MEDIA RELEASE: Friday, May 25, 2012, 4:30 p.m.

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO
PLANNING AND WORKS COMMITTEE
AGENDA

Tuesday, May 29, 2012
9:15 A.M.
Regional Council Chamber
150 Frederick Street, Kitchener, Ontario

1. DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST UNDER THE MUNICIPAL CONFlict OF INTEREST ACT

2. DELEGATIONS

a) Mr. Keith Gummow, re: Report No. E-12-001, Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive Improvements in the Village of Conestogo, Township of Woolwich

3. REPORTS – TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

   DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION

a) CR-RS-12-030, Authorization to Expropriate Lands (2nd Report) for Road 1 Improvements to Bridge Street (Regional Road 52), Bridgeport Bridge to the Kitchener/Woolwich Boundary, in the City of Kitchener

b) CR-RS-12-029, Authorization to Expropriate Lands (2nd Report) for Road 6 Improvements to University Avenue East (Regional Road 57), in the City of Waterloo

c) E-12-001, Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive Improvements in the Village of Conestogo, Township of Woolwich

d) E-12-055, Consultant Selection – Detailed Design and Contract Administration Services; Ira Needles Boulevard Widening from Highview Drive to Erb Street in the Cities of Kitchener and Waterloo

e) E-12-059, Kitchener WWTP Phase 3 Upgrades – Engineering Consulting Services for Detailed Design and Services during Construction

f) Manitou Drive Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Fairway Road to Bleams Road, City of Kitchener - Information Package in advance of Public Consultation Centre #2

   TRANSPORTATION

g) E-12-050, BY-Law 10-030, a By-Law Respecting Signs on Regional Roads, Post 1-year Review

h) E-12-058, 2011 Traffic Signal Corridor and Signal Timing Review

i) E-12-060, Westbound Dual Left-turn Lanes on Can-Amera Parkway (Regional Road 80) at Franklin Boulevard (Regional Road 36), City of Cambridge
RAPID TRANSIT

j)  **E-12-033**, Stage 1 Light Rail Transit: Potential Contractors and Information Management

WASTE MANAGEMENT

k)  **E-12-040**, Waste Management Division Update

   (Staff Presentation)

l)  **E-12-062**, Municipal Hazardous or Special Waste (MHSW) Contracts

WATER

m)  Kitchener WWTP Phase 3 Upgrades Municipal Class Environmental Assessment – Information Package in advance of Public Information Centre #2

REPORTS – PLANNING, HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

COMMUNITY PLANNING

n)  **P-12-060**, Monthly Report of Development Activity for April 2012

o)  **P-12-062**, Referral of Deferral No. 3a of the City of Kitchener’s Official Plan to a Current Ontario Municipal Board Appeal

p)  **P-12-065**, Regional Reurbanization Toolbox

   (Staff Presentation)

COMMUNITY SERVICES

q)  **P-12-066**, Regional Heritage Conservation Toolbox

   (Staff Presentation)

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

r)  **P-12-067**, Amendment to Regional Municipality of Waterloo Controlled Access By-law #58-87 for Access to Regional Road #58 (Fischer-Hallman Road), City of Kitchener

s)  **P-12-068**, Walk Cycle Waterloo Region and King-Victoria Transit Hub Walking and Cycling Links - Joint Public Consultation Centre

t)  **P-12-069**, Recommended 2012 Grand River Transit Service Improvements

u)  **P-12-070**, Software Upgrades and Enhancements for Technology on Grand River Transit

v)  **P-12-071**, Commuter Challenge 2012

4.  INFORMATION/CORRESPONDENCE
5. OTHER BUSINESS

a) Council Enquiries and Requests for Information Tracking List 276


7. ADJOURN
## MEETINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning and Works Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 19, 2012</td>
<td>9:00 A.M.</td>
<td>Planning and Works Committee</td>
<td>Council Chamber 2nd Floor, Regional Administration Building 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 14, 2012</td>
<td>1:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Planning and Works Committee</td>
<td>Council Chamber 2nd Floor, Regional Administration Building 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning, Housing and Community Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon., June 4, 2012</td>
<td>4:30 P.M. – 8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Walk Cycle Waterloo Region / Region of Waterloo Transit Hub – Joint Public Consultation Centre</td>
<td>UW School of Pharmacy Corner of King and Victoria Streets Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue., June 12, 2012</td>
<td>6:00 P.M. – 7:30 P.M.</td>
<td>CTC Community Building Strategy Forum 3 - Strengthening the Region Keynote Speaker Sue Zielinski</td>
<td>Galt Little Theatre 47 Water Street South Cambridge, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue., June 12, 2012</td>
<td>4:00 P.M. – 8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>GTA West Corridor Planning and Environmental Assessment Study Public Information Centre #5</td>
<td>Gellert Community Centre, Kinsmen Hall 10241 Eighth Line Georgetown, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu., June 14, 2012</td>
<td>4:00 P.M. – 8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>GTA West Corridor Planning and Environmental Assessment Study Public Information Centre #5</td>
<td>Milton Sports Centre Banquet Hall 605 Santa Maria Blvd. Milton, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu., June 14, 2012</td>
<td>3:00 P.M. – 7:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Open House re: CTC Community Building Strategy Forum 3 – Strengthening the Region</td>
<td>CBS Storefront 220 King Street West Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue., June 26, 2012</td>
<td>5:00 P.M. – 9:00 P.M.</td>
<td>East Side Lands Public Information Centre #2</td>
<td>Catholic High School Father-René-de-Galinée 450 Maple Grove Road Cambridge, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation and Environmental Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu. June 7, 2012,</td>
<td>5:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Manitou Drive Improvements from Fairway Road to Bleams Road - Information Package in advance of PCC #2;</td>
<td>Conestoga Place 110 Manitou Drive Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue., June 12, 2012</td>
<td>5:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Kitchener WWTP Phase 3 Upgrades Municipal Class Environmental Assessment – Information Package in advance of PCC #2</td>
<td>Pioneer Park Public School 55 Upper Canada Drive Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: May 29, 2012

FILE CODE: L07-90

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZATION TO EXPROPRIATE LANDS (2nd REPORT) FOR ROAD IMPROVEMENTS TO BRIDGE STREET (REGIONAL ROAD 52), BRIDGEPORT BRIDGE TO THE KITCHENER/WOOLWICH BOUNDARY, IN THE CITY OF KITCHENER

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT Council of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the expropriation of the lands for the purposes of construction of road improvements to Bridge Street, in the City of Kitchener, in the Region of Waterloo as detailed in Report CR-RS-12-030 dated May 29, 2012 described as follows:

Fee Simple Partial Taking:

Part of Lots 3 and 4, South Side of Bridge Street, Peter N. Tagge Survey, Registered Plan Number 577, being Part 4, on Reference Plan 58R-17148, PIN 22712-0191(LT) (14 Bridge Street)

AND THAT staff be instructed to register a Plan of Expropriation for the property within three months of the granting of the approval to expropriate the property, as required by the Expropriations Act;

AND THAT the registered owners be served with a Notice of Expropriation and a Notice of Possession for the property after the registration of the Plan of Expropriation;

AND THAT if no agreement as to compensation is made with an owner, the statutory Offer of Compensation and payment be served upon the registered owners of the property in the amount of the market value of the interests in the land as estimated by the Region’s appraiser in accordance with the Expropriations Act;

AND FURTHER THAT the Regional Solicitor be authorized to 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 the transaction.

SUMMARY: Nil

REPORT:

The Region is in the process of acquiring lands for improvements to Bridge Street from the Bridgeport Bridge to the Kitchener/Woolwich Boundary in the City of Kitchener, which was included in the Region’s approved 2012 Transportation Capital Program for construction in 2014. The project consists of complete replacement of the pavement structure, installation of 1.25 metre wide cycling lane and sidewalk on each side of the street.
Council approved the commencement of expropriation of the subject properties on September 14, 2011 as detailed in report CR-RS-11-033. The appropriate forms under the *Expropriations Act* were served in order to initiate formal proceedings under the Act for these properties. All of the affected property owners were previously contacted by Legal Services staff and informed of the project as well as the Region’s intention to commence the expropriation process and the Region’s Expropriation Information Sheet was provided to each of them. Legal Services staff also contacted all property owners and informed them of the Region’s intention to continue with the expropriation process in order to ensure that the construction timeline is maintained, including this report being presented to Council, as detailed in the Region’s Expropriation Information Sheet.

Land acquisitions are required from six (6) property owners. The acquisitions are fee simple partial takings for road widening purposes and permanent easements for relocation of hydro utilities.

The Region has entered into agreements with all six (6) of the property owners to obtain the required fee simple partial takings. To date one (1) of these agreements has not been completed by registration of the Transfer on title conveying interest in the lands to the Region. The lands described above in the recommendation therefore include this property, being an 0.5m (1.6ft.) road widening. Legal Services staff recommends to the Committee that Expropriation proceedings cease with respect to this owner with whom an agreement has been entered into as soon as the conveyance of the interest required has been completed. The expropriation process is proceeding to ensure that the Region has possession of the required land to coincide with utility relocates scheduled to begin in fall, 2012.

The Region did not receive a notice for a Hearing of Necessity within the statutory time frame established by the *Expropriations Act* from any of the affected property owners. The next step in the proceedings is for Council to approve the expropriation of the required property to meet the construction timeline. This approval will ultimately be endorsed upon a certificate of approval on the Plan of Expropriation for the property. The Plan is then registered within three months of the approval. Ownership of the property vests with the Region upon the registration of the Plan. A Notice of Expropriation will then served upon the registered owner.

Once ownership by the Region is secured through the registration of the Plan, it is possible to serve the Notice of Possession. The date for possession can be no sooner than three months following the date of service of the Notice of Possession. The Notices of Expropriation and Notices of Possession may be served at the same time.

After the registration of the Plan of Expropriation and prior to the taking of possession of the property the expropriating authority is required to serve the registered owner with an offer in full compensation for their interest in the land. The offer must be accompanied by the immediate payment of one hundred (100%) percent of the appraised market value of the land to the registered owner as estimated by the Region’s appraiser. The registered owners are also to be served with a report appraising the market value of the property, which report formed the basis for the offer of compensation.

Transportation and Environmental Services staff advises that they are not aware of any environmental concerns with respect to the subject lands. The expropriation of the lands is on an “as is” basis and upon closing the Region assumes all responsibility for the lands.

The subject lands are shown attached as Appendix ‘A’.
CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

One of the goals of the Corporate Strategic Plan is to ensure that the Region maintains and improves the Regional Roads Network.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Transportation and Environmental Services staff advises that the 2012 Transportation Capital Program includes $5,668,000 for this project all to be funded from the Roads Rehabilitation Reserve Fund. Sufficient funding for the land acquisitions outlined within this report is available in the 2012 project budget.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Transportation and Environmental Services staff has been consulted in the preparation of this report.

ATTACHMENTS

Appendix “A” – location map of lands.

PREPARED BY:  Fiona McCrea, Solicitor, Property

APPROVED BY:  Gary Sosnoski, Commissioner, Corporate Resources
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: May 29, 2012

FILE CODE: L07-90

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZATION TO EXPROPRIATE LANDS (2ND REPORT) FOR ROAD IMPROVEMENTS TO UNIVERSITY AVENUE EAST (REGIONAL ROAD 57), IN THE CITY OF WATERLOO

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT Council of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the expropriation of lands for the purpose of construction of road improvements to University Avenue, in the City of Waterloo, in the Region of Waterloo as detailed in Report CR-RS-12-029 dated May 29, 2012 described as follows:

Fee Simple Partial Taking:

a) Part of Lot 77, Registered Plan 1050, being Part 4, on Reference Plan 58R-17179, PIN 22354-0005(LT) (240 Mayfield Avenue)

b) Part of Lot 5, Registered Plan 1132, being Part 2, on Reference Plan 58R-17172, PIN 22355-0057(LT) (147 University Avenue East)

c) Part of Common Element Waterloo North Condominium Plan Number 23, being Part 6, on Reference Plan 58R-17180, PINS 23023-0001(LT) to 23023-0108(LT) (121 University Avenue East)

d) Part of Lot 2, Registered Plan 1050, being Part 1, on Reference Plan 58R-17179, PIN 22691-0047(LT) (251 Glenridge Drive)

AND THAT staff be instructed to register a Plan of Expropriation for the property within three months of the granting of the approval to expropriate the property, as required by the Expropriations Act;

AND THAT the registered owners be served with a Notice of Expropriation and a Notice of Possession for the property after the registration of the Plan of Expropriation;

AND THAT if no agreement as to compensation is made with an owner, the statutory Offer of Compensation and payment be served upon the registered owners of the property in the amount of the market value of the interests in the land as estimated by the Region’s appraiser in accordance with the Expropriations Act;

AND FURTHER THAT the Regional Solicitor be authorized to 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 the transaction.

SUMMARY: Nil
REPORT:

The Region is in the process of acquiring lands for improvements to University Avenue East from Lincoln Road to Weber Street, in the City of Waterloo, which were included in the Region's approved 2012 Transportation Capital Program for construction in 2013. The project improvements consist of complete replacement of the pavement structure on University Avenue, new designated left turn lanes on University Avenue at Carter Avenue and Glenridge Drive, increased storage capacity for all existing left turn lanes on University Avenue within the project limits and construction of 1.25 metre reserved on-road cycling lanes on each side of University Avenue.

Council approved the commencement of expropriation of the subject properties on October 5, 2011 as detailed in report CR-RS-11-059. The appropriate forms under the *Expropriations Act* were served in order to initiate formal proceedings under the Act for these properties. All of the affected property owners were previously contacted by Legal Services staff and informed of the project as well as the Region’s intention to commence the expropriation process and the Region’s Expropriation Information Sheet was provided to each of them. Legal Services staff also contacted all property owners and informed them of the Region’s intention to continue with the expropriation process in order to ensure that the construction timeline is maintained, including this report being presented to Council, also as detailed in the Region’s Expropriation Information Sheet.

Land acquisitions are required from eight (8) property owners. All land acquisitions are partial takings for road widening purposes.

The Region has entered into agreements with five (5) of the eight (8) property owners to obtain the required fee simple partial takings. To date one (1) of these agreements has not been completed by registration of the Transfer on title conveying interest in the lands to the Region. The lands described above in the recommendation therefore include this property. Legal Services staff recommends to the Committee that Expropriation proceedings cease with respect to the owner with whom an agreement has been entered into as soon as the conveyance of the interest required has been completed.

Legal Services staff were not able to reach a negotiated agreement with three (3) of the property owners as yet. One of these properties forms part of the common elements of a condominium corporation. Legal Services staff has had discussions with the lawyer representing the Board of Directors of the Condominium Corporation. While the Board is agreeable to the acquisition of the lands by the Region for the appraised value, the requirements of the *Condominium Act* to sell a portion of the common elements are extensive and time consuming. As a result, the Board of Directors has suggested that the Region expropriate the lands to allow this matter to proceed in a timely way. Negotiations to reach an agreement on compensation for the value of the land following expropriation will follow. While it is always the preference of staff to reach a negotiated agreement to obtain the necessary lands without the use of the expropriation process, the timing and uncertainty of dealing with this matter under the *Condominium Act* process, and the suggestion of the Board to proceed with expropriation in this instance, supports expropriation. Legal staff will also continue to pursue mutually agreeable settlement of compensation with the other property owners.

The Region did not receive a notice for a Hearing of Necessity within the statutory time frame established by the *Expropriations Act* from any of the affected property owners. The next step in the proceedings is for Council to approve the expropriation of the required property to meet the construction timeline. This approval will ultimately be endorsed upon a certificate of approval on the Plan of Expropriation for those properties. The Plan is then registered within three months of the approval. Ownership of the property vests with the Region upon the registration of the Plan. Notices of Expropriation are then served upon all registered owners, including tenants as shown on the assessment roll.
Once ownership by the Region is secured through the registration of the Plan, it is possible to serve the Notice of Possession. The date for possession can be no sooner than three months following the date of service of the Notice of Possession. The Notices of Expropriation and Notices of Possession may be served at the same time.

After the registration of the Plan of Expropriation and prior to the taking of possession of the property the expropriating authority is required to serve the registered owners with an offer in full compensation for their interests in the land. The offer must be accompanied by the immediate payment of one hundred (100%) percent of the appraised market value of the land to the registered owners as estimated by the Region’s appraiser. The registered owners are also to be served with a report appraising the market value of the property, which report formed the basis for the offer of compensation.

Transportation and Environmental Services staff advises that they are not aware of any environmental concerns with respect to the subject lands. The expropriation of the lands is on an “as is” basis and upon closing the Region assumes all responsibility for the lands.

The subject lands are shown attached as Appendix “A”.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

One of the goals of the Corporate Strategic Plan is to ensure that the Region maintains and improves the Regional Roads Network.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Transportation and Environmental Services staff advises that the 2012 Transportation Capital Program includes funds of $4,171,000 for this project to be funded from the Roads Rehabilitation Reserve Fund. Sufficient funding for the acquisitions outlined within this report is available in the project budget of the 2012 Transportation Capital Program.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Transportation and Environmental Services staff has been consulted in the preparation of this report.

ATTACHMENTS

Appendix “A” – Project Area

PREPARED BY: Fiona McCrea, Solicitor

APPROVED BY: Gary Sosnoski, Commissioner, Corporate Resources
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: May 29, 2012

FILE CODE: CO4-20, 5392

SUBJECT: SAWMILL ROAD AND NORTHFIELD DRIVE IMPROVEMENTS IN THE VILLAGE OF CONESTOGO, TOWNSHIP OF WOOLWICH

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the Recommended Design Alternative for proposed improvements to Sawmill Road (Regional Road No. 17) and Northfield Drive (Regional Road No. 22) within the Village of Conestogo in the Township of Woolwich as outlined in Report E-12-001.

SUMMARY:

The Region of Waterloo is currently considering improvements to Sawmill Road from Musselman Crescent to the Conestogo Bridge and on Northfield Drive from the South Limits of Conestogo to Country Spring Walk, within the Village of Conestogo. Please refer to Appendix ‘A’ for a Key Plan. This project has been initiated to address the poor pavement condition on Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive within the project limits.

A Project Team consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo, the Township of Woolwich, and Township of Woolwich Councillor Bonnie Bryant was established to direct the planning of these improvements.

A Public Consultation Centre (PCC) was held at Conestogo Public School, 1948 Sawmill Road in the Township of Woolwich on Wednesday October 5th, 2011 from 5:30 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. Plans showing the Project Team’s Preferred Design Alternative were on display and Project Team representatives were present to answer questions and to receive feedback from members of the public.

Following the PCC, the Project Team thoroughly reviewed all of the public comments received. Based on a review of public comments, the Project Team revised the scope of the proposed improvements and developed a Recommended Design Alternative described as follows:

- Reconstruction of Sawmill Road in its current configuration, with no widening for buggy/cycling lanes;
- No change to boulevard parking on Sawmill Road;
- Re-paving of the asphalt boulevards on Sawmill Road;
- Extension of the sidewalk on the north side of Sawmill Road from Harriet Street to Golf Course Road;
- Reconstruction of Northfield Drive from the South Village Limits to Country Spring Walk in its current configuration without sidewalks;
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Report: E-12-001

- Construction of a pedestrian refuge island on Sawmill Road at the Conestogo Public School;
- Construction of new designated left-turn lanes on Sawmill Road in each direction at Northfield Drive and construction of a new northbound designated right-turn lane on Northfield Drive at Sawmill Road; and
- Enhanced boulevard landscaping where feasible.

The Project Team is now recommending that Regional Council approve the Recommended Design Alternative as described in this Report.

The Region’s Approved 2012 Transportation Capital Program and 10-Year Capital Forecast includes funds of $6,127,000 in years 2012 to 2016 inclusive in order to complete construction of the improvements to Sawmill Road from Musselman Crescent to the Conestogo Bridge and Northfield Drive from the South Limits of Conestogo to Country Spring Walk, within the Village of Conestoga in 2015, to be funded from the Roads Rehabilitation Reserve Fund. The estimated project cost for the Recommended Design Alternative is $2,500,000.

REPORT:

1.0 Background

The Region of Waterloo is currently considering improvements to Sawmill Road from Musselman Crescent to the Conestogo Bridge and on Northfield Drive from the South Limits of Conestogo to Country Spring Walk, within the Village of Conestogo. Please refer to Appendix ‘A’ for a Key Plan. This project has been initiated to address the poor pavement condition on Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive within the project limits.

A Project Team consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo, the Township of Woolwich, and Township of Woolwich Councillor Bonnie Bryant was established to direct the planning of these improvements.

The section of Sawmill Road within the project limits is an urbanized 2 lane roadway with mountable curbs to accommodate paved boulevard parking throughout most of the Village. Sidewalks currently exist on both sides of Sawmill Road from Musselman Crescent to Harriet Street. The Sawmill Road corridor through Conestogo is highly constrained, with numerous building fronts located immediately behind the existing sidewalks. Boulevard widths are minimal with overhead utilities located in close proximity to the existing curbs in many locations. This section of Sawmill Road is identified as a “Very Scenic” road in the Region’s Scenic Roads and Special Character Streets Resource Document (December 2011). There are two (2) properties with heritage designations on Sawmill Road within the project limits (1790 Sawmill Road and 1924 Sawmill Road). Several mature trees are located in the existing boulevard areas. The posted speed limit is 50 km/hr on Sawmill Road and, based on a 2009 speed survey conducted by the Region, the average speed of travel is 52 km/hr.

Northfield Drive is a rural two (2) lane roadway with narrow paved shoulders from Country Spring Walk to the south Village limits. No sidewalks currently exist along this section of Northfield Drive. The section of Northfield Drive from Sawmill Road to the south Village limits has a narrow right-of-way of only 12 metres in some locations and residential building fronts are located in very close proximity to the right-of-way.
The intersection of Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive is currently controlled by traffic control signals. There are no existing left-turn lanes at any legs of this intersection. The intersection is currently operating at an adequate level-of-service. There is some horse-and-buggy traffic along both Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive in the Village of Conestoga.

The Region’s Context Sensitive Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines classify these sections of Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive as Rural Village Main Streets. Rural Village Main Streets are prioritized for vehicular movements and active transportation. The role of the Main Street is to support the urban life of the village and to move traffic efficiently through town at an appropriate speed. Additionally, both Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive are identified as being candidates for long-term on-road cycling facilities in the Region’s Cycling Master Plan.

2.0 Development of the Preferred Design Alternative

In 2011, the Project Team convened on several occasions to develop a Preferred Design Alternative for the proposed improvements to Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive. The Project Team recognized from the outset of the planning process that both Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive within the Village of Conestogo are constrained corridors in a mature setting, such that alterations to these roadway corridors would likely have some adverse impacts on abutting properties. The Project Team considered relevant Regional plans, policies and guidelines when initially developing the Preferred Design Alternative, including the Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines, the Region’s Cycling Master Plan and The Region’s Transportation Master Plan. These documents generally give direction to balance new and retrofitted roads for all modes of transportation including walking, cycling and transit. The Region’s Scenic Roads and Special Character Streets Resource Document specifies that priority should be given to maintaining those features which are special or scenic and to preserve the character of the street.

A traffic study was completed as part of the project planning to consider traffic operational improvements at the intersection of Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive. This traffic study found that the intersection would operate at a poor level-of-service by the year 2024. The traffic study recommended the consideration of designated left-turn lanes on all approaches to the intersection of Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive in order to provide an acceptable level-of-service based on the forecast traffic volumes. A roundabout was also considered to replace the existing traffic control signals at this intersection. The assessment found that taking into account the estimated capital and operating costs of traffic control signals and roundabout, collision histories at this intersection and property constraints, a roundabout was not recommended at this location.

Based on technical studies completed and in consideration of relevant planning documents, the Project Team initially developed a Preferred Design Alternative generally described as follows:

- Reconstruction and widening of Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive to accommodate 1.5 metre wide on-road cycling/buggy lanes;
- Removal of the majority of existing boulevard parking on Sawmill Road, in order to accommodate the proposed cycling/buggy lanes;
- Construction of new designated left-turn lanes on all approaches at the intersection of Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive;
- Construction of new sidewalk on one side of Northfield Drive from Country Spring Walk to the south Village limits and on the north side of Sawmill Road from the existing terminus at Harriet Street to the existing sidewalk at Golf Course Road;
Construction of a raised concrete pedestrian refuge island on Sawmill Road at the Conestogo Public School in order to facilitate pedestrian crossings to the school; and Enhanced boulevard landscaping where feasible.

Please refer to Appendix “B” for drawings of the Project Team’s Preferred Design Alternative.

### 3.0 Public Consultation

A Public Consultation Centre (PCC) was held at Conestogo Public School, 1948 Sawmill Road in the Township of Woolwich on Wednesday October 5th, 2011 from 5:30 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. Plans showing the Project Team’s Preferred Design Alternative were on display and Project Team representatives were present to answer questions and to receive feedback from members of the public. Approximately one hundred and ten (110) members of the public attended the PCC and eighty three (83) members of the public formally signed in. Thirty-four (34) comment sheets were received. Please refer to Appendix ‘C-1’ for all written public comments received and Appendix ‘C-2’ for a summary of the written public comments received.

In general, there was very little support expressed by the public for the proposed widening of Sawmill Road to accommodate on-road cycling/buggy lanes; for the removal of the boulevard parking; and for the construction of new sidewalk on Northfield Drive. There was support for the extension of the existing sidewalk on the north side of Sawmill Road from Harriet Street to Golf Course Road and for traffic operational improvements to the intersection of Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive. High vehicle speeds on Sawmill Road was also cited as a concern by some members of the public and there were requests for some form of ‘traffic calming’ measures on Sawmill Road to be incorporated as part of the proposed road improvements.

### 4.0 Project Team’s Response to Public Input Received at the PCC

Following the PCC, the Project Team thoroughly reviewed all of the public comments received. The Project Team also met on-site and walked through the entire project area in order to gain a better understanding of the impacts and constraints associated with widening Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive to provide for on-road cycling/buggy lanes, sidewalk and designated turn lanes at the intersection of Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive. The Project Team noted that the widening of Sawmill Road results in severe impacts to some abutting properties, trees, and overhead utilities, and significantly reduces the boulevard area available for boulevard parking, snow storage and utility plant. Additionally, the construction of new sidewalk on Northfield Drive, particularly south of Sawmill Road, results in significant property impacts, and the construction of a northbound designated left-turn lane on Northfield Drive would require a full purchase of the property located at 1030 Northfield Drive.

The Project Team also agreed that the widening of Sawmill Road significantly alters the appearance and ‘character’ of this scenic roadway corridor. The Project Team also assessed that new sidewalk on Northfield Drive would not likely attract many pedestrians due to existing available alternative walking routes, confirming comments made by the public.

### 5.0 Recommended Improvements

In view of the public comments received, the existing roadway features and constraints, and the scenic characteristics of Sawmill Road, the Project Team developed the following Recommended Design Alternative for Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive described as follows:
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- Reconstruction of Sawmill Road in its current configuration, with no widening for buggy/cycling lanes;
- No change to boulevard parking on Sawmill Road;
- Re-paving of the asphalt boulevards on Sawmill Road;
- Extension of the sidewalk on the north side of Sawmill Road from Harriet Street to Golf Course Road;
- Reconstruction of Northfield Drive from the South Village Limits to Country Spring Walk in its current configuration without sidewalks;
- Construction of a pedestrian refuge island on Sawmill Road at the Conestogo Public School;
- Construction of new designated left-turn lanes on Sawmill Road in each direction at Northfield Drive and construction of a new northbound designated right-turn lane on Northfield Drive at Sawmill Road; and
- Enhanced boulevard landscaping where feasible.

Please refer to Appendix ‘D’ for drawings of the Recommended Design Alternative.

The Recommended Design Alternative does not include any provisions for traffic calming measures (such as speed humps) on Sawmill Road, as Regional practice does not allow for the use of hard “on-road” traffic calming measures on Regional arterial roadways due to adverse effects on emergency service vehicle response times, noise from vehicles passing over the speed humps and general delays to traffic. The Project Team notes that the average speed on Sawmill Road is 52 km/hr based on the 2009 speed survey. The posted speed on Sawmill Road is 50km/hr through the Village of Conestogo. Additionally, construction of the Pedestrian Refuge Island on Sawmill Road at the Conestogo Public School may have a traffic calming benefit. Subsequent to the PCC, further traffic analysis was undertaken to assess the benefits of construction a designated northbound right-turn lane on Northfield Drive in lieu of a designated left turn-lane at this location and deleting the proposed designated southbound left turn-lane on Northfield Drive, due to the severe property impacts associated with construction of these designated left-turn lanes. This traffic analysis found that with construction of a designated northbound right-turn lane, in combination with the proposed designated left-turn lanes on Sawmill Road at Northfield Drive, the intersection of Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive will operate at a fair to good level-of-service based on the projected 2024 traffic volumes.

Staff sent correspondence on March 12th, 2012 to all area residents as well as those who attended the PCC, informing them of the Project Team’s revised design alternative and inviting comments. Approximately seven (7) members of the public responded to this letter. All but one member of the public were in support of the revised scope of improvements.

The Project Team is now recommending that Regional Council approve the Recommended Design Alternative as described in Report E-12-001. The Project Team believes that the Recommended Design Alternative best balances public preferences with Regional polices, guidelines and objectives.

Although the Recommended Design Alternative significantly minimizes impacts to abutting properties, the Region would still need to purchase very small portions of property from five (5) abutting properties (please refer to the figures in Appendix ‘E’ for property requirements) in order to construct the new sidewalk on Sawmill Road and new designated turn lanes at the intersection of Northfield Drive and Sawmill Road. The preliminary project budget for the Recommended Design Alternative is estimated to be $2,500,000, which is substantially less
than the current $5,200,000 project budget that was developed based on widening Sawmill Road for cycling/buggy lanes.

Letters advising of the recommendations contained in this report were mailed to all those who attended the October 5th, 2011 PCC and to all owners/residents abutting the Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive project limits on May 8th, 2012.

6.0 Project Timing

Subject to Council approval of the Recommended Design Alternative for Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive, acquisition of all required property and receipt of all technical and financial approvals, construction will commence in May 2015 and will be completed by November 2015.

7.0 Construction Staging

It is anticipated that construction will be completed in a staged approach in order to minimize disruption to traffic, businesses and residents, with detours for through traffic being provided as required. Local, emergency and pedestrian access will be maintained throughout construction. Detailed staging plans will be developed in consultation with the Township of Woolwich during the detailed design phase.

8.0 Project Cost

The Region of Waterloo is fully funding the road improvements on this project. The estimated total Regional project cost for the Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive improvements as described in the Recommended Design Alternative, including engineering, construction, utility relocations, property and other project costs, is $2,500,000.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This project is in harmony with the Region’s Corporate Strategic Plan in that implementation of the Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive Improvements achieves Focus Area #2.2 (“Develop, Optimize and Maintain Infrastructure to Meet Current and Projected Needs”) specifically Strategic Objective 2.2.1 which is to ensure all Regional programs and services continue to prioritize and implement capital program projects required to meet community needs and ensure sustainability.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The Region’s Approved 2012 Transportation Capital Program and 10-Year Capital Forecast includes funds of $6,127,000 in years 2012 to 2016 inclusive in order to complete construction of the improvements to Sawmill Road from Musselman Crescent to the Conestogo Bridge and Northfield Drive from the South Limits of Conestogo to Country Spring Walk, within the Village of Conestoga to be funded from the Roads Rehabilitation Reserve Fund. Staff will review the project budget as part of 2013 Transportation Capital Program budget deliberations.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Staff from the Transportation Planning Division of the Planning, Housing and Community Services Department were consulted for the preparation of this report.
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## Appendix C-1

Written Comments Received from the October 5, 2011 Public Consultation Centre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| David H. | Removal of parking in front of school on Northfield (1055) removes access to sports fields on school property (soccer and baseball both are east/west side of Northfield to park and play).  
  
  Sidewalk on north end of Northfield is useless. Only one Mennonite lady and my wife use the road as a walkway.  
  
  Bike lanes (nationally) are being examined and most bikers do not like them (does not remove road hazard). Makes no sense to apply bike lanes in a low speed zone (however carriage is useful....so may be just nomenclative).  
  
  No consideration to speed reduction. Adding turning lanes will only increase speed of ‘through’ traffic; most vehicles (cars and large trucks) barely slow down now, and large trucks apply engine brakes as ‘last minute’ attempt to try and stop, indicating they already have excessive speeds.  
  
  Sidewalk connection on Northfield (west side) makes no sense as pedestrians are located on east side (Country Spring and Ferland). Could sidewalk not be moved to east side and ditch removed? Sidewalk would only have to run from Country Spring to Ferland with no sidewalk where severe property encroachment could occur from Ferland to Sawmill. This would prevent pedestrians on east side from crossing Northfield at uncontrolled locations (north of Sawmill). |
| Karen H. | There is no need for a sidewalk on Northfield Drive north of Sawmill Road. The pedestrian traffic in this area is very minimal. Where it is placed (west side) will not benefit pedestrians as they would have to cross both at Sawmill and again at Country Spring to connect to the southern portion of Northfield.  
  
  I have a significant concern regarding the speed of traffic on Northfield adjacent to the rear yard of the school (1055). Children play close to the road here and traffic goes fast to `make the light’. Introduction of a left turn lane will not help this. At a minimum, this area needs a school zone signage. Reduction of speed for the safety of children in this area is crucial.  
  
  If removing the ditch on the east side of Northfield, perhaps the sidewalk could go there (but it is really not warranted).  
  
  Extending the 50 km/hr zone further out of town or even putting a 40 km/hr at the rear of the school would be good. |
<p>| Sherrie C. | Very interesting in maintaining and continuing to improve the safe crossing areas in front of the school. A concrete pedestrian area could potentially be a traffic calming initiative and therefore I would support it. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florence B.</td>
<td>Suggestion: change the pedestrian signal to match the traffic signal since right turn drivers only look at the red traffic light and don’t notice the pedestrian 'go ahead'! Extreme concern about right turns at Sawmill and Northfield – drivers do not watch for pedestrians especially school age children at school start and end times? Move the stop line back? No right on red? At least put a sign indicating children crossing nearby!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Michael K. | The road improvements do not include any traffic calming measures (as per Regional practice) and will in fact result in the opposite faster vehicle speeds. The improvements will also make Sawmill Road more attractive to truck traffic. This will increase the number of trucks travelling through our community. The traffic mix in Conestogo already consists of a high proportion of truck traffic. We need measures to re-route trucks and reduce truck traffic speed. Recommendations: full traffic study to determine traffic mix at all times of day (average and peak). Evaluation of options to re-route truck traffic and allocation of sufficient resources to complete this. Introduction of traffic calming measures:  
  - Reduced speed limit  
  - Speed bumps  
  - Enforcement  
  - Flashing light/controlled crosswalks  
Need to carefully consider effect of adding turning lanes. This will draw increased traffic through Conestogo. Extend reduced speed limit beyond town limits. Many trucks are faster than 80 km/hr before they hit west side of Weberlyn/Muszelman. Reduce speed limit to 40 km/hr through town. |
<p>| M.B.      | Lack of parking – at present we have parking on both sides of the street. Would rather reduce the amount of truck traffic through the village and leave the road as it is. Houses are close to road as it is without increasing pavement. |
| Larry M.  | The design doesn’t do anything to self-limit speed through this historic village. A design like this new Davenport Road ‘corridor’ (by Conestoga Mall) would be much better to me. Proposed left turn lane on Northfield at Sawmill Road won’t work! (Trucks turning south off Sawmill go right onto where this lane is). Small note: trucks exiting from mill at 1772 Sawmill go onto 1772 boulevard sometimes now. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Betty P.</td>
<td>I would like to see a smaller boulevard. I would like to see something done to slow traffic and put heavy traffic on the expressway going from K-W to Elmira. The proposed sidewalk for Northfield Dr. E. from Sawmill to Country Spring Walk needs to go on the Country Spring Walk and Ferland Ave. side of the road. The ditch is being filled in with storm drainage tiles and the sidewalk can go on top, where it won't affect any residence property and give people on these crescents access to the sidewalk. It might also push the school property boundary back farther from the road which would be a safety zone for the young children attending Conestogo School. Would it not be more cost efficient on that side of the road where you don't need to dig up existing driveways to put in a sidewalk?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.H.</td>
<td>You absolutely must slow the traffic down. If the object of this exercise is to speed it up you are doing us a disservice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niki G.</td>
<td>Our home, located at 1814 Sawmill Road is already really close to our house! How are you going to widen it without my stepping out my front door onto the main road?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave K.</td>
<td>My preference would be to close the road completely in sections to shorten the construction duration. In the vicinity of Harriet, consider pushing road to south by using grid/baskets to build out the embankment as necessary. Would save property acquisition north side and provide space to buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan B.</td>
<td>Loss of parking along whole of village. Widening and beefing up road appears to be for increased gravel truck traffic. Should have signs at each end of village 'No Trucks'. Loss of trees. Why is this being done if not for truck traffic? Trucks can use expressway or highway 86.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty P.</td>
<td>The proposed sidewalk for Northfield Dr. E. from Sawmill to Country Spring Walk needs to go on the Country Spring Walk and Ferland Avenue side of the road, the ditch is being filled in with storm drainage tiles and the sidewalk can go on the top, where it won't affect any residence property and giving people on these crescents access to the sidewalk. It might also push the school property boundary back farther from the road, which would be a safety zone for the young children attending Conestogo School. Would it not be more cost efficient on that side of the road where you don't need to dig up existing driveways to put in a sidewalk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Bruce and Gabriele B | 1) Provide proper crosswalk with lights in front of school as there have been difficulties in obtaining crossing guards for this location.  
2) Sidewalk on Northfield Drive north of Sawmill should be on east side of road providing pedestrian access to Ferland Crescent and the school from the south and Country Spring Walk to the north. Currently the Township of Woolwich provides snow clearing services to some sidewalks within the village and may be willing to provide same for this stretch as there are no homes facing onto Northfield Drive on that side of the road.  
3) If sidewalk on Northfield Drive north of Sawmill Road is placed on west side it should be located closer to edge of road than proposed. Currently homeowners maintain and, in some cases, attempt to beautify this area of the road allowance. By placing the sidewalk so close to the property line you will discourage not just beautification but even maintenance of the grassy boulevard on the road side.  
4) Although these are arterial roads, measures should be considered that will slow vehicle speeds through the village as wider roads encourage greater speeds.  
5) Information should have been provided regarding expected duration of each phase of the project.  
6) Information should have been provided regarding specifics of required detours.  
7) Consideration should be given to placing buried utilities (hydro and CATV) as it appears large portions of this infrastructure will need to be moved during or in preparation for construction.  
8) Provide property line fencing (five foot high chain link) along north side of Sawmill Road west of Northfield Drive to minimize snowmobiles and bicycles that currently cut across private property.  
 I suggest that this project include an extension of the sidewalks on Sawmill from Harriet St to Golf Course Rd. Sidewalks already exist on the bridge, and this extension would connect with the newly constructed sidewalks on Golf Course Road. These new Golf Course Rd sidewalks are currently under-utilized because of the lack of sidewalks on Sawmill.  
 Sawmill, already busy including heavy truck traffic, may be worsened if the gravel pits are approved. This section lacking sidewalks now, is dangerous particularly for children coming from Golf Course Rd to the village or school. This section is a part of the Grand River Trail, with the current grading foring busy road walking. Ideally, the sidewalk extension would be completed well before your 2015 road rebuild target. |
<p>| Dave P        |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| George B     | The most recent changes to control the movement of traffic have done little to improve the flow, especially the road diversion approaching from the south. I realize that this has been introduced to permit east bound semi trailers and other large units to turn south onto Northfield, but makes difficulties for similar vehicles approaching from the south wishing to turn west onto Sawmill. During peak flow periods I have at times endured three traffic light changes before being able to negotiate the intersection from the south.  
The old, boarded up property on the south west corner of the intersection will always prevent a proper solution so long as it remains. Surely safe and efficient traffic flow should trump the preservation of what is deemed to be a historic hostelry. No doubt one of the arguments which decided traffic lights instead of a roundabout was the need to keep the above building. A roundabout would have significantly improved traffic flow, as the St. Jacobs roundabout has proved to be, and what is more, significantly lowered vehicle exhaust emissions to those nearby residents.  
We have experienced semi trailers and other large, heavy vehicles passing through Musselman Crescent in order to reverse direction of travel on Sawmill Road, because of difficulty or inability to negotiate the intersection. Again a roundabout would have prevented this problem.  
Long term planning should consider the demolition of the troublesome building or the dismantling of it and have it reconstructed perhaps on the grounds of the region’s museum                                                                                                                                                   |
| Linda W      | We live at 1007 Northfield Dr. E. Conestogo. It will be 28 years on Oct. 22nd this year. We are on the south east corner of Elgin St. and Northfield. I would like full details of how this plan is going to affect our property. My main concern is how this is going to affect all the houses that are already so close to the highway. As of now our front steps are about 9 ft. from the shoulder of the road which is already paved. Who wants this and why? If it is traffic concerns the only time there is some inconvenience is for an hour and a half from 5 to 6:30 every evening and even then with light changes the traffic moves along. It isn’t any different than any other intersection along Northfield Dr. when I come from work from Waterloo. The rest of the day traffic isn’t a problem. The amount of bicycle traffic and buggy traffic is minimal. Most of the buggy traffic is on Sundays. I know of one buggy coming from New Jerusalem Rd. that went by every morning for years at 8:30 taking their kids to school out past the Iron bridge. Is it going to look like Davenport Rd. with all the lane mess between the mall and Northfield because there isn’t the allowance for all the lanes. Which side is the sidewalk to be on? I have no interest in a sidewalk either because the snowplough pushes 2 to 21/2 feet of snow almost to my front steps over the course of the winter. They are continually ploughing day and night on any given day when it snows. Why do we need storm sewers and where is this water going?  
Not long ago I spoke to a neighbour who was upset because he heard a sidewalk was going in. He said that a number of years ago there was a proposal to bypass Conestogo. Could New Jerusalem Rd. be paved?                                                                                                                                                                           |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Marsha F   | My only concern is the partial one way street beside us. It was to be reviewed in 2 years. It must be close to 10. I've given up trying to change certain situations here. No one seems to care about older neighbourhoods. I only mention it so maybe it can be decided if it is to be permanent and if so the township and region can work together to make a curb that juts out with grass on the inside and a simple oneway sign instead of the monstrosities and weeds that are there now. If any one starts a petition opposing these plans I'd gladly sign it. Living here and seeing the traffic day in and day out it seems to be a waste of time and money not to mention how upset motorists will be during the construction. For residents the four way stop was better at least the cars stopped. Now if the light is green they don't even slow down. We live on the small crescent beside the school, Ferland Ave. My husband has lived here all his life and I with him for the past 10 years. We have 3 small children and have talked to the township a few times about a sidewalk on Northfield Dr. It is not safe to walk or push a stroller along Northfield Dr to the traffic lights. Ever since the traffic lights were installed it is even more dangerous. Before people had to slow down and come to a complete stop before continuing through the intersection. Now they barrel through trying to make the green or yellow light. Many cars and large trucks drive very fast past the school and through the lights. I would like to see a sidewalk put in from Country Spring Walk on Northfield Dr all the way to the little street that leads to the community park. There are many young families that challenge the traffic and it is just not safe. There is no room and once you get to the corner its hard to manoeuvre your stroller up the curb from the road. My other suggestion would be on Sawmill Rd. To make the speed limit 40 not 50 and to even put in a traffic calming zone to slow the big trucks and traffic down in front of the school. Just last June my family had a close call right in front of the school. The crossing guard was out, had her sign up, we were halfway across the street and a lady was about to drive right through anyway. I believe some people feel they are out of the city and their won't be any police around to see what's going on. I understand you will have many people with ideas and wants but you can't please everybody. I just wanted to give my suggestions and wish you well on this huge job! Just wondering what the time line is for this project? Summer?
Don U  
I would certainly agree that improved traffic arrangements at the corner of Sawmill Rd. and Northfield Drive are needed and that it would also be a good opportunity to replace the deteriorating storm sewers.

After studying your proposals and asking a number of questions of your representative, I have a concern and a couple of suggestions.

I think that it is a mistake to remove the parking along the north side of Sawmill Rd. from Harriet St. to Conestogo Public School, except where it is necessary to widen the road for the proposed turn lanes at the corner of Sawmill Rd. and Northfield Dr. I think that a paved shoulder accessed by a mountable curb along both sides of Sawmill Rd. will provide parking for the businesses in the centre of the village and for Sittler’s Bakery as well as for homes along Sawmill Rd. which may not have adequate driveway space for visitor parking. More importantly, the shoulder area in front of the Black Forest Inn currently is reserved for emergency parking for the volunteer firefighters and this should not be changed. Looking at your proposals, retaining this paved shoulder could be achieved by foregoing grassed boulevards and trees. It is an interesting “characteristic” of this village that these paved boulevards exist and with the bike paths which you are proposing, they should not pose a problem. However, the lack of parking areas along Sawmill Rd. might cause people to park in the bike lanes.

My first suggestion involves the home located at 1030 Northfield Dr. located on the southwest corner of the intersection of Sawmill Rd. and Northfield Dr. This building poses an ongoing traffic problem as well as a "problem" for the owners. It seems to me that, as traffic increases at this intersection, the owners will have increasing difficulties accessing their property from either Sawmill or Northfield and I suspect there is already a noise and a potential safety problem. Indeed, I suspect that this property is currently "unsaleable". The building also creates a blind intersection and will continue to be a problem in improving this intersection as traffic increases. My suggestion is that the Region of Waterloo purchase this property and remove the building thereby providing more opportunities for improvement at this busy intersection as well as probably helping the current owner to move to a more desirable location.

My second suggestion involves the construction of a sidewalk along Northfield Dr. south of the intersection. Take advantage of the current vacant property on the southeast corner of the intersection and construct a sidewalk on the east side of Northfield Dr. from Sawmill Rd. to Elgin St. West, primarily for access to the park area on Elgin St. Your current proposal involves continuing this sidewalk down the east side of Northfield Dr. to the south end of the village. Many of the homes affected have very little frontage as it is and this will accentuate the problem. Furthermore, in the winter, the snowplows along Northfield will end up blocking the sidewalk. If you feel that a sidewalk is absolutely necessary south of Elgin St., I would suggest that you approach the Township of Woolwich with the following idea.
There is a strip of land along the west side of the park immediately behind the homes on the east side of Northfield Dr. Put in a walkway here accessing the rear of these properties. At the south end, there appears to be an easement for utilities. Use this easement to provide a walkway from Northfield Dr. at the south end of the village to Evening Star Lane connecting with the aforementioned walkway behind the properties on the east side of Northfield. This might help to service the homes along the west side of Northfield at the south end of the village. In fact, it would be possible to install a viable sidewalk along the west side of Northfield from the southern end of the village to 996 Northfield.

Why is it that bike/buggy lanes were not provided along Northfield Dr. from University Ave. north to Conestogo when this stretch of road was reconstructed a year or so ago? I note that this stretch is used by both cyclists and runners as well as by buggy traffic. If bike lanes had been added on both sides, Northfield Dr. would be much safer for these groups. As a person who enjoys walking and cycling, I avoid Northfield Dr. because of the safety factor. If you are planning to install bike/buggy lanes along Sawmill Rd. why wouldn’t you have provided similar access along Northfield Dr. thereby establishing a link to the bicycle lanes along University Ave?

Secondly, if you are planning to provide bicycle lanes through the village of Conestogo, would it be possible to extend these lanes west along Sawmill Rd. toward St. Jacobs?

I am writing in response to the proposed road improvements to the village of Conestogo in the Township of Wilmot.

I will respond by the numbers indicated on your information package of October 5, 2011.

3. **What improvements are being considered?**

It is my feeling that the construction of 1.50 metre reserved lanes would only serve cyclists. The proposed lane does not seem wide enough to accommodate the buggy traffic which currently uses this road and it would not facilitate the buggy traffic crossing the bridge.

New sidewalks from Harriet Street to the Conestogo bridge would be a welcome addition but not at the expense of expropriating property in order to achieve this.

A proposed pedestrian refuge island at the Conestogo Public School is, in my view, a waste of money as we have a crossing guard now who sees the children safely across the whole road, I see an island disrupting the flow and making it more dangerous for children to cross. The only positive in this proposal would be to slow or calm the traffic in the school area but perhaps speed bumps would do a better job.
New designated left turn lanes would make the Sawmill/Northfield intersection safer.

On road parking is another issue. At present we have on road parking along most of Sawmill Road except close to the school at designated times. This on road parking is absolutely necessary for parents picking up children from school, for those using the commercial facilities along Sawmill Road and for volunteer fire personnel who come from both directions along Sawmill and need to park close to the Firehall.

The Township has encouraged commercial development along Sawmill Road. We currently have a bakery, flower shop, chiropractor, jewelers, antique dealer, children’s clothing store, cafe and craft store, Fireplace store, Steak House, one property just sold and toa, and of course, the Black Forest Inn which uses the on road parking as well as their own parking lot at peak times. All of these properties rely on patrons being able to park on the road. The proposed new parking would not be sufficient to accommodate all these businesses as well as the private residential properties along the road.

4. **How will the proposed improvements enhance the pedestrian environment on this project?**

I do not feel that any of the proposed improvements will enhance the pedestrian environment. The only thing that would improve the pedestrian environment on this road would be to reduce the amount of truck traffic which currently uses it. Have any of your staff ever walked along Sawmill on a regular work day in the summer? It is sometimes difficult to hear yourself think! Spending $5,200,000 and cutting down 24 large very mature trees will not improve this environment.

6. **How does this project relate to the Objectives of the Regional Official Plan, the Regional Transportation Master Plan and the Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines?**

You state that this project supports the RTMP goals of optimizing our transportation system, promoting transportation choice and supporting sustainable development. I don’t think you are achieving any of these goals in your proposal. You also state that “Improving the walking environment is a key objective of the RTMP”, as I stated in (4) above, this is definitely not being considered as a key objective. It appears that the key objective is to improve the road so that truck traffic is encouraged to use this route.

8. **How will vehicular traffic and pedestrian access be maintained during construction?**

You state that eastbound traffic will be detoured via Line 86 to Katherine Street. What you fail to mention is how this increased traffic will safely and effectively negotiate the crowsfoot corner. This definitely needs some serious attention.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>12. Will property acquisition be required for this project?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As I stated earlier, I think it is unreasonable to expect property owners to have their properties expropriated for this flawed and unnecessary proposal. A great deal of the residential properties along Sawmill Road are already very close to the road. Improving the road conditions in this area will only have one effect -- increased traffic, and this will make living on an already busy road unbearable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>17. Is any watermain or sanitary sewer work proposed?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It would make sense to include sanitary sewer options for those properties on Sawmill Road. If the road is being dug up anyway and if that option exists (I am not an engineer!), then I would say, at least give people the option. The village has got too big for more septic systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>18. Are traffic calming measure being considered for this project?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Although the region's &quot;current practice&quot; does not allow for the installation of traffic calming measures on regional roads, I think the region needs to look at this on a case by case basis. This road, although, regional, is within the boundaries of Woolwich Township, and as such, forms part of the rural picture of small settlements within this boundary. For this reason, I feel that the region needs to make an exception to this rule where the road runs through rural settlements, especially those with a school. Where possible the region should provide alternate routes for heavy truck traffic using existing expressways and specifically constructed regional roads, and allow for traffic calming and lower speed limits (i.e. 40 kmh) in these villages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>19. How will on road parking be affected?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This question was dealt with earlier and I reiterate that this is a problem with the proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa H</td>
<td>Although I do not live on Sawmill Road, I appreciate the uniqueness of rural village life and I don't feel that the Region of Waterloo fully understands the impact that a decision such as this would make to our community. We recently purchased the property 1818 Sawmill Road (across from the mill). We were unaware there was a meeting taking place about the proposed improvements to our road but our neighbours were kind enough to bring us an information package. We have read the proposal, here are our concerns. When we originally purchased the property we were already a little concerned about how close we were to the road. It is very hard to determine looking at page 10 of the information package but it would appear you will need approximately 30 feet to accommodate two curbs, two bike lanes, two drive lanes and one sidewalk. When we exit our home through the front door our last step touches the sidewalk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.D</td>
<td>Our greatest concern would be if you were to encroach any further towards our house the sidewalk would be at our front door and running through our porch let alone how would we get off our porch and to the sidewalk as our stairs would have to be removed?! Before I continue I would need to know from you where you are starting on the other side so that I could measure over to my home to see if your dimensions would be doing this. I, like many of my neighbours and businesses, have houses that are only a few feet from the current sidewalk. I <strong>would hate to see bikers, walkers and cars pass my dining room window so close I could reach out and touch them</strong>! If this is to happen, we are also concerned that if we were to sell the property it would be even less desirable to a buyer being that close to the road and bike lane.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Grace and Bruce K   | I have reviewed the proposal for the above upgrades and would like to make the following comments  
1. Additional lighting should be considered due to the number of vehicles that use Sawmill Rd as well as the number of homes and subsequent population along Sawmill Rd who require visibility during low light hours. The addition of buggy and bicycle lanes will only add to these numbers.  
2. A pedestrian refuge island should also be considered in front of Rumble Turn (Glasgow St.) due to the number of persons crossing at that point to access the businesses on the opposite side as well as the residents on either side of that location. The natural tendency will be to cross at that point rather than walk to the public school crossing and walk down the other side, this could be an accident waiting to happen as there are children in that area. |
|                     | First of all, why could the sidewalk not be on the same side north on Northfield Dr North as it is on the South side of Northfield Dr South?  
There is several reasons for this suggestion and I will list them below ...  
a) most of the snow and winds come from the west and north. In the wintertime the snow builds up quite high on the west side of the road making it almost impossible to keep the sidewalk clean should the sidewalk be placed on the west side.  
b) second of all, there would be almost no trees to be lost or removed.  
c) if the sidewalk was located on the east side of Northfield Dr North, it could be connected up with Ferland Crescent as well as Spring Walk Drive making it easier for residents to walk to Sawmill Road.  
d) the snowplow could handle the snow by lifting the wing plow to the sidewalk level and clearing the same time as the road. The property on the east side would look more attractive as most of it is currently not maintained with weeds growing fairly high unlike the west side with the property owners maintaining the property manicured right to the road.  
e) if the sidewalk was located on the east side of Northfield Dr North, it could be easily connected to the Conestogo School along with their playground area. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Kendra E. | f) my personal opinion of people entering the village with having the sidewalk all on one side of Northfield Dr would look more attractive and practical and would make it easier with crossing at Sawmill Rd at the lights as it is currently not at this time. Traffic on Northfield Dr is getting very heavy in the last number of years and when cars/trucks notice the red light, they accelerate making it very very dangerous for anyone let alone our little children trying to cross the street.  

I would like to point out a few details which are specific to the section of road in front of our property - 1906 Sawmill  
In the new design there is no longer going to be any parking/shoulder on the north side of Sawmill. This space is of great importance to us and we use it daily.  
We have a single car driveway and as I am sure you can appreciate we do not want to be forced to pull into our driveway and then have to try and back out into traffic when exiting our driveway. Not only is this dangerous but can be very difficult at times, just due to volume and speed of traffic.  
We use the shoulder to pull on to and then back our vehicles into our driveway. There are others on the road who are in the same situation.  
This space is also used by guests when visiting our home. If these spots are removed where are guests to park? My parents are elderly and walking any long distance is not feasible, especially in the winter.  
During school events families park along Sawmill as there is not ample parking in the parking lot. They park from the school to Glasgow and sometimes beyond. Where would all of these families park if this is taken away?  
In the winter this shoulder is used for piling snow from our driveway. Our neighbor has installed a circular driveway and we can no longer pile snow on the west side of our driveway. If this space on the side of the road is removed we will no longer have any place for snow. The boulevards are not able to hold any vast amount of snow, snow piles on the boulevard and the shoulders. We do clear the spot in front of our home so we can use it for pulling into and then backing into the driveway. The snow is piled on the paved shoulder further down from our house.  
As pointed out in the meeting removal of these paved shoulders is also going to be a problem for the parking across from the Fire Hall as this space is necessary for the volunteers to park.  
Was the Fire Chief for the Conestogo dept. contacted when these plans were originally thought up? |
The removal of old trees should not be in the agenda. Although the policy is to plant 2 trees for each 1 cut down, trust me when I tell you there is absolutely no comparison - these trees have been around a lot longer than most of us and not only do they add to the appeal of the street, they are part of the community, have great environmental impact and need to be respected. If one of the mandates of this project is to "improve the walking environment" the trees need to be worked around - modifications to the plans must be made. With all of the creative minds at work on this project I would expect to see modifications made to stay away from the roots of the trees marked for possible removal.

When I look at our road I see the following things that could be improved yet still maintain what we have

- add sidewalk to the north side of the road to connect to Golf Course Rd - in doing so widen the road more on the south side with the mill and do not cut into the property on the other side of the road - removing heritage trees to put in sidewalk is not a good idea
- leave the paved shoulders and have the hydro poles moved back (as some of these are almost in the middle of the paved shoulder), this is ample space for bikes and buggies to use and still allows parking and the ability to back into a driveway when necessary
- addition of the pedestrian island is a good idea and I think will help to slow traffic
- addition of more trees along the boulevards
- traffic calming measures are a must as part of this project - if this much money is being budgeted to the road for upgrades this should be one of the main objectives

I believe most if not all of the families, that live in the community (especially on Sawmill) would rather have the speed and volume of traffic fixed and not do any of the other improvements as most of us do not see these items as issues that need fixing. (other than the addition of the sidewalk, which is necessary)

I would like to see individuals from the Traffic division attend the next meeting and I would also question why they have not been given some of the project budget to address traffic calming when this has been brought to their attention many times over the past few years.

Although they do like to spew the old "it is current policy for the Region to not slow traffic on a Regional road" I think it is time for that policy to be changed.

It may have been OK 20 years ago to make such a statement but times have changed.....traffic has not become lighter or slower. Transport trucks traveling 80kms through town is not acceptable. There was recently an accident in town where it was stated by police the car at fault was traveling approx. 100kms. Certainly not close to the 52 kms the region likes to state.
As long-time residents of the Village of Conestogo and Waterloo Region my family and I have, and continue to experience the changes that make this community so dynamic and such a wonderful place to live, work, and play. However, when it comes to traffic planning and associated construction become more than suspect. Indeed the Region’s efforts at addressing traffic issues appears to be analogous to trying to predict the weather by wetting a finger and holding it up to the wind. For example, much was made of addressing the congestion as the Region’s main traffic artery, Highway 86, transitions to Arthur Street around St. Jacob’s by constructing a roundabout. Forgetting that many of the people that use this intersection are tourists visiting and supporting our communities and have little if any experience with these types of traffic-flow systems, the lengthy construction required that traffic be detoured. Much of the detoured traffic was directed through the Conestogo using Sawmill and Northfield. I suspect that the money’s spent in “upgrading” this intersection from one controlled by stop-signs to provide for traffic lights and a turning lane on Northfield was, at least in part, related. It should be noted that the roundabout construction at Sawmill and Arthur has been “changed” at least 3 times. Each time money is spent and inconvenienced. Additionally, the construction that resulted at Northfield and Sawmill has likewise been “adjusted” with the turning lane now removed.

To further illustrate my distrust of the traffic planning capacity of the Region of Waterloo you can review this past summer’s renovation of the bridges, east and west of Conestogo on Northfield. For some reason it was found impossible to coordinate the projects, and with the closure of Glasgow Street by the City of Waterloo the residents of Conestogo were faced with limited commuting options. Given these recent examples of the “professionalism” of traffic planning in Waterloo Region as stated the need, let alone the costs that have been estimated at over $5M for the “improvements” on Sawmill and Northfield are at best suspect. That aside, the current plan calls for widening of parts of the intersection to “improve traffic flow”. Longstanding arguments against such a move from the affected residents include the following:

Consideration for Conestogo Public School, students, parents and staff. Indeed, would request that the speed limit be lowered in this area to the more typical 40 km/h to acknowledge the inherent dangers associated with the current traffic, and the fact that crossing-guards have proven difficult recruit so young students are often crossing an already busy intersection by themselves. The residents have for a long-standing desire to limit the growth and expansion of aggregate extraction in the immediate community. Indeed local elections have seen these issues figuring paramount in the minds of voters. Regardless of whether the proposed pits are approved or not, wider roads correlate to increased traffic.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ben K  | Quality of life: It is well understood that bigger roads correlate directly to increased traffic which itself means increased pollution. Both air quality and noise pollution would be increased issues for the local residents of the Village. Beyond a demonstrated poor record of traffic planning and construction by the Region, beyond the quality of life issues for local residents that be apparent with increased traffic in the area, beyond consideration of the young children using the local public school, the last argument I would suggest against proceeding further with the proposed construction plan would be economic. To explain, The Village of St. Jacobs has become a major Southern Ontario tourist destination because of its very character: the stores, the heritage architecture, its residents, and its general environment. The Village of Conestogo has the potential to emulate and even compliment this benefit that experienced Region-wide, but the proposed plan compromises this potential, at least in the near term. Nearly two-dozen decades old majestic trees of varying species will be cut down replaced by little better than saplings. Heritage properties will be encroached by asphalt and concrete. I live at the converted church located 1790 Sawmill Road, on the corner of Sawmill Road and Harriet Street (northwest corner). The plans presented at the Open House on October 5th at the Conestogo Public School indicated that a portion of the property may need to be utilized for the road widening, new sidewalk, etc. Although a small property transfer, on it's own, is not a great concern to me, the plans showed that 3 trees located on my property are at risk of being removed as part of the project. As there are in fact 5 trees located in a straight line along Sawmill Road, it seems unlikely that only 3 of these trees would actually be at risk unless the road orientation was changing (which also seems unlikely). The 5 trees in question are mature trees (I'm guessing at least 50 feet tall) and are thus valuable for many reasons, not the least of which being the contribution they make to the curb appeal and overall attractiveness of my property. These trees also provide a significant amount of afternoon shade on the building and thus help to protect it from direct sunlight and wind. I understand the Region has indicated that it would replace any trees (on a 2 for 1 basis) that need to be removed as part of the program, however it is not possible to 'replace' trees that have spent decades maturing and I am on this basis strongly opposed to the removal of these trees in particular. The plans showed the potential construction of a retaining wall on the north side of this section of Sawmill Road. Although the plans did not specifically address the steps leading up to the church front entrance, to my knowledge, it appears as though the original steps would need to be removed or altered. The age of these steps is not known, however they are in very good shape and form an important part of the entranceway of the building, which has been designated a Heritage Building by the Township of Woolwich. Although I am not opposed to the removal of these steps, I recognize that a suitable compromise may require changes to the front entrance. I respectfully request that any plans for replacement or changes to the steps be discussed with me in detail prior to finalizing plans.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarah F</td>
<td>1. Just to clarify, our property #1880 is not one where land needed to be purchased. Correct? How far (north or south) from the old centreline is the new proposed road centreline at 1880 Sawmill? To help me orient, does the hydro line in front of 1880 stay where it is in new design and the curb abuts it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Is increased capacity for this road a goal that has been identified for future, in an arterial road plan? Not that this could be accomplished by additional lanes, but by increased speed? Or is 50km/hr still the future plan. Currently average speed is 52km/h, any academic guess at how much this might increase by when road appears wider by addition of bike lane, and removal of buggies and slower moving vehicles?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. I'm not sure how much buggies actually factor into future design, or if the thought is we will see less of them in this area. Wondering if they will fill into the bike lane, or with wheels against curb they will tend to hang out by a bit into traffic? Guess I worry that if traffic is moving a bit faster, and cars rather than slow down try and swing out at speed around a bit of overhanging buggy there might a risk there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guess that leads me into 4. Traffic calming. I know there is no precedent for implementing on a municipal road, but it doesn't mean it's a pity something couldn't be done here. I'm glad you are looking at replanting trees. We have a healthy growing community (our school has gone up a class size each of the past 3 years and there have been a lot of young families moving into the mainstream homes). Perhaps we could accomplish this by fundraising for better community welcome signs on the access points to town... just to remind drivers that we are here!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean and Eileen</td>
<td>We always felt that a side walk should exist and be connected to the already existing side walk in Conestogo. The buggy lane would make it safer for those who use that mode of transportation. Many bicycle enthusiasts use Sawmill Road. After seeing the plans and discussing the proposed improvements we are suggesting that you incorporate the bike and buggy lanes as one lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In regards to the road in front of our property, we reside at 1786 Sawmill Road, Conestogo. We were pleased the proposed retaining wall would be on the road side of the long row of cedar trees. Any property that needs to be used by the region would be able to be settled readily with us. Please be aware that you would have to incorporate and maintain our drain and feed that which exists from our house, and guarantee it will run through the retaining wall. Also, if the cedar trees need to be moved or replaced that we would be involved in the decision and any settlement that may occur. We planted those trees approx ten years ago. We understood that the wall may threaten the existing trees and that the Region would be aware of any damage incurred the year or two following the building of the retaining wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a hydo pole that holds three phase lines. We would not accept the moving of that pole closer to our house. We would hope that would be moved to a spot between homes as that noise would be interfering with the quality of life that now exists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I would like to begin by commenting on the session itself. While it was promoted as being a Public Consultation it was in fact an information session. The information presented only included the preferred design option and not all design options under consideration as I would have expected. My impression after spending roughly 30 to 40 minutes at the session was that public input from the residents of Conestogo was neither welcome nor desired. I found The Region staff that I spoke with and listened to were dismissive of resident feedback to the point of being confrontational. I found that even the most basic questions (for example – What is the objective in changing the road layout?) could not or would be answered. It was clear from the session that The Region has created a plan for Sawmill Road and that plan is essentially finalized regardless of the concerns of the residents of Conestogo.

Despite my concerns over how the Region ran the public consultation process I would like to point out my concerns to the proposed changes to Sawmill Road.

1) Increased Traffic Volumes & Velocities: The Region’s objectives behind the proposed changes to the road layout appears to serve the primary purpose of increasing traffic capacity and velocity in Conestogo. As identified by the Region, Conestogo is a village [Village: a group of houses and associated buildings, larger than a hamlet and smaller than a town, situated in a rural area, or a self-contained district or community within a town, city or municipality, regarded as having features characteristic of village life.] and as such any modification to Sawmill Road that fail to recognize Conestogo as a village (ie leads to increased traffic volumes and/or velocities) should be rejected if it do not include corresponding traffic calming measures. Given the location of Conestogo Public School and the proximity of houses to Sawmill Road in The Village the effective control of traffic speed and volume is critical to public health and safety in the Village of Conestogo, a key element that The Region does not adequately address in the package provided on October 5th.

2) Reduction of Effectiveness of Current Traffic Calming Factors: The plan proposed by The Region introduces a paved 1.5m (4.9 ft) reserved bike lane that will presumably also include horse drawn buggy traffic. The effect of moving slower traffic off the primary travel lane of the road surface will be the elimination of an indirect traffic calming measure, a so called moving speed bump or pinch point, ultimately leading to increased average traffic speeds in The Village. Any redesign of Sawmill Road that leads to segregation of traffic by speed must include the incorporation of traffic calming measures including speed humps and pinch points. Traffic calming measures must be seen as the primary approach to limiting speed as enforcement in Woolwich is not a realistic option given the size of the Division allocated to The Township.

3) Road Safety: Assuming the proposed 1.5 m (4.9 ft) bike lane is also intended to be used for horse drawn buggy traffic The Region is creating the potential for increased accidents. At 4.9 ft and border by a concrete curb, the bike lane width will not be sufficient for a significant proportion of horse drawn buggies; this will definitely be the case during the winter months when snow and ice accumulate on the sides of curbed roads forces buggy traffic towards the main travel lane. In these situations horse drawn buggies are likely to straddle the bike lane and the main travel lane creating situations where overtaking and passing cars and trucks will be more likely to attempt to pass in the free portion of the travel lane rather than wait for a clear oncoming lane.
The result will be passing vehicles yielding less space to horse drawn buggies when passing creating a more dangerous road environment in The Village.

4) Pedestrian Safety: I support the decision to install sidewalks along Sawmill Road to Golf Course Road, this is a situation that has been ignored for too long. I do however have concerns about the impact of widening the road surface and the implications for children crossing Sawmill Road and for students walking to and from Conestogo Public School.

5) Disruption: The comment was made by Regional Staff on October 5th that construction could be expected to last a year or more. This disruption to local businesses, residents and to Conestogo Public School is unacceptable. Of particular concern is the effect any construction would have of access to and departure from the Conestogo Fire Station by volunteer fire fighters responding to emergencies and the increased risk to public safety that the proposed construction will cause. Any proposed construction of Sawmill Road that is expected to last a year should be considered a non-viable option.

I do not believe that The Region has demonstrated they have sufficient knowledge of traffic usage patterns, vehicle mixes and vehicle speed distributions over Sawmill Road to adequately understand the implications of their proposed changes to Sawmill Road in the Village of Conestogo as the relate to their impact on the health and safety of the residents of Conestogo both during and after construction. Further, I do not believe that the residents of Conestogo were given an adequate opportunity to provide comments on all proposed designs for the reconstruction of Sawmill Road that were prepared by The Region. At a cost of over $5 million dollars and more than a year of construction to modify less than a mile of road, I do not believe that the proposed changes are in the best interest of the residents of Conestogo or the tax payers of The Region of Waterloo.

Based on the apparent deficiencies, the lack of information provide to evaluate The Region’s preferred option against other options and the lack of an appropriate consultation process I do not support the proposed changes to Sawmill Road in the Village of Conestogo.

Tim A

I am writing to you to express my concerns with the on-road parking provisions being proposed for the South Side of Sawmill Road within the Sawmill Road & Northfield Drive Improvements project. In the Region’s information package under point #3 "What Improvements are Being Considered?" (page 2 of 20) it says that the Region is considering a "provision for designated on-road parking on the south side of Sawmill Road from Glasgow Street to #1835 Sawmill Road and removal of existing on-road boulevard parking at all other locations within the project limits". I currently live at 1875 Sawmill Road with my wife and 2 children aged 4 & 7. We have lived at this location for 7 years and on-road parking has been a daily safety issue for us, to the point where we are prepared to move in the near future if this issue is not addressed.
As a terms of reference, if you look at the picture on the cover of your information package for this project, the red car and pick up truck on the left of the picture are parked in front of our property and our driveway would be located between the back of the pick up truck and the front of the third vehicle. That picture is showing a "light day" of parking on Sawmill Road and you can still see the problems we encounter with obstructed views while trying to exit our driveway safely. Currently due to on-road parking the task of backing our vehicles out of our driveway onto Sawmill Road is extremely dangerous and un-safe as our view of on-coming traffic approaching from both directions on Sawmill Road is blocked by vehicles parked on the street. Either my wife or myself has to stand at the end of our driveway and act as a traffic guard and signal to whichever one of us is driving the car when it is safe to back onto the street. If we are by ourselves we literally take our lives into our hands and try to back out of driveway without being struck by on-coming vehicle. I cannot tell you how many accidents have nearly taken place over the years as we try to safely exit our driveway. We have also tried to back into our driveway whenever possible, but that is not always possible depending on how heavy the traffic is on Sawmill Road. Even with backing into the driveway, we cannot see traffic until we are well onto the road due to the vehicles parking on either side of our driveway blocking our view. The second issue we have with parking on Sawmill Road is that at least once a month we have someone park right in front of our driveway and block our access into or out of our driveway. This issue is so bad that our neighbor at "Adam's Steakhouse" often calls the police and has resorted putting physical barriers and parking his SUV's in front of his property on Sawmill Road to prevent someone from blocking his driveway. Unfortunately this adds to our issue of blocked visibility when backing out of our driveway.

My concern with the Region's proposal is that: 1. our current on-road parking issue is not being addressed and 2. by eliminating the existing on-road boulevard parking at all other locations on Sawmill Road (i.e. North side of Sawmill) you are making the situation worse and increasing the hazards for those of us living on the South side of Sawmill as people will have nowhere else to park but on the South side of the road. My recommendation is that you prohibit all parking on both sides of Sawmill Road. There are only a handful of commercial businesses on Sawmill Road and all of these businesses have parking spaces/ lots contained within their lots to accommodate their customers or have the ability to do so (the only exception would be Fergus Fireplace). If you look at the Town of Bloomingdale just a few kilometers away from Conestogo, there is no on-road parking permitted anywhere on Sawmill Road and they have more commercial business on Sawmill than we do in Conestogo and it does not seem to be an issue in that Town. So it is possible to eliminate parking on Sawmill Road and I would strongly encourage you to do so to improve the safety of our community. I would gladly extend an invitation to yourself our any other staff members of the Region to come and meet me at my property so that you can see the extent of the issue for yourself. I hope that our safety concerns and issues of blocked access to our properties due to on-road parking will be taken into account.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Scott S   | My comments/concerns are twofold as a property owner and also as a Captain on the Conestogo Fire Station. As such, I have include below a brief description of my comments and concerns regarding the proposed Preferred Design as discussed.  

1. Sidewalk on east side of Northfield Drive from South Limits to Elgin Street – not required  
   First, as a property owner on the east side of Northfield Drive, I have a few concerns with the proposed corridor work. I believe the sidewalk should be excluded from the east side of the proposed Northfield Drive improvements. This sidewalk will not provide any greater benefit to homeowner's on the east side of this road than already exists, and comes with the added cost of surrendering 0.3 metres of my property. The existing conditions currently allow for safe roadside pedestrian travel. Additionally, the sidewalk does not provide a thoroughfare or direct pedestrian connection to anything other than Sawmill Road. It is also my belief that providing a wider corridor will increase traffic speeds.  

2. No Reserved Parking for Firefighters on Sawmill Road  
   Second, as a volunteer firefighter, I would like to comment on the insufficient reserved on-road parking on Sawmill Road, specifically in the direct vicinity of the Conestogo fire station. Currently, rollover curb and roadside parking are provided on both sides of Sawmill Road. Dedicated on-road parking spots are currently reserved for firefighters. The proposed design only incorporates on-road parking on the south side of Sawmill Road, which could potentially limit direct access of firefighters to the fire hall, if all the on-street parking is taken. Aligning all of the on-road parking on the south side of Sawmill Road may also provide opportunity to block fire vehicle access to the Right of Way. All of this could compromise the department’s response time targets and cost people their lives. |
| Rhonda W  | I live at 1796 Sawmill Road, and have been here for 9 years. At that time, the school had just introduced the addition of the primary and junior grades and a recent school addition to accommodate the additional children had just been completed. At that time I joined with a couple other townsfolk to try and bring the traffic speeding issue to the Region's attention. We had a meeting with Nancy Button and Bob Henderson in the fall of 2004 at which time all our requests for traffic calming or speed reduction measures were "politically" turned down. We were told to 'plant trees' 'ride bikes' etc  
   So we made the Conestogo Safety Advisory Committee and have had several successes in the last few years in joint efforts with the Township. The Region was helpful in a few areas when they were already doing work in the area, like sidewalks etc. But other than that we have had very little engagement or support from the Region with our attempts to slow traffic and more recently - thwart off the threat of gravel pits etc. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So here are my concerns with regards to the proposal:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trees- you are removing ones we just planted for quite a stretch down the road plus additional trees that are very old and majestic whose roots actually hold back the soil and hence we have a natural front not a retaining wall. The new wall- how will it go through the driveway retaining wall on my west side? Are you aware that my septic is out front of my house. Some houses have their wells out front- this type of construction has what insurance for well coverage that they don’t collapse or deteriorate in quality? My well is 4 years old and was over $9K to install.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sidewalks- thrilled to see they are coming but to what expense? Removal of the front of my lawn and neighbours? The presentation stopped at the bridge- is the sidewalk not continuing through to the Golf Course Road to connect to two ends of town? If so why not show it? Is the sidewalk actually getting wider at all- or just the road. Can we not have the sidewalk with more width and keep the road as is?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road widening- I was aghast at this- a dedicated bike route for 1.2 km through town on a Regional Road, that has no dedicated routes on any of the roads leaving town. What benefit could there possibly be for a cyclist for 1.2 km when they bike much more on much less on other Regional Roads in the area to the detriment of lawns, trees and properties in town? This additional space is dangerous to even label as “horse and buggy lane” as cars will attempt to pass at a speed that will be reckless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of parking- are you aware that the dedicated parking for the volunteer firemen on the north side of Sawmill Road was missing in the proposal? How can the engineers and surveyors possibly miss that? Do you realize the properties along Sawmill are commercial spaces? How does the structure of parking help any future business or enterprises in our town?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visibility from driveways and sideroads- how is anyone to pull out of their driveway or side street when it widens and has increase traffic flow? Are you installing stop signs or another set of lights to which we will have some traffic control? Winter snowbanks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am gravely concerned that the proposal is to help traffic flow through town and is against all measures we were told, to slow traffic down, especially in front of a school. My end of town has trucks so fast that we hear the engine brakes way before the bridge, and the 50km continues for quite a distance after the bridge. It was calculated the average speed was 54KM - documented from Region- at the school end and yet that has the lights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How are we to maintain any form of safety with this in place and potentially 1000 gravel trucks/week? Where else in Ontario are there dedicated bike lanes on Regional Roads- for 1.2 km only, and then the kids of town can’t use them due to traffic issues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have to imagine that in the design of this proposal, many other ideas were presented, and rejected for some reason or another- perhaps “back to the drawing board” would find a better solution, that benefits town and is cheaper on the dollar that actually makes sense- you get your road, we get sidewalks and traffic slowing measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ron S | 1) Provide more parking on north side of Sawmill Rd form Misty River to the Bahony to facilitate commercial operations at minimum Glasgow Street.  
2) Conduct a lighting study to compliment residential and commercial properties.  
3) Conduct a hydro study to eliminate overhead hydro in strategic locations.  
4) The posted speed limit of 50 km/hr is not safe where the Public School is; loaded gravel trucks do not have a safe stopping distance, the limit should be 40 km/hr.  
5) A landscape plan needs to be developed for the Village Historic Landscape.  
6) The sidewalk on the northside of Sawmill requires to be extended as agreed by the Township Council in 2003. |
| Val H | I handle the Crossing Guard program at the Township of Woolwich and I am looking for information on how a Crossing Guard would use the refuge island if it goes in. Do you have any information in it? I’m concerned about impacts on the Guard’s visibility. Let me know if you’ve seen anything on how Crossing Guards would use one. Thanks! |
### SAWMILL ROAD AND NORTHFIELD DRIVE IMPROVEMENTS

#### PCC COMMENT SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Comments Received</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Widening of Sawmill Road for Cycling/Buggy Lanes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Remove Most Boulevard Parking on Sawmill Road</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Installation of Sidewalk on the north side of Sawmill Road from Harriet St. to Golf Course Rd.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Installation of Sidewalk on Northfield Drive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Request for Reduced Posted Speed Limit on Sawmill Road</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Request for Restriction of Heavy Trucks on Sawmill Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Implementation of Traffic Calming Measures on Sawmill Road</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAWMILL ROAD
MUSSELMAN CRESCENT to CONESTOGO BRIDGE
RECOMMENDED DESIGN ALTERNATIVE

* SIDLWALK EXISTS ON SAWMILL ROAD FROM MUSSELMAN CRESCENT TO HARRIET STREET. SIDLWALK IS 1.5m WIDE FROM MUSSELMAN CRESCENT TO NORTHFIELD DRIVE AND 1.2m WIDE FROM NORTHFIELD DRIVE TO HARRIET STREET
NORTHFIELD DRIVE
SOUTH LIMITS OF CONESTOGO to COUNTRY SPRING WALK
RECOMMENDED DESIGN ALTERNATIVE.
Appendix E-2

Recommended Design Alternative

FIGURE 2 - RECOMMENDED DESIGN ALTERNATIVE
PROPOSED SIDEWALK ON NORTH SIDE OF SAWMILL ROAD (REGIONAL ROAD No. 17) FROM HARRIET STREET TO GOLF COURSE ROAD
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: May 29, 2012

FILE CODE: 7282

SUBJECT: CONSULTANT SELECTION – DETAILED DESIGN AND CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION SERVICES; IRA NEEDLES BOULEVARD WIDENING FROM HIGHVIEW DRIVE TO ERB STREET IN THE CITIES OF KITCHENER AND WATERLOO

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into a Consulting Services Agreement with MTE Consulting Ltd. to provide consulting engineering services for Detailed Design, Contract Administration and Construction Inspection Services associated with the Widening of Ira Needles Boulevard from Highview Drive to Erb Street at an upset fee limit of $259,284.00 plus applicable taxes for the design phase, with construction administration services to be paid on a time basis.

SUMMARY:

The Region of Waterloo intends to proceed with the widening of Ira Needles Boulevard from Highview Drive to Erb Street in the Cities of Kitchener and Waterloo. A Preliminary Design Study for the proposed improvements was completed in 2004. The estimated total cost of the widening is approximately $8 million. Approval for widening Ira Needles Blvd. was advanced from 2019 to 2015 by Regional Council on March 7, 2012 as outlined in Report P-12-026. The location of this project is shown on the key plan included in Appendix A. In order to begin the design for the widening of Ira Needles Boulevard, an engineering consultant must be hired now to undertake the project.

An invitation to submit Letters-of-Interest to provide engineering services for this assignment was advertised in the Kitchener-Waterloo Record. Six (6) firms submitted Letters-of-Interest. Three (3) firms were subsequently short-listed. The selection process for this assignment included price as an evaluation factor. Based on the evaluation criteria and review of the submitted work plans and fee estimates, the Consultant Selection Team recommends that MTE Consulting Ltd. be retained to undertake this assignment. Sufficient funds are available in the 2012 Ten Year Transportation Capital Program to initiate the detailed design process in 2012.

Staff were also requested to review the safety of the intersection of Yellow Birch Drive and Ira Needles Boulevard and are working with the City of Kitchener in conjunction with their traffic calming measures on nearby Highview Drive and will report back to Planning & Works committee in the Fall of 2012.

REPORT:

1. Background

The Environmental Assessment (EA) Study for Ira Needles Boulevard was originally completed in 1988, recognizing the need for a west side arterial extending from Highway 7/8 to Erb Street to serve the westerly expansion of the Cities of Kitchener and Waterloo.
The EA Study was updated in 2002 and a Preliminary Design Study was completed in 2004. The Preliminary Design Study identified the preferred ultimate design for Ira Needles Boulevard as a 4-lane urban arterial with cycling lanes, to be constructed initially with two through traffic lanes and cycling lanes. The road was constructed such that costs would be minimized when expanding to 4 lanes which included the construction of the sub-structure for the bridge over the GEXR railway and full depth paved shoulders in some sections of the road. Ira Needles Boulevard between Highview Drive and Erb Street is currently two lanes wide. Widening of this section of the road to a consistent 4-lane cross-section is required to provide additional capacity for future growth. The proposed work also includes widening of the existing bridge deck over the GEXR railway crossing north of Victoria Street and facilities for cyclists and pedestrians.

Funding is currently available in the approved 2012 Ten Year Transportation Capital Program for construction of the proposed works in 2015 as directed by Regional council on March 7, 2012, see report P-12-026. In order to begin the design for the widening of Ira Needles Boulevard, an engineering consultant must be hired now to undertake the project.

During the Planning & Works Committee meeting on February 28, 2012, Committee requested that staff review the safety of the intersection of Yellow Birch Drive and Ira Needles Boulevard. The City of Kitchener is reviewing traffic calming measures on Highview Drive which could cause vehicular infiltration onto Yellow Birch Drive and would increase the volume at the Yellow Birch Drive and Ira Needles Boulevard intersection. Transportation Engineering will conduct an operational review and report back to Planning & Works committee in the Fall of 2012. Any recommendations on this operational review will be incorporated into the consulting assignment and can be constructed with the widening of Ira Needles Boulevard.

A consultant selection process has been undertaken in order to retain an engineering consulting firm to complete the Detailed Design process, obtain approvals and provide Construction Administration services.

2. Consultant Selection

An invitation to submit Letters-of-Interest to provide engineering services was advertised in the Kitchener-Waterloo Record on Thursday March 22, 2012. Six (6) Letters-of-Interests were submitted and evaluated by the Consultant Selection Team which consisted of the following staff:

- Marcos Kroker, Senior Project Manager, Design and Construction Division
- Jason Lane, Senior Project Manager, Design and Construction Division
- Valerie MacQueen-Pearcey, Engineering Technologist, Transportation Division

The Consultant Selection Team short-listed the following three (3) firms:

- Stantec Consulting Ltd.
- Associated Engineering (Ont.) Ltd.
- MTE Consultants Inc.

The criteria used to evaluate the Letters-of-Interest, Work Plans and Fee Estimates were in accordance with the Region’s Purchasing Bylaw and included price as a factor in the selection process. These evaluation criteria and their respective weightings were as follows:

**Quality Factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Approach and Understanding</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of the Project Manager</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of the Project Support Staff</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience on Similar Projects</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Equity Factors

| Current Workload for Region | 3% |
| Local Office               | 2% |

Price Factor

| Upset Limit Fee | 15% |

The Work Plans submitted by the short-listed consultants demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of the components of the project, capable project teams and experience on similar projects.

Based on the review of Detailed Work Plans, and in consideration of the combination of quality, equity and price factors described above, MTE scored the highest of the three short-listed consultants. Therefore, based on the above evaluation criteria, including the review of the detailed work plans, schedules and upset fees provided, the Consultant Selection Team recommends that MTE Consultants Inc. be retained to undertake the detailed design, obtain approvals and provide contract administration for this project.

3. **Scope of Work**

The consultant selected for this assignment will be required to complete the following tasks:

- Preparation for a Public Information Centre
- Determine construction phasing and detours
- Coordinate Utility relocations
- Develop design for widening the existing road and the existing bridge over GEXR tracks
- Prepare detailed design drawings and specifications
- Obtain all required approvals
- Provide contract administration and on-site inspection services during construction

4. **Schedule**

Subject to Council’s approval of the consultant assignment, the proposed schedule for this assignment based on an accelerated design process, is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data collection and preparation of base plans</td>
<td>Summer/Fall 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Design and Approvals (Railway)</td>
<td>2013-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information Centre</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tender construction contract</td>
<td>Winter 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earliest possible start of Construction</td>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Consultant’s Upset Fee**

The short-listed consultants were requested to submit a fee quotation to complete the required scope of work. These quotations were based on an upset fee limit for services required to complete the Detailed Design process.
An estimated fee for construction administration and inspection services was also submitted by each short-listed consultant for budgetary purposes. As has been the Region’s practice, only the upset fee limit component was used in the selection process. MTE’s price was the lowest price submitted from the 3 short-listed consultants. The upset fee limit proposed by MTE Consulting Ltd. to complete the Detailed Design process is $259,284.00 plus applicable taxes.

For road reconstruction and widening projects such as Ira Needles Boulevard, the fees required for construction administration and inspection services can vary significantly depending on the final design, weather conditions, unforeseen conditions during construction, contractor performance, and other unknown variables. Since an upset fee limit does not lend itself well to these types of services, it has been the Region’s practice to pay for construction administration and inspection services on a time basis. The short-listed consultants were required to submit estimated construction administration and inspection fees based on a fixed construction period. The estimated fee proposed by MTE Consulting Ltd. for construction administration and inspection services is $158,396.00 plus applicable taxes. This is within the amount budgeted for this purpose in the approved 2012 Ten Year Transportation Capital Program.

A breakdown of the proposed upset fee limit for the Detailed Design is shown in Appendix B of this report.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The widening of Ira Needles Boulevard between Highview Drive and Erb Street, when complete, will support Focus Area 2 – Growth Management and Prosperity and meets strategic objective number two which is to develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs.

The Region’s consultant selection process supports Focus Area Six – Service Excellence of the Strategic Plan by meeting the objective to ensure services are responsive, efficient, effective and accountable.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The Region’s approved 2012 Ten Year Transportation Capital Program includes a total of $10.4 million for this project in the years 2012 to 2019 funded from the Development Charges and Road Capital Levy Reserve Funds. The currently estimated total cost of the Ira Needles Boulevard reconstruction and widening project is approximately $8 million. The estimated cost includes consulting services. Subject to Council approval, the project budget will be adjusted during the preparation of the 2013 Transportation Capital Program. The upset fee limit proposed by MTE Consulting Ltd. of $259,284.00 plus HST to complete the Detailed Design process is within the consulting fee allowance provided for in the total budget for this project.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

NIL

ATTACHMENTS

Appendix A: Project Key Plan
Appendix B: Breakdown of Consultant’s Fee Estimate

PREPARED BY: Marcos Kroeker, Senior Project Manager, Design and Construction

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

BREAKDOWN OF MTE’S UPSET FEE LIMIT
IRA NEEDLES BOULEVARD WIDENING – HIGHVIEW DRIVE TO ERB STREET
CITIES OF KITCHENER AND WATERLOO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Data collection and preparation of base plans</td>
<td>$40,144.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Agency and stakeholder liaison, Public Consultation, Utility coordination</td>
<td>$24,528.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Detailed Design</td>
<td>$44,188.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Project Management</td>
<td>$88,496.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Preparation of Drawings, Contract Documents &amp; Specifications</td>
<td>$55,928.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Disbursements</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL UPSET FEE LIMIT AND DISBURSEMENTS (excluding HST)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$259,284.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: May 29, 2012

FILE CODE: C04-30/PWC/WS.12

SUBJECT: KITCHENER WWTP PHASE 3 UPGRADES - ENGINEERING CONSULTING SERVICES FOR DETAILED DESIGN AND SERVICES DURING CONSTRUCTION

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo direct staff to enter into negotiations with AECOM for the extension of their existing agreement to include detailed design and services during construction of Phase 3 upgrades to the Kitchener WWTP as described in Report E-12-059 dated May 29, 2012 with the final agreement to be subject to Regional Council approval.

SUMMARY:

In order to accelerate project schedules for the delivery of key wastewater capital projects, Council approved a process in 2008 whereby the Region would initially award consulting assignments for the preliminary design of key wastewater projects and later extend these assignments with the same consultant to include the provision of consulting services during the detailed design and construction administration phases. The extensions would be subject to satisfactory completion of the preliminary design assignment, review of the proposal and upset fees by staff, successful fee negotiations, a detailed review of the proposal and upset fees by an independent consultant, and Council approval of the extension.

AECOM was retained by the Region in June 2010 to complete a preliminary design for Phase 3 of the Kitchener WWTP Upgrades. The preliminary design is nearly complete and Region staff has been satisfied with AECOM’s performance to date. It is recommended that the Regional Municipality of Waterloo direct staff to enter into negotiations with AECOM for the extension of their existing agreement to include detailed design and services during construction of Phase 3 upgrades to the Kitchener WWTP. Subject to successful negotiations staff will submit a future recommendation for Council approval.

REPORT:

Background

The 2007 Wastewater Treatment Master Plan Update (WWTMP) recommended major upgrades to the Kitchener WWTP and the work was planned in three phases, as follows:

- Phase 1: Manitou Drive Dewatering Facility – completed in February 2012;
- Phase 2: Upgrades to Plant 2 aeration, new UV disinfection and effluent pumping station currently under construction; and
- Phase 3: Construction of Plant 3 and associated upgrades.
The preliminary design of the Phase 3 upgrades is nearly complete and the Region must now select an engineering consultant to complete the detailed design and services during construction.

**Consultant Selection Process**

In 2008, the Region completed a project delivery review to optimize the implementation of this project and other large wastewater projects (Report E-08-010). In order to accelerate project schedules and to increase the efficiency for the delivery of key wastewater capital projects, Council approved a process whereby the Region would initially award consulting assignments for the preliminary design of key wastewater projects and later extend these assignments with the same consultant to include the provision of consulting services during the detailed design and construction administration phases. The extensions would be subject to satisfactory completion of the preliminary design assignment, review of the proposal and upset fees by staff, successful fee negotiations, a detailed review of the proposal and upset fees by an independent Consultant, and Council approval of the extension. The Kitchener WWTP Upgrades was identified as one of these key wastewater projects from the WWTMP.

Based on the Council approved approach for consultant selection for the Kitchener WWTP upgrades (Report E-08-010), the Region initiated a competitive engineering consultant selection process for Phase 3 engineering services in February 2010. AECOM had the highest overall score and lowest total estimated cost for the assignment and in June 2010, Council awarded the preliminary design phase of the assignment to AECOM at an upset fee limit of $2,098,275 (plus applicable taxes) (Report E-10-071).

As Region staff has been satisfied with AECOM’s performance to date and the scope of work for the detailed design and services during construction has been defined during the preliminary design, the actual scope of work can be compared to the one used in February 2010, and an extension to the existing agreement can be negotiated.

The advantages of extending the current agreement with AECOM include time savings and maintaining one source of responsibility throughout the design phase and construction phase of the project. Extension of the current agreement could save the Region up to one year, as compared to engaging in a new procurement process and potentially selecting a new consultant. This time savings is essential in order to honor the Region’s commitment to the public and to Government Agencies to improve effluent quality to the Grand River by 2018.

**Recommended Approach to Negotiation of Extension of Existing Agreement**

Based on the above, it is recommended that Regional staff enter into negotiations with AECOM for the extension of their existing agreement to include detailed design and services during construction of Phase 3 upgrades to the Kitchener WWTP. If so directed by Council, staff will conduct negotiations with AECOM and bring forward a recommendation regarding a possible extension of AECOM’s current engineering services agreement for the project, likely in the fall of 2012. Staff will use the fee estimates provided by AECOM in 2010 as a benchmark for the negotiations and the negotiated upset fee will be subject to an independent engineering peer review.
CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The Kitchener WWTP Upgrades supports the Corporate Strategic Plan Focus Areas 1 and 2: Environmental Sustainability and Growth Management and Prosperity, respectively; and the following strategic objectives: protect the quality and quantity of our water sources, and develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

In 2008, Report E-08-010 estimated a consulting fee range of $31 to 35.5 million (in 2008 dollars) for Kitchener WWTP biosolids and process upgrades and five consulting assignments have been awarded to date as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant Assignment</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Upset Fees (excluding taxes)</th>
<th>Planning and Works Committee Report #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detailed design and Services during construction of the Manitou Biosolids Dewatering Facility (Phase 1)</td>
<td>Hydromantis Inc.</td>
<td>$2.2 M</td>
<td>E-08-083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Design and Services during construction of the UV disinfection facility and effluent pumping station (Phase 2)</td>
<td>CH2M Hill</td>
<td>$2.7 M</td>
<td>E-09-021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Design and Services during construction of the Plant 2 Aeration Upgrades (Phase 2)</td>
<td>CH2M Hill</td>
<td>$2.0 M</td>
<td>E-09-057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3 preliminary design services</td>
<td>AECOM</td>
<td>$2.1 M</td>
<td>E-10-071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract 1 – Lagoon decommissioning and digested sludge pumping - detailed design and services during construction (part of Phase 3)</td>
<td>AECOM</td>
<td>$1.9 M</td>
<td>E-12-035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$10.9 M</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remaining estimated consulting fee range allocated for the Phase 3 detailed design and services during construction (after adjusting to 2012 dollars and accounting for inflation during the multi-year term of the assignment) is $23.7 to $29 million.

The Council-approved 2012 10-year Wastewater Capital Program includes a budget of $327,812,000.00 between 2012 and 2020 for upgrading the Kitchener WWTP. The estimated engineering consulting fees for the Phase 3 detailed design and services during construction are included in the capital budget.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Staff from Water Services, Design and Construction, Financial Services and Regional Councilors will be involved in the work plan and fee negotiations with AECOM.

ATTACHMENTS

NIL

PREPARED BY:  
José Bicudo, Senior Project Engineer, Water Services  
Jo-Anne Ing, Senior Project Manager, Design and Construction

APPROVED BY:  
Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation & Environmental Services
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COMMENT SHEET
1.0 What is the Purpose of this Public Consultation Centre (PCC) #2?

The Regional Municipality of Waterloo is undertaking a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) study of the Manitou Drive corridor between Courtland Avenue/Fairway Road and Bleams Road within the City of Kitchener. (Please see Figure 1 – Key Plan of Study Limits.)

The study is intended to examine traffic congestion issues, a new bridge over Schneider Creek, traffic safety, access management, road widening; intersection improvement alternatives, and the impacts of various design concepts on the natural and social environments, including the historic “German Mills” area, and property acquisition needs. The study will also assess opportunities to enhance facilities for cyclists, pedestrians and transit.

The public is invited to this Public Consultation Centre (PCC) #2 to provide comments and input regarding the planning and development of alternatives; as well as the Project Study Team’s Preferred Design Concept. This is the second PCC meeting for this project.

This Consultation Centre is a forum for you to:

- Learn of the current and projected future traffic demands and operational issues on Manitou Drive and within the immediate surrounding area;
- Review the alternative preliminary design concepts being considered to address traffic needs;
- Become aware of the environmental (natural, social, cultural/heritage and cost) issues being considered;
- Learn how the alternative design concepts were evaluated, leading to the selection of the Preferred Design Concept;
- Review the proposed property impacts and potential acquisitions arising from the Preferred Design Concept; and
- Review other details of the project as part of the Class EA process and provide feedback on the conclusions and recommendations to date.

We ask that you complete the Comment Sheet attached to the back of this Information Package and put it in the box at the Consultation Centre, or send it to the address indicated on the Comment Sheet. Your comments will be considered, along with other information received over the course of the project to assist in reaching final conclusions and recommendations related to a Recommended Preferred Design Concept.

2.0 What is a Class Environmental Assessment?

The Class EA is a formal planning process approved under the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act.

The Class EA provides the framework for municipalities to incorporate public consultation and ensure public awareness of municipal project decisions in the planning, designing, and constructing of municipal infrastructure projects. This project is being planned as a Schedule C Class EA project.

Additional information about the Class EA process is displayed at this Public Consultation Centre.
3.0 What are the Limits of the Class EA Study?

The limits of the Class EA for Manitou Drive extend from Fairway Road to Bleams Road. Currently, Manitou Drive is 4 lanes wide from Fairway Road to Webster Road and 2 lanes wide from Webster Road to Bleams Road.

The Manitou Drive Class EA is being conducted concurrently with the River Road Extension Class EA, also being completed by the Region of Waterloo. The River Road Extension Class EA is considering extending River Road to the west from its terminus at King Street East to the intersection of Bleams Road and Manitou Drive.

The results of the River Road Extension Class EA will not be known until after completion of the Manitou Drive Class EA process and as such, analysis of options being considered for the Manitou Drive Class EA will include both options for River Road being extended and River Road not being extended.

4.0 Who is Directing This Project?

The Class EA is being directed by a Project Team consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo and the City of Kitchener, plus Regional Councillor Jean Haalboom and City of Kitchener Councillor John Gazzola. The engineering consulting firm of McCormick Rankin has been retained to assist with this Class EA study.

5.0 Why are We Undertaking This Project?

5.1 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN (RTMP)

The Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) identifies transportation policies and network improvements to 2031 with the goals of optimizing the transportation system, promoting transportation choice, fostering a strong economy and supporting sustainable development. The RTMP prioritizes walking, cycling and public transit improvements to support Rapid Transit, and identifies strategic road improvements in addition to providing strategies for the future to address parking, goods movement and Transportation Demand Management.

The RTMP identified Manitou Drive, between Bleams Road and Webster Road, to need capacity improvements before 2021. This would support the RTMP goal of optimizing the transportation system and fostering a strong economy. The RTMP also identified a priority to extend River Road from King Street to Manitou Drive at the intersection of Bleams Road before 2021.

5.2 WALK CYCLE WATERLOO REGION

Walk Cycle Waterloo Region is the Region of Waterloo’s plan to improve active transportation (e.g. walking, cycling, etc.) in our community. In part, it deals with priorities to develop a network of cycling and walking facilities in the Region and is being developed concurrent with the Manitou Drive Class EA. Walk Cycle Waterloo Region builds upon the 2004 Regional Cycling Master Plan, which identified a core off-road cycling route along Schneider Creek through the study area. In consultation with the staff for Walk Cycle Waterloo Region, the Project Team for
the Manitou Drive Class EA has proposed that on-road cycling lanes and sidewalks be provided on both sides of Manitou Drive and that a multi-use trail crossing of Manitou Drive for pedestrians and cyclist be provided beneath the new bridge at Schneider Creek.

6.0 **What are the Current and Future Traffic Conditions along Manitou Drive?**

6.1 **ROADWAY TRAFFIC**

A transportation study has been completed, which includes a complete review of existing and projected future traffic operations within the study limits, and an analysis of possible improvement alternatives. The review evaluated measures of vehicle delay, queuing and collisions in the Manitou Drive corridor.

The primary conclusions of the transportation study are that the existing capacity of Manitou Drive, which is partly 2 lanes wide and partly 4 lanes wide, is limited by the capacity of the intersections at Courtland Avenue/Fairway Road and at Bleams Road and by friction from left turns at numerous locations. This results in:

- lengthy delays for all movements at the Manitou Drive and Courtland Avenue/Fairway Road intersection;
- lengthy delays for traffic entering or exiting Webster Road; and
- lengthy vehicle queues within the project limits, specifically for south-bound traffic at Bleams Road, west-bound left-turn traffic at Fairway Road and for traffic exiting Webster Road.

All the above problems exist for the current traffic levels during the PM peak traffic period and are expected to worsen with expected growth in traffic volumes.

In addition, a greater number of collisions than expected have been identified within the study limits, most notably rear-end collisions at the intersection of Manitou Drive and Fairway Road/Courtland Avenue and on Manitou Drive between Bleams Road and Cress Lane. Manitou Drive between Bleams Road and Cress Lane ranked 5th worst in the Region for roll-over collisions.

6.2 **PUBLIC TRANSIT, PEDESTRIANS AND CYCLISTS**

Currently the Manitou Drive corridor is served by public transit. Within the study limits, Grand River Transit Bus Route 12 services west Kitchener / Waterloo and north Waterloo with stops along Westmount Road, Fairway Road and University Avenue. The route operates on a 15 minute schedule during the week and on a 30 minute weekend schedule.

Within the study limits, Manitou Drive has no sidewalk facilities, except on the west side of the road near the Fairway Road intersection. Sidewalk facilities are also found on the north side of Bleams Road. Based on the Region’s Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines, 2.1m sidewalks and 1.5m cycling lanes are to be considered along both sides of Manitou Drive.
The preliminary route for the Trans Canada Trail within the study limits is from Schneider Creek northerly along Manitou Drive to Fairway Road. It is proposed that the trail would cross Manitou Drive under a new bridge and extend northerly along both sides of the corridor. The Project Team will continue consultation with the City of Kitchener regarding the City’s requirements for enhanced trail features for the trail crossing beneath the bridge at Schneider Creek and for connectivity with planned extension of the City’s trail west of Manitou Drive beside the north bank of Schneider Creek. During the design stage of the Trans Canada Trail, the trail design team will consider opportunities for historical interpretation of the “German Mills” area.

6.3 SCHNEIDER CREEK BRIDGE

Deterioration of the existing bridge on Manitou Drive across Schneider Creek requires annual inspection and evaluation. Previously, minor repairs have been made to the structure, including the installation of armour stone in 2011 to protect the foundations from scouring by the creek. A structural evaluation was completed for this Class EA study, which determined that the existing structure should be replaced in conjunction with other proposed road improvements. A load restriction is currently in place which applies to Manitou Drive between Fairway Road /Courtland Avenue and Bleams Road. The restriction’s main purpose is to restrict overall vehicle loads that are in excess of 70 tonnes or any vehicle load that exceeds 5 tonnes per axle from crossing the Schneider Creek Bridge on Manitou Drive. Any vehicle carrying a load in excess of these restrictions requires a Special Oversized Load Permit. The replacement would provide additional width for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists and provide sufficient clearance height beneath the bridge for the existing Schneider Creek Trail for pedestrians and cyclists to cross under Manitou Drive. The existing trail at this location follows the north bank of Schneider Creek and is proposed for future expansion by the City of Kitchener.

6.4 PROBLEM STATEMENT

Manitou Drive is a key component to the Region of Waterloo’s transportation system. It runs north-south through the study area and provides an important transportation link between the industrial basin in south Kitchener, the Fairway Road commercial area and the residential areas to the north and south.

Without future investments in capacity and operational improvements on Manitou Drive, daily congestion will continue to be an issue for the residents and businesses located along the corridor. Provision of sufficient north-south transportation capacity for the study area in the future has been identified in a number of transportation studies. These transportation studies confirmed that in the long-term, Manitou Drive, between Bleams Road and Webster Road, requires capacity improvements. In addition, facilities for travel by pedestrians and cyclists are missing or deficient and disconnected through the study area.

The purpose of this study is to confirm the need and justification for improvements to Manitou Drive between Fairway Road and Bleams Road and to identify a recommended solution and preliminary design for improvements. The focus of the work is to address, wherever possible, the current operational and safety deficiencies and to improve overall traffic flow and safety.
The Project Team has developed the following problem statement for the project, identifying the traffic and transportation needs to be addressed as part of this study:

### PROBLEM STATEMENT
**MANITOU DRIVE CLASS EA**

- Road improvements are required to reduce delays, queuing, and collisions for the current traffic conditions, as well as for the expected future traffic growth up to 2031 and beyond, in the Manitou Drive corridor;
- The existing bridge over Schneider Creek is in need of repair or replacement;
- There is a need to accommodate cycling, walking and transit use with a high level of service and network connectivity; and
- The extension of the River Road corridor would not alleviate the need for improvements within the Manitou Drive corridor.

### 7.0 What Work Has Been Done to Date?

Public Consultation Centre (PCC) No. 1 was held on March 2, 2012 to obtain comments from the public and agencies with respect to identifying the problems and issues to be addressed as part of the project. To date, the Project Team has completed or started the following works:

- A transportation study, including a complete review of existing and future traffic operations within the study limits, and analysis of possible improvement alternatives;
- A review and analysis of collision history along Manitou Drive, from 2006 to 2011;
- Topographical survey of the Manitou Drive corridor and preparation of base plans;
- An inventory and assessment of the natural environment (trees, watercourses, drainage crossings, aquatic and terrestrial habitat) within the corridor;
- An inventory and assessment of the social environment (including land use, and adjacent properties) within the corridor;
- A Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Report for the study corridor;
- A Built Heritage Report for the study corridor;
- An evaluation of Alternative Planning Solutions and selection of the Preferred Planning Solution in conjunction with the Class EA process;
- Development of Alternative Design Concepts to address the Problem Statement;
- Evaluation of Alternative Design Concepts, Environmental Impacts and Project Costs (Construction and Property), leading to the selection of the Preferred Design Concept; and
- Refinement of various details of the Preferred Design Concept.
8.0 What Alternative Solutions Were Considered to Address the Problems/Needs on Manitou Drive?

The following Preliminary Alternative Solutions were considered to address the problems along Manitou Drive. Some of the solutions were found to provide benefit when combined with others, while others were determined not to address the problem which has been identified. These alternative solutions were presented at the first PCC.

- **ALTERNATIVE 1 - “DO NOTHING”**
  
  As part of any Class EA process, there is always a consideration of the “Do Nothing” alternative to assess what would happen if no action is taken to address the study concerns. This assessment provides a baseline against which the other alternative solutions can be measured.

- **ALTERNATIVE 2 - INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS/ROUNDABOUTS**
  
  Roundabout screening tools, which test the feasibility of roundabouts, were prepared for the intersections of Fairway Road and Manitou Drive as well as for Bleams Road and Manitou Drive. The Bleams Road and Manitou Drive intersection supported carrying forward roundabout alternatives for evaluation. Signalized intersection improvement design concepts were carried forward for evaluation at the Fairway Road and Manitou Drive Intersection. The Transportation Study has determined that Intersection Improvements together with Road Widening would address the problem.

- **ALTERNATIVE 3 - ROAD WIDENING OF MANITOU DRIVE**
  
  The alternative of widening Manitou Drive by adding more traffic lanes within the study limits would provide increased traffic capacity and address existing and future traffic congestion issues. All road widening options will consider a new bridge structure over Schneider Creek to accommodate the widening of Manitou Drive. All road widening options will include efforts to maintain the existing Canadian Pacific Railway bridge without modification. The Transportation Study has determined that Intersection Improvements together with Road Widening, either to four lanes or two lanes plus a center-turn-lane, would address the problem.

- **ALTERNATIVE 4 - ACCESS MANAGEMENT**
  
  Some of the existing traffic and safety issues may be attributed to vehicles attempting to enter and exit properties along Manitou Drive. Access management initiatives on Manitou Drive would not adequately address the problem of vehicle delay and congestion. Consideration may be given to consolidating and restricting accesses within the study limits as a part of the Preferred Solution.

- **ALTERNATIVE 5 - IMPROVING TRANSIT SERVICE**
  
  Measures to improve the level of transit service within the corridor are being considered. These measures may potentially reduce reliance on vehicle travel and thereby reduce traffic on Manitou Drive. Improving Transit Service targets as identified in the RTMP will be a part of the Preferred Solution.

- **ALTERNATIVE 6 - UPGRADE, EXPAND OR BUILD OTHER ROUTES**
  
  The planning, design and construction of new north-south road corridors or the increase in capacity of other existing corridors may reduce the demands on Manitou Drive by diverting
existing and future traffic demand away from Manitou Drive. Options to upgrade, expand or build other routes have been examined in the 2010 RTMP update study, which identified Manitou Drive, between Bleams Road and Webster Road, to have capacity improvements before 2021.

The Region is undertaking a Class EA for the extension of River Road from King Street to Manitou Drive at Bleams Road. If the River Road Extension Class EA results in approval of the River Road extension, it would alter the volume of future traffic through the Manitou Drive corridor.

The Transportation Study Report for the Manitou Drive Class EA concludes that some improvements to the Manitou Drive corridor are required with or without the future extension of River Road. For the Manitou Drive Class EA, all of the alternative solutions will be evaluated based on:

a) River Road being extended from King Street to Manitou Drive; as well as
b) River Road not being extended from King Street to Manitou Drive.

Taking this approach will allow the Project Team for the Manitou Drive Class EA to implement the Manitou Drive improvements that are needed, with or without River Road Extension.

PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE SOLUTION

The Project Team has identified a combination of Alternative 2 – Intersection Improvements and Alternative 3 – Widening of Manitou Drive as the Preferred Alternative Solution. Improvements to Transit Service as identified in the RTMP and consideration of access management will also be carried forward in the Preferred Solution.

9.0 What Comments were received at PCC No. 1?

At PCC No. 1, held on March 2, 2012, comments sheets were provided that asked attendees to respond to a number of questions, as well as explain any other issues associated with the study area. The responses received are thoroughly summarized in Appendix A. The responses included:

- Recognition/agreement with the problem;
- Support for widening of Manitou Drive;
- Support for improved pedestrian and cycling facilities and trail connection;
- Concerns with impact of road widening on private property use, driveways, grading and access and redevelopment concerns;
- Concern about potential impacts on Schneider Creek, wetlands impacts and the Regional flood plain; and
- Requests for signals at other intersections.
10.0 **What Alternative Design Concepts are Being Evaluated?**

Based on the screening of the Alternative Solutions noted in the previous section, two alternative design concepts were developed for the Preferred Solution. Both alternative design concepts consist of combinations of intersection improvements, widening, sidewalks and on-road cycling lanes on both sides of Manitou Drive. Other elements of the Alternative Design Concepts were also considered and evaluated by the Project Team, including alternative intersection types, continuous center median, multi-use trails for pedestrians and cyclists, and alternative boulevard widths. Each of the Alternative Design Concepts that are being carried forward includes the appropriate elements. The Project Team has developed the following alternative design concepts for presentation at this PCC (As illustrated in Appendix B):

**Alternative Design Concept No. 1 – Maintain Two Lanes with Two-Way Centre Turning Lane**

This alternative would increase overall capacity of the transportation corridor by removing left turning vehicles from the through lanes, improving intersection capacity and thereby improving operations of the corridor.

This alternative is a 3-lane road with 1.5 m wide cycling lanes and 2.6m wide curb-face concrete sidewalk (on both sides of the road) with a 2-lane roundabout at Bleams Road and a signalized intersection at Fairway Road. This option includes a single westbound left-turn lane from Fairway Road onto Manitou Drive if River Road is extended and dual left-turn lanes if River Road is not being extended. The intersections of Fairway Road and Bleams Road will flare from one lane to two in each direction plus additional turn lanes.

**Alternative Design Concept No. 2 – Widen Manitou Drive to Four (4) Lanes**

This alternative would increase overall capacity of the transportation corridor by providing two (2) lanes in each direction and thereby improving operations of the corridor.

This alternative is a 4-lane road with 1.5 m wide cycling lanes and 2.6m wide curb-face concrete sidewalk (on both sides of the road) with a 2-lane roundabout at Bleams Road and a signalized intersection at Fairway Road. This option includes a single westbound left-turn lane from Fairway Road onto Manitou Drive if River Road is extended and dual left-turn lanes if River Road is not being extended.

**Replacement of the Schneider Creek Bridge**

Both of the Alternative Design Concepts being evaluated require replacement of the existing Schneider Creek Bridge to accommodate the required vehicle lanes, cycling lanes and sidewalks. The proposed bridge will provide sufficient height and width for a multi-use trail for pedestrians and cyclists to cross beneath the bridge on the north bank of Schneider Creek. The road design vertical alignment will be raised to match the increased bridge height. The span of the bridge is required to provide a sufficient size of opening for the creek to control the Regional flood impact. The proposed bridge design concept is the same for both Alternative Design Concepts No. 1 and No. 2.

**Roundabouts versus Signalized Intersections**

The Project Team considered the use of roundabouts at both existing signalized intersections of Manitou Drive at Fairway Road and Bleams Road. At the intersection of Manitou Drive and Fairway Road, a 2-lane roundabout would function well for reduction of vehicle delay and
congestion and would result in a reduction in serious collisions involving injuries. However, the roundabout would require property acquisition, including a “full buyout” of an existing business. The Project Team determined that the benefits of a roundabout at the Fairway Road intersection would be outweighed by the additional cost in comparison to signalized intersection improvements and therefore a roundabout at this intersection is not being recommended.

An intersection control study was completed for the Manitou Drive/Bleams Road intersection as part of the River Road Extension Class EA, which determined that a 2-lane roundabout would function well for reducing vehicle delay, congestion and serious collisions involving injuries. The estimated cost, including construction, utility relocations, property acquisition and the cost for injury collisions was determined to be lower for a roundabout in comparison to signalized intersection improvements at this location.

After consideration of the forecasted transportation requirements for the intersection of Manitou Drive and Bleams Road, the Project Team for the Manitou Drive Improvements determined that a roundabout is recommended at the intersection of Manitou Drive and Bleams Road, with or without the River Road Extension.

11.0 What is the Project Team’s Preferred Alternative Design Concept?

Based on the evaluation criteria and the evaluation of the alternative design concepts as outlined in Appendix C, the Project Team has identified Alternative Design Concept No. 1 - Two-Way Centre Turning Lane as the Preferred Alternative Design Concept.

12.0 What are the Advantages of Alternative Design Concept No. 1?

As outlined in Appendix C, the advantages of Alternative Design Concept No. 1 in comparison to Alternative Design Concept 2 are as follows:

- Lower property requirement;
- Less Capital Cost;
- No Impacts on Built Heritage features;
- Less impacts to existing vegetation and wetlands;
- Less increase in impervious areas minimizes storm runoff to Schneider Creek;
- Less impacts to commercial entrances; and
- Provides connections to existing and proposed trails, and provides sidewalks and on-road cycling lanes on both sides of Manitou Drive without the need for a separate tunnel for pedestrians beneath the CP-Rail crossing.
13.0 What Provisions will be made for improved Pedestrian, Cycling and Public Transit?

The Preliminary Preferred Design Concept has made provisions for alternative modes of travel by incorporating the following:

- Continuous sidewalks on both sides of the road throughout the entire project limits;
- Continuous on-road cycling lanes on both sides of the road throughout the entire project limits;
- Link to the existing trail currently located along Schneider Creek, and to the proposed Trans Canada Trail, including a multi-use trail for pedestrians and cyclists beneath the bridge at Schneider Creek; and
- Bus stop considerations as recommended by Grand River Transit.

14.0 Property Impacts and Acquisition

While it is the intent of the design process to minimize or avoid the need to acquire property, the proposed road design for both Alternative Design Concepts involve acquisition of private property. The amount and exact location of land needing to be acquired will not be known until a Recommended Design Alternative has been approved. Exact property acquisition requirements will be developed as part of the detailed final design after approval of the Class EA.

For any property to be acquired as identified by the final approved design, the owner would be reimbursed by the Region of Waterloo for the required land at fair market value. An independent appraisal will be completed for the land based upon recent local sales to determine fair market value. For further information regarding property acquisition, please see the Property Acquisition Process Information Sheet in Appendix D.

Proposed preliminary land acquisitions for each design alternative are shown on the plans on display at the May 30, 2012 Public Consultation Centre.

15.0 Impacts to Schneider Creek and Regional Water Supply Wells

Improvements on Manitou Drive and reconstruction of the Schneider Creek Bridge have raised concerns about the potential impact on Schneider Creek, as well as on two of the Region’s production water supply wells and related pump station facilities located on the west side of Manitou Drive near the north bank of Schneider Creek. In addition, monitoring wells exist on the opposite side of Manitou Drive from the two production water supply wells. The potential for any adverse impacts of proposed road improvements on both Schneider Creek and the water supply wells is being reviewed as part of this Class EA. The Class EA study will also identify measures for mitigating any adverse impacts that the proposed Manitou Drive road improvements might cause to Schneider Creek and/or the source water to the two water supply wells in question. Both the Grand River Conservation Authority and staff from the Region’s Hydrogeology and Source Water group are being consulted as part of this Manitou Drive Class EA study.
16.0 Tree Removals

This project will likely require some trees to be removed. These trees will be replaced (two new trees for each one removed) where space permits in the road allowance and in consultation with the adjacent property owners. Potential tree removals are identified on the display boards.

17.0 Landscaping

Landscaping in the form of street trees and other suitable low-height vegetation will be incorporated in this project where appropriate and where space permits in the road allowance.

18.0 Reinstatement of Lawns and Driveways

Wherever possible, lawns and driveways will be reinstated to their pre-construction state. However, due to the nature of the work being considered, there may be some driveways and lawns that will be significantly altered from their existing condition. The grading of slopes will be altered and in some cases retaining walls will be provided. Potential alterations to driveways and lawns are identified on the display boards at the PCC. After completion of the Class EA, the final detailed design for the road improvements will determine the precise extent of the alterations that would result from the Recommended Design Concept.

19.0 Traffic During Construction, Detours and Closures

Replacement of the bridge that carries Manitou Drive over Schneider Creek is expected to require complete closure of Manitou Drive for approximately eight months. Signage will be placed well in advance of the closure advising the detour and duration of the closure. In addition, there will be times when the nature and extent of the construction work will require short-term temporary closures of one or more of the side streets.

A detailed construction staging and traffic management plan will be developed during final design that will include identification of all detour routes. Detours using Local City roads such as Wabanaki Drive and Wilson Avenue, which are City of Kitchener streets, will be considered in consultation with the City of Kitchener.

20.0 What are the Next Steps for This Class EA Study?

The Project Team will use the comments obtained from the public during this Public Consultation Centre to refine project details and prepare a Recommended Design Concept. The next steps in the Class EA process will include:

- Preliminary Design detailing of the Preferred Design Concept;
- Circulation of plans to agencies, railway, utility authorities, and other interested parties. The utility authorities may identify requirements for new utilities or replacement and/or relocation of existing facilities in conjunction with the construction of road improvements;
- Final cost estimating;
- Recommendation to Regional Council; and
- Completion and filing of the Environmental Study Report.
It is anticipated that Region Planning and Works Committee and Council, will consider final approval of a Recommended Design Concept for this project in the Fall of 2012. After Council approval of a Recommended Design Concept, the Environmental Study Report will be ‘filed’ on the public record for a 30-day review period. This filing will be advertised by mail-outs and notices in newspapers. If someone feels that the study did not fully address all of the issues, they can request that the Minister of Environment order the Project to a more detailed Environmental Assessment (Part II Order). 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 proceed to detailed design and construction. It is anticipated that implementation of improvements will begin in 2015.

21.0 How Will I Receive Further Notification Regarding This Project?

Adjacent property owners and members of the public registering at this Public Consultation Centre will receive all forthcoming additional information, and will be notified by mail of future meetings. Advertisements will also be placed in local newspapers advising the public of the availability of the final Environmental Study Report for review.

22.0 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 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 one of the Project Team members listed below, no later than June 19, 2012.

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

- Mr. Wayne Cheater, P. Eng., Senior Project Manager
  Region of Waterloo
  150 Frederick Street, 6th Floor
  Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3
  Telephone: (519) 575-4757 ext. 3183
  Fax: (519) 575-4430
  Email: wcheater@regionofwaterloo.ca

- Mr. Dan Green, P. Eng., Project Manager
  McCormick Rankin Corporation
  72 Victoria Street South
  Kitchener, ON N2G 4Y9
  Telephone: (519) 741-1464
  Fax: (519) 741-8884
  Email: dgreen@mrc.ca

23.0 How Can I View Project Information Following the PCC?

All of the PCC display materials and other relevant project information, notifications of upcoming meetings and contact information are available for viewing at the Region of Waterloo municipal offices as identified above. Alternatively, you may visit the Region’s website at www.regionofwaterloo.ca.
APPENDIX A: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM PCC No. 1

At PCC No. 1, held on February 2, 2012, comments sheets were provided that asked attendees to respond to a number of questions, as well as explain any other issues associated with the study area. The responses received are summarized below:

Do you think there are any other problems or needs that should be considered and added to the project Problem Statement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th># of Responses</th>
<th>Project team Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make it a one way street, it does not need widening</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Converting Manitou Drive to a one-way street is currently not an alternative being considered due to the lack of parallel route to counterbalance the removed direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle lanes and sidewalk. Continuation of bike lanes to other sections.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Both design concepts include sidewalks and cycling lanes. The multi-use trail under the bridge in this section of Manitou Drive will improve the active transportation network in this area and provide links to other future sections. The inclusion of cycling lanes is in accordance with the Regional Cycling Master Plan which identifies key cycling networks and establishes guidelines for the Region in working with local municipalities and other stakeholders toward an integrated network of regional, local and off-road routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce traffic lights at Webster and Manitou Drive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>This intersection does not warrant signals and the Region does not support the installation of unwarranted traffic control signals for a number of reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Studies indicate that twice as many collisions occur at a signalized intersection compared to a stop controlled intersection with similar traffic volumes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- A 2-year before / after study of 47 signals in the Region documented a 20% increase in overall collisions after signalization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Excluding angle collisions, injury collision increased by 70%. Studies also indicate that signals generally do not improve pedestrian safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Installation of unwarranted signals has a negative impact on the environment. Unnecessary driver delays leads to increased fuel consumption, carbon emissions and noise, as vehicles stop and start more often and idle at red lights.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The attitude of drivers must change so they are willing to seek other forms of transportation and reduce traffic congestion while improving those other forms of transportation. This will reduce costs to the municipality.

| Future traffic projections should include future development within the study area. | 1 | Potential development and zoning of existing lands are considered during the traffic analysis and future traffic projections. |

**Are there any other Evaluation Criteria that you think should be considered?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th># of Responses</th>
<th>Project team Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should include impacts to future business and promoting future business. The City has a shortage of accessible serviced employment lands and many future employment opportunities exist along Manitou.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Potential development and zoning of existing lands are considered in the traffic analysis and future traffic projections.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you have any additional suggestions for possible solutions or alternatives to address the problem/needs?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th># of Responses</th>
<th>Project team Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If the Region extends Bleams Road and also extends Block Line Road the section of Manitou Drive that you want to make 4 lanes will not be necessary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Traffic analysis and projections have been completed considering both the Bleams Road extension proceeding or not proceeding. Our analysis indicates that improvements to Manitou Drive are required with both options with very little change in the overall volumes. The Project Team preferred alternative design concept is a 3 lane option, 2 lanes with a 2 way centre left turn lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike lanes on road, roll curbs – escape for bike</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cycling lanes are included in both alternative design concepts. While roll curbs could offer an escape for the roadway, roll curbs do not provide sufficient drainage capacity during a heavy storm and do not define an urban roadway effectively. It is very difficult to control access to properties when roll curbs are utilized. Barrier curbs will be used where possible for this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian sidewalk one side, number of people walking roadway is low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sidewalks on one side do not provide sufficient accessibility for pedestrians on the opposite side of the road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Are there any other general comments you have regarding this project?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th># of Responses</th>
<th>Project team Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storm drains and sanitary sewers. We do not have sewers on my property</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Storm sewer analysis and drainage are considerations within the EA process. Evaluation of existing and proposed sewers and drainage will be completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put a traffic light on Fairway and Wabanaki</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The requirement for signals at the intersection of Fairway Road and Wabanaki Drive fall outside the limits of our project. The traffic analysis for this intersection will be analyzed as part of the River Road Extension Class Environmental Assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move the road to avoid tearing down the house at 50 Manitou Drive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Project Team will evaluate the alternatives presented based on the criteria included in the information package. Impact on existing properties is part of the evaluation criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no doubt that the creek bridge needs replacement to 4 lanes and that the areas on both sides of the bridge need to be widened In times of economic uncertainty “buy what you need, need what you buy” should be our slogan. Changing what is necessary at this time is all that should be required.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>It is our intention to buy property as required based on the preferred alternative. Typically a small buffer of property would be purchased to account for any unforeseen circumstances. Any left over land if still deemed large enough would be declared surplus lands and sold back to any interested parties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: ILLUSTRATIONS OF ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPTS

Alternative Design Concept 1 and 2 are illustrated on the following pages as described below:

Alternative Design Concept No. 1 - Two-Way Centre Turning Lane

This alternative is a 3-lane road with 1.5m wide cycling lanes and 2.6m wide curb-face concrete sidewalk (on both sides of the road) with a 2-lane roundabout at Bleams Road and a signalized intersection at Fairway Road. This option includes a single westbound left-turn lane from Fairway Road onto Manitou Drive if River Road is extended and dual left-turn lanes if River Road is not being extended.

Alternative Design Concept No. 2 – Widen Manitou Drive to Four (4) Lanes

This alternative is a 4-lane road with 1.5 m wide cycling lanes and 2.6m wide curb-face concrete sidewalk (on both sides of the road) with a 2-lane roundabout at Bleams Road and a signalized intersection at Fairway Road. This option includes a single westbound left-turn lane from Fairway Road onto Manitou Drive if River Road is extended and dual left-turn lanes if River Road is not being extended.

Replacement of the Schneider Creek Bridge

Both of the Alternative Design Concepts being evaluated require replacement of the existing Schneider Creek Bridge. The design of the bridge must accommodate the required vehicle lanes, cycle lanes and sidewalks. The bridge must provide sufficient height for a multi-use trail for pedestrians and cyclists to cross securely beneath the bridge on the north bank of Schneider Creek. The road design vertical alignment must be raised to match the increased bridge height. The span of the bridge is required to provide a sufficient size of opening for the creek to control the Regional flood impact. The proposed bridge design concept is the same for both Alternative Design Concepts No. 1 and No. 2.
APPENDIX C-1:
EVALUATION CRITERIA AND EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE 1</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruct to 3 Lane Cross Section</td>
<td>Reconstruct to 4 Lane Cross Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corridor Road Widening to 3 Lanes to</td>
<td>Corridor Road Widening to 4 Lanes to include 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>include 1 lane each direction, 1 shared centre LT lane, bike lanes and sidewalks</td>
<td>lanes to include 2 lanes each direction, bike lanes and sidewalks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRANSPORTATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forcasted Traffic / Transportation Network</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Meets the capacity requirements for existing and forecasted traffic volumes.</td>
<td>• Meets the capacity requirements for existing and forecasted traffic volumes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Collisions</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Improved Horizontal and vertical alignment</td>
<td>• Improved Horizontal and vertical alignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Greater reduction in Sideswipe collisions with improved left-turn access</td>
<td>• Additional lane will result in more sideswipes, offsetting improved left-turn access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Management</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Impacts to entrances; however business functionality maintained</td>
<td>• Impacts to entrances and business function</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For left turns out of entrances requires crossing of one through lane and storage in two way left turn lane</td>
<td>• For left turns out of entrances requires crossing of two through lanes without storage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Alternative serves the expected transit needs</td>
<td>• Alternative serves the expected transit needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Better traffic progression within corridor</td>
<td>• Better traffic progression within corridor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycling Needs</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Provides for on-road cycle lane in each direction</td>
<td>• Provides for on-road cycle lane in each direction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Narrower road and somewhat lower speeds</td>
<td>• Wider road, somewhat higher speeds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrian Needs</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Provides for sidewalk on each side of roadway</td>
<td>• Provides for sidewalk on each side of roadway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrians must use a long tunnel beneath the CP-Rail crossing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transportation Summary**

**Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are neutral (equally preferred) for the following reasons:**
- Alternative 1 has greater reduction in sideswipe collisions in comparison to Alternative 2.
- Alternative 1 has greater improvements for pedestrians and cyclists in comparison to Alternative 2.

**NATURAL ENVIRONMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Courses Including Fisheries and Aquatic Habitat</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• No impacts to navigable waters are expected with this alternative.</td>
<td>• No impacts to navigable waters are expected with this alternative.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Impacts to fisheries are temporary and can be mitigated with preventive measures.</td>
<td>• Impacts to fisheries are temporary and can be mitigated with preventive measures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terrestrial Habitat / Vegetation / Wetlands</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Reconstruction will result in minor impacts to existing vegetation and wetlands</td>
<td>• Reconstruction will result in greater impacts to existing vegetation and wetlands in comparison to Alternative 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Storm water drainage</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Increase in impervious area minimized.</td>
<td>• Greater increase to impervious area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Oil/Grit Separators to be utilized for improved quality control</td>
<td>• Larger Oil/Grit Separators required to improved quality control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Natural Environment Summary**

**Alternative 1 is preferred** for the following reasons:
- Less impacts to existing vegetation and wetlands in comparison to Alternative 2;  
- Storm drainage impervious area minimized;
## APPENDIX C-2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE 1</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Built Heritage Features</strong></td>
<td>No impacts to protected heritage resources</td>
<td>No impacts to protected heritage resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Built heritage feature (BHF) 6 and Built heritage feature (BHF) 7 (50 Manitou Dr. - yellow brick house and barn) will be demolished for the roundabout</td>
<td>Built heritage feature (BHF) 3 and Built heritage feature (BHF) 7 (50 Manitou Dr. - yellow brick house and barn) will be demolished for the roundabout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Built heritage feature (BHF) 4 (the 1958 bridge) will be replaced</td>
<td>Built heritage feature (BHF) 4 (the 1958 bridge) will be replaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Landscapes</strong></td>
<td>Work would be limited to previously disturbed areas, therefore minimal impacts are anticipated</td>
<td>Reconfiguration of the intersection of Cress Lane and Connor Street (former German Mills Crossroads) and the demolition of BHF 2 and BHF 3 erase the final remnants of the former settlement of German Mills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity to interpret the history of German Mills Cultural landscape unit (CLU 3) on the improved Schneider Creek Cultural landscape unit (CLU 4) trail</td>
<td>Opportunity to interpret the history of German Mills Cultural landscape unit (CLU 3) on the improved Schneider Creek Cultural landscape unit (CLU 4) trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impacts to adjacent property owners</strong></td>
<td>Region will acquire additional property from adjacent landowners</td>
<td>Region will require highest area of additional property from adjacent landowners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Properties Impacted</td>
<td>10 Properties Impacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approximate property requirement is 1200 sq. m</td>
<td>Approximate property requirement is 2100 sq. m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demolition of House at 50 Manitou</td>
<td>Demolition of House at 50 Manitou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impacts in front of 38 Manitou</td>
<td>Impacts in front of 38 Manitou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impacts to parking lots at 110 and 107 Manitou</td>
<td>Impacts to parking lots at 110 and 107 Manitou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Impacts</strong></td>
<td>Manitou Drive to be closed at the bridge during construction</td>
<td>Manitou Drive to be closed at the bridge during construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction durations similar for each alternative</td>
<td>Construction durations similar for each alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Environment Summary</strong></td>
<td>Alternative 1 is preferred for the following reasons:</td>
<td>Alternative 1 is preferred for the following reasons:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower impacts to Cultural Landscapes in comparison to Alternative 2</td>
<td>Less Capital Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced property required in comparison to Alternative 2</td>
<td>Reduced Built Heritage impacts in comparison to Alternative 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COSTS

| Capital Costs (including property) | Preliminary Cost Estimate is 5.8 M | Preliminary Cost Estimate is 7.5 M |

### Overall Assessment

Overall, Alternative 1 is preferred

Legend: Greater Impact/Least Benefit

Less Impact/Most Benefit
Appendix “D-1”

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.
COMMENT SHEET

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO
Manitou Drive Improvements Class Environmental Assessment
Fairway Road to Bleams Road
Public Consultation Centre #2 – June 7, 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 June 19, 2012 to either:

Mr. Wayne Cheater, P. Eng., Mr. Dan Green, P. Eng.,
Senior Project Manager Project Manager
Region of Waterloo McCormick Rankin Corporation
150 Frederick Street, 6th Floor 72 Victoria Street South
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3 Kitchener, ON N2G 4Y9
Telephone: (519) 575-4757 ext. 3183 Telephone: (519) 741-1464
Fax: (519) 575-4430 Fax: (519) 741-8884
Email: wcheater@regionofwaterloo.ca Email: dgreen@mrc.ca

1. Do you think the Preferred Design Concept (Alternative 1) is the best way to address the issues associated with this corridor?
   Yes ☐ No ☐ Please explain why.

   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

2. Is there another Design Concept that you prefer? Please explain why
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
3. Do you have any additional suggestions for possible alternatives to address the problem/needs?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

4. Are there any other general comments you have regarding this project?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Do you wish to be placed on the mailing list for this project? Yes  □  No  □

Name:  ________________________________________________
Address:  ________________________________________________
Postal Code:  ________________________________________________
Phone & email:  ________________________________________________

Thank you for your interest and time.

COLLECTION NOTICE
All comments and information received from individuals, stakeholder groups and agencies regarding these projects and meetings are being collected to assist the Region of Waterloo in making a decision. Under the Municipal Act, personal information (such as name, address, telephone number, and property location) that may be included in a submission becomes part of the public record. Questions regarding the collection should be forwarded to the staff member noted above.
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: May 29, 2012

FILE CODE: A02-40/RSB

SUBJECT: BY-LAW 10-030, A BY-LAW RESPECTING SIGNS ON REGIONAL ROADS, POST 1-YEAR REVIEW

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo amend By-law 10-030, A Sign By-law Respecting Signs on Regional Roads, to permit changes to the election sign size provisions as outlined in Report E-12-050, dated May 29, 2012;

AND FURTHER THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo provide the public with notice, in accordance with the Notice Policy, of the proposed amendment of By-law 10-030, A Sign By-law Respecting Signs on Regional Roads as set out in report E-12-050 dated May 29, 2012.

SUMMARY:

NIL

REPORT:

On June 16, 2010, Regional Council approved Report E-10-067, passing of the Sign By-law Respecting Signs on Region Roads. Sign By-law 10-030 came into force on July 31, 2010 and is attached as Appendix A. This report provides an overview on impacts and administrative and enforcement issues experienced by staff to date regarding the by-law.

Election Signs

A municipal election was held on October 25, 2010. Leading up to the municipal election date, 192 candidates vying for positions on various Municipal and Regional Councils were placing election signs throughout the Regional road network. Various signs were positioned on Regional road allowances in violation of the by-law. Violations included signs:

- On median islands;
- Too close to intersections;
- On the central island of roundabouts; and
- Being too large including mobile signs.
Letters were sent to all candidates in advance of the election advising candidates of by-law provisions associated with election signs. A follow-up letter regarding the widespread abuse of the by-law was later sent to all candidates requesting them to be mindful of the by-law or risk removal of non-complying signs. In total, Regional By-law Enforcement staff removed 734 municipal election signs not complying with the by-law. Transportation Engineering staff assigned to enforce the by-law removed approximately 500 election signs.

Both staff in Transportation Engineering and By-law Enforcement received numerous complaints from the public and municipal candidates during the month leading up to the election. Approximately half of the candidates failed to comply with the by-law. No tickets (charges) were issued as the Ministry of the Attorney-General had not authorized and approved a Set Fine schedule in time for this municipal election. The Region has now received that schedule.

Staff also received calls from several candidates concerning the dimension of election signs specified in the by-law as the dimensions do not match the typical election sign size typically provided by sign providers. A typical election sign is manufactured with measurements of 32” x 48” or 80 cm x 120 cm while the Sign By-law states that signs cannot exceed 90 cm x 100 cm. The repealed Election Sign By-law 99-067 limited election signs to a maximum 1.5 square metres per side. Staff is recommending that the provisions of the Sign By-law be amended to allow for election signs to be up to 80 cm tall x 120 cm wide which matches the typical election sign size.

During the recent federal election, staff observed much better compliance with the Sign By-law and 204 signs were removed by enforcement staff. The infractions included:

- Signs placed too close to intersections and roundabouts;
- Excessive number of signs; and
- Oversized signs.

Staff sent out advance notices to the 16 candidates prior to the federal election date, similar to what was done for the municipal election. The letter, however, included pictures illustrating restricted election sign locations at intersections and roundabouts.

During the municipal election, administrative staff at the Transportation Operations Centre, where seized non-complying election signs were stored, were repeatedly confronted by irate sign owners looking for their seized signs.
Mobile Signs

All known mobile sign companies were issued a notice in 2011 advising that non-complying mobile signs would be subject to removal if they failed to comply with the Sign By-law. Staff received corresponding calls from several sign companies following the notice and mobile sign companies generally have a desire to comply with the by-law. Following this notice staff observed an improvement in the practice of placing new mobile signs and that existing mobile signs were being pushed back further away from the road allowance onto private property.

Although some Regional roads like Hespeler Road in Cambridge seem to attract more mobile signs than others due to the nature of the roadway environment and appear to be hosting a number of non-complying mobile signs, staff reviews have found that mobile signs are generally placed on private property, and thus adhere to the Regional By-law. Figures 1 and 2 illustrate this general observation. Figures 1 and 2 represent the same location along Hespeler Road.

Staff from the Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo approve permits for mobile signs on Regional roads. Staff from all cities has confirmed that permits are only approved for mobile signs to be situated on private property adjacent to Regional roads.

Figure 1 – Mobile Signs on Hespeler Road in the City of Cambridge
Figure 2 – Aerial View of Mobile Signs on Hespeler Road in the City of Cambridge

Temporary Sign Application Process

Members of the community have the ability to request the installation of temporary signs which includes mobile signs on Regional property where land has been dedicated to the Region for widening purposes and where widening has not yet taken place. This application is easily accessible through the Region’s website and is intended to provide private business owners an equal opportunity to advertise their business in a similar fashion as neighbouring properties should they find themselves at a disadvantage due to having previously dedicated property to the Region.

Enforcement of the Sign By-law

Enforcement staff from Regional Licensing and Enforcement Services have been assigned to enforce the by-law on an ongoing basis generally based on complaints received from Transportation Engineering and complaints directly from the public.

Municipal law enforcement officers from all municipalities are authorized to enforce the by-law, however, staff from the Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo advised that they are unable to enforce the Sign By-law on Regional roads because of lack of resources. Staff from the Townships of Woolwich, North Dumfries and Wilmot and more recently Wellesley have been actively enforcing the Sign By-law.

Issues that have arisen over the course of time since inception of the by-law include:

- Personal and fleet vehicles do not adequately facilitate the storage of seized signs;
- Placement and weight of signs make it difficult to remove safely, e.g. placed high on utility poles, out of reach and staff has sustained injuries while removing signs;
Transportation Engineering staff has met with staff in Licensing and Enforcement Services, Transportation Operations and local municipalities to address these issues.

In late 2011, in response to complaints about the proliferation of small wire-mounted advertising signs, Regional staff organized a collaborative enforcement operation that involved staff from Regional Licensing and Enforcement Services, Transportation Engineering, Transportation Operations and several local Municipalities, including City of Cambridge, Township of North Dumfries, Township of Woolwich and Township of Wilmot. All other municipalities not able to provide enforcement services were asked to report infractions of the by-law to Regional staff via email or telephone calls. Notice of the operation was provided in all local newspapers in late 2011 and enhanced enforcement took place over the winter.

It is estimated that approximately 3000 signs have been removed from Regional roads since the by-law became effective on July 31, 2010. Since August 24, 2011 when tracking of sign violations began, a total of 1611 illegal signs have been removed from Regional roads. A total of 1245 non-compliant signs have been removed from Regional roads and disposed of as part of the enforcement operation which started December 8, 2011. Staff will continue to monitor the impact of enforcement and determine if any long-term enforcement strategies need to be developed to address any on-going compliance issues.

Staff feel that the enforcement operation had a noticeable positive impact on Regional roads in terms of improved compliance. Enforcement staff however noted that signs removed from Regional roads are reappearing on local municipal roadways and it will be important for local municipal enforcement staff to be vigilant on local municipal roadways as well.

Questions have arisen regarding who can enforce the by-law. It is important that the by-law be enforced by staff with adequate by-law training and enforcement experience to ensure consistent and proper enforcement. The Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services has delegated authority to enforce the by-law to certain staff. Staff have been enforcing the by-law primarily on a complaint basis, with the exception of the recent enforcement operation. Starting in June of this year (2012), Regional Road Patrol Supervisors will be reporting Sign By-law infractions to Regional Licensing and Enforcement Services for their follow-up.

In total there are 704 kms of Regional roads to continually review and enforce. Current enforcement over the course of a year, including election periods, has amounted to approximately 0.5 Full-Time Employee (FTE) position. The Sign By-law can be enforced at varying degrees of enforcement levels. Enforcing the by-law such that non-complying signs are removed within 1 day of appearing would require approximately four additional FTE positions. Three FTE positions could enforce the by-law such that signs are removed within 2-3 days and 1 FTE staff could travel and enforce the entire 704km of Regional road on a weekly basis. These different levels of enforcement assume FTE are hired specifically to enforce the Sign By-law, no other duties are assigned to them and that each FTE is equipped with an independent vehicle. This estimation of additional FTE does not include time-consuming maintenance of traffic signal and utility poles that see posters and notices glued and taped onto these poles. Experience to date indicates that suitable vehicles such as
pick-up trucks or vans with sufficient storage to adequately store and dispose of non-compliant signs would be required.

**Local Municipal Feedback**

Regional staff requested feedback from all area municipalities on the Sign By-law in general and whether or not they supported the recommended change to election sign size restriction. All municipalities supported the recommended change to the election sign provisions in the by-law. All local municipal feedback is attached as Appendix B. The following summarizes feedback from the local municipalities.

**Township of Wilmot Concerns**

Township staff has advised that they are not in agreement with the by-law permitting farmers to place their signs on Regional roads without any distance restrictions and feel this discriminates commercial core-based businesses who have restrictions limiting placement of business accessory signs to the frontage of their property. During the public consultation phase of the proposed by-law, members of the farming community, Ontario Federation of Agriculture (OFA), Foodlink Ontario, Mennonite community and Township of Woolwich staff strongly opposed by-law provisions that imposed restrictions on farm accessory signs including type, size and location of farm accessory signs. As a result of public consultation, the Sign By-law was revised to address concerns expressed by the OFA, Foodlink, the Mennonite community and Township of Woolwich staff. Staff is not recommending revising the by-law such that members of the farming community have restrictions on the placement of farm accessory signs within a specified distance of their property.

Township of Wilmot staff also expressed a number of other concerns that do not relate to the Sign By-law but rather relate to the Region’s Tourism and Essential Services Signing Policy. To address these concerns would require amendments the Tourism and Essential Services Signing Policy rather than the Sign By-law and this is being followed up on. These concerns related to:

- Service club signs on community boundary signs;
- Community Boundary Signs; and
- Historic settlement signs.

**Township of Woolwich Concerns**

Township of Woolwich staff continues to request that the Region provide an exemption to the by-law and allow service agencies, charities, and non-profit groups to advertise on Regional road allowance using mobile signs. Regional staff does not recommend creating an exemption to the by-law as it was acknowledged during the development of the by-law that mobile signs, including mobile signs placed by service agencies, charity groups and non-profit groups were contributing to the proliferation of mobile signs on Regional roads in general.

The Township has also requested that the Region revisit Township concerns that were initially brought to the attention of Regional staff in 2008. In 2008, Township of Woolwich staff strongly opposed imposing any sign restrictions upon the farming community when the by-law was in draft form. Region staff notes that the by-law, through the development process addressed Township concerns as the by-law in its current form does not restrict the size, type and or number of signs farmers can place on Regional road allowances. The Ontario Federation of Agriculture, Foodlink Ontario and the broader farming community endorsed the revisions made to the by-law that addressed these concerns. As mentioned, Township of Wilmot staff does not support this approach.
City of Waterloo Concerns

City of Waterloo staff has advised that their only concern with the by-law has been the lack of maintenance of illegal poster signs on utility poles. Staff notes that many of these signs are glued to steel poles which cannot be easily removed and agrees that it can be unsightly. However to adequately address this issue would require additional staff. Transportation Operations staff do remove posters from traffic signal plant only during routine traffic signal maintenance activities.

City of Cambridge, City of Kitchener, Township of Wellesley and Township of North Dumfries Concerns

The above-mentioned local municipalities have stated that they have no on-going concerns with the by-law.

Regional staff has had ongoing contact with past delegations raising concerns regarding mobile signs and will continue to work with these sign companies moving forward.

Recommendations

Staff recommend that Part IV – Election Signs, Section 9 b) be amended to read, “has dimensions that are not more than 1.2 metres in sign width (side to side) and not more than 0.8 metres in sign length (top to bottom),” to reflect the current standard election sign size and that sufficient notice per Region Notice Policy be provided to the public advertising the pending amendment to By-law 10-030.

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:

NIL

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Staff from Licensing and Enforcement Services has been consulted with and concur with the recommendations provided in the report.

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

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix A – By-Law 10-030, A By-Law Respecting Signs on Regional Roads
Appendix B – Correspondence

PREPARED BY: Bob Henderson, Manager, Transportation Engineering Services
Marty Sawdon, Administrator, Licensing and Enforcement Services

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
BY-LAW NUMBER 10-030
OF
THE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO

A By-law Respecting Signs on Regional Roads and to Repeal By-law 99-067

WHEREAS section 11 of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c. 25, authorizes The Regional Municipality of Waterloo to pass by-laws respecting Regional roads;

AND WHEREAS The Regional Municipality of Waterloo has determined that a by-law regulating the placement of signs on highways over which it has jurisdiction is desirable to enhance public safety and to reduce aesthetic blight;

AND WHEREAS subsection 63(1) of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c. 25, authorizes The Regional Municipality of Waterloo, if it passes a by-law for prohibiting or regulating the placing, stopping, standing or parking of an object or vehicle on or near a highway, to provide for the removal and impounding or restraining or immobilizing of any object or vehicle placed, stopped, standing or parked on or near a highway in contravention of that by-law;

AND WHEREAS subsections 446(1), 446(3) and 446(4) of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c. 25, authorize The Regional Municipality of Waterloo, where it has authority by by-law or otherwise to direct or require that a matter or thing be done, to direct in the same by-law that, in default of it being done by the person directed or required to do it, such matter or thing be done at the person’s expense and to recover that expense by action or by adding it to the tax roll and collecting it in the same manner as taxes, or by requesting a local municipality to add that expense to its tax roll;

NOW THEREFORE, the Council of The Regional Municipality of Waterloo enacts as follows:

Part I - Definitions

1. In this By-law:
   (a) “Commissioner” means the Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services for the Region or any successor position, or his or her designate;
   (b) “copy” means the wording, letters, numerals, symbols and artwork on a sign;
   (c) “grade” means the elevation of the ground directly beneath a sign or the elevation of the nearest edge of the roadway, whichever is higher;
   (d) “ground-mounted sign” means a sign upheld by no more than two wooden supports constructed on or driven into the ground where each wooden support is no greater than 10 centimetres by 10 centimetres in cross-section (a 4-inch by 4-inch post), or a sign upheld by no more than two metal supports constructed on or driven into the ground where each metal support can be bent by hand, or a sign upheld by a support located on private property such that the sign and support encroach into the road allowance no more than 1.0 metre;
   (e) “intersecting road” means a road under the jurisdiction of the Region or a local municipality that intersects a Regional road;
(g) "movable sign" means a rigid, portable, self-supporting sign that is erected on but not permanently anchored in the ground or affixed in any way and constructed in a manner and of materials such that it can be placed or repositioned by an individual without mechanical aid and includes, but is not limited to, signs commonly referred to as A-frame, T-frame, sandwich board, menu board and sidewalk signs;

(h) "municipal law enforcement officer" means a by-law enforcement officer appointed by the Region or a local municipality;

(i) "official sign" means a sign placed:
   (i) by or under the jurisdiction of the Commissioner; or
   (ii) under the authority of a statute, by-law, or provincial or federal guideline to regulate or prohibit the movement of pedestrians or vehicles or to warn or guide pedestrians or the drivers of vehicles;

(j) "owner" means any person described on the sign, or whose name or address or telephone number appears on the sign, or who installed the sign, or who is in lawful control of the sign, or who benefits from the message on the sign, and for the purposes of this By-law there may be more than one owner of a sign;

(k) "person" includes, but is not limited to, an individual, sole proprietorship, partnership, association or corporation;

(l) "place" when used as a verb means to attach, install, erect, build, construct, reconstruct, move, display or affix;

(m) "Planning Act" means the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended, or any successor legislation;

(n) "poster sleeve" means a covering designed for posters to be placed on it, which has been fitted to a utility pole on a Regional road;

(o) "Region" means The Regional Municipality of Waterloo;

(p) "Regional road" means a road under the jurisdiction of the Region;

(q) "road" includes, but is not limited to, a common and public highway, street, avenue, parkway, driveway, square, place, bridge, viaduct or trestle, any part of which is intended for or used by the general public for the passage of vehicles and includes the area between the lateral property lines thereof and the parts of which may include a:
   (i) "boulevard" which means that part of a road from the edge of the roadway to the nearest lateral property line, but does not include a shoulder or a median;
   (ii) "driveway" which means that part of a boulevard that provides vehicular access to and from the roadway and an adjacent property;
   (iii) "median" which means that part of a road that divides the roadway, including any channelizing islands and the central islands of any roundabouts;
   (iv) "roadway" which means that part of a road that is improved, designed or ordinarily used for vehicular traffic including lanes and curb and gutter but does not include the shoulder;
   (v) "shoulder" which means that part of a road lying adjacent to the roadway that is improved with granular or paved surface and is not intended for the passage of motor vehicles or pedestrians; and
(v) "sidewalk" which means that part of a boulevard with a surface improved with asphalt, concrete or gravel for the use of pedestrians and includes a multi-use trail;

(r) "sign" means any device, object or thing that creates a design or conveys a message, or that is designed to convey a message and that is placed for the purposes of advertising, announcing, directing or promoting any idea, event, activity, product, service or facility, identifying a business or enterprise, or conveying any other type of message and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, this definition includes:

(i) a "business accessory sign" which means a sign advertising any activity, product, service or facility produced, manufactured or provided by a business or enterprise;

(ii) an "election sign" which means a sign advertising any person or political party participating in an election for public office or a sign advertising a position on a plebiscite or municipal question;

(iii) an "event sign" which means a sign advertising or providing directions to a community-sponsored event including, but not limited to, a parade, procession, ceremony, dance, car show, farmers’ market, festival, or carnival;

(iv) a "farm accessory sign" which means a sign advertising or providing directions to the on-farm sale of any activity, product or service produced, manufactured or provided predominately on the farm in compliance with the applicable local zoning by-law including, but not limited to, pick-your-own operations, agri-tourism activities, and the small-scale retailing of local farm produce and related goods;

(v) a "new home builder sign" which means a sign providing directions to a new home development constructed by the new home builder at a location other than where the sign is located;

(vi) an "open house sign" which means a sign providing directions to an open house for the re-sale or lease of a residence taking place at a location other than where the sign is located;

(vii) a "poster sign" which means a non-rigid sign that is made entirely of paper; and

(viii) a "rural property accessory sign" which means a sign identifying resident name, civic address, the provider of a newspaper, or an affiliation to a farm organization including, but not limited to, the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, the National Farmers Union of Ontario, the Christian Farmers Federation of Ontario, and the Environmental Farm Plan;

(s) "sign height" means the vertical height of a sign from the finished grade to the top of the sign including any frame, border or ornamental feature; and

(t) "wire-mounted sign" means a sign upheld by no more than two supports constructed on or driven into the ground, where each support is made of metal wire.

Part II – General Provisions

2. No person shall place, or cause or permit to be placed, a sign, or any part of a sign, on a Regional road other than an official sign or a sign permitted under Parts III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX or X of this By-law.

3. The Region and its authorized agents shall not be liable for any loss, costs, damages, charges or expenses that may be incurred by a person with respect to a sign permitted by this By-law.
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4. No person shall place, or cause or permit to be placed, a sign, or any part of a sign, under Parts III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX or X of this By-law on a Regional road that:

(a) has any part of the sign located within:
   (i) 3.0 metres of any fire hydrant;
   (ii) 15.0 metres of a traffic control signal, crosswalk, bus stop sign or school bus loading zone; or
   (iii) 30.0 metres of a roundabout as measured from the outer edge of any crosswalk at the roundabout and away from the roundabout;

(b) has any part of the sign located within a roadway, shoulder, median or planting bed;

(c) may obstruct the flow of water in a drain, ditch or watercourse;

(d) impacts the function of the road by:
   (i) creating a safety hazard;
   (ii) impeding or obstructing municipal maintenance or construction operations;
   (iii) impeding access to or obstructing a fire hydrant;
   (iv) impeding or obstructing the passage of pedestrians where they are reasonably expected to walk;
   (v) impairing or obstructing the visibility of vehicular or pedestrian traffic or a railway crossing; or
   (vi) obscuring or detracting from the visibility or effectiveness of an official sign or a traffic control signal;

(e) resembles an official sign or a traffic control signal or device in colour, shape, wording, content or location;

(f) is manufactured so that it:
   (i) is illuminated internally or externally;
   (ii) has a variable, animated, video or electronic message sign face or generates a beacon;
   (iii) is inflatable;
   (iv) has more than two sign faces or sides;
   (v) has any visible moving part or visible mechanical movement;
   (vi) contains any device that creates noise;
   (vii) is made of cloth or a similar lightweight non-rigid material, except for a poster sign made of paper;
   (viii) uses retro-reflective or micro-prismatic materials;
   (ix) uses fluorescent material; or
   (x) is created through the use of plants or landscaping materials;

(g) is painted onto, affixed by glue, self-adhesive backing, tape or wire onto, or affixed by excavating, digging, drilling, driving or cutting into:
   (i) a tree, shrub, stone or any other natural object;
(i) asphalt, concrete, brick or any other hard improved surface;

(ii) a utility box, traffic signal control box, transit equipment, bridge, guidewire or any other road structure;

(iv) a utility pole where a poster sleeve is provided within 200 metres;

(v) a waste receptacle, bench, transit shelter, bicycle rack, fence, railing, retaining wall, planter, tree support, Canada Post box or any other street furniture;

(vi) an official sign;

(vii) the support of an ornamental luminaire;

(viii) the support of any transit equipment; or

(ix) the support of an official sign or any other traffic control device;

(h) is not securely fastened to its support;

(i) is not maintained in a proper state of repair so that the sign becomes unsafe or unsightly;

(j) is for an unlawful activity;

(k) contains profanity or obscenity;

(l) promotes discrimination on the basis of race, ancestry, place of origin, colour, ethnic origin, citizenship, creed, sex, sexual orientation, age, marital status, family status or disability; or

(m) is obsolete and advertises an event that is over, a business or enterprise that is no longer conducted, or an activity, product, service or facility that is not in season or is no longer provided.

5. No person shall place a ground-mounted or wire-mounted sign on a Regional road without first informing themselves as to the existence and location of all underground utilities at or adjacent to the sign location.

6. No person shall place accessory or decorative materials adjacent to a sign on a Regional road.

7. No person shall place a sign on a Regional road that fails to comply with any applicable by-law of the local municipality in which the sign is located.

Part III – Business Accessory Signs

8. No person shall or permit to be placed on a Regional road any business accessory sign except for one business accessory sign per business or enterprise that:

(a) is a moveable sign;

(b) has dimensions that are not more than 1.0 metre in sign width (side to side) and not more than 0.9 metres in sign length (top to bottom);

(c) is placed with a sign height from the finished grade to the top of the sign that is between 0.6 and 0.9 metres;

(d) has no part of the sign within:

(i) 0.5 metres of a roadway if there is a curb and no shoulder;

(ii) 0.5 metres of a shoulder;
(iii) 3.0 metres of a roadway if there is no curb and no shoulder; or

(iv) 10.0 metres of an intersecting road, measured from the nearest edge of the shoulder or the roadway if there is no shoulder;

(e) if placed on a sidewalk, maintains a minimum unobstructed sidewalk width of 1.2 metres;

(f) is placed on a boulevard in any local municipality’s community core area or retail core area as defined by that municipality’s Official Plan;

(g) is placed within the perpendicular projection into the road of the side property lines of the premises of the business or enterprise being advertised, on the same side of the road as the business or enterprise, but only where the physical location of the building in which the business or enterprise resides is so close to the road so as to preclude the sign from being located off the road; and

(h) directs attention only to the activities, products, services or facilities produced, manufactured or provided by the business or enterprise at that same location.

Part IV – Election Signs

9. No person shall place or permit to be placed on a Regional road any election sign except for an election sign that:

(a) is a ground-mounted, moveable or wire-mounted sign;

(b) has dimensions that are not more than 1.0 metre in sign width (side to side) and not more than 0.9 metres in sign length (top to bottom);

(c) is placed with a sign height from the finished grade to the top of the sign that is between 0.6 and 0.9 metres;

(d) has no part of the sign within:

(i) 0.5 metres of a roadway if there is a curb and no shoulder;

(ii) 0.5 metres of a shoulder;

(iii) 3.0 metres of a roadway if there is no curb and no shoulder;

(iv) 0.5 metres of a sidewalk;

(v) 5.0 metres of a driveway, measured from the nearest edge of the driveway; or

(vi) 15.0 metres of an intersecting road, measured from the nearest edge of the shoulder or the roadway if there is no shoulder;

(e) is one of not more than two permitted election signs advertising the same person or their political party or position on a plebiscite or municipal question, for each side of a Regional road between two consecutive intersecting roads;

(f) is placed:

(i) less than 45 days before the voting day of a referendum, a municipal question or a municipal or school board election; or

(ii) after the issuance of the writ for an election or by-election; and

(g) is removed within 72 hours following the voting day.
Part V – Event Signs

10. No person shall place or permit to be placed on a Regional road any event sign except for an event sign that:

   (a) is a moveable or wire-mounted sign;
   
   (b) has dimensions that are not more than 0.5 metres in sign width (side to side) and not more than 0.9 metres in sign length (top to bottom);
   
   (c) is placed with a sign height from the finished grade to the top of the sign that is between 0.6 and 0.9 metres;
   
   (d) has no part of the sign within:
       (i) 0.5 metres of a roadway if there is a curb and no shoulder;
       (ii) 0.5 metres of a shoulder;
       (iii) 3.0 metres of a roadway if there is no curb and no shoulder;
       (iv) 0.5 metres of a sidewalk;
       (v) 5.0 metres of a driveway, measured from the nearest edge of the driveway; or
       (vi) 15.0 metres of an intersecting road, measured from the nearest edge of the shoulder or the roadway if there is no shoulder;
   
   (e) is the only sign advertising the same event, for each side of a Regional road between two consecutive intersecting roads;
   
   (f) is placed less than 14 days before the event; and
   
   (g) is removed within 72 hours following the event.

Part VI – Farm Accessory Signs

11. No person shall place or permit to be placed on a Regional road any farm accessory sign except for a farm accessory sign that:

   (a) is a ground-mounted, moveable or wire-mounted sign; and
   
   (b) has no part of the sign within:
       (i) 0.5 metres of a roadway if there is a curb and no shoulder;
       (ii) 0.5 metres of a shoulder;
       (iii) 3.0 metres of a roadway if there is no curb and no shoulder;
       (iv) 0.5 metres of a sidewalk;
       (v) 5.0 metres of a driveway other than the farm driveway, measured from the nearest edge of the driveway; or
       (vi) 15.0 metres of an intersecting road, measured from the nearest edge of the shoulder or the roadway if there is no shoulder.

Part VII – New Home Builder Signs

12. No person shall place or permit to be placed on a Regional road any new home builder sign except for a new home builder sign that:

   (a) is a moveable sign;
   
   (b) has dimensions that are not more than 1.0 metre in sign width (side to side) and not more than 0.9 metres in sign length (top to bottom);
(c) is placed with a sign height from the finished grade to the top of the sign that is between 0.6 and 0.9 metres;

(d) has no part of the sign within:
   (i) 0.5 metres of a roadway if there is a curb and no shoulder;
   (ii) 0.5 metres of a shoulder;
   (iii) 3.0 metres of a roadway if there is no curb and no shoulder;
   (iv) 0.5 metres of a sidewalk;
   (v) 5.0 metres of a driveway, measured from the nearest edge of the driveway; or
   (vi) 15.0 metres of an intersecting road, measured from the nearest edge of the shoulder or the roadway if there is no shoulder;

(e) is the only sign dealing with the same new home builder, for each side of a Regional road between two consecutive intersecting roads;

(f) is located within 2 kilometres of the new home builder development; and

(g) is placed no earlier than noon on any Friday and removed by no later than noon of the following Monday, provided that where a statutory holiday falls on a Friday, the sign shall be placed no earlier than noon on the preceding Thursday, and where a statutory holiday falls on a Monday, the sign shall be removed by no later than noon on the following Tuesday.

Part VIII – Open House Signs

13. No person shall place or permit to be placed on a Regional road any open house sign except for an open house sign that:

(a) is a moveable or wire-mounted sign;

(b) has dimensions that are not more than 0.65 metres in sign width (side to side) and not more than 0.9 metres in sign length (top to bottom);

(c) is placed with a sign height from the finished grade to the top of the sign that is between 0.6 and 0.9 metres;

(d) has no part of the sign within:
   (i) 0.5 metres of a roadway if there is a curb and no shoulder;
   (ii) 0.5 metres of a shoulder;
   (iii) 3.0 metres of a roadway if there is no curb and no shoulder;
   (iv) 0.5 metres of a sidewalk;
   (v) 5.0 metres of a driveway, measured from the nearest edge of the driveway;
   (vi) 10.0 metres of an intersecting road, measured from the nearest edge of the shoulder or the roadway if there is no shoulder; or
   (vii) 50.0 metres of any other sign dealing with the same open house event;

(e) is located within 2 kilometres of the open house; and
(f) is placed no earlier than 9:00 a.m. and removed by no later than 6:00 p.m. on the day of the open house.

Part IX – Rural Property Accessory Signs

14. No person shall place or permit to be placed on a Regional road any rural property accessory sign except for a rural property accessory sign that:

(a) has dimensions that are not more than 60 centimetres in sign width (side to side) and not more than 60 centimetres in sign length (top to bottom).

Part X – Poster Signs

15. No person shall place or permit to be placed on a Regional road any poster sign except for a poster sign that:

(a) has dimensions that are not more than 28 centimetres in sign width (side to side) and not more than 48 centimetres in sign length (top to bottom);

(b) is placed with its top edge no more than 2.2 metres above the ground;

(c) does not cover or overlap in whole or in part another sign;

(d) clearly displays on its face, in ink, the date on which it was first placed and the name, address and telephone number of the owner of the poster sign;

(e) is the only poster sign dealing with the same subject matter placed in any one location; and

(f) is removed within 30 days following the placement of the poster or, where the poster advertises an event, within 72 hours following the event, whichever is the shorter period.

Part XI – Removal

16. Any person who places or permits to be placed a sign that does not comply with this By-law is required to modify the sign to comply with the By-law or remove the sign forthwith and restore the sign location to a condition satisfactory to the Commissioner.

17. Any person who places or permits to be placed accessory or decorative materials adjacent to a sign in contravention of this By-law is required to remove the materials forthwith and restore the sign location to a condition satisfactory to the Commissioner.

18. The Commissioner, a municipal law enforcement officer or a police officer may immediately remove and dispose of any sign that does not comply with this By-law, without notice or compensation and without regard to damages done to such sign during removal.

19. The Commissioner, a municipal law enforcement officer or a police officer may immediately remove and dispose of accessory or decorative materials adjacent to a sign that does not comply with this By-law, without notice or compensation and without regard to damages done to such materials during removal.

20. If a person required to restore a sign location under section 16 or 17 of this By-law fails to do so, then the Commissioner may restore the location.

21. The Region and a local municipality may recover the expense for the removal, transportation and disposal of a sign or accessory or decorative materials and for restoration of the sign location from the owner under sections 18, 19 and 20 of this By-law by court action or in like manner as municipal taxes.
Part XII - Exception

22. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this By-law, the Commissioner may grant a permit to a person to place a temporary sign on a Regional road if:

(i) the portion of the Regional road on which the sign is to be placed was dedicated to the Region pursuant to the Planning Act for the purposes of a road widening;

(ii) the construction of the road widening has not yet commenced and the Region is not otherwise using the dedicated lands for municipal or other public purposes;

(iii) the person is the owner or tenant of the lands immediately adjacent to and within the extension of the property lines of the dedicated lands; and

(iv) the placement of the sign complies with section 4 of this By-law, with the exception of subsection 4(f).

(b) Subject to subsection (c) of this section, the Commissioner may:

(i) prescribe any necessary forms for the permit and the application for a permit;

(ii) set the term of each permit; and

(iii) impose any special conditions upon a permit to ensure the proper operation of the Regional road and transportation system.

(c) It shall be a condition of every permit that it shall expire, and the permit holder shall remove the temporary sign at its own cost, when the Region requires the dedicated lands for the road widening or other municipal or public purposes.

23. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this By-law, the Commissioner may enter into an encroachment agreement on behalf of the Region with a person that allows a permanent sign to remain on a Regional road or to be constructed on a Regional road if:

(i) the person, or a successor in title to the person, dedicated the portion of the Regional road on which the sign is located pursuant to the Planning Act for the purposes of a road widening;

(ii) the construction of the road widening has not yet commenced and the Region is not otherwise using the dedicated lands for municipal or other public purposes; and

(iii) the placement of the sign complies with section 4 of this By-law, with the exception of subsections 4(f) and 4(g)(ii).

(b) The encroachment agreement shall be in a form that is satisfactory to the Commissioner and the Regional Solicitor and the encroachment agreement shall expire, and the person shall remove the permanent sign at its own cost, when the Region requires the dedicated lands for the road widening or other municipal or public purposes.

Part XII – Penalty

24. Every person who contravenes a provision of this By-law is guilty of an offence and upon conviction is liable to a fine as provided for in the Provincial Offences Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.33, as amended.

Part XIII – Administration and Enforcement

25. The Commissioner is responsible for the administration of this By-law.
26. This By-law may be enforced by the Commissioner, a municipal law enforcement officer or a police officer.

27. Regional Council may authorize a minor variance from the requirements of this By-law.

28. If any section or sections of this By-law or parts thereof are found by any Court to be illegal or beyond the power of Council to enact, such section or sections or parts shall be deemed to be severable and all other sections or parts of this By-law shall be deemed to be separate and independent and shall continue in full force.

29. This By-law may be cited as the “Sign By-law”.

30. This By-law comes into force on July 31, 2010.

31. By-law Number 99-067 of the Region shall be repealed effective on the coming into force of this By-law.

By-law read a first, second and third time and finally passed in the Council Chamber in The Regional Municipality of Waterloo this 16th day of June, A.D., 2010.

[Signatures]

REGIONAL CLERK

REGIONAL CHAIR
February 7, 2012

Mr. Bob Henderson
Manager, Transportation Engineering
Regional Municipality of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street
Kitchener ON N2G 4J3

Dear Mr. Henderson:

Please be advised that the City of Kitchener has no objections to the proposed changes to the Sign By-law with respect to election signs.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

John McBride, Director
Transportation Services
March 21, 2012

Mr. Bob Henderson
Manager, Transportation Engineering
Regional Municipality of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street
Kitchener ON N2G 4J3

Dear Mr. Henderson:

Please be advised that the City of Kitchener has no objections to the proposed changes to the Sign By-law.

Yours truly,

John McBride, Director
Transportation Services
February 10, 2012

Region of Waterloo
C/O Bob Henderson
150 Frederick Street
Kitchener, ON
N2G 4J3

Dear Bob,

RE: Regional Sign Bylaw- Proposed Amendment

This letter will confirm that the City of Cambridge Transportation and Public Works Department and Planning Services Department have no concerns with the Regional Sign Bylaw in general or with the proposed amendment to the Bylaw as noted below:

"Part IV – Election Signs, Section 9 b) be amended to read, "has dimensions that are not more than 1.2 metres in sign width (side to side) and not more than 0.8 metres in sign length (top to bottom);" to reflect current standard election sign size"

Should you require anything further please let me know.

Yours truly,

Shannon Noonan, C.E.T.
Manager of Transportation Engineering

Copy: Hardy Bromberg, Planning Services Department

E-mail: noonans@cambridge.ca

Phone: 519-740-4682, Ext. 4607
Bob Henderson

From: Rodger [mordue@township.northdumfries.on.ca]
Sent: August 16, 2011 1:01 PM
To: Bob Henderson
Cc: 'Darryl Denny'
Subject: RE: Sign By-law Report

This by-law change of okay with us.

Also I have had no concerns with the sign by-law over the past year. By copy of this email I will ask Darryl if he has any concerns.

Rodger Mordue
CAO/Clerk
Township of North Dumfries
phone: 519-621-0340
fax: 519-623-7641
mordue@northdumfries.ca

---

From: Bob Henderson [mailto:BHenderson@regionofwaterloo.ca]
Sent: August 16, 2011 12:50 PM
To: 'mordue@northdumfries.ca'
Subject: FW: Sign By-law Report
Importance: High

Hi Rodger,

I understand that you have had some staffing changes at the Township. Therefore I am directing my request to you. Can you please advise me if the Township supports the proposed change to election sign size as outlined below and if you had any concerns with the sign by-law over the course of the past year. I assume you have had no major concerns with the by-law since no one has brought any issues to my attention. If possible can you respond to me on the two points at your earliest possible convenience. Preferably by Wednesday.

Thank you,

Bob Henderson, C.E.T.
Manager, Transportation Engineering
Region of Waterloo
Ph. 519.575.4515
Mob. 519.588.1976
bhenderson@regionofwaterloo.ca

---

From: kschiedel@bell.blackberry.net [mailto:kschiedel@bell.blackberry.net]
Sent: July 29, 2011 2:50 PM
To: Bob Henderson
Subject: Re: Sign By-law Report

Hi Bob I passed on to our bylaw who is doing the job as Dan Brown has left us so it is Darryl Denny 519-621-0340.
February 8th, 2012

Region of Waterloo
150 Frederick St.
Kitchener Ontario

Attn: Mr. Bob Henderson, Manager of Transportation Engineering

RE: Sign By-Law Report Response

Dear Mr. Henderson,

Upon briefly reviewing this issue with our staff we find we have no issue with the Regional Sign By-Law Report as tabled.

Thank you for including us in your review. Should you have any further questions or concerns, please contact me directly.

Regards,

[Signature]

Willis R. McLaughlin CMMIII
Executive Director of Operations
Township of Wellesley

Cc: Andrew Loch
    By-Law Enforcement Officer
    Kevin Beggs
    General Manager of Community Services
    [illegible]
March 26, 2012

Bob Henderson, C.E.T.
Manager, Transportation Engineering
Region of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street, 7th Fl
Kitchener Ontario, N2G 4J3

Dear Mr. Henderson

RE: Regional Sign By-law

Thank you for giving the City of Waterloo the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to the Regional Sign By-law.

In regards to the passing of a Regional Sign By-law, the only issue that the City of Waterloo has experienced is the lack of maintenance of illegal poster signs on utility poles. There are several areas in Waterloo, including around the uptown and the two universities, which have a history of using utility poles as poster sleeves.

Further to the aforementioned, we have no objections to the proposed changes to the size of election signs that better reflect the typical size of a standard election sign.

Yours truly,

Mary George
Manager of Licensing and Standards
Enforcement Division
City of Waterloo
February 1, 2012

Region of Waterloo
Transportation & Environmental Services
150 Frederick Street
Kitchener, Ontario
N2G 4J3

Attn: Bob Henderson, CET
Re: Regional Sign By-Law

Dear Sir:

In regards to your request for Township comments on the Regional Sign By-Law we provide the following information:

Farm Gate Sales Signs

There is no limiting distance/radius in the by-law for farm gate sale signs. We feel the unlimited radius is inappropriate and that a distance of 2km is reasonable – i.e. you can sign your corn maze or haunted barn within 2km of your farm in accordance with the provisions of the Regional sign by-law.

We recognize that some members of the agricultural community feel differently about this. However there is some concern that the by-law unfairly discriminates against traditional commercial core based businesses by allowing farm gate sales unlimited trailblazing style advanced signage and commercial core based businesses none.

Heritage Settlement Signs

The Township, and the Heritage Wilmot Advisory Committee, is concerned that the current Regional by-law does not allow for the installation of Heritage Settlement signs that have a brown background which, are currently installed on Township roads. Regional staff is requiring a blue background. There should not be a difference in the colour of the heritage signs whether or not they are installed on a Township road or a Regional road. This should be noted in the Regional report.

The Township would like clarification on why the new Environmentally Sensitive Landscape (ESL) official boundary signs for the Laurel Creek Headwaters are wood
carved signs and not the Region required official blue colour. These signs have been installed by the Region on both local Township roads and Regional roads.

We note that the Region has extensively signed the Landfill Entrances, Fire Research Centre etc... along Erb’s Road at a much greater extent than that proposed for our Heritage Communities. Identifying our Heritage Communities with one sign with a brown background on each approach is, in our opinion, of minor impact and great importance.

Community Boundary Signs

We are concerned that the current Regional by-law does not allow local service club crests on the Community Boundary signs. This has been an issue with the replacement of the existing signs located on Regional roads particularly on Huron Street and Waterloo Street in New Hamburg.

There have been other issues regarding the replacement (wording, size and placement) of the existing signs and the addition of new signs on the Community Boundary sign boards located on Regional roads particularly on Huron Street and Waterloo Street in New Hamburg. In time all of the signs throughout Township communities will need to be replaced when they are old and need to be repaired. This issue must be resolved.

The New Hamburg Board of Trade is coordinating the Community Boundary signs with the New Hamburg community and the support of the Township. This is a standard practice throughout Ontario and several examples exist in Wilmot including New Dundee and Baden.

If you have any questions, please call.

Yours truly,

Gary Charbonneau, CET
Director of Public Works

Cc  Grant Whittington, CAO
    Harold O’Kraflka, Director of Development Services
    Tracy Loch, Curator/Director of Castle Kilbride
Hi Bob!

This e-mail responds to the question you e-mailed to Christine Broughton on August 18th as to whether or not the Township maintains the position that it would like service agencies, charities and non-profit groups to be allowed to have portable (mobile) signs on the Industrial Drive Boulevard in Elmira. The short answer is that we do.

Back in February of 2011, Mayor Cowan sent a letter to you (copy attached) requesting portable signs be allowed on the Arthur Street South/Industrial Drive boulevard and asking for written confirmation that the Region would not actively enforce the Sign By-law in order to allow that to happen. Woolwich did not receive that permission and discontinued the practice but we continue to maintain the position outlined in that letter. Service agencies, charities and non-profit groups (e.g. Elmira Scouts, Elmira Legion, Elmira Theatre Company, Youth Soccer) still want to use the boulevard to advertise their events, and Woolwich continues to hope that the Region will reinstate this practice.

Given the unique nature of the boulevard, there appears to be an opportunity to consider some options for signage in this location.

It is the Township of Woolwich’s expectation that the Region of Waterloo will consider these comments regarding allowing portable signs on the Arthur Street/Industrial Drive boulevard. We also request that the comments previously provided to the Region in an e-mail dated August 21, 2008 from Jeremy Vink in our Engineering and Planning Services division outlining several other issues that have yet to be resolved, be re-evaluated during the Region’s one-year review.

Bob, let me know if you require any further information.

Val Hummel, Deputy Clerk
TOWNSHIP OF WOOLWICH
Council & Information Services
24 Church Street West, Elmira, ON N3B 2Z6
Phone (519) 669-6005 / Fax (519) 669-1820 / vhummel@woolwich.ca
February 14, 2011

Bob Henderson
Manager, Transportation Engineering
Regional Municipality of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3

Dear Mr. Henderson,

Re: Industrial Drive Boulevard, Elmira

The Township of Woolwich has allowed portable signs for community groups to be located on the boulevard between Arthur Street South and Industrial Drive in Elmira for many years. Recently, our staff received instruction from you to discontinue the practice of allowing portable signs on the Region's portion of the road allowance immediately, and we complied. We investigated whether or not our part of the Industrial Drive road allowance would accommodate portable signs but found that it is too narrow.

Our local service organizations, charities and non-profit groups are extremely distressed from the loss of this service, and I share their concern. Many of the groups do not have frontage on a major road and have relied on the signs to advertise upcoming events of community interest including blood donor clinics, community breakfasts and youth sports registration. The portable signs have served our community well.

The Township of Woolwich requests to reinstate the practice of allowing portable signs on the Region's portion of the boulevard with the following conditions:

1. That the Township of Woolwich will investigate options and costs for installing one permanent sign on the boulevard that the organizations can share, subject to Regional approval;

2. That the Township will limit the number of portable signs on the Region's portion of the Industrial Drive road allowance to three; and

3. I would request that all complaints about portable signs on the boulevard be forwarded to my office so that I can monitor this issue.

"Proudly remembering our past; Confidently embracing our future."
I request written confirmation that the Region will not actively enforce the provisions of its Sign By-law in regards to Industrial Drive Boulevard so that the Township can allow its valued charities, non-profit groups and service clubs to benefit from the placement of these portable signs.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Told A. Cowan,
Mayor
Township of Woolwich
Dear Mrs. Button:

I thank you for your phone call and for discussing the sign by-law with me. The Township still has a number of questions/concerns namely:

**Farm Accessory Signs:**

First and most importantly the by-law is very limiting in the type and location of the signage and does not sufficiently acknowledge or accommodate the farming community including the significant Mennonite component of that farming community here in Woolwich. If the by-law is approved as is, most of the existing signage in the rural areas of Woolwich will not comply with the by-law. These are signs that are recognized as part of the rural character of the area and they do not constitute any sort of traffic hazard.

Allowing only moveable or wire mounted signs as directional signage introduces a significant and unnecessary constraint in the rural areas of Woolwich. Most of the existing signs are mounted on poles are elevated off the ground, and are typically more permanent than the proposed "portable signs" which will be the only type of sign which farmers will be able to use in compliance with the Region’s proposed by-law.

Your by-law’s proposal to permit farm signs only in the boulevard constitutes another problem given that rural road cross sections often mean that the boulevard may be 10 metres from the travelled road and separated from the travelled road by the shoulder and the ditch. With a maximum height of 0.6 to 0.9 metres, once the grass has grown or winter snow piled up, the sign will be obscured. Also, many rural boulevards are lower than the road height, and a sign of 0.6 to 0.9 metres in height may in many cases be lower than the road. To avoid issues of grass and snow, and to be visible to passing traffic, farmers have typically elevated the signage higher up on a pole. Depending on the location of the sign and the ground elevation some of these signs can be very high off the ground. There may be no options for sign placement given the Region’s by-law’s proposed constraints, the need to place the sign where it will effectively be brought to a driver’s attention and the topography of rural areas.

In short, the section of the by-law dealing with farm signs is geared to an "urban" road design and the realities of the rural areas. In urban areas, these portable signs are reasonable and can typically be located close to the travelled edge of the road where the road and the boulevard height are similar in elevation, and the boulevard is close to the travelled surface. As outlined above, this is not the case with rural areas.

**Event/ Election Signage**

Event signage is often placed on shoulders and ditches of a rural road. Even elections signs are often placed along the slopes of the ditches in the rural area. Is the by-law then going to result in the need for significant enforcement?

**Business Signs**

It is not acceptable that only businesses in commercial core areas are permitted Business Accessory Signs versus those outside of the core area.

Until these items are addressed, Township staff strongly opposes approval of this by-law and its implementation.
Please ensure our concerns are documented in any report concerning your proposed sign by-law and that a copy of these comments is attached to any reports. Also please forward a copy of any reports related to the Region’s proposed by-law to the Township of Woolwich.

Jeremy Vink  MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner
Township of Woolwich
69 Arthur Street South, Box 150
Kilmira, Ontario N3B 2Z6
Phone: (519) 669-8706 x 246
Fax: (519) 669-4669
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: May 29, 2012

FILE CODE: T08-50/GEN

SUBJECT: 2011 TRAFFIC SIGNAL CORRIDOR AND SIGNAL TIMING REVIEW

RECOMMENDATION:

For information

SUMMARY:

NIL

REPORT:

This report summarizes the traffic signal corridor and signal timing review completed in 2011.

One of the more noticeable features of a signal system is to improve the flow of traffic along a major street or through a network of streets. Traffic signal progression or coordination of traffic signals within a network is one of the most effective methods of improving the traffic flow. Improvements to traffic flow can provide:

- Improved traffic capacity on roads with closely spaced traffic signals;
- Reduction in overall network travel time and delay;
- Reduction in the overall network number of stops;
- Reduction in collisions; and
- Reduction in noise levels, air pollution and fuel consumption.

The Region currently operates 480 traffic control signals, of which 445 are on a traffic control system and 35 operate independently. The signals that operate independently are generally in the rural areas.

Staff review the operation of approximately 90 traffic control signals each year. Priorities are set for areas that have not had a recent review, have operational problems and or have experienced changes in traffic patterns. Changes can occur due to new developments or the construction of new roads.

In 2011 Traffic Systems staff as part of its annual signals review, reviewed traffic signal coordination and traffic flows for 95 signals in 4 control areas. Figure 1 identifies the 4 signal control areas and Table 1 summarizes the arterials within each signal control area.
Table 1 – 2011 Signal Control Areas and Arterials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Area Name</th>
<th>Number of Intersections</th>
<th>Corridor Name</th>
<th>Section of Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NORTHFIELD /MARKET</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Northfield Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weber Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NORTH GALT</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Franklin Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hespeler Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conestoga Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pinebush Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>HESPELER</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Townline Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Franklin Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Queen Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SUNRISE</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Fischer-Hallman Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Westmount Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ottawa Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Field studies use a Global Positioning System Unit to track repeated staff vehicle movements along arterial roadways and to determine the location, types and extent of traffic delays. Collected data included:

- Progression between the intersections and along arterial roadways;
- Travel time;
- Delays;
- Number of stops; and
- Speed.

Staff analyzed the data and implemented actions to reduce delay and improve operational efficiency. Perfect synchronization for one direction of traffic on a street may result in frequent stops and delays to the other direction. Staff tries to establish balanced traffic flow in each direction for the corridors as well as balancing major crossing arterials. If balance cannot be achieved, then staff favours the arterial and the direction with heavier traffic flow. Optimizing timings that favour the heavier direction of traffic flow is usually preferred. Table 2 summarizes the results of the review.

Table 2: Average Results of 2011 Signal Control Area Review for Traffic Flows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Name</th>
<th>Installation date of New Timing</th>
<th>Number of Intersections</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Average Travel Time (minutes : seconds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Northfield Drive</td>
<td>Aug 2011</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>8:49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>8:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 King Street</td>
<td>Aug 2011</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>6:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>6:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Weber Street</td>
<td>Aug 2011</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>4:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>4:39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Franklin Blvd</td>
<td>Feb 2011</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>5:43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Avenue Road to Pinebush Road)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>6:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Hespeler Road</td>
<td>May 2011</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>5:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>6:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Conestoga Boulevard</td>
<td>May 2011</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>2:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>3:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Townline Road</td>
<td>Feb 2012</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>1:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>1:41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Pinebush Road</td>
<td>Oct 2011</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>1:37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>2:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Fischer-Hallman Road</td>
<td>Dec 2011</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>5:52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>5:59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Westmount Road</td>
<td>Dec 2011</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>4:03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>3:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Ottawa Street</td>
<td>Dec 2011</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>4:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>3:49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Travel time and delay studies were only conducted for arterial roadways containing 3 or more coordinated signals in close proximity. On average, travel times were reduced by 16% as a result of staff reviews and actions.
Signal timings were also reviewed and optimized for the following intersections:

- Coronation Boulevard at Cambridge Memorial Hospital
- Langs Drive at Industrial Road
- Avenue Road at Elgin Street
- Avenue Road at Gail Street
- Guelph Avenue at Scott Road/Baldwin Drive
- Queen Street at Winston Boulevard
- Queen Street at Guelph Avenue/Adam Street
- Franklin Boulevard at Jamieson Parkway
- Franklin Boulevard at Winston Boulevard
- Queen Street at Goebel Avenue
- Ottawa Street at Trussler Road
- Westheights Drive at Driftwood Drive
- Davenport Road at Old Abby Road

Table 3 identifies the traffic signal control areas that are currently under review for 2012.

**Table 3: 2012 Signal Control Areas and Arterials.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Area Name</th>
<th>Number of Intersections</th>
<th>Corridor Name</th>
<th>Section of Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 University/Columbia</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>University Avenue</td>
<td>Westmount Road to Lincoln Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Columbia Street</td>
<td>Westmount Road to Weber Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King Street</td>
<td>Marshall Street to Blue Springs Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weber Street</td>
<td>Marshall Street to King Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Highland/Victoria</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Westmount Road</td>
<td>Queen Street to Stoke Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fischer-Hallman Road</td>
<td>Queen Street to Glasgow Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highland Road</td>
<td>Westforest Trail to Stirling Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria Street</td>
<td>Westforest Trail to Belmont Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 West Waterloo</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Westmount Road</td>
<td>Glasgow Street to Bearinger Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fischer-Hallman Road</td>
<td>Glasgow Street to Laurelwood Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Erbsville Road</td>
<td>Keats Way Drive to Laurelwood Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University Avenue</td>
<td>Westvale Gate to Westmount Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Erb Street</td>
<td>West Side Market to Westmount Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Columbia Street</td>
<td>Erbsville Road to Westmount Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

This report addresses the Region’s objective to optimize existing road capacity to safely manage traffic throughout the region (Strategic Objective 3.3).

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

NIL
OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

NIL

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix A – Traffic Signal Control Area Map

PREPARED BY:  Jennifer Bertelsen, Analyst (Traffic Systems Management)

APPROVED BY:  Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: May 29, 2012

FILE CODE: T08-50/106C

SUBJECT: WESTBOUND DUAL LEFT-TURN LANES ON CAN-AMERA PARKWAY (REGIONAL ROAD 80) AT FRANKLIN BOULEVARD (REGIONAL ROAD 36), CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo amend Traffic and Parking By-Law 06-072, as amended, to add to Schedule 16 – Lane Designation, westbound left-turn, left-turn lane on Can-Amera Parkway (Regional Road 80) at Franklin Boulevard (Regional Road 36) in the City of Cambridge, as outlined in report E-12-060, dated May 29, 2012.

SUMMARY:

NIL

REPORT:

In 2006, westbound dual left-turn lanes on Can-Amera Parkway approaching Franklin Boulevard were reduced to 1 lane in conjunction with other geometric changes to aide the flow of eastbound right-turning vehicles on Can-Amera Parkway. Figure 1 shows the current lane configuration. This lane configuration helped reduce eastbound right-turn queues that were observed spilling back to the roundabout situated at Can-Amera Parkway and Conestoga Boulevard during the afternoon peak periods. Since 2006, traffic patterns have changed causing added demand on the westbound left-turn movement.
As a result of additional westbound left-turn volume, Transportation Division staff has been receiving a number of complaints regarding excessive westbound left-turn delay from Can-Amera Parkway onto Franklin Boulevard. Aggressive driving maneuvers have been reported and observed by staff which includes motorists turning left from the closed outer left-turn lane and motorists travelling though the intersection and making u-turns at 290 Can-Amera Parkway. As such, Transportation Division staff reviewed the existing operation of the Can-Amera Parkway/Franklin Boulevard intersection and is recommending that the westbound lane configuration be changed on Can-Amera Parkway to reinstate dual westbound left-turn lanes. It is forecasted that the implementation of dual westbound left-turn lanes will reduce queuing and delay by approximately 50% during the afternoon peak period. Figure 2 below shows the proposed lane configuration.
This proposed lane configuration will require the traffic signals to operate the westbound left-turn movement fully-protected such that westbound left-turning motorists will only be permitted to move during an exclusive westbound left-turn phase rather than the current protected/permissive left-turn phasing operation. Figure 3 illustrates the current and proposed signal phasing concepts.
During the past 5 years, there have been a total of 31 collisions involving westbound left-turning vehicles misjudging gaps. It is anticipated that that westbound fully-protected left-turn phasing will eliminate nearly 100% of these left-turning collisions based on Regional studies and international research. The City of Cambridge is in favour of the proposed changes.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This report addresses the Region’s goal to optimize existing road capacity to safely manage traffic throughout Waterloo Region (Strategic Objective 3.3).

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The cost for pavement marking adjustments, additional signal equipment and signage is approximately $12,700 and is provided for in the Minor Traffic Signal Modernizations budget.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

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

ATTACHMENTS:

NIL

PREPARED BY: *Jeff Cornwell*, Traffic Systems Management Analyst

APPROVED BY: *Thomas Schmidt*, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: May 29, 2012

FILE CODE: A02-30/PW

SUBJECT: STAGE 1 LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT: POTENTIAL CONTRACTORS AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT The Regional Municipality of Waterloo, with respect to the procurement of Stage 1 light rail transit (LRT) and until the date and time of final execution of the Stage 1 LRT procurement contract, require:

- That no elected official, officer or employee of the Region, shall partake in any meeting, presentation, discussion, social event or other activity with a bidder or potential bidder for Stage 1 light rail transit (LRT), or any officer, director, employee or agent of a bidder or potential bidder for Stage 1 light rail transit (LRT), if the meeting, presentation, discussion, social event or other activity relates directly or indirectly to the procurement for Stage 1 light rail transit (LRT) unless such is part of the formal procurement process; and

- That all elected officials, officers and employees of the Region shall direct any verbal or written questions or other communications in relation to the procurement for Stage 1 light rail transit (LRT) from a bidder or potential bidder for Stage 1 light rail transit (LRT), or any officer, director, employee or agent of a bidder or potential bidder for Stage 1 light rail transit (LRT), to the Director, Rapid Transit or their applicable designated alternates.

pursuant to report E-12-033, dated May 29, 2012.

SUMMARY:

In February 2012, Council approved Design-Build-Finance-Operate-Maintain (DBFOM) as the procurement and delivery option for Stage 1 LRT. There will likely be multiple DBFOM teams (consortiums of contractors) that will bid to deliver the LRT project. Each company within each bidding team is considered a potential contractor.

During the DBFOM team selection process, the potential contractors within each potential DBFOM team may want to contact staff and Councillors of the Region and local municipalities to ask questions about the LRT project, to promote their company and to influence the process. Staff propose to establish a single point of contact during the process. Staff recommend that the Director, Rapid Transit be designated (Director, Rapid Transit may designate an alternate) as the sole contact for potential DBFOM contractors wishing to contact staff and/or Councillors of the Region and local municipalities.
REPORT:

1. **Background**

Rapid transit is needed in Waterloo Region because it will move people and shape urban form as the Region continues with tremendous population and employment growth. In June 2011, among other motions related to rapid transit, Council approved the technology, route, stations, staging and funding of Stage 1 of the Region’s rapid transit project. Stage 1 includes 19 km of light rail transit (LRT) from Conestoga Mall to Fairview Park Mall and 17 km of adapted bus rapid transit (aBRT) from Fairview Park Mall to the Ainslie Street Terminal. In February 2012, Council approved Design-Build-Finance-Operate-Maintain (DBFOM) as the procurement and delivery option for Stage 1 LRT.

2. **Process to Select DBFOM Team**

It will take more than one company to make the Stage 1 LRT project a reality. Many companies of varying fields of expertise (designers, builders, financial lenders, operators, maintenance professionals) will have to pool their skills and resources together to establish a consortium of contractors – a team of talents and resources. There will likely be multiple teams that will bid to deliver the LRT project. Each company within each bidding team is considered a potential contractor.

The potential DBFOM teams will submit their qualifications in response to the Region’s request for qualifications. The Region will evaluate each team’s qualifications. It is anticipated that the Region will then narrow the number of potential DBFOM teams to a shortlist of three. The shortlisted teams will submit their proposals, including their preliminary LRT designs, in response to the Region’s request for proposals. Staff will recommend a preferred DBFOM team to Council based on an evaluation of the proposals and negotiations with the teams.

3. **Potential Contractors and Information Management**

During the DBFOM team selection process, the potential contractors within each potential DBFOM team may want to contact staff and Councillors of the Region and local municipalities to ask questions about the LRT project, to promote their company and to influence the process. Staff propose to establish a single point of contact during the process. Staff recommend that the Director, Rapid Transit (or designated alternate) be designated as the sole contact for potential DBFOM contractors wishing to contact staff and/or Councillors of the Region and local municipalities.

The restriction to the single point of contact would apply to each contractor within a potential DBFOM team, including their subcontractors, agents, officials and employees. The restriction would apply from the date of its approval by Regional Council until the date and time of final close of the Stage 1 LRT procurement contract agreement with the preferred DBFOM team. The single point of contact would not prohibit any activity that is duly authorized as part of the procurement process, including meetings, interviews, presentations, or any public deputations that may be made to Regional Committee or Regional Council in accordance with the Region’s Procedural By-law.

The single point of contact would ensure that:

- All staff and Councillors involved in the process of retaining the DBFOM team receive the same information from all potential contractors at the same time;
- All potential contractors are ensured equal access to information and to staff and Council;
- The flow of information to and from staff and Councillors be handled consistently and efficiently;
- No potential contractor may lobby or seek to influence the outcome of the DBFOM team selection process; and
- An ethical, fair, open, transparent and defendable selection process be maintained.

The intent of this arrangement is not to restrict the free flow of information. Regional staff will develop a process to ensure the free flow of information from potential contractors to staff and Councillors.

It should be noted that the Region’s Purchasing By-law, section 47, has a conflict of interest provision which generally states that no elected official, officer or employee of the Region shall allow contact with a bidder who has submitted a bid. The above noted Staff recommendations will complement this existing By-law and allow the Region to prevent lobbying by regulating the time period before any bids are submitted by a potential bidder/contractor.

4. **Next Steps in the Rapid Transit Project**

There are a number of key decision points and major milestones that will have to be met to maintain the project schedule. Adherence to the project schedule is critical because delays to the project schedule have the potential to result in scope creep and increased costs. Staff anticipate that the next steps in the rapid transit project will include:

- May 2012: report on a memorandum of understanding with Infrastructure Ontario;
- May 2012: begin aBRT design;
- Fall 2012: issue request for qualifications from potential DBFOM teams;
- February 2013: shortlist qualified DBFOM teams;
- February 2013: complete performance specifications and a draft project agreement;
- February 2013: finalize funding agreements with federal and provincial governments;
- March 2013: issue request for proposals from shortlisted DBFOM teams;
- June 2013: begin aBRT construction;
- January 2014: evaluate and select preferred DBFOM team;
- May 2014: approve final agreement with the preferred DBFOM team;
- 2014: full implementation of aBRT;
- 2014: begin construction of LRT Stage 1; and
- 2014: begin the environmental approval process for LRT Stage 2; and
- 2017: complete construction and begin operation of LRT Stage 1.

**CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

The report supports Focus Area 3.1 of Council’s Strategic Focus: Implement a light rail transit system in the central transit corridor, fully integrated with an expanded conventional transit system.
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The capital cost of Stage 1 of the rapid transit project is estimated to be $818 million, in 2014 dollars. The Region's portion of the capital cost is $253 million. On June 15, 2011, Council approved the funding for the Region's portion of the Stage 1 capital costs, subject to annual budget deliberations.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

This report was prepared with input from Finance, from Planning, Housing and Community Services, from Transportation and Environmental Services, from Corporate Resources and from Human Resources.

ATTACHMENTS:

Nil

PREPARED BY: Darshpreet Bhatti, Acting Director, Rapid Transit

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services
TO:        Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
DATE:     May 29, 2012
FILE CODE: A01-20(A)
SUBJECT: WASTE MANAGEMENT DIVISION UPDATE

RECOMMENDATION: For Information.

SUMMARY:

The Waste Management Division is responsible for a wide variety of programs and services related to the collection, diversion, and disposal of waste from residential and industrial/commercial sources. Our collection contractors make over 1,500,000 stops per month to collect garbage, green bin organics, yard waste, large items and blue box recyclables. In addition, over 495,000 transactions were processed at the various Waste Management sites in 2011.

The programs and services offered by the Division are funded by revenue generated from landfill tipping fees, sale of recyclables, landfill gas utilization royalties, funding from Stewardship Ontario, and Regional property taxes. In 2012, the net property tax levy is approximately $109 per household (for a property valued at $269,000) or about $2.10 per week.

The Division currently has long-term landfill disposal capacity (20 to 25 years), enjoys one of the highest residential diversion rates in the province and low system operating costs.

The purpose of this report is to provide an update to Committee on the Waste Management Division’s programs and activities.

REPORT:

The Waste Management Division is responsible for a wide variety of programs and services related to the collection, diversion and disposal of waste. The following list summarizes the major programs and services offered by the Division:

- Curbside garbage, green bin, yard waste, large item and blue box collection;
- Multi-residential cart recycling collection;
- Processing and marketing of blue box materials;
- Chipping/composting of leaves and brush; backyard composting;
- Diversion programs for tires, scrap metal, E-waste, pallets, drywall, appliances, used oil, etc.;
- Reusable building materials, textiles and household item drop-off;
- Municipal Hazardous or Special Waste (MHSW) drop-off and paint exchange program;
- Operation of one engineered landfill (Waterloo) which is an ISO 14001 certified facility;
- Operation of a bulk transfer facility (Cambridge);
- Operation of six small vehicle transfer stations;
- Construction/operation of environmental controls systems (gas/leachate/stormwater);
• Monitoring/maintenance of five closed landfills;
• Partnerships for gas utilization projects (Toromont/Gerdau Ameristeel); and,
• Promotion and education activities.

Typically, North American municipalities look at three key performance indicators to determine the overall health of their waste management system. Based on these indicators, the Region’s situation is favorable compared to many municipalities in that we have close to 20 to 25 years of landfill capacity, reasonable debt levels, and the environmental controls, roads, facilities and buildings are in good condition and operating efficiently.

Also, based on the most recent Ontario Municipal Benchmarking Initiative (OMBI) data for 2010, the Region’s waste diversion rate was one of the highest in the province at 51% in comparison to similar sized municipalities while costs were within the lower range. However, waste disposal is the only municipal operation or service that is subject to direct external competition for operating revenues and the Region’s ability to maintain existing and fund new diversion programs from landfill tipping fees is becoming increasingly difficult as the volume of waste remains constant or decreases. Depending on future external funding related to extended producer responsibility (EPR) programs, funding for these programs may have implications on the property tax levy as landfill tonnage decreases.

**Key Trends/Indicators:**

The following is an update on some of the key trends and indicators for 2011:

**Landfill Tipping Fees and Tonnage:** The amount of waste received for landfiling has declined from that received in the late 1980s when over 400,000 tonnes of waste were landfilled annually with forecasts of 500,000 tonnes by 2000. The actual amount landfilled in 2011 was 210,000 tonnes with approximately 60% from commercial customers and 40% from the residential sector. At the current tipping fee of $72 per tonne ($74 effective July 1st, 2012), commercial landfill customers contributed approximately $8.2 million through disposal fees in 2011. Despite the growth in the Region, there was a revenue shortfall of approximately $1.75 million in 2011 due to lower landfill tonnage received than budgeted. However, this shortfall was off-set by higher than anticipated revenues from the sale of recyclable material (strong market prices) and Stewardship Ontario funding.

Landfill tonnage has either remained constant or slightly declined over the last couple of years due to improved recycling efforts in all sectors, reduction of waste generation at source, increased waste exporting from the Region, and economic factors. The history of tonnage landfilled and tipping fees is provided in Appendix A, Figure 1.

**Landfill Gas Royalties:** In 2011, the total royalties received from both the Waterloo and Cambridge gas utilization projects totaled $768,000 and over $4.8 million has been received since these projects began in 1999.

**Funding from Stewardship Ontario:** Close to $3.17 million in funding was received for the Blue Box and Municipal Hazardous and Special Waste (MHSW) programs in 2011. Industry stewards are required to contribute up to 50% of the Blue Box program costs to municipalities. Similarly, funding is also provided for the MHSW program and an update and details on this funding can be found in report E-12-039 titled “Municipal Hazardous or Special Waste Update”.

**Recycling Revenue:** The revenue received from the sale of recyclables is another major source of funding for the Division. However, this revenue is subject to great volatility since the price received...
is largely dependent on market conditions. For example, in 2009 the revenue from this source reached a low of $2.0 million and two years later, a high of $5.09 million in 2011.

A graph showing the volatility in blue box revenue over the last ten years is presented in Appendix A, Figure 2 along with the tonnage marketed. On Figures 3 and 4 in Appendix A, changes in material marketed and revenue received (based on a percentage of total revenue received) in 2007 versus 2011 is illustrated. While the tonnage marketed by material type has seen slight changes, the revenue shift for the various material types has been more significant. For example, in 2007, a significant percentage of the revenue was generated from fibres making up 57% of the total. In 2011, revenue from fibres decreased to 32%. However, revenue from the sale of metals and plastics has seen a dramatic increase based on the percentage of the total revenue received as presented in Figure 5.

**Waste Diversion:** The Region continues to improve the residential diversion rate while balancing costs to maintain efficient waste diversion programs. In 2010, the residential rate for the Region was 51%. This was one of the higher waste diversion rates in the Province amongst similar sized municipalities.

The 2011 diversion rate increased slightly to 52%. With the green bin organics program now available to all single-family households in the Region as of 2011, the Region is anticipating the rate to grow to close to 60% over time. However, it should be noted that up until recently, the diversion rate measured the amount of waste diverted by Regional programs only and did not account for privately run diversion programs that were typically limited or non-existent. As more programs are being offered by the private sector, capturing the results from these programs becomes more challenging and will result in the misperception that diversion rates of municipally operated programs are declining. Alternatively, another factor to measure the success of all diversion initiatives is the amount of waste landfilled per capita. In 2011, this rate was 168 kg per capita compared to 172 kg in 2010 and 178 kg in 2009. Over time, the trend indicates that the amount of waste being landfilled in the Region is declining as the amount being diverted is rising. Figure 6 in Appendix A summarizes the 2011 achievements in diversion and landfillsing over the last several years.

**2011 Division Highlights:**

A summary of some of the highlights from 2011 is provided below:

- Tonnage landfilled from the residential and commercial sectors totaled approximately 210,000 tonnes;
- Close to 495,000 transactions were handled at all Waste Management sites and over 1.5 million stops per month were made for curbside collection;
- The Blue Box and Cart Recycling programs resulted in 36,310 tonnes of recyclables diverted from landfill;
- The Green Bin Program diverted 9,520 tonnes of organics from landfill;
- The “Don’t Waste Another Day” promotion campaign was introduced;
- Yard waste collected at the curb totaled 13,070 tonnes and an additional 18,570 tonnes were dropped off at the transfer stations;
- 1,275 tonnes of scrap metal and appliances were diverted from landfill;
- 212 tonnes of tires were diverted from landfill;
- An additional 1,300 composters were distributed in 2011, bringing the total number of composters distributed since the program began to over 85,000 units;
- Over 1,300 tonnes of reusable building material, toilets, clothing and household items were collected and diverted from landfill;
- Residents dropped off 906 tonnes of MHSW at the permanent depots and 11 event days.
Compost and woodchip giveaway programs had 1,800 residents picking up over 600 tonnes and contributing $2,000 and 4,000 pounds of food in donations for the local food banks; The E-waste drop-off program diverted 311 tonnes from landfill; Televisions were banned from curbside collection and landfill; Over 37,250 calls were made to the Waste Management customer service center; 5,800 students participated in the Education Center Program, over 8,400 residents visited various waste management exhibits and over 770 attended public landfill tours; and, Commercial diversion programs kept 1,290 tonnes of pallets and 919 tonnes of drywall out of the landfill.

2012 Priority Initiatives:

Some of the priority initiatives or projects to be undertaken by the Division in 2012 are listed below:

**Shingles Recycling Program:** Council recently approved a shingles recycling program (Report E-12-021) which commenced on March 1st and is anticipated to result in approximately 1,000 tonnes of shingles being diverted from landfill in 2012.

**Construction of the North Expansion Area Cell Four (NE-4):** Council recently approved T2012-001 for the construction of the NE-4 landfill cell including leachate and landfill gas collection system upgrades. A comprehensive communication plan has been developed including a notification to the nearby property owners as well as a section on the Division’s website dedicated to NE4 construction to provide regular updates as construction progresses.

**Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR):** Originally introduced to deal with Blue Box materials, the concept of Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) now also exists for used tires, e-waste and municipal hazardous or special waste. However, specific provincial policy regarding EPR does not exist and therefore the service levels and cost recovery models associated with the Industry Funded Organizations (IFOs) that run these programs are inconsistent, not transparent and not easily understood. Waste Management staff, in association with AMO, the Regional Public Works Commissioners of Ontario, the Municipal Waste Association and the Ontario Waste Management Association will continue to advocate for waste management policies in the province that clearly identify incentives that reward waste reduction and shift costs to those that are responsible for creating the waste.

**Waste Management Master Plan:** The majority of the Waste Management program expansion and diversion initiatives recommended in the current Waste Management Master Plan have been implemented resulting in the Region having one of the higher diversion rates in the Province. The new Waste Management Master Plan initiative being embarked upon this year and scheduled for completion by the fall of 2013 will:

- further identify opportunities and direction for expansion of existing programs or implementation of new diversion programs and services;
- recommend post-diversion residual waste management strategies; and,
- assist in developing a sustainable financial plan to provide long term funding for the Division.

**CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

This report has been prepared consistent with the Corporate Strategic Objective of Focus Area 1 “Environmental Sustainability: Protect and enhance the environment and particularly action 1.3 “Reducing the Amount of Waste Requiring Landfill.”
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

All costs associated with the Waste Management programs and services discussed in this report are provided for in the approved 2012 Operating and Capital budgets.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE: Nil

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix A – Trends and Comparisons

PREPARED BY: Jon Arsenault, Director, Waste Management

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

Landfill Tonnage & Tipping Fee Trends

Recyclable Tonnage & Revenue Trends

Recycling Tonnage Comparison (2007 vs 2011)
Appendix A

**Recycling Revenue Comparison**
(2007 vs 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>2007 Revenue</th>
<th>2011 Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fibres</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastics</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recycling Revenue Comparison**
(2007 to 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fibres</th>
<th>Plastics</th>
<th>Metal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Residential Waste Management Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Waste Landfilled</th>
<th>Waste Diverted</th>
<th>Percent Diverted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: May 29, 2012

FILE CODE: E28-40/F11-40/WDO

SUBJECT: MUNICIPAL HAZARDOUS OR SPECIAL WASTE (MHSW) CONTRACTS

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo:

a) Accept the proposal of Hotz Environmental Services Inc. for P2012-28 Transportation and Processing of Municipal Hazardous or Special Waste (MHSW) for a one year term commencing July 1, 2012 at an estimated cost of $385,940.20 including all applicable taxes.

b) Enter into a MHSW Collection Services Agreement with Stewardship Ontario that provides for the partial reimbursement of the costs for the collection of Phase 1 materials in the Region’s MHSW diversion program, subject to approval of the Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services and the Regional Solicitor.

SUMMARY: NIL

REPORT:

In March of 2012, staff updated Committee on the status of the Province of Ontario’s Municipal Hazardous or Special Waste (MHSW) program, and its effects on the Region of Waterloo’s Municipal Hazardous or Special Waste (MHSW) program in report E-12-039. Staff indicated they would advertise for a new Transportation and Processing of MHSW contract by mid-year, and would present Committee with the finalized Phase 1 MHSW Collection Services Agreement from Stewardship Ontario once reviewed.

Transportation and Processing of Municipal Hazardous or Special Waste

Proposals were called for P2012-28 Transportation and Processing of Municipal Hazardous or Special Waste (MHSW). Advertisements for this proposal were placed in the Record, on the Ontario Public Buyers Association website, on the Region’s website, and forwarded directly to four known service providers. Proposals were opened in the presence of J. Bodenham, C. Howard and J. Markovic.

The following proposal was received:

Hotz Environmental Services Inc. Hamilton, ON $385,940.20

Four vendors downloaded the bid document from the Region’s website, and three vendors attended the mandatory pre-bid meeting on May 2, 2012, however only the single bid was received. Two of the vendors who downloaded the document (Aevitas Inc., and Stericycle ULC) specialize in only a portion of the materials the Region requires service for, and another (Buckham Transport Ltd.) indicated via email that they would not be bidding due to their inability to take on the Region’s volume of materials given their current workload.
While Hotz Environmental Services Inc. was the only bid submission, their proposal rated a high score as per the predetermined criteria, which included experience in similar projects, approval by Stewardship Ontario, and references. Based on the Region's previous experience with Hotz Environmental Services Inc., staff believe the bid price submitted is fair and reasonable.

The final date of acceptance for this proposal is July 14, 2012.

*Municipal Hazardous or Special Waste Collection Services Agreement*

Staff have reviewed the Stewardship Ontario (SO) Agreement dated February 15, 2012 and although the funding proposed does not fully reflect the full cost of our Phase 1 MHSW collection program, the level of funding to be provided is comparable to that provided to other municipalities operating similar MHSW programs. In addition, upon the recommendation of the Regional Public Works Commissioners of Ontario, Ontario Waste Management Association, and Association of Municipalities of Ontario, most Ontario municipalities have either signed or are in the process of signing the agreement in order to receive the limited MHSW Phase 1 collection funding that is available at this time. Staff therefore recommend entering into the agreement.

Upon signing, the Region will be eligible for partial MHSW Phase 1 collection cost reimbursement retroactively from July 1, 2011, up to and including December 31, 2012. As the Phase 1 MHSW program matures, staff will continue dialogue with SO to ensure that program funding is maximized.

Details regarding potential MHSW Phase 2 and 3 funding have not yet been announced.

**CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

This report has been prepared consistent with the Corporate Strategic Plan Objective 1.3 of “Reducing the Amount of Waste Requiring Landfill”.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P2012-28</td>
<td>$385,940.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Municipal Rebate of 86.46% of HST (11.24%)</td>
<td>($38,389.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$347,551.10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total amount of the proposal includes up front costs for the transportation and processing of Municipal Hazardous or Special Waste (MHSW) materials collected in the Region’s program.

The Waste Management Division’s Operating Budget for 2012 includes full costs associated with the collection and processing of MHSW, with a provision for an estimated $150,000 in funding to be received from SO to partially reimburse the MHSW Phase 1 collection costs. The projected funding available from SO is anticipated to be within this budgeted range. The costs associated with this proposal are also within the provision made in the 2012 Operating Budget.

**OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:**

The Legal Department was consulted on the MHSW Collection Services Agreement.

**ATTACHMENTS:** NIL

**PREPARED BY:** Cari Rastas Howard, Project Manager, Programs (Waste Management)

**APPROVED BY:** Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO
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NOTICE OF PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #2
KITCHENER WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT UPGRADES
MUNICIPAL CLASS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

The Study

Wastewater generated in the City of Kitchener is treated at the Kitchener Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) located at 368 Mill Park Drive. The Kitchener WWTP is a conventional secondary treatment facility (rated capacity of 122,745 m$^3$/day), which was constructed in the early 1960s followed by expansion in the mid-1970s. The effluent from this facility is disinfected prior to being discharged in the Grand River. In order to upgrade treatment and ensure better effluent quality in the future, the Region is completing a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Study for upgrading the treatment process, as well as for the provision of standby power to provide security to ensure essential operations will continue in the event of a power failure at the plant. The proposed upgrades are part of the last of three WWTP upgrade phases and will not increase the existing WWTP capacity. Some of the upgrades will however improve how odours are managed at the plant.

The Process

The study is being conducted in accordance with the requirements for Schedule “B” projects as described in the Municipal Engineers Association’s, Municipal Class EA document (October 2000 as amended in 2011). The Class EA process includes public and review agency consultation, an evaluation of alternative solutions, an assessment of the impacts of the proposed upgrades, and identification of measures to mitigate any adverse impacts.

Public Information Centre # 1

Public Information Centre (PIC) # 1 was held on November 16th, 2011 to introduce the next phase of the WWTP upgrade project. Information presented included project rationale, scope of proposed improvements, an overview of existing conditions, and recommendations for various upgrade components.

Public Information Centre # 2

A second PIC will be held to further describe how and when the Phase 3 WWTP upgrades will be undertaken and how anticipated impacts from construction will be managed. Representatives from the Region and its consultants, AECOM, will be present at the PIC to answer questions and discuss the project. PIC # 2 is scheduled for:

- **Date:** June 12, 2012
- **Time:** 5:00 pm to 7:00 pm
- **Location:** Pioneer Park Public School, 55 Upper Canada Drive, Kitchener

Comments

You are encouraged to attend PIC # 2 and provide your comments so that they may be included in the study. Comments received through the course of the study will be considered in finalizing the design and implementation of the proposed upgrades. Please contact either one of the following project team members if you would like to be included on the mailing list, have any questions or wish to obtain more information on the project:

- **José Bicudo**
  - Senior Project Engineer, Water Services
  - Regional Municipality of Waterloo
  - 150 Frederick Street, 7th Floor
  - Kitchener ON N2G 4J3
  - Phone: (519) 575-4757 x3416
  - Fax: (519) 575-4452
  - Email: jbicudo@regionofwaterloo.ca
- **John Armistead, P.Eng.**
  - Project Manager
  - AECOM
  - 250 York Street, Suite 410
  - London ON N6A 6K2
  - Phone: (519) 963-5860
  - Fax: (519) 673-5975
  - Email: john.armistead@aecom.com

Region website: [www.region.waterloo.on.ca/kitchenerwwtp](http://www.region.waterloo.on.ca/kitchenerwwtp)

All comments and information received from individuals, stakeholder groups and agencies regarding this project are being collected to assist the Region of Waterloo in making a decision. Under the Municipal Act, personal information such as name, address, telephone number, and property location that may be included in a submission becomes part of the public record. Questions regarding the collection of this information should be referred to Mr. José Bicudo.

Accessibility: This event is accessible to people with disabilities. Accessible parking is available. If you require assistance to attend or participate in this meeting, or to access information in alternative formats, please contact José Bicudo or John Armistead (as above) at least five days prior to the meeting.

This notice issued __________.
Kitchener Wastewater Treatment Plant
Phase 3 Upgrades
Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

Public Information Centre #2

Date: June 12, 2012
Location: Pioneer Park Public School
          55 Upper Canada Drive, Kitchener
Time: 5-7 p.m.
Study Purpose

- Provide for reliable long term operation and performance of the plant
- Improved treatment process efficiencies, effluent quality and odour management.
- No expansion of the WWTP’s rated capacity.

PIC # 1 – November 16, 2012

- Project background, existing conditions, proposed effluent quality and consideration of liquid/solids process treatment options, outfall expansion options and standby power alternatives.
- Feedback indicated support for the project and the importance of minimizing environmental impacts from construction as well as addressing odour management.
- Other feedback related to how the project integrates with other local infrastructure initiatives and timing of information releases.

Purpose of PIC # 2

- Phase 3 WWTP upgrade design and construction methodology;
- Cost Estimates;
- Environmental Work Completed to Date;
- Anticipated impacts from construction and proposed mitigation measures;
- Timeline; and
- Next steps.
Key Components

Communications and Consultation

Status

Dates
Problem/Opportunity Statement

The existing Kitchener WWTP has performed satisfactorily but has experienced issues with respect to odours. Treatment upgrades are required to ensure that better effluent quality is achieved prior to being discharged into the Grand River. By improving effluent quality long term Grand River water quality will be improved having a positive effect on recreational uses and fish communities.

Rationale for Schedule B Planning Process

- The proposed WWTP improvements will not increase wastewater treatment capacity beyond the plant’s approved rated capacity; and
- The Schedule B planning process is being followed to collectively consider impacts from proposed construction and operations.
Contract 1: Lagoon Decommissioning and Biosolids Pumping
Duration: 12/2012 – 10/2013
Capital Cost: ~$22.5 M

Contract 2: Energy Centre & Digester Upgrades
Duration: 10/2013 – 09/2015
Capital Cost: ~$47.7 M

Contract 3A: Headworks
Duration: 10/2013 – 04/2015
Capital Cost: ~$33.2 M

Contract 3B: Tertiary Filtration & Outfall
Duration: 12/2016 – 10/2017
Capital Cost: ~$39.6 M

Contract 4: Plant 3 Secondary Treatment and Plant 2 RAS/WAS Pumping
Duration: 07/2015 – 06/2018
Capital Cost: ~$101.3 M

Contract 5: Sludge Thickening, New Admin-Control Building & Misc. Upgrades
Duration: after 2018
Capital Cost: ~$54.0 M
Contract 1A: Lagoon Decommissioning

- Sludge lagoons being decommissioned to address odour concerns and allow for construction of Plant 3

- Includes:
  - Off-site biosolids/soil disposal as appropriate
  - Off-site disposal of any contaminated materials
  - Transfer of clay material to Lagoon 2 as backfill
  - Prepare site for construction in Lagoon 1
  - Remove sludge pumping equipment;
  - Lagoon 2 regrading with possible stormwater management function
  - Odour management plan during construction
Contract 1B: Digested Sludge Transfer Pumping

- Digested sludge will be pumped to the Manitou Drive Dewatering Facility
- New system includes:
  - New digested sludge transfer pumps
  - New suction and discharge piping
  - New surge protection control
  - New forcemain on-site
  - New electrical service
Contract 2: Anaerobic Digestion

- Upgrade existing digesters to comply with TSSA requirements and gas code:
  - Mixing
  - Heating
  - Covers
  - Gas system

- New digester control building
  - House equipment
  - All equipment one building
  - Allowance for future pumps
  - More efficient operation

- Potential for energy recovery
  - Combined heat and power Co-generation (future)
  - Bio-fuel (future)

Source: JDV Equipment Corp.
Contract 2: Energy Centre

- Constructed concurrently with the anaerobic digester upgrades
- Primary point for a 13.8 kV distribution system
  - Cost effective
  - Efficiency
- The system will include:
  - Indoor switchgear
  - Local transformers
  - Redundant supplies
  - Two (2) 1750 kW standby diesel generators
- Meets the Region's & MOE's standby power standards
- Required early
Contract 3A: Headworks

- Existing headworks facility will be replaced
  - Achieved end of useful life
  - More expensive to retrofit existing facility
  - Limited space to accommodate more and larger new equipment
  - Maintain operations
  - Flood protection

- New headworks include:
  - Enhanced screening and screen cleaning systems
  - Vortex grit separation
  - Twinning of incoming sewage channels
  - Odour control – biofilters
Contract 3B: Tertiary Filtration & Outfall

New tertiary filtration system
- Need to meet stricter TSS and TP effluent requirements
- Preliminary design based on Aqua-Aerobics Aquadisk® disk filters
- A pilot study will be conducted to compare other disk filter technologies

New outfall:
- 1950 mm concrete effluent pipe & 1800 mm diffuser structure
- Accommodate 430 MLD design peak flow
- Address hydraulic loss through the plant
- The existing outfall will be removed
Contract 4: Secondary Treatment

- Influent flow splitting
- New Plant 3 Aeration Tanks:
  - Full nitrification
  - Meet new effluent requirements
  - Flexibility for future upgrades
- New Plant 3 secondary clarifiers
- Associated pumping stations
Contract 5: WAS thickening

- Rotary drum thickeners – same technology used at Waterloo and Galt WWTP
- Improve digestion of biosolids
  - Better digester performance and increased production of biogas
- Space provided for future equipment
- New odour control system
- Common construction with energy centre
Contract 5: Administration-Control Building

- Need for SCADA equipment
- Centralized Control Room
- Limited space in existing building
- Security concerns
- Flood protection
- Additional space required:
  - Increased operations staff
  - Process laboratory
  - Training space
- Designed to achieve LEED Silver
  - Offices
  - Library/Archive room
15 Miscellaneous upgrades

- Effluent water reuse system
- Primary clarifier mechanical equipment
- Secondary clarifier mechanical equipment
- Lighting/security/fencing
- Existing Administration Building – maintenance addition
- Electrical upgrades
- Demolition of old process units
Views from Grand River Trail and Visual Impacts

- All construction activity will be within the Kitchener WWTP Boundaries with the exception of the new outfall pipe;
- The change in view of the WWTP from the Grand River Trail will be minimal with the exception of clearing a small amount of trees/vegetation for the new Grand River outfall that will be reinstated following construction;
- An approach to restoration will be developed in conjunction with GRCA; and
- New vegetative screening is included in the landscape design, which will minimize visible changes from the Grand River Trail.
Existing Conditions: Natural Environmental Features

- All construction will be within the Kitchener WWTP Boundaries with the exception of the new outfall pipe;
- Ecological investigations were completed in 2011 and primarily covered a 50m wide corridor from WWTP fence line to Grand River;
- Other areas investigated included on-site wetland communities and trees/vegetation along WWTP access road;
- Proposed works are within the vicinity of core environmental features: Homer Watson Park – Environmentally Sensitive Policy area and significant valley lands, Strasburg Creek PSW, in addition to all works within GRCA regulated floodplain; and
- No endangered species were observed during investigations, however this will be confirmed at detailed design and prior to construction.
Existing Conditions: Natural Environmental Features

Overview of Findings

- Dominant vegetation along the Grand River and surrounding the site (including access road) includes Manitoba Maple and Garlic Mustard (non native species); and

- Endangered species presence or absence survey will be completed and any impacts to endangered species will be addressed by an environmental impact statement (part of detailed design permitting stage).
# Managing Impacts from Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noise/Vibration/Dust/Traffic</td>
<td>- Notify residents of construction activity and expected road usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Restrict construction operations to the daytime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Designated construction haul routes and traffic management plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Dust control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Grand River Trail Closure:</td>
<td>- Temporary closure of trails similar to current trail closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Required to install new outfall</td>
<td>- Signage/fencing and trail detours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Public and trail user notifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree/Vegetation Removal</td>
<td>- Survey of proposed construction footprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Primarily related to outfall</td>
<td>- Protect mature and mid aged trees along the edge of the alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Restore disturbed areas/habitat using native species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction and Post construction monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater management, dewatering impacts/wetlands</td>
<td>- Review current construction dewatering practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Related to facility and outfall construction</td>
<td>- Complete hydrogeological assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Employ approved dewatering techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Habitat</td>
<td>- Complete fisheries habitat-assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Related to outfall construction</td>
<td>- Conduct hydrodynamic modeling and design of the outfall/diffuser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Complete/submit GRCA permit application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Complete Species at Risk Permit Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Implement restoration of habitat to natural conditions and include monitoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Once the preliminary design and outfall construction methodology is finalized specific construction impact management strategies and mitigation measures will be developed and form part of the detailed design permitting-approvals applications.
20  Designated Construction Access Route

LEGEND:
- Approximate Kitchener Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) Limits
- Walking and Biking Trails
- Community Trail
- Designated Construction Access Route

KITCHENER WWTP UPGRADE

FIGURE 1  DESIGNATED CONSTRUCTION ACCESS ROUTE

AECOM
Region of Waterloo
OCTOBER 2011
# Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACT 1A - Lagoon Decommissioning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACT 1B - Digested Sludge Pumping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACT 2A - Energy Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACT 2B - Digestion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACT 3A - Headworks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACT 3B - Tertiary Treatment &amp; Outfall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACT 4 - Plant 3 and 4 Secondary Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Plant 2 RAS/WAS Pumping Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACT 5A - Administration/Control Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACT 5B - Sludge Thickening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS UPGRADES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Detailed Design, Tender, and Award**
- **Construction**
Next Steps

**Spring 2012**
- Review comments from PIC # 2
- Complete Spring and Summer Ecological Investigations

**Summer/Fall 2012**
- Consultation with review agencies (e.g. MOE, GRCA, City)
- Draft EA Project File
- Draft Pre-Design Report
- Value Engineering

- Complete Pre-Design
- Complete EA Project File
- Submit to Regional Council for approval
- File report for 30-day public review
Kitchener Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrades
Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

1. Background

Wastewater generated in the City of Kitchener is treated at the Kitchener Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP), located at 368 Mill Park Drive. The WWTP is a conventional secondary treatment facility (rated capacity of 122,745 m$^3$/d) that was originally constructed in the 1960s followed by expansion in the 1970s.

In 2007 the Region of Waterloo completed a Wastewater Treatment Master Plan, which recommended a number of upgrades to the Kitchener WWTP to be implemented using a phased approach as shown below.

2. Environmental Assessment Process

The study is being conducted in accordance with the approved requirements for a Schedule “B” project as described in the Municipal Engineers Association’s Class EA document (October 2000, as amended in 2011). The Class EA process includes public and review agency consultation, an evaluation of alternative solutions, an assessment of the impacts of the proposed upgrades, and identification of measures to mitigate any adverse impacts.
3. **Purpose of Public Information Centre # 2**

The proposed Phase 3 WWTP upgrades were first introduced to the public at a Public Information Centre (PIC) #1, held in November 2011. The purpose of Public Information Centre (PIC) # 2 is to inform nearby residents and landowners; municipal, provincial, and federal representatives; and other interested and potentially affected members of the public with respect to the following key information:

- Phase 3 WWTP upgrade component designs and approach to construction;
- Cost Estimates;
- Environmental Work Completed to Date;
- Anticipated impacts from construction and proposed mitigation measures;
- Timeline; and
- Next steps.

4. **WWTP Upgrade Components**

The proposed Phase 3 WWTP upgrades have been designed to be implemented through a number of contracts over the next 6-8 years that will cover the following key components:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Contract 1 – Lagoon Decommissioning and Biosolids Pumping** | • Involves decommissioning existing lagoons;  
• Detailed design underway;  
• Odour management plan will be in place;  
• Region will mitigate odours if it becomes a significant problem;  
• New sludge pumping station to transfer digested sludge to the existing Manitou sludge handling facility. | December 2012 to October 2013 | $ 22.5 M |
| **Contract 2 – Energy Centre and Digester Upgrades** | • Includes new digester control building, equipment and upgrades to meet current codes  
• New energy centre to house new switchgear and electrical equipment including two (2) 1750 Kw stand-by diesel generators; | October 2013 to September 2015 | $ 47.7 M |
| **Contract 3A - Headworks** | • Construction of new headworks facility for screening and grit removal  
• Demolition of existing headworks facility; and  
• Biofilters for odour control. | October 2013 to April 2015 | $ 33.2 M |
| **Contract 3B – Tertiary Filtration and Outfall** | • New tertiary filtration equipment for effluent polishing to meet new discharge criteria for phosphorus and suspended solids;  
• New outfall pipe to Grand River;  
• Will involve some removal of trees and temporary trail closure; and  
• Existing outfall to be removed. | December 2016 to October 2017 | $ 39.6 M |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Contract 4 – Plant 3 Secondary Treatment and Plant 2 RAS/WAS Pumping** | • New secondary treatment plant to satisfy new effluent requirements for year round ammonia removal  
• Includes new blowers, aeration tanks, intermediate sludge pumping stations, and secondary clarifiers. | July 2015 to June 2018 | $101.3 M |
| **Contract 5 – Sludge Thickening, New Administration Building and Miscellaneous upgrades** | • New buildings to house rotary drums for sludge thickening prior to digestion; and  
• New Administration Building and Control designed to achieve LEED Silver certification.  
• Upgrades to various equipment that has reached end of service life  
• Demolition of equipment/structures no longer required. | After 2018 | $54.0 M |

**Total:** $298 M
5. Results of Field Investigations

Field investigations were completed in fall 2011 and confirmed aquatic and terrestrial habitat boundaries in relation to proposed construction. Trees and vegetation within the proposed new outfall corridor can be described as being dominated by Manitoba Maple and Garlic Mustard both of which are non-native species. The investigations also identified the potential for encountering some endangered species based on habitat suitability. Further investigations will cover the spring and summer habitat season and will include an endangered species presence or absence survey and dive survey to confirm aquatic habitat. Any impacts to endangered species will be addressed by an environmental impact statement (part of detailed design permitting stage).

6. Managing Impacts from Construction

Impacts from construction will largely be managed within the WWTP’s fenced limits with the exception of the new outfall pipe that will be extended to the Grand River and construction truck traffic.

The following impacts related to construction are anticipated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noise/Vibration/Dust/Traffic</td>
<td>➢ Notify residents of construction activity and expected road usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Restrict construction operations to the daytime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Designated construction haul routes and traffic management plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Dust control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Grand River Trail Closure</td>
<td>➢ Temporary closure of trails similar to current trail closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required to install new outfall</td>
<td>➢ Signage/fencing and trail detours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Public and trail user notifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees/Vegetation Removal</td>
<td>➢ Survey of proposed construction footprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primarily related to outfall</td>
<td>➢ Protect mature and mid aged trees along the edge of the alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Restore disturbed areas/habitat using native species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Construction and Post construction monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater management, dewatering impacts/</td>
<td>➢ Review current construction dewatering practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wetlands</td>
<td>➢ Complete hydrogeological assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related to facility and outfall construction</td>
<td>➢ Employ approved dewatering techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Habitat</td>
<td>➢ Complete fisheries habitat-assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related to outfall construction</td>
<td>➢ Conduct hydrodynamic modeling and design of the outfall/diffuser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Complete/submit GRCA permit application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Complete Species at Risk Permit Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Implement restoration of habitat to natural conditions and include monitoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. **Designated Construction Access Route**

Construction truck traffic will be restricted to the following local roads that connect to Homer Watson Boulevard.

8. **Project Schedule**

9. **Next Steps**

Comments from PIC #2 will be reviewed and considered in the design of the project that will also be subject to a value engineering exercise. Draft Environmental Assessment document to be filed for 30-day comment period in summer-fall 2012.
10. **We welcome your comments!**

We encourage you to fill out the comment sheets provided and drop them off in the comment box. Alternatively, you can mail, fax, or email your comments to the individuals listed below:

José Bicudo  
Senior Project Engineer, Water Services  
Regional Municipality of Waterloo  
150 Frederick Street, 7th Floor  
Kitchener, Ontario N2G 4J3  
Phone: 519-575-4757 x 3416  
Fax: 519-575-4452  
Email: jbicudo@regionofwaterloo.ca

John Armistead, P.Eng.  
Project Manager  
AECOM  
250 York Street, Suite 410  
London ON N6A 6K2  
Phone: (519) 963-5860  
Fax: (519) 673-5975  
Email: john.armistead@aecom.com

Additional information related to the project and consultation process may be obtained through the study website: [www.region.waterloo.on.ca/kitchenerwwtp](http://www.region.waterloo.on.ca/kitchenerwwtp)

All comments and information received from individuals, stakeholder groups and agencies regarding this project are being collected to assist the Region of Waterloo in making a decision. Under the Municipal Act, personal information such as name, address, telephone number, and property location that may be included in a submission becomes part of the public record. Questions regarding the collection of this information should be referred to Mr. José Bicudo.
Background

Wastewater generated in the City of Kitchener is treated at the Kitchener Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) located at 368 Mill Park Drive. The Kitchener WWTP is comprised of two separate treatment plants served by a common headworks facility and primary clarifier facility, which were constructed in the early 1960s followed by expansion in the mid-1970s. The effluent from both facilities is disinfected prior to being discharged in the Grand River. In order to upgrade treatment and ensure better effluent quality in the future, the Region is completing a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Study for upgrading the treatment process, as well as for the provision of standby power to provide security to ensure essential operations will continue in the event of a power failure at the plant. The proposed upgrades are part of the last of three WWTP upgrade phases and will not increase the existing WWTP capacity. Some of the upgrades will however improve how odours are managed at the plant. Additional information related to the project and consultation process may be obtained through the study website: http://www.regionofwaterloo.ca/kitchenerwwtp

You are invited to provide comments on the materials presented today as well as any other issues that you feel are important to this Class EA study. Please take a few minutes to provide your comments. All comments will be considered in finalizing the preferred solution.
Question 1.
Do you have any comments related to the following proposed WWTP upgrade components?

Contract 1: Lagoon Decommissioning and Biosolids Pumping
Comment:

Contract 2: Energy Centre and Digester Upgrades
Comment:

Contract 3A: Headworks
Comment:

Contract 3B: Tertiary Filtration and Outfall
Comment:

Contract 4: Plant 3 and 4 Secondary Treatment and Plant 2 RAS/WAS Pumping
Comment:

Contract 5: Sludge Thickening, New Administration Building and Miscellaneous Upgrades
Comment:
Question 2.

The proposed upgrades have the potential to periodically generate traffic, noise and dust during construction which will span the next 6-8 years. Other impacts include tree removal for new outfall, temporary Grand River trail closure and odours from lagoon decommissioning. The following impacts related to construction are anticipated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noise/Vibration/Dust/Traffic</td>
<td>Notify residents of construction activity and expected road usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restrict construction operations to the daytime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Designated construction haul routes and traffic management plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dust control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Grand River Trail Closure:</td>
<td>Temporary closure of trails similar to current trail closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Required to install new outfall</td>
<td>Signage/fencing and trail detours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public and trail user notifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree/Vegetation Removal</td>
<td>Survey of proposed construction footprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Primarily related to outfall</td>
<td>Protect mature and mid aged trees along the edge of the alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restore disturbed areas/habitat using native species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction and Post construction monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater management, dewatering impacts/wetlands</td>
<td>Review current construction dewatering practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Related to facility and outfall construction</td>
<td>Complete hydrogeological assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employ approved dewatering techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Habitat</td>
<td>Complete fisheries habitat-assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Related to outfall construction</td>
<td>Conduct hydrodynamic modeling and design of the outfall/diffuser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete/submit GRCA permit application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete Species at Risk Permit Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implement restoration of habitat to natural conditions and include monitoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are the proposed mitigation measures (listed above) reasonable? Please indicate why or why not.

☐ YES ☐ NO

Question 3.

Is there any other information that you would like to provide or do you require any information?

__________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________
Thank you for participating in this study.

Please return this completed Comment Sheet to one of the project team members or place it in the ‘Comment Box’. You can also send them to any of the following (see below) by June 26, 2012:

José Bicudo  
Senior Project Engineer, Water Services  
Regional Municipality of Waterloo  
150 Frederick Street, 7th Floor  
Kitchener, Ontario N2G 4J3  
Phone: 519-575-4757 x 3416  
Fax: 519-575-4452  
Email: jbicudo@regionofwaterloo.ca

John Armistead, P.Eng.  
Project Manager  
AECOM  
250 York Street, Suite 410  
London ON N6A 6K2  
Phone: (519) 963-5860  
Fax: (519) 673-5975  
Email: john.armistead@aecom.com

Optional: Please provide your contact information if you would like to receive future updates on this project, including Notice of Project Completion.

Name:  
Address:  
Telephone:  
Fax:  
Email:  

All comments and information received from individuals, stakeholder groups and agencies regarding this project are being collected to assist the Region of Waterloo in making a decision. Under the Municipal Act, personal information such as name, address, telephone number, and property location that may be included in a submission becomes part of the public record. Questions regarding the collection of this information should be referred to Mr. José Bicudo.
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: May 29, 2012

FILE CODE: D18-01

SUBJECT: MONTHLY REPORT OF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY FOR APRIL 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-laws;
2. Accepted the following plan of subdivision and plan of condominium applications;
3. Modified the following plan of subdivision; and
4. Released for registration the following plans of subdivision and plans of condominium.

REPORT:

City of Cambridge

1. Part Lot Control Exemption By-law 49-12
   Applicant: Gateway Business Campus LP
   Location: 490 and 500 Pinebush Road
   Proposal: To permit the creation of 1 industrial lot.
   Processing Fee: Paid April 20, 2012
   Commissioner’s Approval: April 23, 2012

2. Plan of Subdivision Application 30T-12103
   Date Accepted: April 27, 2012
   Applicant: Daiseyfield Development Corp.
   Location: Fraserwood Court
   Proposal: To permit the development of 26 single detached units.
   Processing Fee: Paid March 29, 2012

3. Registration of Draft Plan of Subdivision 30T-08101
   Draft Approval Date: July 6, 2011
   Phase: Entire Plan
   Applicant: Sunvest Development Corp.
   Location: Cheese Factory Road
   Proposal: To permit the development of 55 single detached units.
   Processing Fee: Paid March 27, 2012
   Commissioner’s Release: April 25, 2012
City of Kitchener

1. **Registration of Draft Plan of Subdivision 30T-96004**
   - Draft Approval Date: May 30, 2005
   - Phase: Stage 3
   - Applicant: JHS Properties Inc.
   - Location: Pioneer Tower Road
   - Proposal: To permit the development of 26 single detached units.
   - Processing Fee: Paid February 24, 2012
   - Commissioner’s Release: April 13, 2012

City of Waterloo

1. **Plan of Condominium Application 30CDM-12403**
   - Date Accepted: April 25, 2012
   - Applicant: Coppertree Enterprises Ltd.
   - Location: 96 University Avenue
   - Proposal: To permit the development of 28 condominium apartment units.
   - Processing Fee: Paid April 20, 2012

2. **Registration of Plan of Condominium 30CDM-10402**
   - Draft Approval Date: Draft Approval Exempt
   - Phase: Entire Plan
   - Applicant: Silverlake Developments Inc.
   - Location: corner of Erb Street and Father David Bauer Drive
   - Proposal: This registration proposes to amend the description of Waterloo Vacant Land Condominium Plan No. 512 to modify the boundary between Unit 1 (proposed hotel) and Unit 2 (proposed parking), such that Unit 1 increases by approximately 133.7 m².
   - Processing Fee: Paid November 30, 2011
   - Commissioner’s Release: April 5, 2012

3. **Registration of Plan of Condominium 30CDM-11407**
   - Draft Approval Date: Draft Approval Exempt
   - Phase: Entire Plan
   - Applicant: Activa Holdings Inc.
   - Location: Millenium Boulevard
   - Proposal: To create a common elements condominium tied to lands in plan of subdivision 30T-08401.
   - Processing Fee: Not applicable
   - Commissioner’s Release: April 16, 2012

Township of North Dumfries

1. **Part Lot Control Exemption By-law 2499-12**
   - Applicant: 828543 Ontario Inc. and 839658 Ontario Inc.
   - Location: Vincent Drive, Ayr
   - Proposal: To permit the creation of 2 semi-detached and 15 townhouse units.
   - Processing Fee: Paid April 18, 2012
   - Commissioner’s Approval: April 20, 2012
Township of Wellesley

1. **Modification to Draft Plan of Subdivision 30T-06501**

   Draft Approval Date: June 3, 2008  
   Applicant: WM. J. Gies Construction Limited  
   Location: Gerber Road and Greenwood Hill Road  
   Proposal: To move a 3.0m wide walkway/access area (Block 37) from the east side of Lot 10 to the west side of Lot 10, and to change the designation of 0.0038 hectares from Block 36 as a new Block (Block 38) to be designated “Future Development”.

   Processing Fee: Paid March 13, 2012  
   Commissioner’s Approval: April 26, 2012

**Residential Subdivision Activity January 2012 to April 30, 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><em>Kitchener</em></td>
<td>117</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>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</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>370</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180</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 April 30, 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><em>Kitchener</em></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

ATTACHMENTS:

NIL

PREPARED BY: Andrea Banks, Program Assistant

APPROVED BY: Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
REPORT

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

DATE: May 29, 2012

FILE CODE: D17-30

SUBJECT: REFERRAL OF DEFERRAL NO. 3a OF THE CITY OF KITCHENER’S OFFICIAL PLAN TO A CURRENT ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD APPEAL

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 described in Report P-12-062, dated May 29, 2012.

SUMMARY:

On June 10, 2006, Tru-Villa Inc. and 2040796 Ontario Limited appealed their proposed Official Plan Amendment as it applies to approximately 63 hectares of land and appealed their Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law amendment applications as they apply to 53.20 hectares (131.4 acres) of land legally described as Part Lots 153, 154 and 155 German Company Tract 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.

On April 17, 2012, in P-12-046, Regional staff requested that the lands of Tru-Villa Inc. and 2040796 Ontario Limited be referred to the Ontario Municipal Board to be consolidated with the Official Plan Amendment, Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law amendment appeals by Tru-Villa Inc. and 2040796 Ontario Limited. Since that time, a request was made to the Region to include all of the lands subject to the Official Plan Amendment appeal of Tru-Villa Inc. and 2040796 Ontario Limited, including lands owned by Karen and Gord Doehn (150 Anand Drive) and 1705 Huron Road owned by Steve and Debbie Reichert.

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 as it applies to approximately 63 hectares of land and appealed their Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law amendment applications as they apply to 53.20 hectares (131.4 acres) of land legally described as Part Lots 153, 154 and 155 German Company Tract located on Huron Road, to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) (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 Minister 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.

On April 17, 2012, in P-12-046, Regional staff requested that the lands of Tru-Villa Inc. and 2040796 Ontario Limited be referred to the Ontario Municipal Board to be consolidated with the Official Plan Amendment, Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law amendment appeals by Tru-Villa Inc. and 2040796 Ontario Limited. Since that time, a request was made to the Region to...
include all of the lands subject to the Official Plan Amendment appeal of Tru-Villa Inc. and 2040796 Ontario Limited, including lands owned by Karen and Gord Doehn (150 Anand Drive) and 1705 Huron Road owned by Steve and Debbie Reichert.

**Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination**

Regional staff is consulting with City of Kitchener staff in preparation for the OMB pre-hearing hearing on June 18, 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:**  Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
Appendix A – Location Map - lands subject to appeals by Tru-Villa Inc. and 2040796 Ontario Limited.
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: May 29, 2012

FILE CODE: D23-20/RR/Strategy

SUBJECT: REGIONAL REURBANIZATION TOOLBOX

RECOMMENDATION:

For Information.

SUMMARY:

Over the past decade, a new planning framework and associated market trends have changed the nature of the urban form in Waterloo Region. Reurbanization activity has increased along with the focus on the integration of land use and transportation planning. Regional Building Permit statistics demonstrate the trends – for example:

- The number of reurbanization units as a percentage of total new units constructed in Waterloo Region has grown from approximately 15% in 2003 to approximately 50% in 2010 and 55% in 2011.
- While 78% of all residential units constructed in 1998 were single detached homes, in 2011 this had decreased to 40% - suggesting a shift in the types of units being constructed.
- There have been approximately 5000 residential units and almost $1.34 billion in non-residential development building permits issued within proposed RT station areas since 2003.
- Almost 30% of all residential building permits were issued for development within the proposed RT station areas in 2011.
- Interest in the consumer market for reurbanization remains strong – with a recent study suggesting approximately 74% of those asked stating that they would consider moving to a reurbanization development (up from previous years).

This report presents the current toolbox for reurbanization activity within the Region (Attachment 1) which will continue to be updated and refined over time. The reurbanization toolbox is a source of information and resources that can be accessed by the Area Municipalities, the Region, Stakeholders and the Public (www.regionofwaterloo.ca/reurbanization). Further, the toolbox highlights several key themes that provide a common focus for many of the initiatives underway in the Planning, Housing and Community Services Department. These themes include:

- Creating a Business Supportive Culture
  Continuing to provide timely, high-quality, customer focused service, while at the same time balancing the responsibility to uphold Corporate Interests and other development review functions as delegated by the province.

- Integrating Development and Transportation
  Fostering transit-supportive development through the completion of several key initiatives that highlight the connection and importance of integrated planning, such as the Community Building Strategy and Transit Hub.
Promoting Active Forms of Transportation
Adopting a more inclusive approach to transportation planning that balances all forms of transportation and provides increased support for cycling, walking and public transportation.

Consideration of Cultural and Built Heritage
Ensuring that as change to the urban areas occurs, cultural heritage resources are considered and conserved where appropriate, reurbanization of key areas should respect the scale, physical and character and context of established neighbourhoods.

Implementation Through Collaboration
Recognizing that implementation of many of the framework elements occurs within a highly collaborative environment. Partnerships are key to each of these initiatives and consultation is frequent, regular and two-way.

Coordination and Integration
Focusing on the coordination and integration of information, processes and outcomes. Ensuring that the activities of the department are consistent and aligned with the broader regional objectives identified in the Corporate Strategic Plan is a key priority.

Building on the toolbox already in place, Staff is developing a comprehensive Reurbanization Strategy for Waterloo Region, as identified in action 2.1 of the 2011-2014 Region of Waterloo Corporate Strategic Plan. This Strategy will also assist in the implementation of several key policy directives, including the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2007) and the new Regional Official Plan (2009).

There are several immediate next steps that will be undertaken to further the development of the more comprehensive reurbanization strategy. For example, a review of the Joint Tax Increment Grant Program (TIG) program and the Regional Development Charge Exemptions for Brownfields is already underway (please see Report P-12-009/F-12-016). Consultation with Area Municipal partners is ongoing, with a follow-up report for Council consideration anticipated by early 2013.

REPORT:

Over the past decade, Waterloo Region has experienced several significant transitions that will have far reaching implications for the form and function of our community. During this period, the community has seen a shift in the traditional economic base, changes in the cultural and demographic mix of the population as well as a new focus on a more sustainable and environmentally friendly approach to community building. Waterloo Region is widely recognized as a vibrant, innovative, growing community – one in which the opportunities and challenges related to growth have been carefully considered and planned for as part of the overall policy framework. This framework has been developed through several key initiatives at the Provincial, Regional and Area Municipal level.

A major step in planning for growth in Waterloo Region was taken with the identification of a common vision for the future as outlined in the Regional Growth Management Strategy (RGMS), adopted by Regional Council originally in June 2003. The key elements of the RGMS include: big picture environmental planning, a firm urban boundary, reurbanization, transportation choice, target greenfield development and quality of life initiatives.

In 2005 and 2006, the vision outlined by the RGMS was complemented by the direction provided by the Province through the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) and the Places to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (the Growth Plan), respectively. Together, these documents emphasized the need for a coordinated approach to creating a more compact, transit-supportive
urban form through reurbanization\(^1\) while at the same time protecting valuable environmental resources, encouraging economic prosperity and enhancing the public’s health.

The Growth Plan states that the Region and Area Municipalities must plan for 729,000 people and 366,000 jobs by 2031. Further, it outlines specific targets for development, requiring that at least 40% of all residential development must occur within the Built-Up Area by 2015.

While in 2003, the term reurbanization was a relatively new concept – the development trend towards it over the past several years has been unmistakable. For example:

- The number of reurbanization units as a percentage of total new units constructed in Waterloo Region has grown from approximately 15% in 2003 to approximately 50% in 2010\(^2\) and 55% in 2011.\(^3\)
- While 78% of all residential units constructed in 1998 were single detached homes, in 2011 this had decreased to only 40% - suggesting a shift in the types of units being constructed.
- There have been approximately 5000 residential units and almost $1.34 billion in non-residential development building permits issued within proposed RT station areas since 2003.
- Almost 30% of all residential unit building permits were issued for development within the proposed RT station areas in 2011.\(^4\)
- Interest in the consumer market for reurbanization remains strong – with a recent study suggesting approximately 74% of those asked stating that the would consider moving to a reurbanization development (up from previous years).\(^5\)

In June 2009, Council took a key step in the realization of the objectives noted above with the adopted of the new Regional Official Plan (ROP). Approved by the Province in December 2010, this document represents the Region’s interpretation of how conformity with both the PPS and Growth Plan can be achieved. It also translates the vision outlined in the RGMS and the Growth Plan in order to provide the policy framework required to guide growth and change for the next 20 years.

One of the key elements of the ROP is the transition to more sustainable modes of transportation supported by the implementation of a rapid transit system along the primary reurbanization corridor (also known as the central transit corridor) that connects the cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo. In June 2011, Regional Council affirmed this strategy by approving a light rail transit (LRT) to be implemented through a staged approach. Stage one of the project will include LRT from Conestoga Mall in Waterloo to Fairview Park Mall in Kitchener as well as an adapted bus rapid system (aBRT) from Fairview Park Mall to the Ainslie Street Bus Terminal in Cambridge. Stage two will include the implementation of a full LRT corridor from Waterloo to Cambridge.

Region of Waterloo Reurbanization Strategy
In the fall of 2011, Regional Council approved the **2011-2014 Strategic Plan**. This document provides a common focus and sense of direction, by which staff can prioritize, implement and measure their core responsibilities.

**Focus Area 2: Growth Management and Prosperity** seeks to "Manage growth to foster thriving and productive urban and rural communities." Related to this is **Strategic Objective 2.1** “Encourage\(^6\)

---

1 Defined in the ROP as “four distinct types of activity, all of which serve to increase the residential ore employment density on sites located within the exiting, built-up area.” The four types of activity consist of infill, intensification, adaptive reuse and redevelopment and may include sites with environmental impacts (brownfields).
2 Based on the building permits issued within the Region’s “Reurbanization Monitoring Line”. Within the Province’s Built Up Area (or within the Built Boundary) the number of units as a percentage of total new units constructed in 2010, was 56%.
3 Based on statistics provided as part of the year-end 2011 Building Permit Activity and Growth Monitoring Report (P-12-029).
4 Based on statistics provided as part of the year-end 2011 Building Permit Activity and Growth Monitoring Report (P-12-029).
5 Reurbanization Marketing Study (2010). MKI.
compact, livable urban and rural settlement form”. This strategic objective is further developed through the related action item 2.1.2:

“Work with area municipalities to develop and implement a comprehensive strategy to promote intensification and reurbanization within existing urban areas.”

Significant progress has been made towards reurbanization in Waterloo Region over the last several years. The Region of Waterloo and the seven Area Municipalities all play important roles in facilitating the ongoing change - and have many tools and resources in place to do so. At the regional level, there are several key initiatives within Planning, Housing and Community Services that together form the basis of the Region’s more comprehensive approach to planning for Reurbanization. The current Regional Reurbanization “Toolbox” is attached as Attachment 1. The Toolbox includes key tools, initiatives and resources falling under five main categories; policy, implementation, facilitation, assistance and research. A more detailed overview of each resource in the Toolbox is included in Attachment 2.

While each of initiatives in this toolbox may differ in terms of their focus on particular elements of the built environment, the ability to impact the nature of reurbanization in Waterloo Region is an underlying principal. Some approaches noted in this toolbox provide guidance at the macro level – while others provide detailed direction more suitable at the individual project scale. Further, it is evident that many of these initiatives are “intersecting” or tied together in the sense that they each play an important role in the ongoing efforts to further integrate the planning of land use and transportation.

**Reurbanization Toolbox – Key Themes**

The suite of existing reurbanization tools reflect themes that have been the focus of Planning, Housing and Community Services over the last several years.

These themes include:

a) **Creating a Business Supportive Culture**

Regional staff recognize that maintaining and enhancing economic strength in a globally competitive knowledge-based economy requires fostering a business-supportive culture. Many of the initiatives in the framework reflect the Region’s supportive role in economic development - either by providing additional information, clarity to development processes or direct financial assistance. The various partnerships that have been created also reflect the importance of working together with the business community in order to achieve mutual objectives. To this end, as the comprehensive reurbanization strategy evolves, Planning, Housing and Community Services will continue to provide timely, high-quality, customer focused service, while at the same time balancing the responsibility to uphold Corporate Interests and other development review functions as delegated by the Province.

b) **Integrating Development and Transportation**

Reurbanization, specifically in the form of transit-supportive development (generally defined as compact, mixed use neighbourhoods containing a range of housing types and other uses) within walking distance of transit services (both rapid transit and conventional) has and will continue to provide focus to the work of Planning, Housing and Community Services. While laying the foundations for more active forms of transportation is important, the nature of new development in the Region can play a critical role in achieving the overall objectives.

---

6 The built environment includes buildings, transportation networks, public spaces, parks, natural systems and all other spaces that collectively shape the form, pattern and function of the community.
Many of the initiatives listed above relate to this overall theme. The new ROP, specialized development application review, various stakeholders partnerships, research, incentive programs and regional projects all aim to provide a comprehensive approach to support this objective. Moving forward, funding for the Transit-Supportive Strategy in Cambridge and the completion of the Central Transit Corridor Community Building Strategy have the potential to greatly influence this development. The Regional Reurbanization Community Improvement Plan is also a key tool that provides opportunity for Council to play a more proactive role if desired.

c) Promoting Active Forms of Transportation

Many of the initiatives underway include shifting the transportation-planning focus to a multi-modal and “active” transportation approach. This more inclusive approach balances all forms of transportation and provides increased choice by supporting cycling, walking and public transportation. The RTMP, Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines, Active Transportation Master Plan, and various Transportation Demand Management Initiatives (TravelWise, TDM and Parking Strategy) and the development of the new Multi-Modal Transportation Hub are all key parts of this multi-faceted approach. While some initiatives relate to the physical infrastructure needs (such as roads, rapid transit, cycling lanes, pedestrian amenities and the hub), others address key issues that affect the users of various modes. As the comprehensive Reurbanization Strategy is further developed, providing greater transportation choice will continue to be a major priority that will help the Region create a more sustainable future.

d) Consideration of Cultural and Built Heritage

Staff recognize that it is not solely the quantity of reurbanization that occurs, but the quality of that new development which is important. The ROP states that cultural heritage resources should be conserved and that reurbanization of key areas should respect the scale, physical and character and context of established neighbourhoods. In addition, the development of the Regional Heritage Conservation Toolbox will play a key role in this respect and will be a valuable resource in the overall reurbanization strategy. Further there are many legislative planning and financial tools that could be further explored by staff and HPAC to this end (please see Report P-12-XXX, dated May 29, 2012 for more information).

e) Implementation Through Collaboration

The implementation of many of the framework elements occurs within a highly collaborative environment. Partnerships are key to each of these initiatives and consultation is frequent, regular and two-way. There are many means by which these partnerships are formed – on a project by project basis or as part of an ongoing body. Project teams consistently include representation from different regional departments and area municipal staff. Further, some of the more formal partnership include the various working groups (Reurbanization Working Group, Brownfields Working Group, the Home Builders Liaison Committee) that meet on a regular basis with Regional Staff to discuss challenges, opportunities and work on joint projects of interest. The Heritage Public Advisory Committee is one example of a formal opportunity to get input from members of the Community. In addition, as part of the more comprehensive reurbanization strategy, the Region continues to look for opportunities to form Public-Private Partnerships (P3s) where appropriate. There may be many such opportunities related to development around rapid transit stations, brownfields, and transportation demand management initiatives.

f) Coordination and Integration

While this framework contains many different elements, staff continue to focus on the coordination and integration of information, processes and outcomes. Ensuring that the activities of the

---

7 For more information on the Reurbanization Working Group and past initiatives, please see Attachment 3.
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department are consistent and aligned with the broader regional objectives identified in the Corporate Strategic Plan is a key priority.

Further, as the Region works together with the Area Municipalities to continue the development of a more comprehensive strategy, there will be many complementary elements that must also be considered. This includes issues such as affordable housing, heritage conservation, human services, sustainable development, and transportation choice that will all serve to support the objective of a thriving and productive community. It is also recognized that both public and private stakeholders will need to work together and continue to coordinate initiatives within their various spheres of influence.

Reurbanization Challenges and Opportunities

The Region is in the midst of a very exciting period of transition with respect to reurbanization. With this come many challenges that must be carefully considered and proactively addressed. While much has been accomplished, it is recognized that there many additional opportunities with respect to the further development and implementation of a comprehensive reurbanization strategy.

The following discussion highlights some of the key considerations staff have identified.

**Pace of Change**

Over the course of the past 10 years, levels of reurbanization activity have increased at a substantial rate – in many instances much faster that would have been anticipated when it became a more recognizable trend in the early 2000s. Since the first Regional Reurbanization Conference in 2005, Waterloo Region has seen an impressive range of high quality projects (many award winning\(^8\)) that have changed the urban landscape and contributed to a new vitality.

The result of this is that all stakeholders (political leaders, municipal staff, the private sector and members of the community) have been required to very quickly recognize that reurbanization is not “business as usual”. For example, reurbanization has necessitated new dialogue around the issues of density, urban design, heritage conservation and adaptive reuse, environmental impacts, infrastructure, parking requirements and many other debates that were not part of the traditional development equation when most new construction took place in greenfield areas. Reurbanization can be complex and there is often a need to approach each project with an individualized approach – there is no “one size fits all” in reurbanization.

Consequently, it must be recognized that the issues and challenges for reurbanization will continue to evolve – especially in light of the transitions that are anticipated in the next several years. With greenfield areas more constrained in certain municipalities, the implementation of the rapid transit system (both LRT and aBRT) as well as more widespread market and demographic shifts, there is much to consider. As a result, those involved in facilitating this transition must continue to identify and prioritize key issues, be flexible in their approach and continue to work together to support each other.

**Resources**

As the level of reurbanization increases or eventually stabilizes as higher levels than typically has been experienced in the Region, it is anticipated that there will be new resource issues that will have to be addressed. This will occur on many different levels; from the municipal perspective, from the private sector and from the broader community.

At the municipal level, understanding the relationships between reurbanization and property taxes, development charges, various long-term master plans and the resulting capital budgets

---

\(^8\) Such as the CUI Brownie Award winning Tannery District (Kitchener) and Waterscape on the Grand (Cambridge) and the widely acclaimed King St Recontruction by the City of Kitchener (with IBI Group).
(transportation and other infrastructure) and planning exercises will all play an important role in the management and prioritization of the financial resources available. Further, the coordination of staff resources at the Area Municipal and Regional level may also become more challenging given the number of initiatives that require involvement from both levels of government.

The private sector will continue to face challenges with respect to the development of reurbanization projects. Those issues related to the creation of additional uncertainty (environmental impacts, financing, review process, market conditions) impact each of the critical resources required in the development industry (ie. time and money). Thus if the trend of successful reurbanization is to continue, efforts should be made to look for appropriate opportunities to improve the business climate – ensuring Waterloo Region will remain a place of choice for those who want to invest.

Residents of Waterloo Region will also be faced with new choices as to how to allocate their own personal and community resources. As reurbanization continues, new “places” to live, work and play will be created. This could have a significant impact of the lifestyles of individuals, as well as the social infrastructure that is provided by the community including; education, recreation, healthcare, transportation.

Transition Period – Implementation of Rapid Transit

The implementation of Rapid Transit, specifically LRT and aBrt will be a significant undertaking in the history of Waterloo Region. It is anticipated to have an important impact on the future shape and development of the community. As was noted earlier, there is already substantial amounts of development (both residential and non-residential) occurring near future RT stations. However, part of the challenge associated with this, is that Waterloo Region is still in the midst of a transitioning policy framework. While the new ROP outlines specific policies for reurbanization and specifically Transit Oriented Development, it is currently under appeal before the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB). Further, the local official plans have not yet been brought into conformity with the ROP, nor have many of the local zoning by-laws been updated to reflect current policy approaches. This means that there are still many examples of key sites in close proximity to future rapid transit stations where redevelopment has been proposed that may not be “transit-supportive” in form or use. Given the importance of the land-uses around rapid transit as a potential trip generator, this is an issue that should be addressed more comprehensively by all the involved stakeholders in the short term.

Refinement of Existing Tools

While some of the tools noted as part of the “toolbox” are employed on a regular basis as part of the ongoing operations of the department (for example development review or the various partnerships that have been formed), two of the tools have the potential for more in depth exploration in the future. The Regional Reurbanization Community Improvement Plan (RRCIP) currently includes one program designed in order to provide Regional Council with the ability to take a more proactive role in the development process if desired. For example, it would allow Council to address some of the obstacles related to reurbanization by purchasing, holding, improving and selling lands within the Central Transit Corridor (CTC). There is also the potential that additional programs could be added depending on future needs.

In addition, there are currently several financial tools that may need to be refined further in order to allow for an integration of multiple regional objectives pertaining to reurbanization. There is also the potential that additional programs could be developed to provide for, or realigned in a way that ensures priority is given to the forms and location of reurbanization activity in such a manner that supports provincial, regional and area municipal objectives. The integration of multiple objectives (such as affordable housing, brownfield remediation, adaptive-reuse and sustainable development) within a more comprehensive program can be examined – thus streamlining certain processes and allowing for a very clear statement in terms of the quality of reurbanization projects that are desired in the Region. As part of the 2012 Brownfields Program Update (please see report P-12-009/F-12-016),
Council directed staff to begin this evaluation and to develop a framework to prioritize financial incentives within key reurbanization areas and to ensure alignment with other strategic Regional objectives.

Monitoring

The ongoing monitoring of reurbanization activity will be an important focus over the next several years. This is both mandated by the province and will provide a key input into future decision making processes related to many of the issues above. With respect to the implementation of the Rapid Transit system, there should be a consistent effort made to measure both the impacts of the system on development as well as transit ridership and changes in mode share. Similar monitoring will take place associated with some of the changes occurring with respect to new parking management strategies.

Education and Communication

Ongoing education and communication around reurbanization continues to be a focus. The dialogue around this topic is important for all those concerned – residents, policy makers and the private sector. Developing strategies to communicate key information, successes, lessons learned and process will assist stakeholders to make informed decisions.

Moving Forward - Next Steps

The continued development and implementation of a comprehensive reurbanization strategy in partnership with the Area Municipalities represents an exciting opportunity for the Region. An integral element of this exercise will be to build upon the existing reurbanization toolbox in place and ensure communication and coordination with key partners moving forward.

There are several immediate next steps that will be undertaken to further the development of the more comprehensive reurbanization strategy. For example, a review of the Joint Tax Increment Grant Program (TIG) program and the Regional Development Charge Exemptions for Brownfields is already underway (please see Report P-12-009/F-12-016). Consultation with Area Municipal partners is ongoing with a follow-up report for Council consideration anticipated by early 2013.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

Staff of the Area Municipalities will continue to be consulted during the course of the overall strategy development and as part of the individual project implementation. Area Municipal staff is represented on several of the Working Groups and are members of the project teams for several of these initiatives. Efforts to streamline Area Municipal participation will also be made in order to ensure efficient use of staff resources.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The Reurbanization Toolbox and development of a Reurbanization Strategy is consistent with Focus Area 2: Growth Management and Prosperity: Manage growth to foster thriving and productive urban and rural communities. Relevant Strategic Objectives include: 2.1. Encourage compact, livable urban and rural settlement form; and 2.4. Promote and enhance arts, culture and heritage.

It is also consistent with Focus Area 3: Sustainable Transportation: Develop greater, more sustainable and safe transportation choices. Relevant Strategic Objectives include: 3.1. Implement a Light Rail Transit System in the Central Transit Corridor fully integrated with an expanded conventional transit system; 3.2. Develop, promote and integrate active forms of transportation (cycling and walking); and 3.4. Encourage improvements to inter-city transportation services to and from Waterloo Region.
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Focus Area 4: Healthy and Inclusive Communities: Foster healthy, safe, inclusive and caring communities. Relevant Strategic Objectives include 4.5 Work collaboratively to increase the supply and range of affordable housing and reduce homelessness.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The development of the Regional Reurbanization Strategy and Toolbox is funded through the 2012 program budget approved for Collaborative Implementation of Reurbanization with Area Municipalities.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Staff from Transportation and Environmental Services (Rapid Transit), and Finance have been consulted in the preparation of this report.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment 1 – Reurbanization Toolbox
Attachment 2 – Detailed Reurbanization Toolbox Overview
Attachment 3 – The Reurbanization Working Group

PREPARED BY: Brooke Lambert, Interim Manager, Reurbanization

APPROVED BY: Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
### Attachment 1

**Reurbanization Toolbox**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Policy** | - The Provincial Policy Statement (2005);  
- Places to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2006);  
- Regional Official Plan (2009)  
- ROP Official Plan Amendments – Transportation Focus (2012);  
- Implementation Guideline for the Review of Development Applications on or Adjacent to Known and Potentially Contaminated Sites (2009);  
- Implementation Guideline for Road Allowance Dedications Adjacent to Known and Potentially Contaminated Sites (2012);  
- Context Sensitive Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines (2010); and  
- Area Municipal Official Plan ROP Conformity. |
| **Implementation** | - Region of Waterloo Corporate Strategic Plan (2011-2014);  
- Regional Transportation Master Plan (2010);  
- Region of Waterloo Transit Hub (King/Victoria St. Kitchener);  
- Affordable Housing Strategy (2008-2013);  
- Community Action Plan for Housing Update (2013);  
- Central Transit Corridor Community Building Strategy;  
- GRT Business Plan;  
- GRT Service Expansion and Realignment;  
- Transit Service Improvements for Cambridge;  
- TDM Parking and Trip Generation Reduction Strategy;  
- Regional Parking Management Strategy;  
- Regional Forest Management Plan Implementation;  
- Active Transportation Master Plan Implementation;  
- Active Transportation Master Plan; and  
- Urban Greenlands Strategy. |
| **Facilitation** | - Specialized Development Application Review;  
- Reurbanization Working Group;  
- Brownfields Working Group;  
- Home Builders Liaison Committee;  
- Reurbanization Community Advisory Panel;  
- Heritage Planning Advisory Committee;  
- Ecological and Environmental Advisory Committee;  
- Active Transportation Advisory Committee;  
- Regional Reurbanization Community Improvement Plan (2008);  
- Waterloo Region Parking Coordinating Committee;  
- TravelWise Transportation Management Association; and  
- Regional Heritage Conservation Toolbox. |
| **Assistance** | - Brownfield Financial Incentive Pilot Program (2006);  
- Environmental Stewardship Fund (2008);  
- Transit Supportive Strategy for Cambridge (RT);  
- Housing Incentives & Funding Resource Guide; and  
- TravelWise Marketing, Promotion and Education. |
| **Research** | - Visualizing Densities (2006 and 2007);  
- A Blueprint for Shaping Growth in Waterloo Region (2007);  
- Reurbanization Market Study (2010);  
- Workplace Count (2011);  
- Soil/Sediment Rehabilitation and Aggregate Recycling;  
- Commuter Parking Lot Feasibility Study (2012);  
- Schneider Creek Floodplain Technical Update and Policy Review;  
- Revitalizing Regionally-Owned Community Housing; and  
- Housing/Demographic Research. |
## Attachment 2
### Detailed Reurbanization Toolbox Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provincial Policy Statement (2005)</strong></td>
<td>In Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) is issued under the authority of Section 3 of the Planning Act. It provides direction on matters of provincial interest related to land use planning and development, and promotes the provincial “policy-led” planning system. The PPS came into effect on March 1, 2005. Further, the Planning Act requires that all decisions affecting land use planning matters &quot;shall be consistent with&quot; the Provincial Policy Statement. The Provincial Policy Statement recognizes the complex inter-relationships among economic, environmental and social factors in planning and embodies good planning principles. It provides strong, clear policy direction on land use planning to promote strong communities, a clean and healthy environment and a strong economy. It includes policies on key issues that affect our communities, such as: the efficient use and management of land and infrastructure; protection of the environment and resources; and ensuring appropriate opportunities for employment and residential development, including support for a mix of uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Places to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2006)</strong></td>
<td>In Place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| On June 16, 2006, the Province of Ontario approved the Places to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (the Growth Plan). Prepared under the Places to Grow Act, 2005, it is part of the Places to Grow initiative to “plan for healthy and prosperous growth throughout Ontario.” The Growth Plan aims to:  
  - Revitalize downtowns to become vibrant and convenient centres;  
  - Create complete communities that offer more options for living, working, shopping and playing;  
  - Provide greater choice in housing types to meet the needs of people at all stages of life;  
  - Curb sprawl and protect farmland and green spaces; and  
  - Reduce traffic gridlock by improving access to a greater range of transportation choices. |
| **Regional Official Plan (2009)** | Under Appeal at the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) |
| The Regional Official Plan (ROP), was adopted by Council in June 2009, and approved by the Province in December 2010. It represents a fundamental shift in planning for the Region by providing a more balanced community structure. This structure emphasizes the principals of sustainability on all fronts – cultural, economic, environmental and social. The concept of “livability” is also ingrained in the plan and ensures that Waterloo Region will be a desirable home for people at all stages of life – recognizing the importance the distinct local urban and rural communities play in providing residents with choice in where they live, work and play. The ROP document represents the Region’s interpretation of what conformity with both the PPS and Growth Plan. Further, the ROP is a legal document that contains goals, objectives and policies to |
manage and direct physical (land use) change and its effects on the community. Once approved, the Planning Act requires that all Regional and Area Municipal public works, Area Municipal official plans and land use related by-laws, must conform to the ROP. As of January 24, 2011 the ROP in its entirety came under appeal before the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB). Despite this status, the policies of this plan represent the direction in which the Region intends to work towards.

The vision set out in the ROP is as follows:
Waterloo Region will be an inclusive, thriving, and sustainable community committed to maintaining harmony between rural and urban areas and fostering opportunities for current and future generations.

| Regional Official Plan Amendments – Transportation Focus. | In 2012 Regional staff will initiate processing of several ROP/ROPP amendments. The amendments will relate to implementation of the Regional Transportation Master Plan, the Rapid Transit Environmental Assessment and a Housekeeping amendment that addresses required minor wording and mapping revisions. Lastly, following the upcoming Provincial election, the Strategic Policy Development team will participate in the review of the Provincial Policy Statement and the Places to Grow Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. | Future Initiative |
| Implementation Guideline for the Review of Development Applications on or Adjacent to Known and Potentially Contaminated Sites (2009) | The Implementation Guideline for the Review of Development Applications on or Adjacent to Known and Potentially Contaminated Sites is used to prescribe when the filing of a Record of Site Condition (RSC) is to be required by the Region of Waterloo as part of the review of development applications. This Guideline replaces the 1997 Protocol for the Review of Development Applications on or Adjacent to Lands Which are Known, Suspected or Potentially Contaminated. Key improvements to this Guideline include a reduction in the number of instances where a RSC is required, greater flexibility in the development approvals process relative to when a required RSC may be submitted and implementation of an environmental site screening questionnaire. | In Place |
| Implementation Guideline for Road Allowance Dedications Adjacent to Known and Potentially Contaminated Sites (2012) | The Implementation Guideline for Road Allowance Dedications Adjacent to Known and Potentially Contaminated Sites outlines the Region's planning requirements and provides a consistent procedure for obtaining road dedications on or adjacent to known and potentially contaminated land. Two key objectives of this Guideline are first to restore contaminated land to an environmental condition suitable for its proposed use as a public right-of-way without creating a barrier to development, and second to mitigate the Regional risk of acquiring road allowance dedications. | In Place |
| Context Sensitive Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines (2010) | The Implementation Guidelines for Regional Transportation Corridor Design provides context sensitive guidelines and design standards for Regional transportation corridors which clarify the relative priority and treatment for the various travel modes and community uses. The objective is to create greater transportation choice by providing space and the environment within the transportation corridor for all modes. These guidelines are organized in three sections:
- Street Elements (curb to curb); | In Place |
**Boulevard Elements (curb to property line); and**
**General Elements such as transition areas, public art, fencing.**

It is recognized that the function of transportation corridors is shifting from being a pure capacity conduit for motor vehicles to serving as part of the community identify and fabric. The right-of-way should be considered as a “place” that better reflects all of the activities that occur within and adjacent to the right-of-way area. There are many competing goals and objectives for uses and space within the right-of-way including providing adequate capacity to move people and goods and addressing operating and maintenance needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Municipal Official Plan ROP Conformity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Strategic Policy Development team is currently collaborating with the Area Municipalities to bring their Official Plans into conformity with the Regional Official Plan (ROP) and new applicable Provincial policies and legislation. It is anticipated that most or all of the seven Area Municipal Official Plans will be forwarded to Regional staff in 2012 for consideration of approval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation**

| Region of Waterloo Corporate Strategic Plan (2011-2014) | In 2011, Regional Council developed the Region of Waterloo Strategic Focus (or Strategic Plan) that provides a common focus for Council and staff over the 2011-2014 period. This strategy has five focus areas:  
- Environmental Sustainability;  
- Growth Management and Prosperity;  
- Sustainable Transportation;  
- Healthy and Inclusive Communities; and  
- Service Excellence.  
Within each of the focus areas, Strategic Objectives have also been articulated. Further the strategic plan outlines a number of actions that will further the realization of the various objectives. | In Place |

| Regional Transportation Master Plan (2010) | Approved by Regional Council June 2010, the RTMP defines how the Region’s transportation system will grow and change in the coming decades. It will help the Region offer more travel choices to residents, and make sure the future transportation system is affordable and environmentally sustainable. The goal of the plan is to create:  
- A transportation network that centres on transit, with a rapid transit system connecting Waterloo, Kitchener and Cambridge;  
- More cycling lanes and pedestrian-friendly routes  
- An expanded bus network, including more express bus service to feed rapid transit stations and better serve the busy residential and commercial centres beyond the rapid transit corridor;  
- Strategic road improvements to ensure movement of goods, relieve traffic problems or support transit policies to help the Region encourage transit ridership, cycling and walking, manage congestion and promote vibrant urban places. | In Place |
| Region of Waterloo Transit Hub (King and Victoria Street, Kitchener) | The Region of Waterloo purchased the properties at the northeast corner of the intersection of King and Victoria Streets in the City of Kitchener. The site will be home to a new multi-modal transit facility or “transit hub” that will bring GRT service, rapid transit, GO buses and trains and VIA Rail together in one location. The site may also include:
- Pedestrian and cycling facilities;
- Underground parking; and
- Retail/Restaurant/Office Space.

The Transit Hub is a pivotal component of the overall transportation network that the Region plans to complete over the next several decades. The integration of the various modes of transportation in a central hub that will serve not only the region but the larger community represents an unprecedented opportunity to shape the travel behaviour of both current and future residents in the community.

Planning for the Transit Hub is currently underway, including an Official Plan Amendment and Zone Change through the City of Kitchener. Further, several key planning studies including a Heritage Impact Assessment and Preliminary Site Design and Station Area Access Plan have been commenced. Staff will also be initiating an Environmental Assessment for the site in early 2012. | In Progress |

| Affordable Housing Strategy (2008-2013) | On October 29, 2008, Regional Council endorsed a new Affordable Housing Strategy (AHS) to create at least 500 new units of sustainable affordable housing, between 2008 and the end of 2013 (P-08-105). By the end of 2011, the Region has developed 382 units towards the 500-unit goal (76%). | In Place |

| Community Action Plan for Housing Update | The Action Plan provides an overview of the state of housing across the full range of housing in Waterloo Region, and provides a community-based strategy to address housing program needs and gaps. The Action Plan will form part of the Provincially-mandated Housing and Homelessness Plan (together with Social Service’s Homelessness to Housing Stability Strategy) due by January 1, 2014. | In Progress |

| Central Transit Corridor Community Building Strategy | The construction of the new rapid transit system, connecting Cambridge, Kitchener, and Waterloo presents an incredible opportunity to not only move people but to also shape the urban landscape. Along this corridor will be major investment – from both the public and private sectors - in both transportation infrastructure and new development that presents great potential for place making.

In February 2012, Regional Council approved the commencement of the Central Transit Corridor Community Building Strategy. This strategy will include the following deliverables:
- The vision, principles, objectives and implementation | In Progress |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>strategies for the Region’s Rapid Transit Corridor:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The purpose for each station area in relationship to each other and the context of the overall corridor;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A methodology for the identification of key near-term redevelopment sites within the corridor;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential strategies to guide new development in terms of use and built form during the interim period before other planning measures are in place;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An implementation work plan, coordinating corridor and station area planning efforts of both the Region and the Area Municipalities; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A suite of visual tools that will help stakeholders conceptualize the anticipated transition of the corridor over the long-term.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>GRT Business Plan</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The 2011 – 2014 Grand River Transit (GRT) Business Plan, approved by Regional Council on February 6, 2012 will guide the implementation of transit service improvements and fare strategies to help achieve the goals of the Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>GRT Service Expansion and Realignment</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Council’s approved Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) recommends significant increases to transit services in the Region in order to provide greater transportation choice. The service improvement plan will increase the competitiveness of Grand River Transit’s (GRT) service and encourage transit use, supporting the Region’s goal of being a thriving and sustainable community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to deal with passenger crowding and to improve schedule reliability, and as part of the steps to realign the transit network in preparation for rapid transit, Council has approved a reserve fund for new service beginning in 2011. This service would begin to implement the cross-corridor routes as part of the Rapid Transit integration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Transit Service Improvements for Cambridge</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing additional service in the Cambridge Area, focusing on upgrading Route 75 Saginaw BusPLUS with conventional service, reviewing service to the LG Lovell Industrial Park and expanding service on Sundays. The service review may also include restructuring of routes in east Cambridge, pending resource availability. A long term route structure will be developed in consultation with the community that will help guide service planning decisions in the future. Initial service improvements are planned for September 2012 implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TDM Parking and Trip Generation Reduction Strategy</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free and abundant parking generates car trips and is responsible for low urban densities and poor walking environments. In January 2010, the Region of Waterloo and the Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo began working with BA Group to develop an incentive for developers to use Transportation Demand Management (TDM) initiatives and Transit Oriented Development (TOD) features to reduce the oversupply of parking. Between January and May 2011 two draft checklists were tested by the Cities. The testing period for the checklists has ended and comments have been received. A final report and recommendation is expected in Fall 2012.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| In Progress |

---
| **Regional Parking Management Strategy** | As identified and recommended by the Regional Parking Strategy, the Region is undertaking a number of initiatives in order to position parking to be better supportive of modal shifts towards transit and active transportation. The availability and pricing of parking greatly affects modal choices which is a topic of central focus to the Region. However, parking falls under the jurisdiction of Area Municipalities who are responsible for the policies and regulations on parking. In addition, the Area Municipalities are also the largest owners and operators of the public parking stock. | In Progress |
| **Regional Forest Management Plan Implementation** | Implementation of the Regional Forest Management Plan (RFMP). The RFMP was approved by Regional Council in July 2006 as a high-level overview and forest management philosophy for Regional Forests and Woodlands. Since that time, Annual Operating and Management Plans are being developed to guide management activities on a property-by-property basis. These short term plans have much greater detail than the RFMP and include specifics of tree harvesting, tree planting and other forest tending activities. In addition to the Annual Operating plans, there also is an ongoing program of hazard tree management, trail and infrastructure maintenance, and other property maintenance items such as sign and gate installation. | In Progress |
| **Active Transportation Master Plan** | The Region of Waterloo has initiated the development of a new Active Transportation Master Plan (ATMP). This Plan will update the Region’s Cycling Master Plan, 2004, while integrating a new regionally significant transportation network for pedestrians. It will integrate and expand existing and planned Regional and Area Municipal active transportation routes for health, recreation, tourism and commuting purposes. The system envisioned in this plan should take walking and cycling beyond the exclusive domain of avid cyclists and the courageous to become the practical and preferred option for average residents. The new Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) identifies active transportation as a critical component of a balanced transportation system that will play a much larger role in urban areas as they build-out and begin to achieve higher land use densities. The target is to increase the walking and cycling mode share, from 8% of pm peak period trips today to 12% of pm peak hour trips by 2031. Achieving this increase will require investment in active transportation infrastructure. | In Progress |
| **Urban Greenlands Strategy** | As part of a larger Greenlands Strategy for Waterloo Region, the Urban Greenlands Strategy complements the reurbanization and intensification efforts throughout the main urban areas and particularly along the Central Transportation Corridor. Urban Greenlands, while typically much smaller in area and lower in natural heritage values than most natural areas, play a substantial role in terms of enhancing quality of life and the liveability of larger urban centres, improving urban air quality, creating venues for social interaction, and promoting walking and physical activity. An urban greenlands strategy must be implemented primarily by Area Municipalities with input from the business community, neighbourhood associations, recreationists, Grand River Transit, Public Health, and Crime Prevention. Ideally, such a strategy | Future Initiative |
should embody *adaptive co-management* which is described as a flexible community-based system of resource management and sharing which is tailored to specific places and situations and supported by, and working with, various organisations at different levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialized Development Review – Reurbanization Team</strong></td>
<td>In Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 2007/2008, the Community Planning Division was reorganized to reflect the changing nature of development review in the Region. As a result of the new planning context, it became evident that there was a need to have dedicated staff well versed in the specific issues pertaining to both greenfield developments and the new trend towards reurbanization within existing built up areas. The Reurbanization Team reviews development applications primarily within the built up area of the cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo. The Brownfields and Rapid Transit land-use planning portfolio also resides within this group. The team meets regularly with each other and staff within other divisions and departments to identify and overcome challenges with respect to reurbanization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **The Reurbanization Working Group**                                         | Ongoing  |
| The Reurbanization Working Group (RWG) established in 2004, meets with the focus of increasing the number of reurbanization projects that occur throughout Waterloo Region. The RWG also provides a forum for the discussion and resolution of identified obstacles to successful reurbanization activity and to identify and share success stories, skill-sets, techniques, incentives, and opportunities among its members. Furthermore, the RWG hopes to generate increased investor and homebuilder interest in the development of lands within Waterloo Region’s existing urban areas and enhance political and public awareness, support, and demand for reurbanization. See more information in Attachment 2. |

| **The Brownfields Working Group**                                            | Ongoing  |
| The Brownfields Working Group comprised of staff from each of the seven area municipalities and the Region meets to further the growth management goals of the local, regional and provincial governments by the promotion and facilitation of brownfield remediation and redevelopment. The BWG allows for a more coordinated approach between all the partners and provides a forum to discuss the opportunities to discuss the shared challenges and potential solutions. This group has also undertaken several joint initiatives, including:  
  - Development of a Brownfields Community Improvement Plan Template for the implementation of a joint tax increment grant program;  
  - The development of a region-wide brownfield marketing and branding package;  
  - Delivery of joint brownfield presentations; and  
  - The hosting of a local forum as part of the National Brownfield Workshop series presented by Bloom (formerly OCETA) and FCM. |


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Home Builders Liaison Committee</td>
<td>The Home Builders’s Liaison Committee provides a forum for the discussion and exchange of ideas with respect to land-development issues in Waterloo Region.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reurbanization Community Advisory Panel</td>
<td>The Reurbanization Community Advisory Panel advises the Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services or reurbanization related matters and serves as a forum for stakeholders to raise their viewpoints and have discussion.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Planning Advisory Committee</td>
<td>The Heritage Planning Advisory Committee (HPAC) advises and monitors the implementation and the impact of heritage issues in accordance with applicable policy. The Committee also assists the Region in developing heritage policies and strategies.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological and Environmental Advisory Committee</td>
<td>The Ecological and Environmental Advisory Committee (EEAC) advises Planning, Housing and Community Services staff on development applications and Environmental Assessments which potentially affect the Region’s most significant natural features. It also advises on other environmental issues of interest to the Region. EEAC consists of fifteen citizen appointees with specialized environmental expertise and two Regional Councillors.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>The Active Transportation Advisory Committee (ATAC) serves as a forum for the public to raise their viewpoints on particular active transportation issues and to advise Regional Council and staff on cycling and pedestrian issues. The Committee will facilitate the Region's goal of developing an Active Transportation Master Plan to encourage higher rates of walking and cycling and to integrate active transportation as part of a balanced transportation network.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Reurbanization Community Improvement Plan</td>
<td>On July 2, 2008, Regional Council adopted a Regional Reurbanization Community Improvement Plan (RRCIP) as a tool to help the Region facilitate reurbanization within the CTC. The RRCIP allows Regional Council to buy key properties in the CTC and prepare them to a point where they become more attractive to prospective developers. With this ability, Regional Council can take a leadership role in developing more compact, mixed-use, transit supportive projects that may not occur otherwise. While this tool has not yet been employed, it provides Council with additional flexibility moving forward. It is also important because the designated community improvement plan area relates directly to the future rapid transit corridor. This could provide an opportunity for Council to focus future community improvement programs (ie. incentives or other assistance) to priority areas as well as a desire to further shape the nature of that development.</td>
<td>In Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Region Parking Coordinating Committee</td>
<td>Parking falls under the jurisdiction of Area Municipalities who are responsible for its policies and regulations. In addition, the Area Municipalities are also the largest owners and operators of the public parking stock. On the other hand, the availability and pricing of parking greatly affects modal choices, which is a topic of central focus to the Region. As such, the Region is helping to mobilize the Waterloo Region Parking Coordinating Committee (PCC) with its primary goals being (a) develop a region-wide common understanding and approach in the management of parking resources; (b) harmonize parking policies, programs and services to support non-SOV modal shares; and (c) research best practices on parking from other jurisdictions, adapt and help implement them.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The PCC membership consist of senior staff representatives from the Region and the Area Municipalities.

**TravelWise Transportation Management Association**

In January 2012, the Region of Waterloo launched the TravelWise Transportation Management Association (TMA) with fifteen employers including the three Cities, the University of Waterloo, Wilfrid Laurier University and Research In Motion. The mission of the TravelWise TMA is to “bring together public and private interests to support and promote alternatives to single occupancy vehicle travel.” The willingness of our private sector partners to dedicate resources to the TravelWise TMA demonstrates the extensive community support that exists to build transit ridership and provide residents with greater transportation choice.

**Regional Heritage Conservation Toolbox**

As part of achieving the objectives outlined in the Strategic Plan (specifically to promote and enhance arts, culture and heritage), staff has committed to investigating and developing a suite of tools that could both practically and sustainably conserve heritage resources across the Region. Action items to this end include:

- Completing ROP Implementation Guidelines for Cultural Heritage Landscapes, Regionally Significant Heritage Resources, and Archaeological Resources;
- Identifying an initial group of Regionally Significant Heritage Resources;
- Identifying funding tools that could directly assist in conserving heritage in consultation with Area Municipalities; and
- Recommending policy changes to senior government levels (such as tax-policy) for heritage conservation.

**Assistance**

**Brownfield Financial Incentive Pilot Program (2006)**

In October 2006, Regional Council approved the framework for a Regional Brownfields Financial Incentive Pilot Program - now referred to as the Brownfields Financial Incentive Program (BFIP) as per Report P-08-084. The goals of this Program are to encourage the remediation and redevelopment of brownfield sites, to promote reurbanization, and to reduce the outward movement of the urban area.

The BFIP consists of four components:

1. Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) Grants;
2. Regional Development Charge (RDC) Exemptions;
3. Joint Tax Increment Grant (TIG) Program; and
4. Funding for Area Municipalities to assist in amending or developing Community Improvement Plans (CIPs) to provide for the implementation of the joint TIG program.

**Environmental Stewardship Fund (2008)**

The Environmental Stewardship Fund was established by Council in the 2008 budget to fund environmental projects throughout the Region with special emphasis on enhancing natural areas and Environmentally Sensitive Landscapes (ESLs). An interim framework for administering the fund was endorsed by Regional Council on April 29, 2009, and amended in 2010 to accommodate an unexpected number of schoolyard greening projects in the initial batch of applications. On February 23, 2010, Council approved the allocation of approximately $182,000 to fund 25 projects. In April 12, 2012, Council approved the allocation of...
approximately $165,720 to fund an additional 27 projects.

### Transit Supportive Strategy for Cambridge

As part of the approval of Phase 1 of the Rapid Transit project on June 11, 2011, staff was directed to undertake measures to encourage transit supportive development, to enhance transit ridership, and to expedite the development of LRT in Cambridge. Further, Regional Council approved an allocation of $1,000,000 annually, for an initial 10-year period to implement a transit supportive strategy in Cambridge. Details of the program were to be developed in conjunction with the City of Cambridge and presented to Regional Council for approval.

City of Cambridge and Region of Waterloo staff has collectively developed a strategy consisting of both short and longer-term initiatives. Led by staff within the PHCS department, this strategy considered a range of options to meet to the overall objectives as outlined by Council. On March 7, 2012, Regional Council approved the 2012 Implementation Plan, which outlined the four key areas of focus, including:

- Funding for the City of Cambridge Core Areas Parking Master Plan;
- Funding to expand the TravelWise TMA and TDM Program in the L.G Lovell Industrial Park in Cambridge;
- Funding for Strategic Pedestrian and Transit Infrastructure Investments within the City of Cambridge, including new transit shelters and improvements to the Ainslie Street Terminal; and
- Funding for a TDM Coordinator/Station Area Planner in the City of Cambridge.

### Housing Incentives & Funding Resource Guide

This guide provides a compilation of funding programs offered not only by the Region, but by other community partners, including the Government of Canada, Province of Ontario, Local Municipalities, non-profit agencies and private organizations.

### TravelWise Marketing, Promotion and Education

Even the best-designed transportation systems do not market themselves. New transit routes and traditional marketing approaches can have some impact, but individualized marketing campaigns in Waterloo Region and around the world have demonstrated that personalized messages are more effective at growing transit ridership. Individualized Marketing (IM) encourages travel behaviour change by empowering people with information and knowledge, motivating them through incentives and supporting them with activities and resources.

The Region has completed seven IM initiatives over the last 6 years and several more are currently underway. The most recent campaign in Uptown Waterloo increased sustainable transportation use by 21% and reduced vehicle based travel by 16% among program participants. The Region’s ongoing IM projects include neighbourhoods adjacent to the new number 12 route on Westmount Road and 201 iXpress station areas in Kitchener.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Incentives &amp; Funding Resource Guide</th>
<th>In Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TravelWise Marketing, Promotion and Education</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Supportive Strategy for Cambridge</th>
<th>In Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visualizing Densities (2006 and 2007)</strong></td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Province’s Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe provided targets for higher numbers of people and jobs per hectare in downtowns as well as in new greenfield developments. Visualizing Densities is a two-part study which describes the current urban form and sets the stage for an examination of various development options that could help the Region meet the Province's prescribed targets. Part 1 looks at densities and development patterns in existing urban and Greenfield neighbourhoods. Part 2 was designed to demonstrate the potential options for developing communities with higher population density. It examines six study areas in Waterloo Region and shows development possibilities that could help us elevate the existing density in order to meet the targets set by the Province. The booklet uses illustrations and 3D modelling to present design ideas of how the communities could look at different densities. It also describes and emphasizes the design features of the streetscapes and buildings that could be used to make our downtowns and future neighbourhoods attractive places to live and work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A Blueprint for Shaping Growth in Waterloo Region (2007)</strong></td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 2007, the Region published “A Blueprint for Shaping Growth” highlighting areas within Waterloo Region where future growth and reurbanization was identified to be focused. This document was one pieced of the larger framework that brought together the RGMS and the Growth Plan into one comprehensive vision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reurbanization Market Study (2010)</strong></td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 2010, the Region updated the Reurbanization Market Study (originally completed in 2005) in partnership with the Reurbanization Working Group. The purpose of this study was to gain a better understanding of the opportunities for reurbanization within Waterloo Region. The results indicated that interest in reurbanization from a market perspective remains strong. In fact, 74% of respondents said that they would consider moving to a reurbanization development (an increase from 70% in 2005). Further, almost 40% of respondents indicated they were considering moving within the next two years (an increase of one third from 2005).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Workplace Count (2011)</strong></td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The Workplace Count, a partnership between the Region of Waterloo and the Area Municipalities, is a survey of almost every place of employment – excluding home-based businesses and farms - in Waterloo Region. The information provided by businesses will help the Region and Area Municipalities to better plan for future business growth and development in Waterloo Region by:  
  * Ensuring adequate land is available for businesses to locate here or expand;  
  * Ensuring sufficient services and infrastructure are available for businesses, i.e. transit service for employees, roads, etc.  
  * Helping businesses that are relocating from within the region to select a new location to meet their needs; |
- Helping to attract complementary businesses such as suppliers or services like restaurants or retail; and
- Ensuring the best use of business lands.

### Soil/Sediment Rehabilitation and Aggregate Recycling

It is anticipated that many of the key development opportunities along the RT corridor may be impacted by environmental issues. Further, the remediation and redevelopment of these sites is often costly, challenging and time-consuming. One of the largest costs associated with these sites is the remediation/disposal of impacted or contaminated soil. As a result, this issue is likely to be one of the key impediments to the redevelopment of this corridor. In an effort to mitigate some of these costs, the Region and its partners are exploring the potential for a more sustainable approach for the management of impacted and contaminated soils as well as other materials. One alternative being considered by staff is the concept of a **Regional Soil Rehabilitation and Aggregate Recycling Campus** that would allow for the treatment and productive re-use of soil and other materials throughout Waterloo Region (and possibly beyond).

On May 17, 2012 the Region held a forum with key stakeholders to discuss the opportunities and challenges related to this concept. Feedback from this session will help inform a more detailed feasibility study to be conducted in conjunction with the Region’s Waste Management Master Planning Process, currently underway.

### Commuter Parking Lot Feasibility Study (2012)

GO Transit received a Build Canada grant to construct park and ride facilities in the Region of Waterloo. This study is identifying and reviewing potential park and ride sites for Go Transit service in Waterloo and Cambridge. Construction on the Sportsworld park and ride facility will begin this summer.

### Schneider Creek Floodplain Technical Update and Policy Review

This study, conducted in partnership with the Grand River Conservation Authority, will update to floodplain mapping for portion of Schneider creek, include modeling of scenarios of changes to built form, and a strategic policy review. The key question is how reurbanization can be accommodated safely in this area.

### Revitalizing Regionally-Owned Community Housing Properties

The Region has initiated a study to investigate the potential for intensification and/or redevelopment at selected Regionally-owned community Housing sites, in order to plan for and accommodate additional community housing needs in a rapidly growing community. The purpose of the study is to:
- Improve efficiencies (financial, energy, unit yield) at selected sites;
- Increase the number of units where possible; and
- Enhance the quality of life for residents through the replacement, intensification, sale and or redevelopment of sites.

The project will include several phases in which a preliminary screening of all 62 sites will be done as well as the categorization and ranking of the sites based on redevelopment/intensification potential. Detailed redevelopment and business plans for the top 6 sites will also be completed which will form the basis for a strategic investment plan for Regional Council consideration.
| Housing/ Demographic Research | Understanding the nature of the housing market is an important part of the Reurbanization Toolbox. Over the past several years the Region has hosted several events engaging industry professionals and other stakeholders to explore some of the key questions around consumer preferences and demographic shifts.  
- Future Shape of Housing in Waterloo Region - Workshop (2009);
- Aging in Place Realtor Focus Groups (2010); and
- The Past is NOT the Future: Housing Choice and Demographic Change (2010). | Ongoing |
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The Reurbanization Working Group (RWG)

One of the key partnerships that has played an integral role in the implementation of several reurbanization initiatives at both the Regional and Area Municipal level is the Reurbanization Working Group (RWG). The RWG has been active since 2004 and includes representatives from the Region, the Area Municipalities and the development community. The group meets with the focus of increasing the number of reurbanization projects that occur throughout Waterloo Region. The RWG also provides a forum for the discussion and resolution of identified obstacles to successful reurbanization activity and to identify and share success stories, skill-sets, techniques, incentives, and opportunities among its members. Furthermore, the RWG hopes to generate increased investor and homebuilder interest in the development of lands within Waterloo Region’s existing urban areas and enhance political and public awareness, support, and demand for reurbanization.

Over the past several years, this group has been actively promoting and facilitating key reurbanization initiatives. Some of these initiatives include:

- The 2005 Reurbanization Market Study;
- The Station Area Plan Pilot Project (2008);
- The 2008 Seizing Opportunity in Transit-Oriented Development Forum;
- The Station Area Plan Pilot Project – Infrastructure Analysis (2009); and
- The 2010 Reurbanization Market Study.

Overall, the RWG has been very successful in leveraging the collective resources of all partners in order to achieve results. Most recently, the group has developed a potential work plan focussing on developing resources and a communication strategy for three key stakeholder groups.

- General Public
- Municipal Staff and Councillors
- Development Industry

This communication strategy was initiated in the fall of 2011 with an introductory presentation entitled “Reurbanization in our Community” delivered to members of Regional and Area Municipal Council. Dates of each of these presentations were as follows:

- Waterloo Council - September 26, 2011
- Kitchener Planning and Strategic Initiatives - October 12, 2011
- Cambridge General Committee – November 7, 2011
- Region of Waterloo Planning and Works Committee - February 28, 2012

The final work plan related to the communication strategy has yet to be determined, but the Regional staff continue to view this group as a key partnership that will help deliver on the development and implementation of a comprehensive reurbanization strategy in the future.
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TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
DATE: May 29, 2012
FILE CODE: D25-01
SUBJECT: REGIONAL HERITAGE CONSERVATION TOOLBOX

RECOMMENDATION:
For information.

SUMMARY:
The Region of Waterloo has established and is continuing to refine a Regional Heritage Conservation Toolbox to support heritage property owners, municipal staff and the public in their common effort to conserve cultural heritage resources in the Region. Developing this toolbox is a Strategic Action in the Region of Waterloo Corporate Strategic Plan (2011-2014).

The Regional Heritage Conservation Toolbox is a source for information, policies and guidelines related to cultural heritage resource conservation, including: cultural heritage conservation policies and planning documents; heritage conservation funding sources; resources for heritage property owners; and resources for municipal staff. The toolbox is a work in progress and will evolve over time as new resources and information become available and/or are developed. As many of the Region’s cultural heritage resources are located in areas planned for intensification, the toolbox is being developed in conjunction with ongoing reurbanization initiatives. The web content layout for the Regional Heritage Conservation Toolbox has been attached in Appendix A.

The toolbox can be accessed on the Region of Waterloo website through the website’s Heritage section, the Reurbanization section or directly at http://regionofwaterloo.ca/heritagetoolbox. Information on the establishment of the toolbox as well as regular updates as it continues to evolve will be circulated to the appropriate Regional staff and to a broad range of community partners including Area Municipal staff, Municipal Heritage Planning Advisory Committees and other heritage organizations, and the Home Builders’ Association.

REPORT:
Cultural heritage resources are natural and cultural assets that provide people with a sense of place, and support the development of community and personal identities. The region has a rich and diverse heritage including, distinctive cultures, traditions, festivals, artisans and craftspeople, landmarks, landscapes, properties, structures, burial sites, cemeteries, natural features and archaeological resources.

These resources are valuable assets that provide an important means of defining and confirming a regional identity, enhancing quality of life of the community, enabling social development and promoting economic prosperity. The Region supports the conservation of significant cultural heritage resources, and shares this responsibility with the Federal and Provincial governments, Area Municipalities, other government agencies, the private sector, property owners and the community.
The Region of Waterloo Corporate Strategic Plan (2011-2014) includes Strategic Action 2.4.3 – Establish a Regional Heritage Conservation Toolbox. This strategic action is one way in which the Region plans to support heritage property owners, municipal staff and the public in their common effort to conserve the region’s cultural heritage resources. The toolbox is an accessible collection of information, policies and guidelines related to cultural heritage resource conservation in the Region. The on-line digital resource can be accessed on the Regions’ website through the website’s Heritage section, the Reurbanization section or directly at http://regionofwaterloo.ca/heritagetoolbox.

Heritage Conservation and Reurbanization

As many of the Region’s cultural heritage resources are located in areas planned for intensification, the toolbox is being developed in conjunction with ongoing reurbanization initiatives. Integrating efforts to conserve cultural heritage resources within reurbanization initiatives will result in creative, multi-layered redevelopment that showcases the evolution of the Region, while preserving important heritage resources. Regional reurbanization initiatives that have the potential to impact cultural heritage resources include initiatives such as the Brownfields Financial Incentive Program and the Central Transit Corridor Community Building Strategy. The Regional Heritage Conservation Toolbox is referenced under the theme Consideration of Cultural and Built Heritage within the Region’s Reurbanization Strategy and under Implementation in the Reurbanization Toolbox (see Report P-12-063, A Regional Reurbanization Strategy and Toolbox, May 29, 2012).

Toolbox Contents

The Regional Heritage Conservation Toolbox includes information on and access to: cultural heritage conservation policies and planning documents; heritage conservation funding sources; resources for heritage property owners; and resources for municipal Staff. The Regional Heritage Conservation Toolbox is a work in progress and will evolve over time as new resources and information become available and/or are developed. The current web content layout for the toolbox has been attached in Appendix A. The following paragraphs provide more detail on the main components of the toolbox.

Cultural Heritage Conservation Policies and Planning Documents

The Province of Ontario has provided municipalities with a wide variety of legislative planning and financial tools that can be used to conserve heritage resources. The Ontario Heritage Act is the most obvious legislation that comes to mind, which provides tools such as Part IV and V designations, heritage easements and demolition control through listing on the municipal heritage register, but there are many other legislative tools that can be used to conserve cultural heritage resources. The Regional Heritage Conservation Toolbox includes a list of planning and financial tools available to Area Municipalities to assist with the conservation of heritage resources (see Appendix B). The list was circulated to Municipal Heritage Advisory Committees (MHACs) and heritage planning staff in 2011.

The toolbox also provides links to Regional policy, Implementation Guidelines and Master Plans. The Regional Official Plan (2009) refers to two Master Plans and three Implementation Guidelines that will support the conservation of cultural heritage resources. These include the Arts, Culture and Heritage Master Plan, the Archaeological Master Plan, and Implementation Guidelines for the conservation of Cultural Heritage Landscapes, Regionally Significant Heritage Resources, and Archaeological Resources. The three Implementation Guidelines are under development, and will outline the existing policy context and conservation processes for the particular form of cultural heritage resource and provide further detail for the implementation of the related Regional Official Plan policies.

Heritage Conservation Funding Sources

Financial incentives for the promotion, preservation, restoration and rehabilitation of cultural heritage resources are an important tool in the ongoing efforts to conserve cultural heritage resources. The
The Regional Heritage Conservation Toolbox will also include information about other available sources of financial support, such as Area Municipal, Provincial and community grants. The toolbox will not include information on the Heritage Property Tax Rebate Program (HPTRP) offered by the Province until more information is available on the implementation of the HPTRP in other municipalities and the interest of local heritage property owners in such a program. The City of Kitchener is currently the only local Area Municipality offering this program.

Resources for Heritage Property Owners

The Heritage Planning Advisory Committee has undertaken preliminary discussions on how best the Region can assist heritage property owners in maintaining, restoring and/or adaptively reusing their heritage buildings. The Regional Heritage Conservation Toolbox will provide access to educational information and resources on topics such as: Repairing Wood Windows; Applying for Heritage Permits; Parks Canada Standards & Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada; Designing Additions and Infill to Complement Your Neighbourhood; and Energy Efficiency and Older Homes.

Resources for Municipal Staff

Area Municipal and Regional staff routinely consider the conservation of cultural heritage resources in their day to day work. Resource documents, guides and inventories, such as the Scenic Roads and Special Character Streets Resource Document, the Guide to Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment and Spanning the Generations: A Study of Old Bridges in Waterloo Region will assist Regional staff during the undertaking of public works projects. The resource documents, inventories and guides consolidate existing practice and research related to the conservation of specific cultural heritage resources, and through their implementation result in increased staff efficiency. Through the toolbox, Area Municipal staff may access these tools to better understand Regional processes and/or to assist with the development of similar resources for their municipality. The general public may also be interested in the information contained in these resources.

Regional Heritage Links

In addition to the heritage conservation resources listed above, the toolbox will provide linkages to information on Regional initiatives that interpret, promote and celebrate our Region’s heritage, including: special projects and educational materials (i.e. the Eby Book and the Historic Place Names map); Regional heritage sites and resources (i.e. the Waterloo Region Museum, the Regional Archives, the Regional Curatorial Centre and the Regional Hall of Fame); and heritage events (i.e. Doors Open and Heritage Showcase). The toolbox will also provide links to local, regional, provincial and national heritage organizations.

Conclusion

In summary, the Regional Heritage Conservation Toolbox consolidates the information and resources used to conserve cultural heritage resources into one accessible and visible place; enabling the efforts of heritage property owners, Regional staff and the public to better conserve the valuable cultural heritage assets of our Region. The Heritage Planning Advisory Committee has supported the development of the Regional Heritage Conservation Toolbox and will continue to assist in its ongoing refinement and promotion. Information on the establishment of the toolbox as well as regular updates as it continues to evolve will be circulated to the appropriate Regional staff and to a broad range of
community partners including Area Municipal staff, Municipal Heritage Planning Advisory Committees and other heritage organizations, and the Home Builders’ Association.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

Area Municipal Cultural Heritage Staff and Municipal Heritage Committees provide support to heritage property owners, other municipal staff and the public for conserving cultural heritage resources. As the Regional Heritage Conservation Toolbox may assist them in their work, ongoing consultation has taken and will continue to take place in conjunction with the development of the individual components, format and accessibility of the toolbox to ensure that the information and resources are both appropriate and effective. The toolbox provides digital links between many shared resources and information sources.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

Creating a Regional Heritage Conservation Toolbox is Strategic Action 2.4.3 under Strategic Objective 2.4 - Promoting and enhancing the region’s arts, culture and heritage. The related strategic actions ensure that the Region has a role in strengthening the local arts and cultures sector, providing opportunities for cultural exploration, and nurturing our Region’s sense of place.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The development of the Regional Heritage Conservation Toolbox is funded through the program budget for Cultural Heritage.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Regional departments will be consulted in conjunction with the development of the individual components, format and accessibility of the toolbox to ensure that the information and resources are both appropriate and effective.

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix A – Regional Heritage Conservation Toolbox (Web Content Layout)
Appendix B – Legislative Planning and Financial Elements of Toolbox

PREPARED BY:  Kate Hagerman, Cultural Heritage Specialist

APPROVED BY:  Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning Housing and Community Services
Appendix A – Regional Heritage Conservation Toolbox (Web Content Layout)

Regional Heritage Conservation Toolbox (Web Content Layout)

Welcome to the Regional Heritage Conservation Toolbox – your source for information, policies and guidelines related to cultural heritage resource conservation in the Region of Waterloo.

Cultural Heritage Conservation Policies and Planning Documents

Legislative Planning and Financial Tools
This document outlines Provincially Legislated Planning and Financial Tools that can be used to conserve cultural heritage resources.

Heritage policies in the Regional Official Plan
The Regional Official Plan will guide the Regional Municipality of Waterloo in directing growth and change over the next 20 years. Cultural heritage policies are included in Chapter 3: Liveability in Waterloo Region.

Archaeological Master Plan and Implementation Guideline
This report includes an assessment of local archaeological resources, a summary of planning policies for known archaeological resources, maps detailing the locations of known resources, and an investigation into the creation of an archaeological facility. The plan was accepted by Regional Council in 1989.

Arts, Culture & Heritage Master Plan
This report includes recommendations and implementation strategies for identifying, protecting, promoting, and investing in arts, culture and heritage resources in Waterloo Region. This plan was accepted by Regional Council in October 2002.

Content under Development
- Implementation Guideline for Cultural Heritage Landscape Conservation
- Implementation Guideline for Regionally Significant Heritage Resource Conservation

Heritage Conservation Funding Sources

Waterloo Regional Heritage Foundation
The Waterloo Regional Heritage Foundation funding program is the primary Regional tool for financially supporting the conservation on cultural heritage in the Region. Through application to the WRHF, owners of properties designated under the Ontario Heritage Act may receive grants in support of restoring the heritage resource.

Web Links under Development
- Area Municipal Granting Programs
- Provincial Funding

Resources for Municipal Staff

Spanning the Generations: A Study of Old Bridges
The Region’s Heritage Planning Advisory Committee has published three phases of Spanning the Generations: A Study of Old Bridges in Waterloo Region.
- Phase 1: an inventory and ranking of more than 100 bridges based on their heritage attributes
  - Pages 1-100
  - Pages 101-244
• Phase 2: a report on the 10 most historically significant bridges
• Phase 3: a focus on steel truss bridges

Scenic Roads and Special Character Streets Resource Document
This document is a supplement to the Context Sensitive Regional Transportation Design Guidelines providing additional guidance and support to Regional staff when planning, designing, constructing and maintaining sections of Regional transportation corridors that have been identified as Special Character Streets or Scenic Roads.

Content under Development
• Guide to Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment
• Public Building Inventory

Resources for Heritage Property Owners

Parks Canada Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada

Content under Development
• Applying for Heritage Permits
• Repairing Wood Windows
• Energy Efficiency and Older Homes
• Designing Additions and Infill to Complement Your Neighbourhood

Regional Heritage Links

Special Projects and Initiatives
• A Research Guide to Churches Established Before 1900
• Historic Driving Tour Interactive Map
• Historic Place Names Map
• Memoriam: War Honour Roll
• The Eby Book Pennsylvania German Pioneer Family History

Heritage Events
• Doors Open Waterloo Region
• Heritage Showcase
• Heritage Day Workshop
• History on the Grand Symposium

Regional Heritage Sites & Resources
• Doon Heritage Village
• Joseph Schneider Haus & Online Artifact Collection
• McDougall Cottage
• Region of Waterloo Archives
• Waterloo Region Museum
• Waterloo Region Hall of Fame
• Waterloo Region Curatorial Centre
• West Montrose Covered Bridge

Heritage Organizations
• Links to local, regional, provincial and national heritage organizations
### Legislative Planning and Financial Tools that can be used to Conserve Cultural Heritage Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Official Plans</strong>&lt;br&gt;(s. 16 of the Planning Act)</th>
<th>A municipality’s official plan (OP) reflects the community’s vision for change and growth, and sets out goals and policies for land use and development. OP policies can be used to conserve cultural heritage resources by enabling the municipality to implement many of the tools listed in the remainder of this chart. OPs can also be used to define and identify, through OP designation, cultural heritage resources such as Cultural Heritage Landscapes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Plans</strong></td>
<td>Municipalities can amend their Official Plan to create a Secondary (Community or District) Plan for an area. A Secondary Plan can recognize and protect unique heritage features or archaeologically sensitive areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design Guidelines</strong>&lt;br&gt;(s. 41 of the Planning Act)</td>
<td>Municipalities can create detailed design guidelines to provide direction for infill development in areas with heritage character (stable neighbourhoods, main streets, rural villages, etc.). Design guidelines promote compatible development by addressing the treatment of building facades (materials, window and door detail, porch style, fencing, garages, etc.), the design of pedestrian areas, streetscaping, lighting, and the connection of the public realm with private development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Zoning By-Laws**<br>(s. 34 of the Planning Act) | Zoning by-laws are used by municipalities to regulate density, uses of land, parking requirements and form-related standards – including building heights, lot coverage, setbacks, minimum lot sizes, and other building envelope specifications. Context-relevant standards can be implemented to support heritage conservation goals. For example, a municipality may require:  
- Minimum or maximum building heights and densities within a stable neighbourhood;  
- a range and mix of land uses that recreate the traditional land use patterns of a community; and/or  
- building massing (form and bulk) that creates vistas, gateways and visually attractive streets and neighbourhoods, in order to retain community character.  
Zone change applications are subject to the development review process. A Heritage Impact Assessment, Cultural Heritage Conservation Plan and/or Archaeological Assessment may be required to support the zone change application. |
| **Interim Control**<br>(s. 38 of the Planning Act) | An interim control by-law puts a temporary freeze on some land uses in a specific area to give municipalities time to assess or study an area. The freeze can be imposed for a year with a maximum extension of a second year. |
| **Height and Density Exchange**  
| (s. 37 of the Planning Act) | An increase in building height and/or density can be granted to a developer by a municipality in exchange for preservation and/or interpretation of a cultural heritage resource. The added height and/or density may be able to be transferred to an alternative property. |
| **Site Plan Control**  
| (s. 41 of the Planning Act) | Municipalities can identify areas where they will review the Site Plans for new development. Site Plan Control allows the municipality to influence the layout of development including the compatibility of the planned development with neighbouring structures. |
| **Subdivision Review and Approval**  
| (s. 51 of the Planning Act) | Municipal review and approval powers provide opportunities to assess the sustainability of proposed plans of subdivision at the lot, street and neighbourhood level, including review of impacts to cultural heritage resources. A Heritage Impact Assessment, Cultural Heritage Conservation Plan and/or Archaeological Assessment may be required by municipal staff to support the development application. |
| **Demolition Control**  
| (s.27 of the Ontario Heritage Act and s. 33 of the Planning Act) | Municipalities are required to list heritage properties protected under the Ontario Heritage Act, and may list additional properties of cultural heritage value or interest, on a Municipal Register. The owner of a listed property must provide 60 days notice to the municipality prior to demolition of a building or structure on the listed property.  

In addition, a municipality may require a demolition permit prior to the demolition of the whole or any part of any residential property in an area identified for demolition control. |
| **Designation**  
| (s. 29 and 41 of the Ontario Heritage Act) | Municipalities can pass by-laws designating individual properties and/or groupings of properties that are of cultural heritage value or interest. Designation requires the owner to seek council’s approval for property alterations or new construction that is likely to affect the heritage attributes of the property described in the designation by-law. Council can also prevent the demolition of a building or structure on a designated heritage property. |
| **Easements**  
| (s. 37 of the Ontario Heritage Act) | Municipalities can pass by-laws entering into easements or covenants - voluntary legal agreements – with heritage property owners. The agreement sets out the requirements for maintaining the property and is registered on title to the property. |
| **Purchase or Lease**  
| (s. 36 of the Ontario Heritage Act) | Municipalities can pass by-laws to buy, lease or expropriate designated heritage properties. |
| **Municipal Cultural Planning**  
| (s. 2 of the Planning Act and s. 2 the Ontario Heritage Act) | Municipalities can develop and implement Cultural Heritage Master Plans and/or undertaking Cultural Mapping Projects which allow the community to take stock of existing cultural heritage resources and express a long-term vision and goals for cultural heritage conservation. |
| **Building Code Flexibility** | Enforcing the Building Code is a municipal responsibility. The 2006 Building Code is written in an objective-based format. The objective- |
The Building Code Act contains prescriptive requirements known as “acceptable solutions” that serve as benchmarks for evaluation. This new approach allows for some flexibility for repairing or altering heritage buildings by allowing building code officials to approve alternate requirements that still meet safety standards.

**Property Standards**

(s. 35.3 of the Ontario Heritage Act and s. 15.1 of the Building Code Act)

Municipalities may require heritage property owners to maintain and repair their property as necessary to protect and prevent deterioration of its heritage attributes.

**Environmental Assessment**

(Environmental Assessment Act)

The Environmental Assessment Act provides for the protection, conservation and wise management of the environment in Ontario during the planning and implementation of public works projects. “Environment is broadly defined, and includes cultural heritage. A Built Heritage Assessment, Heritage Impact Study and/or Archaeological Assessment may be required during the project planning and approvals process.

**Community Improvement Plans**

(s. 28 of Planning Act)

Community Improvement Plans (CIPs) are a tool by which municipalities can provide financial incentives, in order to achieve planning objectives that are for the broader public good, such as improving streetscapes, revitalizing core areas, or adaptive reuse of industrial, commercial and historic buildings.

Municipalities can designate specific areas or the whole of their jurisdiction as a community improvement project area. A community-improvement plan (CIP) can be developed to include provisions to acquire, clear and hold land; construct, repair, rehabilitate or improve land and buildings; sell, lease or dispose of land; and provide grants and loans, such as Tax Increment Grants (TIGs).

**General Power to Make Grants**

(s. 107 of Municipal Act, 2001)

Municipalities have the general power to provide grants and loans. Some municipalities have provided funding:

- to owners of designated heritage properties to help them cover the costs of repair and restoration;
- to property owners in Community Improvement Areas to assist with rehabilitation projects;
- to foundations or other not-for profit organizations to set up a revolving fund to support heritage conservation;
- to help foundations establish endowment funds; and
- for public works projects that conserve heritage resources or enhance the special character of an area.

**Heritage Property Tax Relief Program**

(s. 365.2 of Municipal Act, 2001)

Through a by-law, municipalities can establish a Heritage Property Tax Relief Program which may encourage good stewardship, maintenance, and conservation of designated heritage properties. This program provides tax relief (10 to 40 per cent) to owners of eligible properties to protect heritage features. Municipalities contribute through their portion of the tax relief while the Province shares through the education portion of the tax relief.

**Business Improvement**

A municipality can designate a Business Improvement Area (BIA) and establish a management board to:
## Areas
(s. 204 to s. 215 of Municipal Act, 2001)

- oversee the improvement, beautification and maintenance of municipally-owned land, buildings and structures; and
- promote the area as a business or shopping area.

Designating a BIA could assist with the regeneration of an historic commercial area.

## Municipal Capital Facilities Agreements
(s. 110 of Municipal Act, 2001)

These agreements are commonly used by municipalities to create partnerships with other public bodies, the private sector, not-for-profit organizations, and First Nations to deliver municipal facilities. For example, a municipality may consider a partnership with and provide the financial incentives to a not-for-profit organization to provide a local history museum or archives. Assistance from a municipality can include: giving or lending money; giving, leasing or lending property; guaranteeing borrowing; and development charges exemptions.
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: May 29, 2012

FILE CODE: T15-40/58 KIT C 13-20/CA

SUBJECT: AMENDMENT TO REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO CONTROLLED ACCESS BY-LAW #58-87 FOR ACCESS TO REGIONAL ROAD #58 (FISCHER-HALLMAN ROAD), CITY OF KITCHENER

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo Controlled Access By-law #58-87 be amended to include an emergency access on the east side of Regional Road # 58 (Fischer-Hallman Road) approximately 259 metres north of Huron Road, in the City of Kitchener as outlined in Report P-12-067, dated May 29, 2012.

SUMMARY:

Deerfield Homes Limited is proposing to construct a 136 unit residential development on the east side of Fischer-Hallman Road, north of Huron Road, in the City of Kitchener (Appendix A). The site plan includes the extension of Sienna Court from the adjacent subdivision westerly to Fischer-Hallman Road. The intersection of the extension of Sienna Court at Fischer-Hallman Road will operate as a right-in, right-out only intersection with the installation of a raised median on Fischer-Hallman Road at Deerfield’s cost. The developer has requested a second all movement emergency access approximately 259 metres north of Huron Road in order to comply with City of Kitchener Emergency Service Policy requirements (Appendix B). The emergency access will be approximately 54 metres north of the proposed intersection of Fischer-Hallman Road and the Sienna Court extension. This access will be used for emergency vehicles only and will be maintained and controlled by Deerfield Homes with a gate on the developer's land.

City of Kitchener Planning staff support the location of the proposed emergency access to the subject residential subdivision.

The emergency access will not be required in the future if Deerfield Homes is able to acquire the property at 1680 Fischer-Hallman Road (appendix B). If this property is acquired, it will be consolidated with the proposed development and the emergency access will be closed at Deerfield’s cost.

Fischer-Hallman Road is designated as a Controlled Access-Prohibited Road from Regional Road #4 (Ottawa Street) to Regional Road #12 (New Dundee Road) under the Region’s Controlled Access By-Law #58-87. An amendment to this By-Law is required prior to the issuance of an Access Permit by staff.

Sienna Court is a municipal street and therefore the intersection of Sienna Court at Fischer-Hallman Road does not require an amendment to the Region’s Controlled Access By-Law #58-87.
REPORT:

By-law #58-87, “A By-law to Designate and Regulate Controlled Access Roads”, was enacted to control the construction or alteration to the geometric design of any private means of access to a Regional road. All Regional roads are included in either Schedule “A” or Schedule “B” of the By-law. Regional roads included in Schedule “A” (Controlled Access – Prohibited), include arterial roads and freeways where access to these roads must be restricted due to high traffic volume and speed. All requests for changes to existing accesses or for new accesses require an amendment to the By-law. Regional roads included in Schedule “B” (Controlled Access – Regulated) include all remaining arterial roads within the Regional road system. Typically, these roads are front lotted with access available only to the Regional road or are comparatively lower volume roads.

Deerfield Homes Limited has acquired and consolidated properties at 1650, 1670, 1690 and 1720 Fischer-Hallman Road north of Huron Road in the City of Kitchener and is proposing to construct a 136 unit residential development on the lands known as Huron Landing (Appendix A).

The site plan includes the extension of Sienna Court from the adjacent subdivision westerly to Fischer-Hallman Road. The intersection of the extension of Sienna Court at Fischer-Hallman Road will operate as a right-in, right-out only intersection with the installation of a raised median on Fischer-Hallman Road at Deerfield’s cost. The developer has requested a second all movement emergency access on the east side of Fischer-Hallman Road approximately 259 metres north of Huron Road in order to comply with City of Kitchener Emergency Service Policy requirements (Appendix B). The emergency access will be located approximately 54 metres north of the proposed intersection of Fischer-Hallman Road and Sienna Court. This access will be used for emergency vehicles only and will be maintained and controlled by Deerfield Homes with a gate on the developer’s land. The emergency access will not be required in the future if Deerfield Homes is able to acquire the property at 1680 Fischer-Hallman Road (Appendix B). If this property is acquired, it will be consolidated with the proposed development and the emergency access will be closed at Deerfield’s cost.

City of Kitchener Planning staff support the location of the proposed emergency access to the subject residential subdivision.

A plan showing the proposed development and the proposed amendment to Controlled Access By-law #58-87 is shown on Appendix B.

Fischer-Hallman Road is designated as a Controlled Access – Prohibited Road from Regional Road #4 (Ottawa St) to Regional Road #12 (New Dundee Road) under the Region’s Controlled Access By-law #58-87. Approval of the By-law amendment to permit an emergency access to Fischer Hallman Road would be required by Regional Council prior to the issuance of an Access Permit by staff.

Sienna Court is a municipal street and therefore the intersection of Sienna Court at Fischer-Hallman Road does not require an amendment to the Region’s Controlled Access By-Law #58-87.

Staff has confirmed that the emergency access exceeds minimum standards and recommend the approval of the proposed By-law amendment.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

City of Kitchener Planning staff support the location of the proposed emergency access to the subject residential subdivision.
CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

Managing access to the Regional Road system is integral to the development approval process and is represented in Focus Area 2: Growth Management and Prosperity: Manage growth to foster thriving and productive urban and rural communities.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The applicant will be responsible for the cost to construct the emergency access including the installation and maintenance of a gate on the Deerfield Homes lands. If Deerfield Homes acquires the property at 1680 Fischer-Hallman Road, the emergency access will be closed at Deerfield Homes’ cost.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Corporate Resources would be required to amend Controlled Access By-law #58-87. Upon issuance of a Regional Access Permit, Transportation Engineering would issue a Regional Work Permit to perform works within the Regional right of way on Fischer-Hallman Road.

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix A - Key Map showing the location of Proposed Huron Landings Subdivision.
Appendix B - Location of the proposed access and proposed amendment to Controlled Access By-law #58-87.

PREPARED BY: Joginder Bhatia, Transportation Planner

APPROVED BY: Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee  
DATE: May 29, 2012  
FILE CODE: D09-90(A)  
SUBJECT: WALK CYCLE WATERLOO REGION AND KING-VICTORIA TRANSIT HUB  
WALKING AND CYCLING LINKS - JOINT PUBLIC CONSULTATION CENTRE

RECOMMENDATION:

For information.

SUMMARY:

In June 2010, Regional Council approved a new Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) containing 17 action items including the completion of an Active Transportation Master Plan (ATMP). The RTMP established a target of 12 percent of peak trips to be made by cycling and walking by 2031. This target requires an approximate 50 percent increase in these modes over 2006 levels.

In 2010, Regional Council also approved the “Context Sensitive Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines” that set the framework for accommodating all modes of transportation on Regional roads. The ATMP will provide more detailed direction on priorities for active transportation and integrate facility design to provide clear direction to reduce conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and drivers. The new ATMP, called “Walk Cycle Waterloo Region”, will update the Region’s Cycling Master Plan, 2004, while integrating a new regionally significant transportation network for pedestrians. As part of the development of the plan, key destinations such as Rapid Transit Stations will be targeted to ensure good access for those walking, cycling or rolling (in-line skating, skateboarding, mobility devices).

A project team, consisting of Regional staff, Regional Councillors Jane Mitchell and Geoff Lorentz along with staff representation from Cambridge, Kitchener, Waterloo, and Woolwich, with assistance from the IBI Group, is leading the project.

The first public event was held in November of 2011 and requested ideas and feedback about walking, cycling, winter maintenance, and major areas of concern. The public commented that building sidewalks was not enough and that the walking network should be connected, safe and convenient. Concerns were expressed about how cycling facilities are designed. The public also commented that trails should be integrated and easily accessed via good road connections. They remarked there is a need for all road users to respect one another. People also told us to provide educational resources about walking and cycling to build on existing successful programs and to improve winter maintenance of cycling and walking facilities.

The Project Team has used input from the public, the Active Transportation Advisory Committee, Area Municipal staff and other stakeholders to continue development of the plan. A second public event is planned to obtain public input on the draft cycling and walking networks, the local improvements “fix-it” list, and the strategic signage program.
The Public Consultation Centre invitation (Attachment 2) has been sent to the attendees from the November 2011 workshops and to a list of recipients that have shown interest in past projects such as the Regional Transportation Master Plan and the Rapid Transit Plan. Social media such as Facebook and Twitter are also being used for promotion. In addition, there have been ads placed in the Record, the Kitchener Post, the Cambridge Times, the Waterloo Chronicle, the New Hamburg Independent, the Woolwich Observer and the Elmira Independent.

The meeting will be held on June 4, 2012, at the UW School of Pharmacy as a drop in from 4:30 to 8 p.m. At 6 p.m., there will be a presentation by international cycling expert Hans Moor followed by a brief Walk Cycle Waterloo Region update. The City of Kitchener and Sustainable Waterloo Region are hosting the Hans Moor public presentation. In addition, an online video of about 5-10 minutes will be on the website as of June 4, 2012 for the public to view as well as the network maps and an online comment form for public feedback. Attachment 4 shows the public information booklet that will be given to the public. The maps will be available in large format for viewing at the meeting, as well as online.

The input received at the PCC and by online comments will be used to help continue the development of the final plan that consists of a series of nine action plans that will include: Design Guidelines for Active Transportation, Cycling and Walking Network, Localized Active Transportation Projects of Regional Significance, Infill / Gaps Action Plan, Winter Network, Strategic Signage, Behavioural Shift Program Review, Performance Monitoring, and a Pilot Projects Plan.

In fall 2012, the public will be invited to give input on the full set of draft action plans. Together these will form the basis of the final Walk Cycle Waterloo Region Plan. It is anticipated that the plan will be completed by the end of the year with final Council consideration in early 2013.

As part of the PCC, there will also be displays illustrating walking and cycling links for the King-Victoria Transit Hub. The Transit Hub team is requesting public feedback to be used in developing the plan for this area.

**REPORT:**

In June 2010, Regional Council approved a new Regional Transportation Master Plan consisting of 17 action items including the completion of an Active Transportation Master Plan (ATMP). The Regional Official Plan also includes a policy that directs staff to prepare pedestrian and cycling master plans on a regular basis The RTMP established a target of 12 percent of peak trips to be made by cycling and walking by 2031. This target requires an approximate 50 percent increase in these modes over 2006 levels. In 2010, Regional Council also approved the Context Sensitive Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines that set the framework for accommodating all modes of transportation on Regional roads. In August of 2011, the Walk Cycle Waterloo Region Study was initiated and IBI Group was retained to assist in the development of the plan.

The main objective of Walk Cycle Waterloo Region is to increase cycling and walking rates over the next 20 years. Increasing cycling and walking rates has several strategic environmental, community health and social benefits including decreasing greenhouse gases and providing for natural exercise opportunities to support a healthy community. The Region’s Area Municipal partners have shown leadership in developing active transportation supportive policy environments including a focus on complete streets, complete neighbourhoods, intensification, mixed-use supportive zoning, shared parking, and a growing network of cycling and trail facilities.
The purpose of this study is to produce a comprehensive plan of action for the Region of Waterloo that integrates cycling and walking with transit and land-use (the built form). Walk Cycle Waterloo Region is developing a strategy for safe and comfortable pedestrian and cyclist access to make cycling and walking an easier choice for transportation in the Region of Waterloo. The final plan will recommend short and long-term priorities to enhance Waterloo Region’s growing active transportation network and reflect the principles, goals, objectives, and policies of the Region’s Official Plan, Transportation Master Plan, and Context-Sensitive Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines.

Research has shown that a vast majority of people would chose to cycle more if they could take a route that felt safe, comfortable, and convenient. To meet the RTMP goals it is key to provide cycling facilities that are attractive to this “Interested but Concerned” segment of the population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Walking Network</th>
<th>Cycling Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Just building sidewalks is not enough, walking routes need to be direct, safe, and comfortable.</td>
<td>The design of cycling facilities on Regional roads needs to be more comfortable and convenient. Paved shoulders are okay on rural roads, but more space is needed on higher volume, higher speed roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Region needs a practical way to complete gaps in the sidewalk network within a reasonable time frame.</td>
<td>Trails are an important part of the cycling network, particularly to serve new and novice riders. Existing key trails should be paved or be hard packed with improved maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosswalks, trail crossings, intersections and interchanges need to be more comfortable and convenient.</td>
<td>Connectivity and way-finding are two big issues when building the cycling network, especially through trail crossings and interchanges, which can be barriers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From "Understanding and measuring bicycling behaviour: Implications for urban planning, health, and research," PSU Center for Urban Studies Center for Transportation Studies., 2006, Reflected in the 2008 Ipsos Reid, "Region of Waterloo Transportation Master Plan Public Opinion Survey Final Report"
• **“Burning Issues”** - Beyond building the Regional Walking and Cycling Network, what else could the Region do to address “burning issues" for walking and cycling?
  o Better education, enforcement and etiquette are needed for all road users.
  o Level the playing field for walking and cycling in zoning, land-use, by-law and parking policies.
  o Funding strategies need to be reviewed to show commitment to active transportation.

• **Winter Network** - What could the Region do to help make walking and cycling viable in the winter?
  o Improve winter snow-clearing practices for pedestrian and cycling facilities, including key trails. Clearing needs to be done sooner and more completely.
  o Visibility is a key concern in the winter. Not only is it darker, but high snow banks mean that pedestrians are harder for motorists to see and there is less space on the road to share.
  o Many seasonal pedestrians and cyclists may switch to using transit in the winter, so maintain access to the core transit network and amenities such as shelters and bike racks.

• **Changing Behaviour** – Which programs are most effective to help more people walk and cycle more often?
  o Continue to provide walking and cycling educational resources to build on existing successful programs.
  o Make walking and cycling easier by using various avenues such as signage, way-finding, business and employer incentives, etc.
  o Make walking and cycling "cool" and fun. Raise the visibility of average residents who walk or cycle. Capitalize on the tourism side of the trail network.

Since the workshops last fall, the project team has developed draft walking and cycling networks (Attachment 3) considering the following:

• Comments received from the public at and following the November 2011 workshops
• Input from Regional and Area Municipal staff
• Input received from the Active Transportation Advisory Committee
• Location of destinations of regional importance including employment areas, secondary institutions, commercial centres, etc.
• Areas of potential for increasing walking and cycling given the population density, land use and trip making patterns

The Region will develop a strategy to help prioritize the implementation of the walking and cycling network. Focus will be given to areas with high demand/beaten paths and key centres such as rapid transit stations and commercial centres where quick wins can be achieved.

The draft plans have special study areas identified. These areas are pedestrian bridges, trail/road connections and crossings of concern and will require further study.

In addition, planning is also underway for the Sign Strategy, and the “Fix-it” List of Projects.

**Sign Strategy Action Plan**
The public told us that it can be challenging to find their way around the region by foot and by bike. Regional staff is working with the three Cities and the four Townships to develop an integrated signage strategy for the region’s trail and bike networks. The Trans-Canada Trail was identified as a good route to test out new trail marking, route direction and destination signs. The on-road cycling network would be integrated with the named trail network by adding bicycle logos to street name signs along roads with cycling facilities. Regional destinations would be signed at key decision points, indicating the distance and time. The result would be an easy to
recognize network, and times to destinations. More cycling and walking can be encouraged by improving the user experience and simplifying wayfinding.

“Fix It” List Action Plan
As communities implement walking and cycling infrastructure over time, improvements and maintenance can improve the overall quality. Sometimes smaller “spot” improvements are overlooked or do not have a funding program. The Fix It Action Plan recognizes locations that require small or more significant improvements to improve the overall connectivity, comfort and safety of the network. Projects have been identified by staff, the public, and the Active Transportation Advisory Committee. Examples include:

- Improvements to freeway interchanges such as Franklin Boulevard, Hespeler Road, King Street, University Avenue, etc.
- Improvements to underpasses and overpasses such as Sportsworld Drive at Hwy. 7/8, Lexington at Hwy. 85, etc.
- Improvements to trail crossings such as Moffat Creek Trail at Water Street, Iron Horse Trail at Victoria Street etc.
- Multi-use trail transition to bike lanes such as George Street at Parkhill Road
- Traffic signal timing improvements such as King and William Streets, University Avenue and Phillip Street, etc.

A Public Consultation Centre (PCC) has been planned to obtain input from the public on the above items. The Public Consultation Centre invitation (Attachment 2) has been sent to the attendees from the November 2011 workshops and to a list of recipients that have shown interest in past projects such as the Regional Transportation Master Plan and the Rapid Transit Plan. Social media such as Facebook and Twitter are also being used for promotion. The meeting will be held on June 4, 2012, at the UW School of Pharmacy as a drop in from 4:30 to 8 p.m. At 6 p.m., there will be a presentation by international cycling expert Hans Moor followed by a brief Walk Cycle Waterloo Region update. The City of Kitchener and Sustainable Waterloo Region are hosting the Hans Moor public presentation. In addition, an online video of about 5-10 minutes, that gives a project up date and outlines next steps, will be on the website as of June 4, 2012 for the public to view. The network maps and an online comment form for public feedback will also be provided on the website. The public information booklet that will be distributed to the public is provided in Attachment 4. The maps will be available in large format for viewing at the meeting, as well as online.

Next Steps
The online comments and input received at the PCC will be used to help continue the development of the final plan that consists of a series of nine action plans that will include: Design Guidelines for Active Transportation, Cycling and Walking Network, Localized Active Transportation Projects of Regional Significance, Infill / Gaps Action Plan, Signature Pilot Projects, Winter Network, Strategic Signage, Behavioural Shift Program Review, Performance Monitoring, and a Pilot Projects Plan.

In fall 2012, the public will be invited to give input on the full set of draft action plans. Together these will form the basis of the final Walk Cycle Waterloo Region Plan. It is anticipated that the plan will be complete by the end of the year with final Council consideration in early 2013.

King/Victoria Transit Hub
The Region has purchased a number of properties near the intersection of King and Victoria Streets in the City of Kitchener for developing a Transit Hub that integrates walking, cycling, Light Rail Transit, Grand River Transit, VIA, GO, inter-city buses, taxis and other motor vehicles. The Transit Hub will become a centre of activity in downtown Kitchener, with a high-quality streetscape that attracts development and new opportunities to live, work and play.
To help create a vibrant public space, the Region is identifying high priority routes for people walking and cycling to and through the Transit Hub area. This Access Plan will integrate and expand on existing walking and cycling routes, as well as identify ways to improve the connectivity of surrounding neighbourhoods.

The draft walking and cycling routes in the Transit Hub station area are shown in Attachment 5 and will be displayed on June 4, 2012 as part of the drop-in centre for Walk Cycle Waterloo Region.

The Transit Hub Project Team will use the feedback received from the public, the Active Transportation Advisory Committee, and other stakeholders to prioritize a list of infrastructure improvements to continue to develop an approach for Regional Council’s consideration.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

Area Municipal representatives from Cambridge, Kitchener, Waterloo and Woolwich are participating on the Project Team for Walk Cycle Waterloo Region. The other Townships are key stakeholders and will continue to be consulted throughout the project.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The Walk Cycle Waterloo Region plan supports the 2011-2014 Regional Council’s Strategic Focus Area 3: Sustainable Transportation: Develop greater, more sustainable and safe transportation choices.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The 2012 Transportation Capital Program includes a funding allocation of $250,000 for the Active Transportation Master Plan Study. The costs for holding the public consultation centre have been budgeted within this allocation.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Transportation and Environmental Services and Public Health have representatives on the Project Team for this project that includes Regional Councillors Jane Mitchell and Geoff Lorentz.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment 1 – Summary of Public Input Received to Date
Attachment 2 – Invitation
Attachment 3 – Draft Walking and Cycling Networks
Attachment 4 – Public Information Booklet
Attachment 5 – Draft Walking and Cycling Routes in the King/Victoria Transit Hub area

PREPARED BY: Paula Sawicki, Manager, Strategic Transportation Planning

APPROVED BY: Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
Attachment 1 – Summary of Public Input Received - Workshops – November 2011

The follow items reflect the top three priority items for each key question discussed at the workshops. A fully summary of all comments is provided in an attached table. Attachment 1 outlines the general theme, the comments and the action plan where these comments will be considered by the project team.

**Walking Network**

*Where are sidewalks or other improvements for walking needed along Regional roads and to connect to regional destinations?*

- **Just building sidewalks is not enough.**
  Walking routes need to be direct, safe and comfortable. Sidewalks often follow the roadway curb-line, which may not be the most direct path. More space may be needed both on the sidewalk and away from busier streets. The walking environment needs to be improved with amenities such as benches, trash bins and trees.

- **The Region needs a practical way to fill in the sidewalk gaps within a reasonable time frame.**
  Relying on the Capital Program is not a comprehensive funding and implementation strategy to complete the walking network, and waiting 10 years to install missing sidewalks or key trail sections is too long. Alternate delivery approaches should be explored to align with the Region’s policy commitment to active transportation.

- **Crosswalks, Trail Crossings, Intersections and Interchanges need to be improved**
  Many crosswalks at intersections treat pedestrians as an afterthought: there is often a long wait time, a pedestrian signal to activate and walk times are relatively short. Trail crossings of major streets and interchanges are barriers to both pedestrians and cyclists. Trail crossings often lack visibility for all users and signage to trail users where to go and tell them where they are. Interchanges are uncomfortable environments to walk and cycle; there are often many conflicts with cars approaching the access ramps.

**Cycling Network**

*What type of cycling facilities (paved shoulders, bike lanes, segregated bike lanes, cycling tracks, and boulevard multi-use trails) should be built on Regional roads and which ones need these facilities?*

- **Design of cycling facilities on Regional roads needs to improve**
  Paved shoulders are sufficient on rural roads, but painted lines are not always enough for busy, urban roads. Typically, more space is needed to feel comfortable on higher volume and higher speed roads; segregated bike lanes are generally preferred (>50 km/h—segregated space; ≤ 40 km/h—shared space). The Region should try intersection enhancements for cyclists such as bike boxes, bicycle traffic signals, pavement markings through intersections, advance phasing, etc. Bike lanes should not end approaching an intersection.

- **Trails are an important part of the cycling network**
  Many new and novice riders will likely prefer trails as they are separate from traffic; current cyclists already use trails for their trips. Existing key trails should be paved or at least, hard surfaced to facilitate a wide range of users, better drainage and condition after storms, longer life, and snow clearing. Where segregated facilities cannot be built on the road, boulevard trails can be a viable alternative. However, conflicts with pedestrians and risks at intersections / driveways are a concern.

- **Connectivity and way-finding are two big issues when building the cycling network.**
  The network needs to be fully connected and clear how to transition from one area to another. Signage and way-finding is important in directing cycling routes, however trail crossings and interchanges are big barriers to connectivity. Incorporate cycling facilities into all Regional roads as they are reconstructed. Beyond the Capital Plan, proactively pursue completing a few good routes even when they are difficult to implement but it is the right thing to do.

“**Burning Issues**”

*Beyond building the Regional Walking and Cycling Network, what else could the Region do to address “burning issues” for walking and cycling?*

- **Better education, enforcement and etiquette is needed for all road users**
  Interactions between pedestrians, cyclists and motorist are safer when each party behaves in a consistent and predictable manner. Education is needed to inform the public about rules of the road;
police should correct improper behaviour for all users through enforcement; and etiquette campaigns will help remind everyone to share the road.

- **Level the playing field for walking and cycling**
  Most streets and communities have been built for the car; review zoning, land-use and by-law policies to balance the convenience level for pedestrians and cyclists: direct walkways, front-lotted retail, bike parking requirements that are safe and secure, restrictions on car parking, etc. More mixed-use development should be encouraged as well as car parking rates that reflect the “actual” costs of parking.

- **Funding strategies need to be reviewed to show to commitment to active transportation**
  Building sidewalks, trails and cycling facilities should not be considered as extra costs in the Transportation Capital budget. The Region places walking and cycling as high priorities in their transportation policy, so the funding should match those commitments. Just as with vehicle traffic, the Region needs be monitoring pedestrian and cycling traffic and include them in the needs and performance reviews used for directing funds.

**Winter Network**

*What could the Region do to help make walking and cycling viable in the winter?*

- **Improve winter snow clearing practices for pedestrian and cycling facilities**
  Clearing needs to be done sooner and more completely. Over the weekend, 48-hour and even 24-hour windows are too long to wait. Crosswalks are often blocked with snow banks, bike lanes are often used for snow storage, and debris remains after spring melt. Trails are an important part of the network. All these facilities should cleared.

- **Visibility is a key concern in the winter**
  Darker conditions and more restricted space make visibility a safety concern. Snow banks are piled high next to sidewalks and at crosswalks, there is less space on the roadway to share; key trails have no lighting. Need education on proper winter riding and better visibility of trail crossings of Regional roads.

- **Many pedestrians and cyclists may use transit in the winter**
  It is important to maintain access to the transit network. The transit network can provide some guidance for determining key winter routes. Sidewalks leading to transit stops need to be clear. Bike racks are often covered with snow. Partnerships with transit authorities can be used to come up with winter access strategies (e.g. snow clearing agreements, improved amenities at shelters, etc.)

**Changing Behaviour**

*Which programs are most effective to help more people walk and cycle more often?*

- **Continue to provide resources for walking and cycling and expand on existing programs**
  Some already successful programs include: CAN-BIKE and Safe-Routes-to-School, etc. Link these initiatives together to push for road safety education in schools. Partner with schools to develop active transportation plans and student ambassadors. Look into establishing a central resource for trails and cycling information in the region.

- **Make walking and cycling easy**
  Establish a signage and way-finding strategy, and provide trip planning for pedestrians and cyclists like the GRT trip planner. Make it obvious that walking and cycling are accepted in the community. Provide incentives and/or subsidies for businesses and employers to install pedestrian/cycling amenities and to promote active transportation locally. Investigate the possibility of establishing bike share or public bike programs.

- **Make walking and cycling “cool” and fun**
  Raise the visibility of average residents who walk or cycle. Hold a complementary Commuter Challenge in the winter. Continue with Car-free Sundays / Open Streets. Capitalize on the tourism side of the trail network.
Attachment 2 - Invitation

Help shape the future of walking and cycling in your community

Drop in and provide your input on Walk Cycle Waterloo Region and the Transit Hub Station Area Access Plan and stay for a presentation by international cycling expert/advocate Hans Moor. Hans will speak about his cycling experience in the Netherlands and cycling in Canada.

Sponsored by:

Location: UW School of Pharmacy
(corner of King and Victoria Streets in Kitchener)
GRT buses stop just outside the door and parking is available across the street at the future site of the Transit Hub.

Date: June 4, 2012

Time: Drop in from 4:30 to 8 p.m. Presentation 6 p.m.
For more information and to provide your input online, please visit WalkCycleWR.regionofwaterloo.ca and regionofwaterloo.ca/TransitHub.

Follow us @WalkCycleWR and join the conversation #WalkCycleWR
Like us! Facebook.com/WalkCycleWR
Email us WalkCycleWR@regionofwaterloo.ca

This study is being conducted in accordance with the requirements of Phases 1 and 2 of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment. Under the Municipal Act, personal information such as name, address, telephone number and property location that may be included in a submission becomes part of the public record. Questions regarding the collection of this information should be referred to Walk Cycle Waterloo Region.

These events are accessible for people with disabilities and are served by Grand River Transit. For route information, visit grt.ca or call 519-585-7555. Accessible parking is available. If you require assistance to attend or participate in these meeting, or to access information in alternative formats, please contact us at least five days prior to the meeting.

You can also provide your input on these projects at: WalkCycleWR.regionofwaterloo.ca
regionofwaterloo.ca/TransitHub
Recommended Active Transportation Networks (DRAFT)

How to read the Walking and Cycling Network maps:

- **Provincial highways** are shown in darker, thicker grey lines
- **Regional roads** that are under the jurisdiction of the Region of Waterloo are shown in thicker grey lines
- **Area Municipal roads and streets** under the jurisdiction of the area municipalities are shown in thinner grey lines
- **Pedestrian and cycling facilities** along Regional roads are shown as thicker dark or colour lines
- **Local facilities** are shown on Area Municipal roads as thinner lines

Solid lines (-----) are **existing facilities**
Dashed lines (-----) are **planned facilities** that are recommended to be constructed in the next 20 years.
Each colour represents a different **type of facility**

Types of facilities shown on both the Walking and Cycling Networks

- **Solid thick green lines:** **existing major trails** such as the Kissing Bridge Trail and Walter Bean Trail, for pedestrians and may allow cyclists
- **Dashed thick green lines:** **planned multi-use trails** not along roadways, for pedestrians and cyclists to share
- **Solid thin green lines:** **existing minor trails** such as paths connecting streets and in local parks, and hiking trails in forests and conservation areas
How to read the Walking and Cycling Network maps:

Types of facilities shown on both the Walking and Cycling Networks (cont’d)

Thick dashed orange lines with numbers: special study area such as pedestrian bridges, trail / road connections and crossings, etc.

Dashed blue lines: planned boulevard multi-use trail in the boulevard along a roadway where there are few driveways and side street intersections; A single line is a trail on one side of the road; double lines are trails on both sides of the road.

Types of facilities shown on the Walking Network

Thick solid or dashed black lines: sidewalks along Regional roads. A single line is a sidewalk on one side of the road; double lines are sidewalks on both sides of the road.

Thin solid black lines: sidewalks along local roads or streets. A single line is a sidewalk on one side of the road; double lines are sidewalks on both sides of the road.
How to read the Walking and Cycling Network maps:

Types of Facilities shown on the Cycling Network

- **Solid or dashed red lines:** bike lanes on each side of busier roads; can have a painted buffer if there is enough road width.

- **Solid and dashed purple lines:** paved shoulders
  - 1.2 m or more wide on rural roads

- **Dashed pink lines:** marked shared-use lane, also known as a “sharrow” where cyclists and motorists speeds are similar; if next to a red line, it is a bike lane in the uphill direction and “sharrows” in the downhill direction.

- **Solid light blue:** Local connection of Regional Significance is a cycling facility on an Area Municipal road, street or trail to connect Regional cycling facilities; includes local trails that are part of the Trans-Canada Trail.

- **Thin dashed or solid blue lines:** local cycling facilities planned or existing identified in area municipal trail and cycling master plans; can be multi-use trails, signed routes, bicycle-friendly streets, bike lanes, etc.
How to read the Walking and Cycling Network maps:

Types of Facilities shown on the Cycling Network

Dashed double red lines: segregated bike lanes on higher speed, higher volume roads; various types of segregation: mountable curb and gutter, curbs and bollards, flexible delineators, grass boulevard, planters (two-way on a one-way street), or raised concrete median (two-way on a one-way street)
Planned Pedestrian Network
- Pedestrian Enhancements
- Sidewalk Replacement
- Sidewalk Infill
- Blvd Multi-Use Trail
- Multi-Use Trail
- Special Study Area

Existing Pedestrian Network
- Existing Pedestrian Network
- Boulevard Multi-Use Trail

Off-road Trails
- Major Trail
- Minor Trail

Extend multi-use trail along the proposed Regional corridor in Cambridge

Recommended Pedestrian Network
Walk Cycle
Waterloo Region
Cambridge
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What is Walk Cycle Waterloo Region?

The Region of Waterloo is developing a plan to make it easier to walk, bike and roll (in-line skating, skateboarding, using mobility devices) in our community. This plan will outline actions we can take to meet the walking and cycling targets from the Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP, 2010). The RTMP established a target of 12 percent of peak trips to be made by cycling and walking by 2031. This target requires an approximate 50 percent increase in these modes over 2006 levels. Walk Cycle Waterloo Region will also help us meet the RTMP goal of developing a safe, convenient, and well integrated bicycle and pedestrian network.

Research has shown that a vast majority of people would choose to cycle more if they could take a route that felt safe, comfortable, and convenient. The key to meeting the RTMP goals is to provide cycling facilities that are attractive to this “Interested but Concerned” segment of the population.

Where Are We Now?

In November 2011, over 150 people attended workshops in Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo. Since then, we have developed draft walking and cycling networks. In addition, we will be completing a sign strategy to help make it easier to find your way around Waterloo Region on foot or by bike.

The final plan will include nine action plans. We are currently asking for your input on the first four:

- Cycling and Walking Network
- Infill/Gaps
- Local Improvements “Fix-It” List
- Strategic Signage

We have started background work on the remaining action plans and will be asking for your input on these in the fall:

- Signature Pilot Projects
- Design Guidelines
- Winter Network
- Behavioural Shift Program
- Performance Monitoring
Need More Background on Walk Cycle Waterloo Region?

Be sure to check out our website, walkcyclewr.regionofwaterloo.ca. There you will find information presented at the workshops in the fall of 2011, as well as our newsletter recapping what we heard from the public at the workshops. Be sure to follow us on Facebook and Twitter for project updates.

Cycling and Walking Network Action Plans

The goal of Walk Cycle Waterloo Region is to create a complete cycling and walking network that serves the needs of the community. The network needs to be practical and able to be constructed in a timely manner. The project team has developed draft walking and cycling networks considering the following:

- Comments received from the public at and following the November 2011 workshops
- Input from Regional and Area Municipal staff
- Input received from the Active Transportation Advisory Committee
- Location of destinations of regional importance including employment areas, secondary institutions, commercial centres, etc.
- Areas of potential for increasing walking and cycling given the population density, land use and trip making patterns

The Region will develop a funding strategy to help prioritize the implementation of the walking and cycling network. Focus will be given to areas with high demand/beaten paths and key centres such as rapid transit stations and commercial centres where quick wins can be achieved.

The draft plans have special study areas identified that will require further study. These areas are pedestrian bridges, trail/road connections and crossings of concern. The draft walking and cycling networks are available for your review at the open house or online at WalkCycleWR.regionofwaterloo.ca.

Closing the Gaps with Infill Projects

Filling the gaps is key to providing a network that connects destinations around the region. In some cases, it is not comfortable to cycle or walk along Regional roads. To address this, the walking network recommends building sidewalks on both sides of the road in urban areas and rural settlement communities. The cycling network focuses on closing the gaps in the network we’ve already started to build, but some exceptions do exist:

1. Some Regional roads are in good condition; reconstructing them within the next 20 years to provide cycling facilities would not be cost effective.
2. Our goal is to build bike routes that connect to destinations. Some road segments are isolated from destinations, so they are not included in this plan.
3. Our goal is to build bike routes that more people feel comfortable using. Where there is not enough space to build the type of cycling facility that would be comfortable for “Interested but Concerned” cyclists, we have proposed local connections using trails and local streets rather than busy Regional roads.

Local Improvements: the “Fix It” List Action Plan

As communities implement walking and cycling infrastructure over time, improvements and maintenance can improve the overall quality. But sometimes these “spot” improvements are overlooked or do not have a funding program. The Fix It Action Plan recognizes locations that require small or more significant improvements to improve the overall connectivity, comfort and safety of the network. Projects have been identified by staff, the public, and the Active Transportation Advisory Committee. Examples include:
Improvements to freeway interchanges such as Franklin Boulevard, Hespeler Road, King Street, University Avenue, etc.

- Improvements to underpasses and overpasses such as Sportsworld Drive at Hwy. 7/8, Lexington at Hwy. 85, etc.
- Improvements to trail crossings such as Moffat Creek Trail at Water Street, Iron Horse Trail at Weber Street, etc.
- Multi-use trail transition to bike lanes such as George Street at Parkhill Road
- Traffic signal timing improvements such as King and William Streets, University Avenue and Phillip Street, etc.

A full list of projects is available for your review at the meeting and online. An annual audit program is recommended to identify additional “fix it” locations.

Finding Your Way: The Strategic Signage Action Plan

You told us that it can be difficult to find your way around the region by foot and by bike. The Region is working with the three Cities and the four Townships to develop an integrated signage strategy for Waterloo Region’s trail and bike networks. The Trans-Canada Trail was identified as a good route to test out new trail marking, route direction and destination signs. The on-road cycling network would be integrated with the named trail network by adding bicycle logos to street name signs along roads with cycling facilities. Regional destinations would be signed at key decision points, indicating the distance and time. The result would be an easy to recognize network, and times to destinations that make the trip by bicycle viable to those who have never tried it.

Walking and Cycling to the King/Victoria Transit Hub

The Region has purchased a number of properties near the intersection of King and Victoria Streets in the City of Kitchener for developing a Transit Hub that integrates walking, cycling, Light Rail Transit, Grand River Transit, VIA, GO, inter-city buses, taxis and other motor vehicles. The Transit Hub will become a centre of activity in downtown Kitchener, with a high-quality streetscape that attracts development and new opportunities to live, work and play.

To help create a vibrant public space, the Region is identifying high priority routes for people walking and cycling to and through the Transit Hub area. This Access Plan will integrate and expand on existing walking and cycling routes, as well as identify ways to improve the connectivity of surrounding neighbourhoods.

The draft walking and cycling links to the King/Victoria Transit Hub station area are available for your review at the open house or online at www.regionofwaterloo.ca/transithub.

Your input is important!

We want to get your input on this plan. Please take a moment to fill out a comment form and submit it by June 26, 2012. You can also submit your comments via mail, fax or email or complete the online survey.

A comprehensive consultation page is available on our website to help you provide input. A video, network maps and an online comment form will be available online.

Our Next Steps

Over the summer, we will finalize the walking and cycling network. In fall 2012, we will invite the public to give input on the full set of draft action plans. Together these will form the basis of the
final Walk Cycle Waterloo Region plan. We expect to finish the plan by the end of the year 2012 with final Regional Council consideration in early 2013.

Stay Informed
Visit WalkCycleWR.regionofwaterloo.ca
Follow us! @WalkCycleWR
Like us! Facebook.com/WalkCycleWR
Email us! WalkCycleWR@regionofwaterloo.ca

Norma Moores
IBI Group
Phone: 1-877-822-3798

Paula Sawicki
Region of Waterloo
Phone: 519-575-4035
150 Frederick St. 8th Floor
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3
Fax: 519-575-4449
Attachment 5 – Draft Walking and Cycling Routes in the King/Victoria Transit Hub area
Key Cycling Routes

- GO Train/Via Rail Route - Proposed Station
- LRT Route - Proposed Station
- Existing/Proposed On-Road Bikeway
- Existing/Proposed Off-street Trail
- Existing Trail in Park

Key Cycling Linkage
- Pedestrian/Cyclist Priority Area (Prospect of Transit Hub)
- Potential Trail Along Rail Corridor

Barrier or area of special design consideration for cyclists
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: May 29, 2012

FILE CODE: D28-50

SUBJECT: RECOMMENDED 2012 GRAND RIVER TRANSIT SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the 2012 Grand River Transit (GRT) service improvements as described in Report No. P-12-069, dated May 29, 2012, and shown in Attachments A, B and C, as summarized below:

- Extended Sunday hours of service on selected routes in Cambridge with highest anticipated ridership demands and a broad service coverage network;
- Replacement of the Route 75 SAGINAW BusPLUS 6.5m (21’) mini-bus with a standard 12.2m (40’) bus and expansion of existing peak period service to include weekday, midday and evening service;
- Improved service to the L.G. Lovell Industrial Park area providing two-way service and more service coverage;
- New weekday peak-period Route 76 DOON SOUTH BusPLUS service; and
- Extended weekend service on the 200 iXpress and Route 13 LAURELWOOD.

SUMMARY:

In 2011, the Region of Waterloo implemented the largest increase in transit service in the history of Grand River Transit (GRT). This service addressed significant overcrowding of routes in the Central Transit Corridor and began the implementation process of new iXpress routes designed to be integrated with the Rapid Transit system, providing a high frequency transit network. Transit ridership in 2011 increased by over 9%, or an additional 1.7 million rides, to approximately 19.7 million annual rides, the largest transit ridership increase since GRT was established.

Transit ridership for 2012 has continued to grow with ridership in the first quarter up by 10.6% over 2011. The GRT Business Plan 2011-2014, approved by Regional Council in January of 2012, identified a number of specific improvements in transit service for 2012 which are being recommended for implementation. The improvements serve the objectives of meeting the demand for travel outside of the peak periods, extending transit routes to improve access to residential and employment areas, reducing travel time through direct two-way routes and reducing overcrowding and provide capacity for ridership growth by replacing existing BusPLUS vehicles with standard buses.

The recommended service improvements would require approximately 12, 540 hours of service with a net operating cost of $183,000 and include the following proposed major service improvements:

- Extended Sunday hours of service on selected routes in Cambridge with highest anticipated ridership demands and a broad service coverage network;
- Replacement of the Route 75 SAGINAW BusPLUS 6.5m (21’) mini-bus with a standard 12.2m (40’) bus and expansion of existing peak period service to include weekday, midday and evening service;
• Improved service to the L.G. Lovell Industrial Park area providing two-way service and more service coverage;
• New weekday peak-period Route 76 DOON SOUTH BusPLUS service; and
• Extended weekend service on the 200 iXpress and Route 13 LAURELWOOD.

These improvements were presented at two public consultation centres. The feedback from the public was considered by the Steering Committees and used to modify the final recommendations presented in this report. In the Doon South area, two options were presented to the public with feedback used to develop a modified Option 1 as the first phase of service to the area. In east Cambridge, three options were present to the public with the feedback used to develop a modified Option 3 for the industrial area. Complete feedback is included in Attachment D.

REPORT:

In 2011, the Region of Waterloo implemented the largest increase in transit service in the history of Grand River Transit (GRT). This service addressed significant overcrowding of routes in the Central Transit Corridor and began the implementation process of new iXpress routes designed to be integrated with the Rapid Transit system, providing a high frequency transit network. Transit ridership in 2011 increased by over 9%, or an additional 1.7 million rides, to approximately 19.7 million annual rides, the largest transit ridership increase since GRT was established.

As part of the Regional Transportation Master Plan and the Rapid Transit initiative, a comprehensive redesign of the transit network was completed. The redesign includes a network of express routes to streamline integration with rapid transit and is supported by redesigned local routes. The GRT Business Plan 2011-2014 established the priorities for the service implementation. The first phase of the service improvements was implemented in 2011, concentrating on addressing the significant overcrowding of routes in the Central Transit Corridor with the introduction of 10 minute frequency on the 200 iXpress, the introduction of the 201 Fischer Hallman iXpress and the related local route redesigns. In addition, route restructuring in Hespeler was the first step in reorganizing routes in Cambridge. To date, the impact has been positive with two months since September 2011 having over 2 million riders. In 2012, the first quarter ridership is up 10.6% while revenue has increased by 10.8%.

Regional Council approved the Grand River Transit (GRT) Business Plan 2011-2014 in January of 2012. Building upon the network redesign work, this plan identifies a number of specific improvements in transit service for 2012. These service improvements were presented to the public at two public consultations centres held in March 2012.

Public Consultation

Feedback from the public was obtained through several means including:
• A Public Consultation Centre (PCC) held on March 21 at the Pioneer Park Community Library concentrating on proposed new service to the Doon South area of Kitchener
• A PCC held on March 22nd at the Clemens Mills Library (St. Benedicts CSS) concentrating on proposed service improvements on the east side of Cambridge
• A follow-up survey on the Route 67 Lovell Industrial route
• A follow-up letter regarding a proposed new option for the Doon South service
• Information posted on the www.grt.ca website

In advance of the PCC’s, an extensive notification campaign was undertaken. Methods used to help ensure residents were aware of potential services changes included:
• Postcards distributed to areas affected by potential changes
• Letters distributed to residents on streets where new service was potentially being added
• Newspaper ads
- Posters on buses
- Road signs – at major intersections in the study areas
- Electronic media including the GRT website, Rider E-Alerts, Twitter, Facebook

The two PCC’s were well attended with 114 people signing in. Including people providing comments on the website and as part of the follow-up process, 155 comments were received about the proposals. A summary of the comments is contained in Attachment D. The public input has been taken into consideration in development of the final proposed 2012 Transit Service Improvement Plan. Further discussion of the comments received is contained in the sections on specific proposals below.

**Proposed 2012 Service Improvements**

For 2012, the proposed service improvements would focus on local service improvements that increase hours of operation, frequency, service coverage and directness of travel. The improvements serve the objectives of meeting the demand for travel outside of the peak periods, extending transit routes to improve access to residential and employment areas, reducing travel time through direct two-way routes and reducing overcrowding and provide capacity for ridership growth by replacing existing BusPLUS vehicles with standard buses.

**East Cambridge Service Improvements**

**Route 67 LOVELL INDUSTRIAL**

Route 67 serves the L.G. Lovell Industrial Park, operating in one direction from the Cambridge Centre Terminal along Industrial Road, Pinebush Fleming Drive, Sheldon Drive and Conestoga Boulevard, as shown in Attachment E. Buses on this route operate every 30 minutes from 6:30 a.m. to 9 a.m. and from 2:30 p.m. to 5 p.m. on weekdays. Two late night trips are also provided at 10:30 p.m. and 11 p.m.

Ridership on Route 67 has increased since its introduction in fall 2002 from approximately 1,000 riders per month to 4,000 riders per month. In response to customer requests, the route was extended to meet iXpress in the morning at 7:38 a.m. to reduce travel time for customers travelling from Kitchener-Waterloo to the L.G. Lovell Industrial Park.

Based on analysis and community feedback, staff proposes to replace the current service with two-way operation between the Smart Centre and the Cambridge Centre via Pinebush Road, Thompson Drive, Lingard Road, Sheldon Drive and Conestoga Boulevard and a one-way service from the Smart Centre to Hespeler Road, Langs Drive, Industrial Road and Eagle Street. This proposed routing is shown in Attachment A.

Departure times from the Cambridge Centre would remain unchanged. To ensure customers travelling to Industrial Drive would continue to be able to arrive in time for 7 a.m. shift starts, an additional 6:30 departure would be provided, using the current routing. Late evening service would also continue to follow the current Route 67.

By introducing better integration with the 200 iXpress and the 51 HESPELER ROAD at the Smart Centre and by providing two-way service, travel time for customers using Route 67 would be reduced. By extending Route 67 to Thompson Drive, more of the L.G. Lovell Industrial Park would be accessible to transit customers.
Route 75 SAGINAW BusPLUS

This route connects residential areas in east Cambridge with the Cambridge Centre Terminal. Service is provided along Can Amera Parkway, Franklin Boulevard, Saginaw Parkway, Townline Road, Coulthard Boulevard, Baintree Way, Burnett Drive, Essex Point Drive and Green Vista Drive as shown in Attachment E. Route 75 operates every 30 minutes from 6 a.m. to 9:30 a.m. and from 2:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. on weekdays.

Route 75 BusPLUS service was introduced in September 2004 as a lower cost way to develop the transit market in this growing area. BusPLUS service is a contracted service, currently operated by Hendry Coach Lines, and operates using smaller 6.5m (21’) vehicles.

Route 75 ridership has increased to the capacity of the BusPLUS service, with approximately 2,000 riders per month. At this ridership level, some trips are at the vehicle’s capacity and customers have reported occasions of being unable to board.

It is proposed to replace the current BusPLUS service with standard service using 12m (40’) buses. Route 75 is proposed to continue to use the existing routing. Service hours would be extended to operate every 30 minutes between 6 a.m. and 7 p.m. and hourly from 7 p.m. to 10 p.m. on weekdays.

Community Feedback Regarding East Cambridge Service Improvements

At the PCC on March 22, 2012, three different options for the east Cambridge area were presented to the public (Attachment F). These options provided additional service hours, reduced travel times and two-way service where warranted. Two of the options did not provide service along Saginaw Parkway between Burnett Avenue and Townline Road, instead developing improved service for areas west of Franklin Boulevard. Review of the over 60 comments received following this PCC indicated a strong desire for Route 75 to continue to use the existing routing. Customers also expressed a desire for additional hours of operation on Route 75 including midday, evening and weekend service. The proposed level of service for Route 75 reflects this as much as possible within the available budget.

Route 67 options were also further developed to remove service duplication with the proposed Route 75 while reducing travel time for customers and serving more of the L.G. Lovell Industrial Park. Staff reviewed the proposed improvement to Route 67 directly with customers by distributing a proposed map and schedule together with a brief survey at the Cambridge Centre Terminal. More than 50% of Route 67 customers were reached using this method. Customer responses to this service proposal were positive, and are included in Attachment D.

Doon South Service Improvements

New BusPLUS service is proposed in the Doon South neighbourhood of Kitchener. This service would utilize the 6.5m (21’) mini-bus that is currently being used on Route 75. Over the last several years, there have been increasing requests for service to this area of Kitchener. During development of the neighbourhood, staff was involved with identifying the best route options.

Community Feedback Regarding Doon South Service Improvements

Two route options were presented at the PCC’s, providing service during weekday morning and afternoon rush hour periods between Pioneer Park Plaza and Conestoga College Doon Campus (Attachment G). Option 1 included two-way service through the Apple Ridge Drive area operating every 45 minutes, while Option 2 provided one-way service through the Apple Ridge Drive and Autumn Ridge Drive areas operating every 30 minutes.
Comments following the PCC’s showed that the public were divided with basically the same number of residents preferring each option (30 preferring Option 1 and 28 preferring Option 2). A number of reasons were given such as preferring two-way service (Option 1) or greater service coverage and greater number of trips (Option 2). Some preferred Option 1 as it did not travel along Autumn Ridge or Forest Edge.

In addition, there were a number of residents who were opposed to transit service in the Doon South area. Most of this concern was raised by residents along Apple Ridge Drive and Forest Creek Drive who felt there were safety concerns due to the elementary school on Apple Ridge and the number of younger children in the area. A petition was received from residents along Forest Creek Drive concerning the proposed service (see Attachment H). GRT currently operates safely along a number of similar streets in the Region. Some residents along Autumn Ridge Trail, Thomas Slee Drive and Pinnacle Drive felt that transit service in their area were not needed or appropriate, although others on these streets did want the service.

The planned provision of transit service along Autumn Ridge Trail, Forest Edge Trail, Apple Ridge Drive, Doon Mills Drive, and Tilt Drive, has been identified in approved planning documents including the 2003 Doon South Community Plan. With the subsequent closure of Tilt Drive, planned transit service was realigned from Tilt Drive to Forest Creek Drive.

Upon further analysis and review of public feedback, a revised option for transit service in Doon South has been proposed that would allow the route to maintain the preferred two-way service and 30 minute frequency, as shown in Attachment B. Offering 30 minute frequency provides greater options for connections to additional routes at Pioneer Park Plaza and Conestoga College and more trips, while two-way service offers more direct service. Service would be in the morning (approximately 6:30 AM to 9:30 AM) and afternoon (approximately 2:40 PM to 6:10 PM) peaks on weekdays.

Stage 1 of this proposed service would travel via Pioneer Drive, Bechtel Drive, Doon Village Road, Doon Mills Drive, Doon South Drive, Homer Watson Boulevard, and Conestoga College Boulevard (Attachment B). Service would run during weekday morning and afternoon rush-hour periods.

It is acknowledged that the Stage 1 service leaves some residential areas beyond the 450 metre minimum walking distances to transit. However, future residential development and continued ridership growth in the area will warrant additional service in the future. Further route options would be evaluated, such as service along Apple Ridge Drive, Forest Creek Drive, Robert Ferrie Drive, Thomas Slee Drive, and Autumn Ridge Trail.

Since this was a new option that was not shown at the PCC’s, a follow-up letter was sent to all residents on the streets affected by the new option and to all who provided prior feedback.

Improvements in Service Levels

In addition to the route restructuring noted above, several improvements to service levels were also presented at the public consultation centres. These improvements were all generally met with positive response as they fill various requests for service improvements.

Cambridge Sunday Service

One of the most frequent service requests in Cambridge is to expand the hours of service provided on Sundays. Attachment C shows the proposed changes which expand service both earlier in the morning and later in the evening. The routes that have been selected for Sunday service and the levels of service chosen on each route are based on analysis that shows the most potential for ridership growth and the development of the most effective service coverage on Sundays in Cambridge.
200 iXpress

As a continuation of the ridership growth on the original iXpress route, additional service hours are warranted to meet demand:

- Extend 30 minute service on Saturday evenings from 9:00 p.m. to 11:30 p.m.
- Start 30 minute service Sunday mornings two hours earlier at 8:00 a.m. and extend 30 minute service from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.

Route 13 Laurelwood

- The demand on this route warrants the extension of 30 minute service on Saturday evenings from 6:30 p.m. to 11:00 p.m.

Next Steps

If the service improvements recommended in this report are approved by Council, the service improvements would begin on Monday September 3, 2012. In order to effectively launch the changes, a number of marketing measures would take place. These include:

- Posters on buses and at transit terminals and other key locations
- Ads in local newspapers
- Ads on local radio stations
- Information targeted to specific neighbourhoods
- Alerts to media
- Notices on GRT website
- Announcements via various social media including Rider e-alerts, Twitter and Facebook

As part of ongoing service and operating performance monitoring, the new service improvements would be monitored on a regular basis, and if warranted, staff would recommend service adjustments at a later date.

Future Service Improvements

As part of the GRT Business Plan, service improvements have been identified for the next several years. In relation to the 2012 improvements, additional Sunday service improvements are planned for Cambridge in 2014. Also with the start of aBRT service in 2014, routes in Cambridge will continue to be modified to allow improved connections at the aBRT stations.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

Area Municipalities are being consulted through representation on Steering Committees and have been circulated material related to service improvement proposals.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The 2012 Transit Service Improvement Plan supports the implementation of 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:

The GRT Business Plan (2011-2014) accounts for approximately 12,540 which include 8890 new service hours plus approximately 3650 hours for efficiency within the existing service. The proposed services hours are within the hours proposed in the Business Plan.

Efficiencies were provided through improvements in allocation of services scheduled for student transportation, a reduction in services where service levels were matched better to ridership levels and in the scheduling of bus operators and vehicles.

The net operating costs associated with the proposed 2012 service improvements, as described in this report, amount to $183,000 and are included in the approved 2012 GRT Operating Budget to be funded from the RTMP Reserve Fund. It is estimated that there would be additional revenues of $83,497 in 2012 and additional ridership of approximately 68,000.

The expanded service will require 5 new operators and the use of 2 buses which can come from redeployment within the existing fleet.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Staff from Planning, Housing and Community Services and Transportation and Environmental Services worked together to develop these transit service improvement plans.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment A - East Cambridge Service Improvement Proposal
Attachment B - Route 76 BusPLUS Doon South Service Proposal
Attachment C - Proposed Cambridge Service Area Sunday Service Hours of Operation
Attachment D - Public Feedback on Service improvement Proposals
Attachment E - Existing East Cambridge Service
Attachment F - East Cambridge Service Options presented to the public
Attachment G - Doon South Service Options presented to the public
Attachment H – Petition from Forest Creek Drive Residents

PREPARED BY: Blair Allen, Supervisor Transit Development

APPROVED BY: Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
Attachment B - Route 76 BusPLUS Doon South Stage 1 Service Proposal
## Attachment C - Proposed Cambridge Service Area Sunday Service Hours of Operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>8 a.m.</th>
<th>9 a.m.</th>
<th>10 a.m. through 6 p.m.</th>
<th>7 p.m.</th>
<th>8 p.m.</th>
<th>9 p.m.</th>
<th>10 p.m.</th>
<th>11 p.m.</th>
<th>12 a.m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>current</td>
<td>No Service</td>
<td>30 minute service</td>
<td>No Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proposed</td>
<td>60 minute service</td>
<td>30 minute service</td>
<td>60 minute service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>current</td>
<td>No Service</td>
<td>60 minute service</td>
<td>No Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proposed</td>
<td>60 minute service</td>
<td>30 minute service</td>
<td>60 minute service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>current</td>
<td>No Service</td>
<td>No Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proposed</td>
<td>No Service</td>
<td>60 minute service</td>
<td>No Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>current</td>
<td>No Service</td>
<td>60 minute service</td>
<td>No Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td>60 minute service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>current</td>
<td>No Service</td>
<td>60 minute service</td>
<td>No Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td>60 minute service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>current</td>
<td>No Service</td>
<td>60 minute service</td>
<td>No Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proposed</td>
<td>No Service</td>
<td>60 minute service</td>
<td>No Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>current</td>
<td>No Service</td>
<td>60 minute service</td>
<td>No Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td>60 minute service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>current</td>
<td>No Service</td>
<td>60 minute service</td>
<td>No Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td>60 minute service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>current</td>
<td>No Service</td>
<td>60 minute service</td>
<td>No Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proposed</td>
<td>No Service</td>
<td>60 minute service</td>
<td>No Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>current</td>
<td>No Service</td>
<td>60 minute service</td>
<td>No Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td>60 minute service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment D – Public Feedback on Service Improvement Proposals

2012 Cambridge Area Transit Service Improvement Plan Public Comments Summary

Total Comments: 68

Option 1

Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stated preference with no comment</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This option would reduce travel times for residents living west of Franklin Blvd</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 2

Comments

| Stated preference with no comment | 9 |

Suggestions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request for proposed Route 68 to operate on weekends</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extend proposed Route 75 east along Saginaw Blvd &amp; Glenvalley Dr</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend the afternoon peak period service past 6 p.m. on proposed Route 68</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend peak period service to 8 p.m.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These comments will be retained for consideration during future reviews of area routes.
### Option 3

#### Comments

| Stated preference with no comment | 31 |
| Provides access to parks & Public schools on Saginaw Blvd | 6 |
| Prefer this option because it does not include service on their street (Burnett Avenue or Essex Point Drive) | 3 |

These comments were excluded from counts of those supporting the proposed service option, though the comments were retained. General concerns included parked cars on the street, children playing in the neighbourhood and noise from transit operations.

**Total** 37

#### Suggestions

| Provide weekend service on proposed new routes | 10 |
| This improvement will be considered when budget becomes available |
| Provide early extended weekday service from 5:30 a.m. to midnight on proposed Route 75. Early and late service would help residents accessing jobs in Kitchener & Waterloo, and those working rotating shifts. | 2 |
| Service is proposed to begin at 5:30 a.m. Evening service is proposed to be provided until approximately 10 p.m. Frequency may be reduced to hourly after approximately 7 p.m. |
| Provide two-way service on Route 60 on Elgin St, Glamis Rd, Burnett Dr and Robson Ave |
| Provide hourly service on Saturdays with proposed Route 75 |
| Provide two-way service on Saginaw Blvd east of Burnett using Granite Hill Rd. |
| Increase service coverage on proposed Route 75 using Green Vista Dr or Bishop St N |
| Provide 15 minute frequency |
| Extend evening service on Route 53 |
| Extend Route 67 to Pinebush & Thompson |
| Extend Route 67 to all day weekday operation |

These suggestions cannot be included in the 2012 service plan. However they will be retained for consideration during future reviews of area routes.
Sunday Service improvements in Cambridge

Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General statement of support with no further comment</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional hours of service will make it easier to use transit on Sundays</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Sunday service will make it possible to work earlier/ later on Sundays</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggestions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 minute frequency on weekends would make it easier to use transit</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be helpful if 30 minute frequency service could be extended past 6 p.m.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request Sunday service on Route 57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be helpful if iXpress could run later than proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All routes on Sunday should operate as they do on Saturday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iXpress should operate later in the evening</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iXpress is proposed to operate later on weekday, Saturday and Sunday evenings as part of the 2012 service plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about schedule adherence</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 67 should have full day service from 6 am to 11:30 p.m. to meet changing shift times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit travel times to major destinations from the Saginaw Parkway area should be reduced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 71 weekend routing is confusing – prefer the route to remain consistent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request Route 53 Franklin Blvd evening service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request Route 58 Elmwood evening service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Additional Route 67 Outreach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Proposed service improvement will reduce travel time to work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concern that travel times would be increased</td>
<td>Proposed two-direction travel, with transfer opportunities at two points means that travel times will decrease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that route would not reach Cambridge Centre Terminal at desired times</td>
<td>Proposed new route will have stops at either end of Fleming Drive, with service in both directions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that stops on Fleming Drive would be eliminated</td>
<td>Schedule adherence will be monitored after the route is implemented. Adjustments to the posted schedule will be made if necessary to ensure service meets expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that proposed service could be reliably delivered</td>
<td>This suggestion cannot be included in the 2012 service plan. However it will be retained for consideration during future reviews of area routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for midday service &amp; evening service</td>
<td>Positive comments regarding quality of current service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Survey Responses for Doon South Proposed BusPLUS Service

**Total Comments: 87**

## Stated Reasons for Use of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel to work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel to University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel to College</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request direct service to FVM/extend Rt 10 to Doon South</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery shopping at PPP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get downtown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend hours to provide weekend/full day service</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Support for Option 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General statement of support with no further comment</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-way service is more convenient</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-way service is less confusing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not operate along Autumn Ridge or Forest Edge</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Support for Option 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General statement of support with no further comment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater number of trips</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater service coverage</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces number of trips past their street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## No Preference between Option 1 or Option 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General statement of support for either option</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Opposition to Transit Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General statement of opposition with no further comment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Service is operated by professional drivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety concerns for kids in the area</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Buses are disruptive and should not operate on narrow streets 9
Preferred that the route remain on Doon Mills Dr. and Doon South Dr. 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concern over bus stop placement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clockwise</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter clockwise</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter clockwise in AM / clockwise in PM</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clockwise AM / Counter clockwise PM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment E – Existing East Cambridge Service

Legend
- Route 51 Hespeler Road
- Route 53 Franklin Boulevard
- Route 67 Lovell Industrial
- Route 75 Saginaw BusPLUS
Attachment F – East Cambridge Service Options presented to the public

Option 1:

Option 2:

Legend

- Proposed Route 67 Lovell Industrial
- Proposed NEW Route 68
- Proposed Route 75 Saginaw
- Proposed Route 60 Northview Acres
- Existing Route 51 Hespeler Road
- Existing Route 53 Franklin Boulevard
Option 3
Attachment G – Doon South Service Options presented to the public
**Petition to remove Forest Creek Drive from GRT’s proposed Apple Ridge Bus Route**

**March 2012**

**Petition summary and background:**
- Short street deems route section unnecessary
  - Not a major through-way street, but a short private subdivision area
  - Families moved to this area and street because of the quiet setting
  - Current Don Mills bus route is walking distance
- Forest Creek section of route will not be utilized due to subdivision’s demographic
  - Multiple car families
  - Families with young children not bussing age
  - No college age students
- Immediate Safety Concerns
  - Narrow Street
  - Majority of homes house very young children
  - Child and family foot traffic is very high
  - Community Trail crossing at Apple Ridge and Forest Creek Dr. (Old Tilt) has heavy family foot traffic—currently this intersection only contains a one way stop sign and is regularly monitored by Regional Police due to non-compliance and safety concerns
  - Sight lines at Apple Ridge and Forest Creek Dr. are very limited for drivers and pedestrians
- September 2012 will see additional foot traffic with 10 full-day Kindergarten classes at JW Gerth Public School

**Action petitioned for:**
We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge the Waterloo Region and Grand River Transit to remove Forest Creek Drive from the proposed Apple Ridge Bus Route.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>08/17/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>08/17/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>08/17/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>08/17/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Petition to remove Forest Creek Drive from GRT's proposed Apple Ridge Bus Route

**March 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Petition to remove Forest Creek Drive from GRT's proposed Apple Ridge Bus Route  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Finn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>March 17/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>March 17/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRI MIN SHUKLA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>March 17/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robyn Chamberlain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>March 17/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lizbet Perea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>March 17/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Van</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>March 17/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tania Masters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>March 17/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad Masters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>March 17/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISSTO MALIGAYA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>March 17/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianna Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>March 17/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thea Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>March 17/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Donas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>March 17/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Eikele</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>March 17/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Stohl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>March 17/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Caldwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>March 17/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrie McDougale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>March 17/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saima Khan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>March 17/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

March 2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike D. Felice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar 19/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar 12/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenzi Andrews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar 19/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Austin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar 19/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar 19/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar 19/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
DATE: May 29, 2012
FILE CODE: D28-20/ITS
SUBJECT: SOFTWARE UPGRADES AND ENHANCEMENTS FOR TECHNOLOGY ON GRAND RIVER TRANSIT

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the acquisition and installation of software upgrades, enhancements and new modules from INIT Innovations in Transportation, Inc. for Grand River Transit’s computer-aided dispatch and automatic vehicle location (CAD/AVL) system at a cost not to exceed $525,000 plus applicable taxes;

AND THAT the Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services be authorized to enter into such agreements with INIT Innovations in Transportation, Inc. as may be required to facilitate the implementation of the recommendations in Report P-12-070, dated May 29, 2012, with such agreements to be to the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor.

SUMMARY:

In early 2007, Grand River Transit (GRT) began equipping buses with the intelligent transportation control system supplied by INIT Innovations in Transportation. The computer-aided dispatch and automatic vehicle location (CAD/AVL) system and automatic passenger counting (APC) systems have provided significant benefits relating to operational efficiency, service quality and customer service.

One of the key benefits of the advanced transit technology is the ability to provide on-board visual and audible annunciation of next stops. With the delivery of new replacement buses this year, the entire active fleet will consist of all low-floor fully accessible buses installed with the automated audio and visual announcements. The Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) requires that transit systems and services reduce, and do not create barriers for customers with disabilities. The implementation of the proposed software upgrades, enhanced functionality and new modules will facilitate the continued and improved announcement of bus stops on regular routes, routes on detour and will enable route announcements to be made outside the bus.

The approved 2011 – 2014 GRT Business Plan recommends the expansion of the availability of real time passenger information and the continued automation of transit operations and dispatch control. The proposed enhancements in the upgrade will allow GRT to achieve the business plan recommendations for advanced transit technology.

REPORT:

INIT’s intelligent transportation control system has been in operation on GRT buses since the initial launch in 2007. The INIT in-vehicle system and other components are currently installed on 220 buses and it is anticipated that the entire active fleet will be equipped by the end of 2012. INIT’s
The performance of the INIT system has been effective and reliable, providing considerable benefits to customers and service delivery.

The intelligent transportation control system is divided into several subsystems which focus on the specific tasks of the transit service. Each of these components helps to optimize the transit service performance, provides passengers with better service, and increases service reliability in general. INIT’s intelligent transportation control system provides the following functionalities:

- CAD/AVL system for real-time tracking of vehicles at the transit control centre, which provides enhanced ability for central control of on-street operations to achieve greater operational efficiency and improved service reliability.
- Data communication between vehicles and dispatch to provide continuous tracking and message transmission.
- In-vehicle variable message sign (VMS) display and next stop audio announcements as per requirements set by the AODA.
- Automatic passenger counters (APC) that provide the data required to optimize route designs, service levels and schedules.
- Central data processing and analysis software
- Variable message sign (VMS) at stops displaying next bus arrival information on a real-time basis
- Transit Signal Priority (TSP) at intersections for the Route 200 iXpress

In 2005, the provincial government enacted the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act or AODA. People, businesses and organizations that provide goods or services to the public or to other organizations in Ontario have legal obligations under the Act to identify, remove and prevent barriers to accessibility. Several future AODA requirements will be addressed with the proposed system enhancements and new modules. This will ensure that transit intelligent transportation control system services reduce, and do not create barriers for customers with disabilities.

Customer passenger information as provided by the EasyGO automated information services such as the web-based trip planner, the automated phone system and the text messaging services have, overall, seen significant growth in usage over the past several years. There were over 4.7 million uses of the EasyGO traveller information system in 2011, which increased from 3.1 million in 2010. It is anticipated that moving to the provision of real-time bus arrival information through EasyGO will see the use of these services continue to grow.

Key System Upgrades and Enhancements:

The acquisition and installation of software upgrades, enhancements and new modules from INIT includes the following key upgrades and benefits for GRT staff and customers:

1. CAD/AVL Upgrade – the current version of INIT’s CAD/AVL dispatching and vehicle location system has been in use at GRT since 2007. A basic system upgrade is overdue and is required to provide enhanced features and updates to the latest software release. Upgrades include:
   a) Improved loading speed and dynamic zooming of the GIS map for dispatchers
   b) Trip Modifications - this tool set will allow dispatchers to dynamically modify scheduled trips based on new information such as passenger overloads or bus stop closures by allowing for on-the-fly changes to transit service deployment levels.
   c) Enhanced timetable, route and communication displays for dispatchers that are more readable and easier to navigate. These changes will result in overall enhanced system usability.
2. **Online Detour feature** – the new Online Detour feature allows dispatchers to enter unplanned detours in the system so that detour routing information is dispatched to affected buses and displayed on the driver’s mobile data terminal. While on detour, audio announcements will be provided for temporary detour stops enhancing information for customers currently on-board.

3. **Google Real-time Interface and API** – an API (application programming interface) for real-time information will be provided to enable interaction with other third party software, such as smart phone applications, Google trip planning, web-based maps showing real-time vehicle location and existing EasyGO customer information systems (IVR & text messaging). The required API will provide all necessary real-time bus information based on the Google real-time specification. This new module is key to the successful delivery of real-time bus arrival information to GRT customers via multiple information delivery mechanisms.

4. **Improved Audio Announcement Features**
   a) **Announce Stops at Different Distances** – currently, some bus stop announcements are being made later than desired if successive bus stops are spaced too close together for the announcement system to update its position and call out the stop before the bus reaches it. This can mean that passengers do not have time to make a stop request before the bus is too close to the upcoming transit stop to bring the bus safely to a stop. The current system only allows for stop announcements to be made at one set distance prior to the next stop. This upgrade will allow the system to make announcements at different distances and will eliminate stops from being announced late causing customers to sometimes miss their intended stop.
   b) **Multiple Announcements for the Same Stop** – this feature will ensure customers do not miss stop announcements as multiple announcements can be made between stops.
   c) **Announce Route Name Outside the Bus** – this feature will allow GRT to meet the future pre-boarding AODA requirement as it will allow bus route and destination information be to announced outside the bus for the benefit of the passengers waiting at the stop.
   d) **Adjust Announcement Volume based on Ambient Noise** – the audio announcement system can be configured so that the volume is automatically adjusted based on the ambient noise in the vehicle making announcements easier to hear for all customers on the bus.

5. **On-board Customer Display Updates**
   a) **Alternate Display of Time and Next Stop** - this customization will allow for an alternating display of time and next stop on the next stop display. The time displayed will match the time noted on the drivers screen and any passenger informant displays at bus stops to provide a coordinated time for all passengers and transit staff.
   b) **Alternate Display of PR Announcement and Next Stop** - This customization will allow for an alternating display of Public Relations (PR) announcement and the next stop on the next stop display. This could also include messages about route detours for passengers on-board the bus.

6. **Congestion Handling Feature** – This feature will generate a "delayed" message to display on the variable message signs if the bus is not moving for any length of time. This will improve the customer experience, because they will know why the sign isn’t counting down any more.

7. **Display Trip and Timepoint Notes on the Drivers Screen** – this feature will allow specific driver itinerary notes regarding trip routing, driver directions and public notices to appear on the drivers screen as notes at key points during the trip. This will allow GRT operators access to vital trip information details to improve schedule adherence.

8. **Bike Rack Interface** – this feature will provide an interface with GRT’s bike rack sensors and will track bike rack usage. When customers deploy the rack to transport a bike, a sensor on the rack will count this activation and record the location.

The entire set of upgrades, enhancements and new modules from INIT proposed in this proposal contains other supporting components including software licenses, hardware and software installation support, updated user manuals and six days of on-site training for staff.
Future Directions

The Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) acknowledged the benefits advanced transit technologies are providing regarding operation and service performance and overall ridership growth, and recommends continued implementation of a number of technology initiatives. These would include expanding transit signal priority, vehicle monitoring systems, vehicle depot management system and in-vehicle security. The coordination of these technological advances would be critical to the continued successful implementation of new technology and the continued confidence of transit customers in the system and information that is being provided.

The continued implementation of advanced transit technology will enhance the attractiveness of public transit to current and future riders. Increased access to accurate travel information in real-time, and more reliable and secure service will all contribute to greater use of GRT. Ridership growth is fundamental to achieving the modal share targets of Regional Council’s new Regional Transportation Master Plan.

Staff also continue to collaborate with other Ontario transit systems that currently use INIT’s software, in particular York Region Transit. Also, with the recent announcement that Metrolinx has chosen INIT for deployment on GO Transit vehicles, staff will continue to work collaboratively with these partners on system operations and improvements.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

Area Municipal staff was originally involved in discussions around developing the operating concepts for the advanced technology implementation and have received updates through circulation of the GRT 2011-2014 Business Plan and will be sent a copy of this report.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The expansion of the provision of real-time information on next bus arrival times for GRT vehicles supports the implementation of Council’s Strategic Focus, identified under Focus Area 2: Growth Management: Manage and Shape Growth to Ensure a Liveable, Healthy, Thriving and Sustainable Waterloo Region. This system upgrade also supports Focus Area 3: Sustainable Transportation and specifically Action 3.1.3 by “developing and implementing programs to improve access to...public transit.”

Providing the automated announcements meets Focus Area 5: Service Excellence and specifically Action 5.1.3 “Implement the standards under the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) to comply with Provincial regulations.”

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The software upgrades and enhancements from INIT, which include the intelligent transportation control system upgrade and several distinct software enhancements, including a real-time data interface and related implementation services, will cost $525,000 plus applicable taxes. Staff has reviewed this cost and find it reasonable and competitive based on discussion with another transit authority using the same CAD/AVL vendor. Also, through the previous phased installation of the INIT system, unit pricing did not increase, and in some cases decreased.

The approved 2012 GRT Capital Budget includes $2,186,000 for transit technology upgrades and enhancements to be funded from the GRT Capital Reserve Fund ($1,749,000) and development charges ($437,000). The remainder of the funds is being used for other transit technology
enhancements including the recent installation of automatic vehicle location equipment on 36 buses, replacement of computer servers, additional on-street passenger traveller information displays and continued development and automation of transit applications.

The Purchasing By-Law provides that a “Purchase by Negotiation” is appropriate when it is “the extension of an existing or previous contract which would prove more cost effective or beneficial for the Region” and “the acquisition is required or is beneficial in regard to the standardization of goods or services for the Region”. Such negotiated acquisitions still require Council approval when the contract value exceeds $100,000.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

This report was prepared with staff from Transit Services, Transportation and Environmental Services and Financial Services.

ATTACHMENTS:

NIL

PREPARED BY: Neil Malcolm, Project Manager

APPROVED BY: Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: May 29, 2012

FILE CODE: D10-70

SUBJECT: COMMUTER CHALLENGE 2012

RECOMMENDATION:

For information.

SUMMARY:

Across Waterloo Region, residents are making lifestyle choices to walk, cycle, carpool and take transit more often. “It’s your move” is our 2012 Commuter Challenge call to action for others to join them in the move towards more active and sustainable living. The annual Commuter Challenge is the Region’s most intensive sustainable transportation outreach event of the year. It encourages participants to commute for a week on foot, by bike, by bus, in a carpool, or by teleworking. This year’s event is from June 3-9, 2012. Last year, Commuter Challenge participation grew by 94 percent, attracting 1,355 more participants than in 2010. The Challenge is sponsored and organized by the Region’s Transportation Demand Management (TravelWise) team and Grand River Transit.

The Region is poised to make the 2012 Commuter Challenge the most successful event to date. TravelWise has been working since January 2012 to coordinate and promote the Challenge through the Regional Transportation Management Association (TMA). By promoting the Challenge through the TMA, the Region is encouraging significant private sector involvement. The TMA also provides services to encourage Challenge participants to continue using active and sustainable travel options all year.

REPORT:

The Region evaluates the Commuter Challenge based on the total number of participants, the Region’s participation rate, the total number of organizations represented and by the event’s total reduction in carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions.

In 2011, Waterloo Region placed first in Ontario and second in Canada in the Commuter Challenge in our population category. The event attracted a total of 2,795 participants – an increase of 94 percent over 2010’s 1,440 participants. This is a significant success, since Commuter Challenge participation had leveled off between 2007 and 2010 at just under 1,500 participants. In 2011, the Region increased the number of participating organizations from 60, in 2010, to 68. The event reduced the community’s CO2 emissions by 33,650 kilograms, a 23 percent increase over the previous year.

Tracking the Commuter Challenge

Trip tracking is essential for understanding the environmental impact of Commuter Challenge. In 2012, TravelWise is tracking Commuter Challenge participation in three ways:

i. The Region’s trip tracking tool, [www.TravelWiseCommute.ca](http://www.TravelWiseCommute.ca) is available for all TravelWise TMA members. The advantage of using our own software is that we can continue to...
encourage TravelWise participation and sustainable commuting after the Commuter Challenge is over. TravelWise offers events, quarterly prizes and regular updates on sustainable travel options throughout the year.

ii. The National Commuter Challenge website, which has undergone significant improvements, is the primary site for trip tracking for non-TravelWise organizations.

iii. All organizations can use "Bulk Entry Forms" that are provided by the Region for employees who would like to participate but are not online at work.

In previous years, TravelWise has been unable to measure the long-term impact of the Commuter Challenge. By encouraging more people to signup for the Challenge through www.TravelWiseCommute.ca, TravelWise staff can monitor travel trends throughout the year and better evaluate how sustainable travel behaviours are maintained.

Promoting the Commuter Challenge

In March, the TravelWise team began gathering commuter stories to highlight the commitment residents are making to sustainable transportation. To recognize these Commuter Challenge champions, some of the stories are now available on the Region’s Commuter Challenge webpage (http://www.regionofwaterloo.ca/en/gettingAround/CommuterStories.asp). Region of Waterloo staff have also provided stories, which will be posted at Regional offices to promote the Commuter Challenge. Stories will also be featured on the Region’s portal.

On May 2, 2012, a lunch ‘n’ learn session was held with 23 workplace coordinators to review the Commuter Challenge website and to plan events for the week. TravelWise staff received a very positive response from those in attendance.

Commuter Challenge social media posts are also planned for the Commuter Challenge, leveraging the Region’s extensive Twitter and Facebook following. Facebook advertisements were very successful in 2011 and will be used again in 2012.

Commuter Challenge Events

Kick-Off Keynote Speaker

On June 4, 2012, the Region is partnering with the City of Kitchener and Sustainable Waterloo Region to host keynote guest speaker Hans Moor, President of the Citizens for Safe Cycling in Ottawa and advisor to the Canadian Automobile Association and Members of Parliament.

2-for-1 Transit Tuesday

On June 5, 2012, Grand River Transit is holding 2-for-1 Transit Tuesday. This event rewards existing customers and helps to attract new riders by allowing two people to ride for the price of one.

Hawk Walk

On June 6, 2012, the Wilfrid Laurier University Hawk Walk event is hosted in partnership with the University’s Sustainability Department. Encouraging faculty and staff to celebrate walking and the Commuter Challenge, TravelWise will be available with information on sustainable transportation options and ice cream.

Great Commuter Race

On June 7, 2012, the City of Kitchener is hosting its third annual Great Commuter Race. The City of Kitchener is challenging members of Kitchener City Council, local celebrities, City staff, as well
members of Kitchener’s Cycling Advisory Committee to a 6 kilometre race from Fairview Park Mall to Kitchener City Hall. Three transportation modes are promoted: Carpooling in a Toyota Prius, cycling, and the 200 iXpress.

Region of Waterloo Senior Management Challenge

Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services will hold his own event and will challenge other Regional staff to participate. Last year, Commissioner Horne held a “Briefcase Boogie,” where he invited Regional staff to walk or jog from the Region’s 99 Regina Street offices, in Uptown Waterloo, to 150 Frederick Street, in Downtown Kitchener. The event showed how walking can be a practical commuting option.

Walk to Worship

As part of the Commuter Challenge, TravelWise is partnering with Greening Sacred Spaces to organize the second annual “Walk to Worship” event. Faith communities are invited to log their sustainable trips to and from their places of worship.

Internal Regional Staff

Internally, the Region of Waterloo is looking forward to having a great result for Regional staff participating in this year’s Commuter Challenge with unique events.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination:

The Region invites all of its Area Municipal Partners to take part in the 2012 Commuter Challenge.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

By encouraging and promoting the use of sustainable transportation through friendly competition the Commuter Challenge is poised to decrease CO2 emissions over the week of June 3 to 9, 2012. This supports the Region’s improved air quality objective (Focus Area 1), the promotion of active forms of transportation (Focus Area 2) and the optimal use of existing investments in transit and cycling lanes (Focus Area 5).

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

NIL

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Transportation Planning has consulted with Grand River Transit in the organization of the 2012 Commuter Challenge.

ATTACHMENTS:

NIL

PREPARED BY: James LaPointe, Principal Planner, Transit Development

APPROVED BY: Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
<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>P&amp;W</td>
<td>Staff report on the cost recovery ratios on Region recyclables</td>
<td>T&amp;ES Waste Management</td>
<td>Report E-12-040</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>19-Jun-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>
</tbody>
</table>
## COUNCIL ENQUIRIES AND REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION
### PLANNING AND WORKS COMMITTEE

<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>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>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>
<tr>
<td>08-May-12</td>
<td>P&amp;W</td>
<td>Report detailing the rational for the Injury Crash Cost calculation used by staff in reports for roadway improvements.</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-May-12</td>
<td>P&amp;W</td>
<td>Staff to review options for signalized vehicle lights and signalized pedestrian crosswalks in Roundabouts in the detailed design report prepared later in 2012 for Franklin Boulevard Improvements.</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-May-12</td>
<td>G. Lorentz</td>
<td>Throught the Transportation Master Plan exercise, that staff review the feasibility of providing Grand River Transit for community events and festivals.</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>