations will dictate.

This new reality needs to be addressed during the proposed Airport master planning process (recommendation # 11) to ensure General Aviation security is thought about well in advance so a proper consultation process can be conducted, and infrastructure built. It is also acknowledged that this will become an issue at all airports and the fact that we expect additional legislation will aid in the attempts to persuade tenants that this increased security is happening. The Airport Security Committee will address this in 2012.

h) Recommendation 9

**Automate Data Collection**

A review of data collection processes at the Airport indicates there are several areas where manual data collection processes could be further automated or improved upon. For example, paper forms are currently used for incident reports. Recommendation 9 proposes to take steps to automate data collection processes and/or undertake a review of existing data collection processes to determine which can be automated in a cost effective way.

The benefits to this recommendation are increased effectiveness and better use of existing resources. More specifically, it will reduce staff time spent collecting data to work on other tasks – namely the
value-added interpretation of data. With the federal government placing greater onus on airport management systems in safety and security, the ability to automate data collection and to reduce labour hours to review reports becomes critical to management performance.

**Action:**
The Airport is legislated to develop a Safety management System (SMS) which at the end of March 2012 should be complete. Part of the approach taken in the SMS is to better document items such as runway inspections, airfield lighting inspections, safety concerns and wildlife reports. These were all previously handled on paper and Airport staff has developed its own electronic checklists and data collection which has greatly improved record keeping. Currently, 75% of the Airport’s forms are submitted and stored electronically, with a goal of 100% by the end of 2012.

**Finance & Administration:**

i) **Recommendation 10 & 12**

**Remove Duplication of Efforts in Tracking Administration and Operations Data and Utilize Region’s Financial Reporting System**

There are a number of different business and regulatory requirements for data associated with airport operations and administration. One of the findings of the program review is that there was some duplication of efforts in tracking administration and operations data. Recommendation 10 proposes that the Airport review data sources that could eliminate duplication in budgeting, passenger numbers, finance/administration and operations. The revision of the current processes would reduce the potential for data errors and eliminate the duplication of efforts, thus improving process efficiency and freeing up resources for other critical tasks.

Another finding from the program review indicates that reports used by the Airport’s Finance Team are from a different system than the financial reports used by the Region’s Finance Team. The reason for this is due to a difference in level of detail and specific nature of airport operations (e.g. number of landings versus planned). Having reports from two different systems may result in some inconsistencies in how the results are shown in reports. Recommendation 12 proposes that the Airport utilize Finance’s financial reports and have any additional requirements incorporated into the Region’s corporate financial system. Furthermore, it is recommended that the Airport’s Finance Team and Region’s Finance Team spend additional time together to promote a closer working relationship and address nuances in the level of detail for information collected.

With the Airport and the Region’s Finance Team using the same financial reports, all users of the financial reports will be using the same format. Additionally, it is expected that this recommendation will free up staff time for other activities. This recommendation will be bolstered through a stronger relationship and better communication between the Airport and the Region’s Finance staff, resulting in more effective financial reporting.

**Action:**
Airport staff has already begun to work with the air carriers, Nav Canada and others to streamline the data sources and will continue to work towards efficiency in collecting data.

The Airport has initiated discussions with the Region’s Finance Team to work towards the goals of reducing duplication of efforts and having more effective financial reporting.
j) Recommendation 11
Develop a Long-Range Plan to Guide Capital Plans

Currently, the Airport’s 10 year capital plans are established based on projected capital needs. This allows for proper financial planning on behalf of the Region. Similar to comparable sized airports, there needs to be a renewal of the long-range planning approach to drive Airport business and infrastructure needs. Typically airports the size of Region of Waterloo International Airport have a 20-year vision to guide long-range scenarios for airport development. The last time that the Airport Master Plan was updated was in 2000, and those recommendations are now substantially complete. There are major changes that now render this document limited in relevance to recent changes. Although a 2009 – 2014 Business Plan was subsequently completed, there are fundamental shifts in aircraft size, government requirements, planning standards, opportunities and the outlook for air carrier demand. Further careful long-range planning is needed to ensure short-term capital plan funds are fully justified and incremental to long-term end state.

Recommendation 11 proposes that the Airport undertake long-range planning processes. A strategic plan is needed to ensure that the Airport is able to outline its future outlook and specific business strategies and a Airport Master Plan, comparable to those submitted by other airports to Transport Canada, is recommended to ensure that long-term (20+ years) infrastructure and facility requirements are coordinated.

While the Airport has a capital planning approach integrated with the Region, an airport needs a master plan to ensure that all capital planning decisions lead to an ultimate development concept for the facility and prevent costly ad hoc decisions. The benefit to the Region is to reduce the risk of over/under budgeting for capital requirements. When capital plans are not updated frequently to reflect current needs and conditions, the Airport risks assigning unnecessary capital assets and incorrectly budgeting for required capital improvements. Improving the mechanism to ensure timely updates to the Capital Plan will ensure that future needs will be appropriately met and sufficient funding will be available when needed. It is also important to ensure that future expansion of the Airport will not be hampered by the growth and development of the surrounding area, such as Breslau, Guelph, East side employment lands or the new residential areas adjacent the Grand River in Kitchener.

Action:
Airport staff is planning to undertake a long-range planning process for the Airport and funding for this project is included in the 2012 approved Airport Capital budget for a Master Plan update in 2012 and 2013. A strategic vision of the Airport will be developed in conjunction with the Airport Master Plan and will be the basis for an update to the Airport Master Plan.

k) Recommendation 13
Address Concept of Common Area Maintenance Fees

Due to the lack of common area maintenance fees, the Airport must break down these costs and allocate them to each individual tenant. This needlessly complicates the billing process. For example, snow removal is charged only for the driveways and parking spots directly related to tenant access and the Airport needs to track the time spent on these specific areas.

Recommendation 13 suggests that over time, as leases are modified, the Airport should consider introducing common area maintenance fees. This may result in increased revenue to the Airport and reduced workload related to the tracking of time, to cost allocations and the billing process.

Action:
The idea of a common area maintenance fee has been explored in the past and was not supported by the tenants. The tenants preferred the current fees and charges setup however Airport staff will consider this concept again as part of the next Airport fee review that is typically done on an annual basis.
l) Recommendation 14  
Resolve Onerous Calculation of Tenant Utilities and Property Taxes  
One of the key findings of the program review was that the Airport must calculate and bill the property taxes, water and sewage charges, and utilities (e.g. hydro) individually for each tenant. This represents a significant administrative burden to the Airport and could be handled more efficiently. A number of airports in Canada have already moved away from this practice.

Recommendation 14 suggest that the Airport pursue having the utility company take over billing Airport tenants directly and have the Township of Woolwich take over billing tenants directly for property taxes and water and sewage charges. By eliminating the onerous task of calculating and billing these third party items, there will be weeks of staff time saved from collecting, reconciling and processing utilities. The Airport will likely benefit from better recapture of costs as the utility company and Township of Woolwich may be more effective at capturing these costs.

Action:  
The Airport has previously discussed having the Township of Woolwich and Waterloo North Hydro take over the billing of the Airport tenants directly and both parties were not prepared to do it at that time. Airport and Finance staff will be pursing this issue again in 2012.

m) Recommendation 15  
Implement a Lease Management System  
One of the key findings from the program review was that there is lack of structure and due diligence in the management of leases. Currently the Airport does not have a comprehensive system in place to manage airline and lease agreements at the Airport. This can include lease expiry dates, milestone dates for increasing rental revenues, percentage rent paid, etc.

Recommendation 15 proposes that the Region’s current system for managing leases be reviewed to ensure it has the capability to meet the Airport’s needs for lease management. The Airport relies upon the ALFA system (Airport Landing Fee & Revenue Management) for this functionality. However a region-wide system could provide centralized management and help reduce the risk of missed items for invoicing. The benefits for the Airport program include reduced risk of a missed expiry date and resulting loss in potential rent or rate increase to a tenant. Other benefits include reduced resource time to manage leases. More importantly in the operations of an airport, improved lease management can ensure that the Airport receives maximum amount of revenue from tenants which have similar operations and that the fees charged to these tenants is consistent throughout the Airport.

Action:  
Airport staff has started to investigate software options in conjunction with other departments (Finance, Legal, etc) at the Region who also have a similar need to track contracts, leases and other agreements. It is expected that a lease management system could be in place by the end of 2012.

n) Recommendation 16 and 17  
Improve Handling of Cash Deposits and Address Cash Reconciliation Process  
Currently cash deposits are limited to a specified amount per pickup (bi-weekly basis). Limiting deposits in this way, by amount and timing, requires storage of cash at the Airport and causes deposits to be aggregated rather than deposited separately by source of cash.

With respect to the cash reconciliation process, once counted and reconciled to source documents, cash is no longer kept separate as to the source and is combined with cash from other sources. This makes reconciliation of cash located at the Airport difficult. Recommendation 16 suggests that cash can be delivered and deposited when required without a limitation to the value and timing. Recommendation 17 suggests keeping cash separate with source documents and depositing cash separately so that cash can be reconciled between bank statements and source documents. This will
create a clearer audit trail between cash deposits and source allowing the Airport to reconcile cash deposits against source documents.

**Action:**
Airport and Finance staff will explore potential options for streamlining these processes in accordance with existing financial policies.

**o) Recommendation 18**

**Develop Automated Management Reports**
The current process of downloading data from the NAVCAN site - matching data to current customers, generation of new customers, and the creation of invoices – is a complex and time consuming process. Genivar’s Airport Landing Fee & Revenue Management (ALFA) System does this systematically with good exception reports that provide strong support to the reconciliation process required between the NAVCAN data and the ALFA system. However, currently, there is no report writer in ALFA, and any new report requirements must be custom made by the external application developer. The alternative is to export information into spreadsheets and generate ad hoc reports, which are time consuming and not an efficient use of time.

Recommendation 18 proposes that the Airport perform a review of the type of reports and information currently lacking in ALFA and request a quote from the supplier to have the needed reports developed within the ALFA system. An alternative is to work with the Region’s Finance Team to establish access to a simple report writer (or identify report writing resources) or to generate the needed reports directly from the Region’s finance systems, where possible. The benefit of this recommendation is that it allow for more effective reporting of information.

**Action:**
Airport staff working with Finance and IT staff will investigate what options exist with the ALFA system and determine if the functionality is adequate and if ALFA can be upgraded or if it is necessary to move to another system.

**p) Recommendation 19**

**Improve Documentation for Aviation-Related Revenue Management System and Processes**
The current reliance on key individuals could leave the Airport vulnerable to significant disruption in an unanticipated event. This is especially true for revenue and invoicing processes, as a disruption could result in losing the ability to invoice and reduced cash flows for a period of time. Recommendation 19 proposes that the Airport create and document the detailed process to allow personnel to take over the invoicing in case of a disruption. This will ensure continuity, should there be any disruption of the Airport’s Finance Team, and enable replacement personnel or additional hires to quickly understand and carry out the necessary processes.

**Action:**
Airport staff plan to document in 2012 the detailed process of ALFA (i.e. the Airport’s revenue management system) to ensure continuity should there be a disruption of the Airport’s Finance Team. Currently the day to day activities of the Airport’s revenue management system and processes are mostly completed by the two administrative staff positions of which one is full time and the other is a contract position. In order to ensure that the ongoing work required with the Airport’s revenue management system and processes is being completed it is recommended that the contract position which has been in place for 3 years be changed to a full time position. This position would also be expected to complete the documentation process and keep it updated.
Marketing:

q) Recommendation 20  
**Fill Vacancy in Marketing/Communications**  
The Airport’s Marketing and Communications Team handles a wide variety of responsibilities and would benefit from immediately filling the existing vacancy. Recommendation 20 encourages expediting the filling of this position to aid existing marketing and communications staff. Upon filling the existing vacancy, all responsibilities for marketing and communication will receive the appropriate attention.

**Action:**  
The filling of this position was put on hold until the program review was completed. It is anticipated that this position will be posted shortly and that an Airport Marketing Assistant will be in place by April 1, 2012.

r) Recommendation 21 and 23  
**Renew Approach for Airport Website/Social Media Marketing and Maximize Blogging by Posting Various Topics**  
Responsibility for social media currently resides with a student employee. Over time it is expected that social media will become a more integral part of the Airport marketing and communications function and should be in the hands of a fully trained, consistent and reliable employee well versed in the airport industry. Recommendation 21 proposes to move responsibility for Airport website/social media to a more experienced Airport employee. This will reduce the risk of having the Airport’s image and relationship with the community in the hands of a student.

Another finding from the program review is that while the Airport Manager does blog, it is primarily in response to air service related concerns that have been raised by passengers. Findings indicate that other similar sized airports are now using blogging for a wide variety of topics. Recommendation 23 proposes that blogging be used more comprehensively at the Airport, as observed at other similar sized airports. The Airport should be using blogging to communicate on a variety of topics, including potential weather delays, labour disruptions, traffic or roadway pattern changes and other issues of immediate impact to passengers. This will allow the Airport to connect with a variety of different passenger and community groups and increase exposure for the Airport. Blogging and other forms of social media have replaced some of the more traditional means of communications and travellers have now come to expect this from their airport. This trend is likely to continue over time and the Airport can only benefit from remaining ahead of passenger expectations.

**Action:**  
The new Marketing and Communications Assistant position will have full responsibility for the Airport's Social Media Program, including managing blogging.

s) Recommendation 22 and 24  
**Add Budget for Catchment Area Marketing and Maximize Billboard Opportunities**  
The Airport loses the overwhelming majority of its traffic to neighbouring airports. Studies have indicated that in excess of 99% of transborder and international traffic from the Airport’s catchment area is lost to other airports. While this is due to insufficient air service frequencies, mitigating this loss to build up a sustainable critical mass is a key to the Airport’s development. The Program Review Consultant’s feel there are insufficient funds budgeted to address passenger leakage concerns. Recommendation 22 proposes that the Airport should add passenger marketing funds to complement existing marketing initiatives used for routes. Reducing passenger leakage may allow the Airport to introduce more passengers to what the Airport has to offer regarding convenience, ease of use and generate satisfied repeat customers.
There are many avenues available to help recapture passenger traffic. Recommendation 24 proposes that outdoor advertising could be used more comprehensively to accomplish this. The benefit is such that it may increase passenger traffic at the Airport as well as increased airport exposure.

**Action:**
Passenger leakage is a common problem facing many Canadian Airports. While it is true that the majority of passengers from the primary catchment area fly from neighbor airports, this is only true because of the limited amount of options available to passengers from the Airport. The service currently in place at the Airport does well, proving that as the destination choices increase from the Airport, so will the passengers. It is therefore more prudent to focus on attracting additional air service options from new or existing carriers. Airport Management believes the existing Marketing budget is sufficient in order to continue to attract additional air service, however will monitor over the next couple years and request additional funds through the normal budget process if required.

**Implementation Considerations**

The implementation of these recommendations will involve a considerable effort on the part of staff. Significant changes to work processes and associated interdependencies, the organization of the work, and the associated technology are discussed in this report. The time commitment required to effectively implement these recommendations will be considerable. The implementation will require interaction and support from several other departments and many of the sections within the Airport.

**Implementation Benefits**

The 24 recommendations provided by the consultant in this report have the potential to help take the Region of Waterloo International Airport to a new level of airport management in the effectiveness and efficiency of staff. There are several key benefits that can be derived from recommendations:

- **Improved long-term management of the Airport:** Growing new services and bringing facilities at the optimal time to meet capacity requirements are some of the most sizable challenges any airport has. Some of the benefits of the recommendations will ensure long-range business strategy and Airport Master Plan approaches that are recognized in the industry are adopted to limit any infrastructure overinvestment/underinvestment.

- **Net financial savings through improved efficiencies in business processes:** A reduction of staff time to handle day-to-day operations, including duplication and centralization of certain functions will result from some of the key recommendations in this report.

- **Greater degree of staff effectiveness through automation:** In addition to time savings are expected through automation of key data collection activities, staff will be more effective through improving the value-added tasks of recognizing trends and patterns in airport operations.

- **Avoidance of future costs:** The improvement of quality of financial, operational, technical, drawing and other data about aviation activity will help to avoid future costs of operations and capital requirements.

- **Maximization of marketing efforts:** to realize the potential of the Airport for air traffic generation as well as resulting revenues in fees, leasing of properties and other revenue generation activities

As described in the Financial Implications section of this report, the efficiency improvements will result in cost savings in both day to day operations and future cost avoidance.
Reporting

Staff will report back to Council on the various stages of implementing the recommendations from this Program Review through the development of an annual reporting process. Staff will track the various implementation actions and report on the actual costs and benefits. The first report should be anticipated by the end of 2012.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The completion of the study was done in keeping with Focus Area 5.3: Ensure Regional programs and services are efficient and effective and demonstrate accountability to the public.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

It is expected that the implementation of the actions that are to be completed in 2012 will have an annual savings of approximately $85,000 to the Airport operating budget through more efficient use of staff and improved business processes, however the change of the one administrative staff position from a contract to a permanent FTE, at an annual cost of approximately $70,000, would result in a net reduction of approximately $15,000. The four contract positions that have now been eliminated were funded for the past several years from one-time funding approved by Council in an annual amount of approximately $248,000 and this funding is no longer required. The implementation of the actions noted beyond 2012 is expected to result in additional savings to the Airport operating budget.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

In addition to the staff from the Airport who participated in this program review staff from Corporate Resources, Legal Services, Finance, and Human Resources were directly involved in this review through interviews or workshops.

ATTACHMENTS:

NIL

PREPARED BY: David A. Young, Manager, Internal Audit
              John Hammer, Director, Transportation
              Chris Wood, General Manager, Region of Waterloo International Airport

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
              Michael L. Murray, Chief Administrative Officer
REGION OF WATERLOO
PLANNING, HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
Community Planning

TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: April 17, 2012  FILE CODE: D18-01

SUBJECT: MONTHLY REPORT OF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY FOR MARCH 2012

RECOMMENDATION:


SUMMARY:

In accordance with the Regional By-law 01-028, as amended, the Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services has:

1. Approved the following part lot control exemption by-law;
2. Released for registration the following plans of condominium; and
3. Approved the following official plan amendments.

REPORT:

City of Cambridge

1. Part Lot Control Exemption By-law 27-12
   Applicant: PIDEL Homes Limited
   Location: Chester Drive and Fitzgerald Drive
   Proposal: To permit the creation of 37 townhouse units.
   Processing Fee: Paid March 7, 2012
   Commissioner’s Approval: March 8, 2012

2. Official Plan Amendment No. 36
   Applicant: Canadian Commercial Group
   Location: 1512, 1526 and 1546 King Street East
   Proposal: To amend the City Official Plan from Class 1 (Urban) Residential District to add a site specific provision to develop the subject lands with 1,783m² of gross floor area for one single tenant commercial establishment proposed to be a Shoppers Drug Mart.
   Processing Fee: Paid March 7, 2012
   Commissioner’s Approval: March 29, 2012
   Comes Into Effect: April 19, 2012
City of Kitchener

1. **Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-11204**
   - **Draft Approval Date:** January 24, 2012
   - **Phase:** Stage 1
   - **Applicant:** Savic Homes
   - **Location:** 55 Mooregate Crescent
   - **Proposal:** To permit the conversion of 14 units to condominium townhouse units.
   - **Processing Fee:** Not applicable.
   - **Commissioner’s Release:** March 20, 2012

City of Waterloo

1. **Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-11401**
   - **Draft Approval Date:** August 9, 2011
   - **Phase:** Entire Plan
   - **Applicant:** 2218553 Ontario Inc.
   - **Location:** 133 Park Street
   - **Proposal:** To permit the development of 18 condominium apartment units.
   - **Processing Fee:** Paid February 28, 2012
   - **Commissioner’s Release:** March 6, 2012

2. **Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-11408**
   - **Draft Approval Date:** February 13, 2012
   - **Phase:** Entire Plan
   - **Applicant:** 2273837 Ontario Inc.
   - **Location:** 15 Devitt Avenue South
   - **Proposal:** To permit the development of 15 condominium apartment units.
   - **Processing Fee:** Paid March 6, 2012
   - **Commissioner’s Release:** March 8, 2012

Township of Woolwich

1. **Official Plan Amendment No. 19**
   - **Applicant:** King/86 Developments Limited
   - **Location:** 330 and 335 Farmer’s Market Road, St. Jacobs
   - **Proposal:** To modify certain policies applicable to the “King/85 Power Centre Commercial Area” Official Plan designation related to the number and size of uses permitted on the site and the definition of “Service Commercial”.
   - **Processing Fee:** Paid February 23, 2012
   - **Commissioner’s Approval:** March 21, 2012
   - **Came Into Effect:** April 11, 2012
Residential Subdivision Activity January 2012 to March 31, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Units in Residential Registered Plans</th>
<th>Residential Units Draft Approved</th>
<th>Pending Plans (Units Submitted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Kitchener</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dumfries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Waterloo</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The acceptance and/or draft approval of plans of subdivision and condominium processed by the City of Kitchener under delegated approval authority are not included in this table.

For comparison, the following table has also been included:

Residential Subdivision Activity January 1, 2011 to March 31, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Units in Residential Registered Plans</th>
<th>Residential Units Draft Approved</th>
<th>Pending Plans (Units Submitted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Kitchener</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dumfries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Waterloo</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The acceptance and/or draft approval of plans of subdivision and condominium processed by the City of Kitchener under delegated approval authority are not included in this table.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

These planning approvals, including consultation with Area Municipalities, have been completed in accordance with the Planning Act. All approvals contained in this report were supported by the Area Municipal councils and/or staff.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This report reflects actions taken by the Commissioner in accordance with the Delegation By-law adopted by Council. The activities described in this report are operational activities with the objective of Focus Area 1: Growth Management and Prosperity.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS: NIL

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE: NIL

PREPARED BY: Andrea Banks, Program Assistant

APPROVED BY: Graham Vincent, Acting Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: April 17, 2012

FILE CODE: D16-40

SUBJECT: PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE 1995 REGIONAL OFFICIAL POLICIES PLAN
THOMASFIELD HOMES LTD., BRESLAU RURAL SETTLEMENT AREA,
TOWNSHIP OF WOOLWICH

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo direct staff to hold a public meeting under Sections 17(15) and 22(1) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, Chapter P.13, as amended, to give the public an opportunity to comment on an application by Thomasfield Homes Ltd. to amend the 1995 Regional Official Policies Plan with respect to the Breslau Rural Settlement Area in the Township of Woolwich, as outlined in Report No. P-12-045, dated April 17, 2012.

SUMMARY:

Thomasfield Homes Ltd. has submitted an application to amend the 1995 Regional Official Policies Plan (ROPP) with respect to the Breslau Rural Settlement Area in the Township of Woolwich (see Appendix A for location map). This ROPP remains in force and effect, as the current Official Plan, until the new Regional Official Plan (ROP) comes into effect as described below.

The applicant has filed this amendment in light of the longer than anticipated approval process for the new ROP, which is still before the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB). At present, the new ROP is not expected to come into effect until 2013. This delay has in turn delayed work on the community planning studies for Breslau currently underway by the Township, and has prompted Thomasfield Homes Ltd. to seek an amendment to the 1995 ROPP. This amendment would not be required if the new ROP was in effect.

Approval of the proposed amendment would: 1) re-designate Breslau from a “Rural Settlement Area” and “Industrial/Commercial Area” to a “Township Urban Area”; 2) delete the existing development cap that limits Breslau to a total of 1,250 dwelling units; and 3) revise other associated policies and mapping accordingly. These changes would establish a broad policy framework in the ROPP within which the Township of Woolwich may continue to plan for growth in Breslau, and provide for the future consideration of plan of subdivision applications within that area. It is through the Township planning process that the land uses for Breslau will be defined.

The Township of Woolwich has participated in the process leading up to submission of the proposed amendment. Regional staff will continue to work closely with the Township as the process moves forward.

This report seeks Council’s authorization for staff to schedule a public meeting to obtain input from the broader community. To comply with the application review deadlines set under the Planning Act, staff recommends that the public meeting be held at the regular Planning and Works Committee meeting scheduled for May 29, 2012.
REPORT:

The new Regional Official Plan (ROP) is currently before the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) and is not expected to come into effect until 2013. Until then, the Region must continue to use the 1995 Regional Official Policies Plan (ROP) for legal purposes in reviewing development applications under the Planning Act.

Given the longer than anticipated approval process for the new ROP, and to avoid further delays, Thomasfield Homes Ltd. has submitted an application to amend the 1995 ROP to facilitate its proposed plan of subdivision east of Forwell Creek in the Breslau community. The subdivision plan proposes a compact, mixed-use development with multi-story office employment uses located near a future GO Transit station. Approval of the proposed ROP amendment would:

1. re-designate and consolidate the Breslau community from a “Rural Settlement Area” and an “Industrial/Commercial Area” to a “Township Urban Area”;

2. remove the existing development cap, which currently limits the Breslau community to a maximum of 1,250 dwelling units; and

3. revise other associated ROP policies and mapping accordingly

The overall effect of this amendment is to provide for the consideration of additional population and employment growth in Breslau in the context of the 1995 ROP. This objective is in line with the new ROP adopted by Regional Council in 2009. The new ROP includes Breslau within the Region’s primary “Urban Area” designation, and anticipates Breslau to develop with a greater mix of lands uses and development densities to support the creation of a complete community. Ultimately, the proposed ROP amendment would be superseded by the new ROP once it is approved by the OMB. In the meantime, the proposed ROP amendment would provide guidance into the review of the Township’s Official Plan, the Breslau Secondary Plan, and the review of alternative water and wastewater servicing options to accommodate additional development within Breslau.

No urban expansions are being proposed through the proposed amendment. The lands affected by this amendment are within the existing “Rural Settlement Area” or “Industrial/Commercial Area” designations of the 1995 ROP. Appendix B contains the full text and mapping of the proposed amendment as submitted by the applicant.

Under the Planning Act, a public meeting is required to obtain input from the broader community before an official plan amendment can be considered by Regional Council. To comply with the review deadlines set under the Planning Act, staff recommends that the public meeting be held at the regular meeting of the Planning and Works Committee scheduled for May 29, 2012. Following the public meeting, staff expects to bring a follow-up report to Regional Council for consideration by August 2012.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

Staff has consulted with the Township of Woolwich prior to accepting this application, and will continue to work closely with the Township as the process moves forward.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The recommendations of this report support the Region’s priorities with respect to Focus Area 2 (Growth Management and Prosperity) and Focus Area 5 (Service Excellence) of the Corporate Strategic Plan.
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
NIL

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:
Legal Services have been consulted on the proposed ROPP amendment.

ATTACHMENTS:
Appendix A - Location Map
Appendix B - Draft Copy of the Proposed ROPP Amendment

PREPARED BY:  John Lubczynski, Principal Planner

APPROVED BY:  Graham Vincent, Acting Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
APPENDIX B

AMENDMENT NO. _____ TO THE REGIONAL OFFICIAL POLICIES PLAN

TO PROVIDE FOR THE RE-DESIGNATION OF THE
RURAL SETTLEMENT AREA 35. BRESLAU AND INDUSTRIAL/
COMMERCIAL AREA E. INDUSTRIAL AREA – REGIONAL ROAD 17
AS A TOWNSHIP URBAN AREA

PART I – PURPOSE OF THE AMENDMENT

The purpose of the proposed amendment is:

a) To re-designate the Breslau Settlement Area from ‘Rural Settlement Area 35.’ and Industrial/Commercial Area E. Industrial Area – Regional Road 17’ to ‘Township Urban Area’ on Map No. 6 – Settlement Pattern;

b) To amend the relevant policies of Section 7.5 Rural Settlement Areas and Industrial/Commercial Areas including Table 7.3 to delete ‘35. Breslau’ and ‘E. Industrial Area – Regional Road 17’, Section 7.5.1.8 to delete ‘Breslau’, and to delete Section 7.5.1.10 in its entirety;

c) To amend Map No. 2 – Provincially Significant Wetlands to add the Breslau Wetland Complex;

d) To amend Map No. 3 – Agricultural Resource Areas to remove the ‘Prime Agricultural Areas’ designation, replacing with white (Township Urban Areas).

PART II – BASIS OF THE AMENDMENT

On June 16, 2009 Regional Council following a substantive process and based on a comprehensive Growth Strategy adopted a new Regional Official Plan (ROP) for the Regional Municipality of Waterloo.

The new ROP designates the Breslau Settlement Area as part of the ‘Urban Area’ and provides for population, employment and densities to reflect that designation.

On December 22, 2010 the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing issued their Notice of Decision approving with modifications the new Region of Waterloo Official Plan.

Following approval of the ROP several appeals to the Ontario Municipal Board were filed and since then the OMB has had several pre-hearings and motion hearings, however the appeal process is expected to continue, possibly for one or two years. Substantive delay of the approval of the ROP will delay consideration of the approval of municipal Official Plan Amendments, the Breslau Secondary Plan and development applications currently in circulation in the Township of Woolwich.
The existing Regional Official Policies Plan (ROPP) was approved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, November 23, 1995, and further approved and amended to September 30, 2006. This amendment is required pursuant to Section 7.5.1.7 of the ROPP.

“7.5.1.7 An amendment to this Plan will be required to redesignate a Rural Settlement Area to Township Urban Area if the proposed expansion of the Rural Settlement Area would result in characteristics such as population, land uses, densities, and infrastructure, that are similar to existing Township Urban Areas."

Section 7.5.1.3 of the ROPP provides for Area Municipalities to designate Rural Settlement Areas and Industrial/Commercial Areas in their Official Plans. The Township of Woolwich has designated the ‘Breslau Settlement Area’ in their Official Plan. The proposed amendment incorporates this designated settlement area and the Industrial/Commercial Area E. Industrial Area – Regional Road 17.

Re-designation of the Breslau Community to Township Urban Area will remove the Prime Agricultural Area designations on Map No. 3 – Agricultural Resource Areas.

Map No. 2 – Provincially Significant Wetlands is being amended to reflect current wetland mapping from the Ministry of Natural Resources.

The Breslau Settlement Area

The Township of Woolwich Official Plan (Section 7.16) designates the Breslau Settlement Area as an ‘Urban Settlement’ and provides for a maximum number of residential units which shall not exceed 1,250 to the year 2016. This is in conformity with Section 7.5.1.10 of the R.O.P.P. The residential land use policies provide for new fully serviced residential development density of approximately 12 units per gross residential hectare with a net residential density to a maximum 45 units per net residential hectare.

The Township O.P. provides for new development in two Special Policy Areas to be developed on municipal water and sanitary services extended from the City of Kitchener under a ‘Cross Border Servicing Agreement’ between the City of Kitchener and the Township of Woolwich.

The Township of Woolwich is currently undertaking an Official Plan Review in part to ensure conformity with the new ROP and provincial policy. The Township has also initiated a ‘Breslau Secondary Plan’ process to plan for urbanization of this community consistent with the policies of the new ROP.

The Township and Region have received and accepted complete applications from Thomasfield Homes for Official Plan Amendment, Zone Change and Draft Plan of Subdivision, for land designated ‘Urban Area’ east of Hopewell Creek. The proposed draft plan provides for a compact, mixed-use development with multi-storey office
employment use adjacent to a transit station site. The proposed development does not compromise population and employment density targets established in the new R.O.P. and the Designated Greenfield Area density targets in the Growth Plan.

Provincial policy (P.P.S. and Places to Grow) supports compact, mixed-use development that through higher density targets are efficiently utilizing urban lands and contributing to complete communities.

Metrolinx, an agency of the Government of Ontario, has approved a future GO Transit station site to be integrated with the proposed development. Their mandate includes working with municipalities and developers to support visionary community development at station sites to maximize ridership.

It is expected that other development applications will be submitted for land within the Breslau Settlement Area concurrent or following the secondary plan process.

This proposed amendment will provide the opportunity for the Township and Region to continue with the Breslau Secondary Plan, Township Official Plan Amendment, and ultimately consideration of pending development applications. The existing R.O.P.P. does not provide for this opportunity within the Breslau Settlement Area and this amendment is intended to provide it while the new R.O.P. is under appeal.

**PART III – DETAILS OF THE AMENDMENT**

The following revisions to Section 7.5 and Map Nos. 2, 3 and 6 constitute the proposed amendment to the Regional Official Policies Plan.

1) **Section – 7.5 Rural Settlement Areas and Industrial/Commercial Areas**

   Section 7.5 is hereby amended by deleting from Table 7.3 “35. Breslau” and “E. Industrial Area – Regional Road 17”.

   Section 7.5.1.8 is hereby amended by deleting “Breslau”.

   Section 7.5.1.10 is hereby amended by deleting it in its entirety.

2) **Map No. 2 – Provincially Significant Wetlands** is hereby amended by adding the ‘Breslau Wetland Complex’, as shown on the attached Schedule A.1.

3) **Map No. 3 – Agricultural Resource Areas** is hereby amended by deleting the subject land – the Breslau Settlement Area from the area designated ‘Prime Agricultural Area’, and the symbols ‘35.’ and ‘E.’ as shown on the attached Schedule A.2.

4) **Map No. 6 – Settlement Pattern** is hereby amended by re-designating the subject land – Breslau Settlement Area from ‘Rural Settlement Areas’ and deleting the symbols ‘35.’ and ‘E.’ and replacing it with the ‘Township Urban Area’ designation, as shown on the attached Schedule A.3.
PART IV – IMPLEMENTATION

This amendment will be implemented through amendment to the Township of Woolwich Official Plan and the Breslau Secondary Plan and in the review of development applications submitted for approval.
RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, in its role as the delegate of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, refer the portion of Map 5 of the City of Kitchener Official Plan located west of Fischer-Hallman Road and north of Huron Road that is subject to Deferral 3a to the Ontario Municipal Board under the provisions of Section 17(11) of the Planning Act R.S.O. 1990 and request this referral be consolidated with the Official Plan Amendment, Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law amendment appeals by Tru-Villa Inc. and 2040796 Ontario Limited currently the subject of Ontario Municipal Board Case No. PL090526, as explained in Report P-12-046, dated April 17, 2012.

SUMMARY:

On June 10, 2006, Tru-Villa Inc. and 2040796 Ontario Limited appealed their proposed Official Plan Amendment, Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law amendment applications as they apply to 53.20 hectares (131.4 acres) of land located on Huron Road, to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) (Appendix A). On May 25, 1995, the Region in its role as the delegate of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing approved the City of Kitchener Official Plan (known as the City of Kitchener Municipal Plan). As part of this approval, in consultation with the City of Kitchener, no decision was made with respect to a portion of Map 5 of the Official Plan as it applied to lands on the west and southwest portion of the City of Kitchener. The area to which no decision was made was identified as Deferral 3a within the approval document. The lands subject to the appeals by Tru-Villa Inc. and 2040796 Ontario Limited are within the area affected by Deferral 3a.

In order to ensure that all outstanding issues related to the subject lands can be appropriately addressed by the OMB, Regional staff is recommending that Deferral 3a, as it applies specifically to the lands subject to the appeals by Tru-Villa Inc. and 2040796 Ontario Limited be referred by Regional Council to the OMB. City of Kitchener staff, Tru-Villa Inc. and 2040796 Ontario Limited concur with the request to refer the 3a deferral lands to the OMB and consolidate the referral with the appeals by Tru-Villa Inc. and 2040796 Ontario Limited.

REPORT:

On June 10, 2006, Tru-Villa Inc. and 2040796 Ontario Limited appealed their proposed Official Plan Amendment, Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law amendment applications as they apply to 53.20 hectares (131.4 acres) of land located on Huron Road, to the Ontario Municipal Board (Appendix A). The basis for this appeal was the failure of the City of Kitchener to make a decision with respect to the subject applications within the time frames provided for within the Planning Act. These applications propose development of the lands for residential purposes.
On May 25, 1995, the Region in its role as the delegate of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing approved the City of Kitchener Official Plan (known as the City of Kitchener Municipal Plan). As part of this approval, in consultation with the City of Kitchener, no decision was made with respect to a portion of Map 5 of the Municipal Plan as it applied to lands on the west and southwest portions of the City of Kitchener. The area to which no decision was made was identified as Deferral 3a within the approval document. The lands subject to the appeals by Tru-Villa Inc. and 2040796 Ontario Limited are within the area affected by Deferral 3a.

The purpose of Deferral 3a was to permit the completion of a “West Side Study” by the City of Kitchener. The “West Side Study” that commenced in 1986, was a comprehensive planning exercise to address future development of the lands on the west side of the City of Kitchener. It was intended at that time, that the results of the “West Side Study” would determine the appropriate land use designations within both the City of Kitchener’s Municipal Plan and what was then the new Regional Official Policies Plan (ROPP) that had been adopted by Regional Council on October 27, 1994, but had yet to be approved by the Minster of Municipal Affairs and Housing. As part of its approval of the ROPP on November 22, 1995, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, at the request of the Region, also made no decision with respect to the lands subject to the “West Side Study”.

As a result of the changing policy environment at the Provincial and Regional levels with respect to water resource protection, the “West Side Study” was never formally completed by the City of Kitchener.

The lands subject to the appeals by Tru-Villa Inc. and 2040796 Ontario Limited were designated as City Urban Area in the ROPP through ROPP Amendment No, 16, however, Deferral 3a in the City of Kitchener Municipal Plan that applies to the subject lands has yet to be resolved. In order to ensure that all outstanding issues related to the subject lands can be appropriately addressed by the OMB, Regional staff is recommending that Deferral 3a, as it applies specifically to the lands subject to the appeals by Tru-Villa Inc. and 2040796 Ontario Limited be referred by Regional Council to the OMB.

This request for referral to the OMB is being made in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act as it existed at the time of the original approval of the City of Kitchener Municipal Plan, which still governs the further processing of this application. No similar provision exists in the current version of the Planning Act. The authority to refer applications to the OMB is not provided for within the Regional Planning Housing and Community Services delegation By-law No. 01-028 and as a result, Regional staff is recommending Regional Council refer Deferral 3a specifically as it applies to the subject lands to the OMB.

**Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination**

Regional staff is consulting with City of Kitchener staff in preparation for the OMB pre-hearing hearing in May, 2012. City of Kitchener staff concurs with the request to refer the 3a deferral lands to the OMB and consolidate the referral with the appeals by Tru-Villa Inc. and 2040796 Ontario Limited.

**CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

The actions described in this report are consistent with the 2011 - 2014 Strategic Plan Strategic Objectives: 1.1 Integrate environmental considerations into the Region’s decision-making, 1.4 Protect the quality and the quantity of our drinking water sources, and 1.5 Restore and preserve green space, agricultural land and sensitive environmental areas.
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Costs associated with the filing of this appeal and any costs associated with the Ontario Municipal Board Hearing process can be provided through funds already budgeted for such purposes.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Legal Services have been directly involved in the preparation of the Region’s referral request to the OMB and concur with the recommendations of this report.

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix A – Location Map illustrating the lands subject to appeals by Tru-Villa Inc. and 2040796 Ontario Limited.

PREPARED BY:  Brenna MacKinnon, Manager, Greenfield Planning

APPROVED BY:  Graham Vincent, Acting Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
Appendix A – Location Map - lands subject to appeals by Tru-Villa Inc. and 2040796 Ontario Limited.
REGION OF WATERLOO
PLANNING, HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
Community Planning

TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: April 17, 2012

FILE CODE: D04-30/LAURELCREEK

SUBJECT: FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE LAUREL CREEK HEADWATERS ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE LANDSCAPE PUBLIC LIAISON COMMITTEE

RECOMMENDATION:

For information.

SUMMARY:

Since it was established in 2007 as part of a settlement of the appeal of Regional Official Policies Plan Amendment 22, the Laurel Creek Headwaters Environmentally Sensitive Landscape Public Liaison Committee has been meeting approximately seven to ten times per year. At the March 22, 2012 meeting, the Committee adopted the attached annual report on its activities for the year 2011 for submission to Regional Council as required by its approved Terms of Reference. The annual report is attached as Attachment 1 and lists some of the Committee’s major achievements including work carried out within the Laurel Creek Headwaters Environmentally Sensitive Landscape on projects funded by the Region’s Environmental Stewardship Fund.

REPORT:

On December 4, 2007, Regional Council established the Laurel Creek Headwaters Environmentally Sensitive Landscape Public Liaison Committee pursuant to Minutes of Settlement endorsed by Council on August 23, 2007, and subsequently accepted by the Ontario Municipal Board. The minutes of Settlement resolved the appeal by the Environmentally Sensitive Property Owners (ESPO) and Wilhard Barth of Regional Official Policies Plan (ROPP) Amendment No. 22 which designated the first two Environmentally Sensitive Landscapes (ESLs). The ESL Public Liaison Committee consists of twelve members. Nine are residents or landowners within the Laurel Creek Headwaters Environmentally Sensitive Landscape. The additional three members are representatives of the Waterloo Stewardship Network, an agricultural organisation, and the Ecological and Environmental Advisory Committee. Section 6 of the Committee’s Terms of Reference require it to submit an annual report to Council on its activities over the previous year. At the March 22, 2012 meeting, the Committee endorsed Attachment 1 as its fourth annual report to Regional Council.

In 2011 the Committee met seven times. As has been the case in previous years, the primary location for the meetings was the Kitchener-Waterloo Optimist Club’s Camp Heidelberg, Kressler Road, Woolwich Township within the ESL. This annual report documents highlights from the Committee’s fourth year of operation including:

- **Signage.** In the first year of the committee’s existence, committee members initiated a process to develop distinctive signage to be posted along roadways to mark the boundaries of the ESL. In 2010, a design was approved by the committee and in 2011, five signs were manufactured of cedar, using funds from the Environmental Stewardship Fund and installed
within the roads rights-of-way on Erbsville Road, Kressler Road, Weimar Line, Notre Dame Drive and Wilmot Line where the roads enter the ESL.

- **Stewardship Projects.** Among the successful applications for funding from the Region’s Environmental Stewardship Fund Projects were several that benefitted the Laurel Creek Headwaters Environmentally Sensitive Landscape, including the first stage of an initiative to rehabilitate a badly eroding tributary of Monastery Creek in the northeast corner of Wilmot Township. In addition, several projects were carried out in 2011 by the Waterloo Stewardship Network including planting native trees along roadsides in the ESL as well as some corridor planting projects (shrubs and wildflowers and native grasses).

In addition to the work carried out in 2011, the report also looks ahead to activities planned for 2012 including

- **Stewardship Education.** The committee is investigating opportunities to offer further environmental stewardship education for the residents of the ESL including the continuation of rural landowner stewardship workshops or some other event. These events may be jointly presented with the Waterloo Stewardship Network and/or the Grand River Conservation Authority and the Waterloo Stewardship Network.

- **Stewardship Projects.** A number of the on-the-ground stewardship projects initiated within the ESL during 2010 and 2011 will carry on into 2012 including additional native tree and vegetation planting. Interest generated by these projects is anticipated to result in additional applications for funding and requests for information during 2012.

- **Signage.** Five additional roadside ESL signs will be installed at appropriate locations around the perimeter of the ESL in cooperation with Area Municipal and Regional authorities. It is also planned to make small-scale signs bearing the distinctive ESL logo suitable for mounting on fenceposts or gates. These would be made available for distribution to local landowners interested in displaying them and promoting the identity of the ESL.

In summary, the committee remains active and is dedicated to promoting the features and stewardship values of the ESL and working with the local residents to ensure that the special character of the landscape is protected and enhanced. The committee is looking forward to an increased awareness of the ESL as additional roadside signs are installed in 2012.

**Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination**

The Annual Report will be provided to the City of Waterloo, and the townships of Wilmot, Woolwich and Wellesley. Committee members and support staff are collaborating with Area Municipalities to identify appropriate locations for the installation of the distinctive new ESL signage.

**CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

The work of the committee helps achieve the Strategic Objective of preserving sensitive environmental areas within the Laurel Creek Headwaters Environmentally Sensitive Landscape. It also seeks to achieve the Strategic Objective of strengthening and enhancing partnerships with community stakeholders as the Region works to meet the needs and expectations of the community.
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The Committee does not have a specific budget allocation at this time. The production of the first ESL signs was financed from the Environmental Stewardship Fund. The Optimist Club of Kitchener-Waterloo graciously allowed the Committee to use Camp Heidelberg for the event, and the Planning, Housing, and Community Services Department makes a modest contribution to cover the additional cost of providing heat and light for the meetings.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Transportation and Environmental Services staff will be consulted with regard to the installation of the new ESL signage on Regional roadsides at entrances to the Laurel Creek Headwaters ESL.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment 1 - Laurel Creek Headwaters Environmentally Sensitive Landscape Public Liaison Committee Fourth Annual Report (Spring 2012).

PREPARED BY:  Albert Hovingh, Principal Planner, Environmental and Stewardship Planning

APPROVED BY:  Graham Vincent, Acting Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
LAUREL CREEK HEADWATERS
ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE LANDSCAPE

PUBLIC LIAISON COMMITTEE

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT

Submitted to the Council of
The Regional Municipality of Waterloo

Spring 2012
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1. Introduction

The Laurel Creek Headwaters Environmentally Sensitive Landscape Public Liaison Committee was established by Regional Council on December 12, 2007 pursuant to Minutes of Settlement to resolve an appeal by some local landowners of Regional Official Policies Plan Amendment 22 to designate the first two Environmentally Sensitive Landscapes (ESLs), known such as Laurel Creek Headwaters and Blair-Bechtel-Cruickston. The Committee’s mandate is “to serve as a community-based forum to monitor, discuss and provide periodic advice to the Region on how best to implement the objectives of the Regional Planning Policies for the Laurel Creek Headwaters Environmentally Sensitive Landscape (ESL).” It is intended to foster constructive dialogue amongst the Region, local property owners, farmers, local businesses, and other stakeholders and interested parties within the ESL. The Committee also advises Regional staff on how best to implement the ESL policies and address related issues as they arise.

The Committee advises Regional staff on the development of an Implementation Guideline for the ESL. To accomplish this, the committee is working to:

- develop tools for enhancing natural features within the ESL, and connectivity among them;
- explore opportunities to promote informed private land stewardship to achieve environmental protection and conservation objectives;
- assess impacts resulting from recreational uses or major proposals to extract water within the ESL;
- explore and report on options to fund and purchase lands for conservation purposes; and
- address other relevant issues of concern to residents and property owners within the ESL.

The Terms of Reference require the Committee to submit an annual report of its activities. This is the fourth such annual report to be submitted to Regional Council.

The ESL Public Liaison Committee consists of twelve members. Nine are residents or landowners within the Laurel Creek Headwaters Environmentally Sensitive Landscape. The additional three members are representatives of the Waterloo Stewardship Network, an agricultural organisation, and the Ecological and Environmental Advisory Committee. In 2011 the committee was made up of the following members:

- Wilhard Barth, Wilmot Township landowner
- Bruce Bieth, Wellesley Township landowner
- Dianne Ensing, Wilmot Township landowner, Committee Vice-chair
- Blair McKay, Wellesley Township landowner
- Herbert Millard, Wellesley Township landowner
- Ed Ries, Wilmot Township landowner
- Jane Schneider, Wilmot Township landowner
- Deb Swidrovich, City of Waterloo landowner
- Kevin Thomason, Wilmot Township landowner
- Ron Weber, National Farmers Union of Canada
- Stephen May, Waterloo Stewardship Network, Committee Chair
- Greg Michalenko, Region of Waterloo, Ecological and Environmental Advisory Committee

The three other members nominated by their organisations are:

- At the beginning of 2011, Steve May of the Waterloo Stewardship Network and Dianne Ensing, a Wilmot Township landowner, were re-elected as committee Chair and Vice-chair respectively.
Herb. Millard completed his term at the end of 2011, and was thanked by the committee for his contributions to the committee since its inception.

The Public Liaison Committee met six times in 2011. The Committee is appreciative of the KW Optimist Club for allowing us to use their Camp Heidelberg facilities for our meetings.

Staff from the Planning, Housing, and Community Services Department provide ongoing support functions to the committee.

2. **Laurel Creek Headwaters ESL**

Straddling the northern end of the Waterloo Moraine in the Townships of Wellesley, Wilmot and Woolwich and the northwest corner of the City of Waterloo, Laurel Creek Headwaters is a 2,043 hectare rolling landscape punctuated by three small kettle lakes, Bamberg Bog Lake, Paradise Lake and Sunfish Lake. The latter is a rare meromictic lake. Most of the landscape is drained by Laurel Creek and its tributaries, Beaver Creek and Monastery Creek. The western part of the landscape drains to tributaries of Bamberg Creek, and the extreme northern part around Paradise Lake to Martin Creek. Significant reaches of Laurel Creek and its major tributaries support coldwater fisheries.

Rolling topography and extensive wetlands make much of the area unsuitable for agriculture, and so a significant proportion of the landscape has been left in its natural state. The natural areas within this landscape consist of a mix of upland and lowland forest. Upland forests are dominated primarily by Sugar Maple and Beech. Associated with this are some long-established Hemlock stands. Most of the wetlands are Provincially Significant, and typically consist of fine cedar swamps. Other swamp communities associated with the creek systems consist of high quality Tamarack swamp, Hemlock-Cedar-Balsam Fir-Yellow Birch wetland forest, and Silver Maple swamp. There are also small areas of marsh and open wet meadows. The area has been observed to sustain many significant species of plants and animals.

In addition to a number of farms, the area contains many rural residences on smaller properties. Whether their properties are large or small, however, local landowners demonstrate a commitment to the stewardship of their lands and the natural features upon them.
3. Activities Undertaken in 2011

3.1 Signage

In the first year of the committee’s existence, committee members initiated a process to develop distinctive signage to be posted along roadways to mark the boundaries of the ESL. At that time, a sub-committee was struck to develop a design for the signage. The committee specified that the design should comprise four basic elements of ESLs: hills, farms, woodlands, and wetlands. Regional staff had input into the design process with particular emphasis on how the Regional logo could be appropriately incorporated in the design. The sub-committee worked with a local artist over a period of two years to develop and refine a design. A full-size prototype of the sign was unveiled at the third annual ESL Landowner Stewardship Workshop hosted by the committee on November 25, 2010.

Subsequently, five signs were manufactured of cedar, using funds from the Environmental Stewardship Fund and installed within the roads rights-of-way on Erbsville Road, Kressler Road, Weimar Line, Notre Dame Drive and Wilmot Line where they enter the ESL.

Five additional signs have been manufactured and are being prepared for installation on Township roads during the spring/summer of 2012. The ESL committee will ensure that the signs are monitored and maintained over time.

3.2 Environmental Stewardship Fund Projects

On April 20, 2011, Regional Council approved the second round of applications to theEnvironmental Stewardship Fund. The committee approved the following projects:

- $4,000 to the District of North Bruce for the construction of a Green Roof at the Municipal Office
- $3,000 to the District of North Bruce for the creation of a Wetland at the Municipal Office
- $3,000 to the District of North Bruce for the purchase of a rain barrel
- $3,000 to the District of North Bruce for the purchase of a composting toilet
- $3,000 to the District of North Bruce for the purchase of a water fountain

The committee will continue to review applications for the Environmental Stewardship Fund and will provide regular updates on projects funded.
Environmental Stewardship Fund. Among the approved projects were several that benefitted the Laurel Creek Headwaters Environmentally Sensitive Landscape, including the first stage of an initiative to rehabilitate a badly eroding tributary of Monastery Creek in the northeast corner of Wilmot Township. This consisted of a technical study by a fluvio-geomorphologist to investigate the causes of the stream erosion and recommend a course of action to correct the problem. The report was received by the committee late in the fall of 2011 along with a series of recommendations intended to mitigate the erosion and to put measures into effect to counteract future possible erosion. In early 2012, Council approved a grant from the Community Environmental Fund to partner with the Waterloo Stewardship Network to retain the fluvio-geomorphologist to complete a detailed design for the work, subject to the concurrence of the affected landowners.

The Environmental Stewardship Fund also funded several projects in 2011 that were carried out by the Waterloo Stewardship Network including planting native trees along roadsides in the ESL as well as some corridor planting projects (shrubs and wildflowers and native grasses) carried out by a team of Ontario Stewardship Rangers in the summer of 2011.

Lastly, the Fund has defrayed the cost of producing the first ESL signs.

3.3 Landowner Workshop

During 2011 the committee reviewed the previous years’ landowner workshops and decided that in order to better meet the needs and desires of the landowners in the ESL, a change in format and venue would be beneficial. One of the options explored was to conduct a tour of the ESL highlighting some of the successful activities being conducted by private landowners. In order to learn what would be of interest to the residents in the ESL, a survey will be distributed to assist with the development of the next landowner event.
4. Activities Planned for 2012

4.1 Stewardship Education

The committee is investigating opportunities to offer further environmental stewardship education for the residents of the ESL including the continuation of rural landowner stewardship workshops or some other event. These events may be jointly presented with the Waterloo Stewardship Network and/or the Grand River Conservation Authority and the Waterloo Stewardship Network.

4.2 Stewardship Projects

A number of the on-the-ground stewardship projects initiated within the ESL during 2010 and 2011 will carry on into 2012 including additional native tree and vegetation planting. Interest generated by these projects is anticipated to result in additional applications for funding and requests for information during 2012.

4.3 Signage

Five additional roadside ESL signs will be installed at appropriate locations around the perimeter of the ESL in cooperation with Area Municipal and Regional authorities. It is also planned to make small-scale signs bearing the distinctive ESL logo suitable for mounting on fenceposts or gates. These would be made available for distribution to local landowners interested in displaying them and promoting the identify of the ESL.

4.4 Newsletter and Survey

It is expected that a further edition of the ESL newsletter will be prepared by the committee for distribution to all landowners within and abutting the Laurel Creek Headwaters ESL. This newsletter is intended to be a primary vehicle for providing information about activities within the ESL as well as other items of interest to landowners.

In addition to the newsletter, the committee is preparing a survey intended to discover the level of knowledge and interest the residents of the ESL have about their landscape. The committee will use the results of the survey to establish further opportunities for education and exploration of the ESL for those living within it.

5. Conclusion
The committee remains active and is dedicated to promoting the features and stewardship values of the ESL and working with the local residents to ensure that the special character of the landscape is protected and enhanced. The committee is looking forward to an increased awareness of the ESL as additional roadside signs are installed in 2012.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve May, Chair (2011)
Laurel Creek Headwaters Environmentally Sensitive Landscape Public Liaison Committee
March 22, 2012

Photos courtesy of D.A. Lehman
REGION OF WATERLOO
PLANNING, HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
Transportation Planning

TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: April 17, 2012

FILE CODE: D28-60(A)

SUBJECT: GRAND RIVER TRANSIT 2012 FARE CHANGE PUBLIC CONSULTATION

RECOMMENDATION:

For information.

SUMMARY:

The 2012 Regional Budget includes a 9% increase to Grand River Transit (GRT) fares effective July 1, 2012. Fare increases help the transit system keep pace with increased costs and sustain ongoing service improvements. The Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) also requires fare parity with conventional transit services for customers using the MobilityPLUS specialized transit service. It is proposed that on July 1, 2012, monthly passes and discounted tickets would also be introduced to MobilityPLUS to comply with AODA.

Various programs exist to assist residents who may not have the means to pay the full transit fare. The Transit for Reduced Income Program (TRIP) provides a subsidy for those who live on a reduced income while the Transit Affordability Pass Program (TAPP) assists those Ontario Works participants who are upgrading their education or attending English as a Second Language (ESL) programs.

Two fare options have been developed that represent an overall average fare increase of 9%. The public will have the opportunity to provide feedback on the two fare options at a Public Consultation Centre (PCC) on Wednesday, April 18, 2012 in the lobby at 150 Frederick Street, Kitchener.

A number of methods will be used by staff to inform the public of the PCC including street signs, newspaper ads, emails, twitter and the GRT website. The public can make comments by a number of means including at the meeting, by phone or via the GRT website. Following the PCC, staff will review the feedback and include the results in the analysis for a final recommendation to come to the Planning and Works Committee in May.

REPORT:

The approved 2012 Regional Budget includes a 9% increase to (GRT) fares effective July 1, 2012, consistent with the 2011-2014 Grand River Transit (GRT) Business Plan. The goal of the GRT Business Plan is to implement a fare strategy to keep pace with increasing costs, sustain service improvements and balance the municipal contribution to transit operating costs with transit revenues.

Fare Change Proposal

Two options have been developed for public consideration that achieves the overall 9% average fare increase. Option 1 distributes the fare increase evenly among all fare categories, but the
The proposed cash fare is lower but requires the customer to have exact change with a minimum of four coins. Option 2 proposes a cash fare that would require three coins, and includes slightly lower pass prices. The proposed new fare levels continue to provide significant discounts to riders who use tickets and monthly passes, thereby rewarding the frequent rider. The proposed fare change options are detailed in Table 1.

Table 1: Recommended July 1, 2012 GRT Fares

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fare Type</th>
<th>Current Fares</th>
<th>% Riders (2011)</th>
<th>2012 Fares Option 1</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>2012 Fares Option 2</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Monthly Pass 1</td>
<td>$63.00</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>$69.00</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>$68.00</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Monthly Pass 1,2</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>$57.00</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>$56.00</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Tickets (Sold in Strip of five)</td>
<td>$9.75 ($1.95 each)</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>$10.50 ($2.10 each)</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>$10.50 ($2.10 each)</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Tickets 2 (Sold in Strip of five)</td>
<td>$8.25 ($1.65 each)</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>$9.00 ($1.80 each)</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>$9.00 ($1.80 each)</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Fare</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>$2.75</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Pass</td>
<td>$54.05</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>$59.20</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>$58.35</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Pass 1 (per 4-month term)</td>
<td>$204.00</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>$231.00</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>$227.00</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Summer Pass 1 (July &amp; August)</td>
<td>$87.00</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>$97.00</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>$95.00</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Pass</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIP Pass</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>$39.00</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>$38.00</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-PASS 3</td>
<td>$60.64</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>$67.50</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>$67.50</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School 5-month Term Pass 1</td>
<td>$ 230.00</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>$ 250.00</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>$ 250.00</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Fare Increase: 9%

NOTES:

1 - Photo I.D. charge of $5.00 required - one time fee for Adult and Senior Reduced Monthly Passes; per year for Student Reduced Monthly Passes; per term for Summer Pass, College Pass (except Conestoga College) and High School Pass (paid by student)

2 - Reduced fares are available to seniors, elementary & high school students

3 - As approved by Regional Council on March 28, 2012
   - Children under five ride free with a paying customer
   - Permanent Registered MobilityPLUS users ride conventional transit vehicles for free
   - Percent of riders does not include free rides
At the higher proposed price of $69.00, the GRT unlimited ride monthly adult pass would continue to be among the lowest priced adult monthly pass in the province. The proposed GRT adult ticket prices would also remain below average. Appendix 1 describes the current and average fare structures in comparable Ontario municipalities.

The UPASS price is set via negotiations with the student associations. These prices were recommended to Planning and Works Committee in report P-12-040 dated March 20, 2012 and approved by Council on March 28, 2012.

The high school pass prices noted in Table 1 are also proposed by staff for approval by Council. The school board transportation staff has been notified of this proposal and they have indicated concern with the new proposed fare. They have indicated that their funding is set by the Ministry of Education and are concerned that they cannot absorb this rate of price increase. Further discussion will be taking place with school board officials.

The Region provides a subsidy to those who live on a reduced income and want to purchase a bus pass. The Transit for Reduced Income Program (T.R.I.P.) currently provides a discount of $28.00 per month to those who are eligible. For 2012, this discount is proposed to be increased to $30.00 to reduce the effect of the fare change on these customers. Residents may qualify for T.R.I.P. if their income falls below the low income cut-off as determined by Statistics Canada. In the 2012 budget, an additional $305,000 was included to bring the subsidy to a total of $746,000 which will allow approximately 2000 people to be served each month.

Additionally, the Region offers a free bus pass through the Transit Affordability Pass Program (T.A.P.P.) to Ontario Works participants who are upgrading their education or attending English as a Second Language programs.

**MobilityPLUS fares and fare parity**

The Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) requires communities to introduce fare parity between conventional and specialized transit services on or before January 1, 2013. Currently MobilityPLUS customers pay $2.50 per ride, which is based on the cash fare price offered to conventional transit customers. They do not currently have access to the other fare categories outlined above in Table 1. In conjunction with the July 1st fare increase, it is proposed that the MobilityPLUS fare structure would be broadened to include all fare categories available to conventional transit customers.

**Public Consultation Centres**

A Public Consultation Centre (PCC) is being planned to obtain input from the public on the proposed fare change. The location and date of the Public Consultation Centre is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wed., April 18, 2012</td>
<td>Regional Administrative Headquarters</td>
<td>4:00 - 8:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Front Lobby, 150 Frederick Street, Kitchener, ON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Packages will be distributed at the Public Consultation Centre, including proposed fare options and comment forms. A copy of the information package is attached to this report as Appendix 2.
Public Notification and Advertising

In advance of the Public Consultation Centres, notification will be sent out via various means including:
- Roadside signs will be erected;
- Notices will be posted in the local newspapers and neighbourhood publications;
- Posters informing transit riders of proposed changes and Public Consultation Centre dates will be posted at the Charles Street Transit Terminal in Kitchener and the Ainslie Street Transit Terminal in Cambridge, community centres and on buses;
- Notices of proposed fare changes will be posted on the GRT website: www.grt.ca;
- Comment forms will be available online and at the PCC;
- Mass emailing will be sent to those who subscribe to our rider e-alerts; and,
- Information will be sent out via social media including Twitter.

At all times when internet based comments are invited, provision will also be made for comments to be submitted by telephone, fax or conventional mail.

Next Steps

Following the Public Consultation Centre, staff will review the responses gathered and develop a preferred fare option. Any residents who have indicated an interest during the planning process will be contacted and provided a summary of plans, including any changes. Staff is planning to bring the fare change recommendation to Regional Planning and Works Committee in May for implementation on July 1st.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

Area municipalities were circulated the 2011-2014 GRT Business Plan for information and comment. This document outlined the general fare strategy being proposed. The municipalities were also circulated a copy of this report for information.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The 2012 transit fare changes support the implementation of the Council's Strategic Focus, identified under Focus Area 3: Sustainable Transportation: Develop greater, more sustainable and safe transportation choices. The plan will aid with Strategic Objective Action 3.1.2: Expand the bus network and begin to integrate it with the future Light Rail.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Costs of planning and operating public consultation for transit fare changes are included in the 2012 GRT and MobilityPLUS operating budgets, as approved by Regional Council.

The proposed fare change is expected to increase revenue by $866,000 in 2012. This amount is included in the 2012 GRT revenue budget. It is anticipated that the MobilityPLUS fare parity requirement will have a revenue impact of between $37,500 and $50,000 in 2012. This amount can be accommodated within the 2012 MobilityPLUS budget.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Staff from Planning, Housing and Community Services, Finance and Transportation and Environmental Services worked together to develop these transit fare options.
ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix 1 - Current and Average Fares for comparable Ontario Transit Systems
Appendix 2 - Q&A Brochure for PCC

PREPARED BY:  Blair Allen, Supervisor Transit Development

APPROVED BY:  Graham Vincent, Acting Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
### Appendix 1 - Current (2011) and Average Fares for comparable Ontario Transit Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Exact cash fare</th>
<th>Adult Ticket</th>
<th>Reduced Ticket</th>
<th>Adult Monthly Pass</th>
<th>Reduced monthly pass</th>
<th>2010 Average Fare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York Region</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
<td>$2.80</td>
<td>$1.65</td>
<td>$115.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
<td>$2.75</td>
<td>$1.60</td>
<td>$107.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
<td>$2.60</td>
<td>$2.60</td>
<td>$94.00</td>
<td>$37.00</td>
<td>$1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
<td>$2.60</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$2.60</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>$126.00</td>
<td>$104.00</td>
<td>$1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRT Proposed Option 2</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$1.80</td>
<td>$68.00</td>
<td>$56.00</td>
<td>$1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham Region</td>
<td>$2.90</td>
<td>$2.63</td>
<td>$1.79</td>
<td>$97.00</td>
<td>$39.00</td>
<td>$1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRT Proposed Option 1</td>
<td>$2.75</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$1.80</td>
<td>$69.00</td>
<td>$57.00</td>
<td>$1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>$2.75</td>
<td>$1.90</td>
<td>$1.43</td>
<td>$81.00</td>
<td>$57.50</td>
<td>$1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudbury</td>
<td>$2.70</td>
<td>$2.05</td>
<td>$1.55</td>
<td>$76.00</td>
<td>$46.00</td>
<td>$1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thunder Bay</td>
<td>$2.60</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>$69.50</td>
<td>$59.50</td>
<td>$1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>$2.55</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$87.00</td>
<td>$87.00</td>
<td>$1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$1.60</td>
<td>$79.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Comparable System Average</td>
<td>$2.85</td>
<td>$2.34</td>
<td>$1.78</td>
<td>$86.69</td>
<td>$53.96</td>
<td>$1.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2012 PROPOSED TRANSIT FARE CHANGE

Q. Why did the Region of Waterloo approve a fare change?
A. Regional Council has approved an overall 9% fare increase for 2012 so passenger revenues can keep pace with increasing costs, and to sustain the service improvements outlined in the 2011 – 2014 Grand River Transit (GRT) Business Plan.

Q. What transit improvements are planned for 2012?
A. New service for 2012 includes:
   • Expand Sunday hours of operation in Cambridge on 10 routes so that service begins at 8 a.m. instead of 10 a.m. and ends at approximately midnight instead of 7 p.m.
   • Extend operation of iXpress on Saturdays from 9 p.m. to 11 p.m.
   • Extend operation of iXpress on Sundays from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m.
   • Improve service to east Cambridge residential areas, and to L.G. Lovell Industrial Park
   • Extend operation of Route 13 Laurelwood on Saturdays from 6 p.m. to 10 p.m.
   • Implement BusPLUS service in the Doon South area of Kitchener, during weekday peak periods

Q. Why is it important to continue improving transit service?
A. Improving transit service is the key to:
   • Reducing transit travel times by creating more direct routes
   • Reducing customer wait times by increasing frequency
   • Increasing the number of potential destinations available to transit users
   • Ensuring buses arrive when scheduled
   • Making it possible to use transit to travel later in the evening, or on weekends as well as at peak times

Q. Why are some fares increasing by more or less than 9%?
A. When creating a fare change proposal, we balance the change to each fare type, so that:
   • Pass prices are rounded to the nearest dollar
   • Tickets are sold in strips of five, so the ticket price should make a round number when multiplied by five.
   • Cash fares should require the fewest possible number of coins, to be convenient for the user
   • Fare prices should reward the frequent rider

Q. Will transit still be affordable?
A. Transit provides the opportunity for financial savings to households by reducing the dependency on automobile usage and deferring the costs associated with usage or purchase of a car. Depending on the fare increase proposal that is selected, the annual cost for a transit rider who purchases monthly passes would be $816. The cost to own and operate a small car is estimated by the Canadian Automobile Association (CAA) to be approximately $8,000 annually (http://www.caa.ca/documents/CAA_Driving_Costs_Brochure_2010.pdf).

The Government of Canada offers a public transit tax credit which reimburses riders for some of the cost of monthly passes. Additional information on this tax credit is available through the GRT website or the Canada Revenue Agency (http://www.transitpass.ca/).
The Region provides a subsidy to those who live on a reduced income and want to purchase a bus pass. The Transit for Reduced Income Program (TRIP) currently provides a discount of $28.00 per month to those who are eligible. For 2012, this discount will be increased to $30.00 to reduce the effect of the fare change on these customers. You may qualify for TRIP if your income falls below the low income cut-off as determined by Statistics Canada. More information on this program is available through the GRT website at http://www.grt.ca/en/riderprograms/reducedincome.asp

Additionally, the Region offers a free bus pass through the Transit Affordability Pass Program (TAPP) to Ontario Works participants who are upgrading their education or attending English as a Second Language programs.

Q. What are the next steps?
A. Customer feedback will be considered when Regional Council reviews this proposed fare change, and in the development of future fare strategies. This proposed fare change will be considered by Regional Planning and Works Committee on Tuesday, May 8, 2012 and by Regional Council on Wednesday, May 16, 2012. If you wish to appear as a delegation, please contact the Regional Clerk’s office at 519-575-4420. It is proposed that fare changes would be implemented as of July 1, 2012.

If you would like to send comments at a later date, visit www.GRT.ca and submit a Comments and Suggestions form or call 519-585-7555. Please submit your comments by Friday April 27, 2012.
Proposed Transit Fare Change Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fare Type</th>
<th>Current Fares</th>
<th>% Riders (2011)</th>
<th>2012 Fares Option 1</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>2012 Fares Option 2</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Monthly Pass 1</td>
<td>$63.00</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>$69.00</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>$68.00</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Monthly Pass 1,2</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>$57.00</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>$56.00</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Tickets (Sold in Strip of five)</td>
<td>$9.75 ($1.95 each)</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>$10.50 ($2.10 each)</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>$10.50 ($2.10 each)</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Tickets 2 (Sold in Strip of five)</td>
<td>$8.25 ($1.65 each)</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>$9.00 ($1.80 each)</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>$9.00 ($1.80 each)</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Fare</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>$2.75</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Pass</td>
<td>$54.05</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>$59.20</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>$58.35</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Pass 1 (per 4-month term)</td>
<td>$204.00</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>$231.00</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>$227.00</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Summer Pass 1 (July &amp; August)</td>
<td>$87.00</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>$97.00</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>$95.00</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Pass</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIP Pass</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>$39.00</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>$38.00</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-PASS 1</td>
<td>$60.64</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>$67.50</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>$67.50</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School 5-month Term Pass 1</td>
<td>$230.00</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Fare Increase: 9%

NOTES:

1 - Photo I.D. charge of $5.00 required - one time fee for Adult and Senior Reduced Monthly Passes; per year for Student Reduced Monthly Passes; per term for Summer Pass, College Pass (except Conestoga College) and High School Pass (paid by student)
2 - Reduced fares are available to seniors, elementary & high school students
3 - As approved by Regional Council on March 28, 2012

- Children under five ride free with a paying customer
- Permanent Registered MobilityPLUS users rider conventional transit vehicles for free
- Percent of riders does not include free rides
On March 20, 2012, Report No. P-12-037 provided an update on the Central Transit Corridor Community Building Strategy (CTC CBS) to the Planning and Works Committee. This Memorandum provides further information on the upcoming public consultation process planned for this Strategy.

The CTC CBS is the next step in the process of planning for, and helping to shape, development along the rapid transit corridor. It provides the opportunity to build on the extensive public consultation that has occurred already as part of the rapid transit project, and to further engage stakeholders about the community building potential that can be leveraged by this new investment. This strategy is about building a widely-supported vision for the corridor and future of Waterloo Region. As a result, strong emphasis on public participation will be included and will be accomplished through a series of public meetings, visioning exercises, forums, and open houses in each of the three cities.

On February 29, 2012, the consultant team spent the day meeting with over 100 municipal staff (Region and Cities) to understand and collaborate with other ongoing and upcoming initiatives. On March 20 and 21, 2012 the consultant team spent two full days meeting with private sector stakeholders to understand issues, opportunities and perspectives that can collaboratively advance the strategy and development of the corridor. Efforts to coordinate with other projects and initiatives will be made at every opportunity.

To date, two public events have been held - the Project Launch (March 24 at 150 Frederick Street, Kitchener), and the first Open House and Visioning Workshop (March 27, at Knox Presbyterian Church, Waterloo).

**Storefront Space – 220 King St. W. Kitchener**

As part of ensuring this project is as accessible to the public as possible, the project will include a Storefront Space at 220 King St. W. in Downtown Kitchener. This location will be open to the public on Tuesday, April 17, 2012 and will have a representative of the project on hand to answer questions, provide information, and receive comments. Regular weekly hours are established for the Storefront and are as follows: Tuesdays 9:00 a.m.–1:00 p.m. Thursdays 12:00 p.m.–5:00 p.m. and Fridays 12:00 p.m.–4:00 p.m. In addition to the regular hours, efforts...
will be made to open the Storefront during the many special events, festivals and other opportunities for public engagement that occur in Downtown Kitchener over the summer months. Contact information and information on the project will be available in the Storefront window at all times. Further, the space will also be available for community groups or other stakeholders, interested in learning about the project. To book the space, please contact: Heather Hood, Principal Planner, Region of Waterloo 519-575-4500 x3043 or by email at hhood@regionofwaterloo.ca.

Project Website - www.centraltransitcorridor.ca
On March 24, 2012 the website (www.centraltransitcorridor.ca) was launched for the project. This website contains information and resources, news and media coverage, links to other related projects and project contact information. It also includes an interactive section where the public may view digital media – presentations, maps and display panels from past events (such as the Project Launch and first Open House and Visioning Workshop) and provide online comments. A Project timeline is also included as well as a detailed upcoming event schedule.

Upcoming Engagement Opportunities – Exploring the Opportunities Forums
A key component of the Community Building Strategy will be a series of Exploring the Opportunity Forums. The Forums will be held over a 3 month period and will focus on a specific theme and engage a wide range of community stakeholders in order to discuss and explore the Central Transit Corridor and the potential to shape and enhance the Region. Each of the three Exploring the Opportunity Forums will include a keynote speaker, interactive workshops and a Community Open House. The upcoming schedule is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upcoming Events</th>
<th>Forum 1</th>
<th>Forum 2</th>
<th>Forum 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic</strong></td>
<td>Enhancing Mobility April 24-26</td>
<td>Creating Great Places - May 15-17</td>
<td>Strengthening the Region - June 12-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Steven Cassidy Director, MRC McLean Hazel (Expert on understanding travel behaviours and lifestyle needs)</td>
<td>G.B. Arrington Vice President, PB’s Placemaking Group</td>
<td>Sue Zielinski, Managing Director SMART (Sustainable Mobility &amp; Accessibility Research &amp; Transformation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date/Time</strong></td>
<td>April 24, 2012 7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>May 15, 2012 7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>June 12, 2012 7:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Lang Tannery, Kitchener</td>
<td>Knox Presbyterian Church Waterloo</td>
<td>Galt Little Theatre Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Event</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date/Time</strong></td>
<td>April 25, 2012 TBD</td>
<td>May 16, 2012 TBD</td>
<td>June 13, 2012 TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Storefront, 220 King West Kitchener</td>
<td>Storefront, 220 King West Kitchener</td>
<td>Storefront, 220 King West Kitchener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Event</strong></td>
<td>By invitation</td>
<td>By invitation</td>
<td>By invitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Open House</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date/Time</strong></td>
<td>April 26, 2012 3:00 - 7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>May 16, 2012 3:00 - 7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>June 13, 2012 3:00 7:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Storefront 220 King St. W., Kitchener</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Event</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more information on the CTC CBS, please contact: Becky Schlenvogt, Principal Planner 519-575-4836 or bschlenvogt@regionofwaterloo.ca
To: Chair Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee  
From: Brooke Lambert, Interim Manager - Reurbanization  
Subject: Stakeholder Forum (May 17, 2012)  
Sustainable Solutions - A Concept Facility for Soil and Material Management

On February 28, 2012, Report No. P-12-011/E-12-020 outlined the approaches that the Region and its partners are taking to investigate more sustainable approaches to soil and sediment management.

As part of the recommended next steps, staff was directed to initiate a broader stakeholder consultation to generate discussion, share information and ideas and identify opportunities for partnerships related to the concept of a Soil Remediation and Aggregate Recycling Facility.

To that end, staff has engaged the Bloom Centre for Sustainability to undertake a focused stakeholder consultation as Phase 2 of the Project Scoping and Research Study.

A Stakeholder Forum is now planned for Thursday, May 17, 2012, from 8:00 A.M. – 4:30 P.M. and will be held at the Holiday Inn, Cambridge (200 Holiday Inn Drive). Given this topic is very specific in nature, a targeted range of perspectives and input will be sought. As a result, participants will be invited to attend based on their experience/background. Invitations will go out to several stakeholder groups, including; Regional and Area Municipal Councillors, Regional and Area Municipal Staff, Academia, Professional Associations, Development & Construction Industry, Engineering and Consulting Firms, Legal Firms, Provincial and Federal Government, Non-Governmental Organization, Regulatory Agencies and the Aggregate Industry.

The facilitated discussion will include a mix of background presentations, panel discussions and focused workshops. All proceedings will be documented and provided to participants after the event. Further, a detailed summary report will be completed and will include practical recommendations as well as key information that will help shape the overall business case for this initiative. The Region will then initiate a more detailed Concept Feasibility Study, which will be completed in parallel with the Region’s Waste Management Master Planning Process.

For more information, please contact:  
Brooke Lambert, Interim Manager – Reurbanization  
(519-575-4500 x3113)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting date</th>
<th>Requestor</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Assigned Department</th>
<th>Anticipated Response Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-Aug-11</td>
<td>P&amp;W</td>
<td>One year review of Report E-11-085 re: Parking on Bleams Road</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>14-Aug-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Aug-11</td>
<td>G. Lorentz</td>
<td>Staff report back to Committee regarding how many gravel pits in the Region have not been restored.</td>
<td>Planning, Housing &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-Oct-11</td>
<td>C. Millar</td>
<td>Staff review the aesthetics of the bridge repairs to the Main Street, Cambridge</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>29-May-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Jan-12</td>
<td>P&amp;W</td>
<td>Update report on proposed Source Protection Policies after GRCA Source Protection Committee public consultation is completed</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>Summer 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Jan-12</td>
<td>P&amp;W</td>
<td>That staff meet with representatives of the Canadian National Institute for the Blind and the Grand River Accessibility Advisory Committee to develop solutions for the visually- and hearing-impaired at all roundabouts and intersections in the Region of Waterloo.</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Feb-12</td>
<td>G. Lorentz</td>
<td>Staff review the safety of the intersection of Yellow Birch Drive and Ira Needles Boulevard</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Feb-12</td>
<td>P&amp;W</td>
<td>Report outlining consultant contracts, identifying the tender cost with upset limits and the final cost of the contract.</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>14-Aug-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Feb-12</td>
<td>J. Brewer</td>
<td>Report regarding reducing the speed limit from 70 kilometers per hour (70 kms) on Can-Amera Parkway approaching the Roundabout at Conestoga Boulevard.</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting date</td>
<td>Requestor</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Assigned Department</td>
<td>Anticipated Response Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-Mar-12</td>
<td>C. Millar</td>
<td>Town of Halton Hills Resolution regarding Provincial Regulations relating to Commercial Fill Operations referred to staff for review and report.</td>
<td>Planning, Housing &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Mar-12</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Staff to report back on the design of the proposed Weber Street grade separation after the Weber Street Project Team reconsiders the aging impacts of the proposed materials.</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>Council 25-April-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Mar-12</td>
<td>D. Craig</td>
<td>Report on possible enhancements similar to what is proposed for Weber Street in Kitchener at the railway overpass for the Delta construction in Cambridge.</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>14-Aug-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Mar-12</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Staff to review the operation of the roundabout and report back to Council in 2013.</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>