Regional Municipality of Waterloo

Planning and Works Committee

Agenda

Tuesday, January 28, 2014
9:00 a.m.

Regional Council Chambers
150 Frederick Street, Kitchener

1. Declarations Of Pecuniary Interest Under The Municipal Conflict Of Interest Act

2. Delegations

a) Kevin Litwiller, Director of Business Development, Lystek International Inc. re: Biosolids Management

Consent Agenda Items

Items on the Consent Agenda can be approved in one motion of Committee to save time. Prior to the motion being voted on, any member of Committee may request that one or more of the items be removed from the Consent Agenda and voted on separately.

3. Request to Remove Items From Consent Agenda

4. Motion to Approve Items Or Receive For Information

a) E-14-006, Consultant Selection – Preliminary Design, Detailed Design and Construction Administration and Inspection Services for Ottawa Street Improvements, Highway 7 Westbound Ramp to King Street East, City of Kitchener (Approval)
b) **P-14-005**, Monthly Report of Development Activity for December 2013 (Approval)  

c) **P-14-006**, Amendment to Regional Municipality of Waterloo Controlled Access By-law #58-87 for an Access to Regional Road #58 (Bearinger Road), City of Waterloo (Approval)  

d) **P-14-007**, Region of Waterloo Contribution to the Preparation of a Reference Plan for Road Widening Dedication on Regional Road #42 (Blair Road), Township of North Dumfries (Approval)

### Regular Agenda Resumes

### 5. Reports – Transportation and Environmental Services

#### Design and Construction

a) **E-14-007**, Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road Reconstruction, Township of Wilmot  

b) **E-14-010**, King Street and Weber Street Improvements, City of Waterloo

#### Rapid Transit

 c) **E-14-009**, Recommended Intersection Modifications at Mill Street and Ottawa Street  

 d) **E-14-015**, 2013 Summary of ION Community Relations Activities in 2013

#### Transportation

 e) **E-14-005**, Proposed Accessible On-Street Parking  

 f) **E-14-012**, Airport Master Plan – Update  

#### Waste Management

 g) **E-14-014**, Curbside Collection Contract Considerations  

#### Interdepartmental Reports

 h) **E-14-013/P-14-008**, 2014 Planning and Works Project Team Membership  

 i) **P-14-009/F-14-008**, Recommended Refinements to the Region of Waterloo Brownfields Financial Incentive Program
Reports – Planning, Housing and Community Services

j) P-14-010, Mid-Year 2013 Region of Waterloo Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory

k) P-14-011, Regional Transportation Master Plan – Progress Report (Presentation)

6. Information/Correspondence

a) Letter from Grand River Accessibility Advisory Committee re: Report E-14-005, Proposed Accessible On-Street Parking

b) Council Enquiries and Requests for Information Tracking List

7. Other Business

8. Next Meeting – February 11, 2014

9. Motion To Go Into Closed Session

That a closed meeting of the Planning and Works and Administration and Finance Committees be held on Tuesday, January 28, 2014 immediately following the Planning and Works Committee meeting in the Waterloo County Room, in accordance with Section 239 of the “Municipal Act, 2001”, for the purposes of considering the following subject matters:

a) proposed or pending disposition of land in the City of Kitchener

b) proposed or pending litigation and receiving of legal advice subject to solicitor-client privilege related to a matter before an administrative tribunal

c) personal matters about identifiable individuals regarding financial matters

10. Adjourn
### Next Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 11, 2014</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>March 4, 2014</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>
</tbody>
</table>
Report: E-14-006

Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Design and Construction

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

Date: January 28, 2014  File Code: C04-30, 5163/5565

Subject: Consultant Selection – Preliminary Design, Detailed Design and Construction Administration and Inspection Services for Ottawa Street Improvements, Highway 7 Westbound Ramp to King Street East, City of Kitchener

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into a Consultant Services Agreement with MTE Consultants Inc. of Kitchener, Ontario to provide consulting engineering services for preliminary design, detailed design, construction contract administration and construction inspection for the Ottawa Street Improvements from the Highway 7 Westbound Ramp to King Street East in the City of Kitchener at an upset limit of $201,047.75 plus applicable taxes, as per Report E-14-006 dated January 28, 2014, for the preliminary design and detailed design phases with construction contract administration and construction inspection to be paid on a time basis.

Summary:

The Region of Waterloo wishes to proceed with the Ottawa Street Improvements from the Highway 7 Westbound Ramp to King Street East in the City of Kitchener. This project is approximately 0.86 km in length and construction is planned in 2018. This project includes full reconstruction between McKenzie Avenue and the Westbound Ramp to Highway 7 which will include sanitary sewer, watermain and storm sewer replacement and replacement of the curbs, sidewalks and pavement. The remaining portion between McKenzie Avenue and King Street will include work to address poor pavement condition, replacement of watermain and some storm sewer sections due to deterioration, sidewalk repairs at various locations and new curb installation. Cycling facilities will be incorporated throughout the project limits on both sides of the road as...
well as consideration of various intersection improvements throughout the corridor.

The Project Team includes staff representatives from the Region of Waterloo and the City of Kitchener as well as the local ward Councillor Dan Glenn-Graham.

In order to meet the 2018 construction start timeline, an engineering consultant must be hired now to undertake the preliminary design, detailed design and construction administration. An invitation for Letters of Interest to provide engineering services was advertised in the Waterloo Region Record and posted on the Region’s website. Eight (8) firms submitted proposals, out of which three (3) were short-listed.

Based on the evaluation criteria, review of the detailed work plans, schedules and upset fees provided by the shortlisted consultants, the Evaluation Team recommends that MTE Consultants Inc. be retained to undertake this assignment at an upset fee limit of $201,047.75 plus applicable taxes for the preliminary design and detailed design phases with construction contract administration and construction inspection to be paid on a time basis.

Report:

1. Background

Improvements on Ottawa Street from the Highway 7 Westbound Ramp to King Street East in the City of Kitchener are identified in the Region’s 2014 Ten Year Transportation Capital Program for construction in 2018 in order to address the deteriorated road condition, storm sewer, sanitary sewer and watermain replacement needs as well as various intersection improvements. Other improvements to be considered include new curb and gutter installation, repair/replacement of deteriorated sidewalks, new detectable warning plates at sidewalk ramps, pedestrian and cycling refuge crossings to accommodate connections to local trails and pathways as well as the installation of cycling facilities as part of the proposed reconstruction. Planning of these improvements will be completed in accordance with the Schedule ‘A+’ requirements of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA).

The Ottawa Street project limits are from the Highway 7 Westbound Ramp to King Street East as shown on the Key Plan in Appendix “A”. Ottawa Street within the project limits consists of a 4 lane urban cross section between Highway 7 and King Street East. The posted speed limit through the entire 0.86 km project length is 50 km/hr.

The Project Team includes staff representatives from the Region and the City of Kitchener as well as the local ward Councillor Dan Glenn-Graham.

Under the Region’s Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines, Ottawa Street is designated as an “Urban Neighborhood Connector – Avenue” and the abutting land on Ottawa Street is a mix of residential, institutional and commercial uses.

Within the project limits, Ottawa Street has signalized intersections at the Highway 7
Westbound Ramp, Weber Street and King Street East. The following intersection improvements are under consideration as part of this project:

- Increase the eastbound left turn lane storage on Ottawa Street to provide 100 metres of storage for left turns onto Weber Street;
- Increase the westbound left turn lane storage on Ottawa Street to provide 100 metres of storage for left turns onto Weber Street;
- Increase the northbound left turn lane storage on Weber Street to provide 35 metres of storage for left turns onto Ottawa Street;
- Increase the southbound left-turn lane on Weber Street to provide 35 metres of storage for left turns onto Ottawa Street.

Regional staff is fully committed to other capital projects at this time and therefore staff recommends that an external consultant be hired to complete this project. Staff has determined that it is necessary to commence the engineering for this project now, in order to provide sufficient time to complete the planning and design phases, acquire any necessary property and complete utility relocations, if necessary, in advance of construction.

2. Consultant Selection

The Evaluation Team involved with the consultant selection consisted of:

Garrett Donaher, Transportation Planning Engineer, Transportation Planning

Kevin Mick, Design and Approvals Engineer, City of Kitchener

Mike Henderson, Project Manager, Design and Construction

An invitation for Letters of Interest to provide engineering services for this project was advertised in the Waterloo Region Record and posted on the Region’s website on November 8, 2013. Eight (8) consultants submitted Letters of Interest. Following a review of the submissions, three (3) firms were short-listed based on their qualifications. The three short-listed consultants were:

- MTE Consultants Inc.
- Walter Fedy, and
- Associated Engineering

The detailed work plans and upset fee quotes for design activities, plus an estimate of fees for contract administration and construction inspection services from the short listed consultants were then reviewed and a final assessment was made based on the evaluation criteria.
The evaluation criteria used for selecting the successful consultant were in accordance with the Region’s Purchasing By-law and included price as a factor in the selection process. These evaluation criteria and their respective weightings were as follows:

**Quality Factors**

- Project Approach and Understanding: 35%
- Experience of the Project Manager: 20%
- Experience of the Project Support Staff: 10%
- Experience on Similar Projects: 15%

**Equity Factors**

- Current Workload for Region: 3%
- Local Office: 2%

**Price Factor**

- Upset Price: 15%

The Letters of Interest submitted by the three short-listed consultants demonstrated a good understanding of the project, capable project teams and experience on similar projects. When considering all quality, equity and price factors, the submission from MTE Consultants Inc. scored the highest. MTE Consultants Inc. also had the lowest upset fee submission. Based on the above evaluation criteria, including the review of the detailed work plans, project approach, schedules and upset fees provided, the Evaluation Team recommends that MTE Consultants Inc. be retained to provide the preliminary design, detail design, contract administration and construction inspection services for this project.

### 3. Scope of work

For this engineering assignment, the consultant will: undertake a complete review of required infrastructure for existing and future conditions; develop and assess transportation improvement/reconstruction alternatives; conduct a public consultation program; complete the preliminary and detailed design for the road improvements/reconstruction; assess the advantages and disadvantages of different construction staging alternatives; make presentations to Regional Planning and Works Committee; prepare contract drawings, specifications and tender documents; obtain all necessary agency approvals; assist during the tendering period; provide contract administration and site inspection services during construction; prepare record drawings; and provide post-construction services during the warranty period. A breakdown of the successful consultant’s upset fee is included in Appendix B attached.
to this report.

4. Schedule

Subject to Council’s approval of this consultant assignment, the proposed implementation schedule is as follows:

- Base Plan, Preliminary Design and Generation of Alternatives Spring 2014
- Public Consultation Centre Fall 2014
- Presentation of Recommended Alternative to Regional Council Spring 2015
- Property Acquisition, Utility Relocations, Final Design and Tendering Spring 2015 – Spring 2017
- Construction - Highway 7 to King Street East Spring - Fall 2018

5. Consultant’s Upset Fee

The short-listed consultants provided an upset fee for professional services for public consultation and engineering design, and also an estimate of construction contract administration and construction inspection fees. On road and bridge projects, the time required for construction contract administration and construction inspection can vary significantly depending on weather conditions, unforeseen developments during construction, contractor performance, and other unknown variables. Because an upset fee does not lend itself well to these types of services, it has been the Region’s practice on road and bridge projects to pay for construction contract administration and construction inspection services on a time basis. It is recommended that this same practice be followed for this project. For budgetary purposes, staff has estimated the cost of construction contract administration and construction inspection services to be $182,000 which is based on the preliminary estimate of fees submitted by MTE Consultants Inc. and a review of costs on similar projects.

The upset limit for MTE Consultants Inc. to undertake the preliminary and detailed design phases of this project is $201,047.75 (plus applicable taxes) for consultant fees and disbursements.

The total estimated construction cost for this overall project including both the Region’s and City work is $3,400,000. The upset fee for the design phases is $201,047.75 and approximately represents 5.9 % of this estimated construction value which is considered competitive for a project of this magnitude and complexity. The upset fee includes the assembly of base plans, investigation of various alternatives, coordination with concerned agencies, a public consultation program, preliminary design, detail design and preparation of tender documents.
**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

This project meets the Region’s (2011-2014) Corporate Strategic Plan objective 2.2 to “Develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs” under Focus Area 2 “Growth Management and Prosperity”.

**Financial Implications**

The Region’s approved 2014 Transportation Capital Program includes funds of $1,855,000 in years 2014 - 2018 inclusive for the Region’s portion of the project to be funded from the Road Rehabilitation Reserve Fund. The City of Kitchener has committed funding in 2018 for their share of the work.

Based on the $201,047.75 upset fee limit of MTE Consultants Inc. the net cost of this consulting assignment is $204,586.59 as per the following breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTE Consultants Inc.</td>
<td>$201,047.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S.T (13%)</td>
<td>$26,136.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$227,183.96</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Municipal Rebate of 86.46% of HST</td>
<td>$22,597.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$204,586.59</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MTE Consultants Inc. total fees for the preliminary and detailed design and contract administration/construction inspection are 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 Upset Fee

**Prepared By:** Mike Henderson, Project Manager, Design and Construction

**Approved By:** Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Appendix A – Key Plan

OTAWA STREET
(REGIONAL ROAD 4)

HIGHWAY 7 (WEST BOUND RAMP) TO KING STREET
(REGIONAL ROAD 15)

CITY OF KITCHENER
Appendix B – Preliminary and Detailed Design for Ottawa Street Improvements, Highway 7 Westbound Ramp to King Street East, City of Kitchener

Breakdown of Consultant's Upset Fee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Project Initiation/Data Collection/Base Plan Preparation</td>
<td>$34,337.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Class EA and Preliminary Design</td>
<td>$75,036.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Detailed Design and Approvals</td>
<td>$74,445.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Contract Document, Specifications and Tendering</td>
<td>$17,228.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$201,047.75</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HST</strong></td>
<td><strong>$26,136.21</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Upset Fee</strong></td>
<td><strong>$227,183.96</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region of Waterloo
Planning, Housing and Community Services
Community Planning

To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: January 28, 2014
File Code: D18-01

Recommendation:

Summary:
In accordance with the Regional By-law 01-023, as amended, the Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services has:

- Accepted the following plans of condominium; and
- Released for registration the following plans of subdivision and plans of condominium.

Report:

City of Cambridge
Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-12102
Draft Approval Date: December 20, 2012
Phase: Phase 3
Applicant: Deerfield Homes Ltd.
Location: 750 Lawrence Street
Proposal: To permit the development of 7 townhouse residential units.
Regional Processing Fee:  Paid November 29, 2013
Commissioner’s Release:  December 6, 2013

City of Kitchener

Registration of Draft Plan of Subdivision 30T-98201

Draft Approval Date:  December 20, 2012
Phase:  Stage 4A
Location:  Huron Road and Strasburg Road
Proposal:  To permit the development of 43 single detached residential units and 54 multiple residential townhouse units.

Regional Processing Fee:  Paid November 8, 2013
Commissioner’s Approval:  December 12, 2013

Registration of Draft Plan of Subdivision 30T-98201

Draft Approval Date:  December 20, 2012
Phase:  Stage 5A
Location:  Huron Road and Strasburg Road
Proposal:  To permit the development of 29 single detached residential units.

Regional Processing Fee:  November 20, 2013
Commissioner’s Release:  December 12, 2013

Registration of Draft Plan of Subdivision 30T-92009

Draft Approval Date:  November 5, 1998
Phase:  Entire Plan
Applicant: Chalon Estates Inc.
Location: Evenstone Avenue
Proposal: To permit the development of 12 single detached residential units.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid December 13, 2013
Commissioner’s Release: December 16, 2013

Registration of Draft Plan of Subdivision 30T-04204
Draft Approval Date: June 25, 2006
Phase: Stage 2
 Applicant: LVH Developments (DC) Inc.
Location: Tilt Drive and Stauffer Drive
Proposal: To permit the development of 80 single detached residential units and 34 multiple residential units.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid November 7, 2013
Commissioner’s Release: December 20, 2013

Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-13205
Draft Approval Date: September 10, 2013
Phase: Entire Plan
Applicant: 2260154 Ontario Ltd.
Location: 487 and 489 East Avenue
Proposal: To permit the development of 7 multiple residential units.
Regional Processing Fee: Not applicable
Commissioner’s Release: December 24, 2013
City of Waterloo

Plan of Condominium Application 30CDM-13408

Date Accepted: December 16, 2013
Applicant: MNL Properties Inc.
Location: 392 Albert Street
Proposal: To permit the development of 15 residential condominium apartment units.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid November 1, 2013

Plan of Condominium Application 30CDM-13409

Date Accepted: December 18, 2013
Applicant: Waterloo Residences Inc.
Location: 64 Marshall Street
Proposal: To permit the development of 23 residential condominium units.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid December 11, 2013

Plan of Condominium Application 30CDM-13410

Date Accepted: December 24, 2013
Applicant: The INCC Corp.
Location: 101 Ira Needles Boulevard
Proposal: To provide additional parking for the Empire Theatre at The Boardwalk, and to provide for a future office building.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid December 13, 2013
Township of Woolwich

Registration of Draft Plan of Subdivision 30T-07702

Draft Approval Date: November 25, 2011
Phase: Stage 1A
Applicant: Lunor Group Inc. and 2079993 Ontario Inc.
Location: 88 and 90 Church Street West, Elmira
Proposal: To permit the development of 4 single detached residential units and 6 semi-detached residential units.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid October 25, 2013
Commissioner's Release: December 6, 2013

Registration of Draft Plan of Subdivision 30T-07703

Draft Approval Date: November 25, 2011
Phase: Stage 1A
Applicant: Lunor Group Inc. and District Association of Community Living (Lunor Development)
Location: 128 and 158 Church Street West, Elmira
Proposal: To permit the development of 53 single detached residential units, 24 semi-detached residential units, 16 townhouse residential units, 22 to 34 multiple residential units and 34 to 51 multiple residential apartment units.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid October 25, 2013
Commissioner's Release: December 6, 2013
Residential Subdivision Activity January 1, 2013 to December 31, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Units in Residential Registered Plans</th>
<th>Residential Units Draft Approved</th>
<th>Pending Plans (Units Submitted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Kitchener</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>569</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>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Waterloo</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1305</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, 2012 to December 31, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Units in Residential Registered Plans</th>
<th>Residential Units Draft Approved</th>
<th>Pending Plans (Units Submitted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Kitchener</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>2,181</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>1,445</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>2,335</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 Consultations/Coordination

These planning approvals and releases, including consultations 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 consistent with objectives of Focus Area A: Growth Management and Prosperity.

Financial Implications

Nil

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Nil

Prepared By: Andrea Banks, Program Assistant

Approved By: Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Housing and Community Services
Region of Waterloo
Planning, Housing and Community Services
Transportation Planning

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

Date: January 28, 2014

File Code: T15-40/58

Subject: Amendment to Regional Municipality of Waterloo Controlled Access By-law #58-87 for an Access to Regional Road #58 (Bearinger Road), City of Waterloo

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve an amendment to Controlled Access By-law #58-87 for an access on the west side of Regional Road #58 (Bearinger Road), approximately 130 metres north of Laurelwood Drive in the City of Waterloo, as described in Report No. P-14-006, dated January 28, 2014.

Summary:

The Region of Waterloo has entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the University of Waterloo to transfer ownership and maintenance responsibilities of the existing Regionally owned storm water management pond, located on the west side of Bearinger Road north of Laurelwood Drive, to the University of Waterloo (please see Attachment 1). The MOU also outlines the cost sharing agreement and future maintenance responsibilities between the Region and the University to expand the existing pond in the spring of 2014 onto adjacent lands owned by the University. The expanded pond will facilitate storm water flows from the Schlegel Villages development on the northeast corner of Bearinger Road and the proposed extension of Laurelwood Drive to Westmount Road, and future road expansion. The MOU was approved by Regional Council on October 30, 2013.

In order to access the future pond for maintenance purposes, an access from the west side of Bearinger Road located approximately 130 metres north of Laurelwood Drive is required (please see Attachment 2). The proposed access would be gated and only accessed by authorized maintenance vehicles.

Region of Waterloo staff have reviewed the proposed location of the access and
recommend approval of the proposed by-law amendment. City of Waterloo and University of Waterloo staff is also in support of the location of the proposed access to Bearinger Road.

As Bearinger Road is designated as a Controlled Access – Prohibited road under the Region of Waterloo Controlled Access By-law #58-87 from Laurelwood Drive to Regional Road # 50 (Westmount Road), an amendment to this By-law is required prior to issuance of an Access Permit by staff.

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 speeds and volume of traffic. The main function of a Controlled Access – Prohibited road is to move through traffic. All requests for changes to existing accesses or for a new access on these roads require an amendment to the By-law.

The Region of Waterloo has entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the University of Waterloo to transfer ownership and maintenance responsibilities of the existing Regionally owned storm water management pond, located on the west side of Bearinger Road north of Laurelwood Drive, to the University of Waterloo (please see Attachment 1). The existing pond is proposed to be expanded onto lands owned by the University in the spring of 2014 in order to accommodate storm water flows from the Schlegel Villages development on the northeast corner of Bearinger Road and the proposed extension of Laurelwood Drive to Westmount Road, in addition to the future widening of Bearinger Road/Fischer-Hallman Road by the Region of Waterloo. The MOU also outlines the cost sharing agreement and future maintenance responsibilities between the Region and the University for the construction of the expanded storm water management pond. The MOU was approved by Regional Council on October 30, 2013.

In order to access the future pond for maintenance purposes an access from the west side of Bearinger Road located approximately 130 metres north of Laurelwood Drive is required (please see Attachment 2). The proposed access would be gated and only accessed by authorized maintenance vehicles.

Region of Waterloo staff have reviewed the proposed location of the access and recommend approval of the proposed by-law amendment. City of Waterloo and University of Waterloo staff is also in support of the location of the proposed access to Bearinger Road.

As Bearinger Road is designated as a Controlled Access – Prohibited road under the Region of Waterloo Controlled Access By-law #58-87 from Laurelwood Drive to Regional Road # 50 (Westmount Road), an amendment to this By-law is required prior to issuance of an Access Permit by staff.
Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

City of Waterloo staff has been involved in the planning and design of the stormwater management pond and support the proposed access to Bearinger Road. A copy of this report has been sent to City of Waterloo staff as well.

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 Region of Waterloo and the University of Waterloo will share all costs for the construction and expansion of the stormwater management pond including the proposed access to Bearinger Road. The 2014 Transportation Capital Program includes $200,000 in the year 2014 to cover the Region’s share of costs and will be funded from the Roads Rehabilitation Reserve Fund.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Corporate Resources would be required to amend the Controlled Access By-law #58-87. Upon issuance of a Regional Road Access Permit, Transportation Engineering would issue a Regional Work Permit to allow works within the Regional right-of-way on Bearinger Road.

Attachments:

Attachment 1 – Key Map

Attachment 2 – Plan showing proposed access to Bearinger Road and proposed amendment to Controlled Access By-law #58-87

Prepared By: Bruce Erb, Supervisor, Corridor Management

Approved By: Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Housing and Community Services
Attachment 1 – Key Plan
Attachment 2 - Plan showing proposed access to Bearinger Road and proposed amendment to Controlled Access By-law #58-87
Region of Waterloo
Planning, Housing and Community Services
Transportation Planning

To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: January 28, 2014
File Code: T15-40/42
Subject: Region of Waterloo Contribution to the Preparation of a Reference Plan for Road Widening Dedication on Regional Road #42 (Blair Road), Township of North Dumfries

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo contribute $1,800 toward the cost of the preparation of a reference plan for a road allowance widening dedication along the south side of Regional Road #42 (Blair Road) in the Township of North Dumfries, as described in Report No. P-14-, dated January 28, 2014.

Summary:

The rare Charitable Research Reserve (rare) at 1155 Blair Road will be transferring land to a neighbouring property at 1001-1010 Blair Road through a consent application in the Township of North Dumfries (please see Attachment 1). As a condition of the consent application, the Region of Waterloo is requiring the dedication of a road allowance widening from the rare property of between approximately 2.13 metres and 3.0 metres along the south side of Blair Road for a length of approximately 1,500 metres (please see Attachment 2). This road allowance widening will allow the Region of Waterloo to address issues related to boulevard maintenance and safety concerns related to utility pole locations on Blair Road in this area.

The Region of Waterloo’s current policy for the reimbursement of the preparation of reference plans for road allowance widenings without Regional Council approval is $1,800 but only applies to site plan and zoning by-law amendments. Due to the extent of the road allowance widening required from the rare lands, rare has requested that the Region contribute to the cost of the preparation of the reference plan for the road widening under the consent application. The estimated cost for the preparation of the reference plan for the road widening is $6,200 plus HST.
Region of Waterloo staff has reviewed the request for the reimbursement of costs for the preparation of the reference plan and due to the extent of the widening and benefit to the Region of Waterloo to acquire these lands, recommend approval of the $1,800 reimbursement of costs related to the consent application. The $1,800 reimbursement would be paid to rare upon transfer of the road allowance widening to the Region of Waterloo.

The Township of North Dumfries supports the reimbursement of these costs.

Report:

The rare Charitable Research Reserve (rare) at 1155 Blair Road will be transferring land to a neighbouring property at 1001-1010 Blair Road through a consent application in the Township of North Dumfries (please see Attachment 1). As a condition of the consent application, the Region of Waterloo is requiring the dedication of a road allowance widening from the rare property of between approximately 2.13 metres and 3.0 metres along the south side of Blair Road for a length of approximately 1,500 metres (please see Attachment 2). This road allowance widening will allow the Region of Waterloo to address issues related to boulevard maintenance and safety concerns related to utility pole locations on Blair Road in this area.

Region of Waterloo Transportation Engineering staff has noted issues related to maintenance of roadside ditches and drainage culverts along Blair Road in this area due to the restricted road allowance width. In addition, utility poles are located in close proximity to the travelled portion of Blair and in some instances, within the roadside ditch.

The five year collision history (2008 to 2012) along Blair Road between Langdon Drive and the Blair Road/George Street intersection indicates a total of 96 collisions where 77 would be expected. Of the 96 collisions, there were 46 vehicle collisions with animals and 10 vehicle collisions with poles. It should be noted that a pole could reference either a utility pole or a sign pole.

Acquiring additional road allowance widening of Blair Road from the rare property will enable Region of Waterloo staff to maintain roadside infrastructure for drainage, keep vegetation maintained to provide visibility for motorists and potentially reduce animal grazing along the roadway and provide for the ability to locate utility poles away from the travelled portion of the roadway along the south side of Blair Road.

The Region of Waterloo’s current policy for the reimbursement of the preparation of reference plans for road allowance widenings without Regional Council approval is $1,800 but only applies to site plan and zoning by-law amendments. Due to the extent of the road allowance widening required from the rare lands, rare has requested that the Region contribute toward the cost of the preparation of the reference plan for the road widening under the consent application. The estimated cost for the preparation of the reference plan for the road widening is $6,200 plus HST.

Region of Waterloo staff have reviewed the request for the reimbursement of costs for the preparation of the reference plan and due to the extent of the widening and benefit
to the Region of Waterloo to acquire these lands, recommend approval of the $1,800 reimbursement of costs related to the consent application. The $1,800 reimbursement would be paid to rare upon transfer of the road allowance widening to the Region of Waterloo.

The Township of North Dumfries has no objection to the reimbursement of these costs.

**Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination**

Township of North Dumfries staff supports the reimbursement of $1,800 for the cost of the preparation of the reference plan for the road allowance widening along Blair Road. A copy of this report has been sent to Township of North Dumfries Staff as well.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

Reimbursement of reference plan costs for road widenings is represented in Focus Area 3: Sustainable Transportation: Optimize existing road capacity to safely manage traffic throughout Waterloo Region.

**Financial Implications:**

Payment of the $1,800 reimbursement for the preparation of the reference plan for the road allowance widening on Blair Road would be funded by the Region of Waterloo from the 2014 Transportation Capital Program under Growth Related Land Dedication Surveys and Purchases which is funded by the Development Charge Reserve Fund.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Staff from Corporate Resources, Transportation and Environmental Services and Planning Housing and Community Services have been consulted and concur with the recommendation of this report.

**Attachments:**

Attachment 1 – Key Map showing rare / Chaplin properties
Attachment 2 – May showing extent of proposed road widening

**Prepared By:** Bruce Erb, Supervisor, Corridor Management

**Approved By:** Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Housing and Community Services
Attachment 1 – Key Plan
Attachment 2 – Extent of Proposed Road Widening
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Design and Construction

To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: January 28, 2014
File Code: 5493
Subject: Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road Reconstruction, Township of Wilmot

Recommendation:
For information only.

Summary:
It is anticipated that the following recommendation will be brought forward for Committee’s consideration at the February 11, 2014 Planning and Works Committee Meeting:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to proposed improvements in the Village of Petersburg, on Notre Dame Drive (Regional Road 12) from the Highway 7/8 interchange to the railway tracks at the north village limit, and on Snyder’s Road (Regional Road 6) from the east village limit to the west village limit:

i) approve the proposed roadway improvements as outlined in Report E-14-007.1

ii) Effective March 31, 2014, amend Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended as follows:

a) Add to Schedule 18 Rates of Speed, 50 km/h Maximum Speed on Snyder’s Road East (Regional Road #6) from 350 metres west of Notre Dame Drive to 420 metres east of Notre Dame Drive; and
b) Add to Schedule 18 Rates of Speed, 50 km/h Maximum Speed on Notre Dame Drive (Regional Road #12) from 470m south of Reinhardt Place to 255 north of Deerfield Avenue.

Following a request from members of the Petersburg community, it was agreed that the content of this report would be made available to the public on January 24, 2014 with the January 28, 2014 agenda package but that the report recommendation would be considered by Committee on February 11, 2014. In this way, the public will have more time to review the staff report and prepare delegation presentations for the February 11, 2014 Committee meeting.

The Region of Waterloo plans to reconstruct the main streets in the Village of Petersburg in 2016. The project limits include Notre Dame Drive from the Highway 7/8 interchange to the railway crossing at the north limit of the village, as well as Snyder’s Road from the east village limit to the west village limit, for a total combined distance of approximately 2,000 metres. Please refer to Appendix A for a key plan of the Project Area. A Project Team was established to direct this project, consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo and the Township of Wilmot as well as Township Councillor Peter Roe, and the Region’s consultant MTE Consultants Inc.

Improvements are required on Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road to address the deteriorated roadway condition, the lack of proper drainage on the roadway and on adjacent property, and a lack of facilities for pedestrians and cyclists through the village.

Based on the project needs, the Project Team developed a preferred design for improvements to Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road which was presented to the public on May 1, 2012 at the first Public Consultation Centre (PCC #1). The preferred design presented at PCC #1 included: full reconstruction of the existing roads; on-road cycling lanes; new curb and gutter and storm sewers; sidewalk on both sides of the road; some areas of parking behind the curb; and modernization of the traffic signals at the intersection of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road.

The main issues expressed by the public at PCC #1 included: comments that sidewalks and curbs are not needed or desired in the village and that the paved shoulders should remain; concerns about the loss of parking with the proposed cycling lanes and curbs; concerns about speeding through the village; concerns at The Blue Moon restaurant regarding loss of parking and access for delivery trucks; and concern about traffic operations at the Notre Dame Drive/Snyder’s Road intersection.

From the comments received at PCC #1, the Project Team developed a revised preferred design which was presented to the public on February 28, 2013 at PCC #2 held at the Emmanuel Lutheran Church in Petersburg. Revisions to the original design presented at PCC #2 included: replacement of the proposed on-road cycling lanes with segregated cycling lanes behind a semi-mountable curb (to narrow the road to encourage lower speeds); elimination of a section of proposed sidewalk on the south side of Snyder’s Road east of Notre Dame Drive; raised centre medians on all four approaches to the village to alert motorists they are entering the village and to encourage lower speeds; additional proposed parking spaces behind the curb; additional parking on the road allowance for patrons and delivery vehicles at The Blue
Moon restaurant; and a reduction in the posted speed limit (from 60 to 50 kph) following the implementation of the proposed improvements.

A formal Public Input Meeting (PIM) was held on June 25, 2013 at Rebel Creek Golf Club to allow members of the public to appear before Regional Councilors to share their views about the currently proposed project improvements. The main comments heard from members of the public at the PIM included: a preference for paved shoulders over sidewalks and cycling lanes; requests for an immediate reduction of the posted speed limit from 60 to 50 kph; concerns about insufficient roadway width for farm vehicles; requests for designated turn lanes at the Notre Dame Drive/Snyder’s Road intersection; and concerns about limited parking in several locations, including in front of the Emmanuel Lutheran Church and at the Post Office.

Subsequent to the PIM, the Project Team met again to consider the comments received from the public. The following changes to the proposed design are now being recommended based on the public comments received at the PIM:

1. Effective March 31, 2014, a reduction in the posted speed limit within the village limits to 50 kph;
2. Additional parking spaces on the road allowance at the Church and Post Office;
3. Additional parking spaces on the road allowance on the west leg of Snyder’s Road;
4. The proposed segregated cycling lanes would be constructed and would function as cycling lanes but would not be formally designated in the Region’s By-law, which would allow wide over-sized farm equipment to legally occupy the cycling lane when required to do so; and
5. Additional roadway illumination would be provided near the Post Office.

A new multi-day traffic count was taken in October 2013 to confirm whether the warrants for turning lanes are met at the intersection of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road. Based on the recent counts which represent normal traffic activity and based on projected future increases in area traffic to a horizon year of 2026, it is concluded that separate designated turning lanes are not required and are therefore not recommended at this intersection for this project.

At this time the Project Team is recommending a final Design Alternative to Regional Council for approval. The final Recommended Design Alternative includes the following overall improvements:

- Full reconstruction of the existing roads with one lane in each direction;
- Segregated coloured concrete cycling lanes on both sides of the road located behind a roll-over curb and gutter;
- Sidewalk on both sides of the road in most areas, except on the south side of Snyder’s Road east of Notre Dame Drive, with an approximate 1.0m
grassed or hard surface boulevard between the sidewalk and segregated bike lane;

- Short sections of raised centre medians at all four entrances to the village, one of which will be constructed as a pedestrian refuge island north of Deerfield Avenue / Cecil Kennedy Court for pedestrians accessing Petersburg Community Park;

- Installation of new storm sewers (including curb and gutter) to replace the existing old and inconsistently sized storm sewers;

- Forty (40) parking spaces behind the cycling lanes;

- Modernization and upgrading of the traffic signals at the intersection of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road;

- Elimination of the existing short right turn lane markings on Snyder’s Road at Notre Dame Drive while maintaining sufficient pavement width on Snyder’s Road for through vehicles to bypass left-turning vehicles;

- Minor culvert rehabilitation at the Alder Creek culvert on the west leg of Snyder’s Road; and

- Upgrades to various overhead and below-ground utilities as required to accommodate the proposed improvements.

The estimated total cost for the project is $4,980,000. Pending final approval of the project, construction is scheduled to commence in April 2016 with completion in late fall 2016.

Letters advising the public of the recommendations included in this report and the date the report is to be considered by the Planning and Works Committee were mailed on January 9, 2014 to all Petersburg businesses and residents and those who attended the PCCs or PIM. On January 21, 2014 a follow-up letter was mailed to advise that the date of the Committee Meeting was changed to February 11, 2014 to allow more time for the public to prepare for the meeting.

**Report:**

It is anticipated that the following recommendation will be brought forward for Committee’s consideration at the February 11, 2014 Planning and Works Committee Meeting:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to proposed improvements in the Village of Petersburg, on Notre Dame Drive (Regional Road 12) from the Highway 7/8 interchange to the railway tracks at the north village limit, and on Snyder’s Road (Regional Road 6) from the east village limit to the west village limit:
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iii) approve the proposed roadway improvements subject to funding approval as part of the Region’s 2014 Transportation Capital Program budget, as outlined in Report E-14-007

iv) Effective March 31, 2014, amend Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended as follows:

c) Add to Schedule 18 Rates of Speed, 50 km/h Maximum Speed on Snyder’s Road East (Regional Road #6) from 350 metres west of Notre Dame Drive to 420 metres east of Notre Dame Drive; and
d) Add to Schedule 18 Rates of Speed, 50 km/h Maximum Speed on Notre Dame Drive (Regional Road #12) from 470m south of Reinhardt Place to 255 north of Deerfield Avenue.

Following a request from members of the Petersburg community, it was agreed that the content of this report would be made available to the public on January 24, 2014 with the January 28, 2014 agenda package but that the report recommendation be considered by Committee on February 11, 2014. In this way, the public will have more time to review the staff report and prepare delegation presentations for the February 11, 2014 Committee meeting.

1. Introduction

The roads in the Village of Petersburg are identified in the Region’s 2014 Ten-Year Transportation Capital Program as requiring reconstruction and major rehabilitation in 2016. The project limits include Notre Dame Drive from the Highway 7/8 interchange to the railway crossing at the north limit of the village, as well as Snyder’s Road from the east village limit to the west village limit, for a total combined distance of approximately 2,000 metres. Please refer to Appendix A for a key plan of the Project Area.

The project is being undertaken as a Schedule ‘A+’ project under the “Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Act”, and is being directed by a Project Team that includes staff from the Region of Waterloo and Township of Wilmot as well as Township Councilor Peter Roe and the Region’s consultant MTE Consultants Inc.

Improvements on Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road are being proposed to address a variety of needs in accordance with the objectives of the Region’s Transportation Master Plan, Context Sensitive Corridor Design Guidelines and the Draft Active Transportation Master Plan.

2. Existing Needs and Proposed Improvements

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

a) Deteriorated Road Condition

The pavement condition is fair to poor on most sections of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road. In general, the deterioration is due to the age of the asphalt combined
with areas of poor roadway drainage. The roadway will be fully reconstructed as part of this project.

b) Drainage Issues

Except for a few small sections of curb and gutter located near the intersection of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road, most of the roadway consists of areas of paved shoulders with road drainage flowing into shallow swales, roadside ditches or directly onto private driveways and front yards. In many locations the houses and properties are lower than the existing road resulting in surface drainage from the roads flowing onto private property. This drainage condition exists on the south side of the east leg of Snyder’s Road where road surface drainage flows onto private property. Backyard flooding and the potential for basement drainage flows have been reported in this general area. Flooding problems have also been reported on the south leg of Notre Dame Drive between Snyder’s Road and Reinhart Place. In some locations, along both roads, there are “makeshift” catchbasins and storm sewers installed in the roadway; however, many of these are in questionable condition due to their age, have inconsistent and/or insufficient size and unknown or partially buried outlets. Accordingly, there is a need for a new storm sewer system throughout Petersburg to address these drainage deficiencies.

c) Pedestrian Needs

Currently, there is no sidewalk on Notre Dame Drive or on Snyder’s Road. To promote and encourage walking for local trips, reduce the use of cars and for pedestrian comfort reasons, the Region of Waterloo has a Strategic Plan objective to consider continuous sidewalks on both sides of Regional Roads as part of any road reconstruction project in built-up areas. Sidewalks are therefore being considered for construction on both sides of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road in support of the Region’s Transportation Master Plan, Context Sensitive Corridor Design Guidelines and the Draft Active Transportation Master Plan. Sidewalks assist in promoting walking for local trips, and the inclusion of a landscaped boulevard between the sidewalk and the traveled portion of the roadway provides a greater separation between pedestrians and traffic.

It should be noted that snow removal on all sidewalks is the responsibility of the abutting landowners in Wilmot Township as per Township By-Law 84-72.

d) Cycling Needs

There are currently no designated cycling lanes on Notre Dame Drive or Snyder’s Road; however Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road (both within and beyond Petersburg) are identified as designated cycling routes in the Region’s Draft Active Transportation Master Plan and accordingly cycling facilities are being considered as part of this project.

The Township of Wilmot has also requested that the Region consider the construction of cycling facilities as part of the proposed reconstruction of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road as a part of an initiative to provide cycling connections between the various towns and hamlets in Wilmot Township.
3. **Public Consultation**

a) May 1, 2012 Public Consultation Centre #1

Based on the project needs, the Project Team developed a preferred design for improvements to Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road which was presented to the public on May 1, 2012 at the first Public Consultation Centre (PCC #1) held at the Rebel Creek Golf Course in Petersburg. Notices were placed in the local newspapers advertising the PCC. Signboards were erected on site in advance of the PCC and notices were mailed to area residents, property owners, and businesses. In addition notice letters were hand-delivered and mailed to all residents within the community. Plans showing the proposed improvements were on display at the PCC and Project Team representatives were present to answer questions and receive feedback.

Typical cross-sections were also on display at the PCC to illustrate what the proposed improvements would look like.

The preferred design presented at PCC #1 included: full reconstruction of the existing roads; on-road cycling lanes; new curb and gutter and storm sewers; sidewalk on both sides of the road; minimum 1.0m boulevards, with new tree plantings where possible; some areas of parking behind the curb; and modernization/upgrading of the traffic signals at the intersection of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road.

Approximately 63 people attended PCC #1 and forty-three (43) written responses were received. The main issues expressed by the public at PCC #1 included: comments that sidewalks and curbs are not needed or desired in the village and that the paved shoulders should remain; concerns about the loss of most of the parking with the proposed cycling lanes and curbs; concerns about speeding through the village; concerns at The Blue Moon restaurant regarding loss of parking and access for delivery trucks; and concern about traffic operations at the Notre Dame Drive/Snyder’s Road intersection.

Based on the public comments received at PCC #1, the Project Team made revisions to the proposed improvement plans and the revised plans were then presented back to the public at PCC #2 in February 2013 (described below in Section 3d).

b) Informal Community Meeting

A community-organized meeting was held at The Blue Moon restaurant, 1677 Snyder’s Road East on May 10, 2012. This meeting was arranged by local residents, and staff and Wilmot Mayor Armstrong were invited to attend to provide clarification on the project process and to answer questions about the proposed improvements.

c) Public Petition

A petition signed by 979 people was received on December 19, 2012. The petition read as follows: “Petition against the $4,580,000.00 Notre Dame Drive and Snyder's Road Reconstruction in Petersburg (curbs, sidewalks, boulevards, and on-road bike lanes), but for shoulder resurfacing in order to accommodate walking, biking and parking throughout the whole of Petersburg”. One hundred and twenty-three (123) of the
signatures were from residents of Petersburg. The other 856 signatures were from people who do not live in Petersburg.

d) February 28, 2013 Public Consultation Centre #2

Based on prior comments received for the project, the Project Team developed a revised preferred design which was presented to the public on February 28, 2013 at a second PCC (PCC #2) held at the Emmanuel Lutheran Church in Petersburg. Notices were again advertised and mailed and signboards were erected in advance of the PCC.

Changes to the original design that were included in the revised plans presented at PCC #2 include the following: replacement of the proposed on-road cycling lanes with segregated cycling lanes behind a semi-mountable curb (to encourage lower speeds); elimination of a section of proposed sidewalk on the south side of Snyder’s Road east of Notre Dame Drive; raised centre medians on all four approaches to the village (to alert motorists they are entering the village and to encourage lower speeds); additional proposed parking spaces behind the curbs; additional parking on the road allowance for patrons and delivery vehicles at The Blue Moon restaurant; and a reduction in the posted speed limit (from 60 to 50 kph) following the implementation of the proposed improvements. Typical cross-sections showing the proposed improvements were included with the PCC information and are included in Appendix B for reference. The cycling lanes in Petersburg are proposed to be 1.25m in width. The Project Team felt that this width is appropriate given the grading constraints in some sections and the presence of proposed semi-mountable curb adjacent to the cycling lane which provides an offset to the driving lane.

Approximately 51 people attended PCC #2 and twenty-three (23) written responses were received. The main issues expressed by the public at PCC #2 included comments similar to PCC #1: that sidewalks and curbs are not needed or desired in the village and that the paved shoulders should remain; concern that the speed limit reduction was not occurring immediately; concerns about the loss of parking; concerns at The Blue Moon restaurant regarding loss of parking and access for delivery trucks; and concern about traffic operations and the removal of turn lanes at the Notre Dame Drive/Snyder’s Road intersection.

e) June 25, 2013 Public Input Meeting

A special public meeting of the Planning and Works Committee was held June 25, 2013 at Rebel Creek Golf Club. The purpose of the formal Public Input Meeting (PIM) was to allow members of the public to appear before Regional Councillors to share their views about the proposed project improvements. Staff began the meeting with a slide presentation describing the proposed design as shown at PCC #2 and explaining the technical rationale for the proposed improvements.

The PIM was attended by approximately 50 members of the public and 14 delegations addressed the members of Planning and Works Committee. The main comments heard from members of the public at the PIM included: a preference for paved shoulders over sidewalks and cycling lanes; requests for an immediate reduction of the posted speed limit from 60 to 50 kph; concerns about insufficient roadway width for farm vehicles;
requests for designated turn lanes at the Notre Dame and Snyder’s Road intersection; and concerns about limited parking in several locations, including in front of the Emmanuel Lutheran Church and at the Post Office.

The recorded minutes from the PIM are contained in Appendix C.

f) Second Public Petition

A second public petition signed by 219 people was received on July 30, 2013 requesting an immediate reduction of the posted speed limit in Petersburg to 50 kph.

4. Main Issues Raised by the Public

Through the public consultation process conducted for this project, six (6) main concerns have been expressed by the public about the proposed improvements in Petersburg, as follows:

a) Curb and Sidewalks not Required; Keep Paved Shoulder
b) Reduce Speed Limit
c) Concerns with Proposed Parking Arrangements
d) Cycling Lanes not Required
e) Turn Lanes Needed at the Notre Dame and Snyder’s Road Intersection
f) Insufficient Road Width for Farm Equipment

detailed descriptions of these main concerns along with the Project Team’s responses are provided in Appendix D.

The Project Team met again following the June 25, 2013 PIM to consider the public comments from the PIM. As a result of the Project Team meeting, there have been a number of additional design changes made since the public last saw the preferred design as presented at the PIM. A summary of the recent design changes that are included in the final Recommended Design Alternative is as follows:

- Effective March 31, 2014, a reduction in the posted speed limit to 50 kph;
- Additional parking spaces on the road allowance at the Church and Post Office;
- Additional parking spaces on the road allowance on the west leg of Snyder’s Road;
- The proposed segregated cycling lanes would be constructed and would function as cycling lanes but would not be formally designated in the Region’s By-law, which would allow wide over-sized farm equipment to legally occupy the segregated cycling lane when required to do so; and
- Additional roadway illumination would be provided near the Post Office;
A new multi-day traffic count was taken in October 2013 to confirm whether the warrants for turning lanes are met at the intersection of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road. Based on the recent counts which represent normal traffic activity and based on projected future increases in area traffic to a horizon year of 2026, it is concluded that separate designated turning lanes are not required at this intersection and are therefore not recommended for this project. The recommended design at the intersection includes a paved width of 5.1m on both Snyder’s Road approaches so that through vehicles will be able to bypass vehicles queued to turn left. Appendix F includes a plan view of the intersection with vehicles drawn to scale to illustrate the space available for through vehicles to “slip around” queued left-turn vehicles.

For reference, Appendix E includes a map of Petersburg showing the location of all of the proposed sidewalk as well as the number and location of the proposed parking spaces.

5. **Recommended Design Alternative**

Based on all of the public comments received for this project and all the technical considerations, the Project Team has confirmed the Recommended Design Alternative as follows:

- Full reconstruction of the existing roads with one lane in each direction;
- Segregated coloured concrete cycling lanes on both sides of the road located behind a roll-over curb and gutter;
- Sidewalk on both sides of the road in most areas, except on the south side of Snyder’s Road east of Notre Dame Drive, with an approximate 1.0m grassed or hard surface boulevard between the sidewalk and segregated bike lane;
- Short sections of raised centre medians at all four entrances to the village, one of which will be constructed as a pedestrian refuge island north of Deerfield Avenue / Cecil Kennedy Court for pedestrians accessing Petersburg Community Park;
- Installation of new storm sewers (including curb and gutter) to replace the existing old and inconsistently sized storm sewers;
- Forty (40) parking spaces behind the cycling lanes;
- Modernization and upgrading of the traffic signals at the intersection of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road;
- Elimination of the existing short right turn lane markings on Snyder’s Road at Notre Dame Drive while maintaining sufficient pavement width on Snyder’s Road for through vehicles to bypass left turning vehicles;
- Minor culvert rehabilitation at the Alder Creek culvert on the west leg of Snyder’s Road; and
6. Benefits of the Recommended Design Alternative

The benefits of the Recommended Design Alternative are as follows:

- Traffic calming features including median islands at village entrances, reduced lane widths, landscaped boulevards and reduction in the posted speed limit will encourage slower traffic through the village;
- Sidewalks and segregated cycling lanes throughout the village will increase the comfort level for pedestrians and cyclists and help to achieve Regional Active Transportation goals;
- Storm sewer upgrades will improve drainage throughout the village and prevent ponding on adjacent properties;
- Parking is provided within the road allowance for local residents, businesses, Emmanuel Lutheran Church and the cemetery; and
- Road reconstruction will remedy the existing poor asphalt condition.

7. Project Cost

The total estimated Region of Waterloo cost for the recommended Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road improvements included in this report is $4,980,000.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

Construction of the proposed Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road improvements meets the Region’s (2011 – 2014) Corporate Strategic Plan Objective 2.2 to develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs under Focus Area 2, “Growth Management and Prosperity”.

Financial Implications:

The Region’s 2014 Transportation Capital Program and Ten Year Forecast includes funding of $4,980,000 between 2014-2016 for this project to be funded from the Roads Rehabilitation Reserve Fund.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Staff from the Council and Administrative Services Division will be required to prepare the By-laws for the recommended posted speed reduction.

Attachments:

Appendix A - Key Plan
Appendix B - Typical Cross-sections
Appendix C - Minutes of June 28 2013 Public Input Meeting
Appendix D - Main Issues Raised by the Public and Project Team Responses
Appendix E - Map of Proposed Sidewalks and Parking
Appendix F – Snyder’s Road at Notre Dame Drive, Slip-around Design

Prepared By: Ian Young, Project Manager, Design and Construction
Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
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June 25, 2013 Public Input Meeting Minutes

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO
PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
PLANNING AND WORKS COMMITTEE
MINUTES

Tuesday, June 25, 2013
7:07 p.m.
Rebel Creek Golf Club
1517 Snyder’s Road
Petersburg, ON

Present were: Chair J. Wideman, L. Armstrong, T. Galloway, J. Haalboom, G. Lorentz, J. Mitchell, K. Seiling, S. Strickland and C. Zehr

Members absent: J. Brewer, T. Cowan, D. Craig, R. Deutschmann, B. Halloran, R. Kelterbom, and C. Millar

OPEN REMARKS

Chair J. Wideman provided opening remarks regarding the purpose of the public meeting and the advertisement history.

DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST UNDER THE MUNICIPAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT

None declared.

REPORT – PLANNING, HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES - COMMUNITY PLANNING

a) Report E-13-083, Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road Reconstruction, Township of Wilmot – Public Meeting

Received for information.

Bob Wheildon, Senior Project Manager, Transportation Base Program provided a presentation highlighting:

- Proposed improvements;
- Public consultation;
- Main issues raised by the public;
- Project teams preferred design alternative;
- Next steps; and
- Schedule and cost.

A copy of the presentation is appended to the original minutes.

B. Wheildon responded to Committees’ questions regarding changes made since the last public consultation in February, coloured concrete cycling lanes, eliminating the turning lanes, parking spaces, snow storage, and farm equipment.

Chair J. Wideman noted that there were no registered delegations. He made a call for delegations.
DELEGATIONS

a) Lewis Straus appeared before Committee expressing his concern with the speed limit, asking that the speed limit be reduced to 50 km/h now and not waiting for the project to be complete. He also stated his concern with the one meter grass boulevards noting it will be impossible to grow grass in such a small area.

b) Steve Bechtold appeared before Committee stating he is a local farmer. He expressed his concern with the road way not being wide enough to accommodate farm equipment and explained the danger of the farm equipment slowing down and vehicles coming up over the hill and having to slam on their brakes.

Committee members asked the delegation what would be an appropriate width for the roadway. S. Bechtel stated that 11 meters would be the minimum width.

c) Jim Bearinger, 1993 Snyder’s Road appeared before Committee looking for clarification if it is legal to drive around turning vehicles making a left turn and if combines are allowed to hop the curb with their equipment if more room is required.

Staff indicated that it is legal to drive around turning vehicles if it is paved and there for that purpose. It was also noted that farm equipment can extend pass the roadway.

d) Gary Beach, 1641 Snyder’s Road appeared before Committee stating he has been part of the community for over 40 years. He explained that eliminating the turning lanes will cause more traffic congestion. He pointed out that Erb Street has rolled over curbs all the way into Waterloo stating that he would like his community to look the same. He feels there is no need for concrete or grass boulevards.

e) Warren Bechtold appeared before Committee stating his business is located at 1239 Notre Dame Drive. He asked that the speed limit be reduced to 50 km/h now instead of waiting until 2016. He noted that safety should come first and he has no issue with the sidewalk or shoveling the sidewalk. He did state his concern with the grass boulevard and asked that more parking be available in front of the new addition that was added onto the church. He highlighted that the improvements clean up Petersburg and makes it a safer place.

f) Les Armstrong appeared before Committee raising the concerns of residents. He pointed out the growth in Baden, New Hamburg and Wellesley and the effect that has on the traffic congestion in Petersburg. He talked about the limited amount of parking and asked that the grass boulevards be eliminated to allow for extra parking. He asked that there be a designated turning lane to help with confusion.

g) Stephanie Beach, 1561 Snyder’s Road appeared before Committee expressing concerns that the residents’ complaints were not being heard and the second report reflects that. She noted that out of 90 residents only 8 said they wanted sidewalks. She suggested installing a sidewalk from the gas station to the park. She asked why segregated bike lanes were being installed in Petersburg when the residents prefer on road cycling. She highlighted that the elimination of the shoulder reduces parking at residents’ homes as well as the businesses. She stated that the parking spaces will be a safety hazard because vehicles will have to come to a complete stop in order to parallel park.
h) Helen Southwood, the post master of Petersburg appeared before Committee expressing her concerns with lack of parking. She stated that over 700 people pick up mail at her office and there will only be three designated parking spaces. She also asked that extra lighting be installed in front of the post office.

i) Leah Dickert a resident of Petersburg appeared before Committee stating that turn lanes will help with the traffic congestion. She pointed out that Ira Needles Boulevard hasn’t worked like it was supposed to since it is only a two lane road and over flow of traffic is still traveling through Petersburg.

j) Karin Demerling, 1611 Snyder’s Road appeared before Committee asking for clarification on signage located on the medians. She noted that transport trucks are always making left turns into her property and this will cause a problem. She asked that the median start at the top of the hill and why parking was eliminated on the west side of Snyder’s Road.

k) Jim Hilier appeared before Committee asking that the speed limit be changed to 50 km/h now and not in 2018.

l) Lewis Straus had a few more additional comments. He asked that Council make the decision on the project not the engineers and that a longer parking study of 7-14 days should take place.

m) Jim Bender appeared before Committee suggesting that a paved shoulder would allow for cycling, parking and walking. He noted that he preferred the Region take care of the snow plowing of the shoulder rather than the residents shoveling the sidewalks.

n) Dan Simpson, appeared before Committee noting he lives across the street from the gas station. He asked that a cycling and pedestrian study be conducted. He pointed out his concern with his well and how it may be affected once construction starts. He asked if the Region would be responsible for snow removal on the sidewalks.

Committee members clarified who is responsible for snow removal.

o) Stephanie Beach made additional comments with respect to parking and noted that the majority of the residents would prefer a paved shoulder with rolled over curb for allow for parking.

Committee members encouraged the public to submit any further comments to staff.

ADJOURN

MOVED by G. Lorentz
SECONDED by S. Strickland

THAT the meeting adjourn at 8:37 p.m.

CARRIED

COMMITTEE CHAIR, J. Wideman

COMMITTEE CLERK, E. Flewelling

1421524
Appendix D

Main Issues Raised By the Public and the Project Team Responses

a) Curb and Sidewalks not Required – Keep Paved Shoulder

- A small community does not need sidewalks;
- Sidewalks are not required on both sides of the road;
- Nobody walks now;
- The existing shoulders are adequate for pedestrians;
- The sidewalk will result in the removal of too many trees;
- Increased maintenance time and effort to shovel snow;
- Cost not warranted, too expensive, taxes will increase;
- Sidewalk will be very close to front of houses in some cases;
- Growth in Petersburg not anticipated so no improvements necessary;
- Curbs and medians will limit use of road by large farm equipment;
- Curbs and sidewalks will change the character of the community;
- The curbs and revised entrances to businesses will restrict access to their property;
- Curbs and sidewalks will impact drainage, vegetation and detract from the historical nature of the designated heritage building at 1634 Snyder’s Road; and
- Gravel trail to the community park north of Cecil Kennedy Court provides a less expensive and safer alternative to the proposed sidewalk at road level.

Other general comments that were received included;

- Work needs to be done to our road;
- Road should be repaved;
- Drainage on our road is terrible, neighbours front lawn always floods during heavy rain and the roadside in front of their home always stays quite wet.

Project Team Response

The Recommended Design Alternative for Snyder’s Road and Notre Dame Drive includes curbs and sidewalks. Curbs and gutters are an important road
component needed to intercept and collect storm water and to correct the drainage problems identified in Section 2b of this report. Sidewalks separated from the travelled portion of the roadway by landscaped boulevards, cycling lanes and/or parking provide a much more comfortable pedestrian facility (compared to the existing paved shoulders) from both a physical and visual perspective, due to the separation of the pedestrians and vehicles.

Based on the public comments received at PCC #1, a number of changes were made to reduce the extent of proposed sidewalk, as follows:

- South side of the east leg of Snyder’s Road - sidewalk is now not proposed, to reduce adverse grading impacts on private property and driveways, to maintain sight line visibility and to reduce loss of privacy due to houses being significantly closer to and lower than the road;

- North of Cecil Kennedy Court/Deerfield Avenue on Notre Dame Drive - no curb or sidewalk is proposed at the road level; the existing gravel path at the bottom of the embankment will be replaced with a concrete sidewalk in the same location; and

- On all four legs of this project, the curbs and sidewalk is to be terminated approximately where the last residences are located, near the end of the project limits. From the end of the curb and sidewalk to the end of the project limits, the road will be constructed to the cross section illustrated in either Figure 3 or Figure 4 of Appendix B.

In response to some of the other concerns regarding proposed curb and gutter and sidewalk, the Project Team responds as follows;

- With curb and gutters, driveway entrances to businesses and residences are better defined to avoid wider than necessary driveways and yet are still designed to accommodate large vehicles. The use of the proposed rollover curb will allow larger vehicles to still make slightly wider turns where necessary.

b) Reduce Speed Limit

Public Comments

Seventeen (17) written comments from the PCCs and a number of delegations at the PIM expressed concerns about vehicles speeding through the community and felt that the existing posted speed limit of 60 km/h resulted in excessive vehicle speeds. It was stated that gravel and other trucks travelling through Petersburg often exceeded the posted speed limit which presents a potentially dangerous situation. Many felt the speed limit should be reduced for safety reasons from 60 km/h to 50 km/h.

One written comment indicated that it was their experience that curbs, boulevards and sidewalks will slow down traffic.
Project Team Response

Speed studies undertaken by the Region indicated that most vehicles were driving within the 60 km/h posted speed limit through Petersburg; however, the speed studies did find some vehicles exceeding the speed limit. Staff believe that those vehicles currently exceeding the speed limit are doing so due to the existing wide-open road design (i.e. wide expanse of asphalt width, partially due to the paved shoulder) that contributes to motorists feeling more comfortable driving at those increased speeds, as opposed to the posted speed limit.

As a result of the expressed speeding concern by the public, the Project Team revised the proposed cross-section within the settlement area after PCC #1 to physically restrict the width of the road platform and encourage slower speeds. With reference to the cross-sections in Appendix B, the Recommended Design Alternative includes narrower 3.35m travel lanes for vehicles but replaces the originally proposed on-road cycling lanes with segregated cycling lanes on each side, 1.25m in width and behind a “rollover” curb.

The revised cross section with narrower asphalt lanes for vehicles, segregated cycling lanes behind the rollover curb and the proposed plantings behind or in front of the sidewalk would provide forms of traffic calming and would have the potential to reduce motorist speed compared to leaving the roadway wide open with asphalt shoulders. Staff believes that the implementation of these traffic calming initiatives will contribute to reduced speeds. In addition, in recognition of the many public requests to reduce the speed limit now (in advance of the proposed roadway changes), staff are also supporting a reduction in the posted speed limit effective March 31, 2014 as part of this approval report.

The project plans also include raised centre medians on all four approaches to the village to alert motorists that they are entering the village and to encourage lower speeds. These medians may include landscape plantings or the Township may elect to erect a small decorative community welcome sign to advise motorists they are entering the Village of Petersburg and to encourage reduced speeds. In addition the proposed centre median at the intersection of Notre Dame Drive with Deerfield Avenue/Cecil Kennedy Court will include a pedestrian refuge to assist pedestrians crossing Notre Dame Drive to access the proposed sidewalk to the community park.

c) Concerns with Proposed Parking Arrangements

Public Comments

Currently, parking is unrestricted in Petersburg, except in the vicinity of the signalized intersection of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road. Twenty-three (23) written comments were received and a number of delegations spoke at the PIM concerning the proposed parking space areas behind the proposed curb. The comments included:

- Blue Moon will lose parking spaces;
- Currently can park anywhere in town on paved shoulder;
- Need some on-street parking near Cemetery on Notre Dame Drive and in front of the Church on Snyder’s Road for use during funerals;
- Safety concerns with strangers parking near their homes where no parking exists now;
- Private driveways are large enough to accommodate parking in the community;
- Parking survey should be done during the summer, not in winter;
- On-street parking should be allowed throughout the community;
- Elimination of paved shoulder will take away overflow parking for existing homes and especially businesses;
- On-street parking should be concentrated near the businesses; and
- Delineation of entrances to The Blue Moon parking lot will remove parking.

**Project Team Response**

The original design presented at PCC #1 showed a number of parking spaces in select areas throughout the project limits (20 spaces overall) based on a parking demand study undertaken by the Region in February 2012. Based on comments received at PCC #1, an additional parking study was undertaken on Snyder’s Road and Notre Dame Drive in July 2012 to capture parking demand in a summer month also. The July parking study found very little difference when compared to the February parking study. Both parking studies captured parking demand on a typical weekday and on a Saturday.

Currently, parking is permitted on all of the paved shoulders within the Petersburg village limits, except for By-lawed restrictions near the intersection of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road. The parking demand studies however showed that there is very limited usage of the paved shoulders for parking, and most usage was for only short durations.

Following the PIM, the Project Team again re-assessed the opportunities for proposed parking. A number of additional spaces have been added into the design including one space in front of Emmanuel Lutheran Church, two additional spaces in front of the Post Office and two additional spaces on the south side of Snyder’s Road, west of Notre Dame Drive. In addition, roadway lighting will be upgraded in front of the Post Office for Post Office patrons. With reference to the Proposed Sidewalk and Parking Map in Appendix ‘E’, the final proposed parking arrangements as part of the Recommended Design Alternative include 40 spaces overall comprised of the following:
Snyder's Road

- No parking is proposed on the south side of the east leg due to driveway grading, sight visibility and property limitations, with the exception that four parking spaces are proposed near the intersection at The Blue Moon restaurant on the Snyder's Road frontage to provide a limited number of spaces for disabled persons and for patron parking; these spaces would be in close proximity to the only handicap-accessible entrance to The Blue Moon restaurant;

- Nine parking spaces are proposed on the north side of the east leg of Snyder’s Road;

- Two parking spaces are proposed on the south side of the west leg of Snyder’s Road and none on the north side based on very little demand and comments from the public at PCC #1.

Notre Dame Drive

- To address concerns about the loss of parking and access for deliveries, twelve parking spaces are proposed on the east side near Snyder’s Road at The Blue Moon patio area, to accommodate truck delivery of supplies to The Blue Moon and to provide general parking during other times;

- Three parking spaces are proposed on the west side of the south leg of Notre Dame Drive between the existing entrances at the cemetery;

- One truck parking space on each side (total of two) is proposed on the north leg of Notre Dame Drive near Snyder’s Road for customers with large vehicles who patronize the businesses at the intersection. Currently large vehicles are observed to park on the paved shoulder in this area to access the variety store, gas bar and restaurant;

- On the north leg of Notre Dame Drive between Snyder’s Road and Cecil Kennedy Court/Deerfield Avenue, eight parking spaces are proposed on the east side near the Post Office;

- North of Cecil Kennedy Court/Deerfield Avenue, the shoulders will be paved and no curb and gutter is being installed. The paved shoulder provides for a 1.5 m bicycle lane adjacent to the travel lane. (Please refer to Figure 3, Appendix B for a cross-section view.) During large events at the Community Park, there is an opportunity to allow overflow parking on these paved shoulders. This parking will encroach into the cycling lane; however, under these infrequent events special parking signs could be erected by the event organizers to advise cyclists about the short-term encroachment of the parking onto the bike lanes.

d) Cycling Lanes Not Required

Public comments
Twelve (12) written comments were received that were not in favour of cycling lanes. Four (4) comments specifically indicated that cycling lanes are required. The comments opposed to cycling lanes included:

- Paved shoulder can be used by cyclists;
- Why install cycling lanes in Petersburg when there are no cycling lanes to connect to outside of Petersburg;
- Very few cyclists use the roads now; and
- Bicycle lanes too expensive.

**Project Team Response**

Snyder's Road and Notre Dame Drive are not designated cycling routes under the Region’s current Cycling Master Plan; however under the Region’s Draft Active Transportation Master Plan, both Snyder’s Road and Notre Dame Drive are designated as planned cycling routes, both within and beyond the settlement limits of Petersburg. In addition, the Township of Wilmot has requested the Region to consider the provision of cycling facilities as part of the proposed reconstruction of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder's Road.

As construction of other sections of these roads proceeds in the future, cycling facilities are to be constructed to ultimately form part of an overall uninterrupted cycling route network within the Region. It is therefore important that cycling facilities be constructed in Petersburg as part of the proposed road reconstruction, to avoid future expensive modifications and the associated additional construction disruption within Petersburg.

As part of the Recommended Design Alternative for this project, it is therefore proposed to build a “segregated” coloured concrete cycling lane behind the roll-over curb to provide an area dedicated just for cyclists and to provide some separation, from the motorized vehicle lanes. The coloured concrete surface will clearly identify the cycling lane for use by cyclists, but the lane will not be reserved so as to allow wide farm equipment to use it when necessary.

e) **Turn Lanes Needed at Intersection of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road**

**Public comments**

Nine (9) written comments related to the traffic signals or turn lanes at Notre Dame Drive and Snyder's Road. In addition, a number of delegations at the PIM requested marked turn lanes to allow through traffic to bypass turning vehicles. The comments included:

- Install an advanced green signal for left turning vehicles;
- Upgraded intersection is for cities not for rural areas; and
- Turn lanes are required especially on the south leg of Notre Dame Drive.
Project Team Response

From comments received at PCC #1, Region staff completed another up-dated operational review of the intersection of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road, to determine if turn lanes and/or an advanced green signal phase are required based on projected future traffic volumes. The results of this review were re-confirmed in October 2013 with an additional series of traffic counts on three consecutive weekdays. The reviews concluded that neither an advanced green signal phase nor turn lanes are required on any legs of this intersection. This review was completed using 2026 traffic forecasts. As a result, no turn lanes are recommended at the intersection. Traffic signals will be modernized and upgraded at the intersection; however an advanced green signal will not be installed with the proposed improvements.

In addition, the existing marked eastbound and westbound short right turn lanes on Snyder’s Road will not be marked after construction is completed. The new curb will however be placed such that there will be sufficient room on Snyder’s Road at the intersection to allow through vehicles to bypass vehicles waiting to make a left turn onto Notre Dame Drive, as shown in Appendix F.

f) Insufficient Road Width for Farm Equipment

Public comments

Several comments related to the passage of farm equipment and large trucks through the village. The comments included:

- A large number of oversize farm vehicles pass through the village;
- Width around median islands at village entrance may not be sufficient; and
- Oversize farm vehicles will have to drive in the segregated cycle lanes.

Project Team Response

MTE Consultants Inc. researched the regulations governing the use of farm equipment on roadways. Over-sized farm vehicles are legally allowed to use any roadway provided the use is done in a safe manner. Maximum sizes for commonly used farm equipment were determined from conversations with local farmers and with equipment manufacturers. While some over-size farm equipment may need to encroach onto the cycling lane when driving through the village, the minimum hard surface width through the village is 4.95m (3.35 travelled lane + 0.35m curb and gutter + 1.25m cycle lane) which is sufficient to accommodate the largest farm vehicles that would typically pass through the area. In addition, staff are recommending that the cycling lanes through Petersburg not be formally designated as cycling lanes through a By-law. In this way, the cycling lane will fully function as a cycling facility but farm equipment can encroach legally onto the cycling lane when the infrequent need to do so arises.
Appendix E

Parking Spaces and Sidewalk Locations on Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road

LEGEND
- PROPOSED SIDEWALK
- PROPOSED PARKING SPACE
- PROPOSED TRUCK PARKING
- NUMBER OF PROPOSED PARKING SPACES

TOTAL PROPOSED SPACES = 40
Appendix F

Snyder’s Road at Notre Dame Drive, Slip-around Design
Region of Waterloo

Transportation and Environmental Services

Design and Construction

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

Date: January 28, 2014

File Code: C04-30, 5633, 7042, 5489

Subject: King Street and Weber Street Improvements, City of Waterloo

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to proposed improvements on King Street (Regional Road 15), Weber Street to Highway 85, and on Weber Street (Regional Road 8), Forwell Creek Road to Blythwood Road, in the City of Waterloo:

a) approve the Recommended Design Alternative for King and Weber Streets as outlined in Report E-14-010; and

b) amend Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as proposed herein, upon completion of construction to accommodate the following modifications:

i) Remove Schedule 1, Weber Street (Regional Road 8), King Street (Regional Road 15) to Kitchener City Limits;

ii) Add to Schedule 1, No Parking Anytime on both sides of King Street (Regional Road 15), Weber Street to Highway 85, and on Weber Street (Regional Road 8), Blythwood Road to Kitchener City Limits, in the City of Waterloo; and

iii) Add to Schedule 24, Reserved Lane Anytime on Both Sides of Weber Street (Regional Road 8) from Forwell Creek Road to Blythwood Road for Bicycles.

Summary:

On June 18, 2013, staff submitted Report E-13-082 to Planning and Works Committee with recommendations for improvements on King Street (Weber Street to Highway 85)
and Weber Street (Forwell Creek Road to Blythwood Road) in the City of Waterloo. The project includes replacement of underground infrastructure, new cycling lanes on Weber Street, new multi-use trails on King Street, as well as a number of turning lane improvements at the intersections within the project limits. The June 2013 report for the project is appended as Appendix ‘A’ and includes a description of the overall project needs/requirements, a summary of the concerns raised at the October 2012 Public Consultation Centre, the Project Team responses and recommendations to address these issues, a description of the Recommended Design Alternative and details on the project schedule and budget.

Following a staff presentation to Committee at the June 18th meeting, representatives of the Waterloo Inn and Conference Centre (WICC) and Parkway Ford appeared as delegations asking that traffic signals and other additional improvements be implemented at the intersection of King Street with King Street North Service Road. The delegations felt that the intersection is unsafe for vehicles attempting to turn left out of the Service Road and asked that an updated traffic study be conducted that includes traffic from an event at the WICC, as well as consideration of a number of other improvements at the intersection.

Committee deferred report E-13-082 and by resolution, directed staff “to prepare an updated and more extensive traffic study and evaluate the feasibility of actuated signals at the King Street North Service Road, implementing a refuge lane on King Street, widening of King Street North Service Road to create separate left and right turn lanes and connection of the King Street North Service Road with King Street at Blue Springs Drive and report to Planning and Works Committee with the outcomes and a revised, as required, Report E-13-082.”

This report provides the outcome of staff’s evaluation of these other considerations.

An updated traffic count was completed that included traffic generated from an event at the WICC. A traffic signal warrant analysis was then conducted using this event-based traffic and projections of future background traffic to the year 2031. The analysis still shows that traffic signals are not warranted at this location based on the Region’s signal warrant criteria.

Staff investigated the feasibility of an interconnection from the North Service Road southerly to the Blue Springs Drive intersection. An interconnection would require the elimination of a substantial amount of parking and landscaping within the adjacent commercial property and the interconnection would be too close to King Street to safely allow all turning movements. The interconnection is therefore not being recommended.

Staff is however recommending that the following additional improvements be implemented as part of this project:

1. Provide an informal painted refuge area in the centre of King Street so that left-turning motorists exiting the North Service Road will only have to look for gaps in one direction of traffic at a time;
2. Re-mark the North Service Road to provide two outbound lanes so that right-turning motorists can exit without having to wait behind left turning vehicles;

3. Widen the intersection of Blue Springs Drive and King Street (135m south of North Service Road) so that motorists (passenger vehicles only) wishing to travel north on King Street have the option of exiting right from the North Service Road and making a U-turn at Blue Springs Drive.

It is also noted that vehicles exiting from an event at WICC always have the option of exiting through the back of the WICC property to Weber Street, which provides a convenient alternate for traffic destined to the north or to Highway 85.

Staff has met with representatives of WICC and Parkway Ford to review the recommendations contained in this report. WICC and Parkway Ford have indicated in writing that they endorse the proposed changes (Appendix ‘E’).

At this time, staff is recommending that the three additional improvements identified above be added to the list of original improvements identified in Report E-13-082 and that all of these recommendations now be approved as part of this Report E-14-010. A complete list of the recommended improvements restated from Report E-13-082 plus the three new recommendations above is therefore as follows:

King Street - pavement rehabilitation, underground infrastructure replacement or repair (storm sewer, sanitary sewer, watermain) where warranted, lengthening the southbound left-turn lane at Weber Street by shortening the northbound left-turn lane to the commercial access opposite Blue Springs Drive, road widening for a new northbound left-turn lane at King Street North Service Road, road realignment between King Street North Service Road and Highway 85, introduction of a landscape median, construction of multi-use trails on both sides of King Street from Weber Street northerly through the Highway 85 interchange to Conestogo Road (west side) and to Conestoga Mall (east side) to connect to the future Rapid Transit station, road widening for an informal painted centre refuge area north of King Street North Service Road, re-marking of King Street North Service Road to provide separate right and left outbound turn lanes, and widening at the intersection of Blue Springs Drive and King Street to accommodate southbound passenger-vehicle U-turns.

Weber Street - full depth road reconstruction, replacement of the road base, widening for cycling lanes, widening for a pedestrian refuge island at Blythwood Road, widenings for construction of a westbound right-turn lane at King Street and extending the eastbound left-turn lane at King Street, installation of new sidewalk on the east side adjacent to vacant commercial land, underground infrastructure replacement (storm sewer, sanitary sewer, watermain), reconstruction of the driveway entrance to St. David Catholic Secondary School to a full movement entrance, and replacement/lengthening of the Grand River Transit school bus stop adjacent to the school.

Presently, construction is scheduled in the Transportation Capital Program for 2014 so that the King Street work can be completed in advance of Rapid Transit work occurring to the north on King Street. Staff is closely monitoring the timing of the nearby work planned under the Rapid Transit project and may consider modifying the timing of this
The total Region of Waterloo project cost for improvements on King Street and Weber Street is $4,745,000 to be funded from the Roads Rehabilitation Reserve Fund. The City of Waterloo is responsible for funding the cost of the sanitary sewer / watermain improvements on Weber Street and King Street, and the new multi-use trails on King Street. The estimated cost for the City work is approximately $1,250,000. The City of Waterloo has confirmed funding is available for the sanitary sewer and watermain work, and that a recommendation will be made to City Council to fund the City’s share of multi-use trails.

Report:

Background

On June 18 2013, staff submitted Report E-13-082 to Planning and Works Committee with recommendations for improvements on King Street (Weber Street to Highway 85) and Weber Street (Forwell Creek Road to Blythwood Road) in the City of Waterloo. The project includes replacement of underground infrastructure, new cycling lanes on Weber Street, new multi-use trails on King Street, as well as a number of turning lane improvements at the intersections within the project limits. The June 2013 report for the project is appended in Appendix ‘A’ and includes a description of the overall project needs/requirements, a summary of the concerns raised at the October 2012 Public Consultation Centre (PCC), the Project Team responses and recommendations to address these issues, a description of the recommended Design Alternative and details on the project schedule and budget. Please refer to Appendix ‘A’ in Report E-13-082 for a keymap of the project area.

In Report E-13-082, staff had included the Project Team’s detailed responses to the issues raised by the public at the PCC. Specifically, there were four public comments expressing concern that the proposed improvements at the King Street / King Street North Service Road intersection were not addressing the safety concerns at the intersection. A new left turn lane on King Street at this intersection is proposed as part of this project to improve intersection operations but traffic signals are not warranted based on collision rates, traffic and/or pedestrian volumes.

Following a staff presentation at the June 18th meeting, Mr. Angelo Innocente, MTE Consultants Inc. (MTE) appeared before Committee speaking on behalf of the two businesses located on King Street North Service Road, the Waterloo Inn and Conference Centre (WICC) and Parkway Ford. Mr. Innocente, WICC and Parkway Ford all feel that traffic signals are required at the intersection of King Street and North Service Road. Mr. Innocente asked that an updated traffic study be completed using the most recent traffic data and that traffic projections be included that take into account future intensification densities in the area. In addition, if traffic control signals are not installed, Mr. Innocente asked that the Region consider the installation of underground traffic ductwork and pole bases at this time (for future signals) and that the proposed design on King Street provide a safe refuge for left turning vehicles exiting the North Service Road.
Committee deferred report E-13-082 and by resolution, directed staff “to prepare an updated and more extensive traffic study and evaluate the feasibility of actuated signals at the King Street North Service Road, implementing a refuge lane on King Street, widening of King Street North Service Road to create separate left and right turn lanes and connection of the King Street North Service Road with King Street at Blue Springs Drive and report to Planning and Works Committee with the outcomes and a revised, as required, Report E-13-082.”

The following sections of this report outline staff’s findings related to these other considerations for this project.

**Additional Work by Project Team to Address Public Concerns**

1. **Signal Warrants at King Street North Service Road**

An updated traffic count was conducted on three successive days in mid-September 2013. Following consultation with WICC staff, it was determined that events at WICC planned for the week of September 18-22 afforded a good opportunity to capture WICC event-based traffic demand at the intersection of King Street and the King Street North Service Road. Region staff scheduled a three (3) day traffic count from Thursday, September 19th to Saturday, September 21st. Volumes were recorded each day from 7am to 7pm.

For the purpose of calculating signal warrants, the highest one-hour volume was captured from the count data for three periods during the day, namely “am” (7am-noon), “mid-day” (noon-3pm) and “pm” (3-7 pm). A summary of the highest hourly volumes (peak hour) in each period is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AM Peak Hour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15 To 9:15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MID Peak Hour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15 To 13:15</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PM Peak Hour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00 To 18:00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These event-based volumes for traffic exiting King Street North Service Road are, as expected, higher than the traffic volumes counted previously, which ranged from 10-16 vehicles per hour (left turns) and 21-37 vph (right turns). The previous counts were taken when there were no special events at the WICC so that the counts would be representative of a typical weekday, which is customary for traffic signal warrant analysis.

As described in Report E-13-082 (appended in Appendix ‘A’), the Region’s warrant criteria used to establish the need for traffic control signals includes an assessment of collision history, vehicular/pedestrian volumes and delays, and a technical assessment...
of the roadway geometry/characteristics. The warrant evaluation is based on established provincial guidelines documented in the Ontario Traffic Manual Book 12 and developed through the Ministry of Transportation of Ontario.

The Region’s process includes three separate sets of warrant calculations. If any of the three calculations achieves a 100% warrant level, signals are recommended. Alternatively if any two of the calculations achieve at least an 80% warrant level, signals are also recommended. The analysis for the King Street / North Service Road intersection using the WICC event-based traffic resulted in maximum warrant levels of 29%, 48% and 48% respectively for side-street traffic over the three days studied. Accordingly, traffic signals warrants are not achieved for the intersection and traffic signals are therefore not recommended.

Where unwarranted signals are installed, studies have shown that there can be adverse impacts. On average, at least twice as many collisions occur at a signalized intersection compared to a stop-controlled intersection with similar traffic volumes. In 2007, staff presented the results of an intersection collision analysis as part of Planning and Works Committee Report E-07-074, Traffic Control Signal Warrants. Through this study, staff compared 47 intersections over a two-year period before and after the installation of traffic signals. The results found that overall collisions increased by approximately 20 per cent and collisions involving bodily injury increased by 70 per cent, excluding angle collisions.

The study further indicates that signals generally do not improve pedestrian safety and the majority of pedestrian collisions typically occur at signalized intersections, most often while the pedestrian is in the crosswalk and has the right of way. Of the 47 intersections assessed during the study, collisions involving pedestrians increased from two to eight.

In the past, staff would support the installation of unwarranted signals if an adjacent property owner, developer or a local municipality was prepared to incur the capital cost for installation. However, staff has not recommended the installation of unwarranted signals in recent years in light of these findings on collision rates and pedestrian safety.

Because of the proximity to Highway 85, the King Street North Service Road intersection is within the Ministry of Transportation’s (MTO) limit of jurisdiction for the approval of traffic signals. Staff has made contact with the MTO on this issue and MTO has advised that signals could be considered at this location but that a detailed traffic study and analysis of possible impacts on Highway 85 ramp operations would be required before the MTO could state with certainty that signals would be permitted at this location. Therefore it is noted that any future signals at the King Street North Service Road would also be subject to approval from the MTO.

If re-development were to occur on the WICC site, a Traffic Impact Study would have to be completed by the Developer to assess the impacts of the increased traffic. If traffic signals were warranted and required for the new development, and approved by the MTO, the signals would be installed by the Region using development charges funding.

The current design for the intersection would accommodate future traffic signals but staff is recommending that the underground ductwork not be installed at this time for
possible future signals, as requested by MTE. If signals become warranted in the future, the underground ductwork could be easily installed by trenchless drilling methods at minimal extra cost.

As previously noted in Report E-13-082, vehicles exiting from an event at WICC have the option of exiting through the back of the WICC property to Weber Street, which provides a convenient alternate for traffic destined to the north or to Highway 85.

2. Refuge Lane on King Street

In Report E-13-082, staff had appended an earlier letter to MTE in which staff addressed MTE’s suggestion of incorporating a centre refuge lane into the current design on King Street north of North Service Road, so that left-turn vehicles exiting the North Service Road would only have to look for gaps in one direction of traffic at a time. It was pointed out that a formal refuge lane would contravene Transportation Association of Canada guidelines for intersection design. However, staff do feel that it would be acceptable to construct an informal, un-marked refuge area that would be available to drivers who are comfortable waiting in the refuge area for gaps in northbound traffic. Accordingly, it is recommended that part of the proposed raised centre island on King Street be converted to a painted refuge area 4.0m in width and 45m in length (see illustration attached in Appendix ‘D’).

3. Separate Left and Right Turn Lanes on King Street North Service Road

In Report E-13-082, staff had indicated that widening of the City’s North Service Road would be discussed with City of Waterloo staff to provide dedicated left and right turn lanes at the King Street intersection. Staff has reviewed the roadway geometry in greater detail and have confirmed that the width of the existing pavement is sufficient for three lanes of traffic. Staff is therefore recommending that the existing road width be retained and the pavement be re-marked to delineate two outbound lanes, one for right-turning vehicles and one for left-turning vehicles. It is proposed that the length of the turning lanes be 50-55m (back to the entrance to Parkway Ford) which will allow storage for 7-8 vehicles per lane.

Due to the geometry of the intersection, there will be occasions when an incoming southbound tractor trailer (delivering vehicles to Parkway Ford for example) will have to wait until the outbound queue clears before making a right turn into the North Service Road. Region and City staff feel that this situation is acceptable in that it would be an infrequent occurrence and outbound drivers would leave gaps to make allowances for turning trucks.

4. Connection of King Street North Service Road to Blue Springs Drive Intersection

Staff has considered the feasibility of realigning King Street North Service Road to connect with the intersection of King Street and Blue Springs Drive. In order to accommodate this realignment, King Street North Service Road would require an extension through private property at #435 King Street.

Staff has reviewed the potential impacts to this property and approximately 40 parking spaces would be removed if King Street North Service Road was extended through the
property. The footprint of the existing building would not be disturbed, however the principal entrance and landscape area along the building frontage would be impacted as a result of a North Service Road extension. In addition, an architectural stone and steel entrance feature would require removal along the walkway to the main entrance.

Additionally, an interconnection would result in the North Service Road extension being too close to King Street to safely allow turning movements through the combined intersection. Please refer to Appendix ‘D’ for a plan showing the building location at #435 King Street in relation to the road on King Street. Given the property and operational impacts, it is not feasible to consider the extension of King Street North Service Road to the intersection of King Street and Blue Springs Drive.

5. U-Turns at Blue Springs Drive

Staff is also recommending that the intersection of Blue Springs Drive and King Street (135m south of the King Street North Service Road intersection) be widened in the north-east quadrant so that passenger vehicles wishing to travel north on King Street have the option of exiting right from the North Service Road and making a U-turn at Blue Springs Drive.

Recommended Improvements

In summary, the Project Team is recommending three additional improvements on King Street as follows:

1. Provide an informal painted refuge area in the centre of King Street so that left-turning motorists exiting the North Service Road will only have to look for gaps in one direction of traffic at a time;
2. Re-mark the North Service Road to provide two outbound lanes so that right-turning motorists can exit without having to wait behind left turning vehicles;
3. Widen the intersection of Blue Springs Drive and King Street (135m south of North Service Road) so that motorists (passenger vehicles only) wishing to travel north on King Street have the option of exiting right from the North Service Road and making a U-turn at Blue Springs Drive.

A plan showing the 3 proposed new recommendations is included in Appendix ‘D’. Staff has contacted representatives of WICC and Parkway Ford to review the recommendations contained in this report. WICC and Parkway Ford have indicated in writing that they accept the proposed changes and a copy of the letters received are contained in Appendix ‘E’.

Staff is recommending that the three additional improvements identified in this report be added to the list of original improvements identified in Report E-13-082 and that all of these recommendations now be approved for this project as part of this Report E-14-010. A complete list of the recommended improvements restated from Report E-13-082 plus the three new recommendations from this report is therefore as follows:

King Street - Weber Street to Highway 85

- Reconstruct the current four (4) lane urban cross-section, standardizing lane
widths in accordance with Regional design specifications and planning policies;

- Enhance the King Street and Blue Springs Drive intersection by extending the storage of the southbound left-turn lane on King Street;

- Introduce a northbound left-turn lane at the King Street and King Street North Service Road intersection;

- Extend the southbound left-turn lane at the King Street and Weber Street intersection;

- Realign King Street between King Street North Service Road and the MTO signalized intersection at Highway 85 (near Manulife Financial) in order to provide for a multi-use trail and landscaped boulevard on the east side of the roadway;

- Introduce a centre landscape median between King Street North Service Road and the MTO signalized intersection at Highway 85 (near Manulife Financial) as recommended in the Context Sensitive Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines ("Urban Community Connector" classification);

- Install boulevard and median landscaping where possible to enhance the appearance of the streetscape;

- Provide a 3.0m multi-use trail on both sides of King Street from Weber Street northerly through the Highway 85 interchange to Conestogo Road (west side) and to Conestogo Mall (east side) to connect to the future Rapid Transit station as shown in Appendix ‘B-2’;

- Install double-sided street lighting where illumination is currently not provided;

- Replace black pipe sanitary service connections on behalf of the City of Waterloo;

- Road widening for an informal painted centre refuge area on King Street north of King Street North Service Road;

- Re-marking of King Street North Service Road to provide separate right and left outbound turn lanes; and

- Widening at the intersection of Blue Springs Drive and King Street to accommodate southbound passenger-vehicle U-turns.

**Weber Street - Forwell Creek Road to Blythwood Road, City of Waterloo**

- Reconstruct the current four (4) lane urban cross-section, standardizing lane widths in accordance with Regional design specifications and planning policies;

- Widen the road allowance to accommodate on-road reserved cycling lanes, as recommended in the Context Sensitive Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines ("Neighbourhood Connector - Avenue" classification);
• Enhance the Weber Street and King Street intersection by increasing storage capacity for the southbound left-turn lane on King Street, the eastbound left-turn lane on Weber Street and the westbound right-turn lane on Weber Street;

• Introduce a channelized right-turn lane with pedestrian refuge for westbound Weber Street traffic at King Street;

• Introduce sidewalks and infill a section of new sidewalk fronting vacant properties between Milford Avenue and Blythwood Road;

• Install a pedestrian refuge island at the Weber Street and Blythwood Road intersection;

• Maintain single-sided street lighting on the existing overhead hydro poles, providing double-sided fixtures at pedestrian crossings and sections of the road with five (5) lanes or more, as per the Region’s Illumination policy;

• Install boulevard landscaping to enhance the appearance of the streetscape; and

• Replace sanitary sewer and watermain on behalf of the City of Waterloo.

Project Schedule and Cost

Subject to Council approval of these recommended design improvements, staff will seek the necessary technical approvals from the Ministry of Environment (MOE) and Ministry of Transportation (MTO). MTO approval is required for the proposed multi-use trails through the Highway 85 interchange area.

Presently, construction is scheduled in the Transportation Capital Program for 2014 so that the King Street work can be completed in advance of Rapid Transit work occurring to the north on King Street. Staff is closely monitoring the timing of the nearby work planned under the Rapid Transit project and may consider modifying the timing of this project to minimize overall construction disruption for the public.

The total Region of Waterloo project cost for improvements on King Street and Weber Street is $4,745,000. The City of Waterloo is responsible for funding the cost of the sanitary sewer / watermain improvements on Weber Street and King Street, and the new multi-use trails on King Street. The estimated cost for the City work is approximately $1,250,000.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

The recommended design alternative proposed for King Street and Weber Street support the Region’s Corporate Strategic Plan in the following Focus Areas, Strategic Objectives and Actions:

Focus Area 2.0 - Growth Management and Prosperity: Manage growth to foster thriving and productive urban and rural communities.

Strategic Objective / Action
2.2 Develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs.

2.2.1 Continue to prioritize and implement capital program projects required to meet community needs and ensure sustainability.

Focus Area 3.0 - Sustainable Transportation: Develop greater, more sustainable and safe transportation choices.

Strategic Objective / Action

3.2 Develop, promote and integrate active forms of transportation (cycling and walking).

3.2.1 Work with Local Municipalities and other stakeholders to expand an integrated and safe network of regional, local and off-road cycling and walking routes.

Financial Implications:

The Region’s 2014 Transportation Capital Program and Ten-Year Capital Forecast includes $4,745,000 to be funded from the Roads Rehabilitation Reserve Fund in 2014-2015 to complete detailed design and construction of the proposed improvements on King Street and Weber Street. The City of Waterloo cost for sanitary sewer and watermain improvements on Weber Street and King Street and for their share of the multi-use trails on King Street is estimated to be $1,250,000. The City of Waterloo has confirmed funding is available for the sanitary sewer and watermain work, and that a recommendation will be made to City Council to fund the City’s share of multi-use trails.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Subject to Council approval of Report E-14-010, Council and Administrative Services Division / Corporate Resources Department will be consulted at the time these facilities are constructed regarding a by-law amendment to incorporate reserved bicycle lanes on both sides of Weber Street (Regional Road 8) from Forwell Creek Drive to Blythwood Road.

Attachments:

Appendix A  Report E-13-082: King Street and Weber Street improvements
Appendix B  June 18, 2013 Planning and Works Committee - Delegation presentation
Appendix C  June 18, 2013 Planning and Works Committee – Minutes of meeting
Appendix D  King Street and King Street North Service Road – Proposed revisions
Appendix E  Letters of endorsement from Parkway Ford and WICC

Prepared By: Eric Saunderson, Project Manager, Design and Construction

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Appendix A

Report E-13-082: King Street and Weber Street improvements

REGION OF WATERLOO
TRANSPORTATION & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
Design & Construction

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

DATE: June 18, 2013
FILE CODE: C04-30, 5633, 7042 and 5489

SUBJECT: KING STREET AND WEBER STREET IMPROVEMENTS, CITY OF WATERLOO

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to proposed improvements on King Street (Regional Road 15), Weber Street to Highway 85, and on Weber Street (Regional Road 8), Forwell Creek Road to Blythwood Road, in the City of Waterloo:

a) approve the Recommended Design Alternative for King and Weber Streets as outlined in Report E-13-082; and

b) amend Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as proposed herein, upon completion of construction to accommodate the following modifications:

i) Remove to Schedule 1, Weber Street (Regional Road 8), King Street (Regional Road 15) to Kitchener City Limits;

ii) Add to Schedule 1, No Parking Anytime on both sides of King Street (Regional Road 15), Weber Street to Highway 85, and on Weber Street (Regional Road 8), Blythwood Road to Kitchener City Limits, in the City of Waterloo; and

iii) Add to Schedule 24, Reserved Lane Anytime on Both Sides of Weber Street (Regional Road 8) from Forwell Creek Road to Blythwood Road for Bicycles.

SUMMARY:

The Region of Waterloo is planning road improvements on King Street, Weber Street to Highway 85, and Weber Street, Forwell Creek Road to Blythwood Road, in the City of Waterloo. Please refer to Appendix ‘A’ for an area map and limits of the proposed work.

In 2012, a Project Team was established to provide direction on these improvements consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo and the City of Waterloo, as well as City of Waterloo Councillors Diane Freeman and Jeff Henry. McCormick Rankin
Corporation (MRC) was retained by the Region for consulting services to complete the engineering design and construction administration for these improvements.

A Public Consultation Centre (PCC) was held at St. David Catholic Secondary School, 4 High Street, Waterloo on Tuesday, October 23, 2012. Approximately twenty-five (25) people attended the PCC with seventeen (17) signing the attendance register. Six (6) comment sheets were received. The predominant concern that was noted in four of the comments sheets was that not enough is being done at the King Street intersection with King Street North Service Road to address delays and collisions at this location. A new northbound left-turn lane is proposed at this location to reduce collisions and to improve traffic operations at this unsignalized intersection; however staff have again reviewed the most recent traffic data and forecasts at this location and has confirmed that signalization or a roundabout at this location is not warranted based on the Region’s warrant criteria.

Other public comments included: concern with an adjacent commercial access and its adverse impact on queuing in the southbound left-turn lane on King Street at the Weber Street intersection; a request to implement now the “possible future” multi-use trail on King Street; and a request to consult with St. David Catholic Secondary School staff throughout the detailed design process.

Based on a review of the public comments received and technical information gathered during the preliminary design phase of the project, the Project Team is recommending that Regional Council approve the following improvements for King Street and Weber Street in the City of Waterloo:

King Street - pavement rehabilitation, underground infrastructure replacement or repair (storm sewer, sanitary sewer, watermain) where warranted, lengthening the southbound left-turn lane at Weber Street by shortening the northbound left-turn lane to the commercial access opposite Blue Springs Drive, road widening for a new northbound left-turn lane at King Street North Service Road, road realignment between King Street North Service Road and Highway 85, introduction of a landscape median, and construction of multi-use trails on both sides of King Street from Weber Street northerly through the Highway 85 interchange to Conestogo Road (west side) and to Conestoga Mall (east side) to connect to the future Rapid Transit station.

Weber Street - full depth road reconstruction, replacement of the road base, widening for bike lanes, widening for a pedestrian refuge island at Blythwood Road, widenings for construction of a westbound right-turn lane at King Street and extending the eastbound left-turn lane at King Street, installation of new sidewalk on the east side adjacent to vacant commercial land, underground infrastructure replacement (storm sewer, sanitary sewer, watermain), reconstruction of the driveway entrance to St. David Catholic Secondary School to a full movement entrance, and replacement/lengthening of the Grand River Transit school bus stop adjacent to the school.

Subject to Council approval of these recommended design improvements, staff will seek technical approvals from partnering agencies, specifically the Ministry of Environment (MOE) and Ministry of Transportation (MTO). The Ministry of Transportation has been contacted by Regional staff and the consultant McCormick Rankin Corporation
regarding multi-use trails through the King Street and Highway 85 interchange. MTO staff has endorsed the design proposal in principle. A formal detailed design submission will be completed in the months ahead to secure final approvals under the MTO encroachment permit process.

Presently, construction is tentatively scheduled in the Transportation Capital Program for 2015 although staff are closely monitoring the timing of nearby work planned under the Rapid Transit project on King Street between Conestogo Road and Northfield Drive. As such, it is the intention of staff to accelerate the design process and complete the tender documents by the end of this year, to be in a position to advance construction on King Street between Weber Street and Highway 85 to 2014 if necessary, for traffic management reasons and to minimize construction disruption for the public.

The total Region of Waterloo project cost for improvements on King Street and Weber Street is $4,500,000 to be funded from the Roads Rehabilitation Reserve Fund. The City of Waterloo is responsible for funding the cost of the sanitary sewer / watermain improvements on Weber Street and King Street, and the new multi-use trails on King Street where sidewalk does not currently exist. The estimated cost for the City work is approximately $1,250,000. The City of Waterloo has confirmed funding is available for the sanitary sewer and watermain work, and that a recommendation will be made to City Council to fund the City’s share of multi-use trails as part of their 2014 budget deliberations.

1. Background

King Street and Weber Street are arterial roads that provide important north-south transportation links through the City of Waterloo and provide local access to numerous businesses, a secondary school and a number of residential subdivisions / commercial properties. Both roads have been identified for improvements through the Region’s Transportation Capital Program, to address poor pavement condition, to expand and improve active transportation and transit facilities, to address safety and operational issues at intersections, and to replace or repair deteriorated underground services. Based on these needs, the Project Team established a preliminary design in 2012 which included the following proposed improvements:

King Street - pavement rehabilitation, underground infrastructure replacement or repair (storm sewer, sanitary sewer, watermain) where warranted, lengthening the southbound left-turn lane at Weber Street by shortening the northbound left-turn lane to the commercial access opposite Blue Springs Drive, road widening for a new northbound left-turn lane at King Street North Service Road and consideration of a multi-use trail on King Street from Weber Street northerly through the Highway 85 interchange to connect to the future Rapid Transit station.

Weber Street - full depth road reconstruction, replacement of the road base, widening for bike lanes, widening for a pedestrian refuge island at Blythwood Road, widenings for construction of a westbound right-turn lane at King Street and extending the eastbound left-turn lane at King Street, installation of new sidewalk on the east side adjacent to vacant commercial land, underground infrastructure replacement or repair (storm sewer, sanitary sewer, watermain) where warranted, reconstruction of the driveway entrance to
St. David Catholic Secondary School to a full movement entrance, and replacement/lengthening of the Grand River Transit school bus stop adjacent to the school.

2. Public Consultation

A Public Consultation Centre (PCC) was held at St. David Catholic Secondary School, 4 High Street, Waterloo on Tuesday, October 23, 2012. Notices were placed in the local papers advertising the PCC. Signboards were erected on site in advance of the PCC and notices were hand delivered to area residents, property owners, and businesses directly adjacent to the road improvement limits.

Approximately twenty-five (25) people attended the PCC with seventeen (17) signing the attendance register. Six (6) comment sheets were received. Plans showing the proposed improvements were on display at the PCC and Project Team representatives were present to answer questions and receive feedback. Appendix ‘B.1’ shows the typical cross-sections presented at the PCC.

A summary of the written comments received at the PCC are included in Appendix ‘C’. The main issues raised by the public at the PCC were:

i) Intersection improvements at King Street and King Street North Service Road

Public Comments

Four comments were received requesting the Region to consider further improvements to the King Street intersection at King Street North Service Road because of concerns with delay and collisions. Two comments were provided by local residents and the other two comments were provided by representatives of the Waterloo Inn and Conference Centre (WICC).

Acting on behalf of WICC, MTE Consultants provided a detailed letter requesting the Region to consider the following additional improvements to the King Street design:

- Installation of traffic signals at King Street and King Street North Service Road, coordinating the signals with the nearby King Street and Blue Springs Drive intersection; or

- Installation of a roundabout at King Street and King Street North Service Road; or

- Installation of a roundabout at King Street and Blue Springs Drive (to allow northbound vehicles exiting King Street North Service Road to turn right and make a u-turn at Blue Springs Drive);

- Improvements to the King Street North Service Road to provide additional storage for the northbound left-turn lane so that right-turn vehicles do not have to wait behind queuing vehicles; and
Incorporate a ‘painted island refuge’ on King Street so that northbound vehicles making left-turn movements from King Street North Service Road only need to wait for a gap of traffic in one direction at a time.

Project Team Response

It had been recognized that operational improvements were needed at the King Street North Service Road intersection with King Street. Based on the type of collisions experienced at this location and the volume of traffic, a new left-turn lane on King Street is warranted and is proposed to be constructed as part of this project. The addition of this left-turn lane is intended to reduce the number of rear-end collisions and improve the operation of this unsignalized intersection.

It is Regional practice to consider the installation of traffic control signals or a roundabout if Regional intersection signal warrants have been met. Staff have reviewed the most recent traffic data and forecasts at this location and it has been confirmed that signalization or a roundabout at this location is not warranted based on the Region’s warrant criteria, which is modelled after provincial standards established by the Ontario Ministry of Transportation. Traffic volumes used in the warrant analysis are based on traffic counts during the busiest 8-hours of a weekday and are considered representative of a typical day. The criteria used to establish the need for traffic control signals includes collision history, vehicular / pedestrian volumes and a detailed assessment of the roadway characteristics.

It is recognized that much of the delay concerns at the King Street North Service Road intersection occur at the conclusion of events at the WICC. These event-based volumes and delays are not captured in a typical warrant analysis and are not therefore used to determine when signals or other improvements are required. It is also noted that an alternate exit is available for WICC patrons at the rear of the property to Weber Street. In addition, staff are discussing minor widening opportunities on King Street North Service Road with the City of Waterloo which would improve capacity for turning vehicles entering King Street. Any improvements on King Street North Service Road, a City road, would have to be endorsed and funded by the City. The WICC consultant has been advised of the warrant criteria and the basis for the Region’s recommendations at this intersection. A copy of the Region’s detailed response to all of the suggestions made by the WICC consultant is found in Appendix ‘D’.

ii) Southbound Left-Turn Lane at the King Street / Weber Street Intersection

Public Comment

One concern was raised regarding the southbound turning movements at the King Street and Weber Street intersection, specifically the queuing of southbound vehicles when other southbound motorists are turning left to enter the commercial plaza access just north of the intersection. The concern is that vehicles waiting to enter the plaza delay motorists attempting to turn left at the intersection.

Project Team Response

It is acknowledged by staff that queued vehicles waiting to turn into the commercial
plaza access (100 metres north of the King Street / Weber Street intersection) do occasionally interrupt the flow of queued vehicles turning left at Weber Street. This commercial access is an enter-only condition that was approved by Regional staff when the development (that includes National Sports, Chapters and Wholesale Club) was constructed in the 1990’s. Since there are very few collisions attributed to this condition, staff recommend that the current condition be maintained without change.

iii) Other Comments

Two other comments were received as follows:

- A request to implement now the “possible future” multi-use trails on King Street from Weber Street northerly through the Highway 85 interchange to Conestogo Road and Conestoga Mall. The multi-use trails are now included as part of the Recommended Design Alternative as discussed in the next section of this report; and

- A request to consult with St. David Catholic Secondary School (SDCSS) staff throughout the detailed design process. Staff have committed to continue to work with SDCSS staff during the detailed design phase of the project.

3. Active Transportation on King Street

King Street in Waterloo has been identified as a critical link between major employment lands, the universities, residential developments and key destinations / attractions such as Conestoga Mall and the Region’s proposed Conestoga Mall Rapid Transit station (scheduled to be operational in 2017). It is the intent of Regional staff to integrate Rapid Transit stations with other forms of transit and active transportation infrastructure, to achieve a balanced transportation system and providing mode transportation choice for the public.

This particular section of King Street has been identified as an Urban Community Connector in the Region’s Corridor Design Guideline, of which the primary objective of this classification is to move goods and people effectively. The focus for Community Connectors is to accommodate vehicular traffic while at the same time considering higher order transit and active transportation facilities as part of the planning / engineering design process. Grand River Transit (GRT) currently provides conventional bus service along the King Street corridor and is also planning to integrate an iXpress route to enhance connectivity with Conestoga Mall, Manulife Financial and St. David Catholic Secondary School.

In terms of active transportation, the Project Team has considered various alternatives on King Street between Weber Street and Highway 85. Presently, on-road cycling facilities are proposed on the adjacent corridors of Weber Street and Northfield Drive in the years ahead. On-road cycling was considered as part of the preliminary design process for King Street; however it was concluded that on-road cycling lanes would present too many points of conflict with traffic at the highway interchange ramps and therefore a consistent and user-friendly on-road cycling facility could not be achieved.
In addition, vehicular speed is excessive on this section of King Street and not conducive for the average cyclist. Regional studies have shown that the general population is comprised of people attracted to cycling by the significant advances the Region has made developing its network and supporting infrastructure. Some cyclists are comfortable sharing the road with motorists in high-speed conditions, but most prefer to cycle in off-road facilities separated from traffic when higher speeds exist.

Under these circumstances, the preferred approach for this project is a multi-use trail on both sides of King Street, supported by landscaped boulevards and improved active transportation crossing opportunities through the Highway 85 interchange. At the PCC, a multi-use trail on King Street was shown as a “possible future” improvement. Subsequent to the PCC, the Project Team has established a multi-use trail design that can be implemented with this project. It is now proposed that multi-use trails be extended on both sides of King Street through Highway 85 to Conestogo Road (west side) and to Conestoga Mall (east side) to provide cycling / pedestrian connections to the future Rapid Transit station at Conestoga Mall. In accordance with current Regional policy, the local municipality must fund multi-use trails where a sidewalk currently exists. City of Waterloo staff has committed to make a recommendation to City Council as part of their 2014 budget deliberations that the City fund their share of the cost for these trails to allow them to be constructed as part of this project.

The Project Team is also recommending other improvements on King Street that will encourage slower speeds and provide safe separation of pedestrians / cyclists from vehicular traffic. It is recommended that King Street be shifted slightly to the west (south of the Highway 85 interchange) to accommodate the 3.0m wide multi-use trail width on the east side where there is a steep drop-off to a low area. In addition, this shift in King Street will also allow for a grassed boulevard between the proposed trail and the road as well as a raised centre median island with grass and trees. These improvements would better accommodate pedestrians and alternate modes of travel through this corridor, would enhance the streetscape and the centre median would also provide a traffic calming and speed reduction effect. Appendix ‘B.2’ illustrates the existing road cross-section as well as the recommended modified cross-section on King Street that was developed following the PCC to incorporate the multi-use trails. This recommended modification to the King Street cross-section south of the Highway 85 interchange was communicated to all residents/owners and to those who attended the October 2012 PCC by way of a letter dated June 3, 2013, which also included a description of the Project Team’s other final recommendations as outlined in this report.

4. Ministry of Transportation (MTO) Approval

Presently, staff are seeking technical approvals from the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) for the proposed improvements on King Street through the Highway 85 interchange. The MTO have been contacted by Regional staff and the consultant, McCormick Rankin Corporation, regarding multi-use trails through the King Street and Highway 85 interchange. Ministry staff have responded and endorsed the preliminary design recommendation in principle although a formal design drawing submission will be required for final approvals under the MTO encroachment permit process. Subject to
Ministry approval, it is the intent of staff to construct these improvements under the Region’s contract for King Street and Weber Street.

5. **Recommended Design Alternative**

Based on a review of the public comments received and technical information gathered during the preliminary design phase of the project, the Project Team is recommending therefore that

Regional Council approve the following improvements for King Street and Weber Street in the City of Waterloo:

**King Street - Weber Street to Highway 85**

- Reconstruct the current four (4) lane urban cross-section, standardizing lane widths in accordance with Regional design specifications and planning policies (ie. 3.25m turning lanes, 3.35m inner lanes and 3.65m curb lanes);

- Enhance the King Street and Blue Springs Drive intersection by extending the storage of the southbound left-turn lane on King Street;

- Introduce a northbound left-turn lane at the King Street and King Street North Service Road intersection;

- Extend the southbound left-turn lane at the King Street and Weber Street intersection;

- Realign King Street between King Street North Service Road and the MTO signalized intersection at Highway 85 (near Manulife Financial) in order to provide for a 3.0m multi-use trail and 1.4m landscape boulevard on the east side of the roadway;

- Introduce a 2.8m centre landscape median between King Street North Service Road and the MTO signalized intersection at Highway 85 (near Manulife Financial) as recommended in the Context Sensitive Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines (“Urban Community Connector” classification);

- Install boulevard and median landscaping where possible to enhance the appearance of the streetscape;

- Provide a 3.0m multi-use trail on both sides of King Street from Weber Street northerly through the Highway 85 interchange to Conestogo Road (west side) and to Conestoga Mall (east side) to connect to the future Rapid Transit station as shown in Appendix ‘B-2’;

- Install double-sided street lighting where illumination is currently not provided;

- Coordinate watermain valve and fire hydrant replacement with City of Waterloo Operations staff where required; and,
- Replace black pipe sanitary service connections on behalf of the City of Waterloo.

- Weber Street - Forwell Creek Road to Blythwood Road, City of Waterloo

- Reconstruct the current four (4) lane urban cross-section, standardizing lane widths in accordance with Regional design specifications and planning policies (eg. 3.25m turning lanes and 3.35m through lanes);

- Widen the road allowance to accommodate 1.25m on-road reserved cycling lanes, as recommended in the Context Sensitive Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines (“Neighbourhood Connector - Avenue” classification), increasing the width of the cycling lane to 1.50m at right-turn traffic lanes;

- Relocate existing utility hydro poles and aerial plant to accommodate on-road cycling lanes, new road alignments and widening for turning lanes;

- Enhance the Weber Street and King Street intersection by increasing storage capacity for the southbound left-turn lane on King Street, the eastbound left-turn lane on Weber Street and the westbound right-turn lane on Weber Street;

- Introduce a channelized right-turn lane with pedestrian refuge for westbound Weber Street traffic at King Street;

- Modernize the traffic signals at the Weber Street and King Street intersection, considering options to enhance pedestrian crossings by considering ‘off-set’ crosswalk markings (which provide additional space for turning vehicles to wait while pedestrians are crossing);

- Reconstruct the existing pavement, replace granular base and hot mix asphaltic concrete;

- Introduce 2.1m wide sidewalks and infill a section of new sidewalk fronting vacant properties between Milford Avenue and Blythwood Road;

- Install a pedestrian refuge island at the Weber Street and Blythwood Road intersection;

- Maintain single-sided street lighting on the existing overhead hydro poles, providing double-sided fixtures at pedestrian crossings and sections of the road with five (5) lanes or more, as per the Region’s Illumination policy;

- Install boulevard landscaping to enhance the appearance of the streetscape; and

- Replace sanitary sewer and watermain on behalf of the City of Waterloo.

6. Project Cost

The Region is funding the cost of the Regional road improvements and new sidewalk on King Street and Weber Street. The estimated total cost for these improvements including engineering, construction and other project costs is $4,500,000. The City of
Waterloo would be responsible for funding the cost of the sanitary sewer / watermain improvements on Weber Street and King Street, and the City’s share of multi-use trails on King Street between Weber Street and Conestogo Road. The estimated cost of the City’s contribution is $1,250,000.

7. Project Schedule

Subject to Council approval of the Recommended Design Alternative and confirmation of technical / financial approvals, construction of King Street and Weber Street is currently scheduled in the Transportation Capital Program for 2015. Staff are assessing the impact of this schedule in light of nearby work planned under the Rapid Transit project, anticipated to commence in 2015 on King Street at the Conestogo Road intersection (Conestoga Mall station).

It is the intention of the Project Team to accelerate the design process and complete the tender documents for the King Street / Weber Street project in late 2013, thereby providing an opportunity to advance the start of construction on this project to 2014 to mitigate overall construction disruption for the public. Following confirmation of the Rapid Transit project schedule and subject to approval of the advancement of funds from 2015 to 2014, the contract for the King Street / Weber Street project would be tendered to have work completed on King Street 2014 in advance of the Rapid Transit construction work on King Street. Weber Street would be scheduled to follow in 2015.

With the exception of the multi-use trail on the west side of King Street, the proposed work on King Street does not require property purchase; however since property acquisitions would be required for the west-side multi-use trail, this trail would have to be constructed as separate construction work in 2015.

It is anticipated that the staging of construction work on both King Street and Weber Street will permit one through lane of traffic to be maintained in each direction during construction. Local access to businesses, emergency services and pedestrian traffic will be maintained at all times throughout each stage of the work.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The recommended design alternative proposed for King Street and Weber Street support the Region’s Corporate Strategic Plan in the following Focus Areas, Strategic Objectives and Actions:

Focus Area 2.0 - Growth Management and Prosperity: Manage growth to foster thriving and productive urban and rural communities.

Strategic Objective / Action

2.2 Develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs.

2.2.1 Continue to prioritize and implement capital program projects required to meet community needs and ensure sustainability.
Focus Area 3.0 - Sustainable Transportation: Develop greater, more sustainable and safe transportation choices.

 Strategic Objective / Action

3.2 Develop, promote and integrate active forms of transportation (cycling and walking).

3.2.1 Work with Local Municipalities and other stakeholders to expand an integrated and safe network of regional, local and off-road cycling and walking routes.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

The Region’s 2013 Transportation Capital Program and Ten-Year Forecast includes $3,225,000 of funding in 2013-2015 to complete detailed design and construction of the proposed improvements on King Street and Weber Street. Due to an extension in the scope of work as well as an updated estimate of the project budget, the Region of Waterloo component of the project is now estimated to cost $4,500,000. Therefore, a budget increase of $1,275,000 will be submitted for consideration as part of the Region’s 2014 budget deliberations to cover the updated estimated cost of this project.

The City of Waterloo cost for sanitary sewer and watermain improvements on Weber Street and King Street and for their share of the multi-use trails on King Street is estimated to be $1,250,000.

**OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:**

Subject to Council approval of Report E13-082, Council and Administrative Services Division / Corporate Resources Department will be consulted at the time these facilities are constructed regarding a by-law amendment to incorporate reserved bicycle lanes on both sides of Weber Street (Regional Road 8) from Forwell Creek Drive to Blythwood Road.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A</td>
<td>Project Area and Key Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B.1</td>
<td>Typical Cross-sections presented at Public Consultation Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B.2</td>
<td>Modified Cross-section for King Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C</td>
<td>Public Consultation Centre Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix D</td>
<td>Letter Response to Waterloo Inn and Conference Centre (WICC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PREPARED BY:** Eric Saunderson, Project Manager, Transportation Base Program

**APPROVED BY:** Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
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Project Area and Key Plan

WEBER STREET (REGIONAL ROAD No. 8)
BLYTHWOOD ROAD TO FORWELL CREEK ROAD
KING STREET (REGIONAL ROAD No.15)
WEBER STREET TO HWY 85
CITY OF WATERLOO

Appendix B.1
Typical Cross-Sections

REGIONAL ROAD No. 15
(KING STREET NORTH)
PROPOSED TYPICAL CROSS SECTION
WITH MULTI-USE TRAIL
(2012 PCC VERSION)

REGIONAL ROAD No. 8
(WEBER STREET NORTH)
PROPOSED TYPICAL CROSS SECTION
WITH BIKE Lanes

Region of Waterloo
City of Waterloo
Appendix B.2

Modified Cross-Section for King Street

Existing Typical Cross Section

Proposed Typical Cross Section with Multi-Use Trail

Regional Road No. 15
(King Street North)
King Street North Service Road to Highway 85
City of Waterloo
### Appendix C

#### Public Consultation Centre Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Bingeman</td>
<td>12 Halliwell Dr., Kitchener</td>
<td>Re: King St. N and King St. N service road – this intersection has gotten worse over the years. Pre Conestoga Mall, there was little to not problem (1978), now it is next door to a death trap. This area is probably on Waterloo's worst areas for accidents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macie Szblag</td>
<td>108 Blythwood Rd Rd</td>
<td>Include multi-use lanes on King Street (called as a future possible ASAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extend bike lane on Weber Street behind Blythwood Rd towards Northside (by the Sobey’s store)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td></td>
<td>I understood from you that a new southbound right turn lane would be constructed on King at Weber. However when I reviewed the notice that was sent to property owners and tenants in the area I see no mention of that. I think this would help move the traffic westbound on Weber in a more efficient manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>My biggest concern is the entrance beside Chapters on King. As I mentioned cars turning left into Chapters, on King southbound, clog the left turn lane for Weber Street eastbound. The Region’s proposal to lengthen that southbound left turn lane is not going to move the cars any faster to the intersection – people will still be stopping traffic in an effort the turn left into Chapters and cars will line up behind them. Another thing which I did not think of last night, which I foresee causing more problems is the traffic on the new Weber St. westbound right turn lane at King. This traffic will move much faster on to King northbound and I foresee collisions with slow moving vehicles trying to make a left turn from King southbound to Chapters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I agree with the gentleman who said traffic from the service road making a left turn to go northbound on King will have an even harder time than they do now (once you install the proposed left turn lane into the service road). I assume the majority of the cars from the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Golem</td>
<td>302-30 Blue Springs Dr. Waterloo N2J 4T2</td>
<td>I like what you are proposing for Weber Street, especially the dedicated right turn ramp heading westbound on Weber and emptying onto King going northbound. Creating a left turn lane onto the King Street North Service Road is a slight improvement over what exists today but in the final analysis it just amounts to tinkering. Accidents will still occur, especially caused by people turning left onto King out of the Service Road. The Service Road needs to be extended in a U shape around the back of the IMS building so it can empty out at the Blue Springs Drive corner. It will be expensive to expropriate the required land to do this, but it’s the only viable long term solution to the existing design problem. I realize there are jurisdictional issues with the King Street entry onto the expressway and into Manulife, but the Region and the Province ought to get together to fix that intersection. Far more accidents occur there than at the entrance to the Service Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Lejcar</td>
<td>MTE Consultants</td>
<td>Regarding the planned road improvements to King Street and further to our attendance at the open house held at St. David Catholic Secondary School on Tuesday, October 23rd, 2012 to review the same, the foregoing has been prepared on behalf of our client, Waterloo Inn, and is presented as follows for consideration in the design development. We understand the proposal at the King and North Service road intersection is to provide a ‘Northbound left turn lane’ into the site based on traffic volume warrants. Discussions with the Region have indicated there are currently eighteen (18) documented traffic accidents (six (6) forecasted) at this intersection, nine (9) of which were rear end collisions to northbound traffic waiting to turn left onto North Service Road. Presently, and as we understand, there is no warrant for traffic signals at this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The location and consideration of a roundabout is precluded based on this warrant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Waterloo Inn has the capacity to accommodate over 3000 people between their overnight rooms and the convention rentals. Furthermore, the surrounding developable properties at full build-out could also contribute significantly to future traffic volumes and turning movements at this intersection. These existing and future considerations, paired with the proposed ‘Northbound left turn lane’ may potentially compound the already unsafe condition for eastbound left turn movements onto King Street from the North Service Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We have discussed with you the opportunity to investigate traffic counts further for at least a 7-day period (day/night) to accurately define traffic demands and further review traffic signal warrants at this intersection to address the following concerns and considerations: 1 – Number of vehicles and turning movements; 2 – Number of accidents and the possibility they could increase and become more serious; 3 – Delays (excess time) caused in the inability to make left turns exiting North Service Road; 4 – Delays (excess time) caused to right turning movements as a result of queued left turning movements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Please notify the undersigned and the Waterloo Inn of when you intend to complete the traffic counts at this intersection to ensure that we are capturing what would be considered average traffic demands. We ask that the Region review the following options with respect to the intersection at North Service Road and King Street in addressing the aforementioned considerations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 – Install traffic signals linking North Service Road signals to Blue Springs Road signals to address operation issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 – Install roundabout at North Service Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 – Install roundabout at Blue Springs Road to allow right turn movements from North Service Road to ultimately head northbound on King Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|      |         | 4 – Improvements to the North Service road leg to incorporate left turn storage so as not to impede right
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Virina Elgawly       | 480 Dutton Dr. Waterloo, ON N2L 4C6 | Staff at the Waterloo Catholic District School Board has reviewed the Notice of Public Consultation Centre for the above mentioned project. The notice states that the improvements include:  
- The reconstruction of the St. David Catholic Secondary School driveway to Weber Street as a full movement entrance; and  
- Replacement/lengthening of the Grand River Transit school special bus stop adjacent to the school.  
Consequently, we kindly request that we are kept informed of the process by sending us any updated information as it becomes available, timing for the project, and the potential designs being contemplated.  
In addition, the Notice states that the proposed construction is planned for spring/summer 2015. We also request that the construction is only conducted during the summer so as not to interfere with school operations. Also, as stated above, if you could advise us of actual construction times closer to the date that would be great as it may affect when we can move portables to and from the site. |
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Public Consultation Centre Response

Waterloo Inn and Conference Centre (WICC)

Refer To:
Eric Saunderson
519-575-4746

File No:
5633

Date:
January 7, 2013

Re: Weber Street and King Street Improvements – North Service Road Entrance to Waterloo Inn

Dear Mr. Lejcar and Ms. D’Alton,

I am writing in response to your letter to John Lee dated November 2, 2012, regarding the King and Weber Streets reconstruction project planned for 2015, and more specifically, the improvements proposed to the King Street North Service Road intersection. If you are not aware, John Lee retired on December 20, 2012, and I have assumed John’s responsibilities on the King and Weber Streets project.

Northbound Left-turn Lane at King Street North Service Road

As presented at the Public Consultation Centre (PCC) held at St. David’s secondary school on October 23, 2012, it is the Region’s intent to improve the northbound turning movements at the King Street North Service Road intersection by introducing a dedicated left-turn lane with 30m of vehicular storage. A review completed by the Region’s Traffic Engineering section concluded that a dedicated northbound left-turn lane is warranted based on traffic volume entering/existing the intersection. The five-year collision history (2007 to 2011) shows that there were 19 collisions at the King Street/North Service Road intersection. 21% of the collisions may be correctable with the installation of a northbound left-turn lane. These collisions include motorists attempting a northbound left turn from King Street onto North Service Road and being struck. It is anticipated that the addition of this left-turn lane will reduce the number of rear-end collisions and improve the operation of this unsignalized intersection.

Signalization at King Street North Service Road

Current Regional practice is to consider the installation of traffic control signals or a roundabout if Regional warrants have been met. The warrant evaluation is based on established provincial guidelines as documented in the Ontario Traffic Manual (OTM) Book 12 and developed through the Ministry of Transportation of Ontario. Traffic volumes used in the analysis are based on traffic counts during the busiest 8-hours of a weekday and are considered representative of a ‘typical’ day. Accordingly, traffic volumes generated by special events do not constitute ‘typical’ weekday volumes and are not commonly used in assessing signal warrants. The criteria used to establish the need for traffic control signals includes collision history, vehicular / pedestrian volumes and a detailed assessment of the roadway characteristics.

Additional traffic control was reviewed as part of this review and determined to be unwarranted given the current vehicular volumes entering and existing the intersection. In addition to the volumetric and collision review, the proximity of the Blue Springs Road intersection poses a potential delay / timing / queuing concern with vehicular traffic on King Street. For this reason Regional staff generally does not recommend that traffic control signals be installed at an intersection which is located less than 200 metres from an existing traffic control signal. The spacing between Blue Springs Road and King Street North Service Road is approximately 140m.
Should future proposed development conditions result in the need for additional traffic control measures, traffic signals could be retrofitted in at this location at that time.

**Roundabout at Blue Springs Road**

As a follow up to your request for roundabout consideration at the King Street and Blue Springs Road intersection, the Region's Traffic Engineering section was consulted further and a review of the latest collision history for the past five years (2007 to 2011) was conducted. The collisions during this timeframe are less than anticipated where, 16 collisions were documented when 53 were expected based on a probability assessment of annual traffic volumes. Of the 16 collisions recorded, only 1 collision resulted in an injury. Based on this historical collision data, a roundabout would not be warranted to address collisions at the King Street and Blue Springs Road intersection.

**Traffic Exiting King Street North Service Road**

As noted previously, traffic signals are not warranted at King Street and King Street North Service Road based on established provincial guidelines for the determination of signal warrants. It is acknowledged that the Waterloo Inn and Conference Centre hosts special events on occasion which may attract in excess of 3,000 guests, causing delays for patrons egressing the King Street North Service Road.

Between 2007 and 2011, there were 10 collisions involving vehicles exiting King Street North Service Road that may have been avoided with traffic signals. The OTM collision-based warrant requires 5 collisions per year for 3 consecutive years before traffic signals are considered. Accordingly, the existing condition and collision history do not warrant consideration of traffic signals at King Street and King Street North Service Road.

The suggestion to extend the proposed centre lane in the middle of King Street to be used as a refuge area by northbound vehicles exiting King Street North Service Road cannot be formalized as it contravenes the Transportation Association of Canada (TAC) guidelines for Intersection design. It is anticipated that such a design would likely lead to an increase of sideswipe collisions.

**King Street North Service Road Improvements**

Improvements on King Street North Service Road, such as extending the limits of work to incorporate right and left-turn lanes onto King Street can be considered as part of this project. Extended turn lanes would improve the capacity for vehicles exiting the King Street North Service Road during peak periods. Further discussions will be required with the City of Waterloo as King Street North Service Road is under the City's jurisdiction and would therefore require City endorsement / funding.

Please feel free to contact me should you wish to discuss these options further.

Regards,

Eric Saunderson
Project Manager

ES/mw

cc:  Gary MacDonald, Design and Construction, Region of Waterloo
     Mike Jones, Traffic Engineering, Region of Waterloo
     Dan Green, MRC
     Randal Harder, MRC
     Jessica Kellerman, City of Waterloo

DOCS # 1390536
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Delegation Notes and Presentations

MTE

EXTERNAL MEMORANDUM

TO: Eric Saunderson, PMP CET EIT
COMPANY: Region of Waterloo
EMAIL: Esaunderson@regionofwaterloo.ca

MTE FILE NO.: 01720-400
DATE: June 18th, 2013
FROM: Peter Lejaar, P.Eng.
PROJECT NAME: Waterloo Inn & North Service Road

Re: Presentation to Planning and Works Committee, June 18, 2013
Regional Project File #5633:
Weider Street/King Street Improvements -- North Service Road Entrance, Waterloo Inn/Parkway Ford

Prepared By MTE Consultants Inc.:
Mr. Angelo Innocente (Retired) and Mr. Peter Lejaar, Municipal Division Manager, MTE

In Attendance:
Ms. Mary D'Alton, and Mr. Lawrence Bingeman representing Waterloo Inn
Ms. Carolyn Zenger and Mr. Ken Bast representing the Parkway Ford (Business and Property)

As you are aware, we attended the October 23, 2012 "Public Consultation Centre" and have made recommendations to the Regional Project Team. We thank them for their consideration and efforts and at this time we ask that Planning & Works Committee reconsider some of our concerns.

We have concerns with the ever increasing traffic flow on King Street, and more importantly for safe turning movements for our customers and staff. The Waterloo Inn and Convention Centre hosts special events where there may be in excess of 3,000 guests, combined with Parkway Ford's many clients, their staff and their car/truck offloading in a high density commercial node. This node functions at all hours of the day and night, with a good portion of their peak periods being outside of the normal 8 hour "typical day" for the Regional Traffic counts.

Our concern is that the Region is using traffic counts that were completed on December 9th, 2010. These figures were then utilized to design road improvements for five years down the road in 2015. We had asked the Region in our letter of November 2, 2012 to consider a new 7 day traffic count, to capture both the up and downs of the commercial business trade into the North Service Road and address specifically the safety issues associated with the high number of turning movements at that intersection for now and into the future.

As Businesses and Property Owners, we have concern for the safety of our customers and staff who enter and exit the North Service Road daily. Left turns are a safety hazard now, and will only get worse with densification and increased traffic flow along the King Street Corridor.

Recommendation #1 – We ask that the Planning and Works Committee undertake a Traffic Impact Study for this King Street/North Service Road Intersection utilizing the most recent

MTE Consultants Inc.
www.mte68.com
(2013) Vehicular Traffic Data. As well develop traffic projections that include the full intensification densities that are allowed under the current zoning.

A Traffic Impact Study should be undertaken to include the most current traffic counts, with projections that include the future build out (to current zoning) of the lands in question. Over the next 5-20 years, there will be intense densification along the King Street Corridor. Some of that has already happened on King Street just south of Columbia which is generating a considerable increase in vehicular traffic, and thus impacting the entire King Street Corridor. The TIS should address what are the necessary road improvements to meet both the immediate and long term future needs of this corridor.

Should the TIS find that Traffic Controls are not warranted, we ask that the Region consider safety a priority and reconsider the following improvements:

Recommendation #2

2.1 Installation of underground traffic ductwork and pole bases to allow for a “quick” implementation of Traffic Signals at the North Service Road, when the warrants for signals are reached.

We are of the opinion that traffic has increased tremendously over the last 2-3 years with all of the intensification and Infill Developments that are currently underway. Projected Traffic Warrants for the next 5-20 year period are likely to confirm that a signalized intersection is necessary in the very near future.

2.2 That the design of the proposed median for King Street be such that it provides a safe refuge for left turning vehicles exiting the North Service Road.

The current design width of the median will not accommodate future Traffic Lights. The island should be a 5.0 m width to allow for a concrete island and a Northbound Left Turn Lane.

As well, for the safety of the Left Turn Movement exiting the North Service Road, cars will have to cross 2 travelled lanes and they will need a “safe refuge area” in the middle of the roadway before they can accelerate northbound. We had recommended back in November that a “painted island” be considered which would allow vehicles to accelerate northbound on King Street and ease into traffic. For safety, a 5.0m median width with curbs should be installed now to accommodate the traffic pole bases, and as well allow for the safe acceleration of northbound traffic to ease onto King Street.

In summary, we believe a “Traffic Impact Study” that utilizes projections for the full build-out and densification of the immediate area, will identify clearly, what are the future needs of this King Street/North Service Road Intersection, and what needs to be completed now.

I have asked both Parkway Ford and the Waterloo Inn to make a brief comment with regards to increased traffic and safety concerns that they have for their customers and staff.
Appendix C

Planning and Works Committee Meeting Minutes – June 18, 2013

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO
PLANNING AND WORKS COMMITTEE
MINUTES

Tuesday, June 18, 2013
9:07 a.m.
Regional Council Chambers
150 Frederick Street, Kitchener

Present were: Chair J. Wideman, L. Armstrong, J. Brewer, T. Cowan, D. Craig, R. Deutschmann, T. Galloway, B. Halloran, J. Haalboom, R. Kellerborn, G. Lorentz, J. Mitchell, K. Seiling, S. Strickland, and Z. Zehr

Members absent: C. Millar

DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST UNDER THE MUNICIPAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT


DELEGATIONS


Ross White appeared before Committee representing Waterloo Central Railway. He provided some background information on the history of the Southern Ontario Locomotive Restoration Society. He provided statistics on ridership and how Waterloo Central Railway has contributed to the tourism in the Region of Waterloo. He stated the future of the railroad is in extreme
jeopardy. He summarized his presentation and a copy of the presentation is appended to the original minutes.

Committee members thanked the delegation and the Waterloo Central Railway for their work in the Community and noted the importance of the railway for tourism in the Region.

Staff was asked to report back to Committee with respect to the future of the railway.

MOVED by B. Halloran
SECONDED by T. Galloway

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo extend, for an additional one year term, the existing agreements to permit the Southern Ontario Locomotive Restoration Society to operate a tourist train and locomotive restoration operation on the Waterloo Spur Railway owned by the Regional Municipality of Waterloo as described in Report CR-RS-13-060/E-13-084 dated June 18th, 2013 with such agreements to be to the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor.

CARRIED

b) E-13-082, King Street and Weber Street Improvements, City of Waterloo

Eric Saunderson, Project Manager, Transportation Base Program appeared before Committee with a presentation highlighting;

- Improvements;
- Project;
- Public Consultation Centre (October 2012);
- Project Team Response; and
- Schedule and Budget

A copy of the presentation is appended to the original minutes.

E. Saunderson provided clarification to Committees’ questions regarding the left turn onto King Street North and the design plans for the Service Road.

Some Committee members suggested installing a roundabout and asked about installing actuated signals. Committee members also asked about actuated signals installed in front of the Bilingual School on Erb Street noting those signals were not warranted. Staff noted that actuated lights cause a problem in flow of traffic and stated the actuated lights in front of the Bilingual School have not caused an impact on traffic flow but highlighted that the volume of traffic is low in comparison.

Committee members expressed their concerns with the traffic study noting the timing of the study.

Angelo Innocente, MTE Consultants Inc. appeared before Committee speaking on behalf of Waterloo Inn and Parkway Ford. He stated that he attended the PCC on October 2012 and made recommendations to the project team. He highlighted concerns with increasing traffic flow on King Street. He presented three recommendations to Committee members; that staff undertakes a traffic impact study for the King Street North Service Road intersection; install underground traffic ductwork and pole bases to allow for quick implementation of traffic signals when lights are warranted; and that the median on King Street provides a safe refuge for left turning vehicles exiting the North Service Road.

1418896
A. Innocente introduced Ken Bast from Parkway Ford. He expressed concerns with the safety of staff and customers making left turns onto King Street.

A. Innocente introduced Mary D’Alton from Waterloo Inn. She highlighted the difficulties making a left hand turn onto King Street especially in the evenings and weekends when there is an event going on there. She noted that the Waterloo Inn has done an internal study looking at optimizing the property and stated that Committee needs to take into consideration the future development of the property.

Committee members pointed out the standard warrant study does not work at this intersection because of the unique circumstances.

Staff responded to questions regarding the multiuse trail.

Committee members requested that this item be deferred back to staff to report back to Committee with an updated and more extensive traffic study, the feasibility of actuated signals, the feasibility of implementing a refuge lane on King Street, the feasibility of widening of King Street North Service Road, and the possibility of connection with Blue Springs Drive.

MOVED by S. Strickland
SECONDED by G. Lorentz

THAT The Regional Municipality of Waterloo defer report E-13-082, King Street and Weber Street Improvements, City of Waterloo.

And direct staff to prepare an updated and more extensive traffic study and evaluate the feasibility of actuated signals at the King Street North Service Road, implementing a refuge lane on King Street, widening of King Street North Service Road to create separate left and right turn lanes and connection of the King Street North Service Road with King Street at Blue Springs Drive and report to Planning and Works Committee with the outcomes and a revised, as required, Report E-13-082.

CARRIED

c) P-13-087, Update on Bike Sharing Projects in the Region of Waterloo

Received for information.

Adrian Underhill, The Working Centre provided an update on the Centre. He talked about the Community Access Bicycles project. He highlighted the approach, project funding, how it works, station locations, and memberships. A copy of the presentation is appended to the original minutes.

Committee members asked the delegation about working collaboratively with Grand River Public Bike Share. A. Underhill stated that discussions have occurred with Grand River Public Bike Share and the plan is to continue with their individual project over the next year and discussions will continue.

d) E-13-032, Franklin Boulevard Improvements – Roundabout Design at Franklin Boulevard and Saginaw Parkway, City of Cambridge
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King Street and King Street North Service Road – Proposed Revisions

Appendix E
December 2nd, 2013

MTE File No.: 01726-400

Eric Saunderson  
Project Manager  
Design and Construction  
Region of Waterloo  
150 Frederick Street  
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3

Re: King Street and King Street Service Road Entrance at Waterloo Inn:  

Dear Eric:  

Thank you for your correspondence of November 22, 2013 regarding the Region's Analysis of updated traffic counts to address our concerns with the safety of our customers and staff that must access King Street North from the North Service Road Entrance.  

Please pass on our sincere thanks to your project team and the P&W committee for giving the original proposal for this project a second look. We are appreciative of the following recommendations as per your attached drawing:  

- A modified island design on King Street to include a 40-50m long, 4.0m wide painted refuge area for northbound motorists exiting the North Service Road to wait and merge into King Street northbound traffic;  
- Allowing legal U-turns at the King Street North/Blue Springs intersection;  
- Widening the North Service Road entrance to provide for left and right turns out of the entrance; and  
- Installing underground traffic signal ductwork for future traffic signals which we interpret as a commitment to the imminent future growth and intensification of King St. North  

All of the above are improvements but we would be remiss if we did not express our continued concern that traffic signals would significantly improve safety for users of the North Service Road.
Eric Saunderson, Project Manager  
MTE File No. 01728-400  
December 2, 2013  
Page 2

We acknowledge that at present we do not meet the Region’s warrants for installation of traffic lights but we ask that the intersection continue to be monitored after construction or potential additional safety modifications and the need for traffic signals.

There are a couple of items going forward that we would like to ensure we are all in agreement on. It would be ideal if:

- The Region keep us informed of construction details and schedule so we can work with Region staff and the contractor to help ensure that we mitigate any risks to the safety of our customers, staff and crew on site and that we all work together to ensure efficiency of movement for all.

- That the signal timing on King Street North at the Hwy 85 Ramp/Manulife Entrance and at the Blue Springs intersection be coordinated to allow appropriate breaks in traffic for safe egress from the North Service Road onto King Street North.

Thanks again for the collaborative approach everyone involved has taken on this review. We look forward to further communication from you and your staff both before and during construction and please let us know if there is anything we can do during the construction to assist.

Sincerely,

Mary D’Alton  
President and Managing Director

c.c. Dave Hallman, MTE Consultants Inc.  
Ken Basti, Parkway Ford
December 3, 2013

Eric Saunderson
Project Manager
Design & Construction
Region of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3

Re: King Street and Weber Street Improvements, City of Waterloo

Dear Eric,

We appreciate the efforts made to address our concerns with the proposed changes to the access road for our dealership. Having received a copy of the response by Mary D’Allion of the Waterloo Inn, we also wish to express our appreciation for the willingness of the Region to address our concerns and make some changes to the project.

We do have some issues that are unique to our property. Some of our suppliers and customers will be in vehicles that cannot be accommodated with a legal U-turn at the King St. North and Blue Springs Drive intersection. These vehicles will continue to be a potential safety hazard as they try to complete the safest and most direct access to Highway 85.

Our property has only this one access to King Street so we appreciate an on-going communication of the timing of this project. We appreciate the co-operation of our Waterloo Inn neighbours in giving us access to Weber Street through their property. As there is also a Weber Street project to be completed, we ask that the work be co-ordinated to minimize the impact on the North Waterloo area.

Thank you for your review and we will continue to work together to reduce the inconveniences that any project of this nature will present.

Sincerely,

Ken Bast
Vice President

c.c. Dave Hallman, MTE Consultants Inc.
Mary D’Allion, Waterloo Inn
Region of Waterloo

Transportation and Environmental Services

Rapid Transit

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

Date: January 28, 2014       File Code: A02-30/PW

Subject: Recommended Intersection Modifications at Mill Street and Ottawa Street

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the recommended intersection modifications at Mill Street and Ottawa Street, as per report E-14-009, dated January 28, 2014.

Summary:

ION, the Region of Waterloo’s rapid transit service, is moving forward, with construction starting in 2014 and operation beginning in 2017. As part of the early ION functional design, opportunities to improve traffic operations through the realignment of the Mill Street and Ottawa Street intersection were identified. As a result, a consultant was retained by the Region to conduct an operational analysis of possible functional design modifications that would accommodate the introduction of Light Rail Transit (LRT), which will cross through the intersection of Mill Street and Ottawa Street.

Currently, this intersection is signalized. The north leg of Mill Street has an additional short diverting link (west of the rail lines), which allows southbound right-turns (west towards Homer Watson) and left-turns (towards Courtland Avenue) to bypass the existing traffic signal. Attachment A shows the existing configuration of the intersection with the planned northbound LRT tracks.

Two alternatives for modifications were developed and presented to the public for feedback. Based on this consultation, City of Kitchener preference, and regional staff review, Alternative 1 was selected and the following intersection modifications at Mill
Street and Ottawa Street are recommended (Attachment B):

- Close the north leg of Mill Street that is currently signalized.
- Implement a traffic control signal at the existing stop controlled intersection of Ottawa Street and the diverting link of Mill Street (west of the rail lines).
- Convert the south leg of Mill Street to right-in and right-out only for northbound movements.

Report:

1.0 Description of Alternatives

The proposed alternatives for the intersection modifications at Mill Street and Ottawa Street were evaluated based on a number of factors that affect the operations, safety, social environment and the natural environment. The primary evaluation criteria were LRT operations, GRT integration, and traffic operations. Additional evaluation criteria included:

- Safety
- Efficiency (Level of Service) at Ottawa Street and Mill Street
- Impacts on Ottawa Street at Courtland Avenue
- Impact on Pedestrians and Cyclists
- Impact on Conventional Transit
- Delay to LRT
- Impact to Emergency Vehicle Access
- Capital Costs
- Maintenance Costs
- Property Requirements
- Displacement of Existing Land-Use
- Heritage Impacts
- Streetscape Opportunities
- Flexibility of Traffic Movements with the Area

Based on these criteria, two alternatives were identified as acceptable alternatives.
Alternative 1 (as shown in Attachment B) would close the Mill Street section that currently utilizes the existing traffic control signal. All traffic using the north leg of Mill Street will then use the part of the road that runs parallel to the west side of the rail lines. Left turns (northbound and westbound) would not be permitted at the intersection of Ottawa Street and the south leg of Mill Street. The south leg would also be stop controlled, allowing only right turns for the northbound movements. A new relocated signal will control the intersection of Ottawa Street with the short diverting link of the north leg (west of the rail lines). It is expected that the traffic that would have utilized the prohibited movements will divert to Courtland Avenue.

Alternative 2 (as shown in Attachment C) is similar to Alternative 1, with the exception that southbound left turns from Mill Street would be prohibited. It is expected that the traffic that would have utilized the prohibited movements would primarily divert to Courtland Avenue or as a secondary option Pattandon Avenue.

2.0 Evaluation of the Alternatives

Both alternatives presented are technically acceptable. Both alternatives have the following strengths:

- Establishes the most direct and central connection opportunities between ION and GRT
- Simplest intersection design
- Fewest conflict points with ION operations, vehicular and pedestrian traffic
- Least amount of delay for ION at the intersection
- Highest level of service with the least amount of delay for vehicles at the intersection
- Crosswalks are located at signals with clear and direct sidewalk access
- Lowest cost
- No additional property requirements or impact to existing land uses
- No heritage impacts

Both alternatives have the following challenges:

- Slight delays for GRT at the Courtland Avenue and Ottawa Street intersection
- Some traffic diverted to Courtland Avenue, causing some delay at the Ottawa Street and Courtland Avenue intersection
- Some out of the way travel due to prohibited movements

The strength specific to Alternative 1 is that it provides more flexibility in route options.
through the addition of the left turn from southbound Mill Street to eastbound Ottawa Street. However, Alternative 1 does have slightly longer average delays per vehicle during the a.m., and p.m. peak hours (8.7 seconds and 0.8 seconds, respectively). Even with this delay, Alternative 1 is expected to maintain acceptable levels of service A and B for the traffic operations. In light of the above, Alternative 1 is preferred.

3.0 Public Information Centre

A Public Information Centre (PIC) to present these alternatives to the community was held on:

Date: December 4, 2013 (Drop-in from 4 to 8 p.m.)

Location: Concordia Club

Address: 429 Ottawa St S, Kitchener, N2M 3P6

Letters were sent out to residents and businesses in the adjacent neighbourhoods in the City of Kitchener on November 22, 2013 inviting them to participate in the PIC. Newspaper advertisements were also inserted in the Kitchener Post and the Record on November 29, 2013. Road signs advertising the PIC were posted between November 25 and December 5, 2013. Social media and the rapid transit website were also used to invite residents to participate in the PIC.

4.0 Public Consultation Results

The PIC was very well attended. In total, 77 residents and business owners signed in for the PIC with 37 submitting written comments. A summary of the comments received is as follows:

- Preferred Alternative 1 - 20 responses (54%)
- Preferred Alternative 2 - 8 responses (22%)
- Preferred Neither Alternative - 3 responses (8%)
- Did not state a preference - 6 responses (16%)

A compilation of written comments received from the public is provided in Attachment D.

Participants were asked why they chose their preferred alternative. Participants chose Alternative 1 because of the increased route flexibility for both vehicles and cyclists. Participants who chose Alternative 2 identified overall improvement in delays for the intersection as their rationale for the preference.

The following is a summary of key concerns raised by the participants at the PIC and the recommended mitigation measures:

- Traffic infiltration into the adjacent neighbourhood: Although some traffic may be
diverted to neighbourhood streets, such as Acacia and Lilac, during off peak hours, it is unlikely that vehicles will choose those routes during peak hours due to a lack of traffic control signals. Therefore, vehicles will likely use other major alternative route options such as Courtland Avenue. The neighbourhood traffic on Mill Street will decrease due to the northbound movement becoming right-in and right-out only.

- Pedestrian and cyclist access: Alternative 1 provides more flexibility for cyclist route options. Crosswalks are located at signals with clear and direct sidewalk access for both pedestrians and cyclists.

- Increased traffic congestion at Ottawa Street and Courtland Avenue: Diverting traffic will cause some movements at Ottawa Street and Courtland Avenue to operate at a lower level of service. However, traffic analyses confirm that the additional delays, resulting from the diversion of traffic, are technically acceptable.

- Safety of the Courtland Avenue and Sydney Street South intersection: Although this issue is outside the scope of the rapid transit project, the concerns raised at the PIC have been conveyed to the appropriate Transportation Planning staff for further action.

- Lack of route flexibility: Alternative 1 addresses the concerns of the lack of route flexibility attributed to Alternative 2.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

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

**Financial Implications**

In June 2011, Council approved the implementation of the RT project, including LRT and aBRT, with estimated capital costs of $818 million, in 2014 dollars, with capital funding to be provided by the Province (up to $300 million), the federal government (one third of eligible project costs to a maximum of $265 million) and the Region ($253 million). The RT project and improvements to conventional transit are financed through an annual tax rate increase.

The costs associated with the Mill Street at Ottawa Street intersection modifications are contained within the DBFOM contract and will be included in that component of the overall project.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Transportation Planning, Planning Housing and Community Services
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### Attachment D – Public Comments Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which intersection design alternative do you prefer, 1 or 2?</th>
<th>Why?</th>
<th>Do you have any other comments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>For many residents of Mill St people use Mill St to get to Queen and Park Streets</td>
<td>About the no left turn from northbound Mill to Westbound Ottawa. We are concerned about how we could get to Zehrs and Banks at Laurentian Plaza from our home on Mill St. It might be possible to go to Acacia St and turn left but traffic may be heavier and wait time too long. Alternatives may be to go to Sydney and turn left on Courtland and left again on Ottawa. This would be a very dangerous situation given the curve of Courtland between Mill St and Sydney Streets. A traffic light should make the turn much safer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Which allows left turn Mill St - Ottawa. Allows traffic from Mill</td>
<td>Staff Present - not everyone totally knowledgeable about project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>left lane at Mill St N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Please leave more choices for drivers</td>
<td>I am a daily GRT user. Please give us more frequent bus service. Thanks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I live in the area and I use Mill Street for shopping gas etc.</td>
<td>Turn Ottawa into 4 lanes would help also have sidewalks on both sides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I often travel SB on Mill St and turn left onto Ottawa St NB to go home. Restricting this movement would negatively impact me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>When you go from the north Mill I want to turn left</td>
<td>Traffic lights on Sydney and Courtland - also control speed on curve on Courtland (radar enforcement). Our street Acacia is going to be busier. No more speed bumps on Sydney or Carwood Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Because it allows for a left turn from the north leg of Mill St. onto Ottawa and a continued journey onto the south leg of Mill St to Courtland Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the afternoon, Ottawa and Courtland are very congested. How will this improve? Concerned that traffic at that intersection and around it will become worse.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I do come down Mill to go to Ottawa enough times a week. An advanced left would be great.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I spoke to enough and the presenters - all were polite and helpful despite feeling the heat of people not happy (yet) with the ION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>If we close off Mill St the surrounding streets will have significantly increased traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I do not like either proposal. Mill is a very busy street. To make the car traffic suffer because of more efficiency for light rail does not seem right to me. Have the light rail go over Ottawa / Mill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I have a slight preference for 1 as I like between Mill and Courtland on Ottawa and it makes it much easier to get to my house.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thanks very much.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alt 1 would preserve SB cycling connection that Alt 2 wouldn't have, but there'd be no way to go back</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consider how to preserve cycling connections North and South whether by marked safe alternative routes, two stage left turn boxes, bike refuge in the median, etc. Crosswalk on the east side is angled - it's difficult enough crossing 4 lanes, don't make it worse by lengthening it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Allowing a left turn onto Ottawa from Mill will make my life easier. I constantly go onto the north leg of Mill to get onto Courtland (and then the highway)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would really like to see how they plan to move our freight line to put in LRT because it's already so close to our house/complex. As it stands the freight train is very loud and shakes the houses in our development (Jay Kitchener) and now it's moving closer which is a HUGE concern. I would appreciate being contacted with more specific info on the matter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Due to the turn lane (both) for access to major arteries to commute back and forth to work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would like to have the lane sizes as they need to be larger in the North leg by the church. A 3d view of the intersection is needed. Staff on hand were knowledgeable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>We have a lot of service vehicles that need to access 509 Mill St from the North.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Your organization has done an excellent job getting public input and communicating your plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the two road alignments proposed, my preferred option would be Alternative 1. The left turn lane from eastbound Mill to Northbound Ottawa allows Mill Street to become a viable route for a local bus route which would continue along Courtland Ave to Fairview Park. While an ideal solution would be to realign Mill so it continues to be a through street, there are property and geometry constraints which would limit this possibility. While it is my preferred alternative, Alternative 1 currently provides no alternative for people travelling on bike from the south to continue travelling north on Mill without significant detour. Alternative 2 also removes left turns coming from the north on Mill, completely removing through access. Unless straight movements on Mill are allowed for, there will be situations where cyclists will be either travelling against traffic in the cycling lane, hopping the median, or riding on sidewalks in an area which has the potential for a high volume of vehicle and pedestrian traffic. There are alternative roads, but when biking to get somewhere, people tend to take the route which is either the shortest, or will expend the least amount of energy, even if it means disobeying the law. With Mill being designated as a cycling corridor in Kitchener’s Cycling Master Plan it would make sense to extend the multi-use trail running on the south side of Courtland up Mill Street (which currently has no sidewalks) to Ottawa Street and onwards up Mill St as Sharrows or to connect to Borden. The trail extension would guide cyclists to an intersection where it is safe to cross and will fill in a currently missing link in the trail network. Even without bike infrastructure, the generally low speeds and directness of Mill Street make it an attractive option to get to South Kitchener from the Iron Horse Trail or Downtown.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Of the two road alignments proposed, my preferred option would be Alternative 1. The left turn lane from eastbound Mill to Northbound Ottawa allows Mill Street to become a viable route for a local bus route which would continue along Courtland Ave to Fairview Park. While an ideal solution would be to realign Mill so it continues to be a through street, there are property and geometry constraints which would limit this possibility. While it is my preferred alternative, Alternative 1 currently provides no alternative for people travelling on bike from the south to continue travelling north on Mill without significant detour. Alternative 2 also removes left turns coming from the north on Mill, completely removing through access. Unless straight movements on Mill are allowed for, there will be situations where cyclists will be either travelling against traffic in the cycling lane, hopping the median, or riding on sidewalks in an area which has the potential for a high volume of vehicle and pedestrian traffic. There are alternative roads, but when biking to get somewhere, people tend to take the route which is either the shortest, or will expend the least amount of energy, even if it means disobeying the law. With Mill being designated as a cycling corridor in Kitchener’s Cycling Master Plan it would make sense to extend the multi-use trail running on the south side of Courtland up Mill Street (which currently has no sidewalks) to Ottawa Street and onwards up Mill St as Sharrows or to connect to Borden. The trail extension would guide cyclists to an intersection where it is safe to cross and will fill in a currently missing link in the trail network. Even without bike infrastructure, the generally low speeds and directness of Mill Street make it an attractive option to get to South Kitchener from the Iron Horse Trail or Downtown.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Less traffic on Mill Street with this</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>But really it was hard to tell the differences between them</td>
<td>Was concerned about noise levels from the crossing gates. Do they have audible bells and how loud will they go if so?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Would help traffic flow and stop &quot;short cut&quot; traffic from expressway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Really doesn’t matter. Have a slight preference for 2.</td>
<td>Looking forward to it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eases traffic on Mill and fewer delays at the lights.</td>
<td>I reside at Sydney and Mill St. If we cannot go left onto Ottawa we need to go down Sydney to Acacia or Lilac or Courtland. All the intersections have blind spots, right or left depending on the intersection. Traffic lights at Sydney and Courtland would improve. Safety for vehicles and pedestrians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Although the lack of a left turn from Mill to Ottawa will be an occasional inconvenience to me, I think the overall improvement in delay for the intersection as a whole is preferable.</td>
<td>I am concerned about the amount of traffic that will be diverted from Mill Street northbound to Courtland northbound will overwhelm Courtland and particularly the intersection with Ottawa. I can't see how that intersection will accommodate an increase in traffic seeking to turn left onto Ottawa WB from Courtland NB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The reduction in the average delay during peak hours in the pm.</td>
<td>My concern is the increased amount of traffic in the intersection of Ottawa and Courtland and the areas close to the intersection. This is already an extremely busy intersection and with the decrease in traffic on Mill/Ottawa especially will become more challenging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build whatever and I will adjust my travel habits accordingly</td>
<td>Build it - I will use it!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not matter you will do it anyway</td>
<td>This is a big waste of taxpayers money I don't want higher taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Keep it the way it is.</td>
<td>Do we need this LRT!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>2 Bad options doesn't equal a good choice</td>
<td>Your design options are terrible for folks on the south side of Mill + Ottawa. There concerns with emergency vehicles traveling north or south on Mill Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Concerned with the safety of the homes of people living so close to the tracks. Not in favour of no left hand turn at Mill. Traffic congestion is already bad at Ottawa and Courtland. Closing Mill for turning will add to this congestion. Why are they cutting back on bus services and pushing LRT? How will this effect snow removal?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference - I do not use Mill Street</td>
<td>I'm disappointed that the design did not include a designate left turn lane from Ottawa Street to the north leg of Mill Street. This is an area of congestion / frustration on a daily basis. Otherwise, well done!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whichever one makes the ION move more quickly.</td>
<td>It should be priority over cars.</td>
<td>I am a big supporter of LRT. It should not have to stop for any car traffic or lights. The faster you can make it the better. It's time to stop planning everything around the automobile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stop the whole idea!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Further information of impact of alternative 1 and alternative 2 on Courtland Avenue traffic from Mill to Stirling Avenue is required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region of Waterloo

Transportation and Environmental Services

Rapid Transit

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

Date: January 28, 2014

File Code: A02-30/PW

Subject: Summary of ION Community Relations Activities in 2013

Recommendation:

For information.

Summary:

ION, the Region of Waterloo’s rapid transit service, is well underway and making great progress. Community engagement and public input has been, and will continue to be, a critical focus for ION as the service moves forward.

In 2013, ION staff implemented a wide-range of community relations activities, events and initiatives aimed at engaging residents, businesses, key stakeholders and community groups.

Two major events featuring the light rail transit (LRT) vehicle highlighted a successful year of on-going public engagement that also included:

- the Rapid Transit Tradeshow (a partnership with the Greater Kitchener-Waterloo and Cambridge Chambers of Commerce);

- the Small Business Workshop Series (a partnership with the Waterloo Region Small Business Centre);

- 60 ION presentations to key stakeholders, community groups and neighbourhood associations;
• the Business Improvement Area (BIA) Working Group (with representation from the BIA’s and economic development staff in Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo as well as the K-W Chamber of Commerce, Waterloo Region Tourism and Waterloo Region Small Business Centre);

• 14 public consultation/information centres on a variety of topics (i.e. branding, intersection modifications and ION stop design concepts);

• the monthly ION Update newsletter.

Community relations and public engagement will continue to play an important role for ION moving forward.

In 2014, staff will continue to plan events, activities and initiatives to establish and build consistent and reliable two-way communications with residents, businesses, key stakeholders and community groups.

Keeping the public engaged and interested in ION as well as increasing awareness and understating of the new service will be critical in 2014 as construction gets underway and the Region prepares for the start of operations in 2017.

Report:

The Region of Waterloo has been planning for rapid transit for nearly a decade. During this time, community relations, including public engagement and input, has continued to play an important and vital role.

In 2011, prior to Council’s decision on the preferred approach to rapid transit, the Region held a variety of community relations activities and events, including:

• 25 public consultation/information centres (2,650 participants);
• 20 consultations with local businesses and agencies (550 participants);
• two formal public input meetings at Council (101 participants);
• a live webcast (139 participants);
• 1,760 written comments from the community.

Following Council’s decision to implement LRT in two stages, community engagement and public participation continued to take place as the Region completed its Environmental Assessment and Transit Project Assessment processes in 2012.

Significant community relations and public engagement took place in 2013 as a number of new initiatives, activities and events were created. With the goal of informing and
updating residents, businesses, key stakeholders and community groups about ION, the community relations activities gave the public a chance to provide their input on key rapid transit decisions.

Two major community events in 2013 featuring the LRT vehicle highlighted a year full of public engagement that included:

- 60 ION presentations to key stakeholders, community groups and neighbourhood associations;
- 14 public consultation/information centres on a variety of topics (i.e. branding, intersection modifications, ION stop design concepts, etc.);
- the Rapid Transit Tradeshow (partnership with the K-W and Cambridge Chambers of Commerce);
- the Small Business Workshop Series (partnership with the Waterloo Region Small Business Centre);
- the monthly ION Update newsletter;
- the BIA Working Group (representation from the BIA’s and economic development staff in Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo as well as the Greater K-W Chamber of Commerce, Waterloo Region Tourism and the Waterloo Region Small Business Centre).

An overview of the Region’s 2013 ION community relations activities, events and initiatives is included below:

**Rapid Transit Tradeshow (April 2013)**
- More than 50 local businesses and organizations participated
- Featured the Downtown Kitchener and UpTown Waterloo BIA’s as well as the University of Waterloo, Wilfrid Laurier and the University of Guelph
- Partnership with the K-W and Cambridge Chambers of Commerce
- Opportunity for local businesses and organizations to meet one-on-one with each of the three shortlisted teams in the running to design, build, finance, operate, and maintain Stage 1 LRT for ION

**ION the Way! (July 2013)**
- 60-foot mock-up of the LRT vehicle arrives at Region of Waterloo headquarters to celebrate Council’s decision to purchase 14 LRT vehicles from Bombardier
- More than 1,300 residents toured the vehicle during the one-day community event that also featured the ION stop design concepts
• Event showcased other transit-related initiatives in the Region, including: Grand River Transit, the Community Building Strategy, King-Victoria Transit Hub and TravelWise

IONtoberfest (October 2013)
• 60-foot LRT mock-up vehicle returns to Waterloo Region, this time at Waterloo Public Square in UpTown Waterloo
• More than 1,700 residents toured the vehicle during the three-day community event that also included a visit from Onkel Hans and Miss Oktoberfest

Small Business Workshop Series (November 2013)
• 25 businesses took part in the first workshop that highlighted the importance of advancing planning to deal with ION construction
• Partnership with the Waterloo Region Small Business Centre
• Four free workshops to help small businesses successfully prepare for ION construction (workshops to continue through 2014)
• Topics include: financial planning, smart marketing, social media, building partnerships, promotions, etc.
• Participants encouraged to utilize the services and resources offered by the Waterloo Region Small Business Centre

ION update newsletter (Monthly)
• Regular updates on ION’s progress, including: key topics, dates and milestones
• Emailed monthly to an expanding number of residents, businesses, key stakeholders, media and community partners
• Posted on the rapid transit website and social media channels

BIA Working Group (Bi-monthly)
• Regular updates to local BIA’s in Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo as well as economic development staff at each City
• Representation also includes the K-W Chamber of Commerce, Waterloo Region Tourism Marketing Corporation and the Waterloo Region Small Business Centre
• Chance for ION staff to answer questions, address concerns and assist with joint events and projects

ION presentations (On-going)
• 60 ION presentations took place in 2013
• Update and/or overview of ION, its progress and key milestones
• Provided regularly to key stakeholders such as the BIA’s as well as a variety of community groups, organizations, committees and associations
• For a complete list of ION presentations, see Appendix A

Public consultation/information centres (On-going)
• 14 ION-related public consultation/information centres were held in 2013
• Opportunity for the public to provide input on a variety of rapid transit topics and decisions, including intersection modifications, branding and the ION stop design concepts
• ION was also featured in public consultation/information centres organized with other Regional and City projects (i.e. the Community Building Strategy, UpTown Waterloo Streetscape, UpTown Waterloo Transportation Summit)
• For a complete list of ION-related public consultation/information centres, see Appendix B

ION staff also contributed regular articles and updates to both the UpTown Waterloo and Downtown Kitchener BIA newsletters in 2013. Additionally, staff met one-on-one with a wide-range of businesses and property owners along the ION corridor to discuss the adapted bus rapid transit (aBRT) and LRT routes, stops and impact of early utility construction. At these meetings, ION staff answered questions and addressed concerns related to the new service.

Next Steps:
Community relations will play a critical role in shaping the public’s awareness and understanding of ION. Building trust and confidence in the Region’s future will be important as rapid transit moves forward.

In 2014, staff will continue to plan events, activities and initiatives to establish and build consistent and reliable two-way communications.

Input from residents, businesses, key stakeholders and community groups will help keep the public engaged and interested in ION.

The following communications and community engagement initiatives, created in 2013, will continue in 2014:

• Small Business Workshop Series (February, May, September)
  o Topics include: marketing and communications, social media and preparing for the start of ION construction
- **LRT Vehicle in Waterloo Region (Spring/Summer)**
  - 60-foot mock-up of the LRT vehicle returns to Waterloo Region, this time in the City of Kitchener

- **Monthly ION updates (On-going)**
  - Consistent updates, emailed to a wide-range and expanding number of residents, businesses, key stakeholders, media and community partners
  - Posted on the rapid transit website and social media channels

- **BIA Working Group (Bi-monthly)**
  - Representatives include the local BIA’s and economic development staff in Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo; Waterloo Region Tourism Marketing Corporation and the Waterloo Region Small Business Centre

- **ION presentations (On-going)**
  - Regular ION updates to a wide-range of community groups, neighborhood associations, businesses, residents, etc.

- **Public consultation/information centres (On-going)**
  - Collect community input and feedback on various ION-related issues or projects

While ION staff continue to refine the community relations and communications initiatives planned for 2014, a series of major activities and events have already been identified. They include:

- **Funding agreement signing with the Province (Winter/Spring)**
  - To highlight Ontario’s investment in ION

- **Start of Hydro One construction (Winter)**
  - Along the hydro corridor near Fairview Park Mall

- **Neighbourhood Advisory Panel (Spring)**
  - Nominations to be collected in the spring; meetings to begin in the fall
  - Focus on providing information to residents, overall updates, input, etc.

- **Name the ION stops contest (Spring)**
  - To collect feedback in order to finalize the name of each ION stop
• Funding agreement event with the federal government (Spring/Summer)
  o To highlight Canada’s investment in ION

• Stage 1 LRT contract signing (Spring)
  o Celebrate the signing of the Project Agreement with the team selected to
design, build, finance, operate and maintain Stage 1 LRT in Waterloo
Region

• Start of LRT construction (Summer)
  o Groundbreaking ceremony to mark the start of ION LRT construction

• Stage 2 LRT consultation (Summer)
  o Public engagement begins on the route, stops and alignment for Stage 2
LRT (Cambridge to Kitchener), in advance of the Environmental
Assessment

• Start of ION aBRT construction (Summer)
  o Groundbreaking ceremony to mark the start of aBRT construction

• ION aBRT service launch (Fall/early-2015)
  o To celebrate the start of aBRT service in Waterloo Region

Corporate Strategic Plan:

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

Financial Implications

In June 2011, Council approved the implementation of the rapid transit project,
including LRT and aBRT, with estimated capital costs of $818 million, in 2014 dollars,
with capital funding to be provided by the Provincial government (up to $300 million),
the federal government (one third of eligible project costs to a maximum of $265 million)
and the Region ($253 million). The rapid transit project and improvements to
conventional transit are financed through an annual tax rate increase.

All costs associated with ION community relations activities, events and initiatives are
included within the overall rapid transit budget.
Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:
This report was prepared with input from Transportation and Environmental Services as well as Corporate Communications.

Attachments
Appendix A – Complete List of ION presentations
Appendix B – Complete List of public consultation/information centres for ION

Prepared By: Kimberly Moser, Manager of Community Relations, Rapid Transit

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services
Appendix A – Complete list of ION presentations

- City of Cambridge Economic Development Committee – January 9, 2013
- City of Cambridge Revitalization Advisory Committee – January 9, 2013
- Tri-TAG Meeting – January 17, 2013
- Grand River Accessibility Advisory Committee – January 24, 2013
- LPGA Organizers – January 28, 2013
- City of Waterloo/BIA Update Meeting – February 13, 2013
- Preston BIA AGM – February 20, 2013
- UpTown Waterloo BIA Update – February 21, 2013
- Galt BIA Update – March 8, 2013
- Public Art Advisory Committee – March 11, 2013
- Reurbanization Community Advisory Panel – March 25, 2013
- University of Waterloo Employee Lunch & Learn – March 27, 2013
- Downtown Kitchener BIA Networking Event – March 27, 2013
- Wonders of Winter Meeting – April 2, 2013
- UpTown Waterloo BIA Networking Event – April 4, 2013
- University of Waterloo School of Architecture – April 10, 2013
- Galt BIA AGM – April 23, 2013
- UpTown Waterloo BIA AGM – April 24, 2013
- Downtown Kitchener Action and Advisory Committee – April 25, 2013
- Waterloo Wellington Museums and Art Galleries Network Meeting – May 6, 2013
- City of Waterloo Fire and Rescue – May 6, 2013
- Reurbanization Community Advisory Panel – May 6, 2013
- City of Waterloo Fire and Rescue – May 7, 2013
- Kitchener Economic Development Advisory Committee – May 22, 2013
- Waterloo Rotary Club – May 23, 2013
- Alliance for a Grand Community – May 25, 2013
- Downtown Kitchener BIA Networking Event – May 29, 2013
- Belmont BIA Annual General Meeting – June 12, 2013
- Terrance on the Square – June 14, 2013
- UpTown West Waterloo Neighbourhood Association – June 17, 2013
- City of Kitchener Arts and Culture Advisory Committee – June 18, 2013
- Public Art Advisory Committee – June 21, 2013
- UpTown Waterloo BIA Walking Tour – June 21, 2013
• King & Northfield Business Owners – June 25, 2013
• Downtown Kitchener BIA Networking Event – June 26, 2013
• Grand River Accessibility Advisory Committee – August 22, 2013
• Cambridge Rotary Club – August 23, 2013
• Wilfrid Laurier University Get Involved Fair – September 4, 2013
• UpTown Waterloo BIA Walking Tour – September 9, 2013
• Oktoberfest Meeting – September 9, 2013
• UpTown Waterloo BIA Networking Event – September 9, 2013
• City of Waterloo All Staff Lunch and Learn – September 11, 2013
• Waterloo Park Advisory Committee – September 11, 2013
• City of Kitchener All Staff Lunch and Learn – September 12, 2013
• Region of Waterloo All Staff Lunch and Learn – September 13, 2013
• City of Waterloo/BIA Update Meeting – September 18, 2013
• Public Art Advisory Committee – September 26, 2013
• Central Frederick Neighbourhood Association – September 28, 2013
• Grand River Accessibility Advisory Committee – October 10, 2013
• UpTown Waterloo BIA AGM – November 6, 2013
• Mary Ellen Neighbourhood Association – November 7, 2013
• City of Waterloo Economic Development Committee – November 14, 2013
• Grand River Building Manager’s Association – November 19, 2013
• Tri-TAG Meeting – November 28, 2013
• Reurbanization Community Advisory Panel – December, 2013
• Public Works Association – December 9, 2013
• UpTown West Taskforce Committee – December 18, 2013
Appendix B – Complete list of public consultation/information centres for ION

- Community Building Strategy
  - Waterloo (Knox Church) – February 20, 2013
  - Kitchener (The Tannery) – February 21, 2013
  - Cambridge (Cambridge City Hall) – February 25, 2013

- Rapid Transit Brand Name
  - Cambridge (United Kingdom Club) – January 10, 2013
  - Waterloo (Knox Church) – January 14, 2013
  - Kitchener (School of Pharmacy) – January 15, 2013

- Grand River Hospital – Entrance and Intersection Modification
  - Waterloo (Knox Church) – March 20, 2013

- ION Stop Design Concepts
  - Kitchener (Regional Headquarters) – June 19, 2013
  - Cambridge (Chamber of Commerce) – June 20, 2013
  - Waterloo (Knox Church) – June 25, 2013

- Northfield Drive at Highway 85 – Intersection Modification
  - Waterloo (Albert McCormick Arena) – June 27, 2013

- City of Waterloo Transportation Summit
  - Waterloo Recreation Complex – October 30, 2013

- UpTown Waterloo Streetscape
  - Waterloo Recreation Complex – November 13, 2013

- Ottawa & Mill Street – Intersection Modification
  - Concordia Club – December 4, 2013
Region of Waterloo

Transportation and Environmental Services

Transportation

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

Date: January 28, 2014  File Code: T01-20/GEN VAR

Subject: Proposed Accessible On-Street Parking

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the designation of up to 2% of existing on-street parking spaces along Regional roads as accessible parking within the “Core” areas in the Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo and within the Townships of North Dumfries, Wellesley, Wilmot and Woolwich; as outlined in Report E-14-005 dated January 28, 2014.

Summary: Nil

Report:

Transportation Division staff has received a request to consider installing accessible on-street parking in the Uptown Waterloo area. Current Regional practice is to consider accessible on-street parking upon request. This practice leads to random allocation of accessible parking spaces based on individual needs and does not address the needs of all motorists who require accessible on-street parking. A new practice regarding the allocation of accessible parking spaces along Regional roads where on-street parking is provided within the core areas of the Region is being recommended. There is no regulation today requiring a municipality to provide on-street accessible parking. Despite no regulatory requirements, it is recommended that the Region adopt a practice to designate up to 2% of existing on-street parking spaces within core areas. A core area is generally the commercial area of a city and is commonly referred to as the “downtown”. The cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo have provided Regional staff limits of their defined core areas and are provided in Appendix A. At this time the downtown areas of the 4 Townships have not been identified. Staff will be working with Township staff to define what is considered the commercial areas of Settlements within each Township for the purpose of designating up to 2% of existing on-street parking.
spaces along Regional roads as accessible parking.

On-street parking spaces for members of the community with accessibility needs have specific requirements to accommodate wheelchairs safely and efficiently. Accessible parking spaces should be located in an unobstructed area where the road surface is even and level. Accessible parking spaces should also have access to a nearby curb cut or ramp for wheelchairs.

Transportation staff has developed Regional standards for accessible parking. Generally, the wheelchair symbol is placed in accessible parking spaces. A blue background and white border may supplement the wheelchair symbol. Accessible parking spaces should be as wide as existing parking spaces and should be 7.5 metres long. The parking space should preferably be located at the end of a row of parking or adjacent to a fire hydrant, which provides a gap in the row of parking. A curb cut should be located in the front and the rear of the parking space to allow a wheelchair access to the sidewalk area. The area on the sidewalk, adjacent to the parking space should be clear of obstructions to allow for the passenger to open the vehicle door and unload a wheelchair. Figure 1 illustrates a typical accessible on-street parking space.

Figure 1 – Typical Accessible On-street Parking.

The Accessibility For Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) regulations require municipalities that develop new or redevelop existing on-street parking spaces to consult on the need, location and design of accessible on-street parking spaces with its municipal accessibility advisory committee where one has been established. In Waterloo Region there are 2 accessibility advisory committees, the Grand River Accessibility Advisory Committee (GRAAC) and the Cambridge Accessibility Advisory Committee (CAAC).

On February 28, 2013, Traffic Engineering staff attended a GRAAC meeting and presented the proposed concept to designate up to 2% of existing on-street parking for accessible parking. Appendix A includes the figures presented at the GRAAC meeting which details proposed on-street accessible parking for the Core Areas of the City of Cambridge, City of Kitchener and City of Waterloo. As previously noted, the designated core areas shown in Appendix A were obtained from local Municipal staff. The Core Area of Hespeler, within the City of Cambridge, is not being considered as there are no current roadways in Hespeler under Regional jurisdiction. Comments received from GRAAC are included in Appendix B. Existing on-street parking along Charles Street
south of Francis Street is planned to be removed with the construction of the LRT, however accessible parking will be considered until such time as the parking is removed.

On April 17, 2013, the on-street accessible parking proposal was forwarded to the CAAC for review and comment. Also included in Appendix B are comments received from the CAAC regarding the proposed accessible on-street parking concept.

Advisory committee members have requested that the Region consider designating more than 2% of existing on-street parking spaces as accessible parking. Staff has indicated that there is no requirement to provide accessible parking on roadways and that the proposed 2% supplements accessible parking provided in existing surface parking lots. Current AODA standards indicate the following be designated as accessible parking for all surface lots.

- 1 space be designated as accessible parking where 12 or less spaces are provided;
- 4% of spaces be designated where 13 to 100 spaces are provided;
- 1 space plus an additional 3% be designated where 101 to 200 spaces are provided;
- 2 spaces plus an additional 2% be designated where 201 to 1000 spaces are provided; and
- 11 spaces plus an additional 1% be designated where more than 1,000 spaces are provided.

Staff obtained comments from the three Cities and four Townships with regard to the proposal to designate up to 2% of existing on-street parking spaces within core areas as accessible parking. Feedback was also obtained on local municipal practices pertaining to local on-street accessible parking. In general, local municipal staff supports the Region’s proposal to designate up to 2% of existing on-street parking spaces as accessible parking. The Township of Wilmot and the Cities of Waterloo and Cambridge have no plans to provide on-street accessible parking on local roadways. However, the Township of North Dumfries and City of Kitchener may be considering designating on-street accessible parking on local roadways. Comments received from the local municipalities are summarized in Appendix C.

The BIA of Cambridge, Uptown Waterloo and Downtown Kitchener have all been consulted with and are aware of the proposal to designate up to 2% of parking spaces as accessible parking in core areas. No major concerns were raised as part of this consultation. Each BIA supports accessible parking in principle and has requested that they be consulted when specific accessible parking spaces are under consideration. Uptown Waterloo BIA has also requested that when specific accessible parking is being considered that off-street accessible parking and Light Rail Transit parking impacts be taken into consideration. Each BIA has been advised of the date and time of this report being presented to the Planning and Works committee.

Transportation Division staff will identify appropriate locations for accessible parking in
consultation with appropriate agencies, municipal staff and staff working in Rapid Transit before designating any existing on-street parking space as accessible parking. Following appropriate consultation, Transportation Division staff will pursue appropriate traffic and parking by-law amendments through Regional Council approvals.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

This report addresses the Region’s goal to develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs (Strategic Objective 2.2).

Financial Implications

The cost to install 1 accessible parking space is approximately $1,550. The overall cost to install accessible parking spaces can be accommodated in the Region’s Transportation maintenance budget.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Nil

Attachments

Appendix A - City of Cambridge, City of Kitchener and City of Cambridge Proposed On-Street Accessible Parking

Appendix B - Comments received from GRAAC and CAAC on our Proposed On-street Accessible Parking

Appendix C - Municipal Comments

Prepared By: Valerie Pearcey, Engineering Technologist

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Charles Street proposed on-street accessible parking is no longer being considered due to LRT impacts.
Should other Regional Roads within the Core Area of Kitchener allow on-street parking, up to 2% will be designated as accessible parking.
City Of Cambridge (Galt)

Total On-Street Parking
180 Spaces

- Region proposing 2% of available on-street parking be designated accessible parking
- Located as close to centre of designated core area as possible

Proposed On-street Accessible Parking
Proposed On-street Accessible Parking

Total On-Street Parking 148 Spaces

- Region proposing 2% of available on-street parking be designated accessible parking
- Located as close to centre of designated core area as possible

City Of Cambridge (Preston)

City of Cambridge (Preston) Core Area

Regional Road Being Considered for Disabled On-street Parking
Comments:

**Kitchener-Waterloo GRAAC Committee Comments:**

- Recommend Regional staff consult with CAAC (Cambridge Accessibility Advisory Committee) regarding parking in Cambridge;

- the proposal of 2% available on street accessible parking spaces is not adequate, given the current number of people with disabilities and the projected increase of people with disabilities as the population ages;

- Stagger parking between Charles Street and King Street; and

- Accessible parking between Bridgeport Road and Erb Street (in the area of Princess Street (either direction), and between William Street and Willis Way (northbound))

**Cambridge CAAC Committee Comments:**

- Motorists transferring from the driver’s seat to a wheelchair would require a wider space;

- A curb cut or access to the sidewalk immediately from the parking spot to allow person to get off the road as quickly as possible would be necessary;

- Paint the entire space blue or appropriate colour to show other drivers this space is reserved;

- Reserve one extra parking space on-street, adjacent to the initial parking space;

- Galt area – possibly have two streets that travel perpendicular to each other (East-west and North-south) to allow for more options/opportunities, rather than two parallel streets next to each other (Water and Ainslie); and

- Is the area of Hespeler being considered for accessible parking?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Comments Re: Region of Waterloo 2% Proposed on-Street Accessible Parking</th>
<th>Municipality Proposal for on-Street Accessible Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Township of Wilmot</td>
<td>Township has no concerns with 2% proposal. If the Region determines that additional on-street parking is required, the Township of Wilmot would like the opportunity to provide comments on locations</td>
<td>No plan for providing on-street accessible parking on local streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Waterloo</td>
<td>City of Waterloo is in favour of accessible parking on all streets. If the Region wishes to determine % of the spaces to be designated, the City of Waterloo agrees with this proposal</td>
<td>It is not the intent of the City of Waterloo to determine a % of designated spaces on local streets at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td>Are there factors being considered such as proximity to off-street parking facilities with designated accessible spaces, location of accessible parking spaces within a row of spaces? Cambridge would like the opportunity to comment on locations at such time that they are selected</td>
<td>The City of Cambridge currently does not provide on-street parking and do not have an action plan to provide on-street accessible parking spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Comments Re: Region of Waterloo 2% Proposed on-Street Accessible Parking</td>
<td>Municipality Proposal for on-Street Accessible Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township of Wellesley</td>
<td>Township of Wellesley does support accessible parking.</td>
<td>The Township does not have a lot of parking in the core area. It is felt that it would be better if initiated by local businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township of Woolwich</td>
<td>At a Staff level, we do support 2% accessible on-street parking spots on Regional roads through the designated core / settlement areas subject to consultation with the adjacent property owner. At a Staff level, we support 1 parking spot being accessible for the first 50, then spot number 51 being accessible parking as well, compared to a straight percentage and associated rounding. We will advise our Council of the Region's intent through your report and will advise if they have any comments different then Township Staff.</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township of North Dumfries</td>
<td>The Township of North Dumfries supports accessible parking.</td>
<td>The Township has five public parking spaces under our jurisdiction on Piper Street. We would be willing to convert one space to accessible parking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Region of Waterloo International Airport

To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: January 28, 2014
File Code:

Subject: Airport Master Plan – Update

Recommendation:
For information.

Summary:
This report is intended to provide an update on the process of preparing a master plan to guide future development activity at the Region of Waterloo International Airport. The first of two planned public information sessions has been scheduled for February 6th, 2014, between 4:00 pm and 8:00 pm, at the Waterloo Region Museum, 10 Huron Road (at Homer Watson) in the City of Kitchener.

The purpose of the first public consultation session is to seek input on the future role that the airport can or should play in the community. Community feedback will be solicited in the context of four (4) conceptual development scenarios, ranging from the status quo to a larger “reliever” type facility. The period of study for the plan will cover the next twenty (20) years. In addition to providing feedback at the Public Information meeting on February 6th, members of the community may also obtain information, including an on-line comment form, from the airport’s website – www.waterlooairport.ca/masterplan.

Report:

Background
The Region of Waterloo International Airport (“the Airport”) is a key feature of the Region’s transportation infrastructure. More than 360 direct full-time jobs are associated with commercial and aviation activity at the Airport and, in 2013, the Airport hosted 138,733 passengers, a record number. Commencing in the Spring of 2013, a
project team consisting of staff and Councillors Sean Strickland, Jim Wideman and Geoff Lorentz from the Region of Waterloo, Julie-Anne Herteis from the Township of Woolwich, Donna Reid from the City of Cambridge, Angela Vieth from the City of Waterloo, Berry Vrbanovic from the City of Kitchener and the Grand River Conservation Authority began the process of developing a master plan for the future development of the Region of Waterloo International Airport. The complete membership list of the Airport Master Plan Project Team is attached to this report as Appendix 1.

The Project Team has been assisted by a consultant team including representatives from MMM Group (engineering), Intervistas (aviation demand and business forecasting) and AirBiz (air terminal design).

**What is the purpose of a Master Plan?**

The master planning process is a tool used by most airports across the country to anticipate, and plan for, future airport development. The most recent master plan for the Region of Waterloo International Airport was completed in 2001. In 2009, Regional Council also adopted a five (5) year business plan for the Airport.

The purpose of the current planning process is to look ahead to the next twenty (20) years and evaluate a series of development scenarios in the context of both the impacts to the community and the economic benefits of potential development. The plan must also take into consideration the ever changing nature of the aviation industry. The approval of a plan or endorsement of a preferred development option does not, however, guarantee that the plan will be fulfilled in the next twenty (20) years. The actual implementation of the plan over time will be dependent upon the speed of future growth, needs of the community and the costs/benefits associated with the construction of infrastructure at the time it may be required.

**First Public Information Meeting**

The first public information meeting has been scheduled for February 6th, 2014 between 4:00 pm and 8:00 pm. The meeting will be held at the Waterloo Region Museum, 10 Huron Road (at Homer Watson) in Kitchener. A brief presentation will be provided at the top of every hour. A short presentation on noise mitigation measures associated with future airport development will also be provided every hour, on the half hour.

An information package similar to the sample attached as Appendix 2 will be distributed to attendees at the Public Information Meeting. Additional static displays will be available together with information describing four conceptual airport development scenarios. Images of the static displays will be available on the airport website on or about February 6th for viewing by members of the community – see [http://www.waterlooairport.ca/masterplan](http://www.waterlooairport.ca/masterplan)

The possible development scenarios range from the “status quo” to a larger facility capably of fulfilling the role of reliever airport contemplated in a needs assessment study released by Transport Canada in 2011 – see [http://www.tc.gc.ca/eng/ontario/pickeringstudy.htm](http://www.tc.gc.ca/eng/ontario/pickeringstudy.htm).
Although the development options will be presented as four distinct scenarios, each successive option contains elements from the other as the most likely scenario for future growth of the airport would entail development in phases as justified business requirements of the airport and the needs of the community over the next twenty years.

The static displays that will be available at the public meeting will describe the costs, impacts and benefits associated with each option at a high level with the intent of soliciting feedback from the community. This feedback and other technical data will be used by the Project Team to evaluate the development options and identify a preferred option.

**Next Steps**

The Project Team will consider feedback received from the first public information session in evaluating the options for future development of the airport will identify a preferred development option. A second public information session will be held later in 2014 to seek feedback on a preferred development option. The outcome of the master plan process will be a comprehensive written plan for future airport development which will be presented to Regional Council with a series of recommendations for the implementation of the plan, likely in 2015.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

The completion of an update of the Master Plan for the Airport is in keeping with Focus Area 5.3 in that it ensures Regional programs and services are efficient, effective and demonstrate accountability to the public.

**Financial Implications**

The cost of consulting services for the Airport Master Plan update has been included in the 2014 approved Airport Capital Program.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

NIL

**Attachments**

Appendix 1 – Project Team Membership List

Appendix 2 - Sample Information Package for the First Public Information Meeting

**Prepared By:** Jeff Schelling, Solicitor, Corporate

Chris Wood, General Manager, Region of Waterloo International Airport

John Hammer, Director of Transportation

**Approved By:** Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Appendix 1

The Region of Waterloo International Airport Master Plan

Project Team Membership

Councillor Sean Strickland, Region of Waterloo ("RMOW")
Councillor Jim Wideman, RMOW
Councillor Geoff Lorentz, RMOW

Shilling Yip, Planner, RMOW
John Hammer, Director, Transportation, RMOW
Chris Wood, Airport General Manager
Calvin Barrett, Finance, RMOW
Jeff Schelling, Solicitor, RMOW
Ildiko Tiszovszky, Finance, RMOW

Beth Brown, Grand River Conservation Authority

Katie Anderl, Senior Planner, and Councillor Berry Vrbanovic, City of Kitchener

Leah Bozic, Senior Economic Development Officer and Councillor Donna Reid, City of Cambridge

John Scarfone, Manager of Planning and Councillor Julie-Anne Herteis, Township of Woolwich

Scott Nevin, Director Growth Management and Councillor Angela Vieth, City of Waterloo
Airport Master Plan
Information Package & Comment Sheet

Thursday, February 6, 2014

4 to 8 p.m.

Waterloo Region Museum - 10 Huron Road, Kitchener

Introductory Presentations at: 4, 5, 6, & 7 p.m.
Noise Information Sessions at: 4:30, 5:30, 6:30 & 7:30 p.m.

Drop off your completed Comment Sheet attached to the end of this document at the Registration Table.

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 the Regional Clerks Office.
1.0 Why is the Region of Waterloo undertaking this project?

The Master Plan is being developed to provide a set of recommendations for future development at the Region of Waterloo International Airport over the next twenty (20) years (2013 – 2032). The Airport’s current plan, adopted by Regional Council in 2000, laid the foundation for the development of the Airport into the world class facility we have today. The development contemplated in the 2000 Master Plan has now been completed.

A new Master Plan will provide a set of recommendations for future airport development in the short (0 - 5 year), medium (6 - 10 year), and longer (11 - 20 year) terms. The Plan will take into consideration the dynamic nature of the aviation industry and will identify facility needs and alternatives for the future development of the Airport recommending capital improvements in the next twenty (20) years. It is understood that recommendations will be undertaken in a financially feasible manner and will ensure the continued operation of a safe, efficient, and environmentally compatible airport recognizing the environmental and socio-economic issues that exist in the community.

2.0 Who is directing this project?

The project is being directed by a multi-jurisdictional Project Team, consisting of staff from the Airport, The Regional Municipality of Waterloo, the cities of Cambridge, Waterloo, and Kitchener, the Township of Woolwich, the Grand River Conservation Authority, and the following elected officials:

- Geoff Lorentz, Councillor, Region of Waterloo
- Jim Wideman, Councillor, Region of Waterloo
- Sean Strickland, Councillor, Region of Waterloo
- Donna Reid, Councillor, City of Cambridge
- Berry Vrbanovic, Councillor, City of Kitchener
- Angela Vieth, Councillor, City of Waterloo
- Julie-Anne Herteis, Councillor, Township of Woolwich

3.0 What is the purpose of this Public Information Session?

The public are invited to this Public Information Session to:

- review the background information and the four options being considered for future Airport development;
- ask questions of staff from the Region of Waterloo, Project Team and members of the Consultant Team; and
- provide comments and input regarding the four options being considered.

Your comments will be considered along with other information received to assist the Region of Waterloo in completing this project.
4.0 What Potential Improvements are being considered?

The Project Team is considering four conceptual development options:

- **Option 1 – Status Quo, up to 243,100 Annual Passengers**
  This option entails the completion of a five year business plan approved by Regional Council in 2009 which would see no further significant development of the airport. Future passenger growth would be constrained by the size of the existing airport terminal building or approximately 243,100 passengers per year, an increase from 140,000 passengers in 2013.

- **Option 2 – Low Growth, 243,100 to 388,000 Annual Passengers**
  This option entails several phased improvements to the airport which would eventually accommodate up to approximately 388,000 passengers per year. Improvements could include an expansion to the existing terminal and extension of the secondary runway (14/32) as an added measure of safety and reliability in weather conditions which do not favour the primary runway (08/26).

- **Option 3 – Moderate Growth, 388,000 to 1,024,700 Annual Passengers**
  This option builds on the improvements identified in Option 2 with additional measures to position the airport for future growth. The most significant aspects of this option include a more substantial phased terminal building expansion plan, zoning for a possible third runway which would protect for long term future growth and the lengthening and relocation eastward of the primary runway (08/26) to help mitigate the impacts of noise for the residential areas of Kitchener to the west of the airport.

- **Option 4 – High Growth, greater than 1,024,700 Annual Passengers**
  This option considers the role contemplated for the airport in the Pickering Airport Needs Assessment Study released by Transport Canada in 2011. This study is available online at [http://www.tc.gc.ca/eng/ontario/pickeringstudy.htm](http://www.tc.gc.ca/eng/ontario/pickeringstudy.htm). While this option has been included in the analysis, given the significant community impact and investment required, further consultation and analysis would be necessary outside the scope of this master plan project to fully evaluate this option.

*Infrastructure improvements for each option are described in detail in Appendix A.*

5.0 How are noise impacts on the community being considered?

The Region of Waterloo will continue to address the noise concerns of citizens in the residential communities to the west and north of the airport. Aircraft engine technology has drastically improved resulting in much quieter operating aircraft. To date, the airport has received relatively few noise complaints resulting from scheduled passenger aircraft. However opportunities exist within this master plan to further reduce the impact of noise.

The noise impact of each of the four development scenarios are:

- Option 1 – Status Quo, up to 243,100 Annual Passengers
  Noise impact would be relatively unchanged from today’s operation, with few new
aircraft types operating at the Airport and no substantial infrastructure upgrades or changes.

1. **Option 2 – Low Growth, 243,100 to 388,000 Annual Passengers**
   This Option allows for the use of the secondary runway (Runway 14/32) in bad weather as an alternative for larger commercial aircraft, mostly for arrivals from the south on Runway 32. Runway 32 departures towards Breslau would be controlled through airport imposed noise abatement regulations including time of day restrictions and standard instrument departure procedures.

2. **Option 3 – Moderate Growth, 388,000 to 1,024,700 Annual Passengers**
   This Option includes the extension of the secondary runway, as in Option 2, but also would result in the reduction of noise for Kitchener/Cambridge residents, as the main runway (Runway 08/26) would be lengthened and shifted towards Guelph (east) which would allow aircraft to be higher over Kitchener/Cambridge on arrivals and departures. A longer runway will also allow for an aircraft to use a lower power setting on takeoff, saving fuel and the reduction of noise.

3. **Option 4 – High Growth, greater than 1,024,700 Annual Passengers**
   This Option has significantly more aircraft operating from the Airport on a daily basis. The addition of a third runway to the east of existing runway 14/32 would reduce noise for residents to the west of the Airport. Further consultation and analysis would be necessary outside the scope of this master plan project to fully evaluate this option.

### 6.0 What are the economic benefits of future development?

The Airport plays an important role in creating and supporting economic development within the community. There are currently 362 direct full time jobs associated with activity at the Airport. Additional development and economic activity at the Airport would generate additional jobs and complement the economic development initiatives in surrounding areas, specifically the employment lands identified for future development in Cambridge, located south of the Airport.

### 7.0 When will future development take place?

The four options considered by the Project Team involve varying levels of development over the next 20 years. Even with the approval of an overall Airport Master Plan individual capital projects remain subject to Regional Council approval and will be initiated based on the needs of the community. For example, improvements to the existing terminal building may be staged to accommodate moderate growth over the next five to ten years with an additional expansion to accommodate further growth if required.

### 8.0 What are the next steps for this project?

The Project Team is requesting the public’s input on the four future development options being considered. This Public Information Session is your first opportunity to ask questions, provide suggestions, and make comments. The Project Team will use the comments obtained to evaluate and recommend a preferred Option in conjunction with other technical data. A second Public Information Session will be scheduled in the late spring of 2014 and prior to the Project Team making a recommendation to Council.
9.0 When will a decision be made for this project?

The Project Team will review the public comments received and use them to identify a Recommended Option. The final Airport Master Plan including the Recommended Option is expected to be presented to The Region of Waterloo’s Planning and Works Committee for approval following a second Public Information Session. In advance of the second Public Information Session, a letter will be sent to all adjacent property owners, tenants and members of the public who registered at the first Public Information Session or online to ensure anyone who wishes to speak to the Committee or Council about this project can do so before final approval.

10.0 How will I receive further notification regarding this project?

A letter will be sent to all adjacent property owners, tenants and members of the public who registered at the first Public Information Session or online.

There is also a webpage on the Airport’s website dedicated to the Airport Master Plan. www.waterlooairport.ca/masterplan

11.0 How can I provide my comments?

In order to assist the Project Team in addressing any comments or concerns please complete and drop off the attached Comment Sheet at the Registration Table or mail, fax or e-mail your comments to Chis Wood no later than February 28, 2014. Thank you.

Chris Wood, Airport General Manager, Region of Waterloo International Airport (YKF)
1-4881 Fountain Street North, Breslau, ON N0B 1M0
E-mail: AirportMasterPlan@regionofwaterloo.ca
Fax: 519-648-3540

12.0 How can I view Project Information following the Public Information Session?

All of the Public Information Session display materials and project information, notifications of upcoming meetings and contact information are available on February 7, 2014 at the Region of Waterloo International Airport Administrative Office or online at: www.waterlooairport.ca/masterplan
Appendix A - Conceptual Development Options

Option 1 – Status Quo, up to 243,100 Annual Passengers

Features Include:

- Terminal Parking Lot Improvements / Expansion
  - Complete ‘P4’ Parking Lot Expansion
- Minor Terminal Building Improvements
  - Existing Terminal can accommodate approximately 250,000 annual passengers
  - Some modification to the existing terminal building to relieve constraints
- Air Traffic Control Tower Relocated (By Nav Canada)
  - The Existing Control Tower owned by Nav Canada to be demolished
- Continue Apron IV / Apron VII Aviation Development
  - Lease Existing Serviced Lots to private individuals and companies

The capital costs associated with this option are approximately $5 million and within an existing ten year capital plan for the airport. With limits to future growth beyond approximately 250,000 passengers, it is unlikely that the airport would be financially self-sustaining and a taxpayer contribution would be required. The airport currently receives a taxpayer contribution equivalent to $25 per household.

Option 2 – Low Growth, 243,100 to 388,000 Annual Passengers

Features Include:

- More Substantial Improvements to the Terminal than Option #1
  - As capacity of existing terminal is achieved (approximately 250,000 passengers) the capacity of the Terminal Building can be increased by 50%
- Runway 14-32 Extended to 6000’ [1828.8m]
  - Runway 14 Extended 820’ [249.9m], Runway 32 Extended 1080’ [329.2m] to provide an added measure of safety in crosswind conditions
- Taxiway ‘B’/C’ Extensions
  - Extended to meet new Runway 14-32 thresholds
- Air Traffic Control Tower Relocated (By Nav Canada) – as in Option 1
- Continue Aviation Development in existing lease areas as in Option 1
- Reconfigured Entrance Road (additional lanes)

The capital costs associated with this option would be approximately $50 million and within a ten year capital plan for the airport. At 388,000 annual passengers, revenue is anticipated to be in the range of $5 to $6.5 million however a taxpayer contribution would still be required to operate the airport taking into consideration the debt servicing costs associated with the additional infrastructure required.
Option 3 – Moderate Growth, 388,000 to 1,024,700 Annual Passengers

Features Include:

- Runway 14-32 Extended to 6,000’ [1828.8m] as Proposed in Option #2
- Runway 08-26 Relocated 644’ [196.3m] to the East and Extended to 8,100’ [2468.9m]
- Phased Expansion of Terminal Building with Initial Expansion as Outlined in Option #2 and a plan for further expansion in the future when warranted by growth in air passenger traffic
- New Cat. I Approach Lighting / Localizer on Both Ends of Runway 08-26
- Keep long-term options open by establishing zoning protection for a possible future north-south runway
- Taxiway ‘A’/ ‘B’/ ‘C’ Extensions
- Shantz Station Road Realignment / Grade Separation
- Continue / New Aviation Development with possible new development within existing airport owned lands
- Apron ‘III’ Expansion
- Entrance Road Widening / Parking Lot Improvements as in Option #1 and #2

The capital costs associated with this option are $50 million (to undertake the improvements contemplated in Option #2) and an additional $50 million to extend the capacity of the airport beyond the limitations in Option #2 to a potential capacity of up to one million passengers annually. The additional $50 million required for a second phase of development (between 388,000 and 1,024,700 passengers) is not within the existing ten year capital plan for the airport.

Airports that serve approximately one million passengers typically self-finance their operational and capital requirements and no taxpayer contribution would be required as the airport nears this capacity.

Option 4 – High Growth, greater than 1,024,700 Annual Passengers

Features Include:

- All Infrastructure Improvements as Detailed in Options 2 & 3 with the Following Additional Requirements:
  - New Terminal Building (on North side of Runway 08-26)
  - New Parking Solution (for New Terminal Building)
  - New Entrance / Access Roads (Major Redevelopment)
  - Runway 08-26 Extended to 10,000’ [3048.0 m]
  - Build Third Runway
  - Taxiway ‘A’ Extension
  - New Parallel Taxiway ‘D’ & Terminal Apron
  - Continue / New Aviation Development
  - Land Acquisition to accommodate infrastructure improvements
  - Potential Governance Change

The capital costs associated with this option would exceed $100 million having regard to the requirement for a new terminal, a possible third runway and the need for acquisition of additional lands.
Airport Master Plan
Public Information Session
COMMENT FORM

Comments or concerns regarding this project:

1. Was the purpose of the Public Information Centre clearly identified?

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

2. Did the display boards adequately outline the four (4) possible development options in a meaningful and understandable way?

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

3. Is there more information that you feel is required to assess the merits of one or more options?

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

4. Which development scenario do you believe would be best suited for the community? Why?

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

5. What more can the airport do to address the noise concerns of neighbouring residents?

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
6. What role should the airport have in supporting the economic development of the Region?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

7. Do you have any other comments?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

8. Have you used the airport for personal or business air travel in the past? Yes □ No □

Name: ____________________________

Phone: ____________________________

Address: ____________________________

Email: ____________________________

If you cannot complete your comments today, please take this home and mail, fax or email your comments by (INSERT MONTH AND DATE), 2014 to:

Chris Wood, Airport General Manager
Region of Waterloo International Airport (YKF)
1-4881 Fountain Street North, Breslau, ON N0B 1M0
E-mail: AirportMasterPlan@regionofwaterloo.ca
Phone: 519-648-2256 ext. 8502 / Toll Free: 1-866-648-2256 ext. 8502
TTY: 519-575-4608 / Fax: 519-648-3540

Thank you for your interest and time.
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 the Regional Clerks Office.
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Waste Management

To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of Planning and Works Committee
Date: January 28, 2014
File Code: E33-30A
Subject: Curbside Collection Contract Considerations

Recommendation:


Summary:

The Region’s current curbside waste collection contract ends February 27, 2016. A number of initiatives affect the scope of a new waste collection contract and have a considerable impact on the timelines to develop a new waste collection tender. These include a thorough review of diversion recommendations presented as part of the recently approved Waste Management Master Plan (WMMP) (Nov. 12, 2013, E-13-127), public consultation regarding proposed service levels, the pending outcome of the Waste Reduction Act and identifying and addressing a number of existing collection inconsistencies in order to develop and present to Council new curbside waste service level options for approval. The reasons for extending the contract are:

- to allow for enhanced public engagement and consultation this spring focusing on proposed service level changes;
- to allow sufficient time to fully review and consider the full suite of diversion recommendations from the recently approved Waste Management Master Plan;
- take into consideration potential changes as a result of the pending Waste Reduction Act;
- allow staff sufficient time to fully investigate inconsistencies with the existing collection contract (i.e. multi-residential, BIAs, etc.) and how new policies may
apply to a new collection contract;
  • negate potential negative competition/pricing implications from tendering over
    the same time frame as two other large collection contracts in the Province
    (Region’s of Halton and Peel); and,
  • to allow staff to report back to Council in early 2015 with recommendations on
    an integrated approach to increase waste diversion through new curbside
    collection standards and policies that will shape the development of the next
    long term waste collection contract.

This report also responds to Council’s direction to investigate potential diversion
opportunities within the existing collection contract.

Report:

Residents of the Region of Waterloo enjoy one of highest levels of curbside waste
collection service in the province, and the Region was identified as "best in class" for
waste and recycling in a national citizen satisfaction survey (Citizen First 6 Survey,
2012). Attachment A outlines the curbside collection services currently available to
residents.

With the transfer of residential waste collection to the Region in 2000, the Region
committed to maintaining or enhancing service levels. Garbage bag limits had been in
place for many years in the townships, however, there were no restrictions on garbage
bags set to the curb in the tri-cities. A tri-city ten bag limit was established as part of the
Region’s first waste collection by-law. Residents were encouraged to place as many
blue boxes to the curb as needed and their participation in all programs was voluntary.
The Region of Waterloo has depended on voluntary participation in curbside waste
diversion programs, with a strong emphasis on public education as a means of diverting
waste from landfill.

These standards remain today and, while convenient for residents, they generally do
not encourage residents to divert the waste they generate or to fully utilize the diversion
options available to them. While approximately 90 per cent of Regional citizens
participate in the blue box program, it is estimated that between 15 to 35 per cent of
households (depending on the neighbourhood) participate in the green bin program.
Waste composition audits estimate that over 50 per cent of the contents of garbage
bags could be diverted through the green bin program; this equals approximately
45,000 tonnes of green bin material going to landfill. The Region’s residential diversion
rate is about 52% which is near the upper range of similar sized municipalities but it has
plateaued at this level over the last several years.

Waste diversion (reducing the amount of waste requiring landfill) is a core objective of
the Region’s 2011 – 2014 Strategic Plan and remains a high priority for the Region.

Future Contract Options and Timelines

Items, Recycling, Yard Waste and Christmas Trees within the Region of Waterloo was
approved for the seven year term of March 2, 2009 to February 27, 2016. The contract also includes the right of renewal by the Region for up to two (2) one-year periods immediately thereafter, under the same terms and condition.

A minimum of 18 months is typically required for tender development, assessment and award of a new collection contract and preparation/purchasing timelines needed by the successful bidder(s) for a long-term waste collection contract as shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anticipated new waste collection contract timelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare and issue tender for region-wide curbside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waste collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor submission timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review vendor submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council approval; award to successful bidder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful bidder. Successful bidder must:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Acquire new equipment, vehicles, permits/approvals and hiring and training of staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understand community needs; establish new collection days and routing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contingency time for any potential operational issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total estimated time required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two (2) potential tendering contract strategies are provided as follows:

**Option 1: Status Quo Timeline**

The following timeline and tasks would be required to be achieved in order to ensure a March 2016 start date to match the end of the existing collection contract:

- Council approval of new curbside service levels/scope of work (May 2014);
- Tender development (June 2014);
- Advertisement of collection contract (September 2014);
- Award of contract (December 2014);
- Contract commencement (March 2016)

**Option 2: 1-year Contract Extension**

The following timeline and tasks would be required to be achieved in order to ensure a March 2017 start date to match a 1-year extension of the existing collection contract:

- Council approval of curbside service levels/scope of work (May 2015)
- Tender development (June 2015)
- Advertisement of collection contract (September 2015);
- Award of contract (December 2015);
- Contract commencement (March 2017)
Impacts on the Development of a New Waste Collection Contract

A number of issues challenge the status quo timeline for the development of a new waste collection contract, as follows:

1. Waste Management Master Plan

The recently approved WMMP included the following primary recommended action regarding waste diversion:

- Consideration of curbside collection policy changes to increase diversion (e.g. bag limits, bi-weekly garbage collection, standardized Regional residential waste collection), and consider "user pay" options (e.g. bag tags).

The WMMP also identified a number of additional waste diversion options for the Region’s consideration (Attachment B) over the next ten year horizon. Many of these opportunities represent a significant shift from current curbside waste collection services and existing waste management policies, practices and by-laws. To ensure an integrated, sustainable waste management strategy is implemented, a thorough review of the full suite of WMMP diversion recommendations and the development of diversion options for Council approval and direction is recommended. Staff has already initiated this review but anticipate that it will take up to one year to complete fully.

Citizen feedback was an integral part of the WMMP and over 600 citizens responded to questions about diversion programs through social media, surveys, and attendance at Public Information Centres. Residential diversion opportunities such as bi-weekly garbage collection with weekly blue box and organics, garbage bag restrictions and bans for materials that have an existing drop-off or collection program had strong support.

These initial findings support potential changes to curbside collection practices as a method to increase diversion. However, staff recognizes that some of the proposed changes would be a significant shift from historical curbside service levels and will have considerable impacts on residents receiving curbside collection. The WMMP highlighted the need of a well planned, multi-faceted, ongoing public education program for a successful transition to new waste collection services. In advance of finalizing the scope of curbside service levels and implementing a contract, public engagement and education is vital and should focus on an assortment of public outreach. In this regard, staff recommends undertaking additional public consultation this spring to review and discuss potential curbside service level changes to ensure citizens are engaged and informed accordingly.

2. Waste Reduction Act

The Province of Ontario has launched a sweeping review of the Waste Diversion Act, citing potential waste diversion bans, full producer responsibility, and an organics diversion strategy (E-13-109). The Act is currently in 2nd reading at the Provincial legislature and more details are expected to be available in the first half of 2014 which...
may fundamentally impact the scope of the next collection contract.

3. Existing collection inconsistencies

Tri-cities: A number of collection inconsistencies were inherited as part of the transfer of waste collection responsibilities to the Region in 2000 and there are sites where garbage bag/container limits and/or bi-weekly collection may not be as easily implemented as single family homes. Examples include scheduled off-campus student rental property collection, downtown Business Improvement Areas (BIAs), multi-residential sites and other grandfathered sites that pile bagged garbage to the curb.

Townships: Residents in the four townships have different bag limits, collection frequency differences (i.e. some rural areas have bi-weekly blue box collection and no green bin) and, unique to the townships, all businesses that generate no more than the current weekly bag limit can receive curbside collection.

These inconsistencies, and any other areas where service level implementation changes may be more complex, require further investigation and/or collaboration with our local municipal partners to determine appropriate service levels. Staff will require time to report back to Council with recommendations for approval for inclusion in a new waste collection tender.

4. Potential competitive bidding implications

The size and scope of curbside collection contracts are significant and require a large amount of time for vendors to submit comprehensive bids and provide the extensive resources after tender award to fulfill the requirements of the contract. Staff are aware of at least two (2) other large curbside collection tenders in Ontario with contract commencement dates in early 2016 (Region’s of Halton and Peel) that coincide with our current tendering schedule. Given the limited number of potential bidders for contracts of this size and nature, the potential exists for implications on the number of bidders, quality and price competitiveness of the bids under the status quo timeline.

**Recommended Option**

Through the WMMP process and in consultation with other municipalities that have implemented curbside policy changes such as reduced bag/container limits and/or bi-weekly garbage collection, an appreciable increase in diversion would be expected. However, the most important component of success has been the provision of enough lead time prior to implementation in order to undertake appropriate public engagement and to provide enhanced promotion and education of service level changes. While the status quo timeline under Option 1 is achievable, it is based on the assumption that the level of public engagement undertaken to-date as part of the WMMP process is sufficient to confirm decisions around future curbside level of service. As well, the risk of not fully addressing the aforementioned impacts could negatively impact the development of an optimal tender document. Staff, therefore, recommend that Option 2 (up to 1-year contract extension to the current collection contract) be considered as it would:
• allow for enhanced public engagement and consultation this spring focusing on proposed service level changes prior to approving the future curbside collection scope of service;
• allow sufficient time to review and consider the full suite of diversion recommendations identified as part of the recently approved Waste Management Master Plan;
• take into consideration potential changes as a result of the pending Waste Reduction Act;
• allow staff sufficient time to fully investigate inconsistencies with the existing collection contract (i.e. multi-residential, BIAs, etc.) and how any new policies may apply to a new collection contract;
• negate potential negative competition/pricing implications from tendering over the same time frame as two other large collection contracts in the Province as the tender periods for the Region’s of Halton and Peel mimic our status quo timeline (based on staff inquiries of other municipalities in the Province, we are unaware of any large collection tenders aligning with the 1-year contract extension option);
• allow consideration of cost recovery impacts, if any, on the waste collection contract from assessment of potential funding models (Staff have already been provided with direction to report back to Council in late 2014/early 2015 in accordance with report E-13-136); and,
• report back to Council in early 2015 with recommendations on an integrated approach to increase waste diversion through new curbside collection standards and policies that will shape the development of the next long term waste collection contract.

**Diversion opportunities within the current collection contract**

As directed by Council on May 28, 2013 (Report E-13-065), staff initiated discussions with the existing curbside collection contractors as well as other municipalities that offer alternative curbside collection programs such as reduced bag/container limits and/or bi-weekly garbage collection in order to identify potential cost and resource allocation impacts within the current collection contract.

With respect to discussions with the curbside collection contractors, no cost savings were identified for a reduced bag/container limit scenario under the current contract, however, some potential contract savings could be realized for bi-weekly garbage collection (with a strict 3-bag limit) provided a two (2) year contract extension was provided. Through discussions with other municipalities that have implemented similar service level changes, it was identified that additional resources are required to respond to increased telephone inquiries, collection issue resolution and on-street inspection and enforcement than is currently experienced by the Region. Specifically, it would be anticipated that additional program costs would be incurred related to such items as standardized/expanded service levels across the Region, making available additional free green bins and blue boxes, undertaking a “free” limited time bag tag program, undertaking enhanced public engagement, promotion and education and allowance for additional staffing/vehicle requirements.
Based on a preliminary analysis of the findings, any potential curbside collection cost savings identified would be expected to be more than offset by increased program costs within the current collection contract. Therefore, staff is not recommending changes to the current curbside practices at this time given current budgetary constraints. However, as part of the 2015 planning and budget process, phasing in a standardized Region-wide reduced bag/container limit as part of the current waste collection contract in 2015 could be considered as a beneficial first step towards increasing residential waste diversion prior to implementation of the next collection contract.

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:

The existing Waste Management Division operating budget has provisions for the current level of services provided under T2007-125. However, no additional funding is currently available for any additional costs that would be incurred by a service level change at the curb within the existing contract.

Under the Purchasing By-law, the Chief Purchasing Officer may acquire any goods or service through negotiation where the extension of an existing or previous contract would prove more cost effective or beneficial for the Region.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Staff from the Finance Department was consulted in preparation of this report.

Attachments

Attachment A  Current Waste Collection Services
Attachment B  Master Plan Waste Diversion Recommendations

Prepared By:  Susan White, Manager, Waste Collection and Diversion

Approved By:  Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
WHAT ARE OUR CURRENT COLLECTION SERVICES?

DID YOU KNOW...
Collection crews make over 1.5 million stops each month to provide these curbside services.

Residential Waste Collection Services on Garbage Day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cambridge/Kitchener/Waterloo</th>
<th>Green Bin</th>
<th>Garbage per property</th>
<th>Large Items</th>
<th>Yard Waste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>April - November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>April - November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every second week in rural areas</td>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>April - November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>April - November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every second week in rural areas</td>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>April - November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>April - November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every second week in rural areas</td>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>April - November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>April - November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every second week in rural areas</td>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>April - November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>April - November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every second week in rural areas</td>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>April - November</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## First Priority Recommendations (2014 – 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Standardization of Waste Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Modification of Depot Drop-Offs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage Collection and Diversion Programs</td>
<td>Bi-Weekly Garbage Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce and Standardize Garbage Bag Limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Bin Specific</td>
<td>Enhance Programs to Maximize Diversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion &amp; Education</td>
<td>Continue to Encourage Residents to Reduce Waste</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Second Priority Initiatives (2019 – 2023)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Multi-Municipal Planning Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish Defined Performance Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Standardize Existing Regional Waste Bylaws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extended Producer Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>Enforce Participation in Waste Diversion Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Partner with Local Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocate for Increased Availability of Community Drop-off Bins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standardize Items at Drop-off Locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage Collection and Diversion Programs</td>
<td>Improve Convenience of Diversion Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Bin</td>
<td>Expand Source Separated Organics (SSO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Residential</td>
<td>Continue to Help Multi-Residential Improve Waste Diversion Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partner with Local Area Municipalities to Establish Building Specifications that Support Waste Diversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion and Education</td>
<td>Increase the Number of Waste Facility Tours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve Promotion of Diversion Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue to Develop Partnerships to Promote Waste Diversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage Return to Retailer Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expand Target Groups for Communication Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region of Waterloo

Transportation and Environmental Services

Planning, Housing and Community Services

Commissioner’s Office

To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: January 28, 2014  File Code: C04-30/PWC/CORR
Subject: 2014 Planning and Works Project Team Membership

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo appoint Regional Councillors to the project and study teams as noted in Appendix A to Report No. E-14-013/P-14-008, dated January 28, 2014;

And that the Regional Municipality of Waterloo forward the requests for area Councillor representatives on project and study teams to the Area Municipalities.

Summary:

Nil

Report:

Major Planning and Transportation and Environmental Services projects or studies have been directed, for many years, by multi-disciplinary project teams which have usually included one or more Regional or Area Municipal Councillors. The involvement of elected officials has always made a significant, positive impact on the successful completion of these projects. These committees and project teams are distinct from formal sub-committees of Council (e.g. Water Efficiency Advisory Committee), whose Council members have already been appointed.
A list of ongoing Steering Committees and major projects and studies to be undertaken in 2014, including the current political or stakeholder representatives on each group, is provided in Appendix A.

Those projects and studies which do not already have and would most benefit from political representative(s) are noted in the table below. These are typically projects which may have high public interest and/or significant implications for the Region. In addition to the projects listed below, participation by Councillors on any of the project teams noted in Appendix A is welcomed. After appointing appropriate Regional Councillors to these teams, it is recommended that this list be forwarded to the appropriate Area Municipalities to provide them an opportunity to appoint their Councillors to some of the project teams.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Suggested Council Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>2015 Proposed Transit Service Improvements (Highland and Victoria iXpress)</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>1 Regional Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>2 Local Councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>GRT Business Plan 2015-2018</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>2 Regional Councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Myers Road Reconstruction Branchton to Water Street</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>1 Local Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design 2014-2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street, King Street to Erb Street, and Erb Street</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>1 Local Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from King to Caroline Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design 2014-2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Victoria Street Reconstruction, Lawrence Avenue to Fischer Hallman Road</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>1 Local Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design 2015-2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Fischer Hallman Road Widening, Plains Road to Bleams Road</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>1 Regional Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design 2014-2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Local Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Area Municipality</td>
<td>Suggested Council Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Erb Street Improvements&lt;br&gt;Fischer Hallman Road to Wilmot Line&lt;br&gt;EA 2014-2015&lt;br&gt;Design 2015-2017&lt;br&gt;Construction 2018</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td><strong>1 Regional Councillor</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>1 Local Councillor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>Shantz Station Road Reconstruction, Kossuth Road to Menno Street&lt;br&gt;Design 2014-2016&lt;br&gt;Construction 2017</td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td><strong>1 Local Councillor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Snyder's Road, Foundry Street to Gingerich Road&lt;br&gt;Design 2014-2017&lt;br&gt;Construction 2018</td>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td><strong>1 Local Councillor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>Westmount Road Reconstruction, John Street to Erb Street&lt;br&gt;Design 2014-2017&lt;br&gt;Construction 2018</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td><strong>1 Local Councillor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>Cambridge Water Supply System Upgrade</td>
<td>Region Cambridge</td>
<td><strong>1 Regional Councillor</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>1 Local Councillor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>Cambridge Water Distribution Upgrades Class EA</td>
<td>Region Cambridge</td>
<td><strong>1 Regional Councillor</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>1 Local Councillor</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

The involvement of Regional Councillors on Transportation and Environmental Services and Planning, Housing and Community Services Project Teams is consistent with the Strategic Focus Area Six: Service Excellence which ensures that the Region’s programs and services foster a culture of citizen/customer service that is responsive to community needs.
Financial Implications

The costs for the various projects outlined in Appendix A to Report E-14-013/P-14-008 are included in each Division budget.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:
Nil

Attachments

Appendix A – Planning and Works – Project Teams - 2014

Prepared and Approved By:

Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services

Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Housing and Community Services
# Appendix A

## Planning And Works – Project Teams – 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Political/Stakeholder Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Ecological and Environmental Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wayne Caston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eduardo Cejuda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ted Creese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lauren Cymbaly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ron Donaldson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patrick Duxbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jared Ehgoetz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Laura Ehnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alison Featherstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alge Merry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greg Michalenko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Claudette Millar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Younus Muhammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Priddle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amy Woroch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>King-Victoria Transit Hub Project Team</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Wideman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jean Haalboom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sean Strickland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dan Glenn-Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Area Municipality</td>
<td>Political/Stakeholder Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Heritage Planning Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jean Haalboom, Wendy Wright Cascaden, Ron Hacket, Marg Rowell, Natalie Hardacre, Bill Sutherland, Carolyn Coakley, Elizabeth Waters-Heinrichs, Terrence Gallamore, Karen Oddson, Barbara Wallace, Brad Paddock, Elizabeth Thorson, James Arteaga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Active Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dave Banks, Michael Cahill, Anne Crowe, Bart Forwell, Patrick Gleeson, Bruce Hawkings, Chris Klein, Geoff Lorentz, Jane Mitchell, Ken Parker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Political/Stakeholder Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active Transportation Advisory Committee Cont’d</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jonathan Plummer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paola Rowe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Sommer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barry Tracey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carmen Zannier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transit Advisory Committees**

| 5.  | Specialized Transit Services Advisory Committee |                   | Greg Bechard                         |
|     |                                               |                   | Alfred Bott                          |
|     |                                               |                   | Felix Codat                          |
|     |                                               |                   | Karen Ferguson                        |
|     |                                               |                   | Sharon Giles                         |
|     |                                               |                   | Jean Haalboom                         |
|     |                                               |                   | Tom Livingstone                       |
|     |                                               |                   | Laurie Modderman                      |
|     |                                               |                   | Myrna Nicholas                        |
|     |                                               |                   | Jay Oswald                           |
|     |                                               |                   | Mark Urquhart                         |

**Studies**

| 6.  | Goods Movement Study                           |                   | Geoff Lorentz                        |
| 7.  | Electronic Fare Payment System                 | Region            | Jim Wideman                         |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Political/Stakeholder Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>aBRT Implementation</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>Claudette Millar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>John Gazzola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pam Wolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Pedestrian and Transit Access to Hanson Avenue</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>Jean Haalboom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Gazzola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>2015 Proposed Transit Service Improvements</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>1 Regional Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Highland and Victoria iXpress)</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>2 Local Councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>GRT Business Plan 2015-2018</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>2 Regional Councillors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rapid Transit**

**Steering Committees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Political/Stakeholder Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Rapid Transit Steering Committee</td>
<td>Cambridge/</td>
<td>Jim Wideman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kitchener/</td>
<td>Tom Galloway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>Sean Strickland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Claudette Millar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Studies**

**Transportation**

**Advisory Committees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Political/Stakeholder Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Aeronautical Noise Management Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Berry Vrbanovic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scott Davey (alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Donna Reid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Political/Stakeholder Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aeronautical Noise Management Committee <em>Cont’d</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bonnie Bryant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Geoff Lorentz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art Sinclair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Stoddart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Matthew Bather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gary Tomic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Wagner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christine Rier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Connors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barry Aylward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Steve Darling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Active Transportation Master Plan</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>Geoff Lorentz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jane Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Airport Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sean Strickland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Wideman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Geoff Lorentz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>King Street, Eagle Street to Fountain Street and Fountain Street, King Street to Shantz Hill Road</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>Jane Brewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Karl Kiefer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- EA and Design 2012-2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction in 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Studies

15. Active Transportation Master Plan

16. Airport Master Plan

Design and Construction

17. King Street, Eagle Street to Fountain Street and Fountain Street, King Street to Shantz Hill Road
   - EA and Design 2012-2014
   - Construction in 2016
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Political/Stakeholder Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 18  | South Boundary Road, Water Street to Franklin Boulevard  
- Design in 2013-2015  
- Construction in 2015-2017 | Cambridge         | Rob Deutschmann  
Gary Price  
Ted Higgins  
Doug Craig  
Neil Ritchie |
| 19  | Ottawa Street Improvements Transportation Study, Alpine Road to Homer Watson Boulevard  
- Design in 2013-2014  
- Construction in 2016 | Kitchener         | Tom Galloway  
Jim Wideman |
| 20  | Franklin Boulevard Widening – Pinebush Road to Myers Road  
- Design in 2014  
- Construction in 2015 – 2016 | Cambridge         | Doug Craig  
Ben Tucci |
| 21  | Homer Watson Improvements, Doon South Drive to Conestoga College Boulevard  
- Environmental Assessment in 2013-2014  
- Design in 2014-2016  
- Construction in 2017 | Kitchener         | Tom Galloway  
Jean Haalboom  
Yvonne Fernandes |
| 22  | Victoria Street, Edna Street to Bruce Street  
- Design in 2013  
- Construction in 2014 | Kitchener         | Daniel Glenn-Graham  
Scott Davey |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Political/Stakeholder Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Weber Street Widening – Victoria Street to Guelph Street -Construction in 2013-2014</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>Tom Galloway Jim Wideman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Highland Road Improvements, Patricia Avenue to Westmount Road - Design in 2013  - Construction in 2014</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>Frank Etherington Zyg Janecki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Bishop Street Improvements, Conestoga Blvd to Concession Road, - Design in 2013-2014  - Construction in 2015</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>Karl Kiefer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>University Avenue Improvements, Lincoln Road to Weber Street - Construction in 2014</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>Mark Whaley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Area Municipality</td>
<td>Political/Stakeholder Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 29. | Swan Street Improvements, Hilltop Drive to Stanley Street and Northumberland Street /Stanley Street, Swan Street to Rail Tracks  
- Design in 2014-2016  
- Construction in 2017 | North Dumfries    | Rob Deutschmann  
Sue Foxton |
| 30. | Spragues Road Improvements, Brant/Waterloo Boundary to Wrigley Road  
- Construction in 2014 | North Dumfries    | Gord Taylor |
| 31. | River Road Extension, King Street to Manitou Drive  
- Environmental Assessment – Ongoing  
- Construction in 2017 | Kitchener         | Jim Wideman  
Jean Haalboom  
John Gazzola  
Berry Vrbanovic  
Claudette Millar |
| 32. | Weber Street Improvements, Benjamin Road to King Street  
-Design in 2018-2021  
-Construction in 2022 | Waterloo          | Mark Bauman  
Jeff Henry |
| 33. | Weber Street Improvement, Forwell Creek Road to Milford Avenue  
-Construction in 2014 | Waterloo          | Diane Freeman  
Jeff Henry |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Political/Stakeholder Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 34. | Sawmill Road, Conestoga Bridge to Musselman and Northfield Drive, Country Spring Walk to South Village Line  
     - Design in 2014-2016  
     - Construction in 2017 | Woolwich          | Bonnie Bryant                       |
| 35. | Northfield Drive Widening, Davenport Road to University Avenue  
     - Design in 2014  
     - Construction in 2015 | Waterloo          | Sean Strickland, Diane Freeman      |
| 36. | Bloomingdale Drive, Kraft Street to Bridge Street  
     - Design in 2014  
     - Construction in 2015 | Kitchener         | Scott Davey                         |
| 37. | Frederick Street Improvements, Duke Street to Lancaster Street  
     - Design in 2014-2017  
     - Construction in 2018 | Kitchener         | Dan Glenn-Graham, Jean Haalboom     |
| 38. | Ottawa Street Improvements, Imperial Drive to Pattondon Drive  
     - Design in 2014-2017  
     - Construction in 2018 | Kitchener         | Frank Etherington                   |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Political/Stakeholder Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Snyders Road and Notre Dame Drive Improvements, Petersburg</td>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td>Peter Roe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design in 2015-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction in 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>King Street Improvements, Printery Road to Sawmill Road, St. Jacobs</td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>Mark Bauman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design in 2014-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction in 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Bridge Street Improvements, Woolwich Street to University Avenue</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>Scott Davey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design in 2013-2016</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>Mark Whaley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction in 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Church Street Improvements, Arthur Street to Spruce Lane, Elmira</td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>Julie-Ann Herteis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design in 2014-2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction in 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Manitou Drive Reconstruction, Homer Watson Blvd. to Bleams Road</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>John Gazzola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design in 2014-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction in 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Ainslie Street Reconstruction, Walnut Street to Dickson Street</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>Ben Tucci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design in 2013-2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction in 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Area Municipality</td>
<td>Political/Stakeholder Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 45. | Manitou Drive Improvements, Bleams Road to Fairway Road  
- Design 2013-2014  
- Construction 2015                                                                                                                                  | Kitchener         | Jean Haalboom  
John Gazzola                                    |
| 46. | East Boundary Road Corridor Planning Study  
- Environmental Assessment in 2013-2014                                                                                                               | Cambridge and North Dumfries | Jane Brewer  
Neil Ritchie  
Gary Price                                       |
| 47. | Cedar Street Reconstruction, Osborne Street to Cambridge Boundary and St. Andrews Street Improvements, Cambridge Boundary to Grand Avenue  
- Design 2014-2015  
- Construction 2017                                                                                                                                         | Cambridge         | Pam Wolf  
Gary Price                                      |
| 48. | Kressler Road, Lobsinger Line to Apollo Drive  
- Design 2016-2018  
- Construction 2019                                                                                                                                         | Wellesley Woolwich | Mark Bauman                                     |
| 49. | Dundas Street Improvements, Elgin Street to Hespeler Road, Cambridge  
- Design 2014-2016  
- Construction 2017                                                                                                                                         | Cambridge         | Ben Tucci                                      |
# Planning And Works – Project Teams – 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Political/Stakeholder Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Ottawa Street Improvements, Highway 7 to Lackner Blvd.</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>Scott Davey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design 2014-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction 2016-2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Sawmill Road Improvements, King Street to Waterloo / St Jacobs Tracks</td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>Mark Bauman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design 2014-2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Sawmill Road Improvements River St. to Snyders Flats Road</td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>Bonnie Bryant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design 2014-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Fountain Street Improvements, King St. to Cherry Blossom Rd</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>Claudette Millar</td>
<td>Donna Reid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design 2013-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Highland Road Improvements, Highland Hills Mall Entrance to Trussler Road</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>Geoff Lorentz</td>
<td>Bil Ioannidis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- EA 2014-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design 2016-2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>University Avenue Improvements Keats Way to Erb Street</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>Jane Mitchell</td>
<td>Jeff Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- EA 2014-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design 2016-2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Area Municipality</td>
<td>Political/Stakeholder Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>King Street Reconstruction, Bishop St to Eagle St</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>Karl Kiefer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design 2014-2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Ottawa Street Reconstruction, Alpine Road to Wilson Road</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>Paul Singh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design 2016-2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction 2020-2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Arthur Street Reconstruction, Whippoorwill to First Street</td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>Julie-Anne Herteis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design 2020-2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction 2023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Fountain Street Widening, Maple Grove Rd to Kossuth Rd</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>Jane Brewer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design 2014-2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>Donna Reid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Meyers Road Reconstruction Branchton to Water Street</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>1 Local Councillor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design 2014-2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street, King Street to Erb Street, and Erb Street</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>1 Local Councillor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from King to Caroline Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design 2014-2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Area Municipality</td>
<td>Political/Stakeholder Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Victoria Street Reconstruction, Lawrence Avenue to Fischer Hallman Road</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>1 Local Councillor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design 2015-2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Fischer Hallman Road Widening, Plains Road to Bleams Road</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>1 Regional Councillor, 1 Local Councillor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design 2014-2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Erb Street Improvements</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>1 Regional Councillor, 1 Local Councillor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fischer Hallman Road to Wilmot Line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EA 2014-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design 2015-2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Weber Street Reconstruction, Borden Avenue to Queen Street</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>Dan Glenn-Graham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design 2014-2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>Shantz Station Road Reconstruction, Kossuth Road to Menno Street</td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>1 Local Councillor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design 2014-2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Planning And Works – Project Teams – 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Political/Stakeholder Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Snyder’s Road, Foundry Street to Gingerich Road</td>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td>1 Local Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design 2014-2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>Westmount Road Reconstruction, John Street to Erb Street</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>1 Local Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design 2014-2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>Ottawa Street Reconstruction, Highway 7 to King Street</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>Dan Glenn-Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design 2014-2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>King Street Improvements, South of Erb Street to University Avenue</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>Melissa Durrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design 2014-2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction 2014 and 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Water Services

#### Advisory Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>Water Efficiency Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Les Armstrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tom Galloway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lou Lima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Area Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|     | Water Efficiency Advisory Committee  
*Cont’d*                           |                   | Claudette Millar                      |
|     |                                                                              |                   | James Robinson                        |
|     |                                                                              |                   | Ken Seiling                           |
|     |                                                                              |                   | Pete Leonard                          |
|     |                                                                              |                   | Jim Wideman                           |
|     |                                                                              |                   | Chris Toal                            |
|     |                                                                              |                   | Susan Bryant                          |
| 72. | Source Water Protection Liaison Committee                                    | Cambridge         | Jean Haalboom                         |
| 73. | Well Interference Appeals Committee                                          |                   | Ken Seiling                           |
|     |                                                                              |                   | Les Armstrong                         |
|     |                                                                              |                   | Ross Kelterborn                       |
|     |                                                                              |                   | Todd Cowan                            |
|     |                                                                              |                   | Rob Deutschmann                       |
|     | Water Supply – Studies and Pre-Design                                        |                   |                                      |
| 74. | Integrated Urban System Groundwater Study, Cambridge East Environmental Assessment | Cambridge         | Donna Reid                            |
| 75. | Wilmot Centre Monitoring Program and Public Liaison Committee                 | Wilmot            | Les Armstrong                         |
| 76. | Maple Grove Area Water Supply Environmental Assessment                        | Cambridge         | Donna Reid                            |
|     |                                                                              |                   | Claudette Millar                      |
### Planning And Works – Project Teams – 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Political/Stakeholder Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>Conestoga Plains Water Supply System Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>Todd Cowan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bonnie Bryant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>William Street and Strange Street Water Supply Upgrades</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kitchener, Waterloo</td>
<td>Jean Haalboom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Melissa Durrell, Frank Etherington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>Water Efficiency Master Plan Update Steering Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Jim Wideman, Les Armstrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>Cambridge Water Supply System Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td>Region, Cambridge</td>
<td>1 Regional Councillor, 1 Local Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>Cambridge Water Distribution Upgrades Class EA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Region, Cambridge</td>
<td>1 Regional Councillor, 1 Local Councillor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Water Supply – Design and Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>Mannheim WTP Residue Management Plant Upgrades</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>None Required at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction in 2014-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>Baden – New Hamburg Trunk Watermains (Nafziger Road)</td>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td></td>
<td>None Required at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction in 2016-2017 (Future Stages)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>Zone 4 Trunk Watermain</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>None Required at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design 2014-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction 2016-2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Planning And Works – Project Teams – 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Political/Stakeholder Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>Mannheim Surge Tanks Recoating Design and Construction 2014</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>None Required at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>East Side Pump Station and Forcemain – Class EA and Pre-design</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>Todd Cowan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>Donna Reid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allan Poffenroth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>Baden and New Hamburg Waste Water Treatment Plant Expansion Class Environmental Assessment</td>
<td>Baden/New Hamburg</td>
<td>Les Armstrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barry Fisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>Hespeler Waste Water Treatment Plant Expansion Class Environmental Assessment</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>Jane Brewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rick Cowsill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>Kitchener Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrades</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>Jim Wideman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design and Construction ongoing in 2014-2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jean Haalboom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Gazzola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yvonne Fernandes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>Waterloo Wastewater Treatment Plant Update</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>Mark Whaley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction Ongoing in 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>Preston Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrades</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>None required at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design and Construction Ongoing 2014-2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Political/Stakeholder Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>Galt Process Upgrades</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>None required at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>Southern Ayr Wastewater System Upgrades</td>
<td>North Dumfries</td>
<td>None required at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>Heidelberg Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrades</td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>None required at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>Galt Wastewater Treatment Plant Odour Control Upgrades</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>None required at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>Foxborough Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrades</td>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td>None required at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.</td>
<td>Elmira Wastewater Treatment Plant SCADA Upgrades</td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>None required at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Area Municipality</td>
<td>Political/Stakeholder Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.</td>
<td>Waterloo Region Landfill Liaison Committee</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Jane Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Whaley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.</td>
<td>Waste Management Master Plan</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Jane Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Wideman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Todd Cowan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Claudette Millar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.</td>
<td>Waterloo Landfill South Expansion Area New Cell SE4A</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>None Required at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction in 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region of Waterloo
Planning, Housing and Community Services

Community Planning
Finance
Treasury Services

To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: January 28, 2014

Subject: Recommended Refinements to the Region of Waterloo Brownfields Financial Incentive Program

Recommendation:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following action regarding the Region’s Brownfields Financial Incentive Program, as described in Report No. P-14-009/F-14-008, dated January 28, 2014:

a) Endorse the Brownfields Financial Incentive Program “Eligible Remediation Cost Submission Requirements” document attached in this report in order to provide further clarity with respect to the administration and implementation of the program; and

b) Endorse further consultation with the Area Municipalities and industry stakeholders regarding the program areas identified for further potential revision, and report back to Regional Council in 2014.

Summary:

The Brownfields Financial Incentive Program (BFIP) was established by Regional Council as a pilot program in 2006 in order to facilitate the remediation and redevelopment of brownfields throughout the Region. The BFIP consists of three incentive programs: the Phase Two Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) Grant; the joint Tax Increment Grant (TIG); and the Regional Development Charge (RDC) exemption.
Regional Council’s financial commitment in the BFIP since 2006 reflects the approval of 33 applications. In total, approximately $534,000 has been expended in approved Phase Two Assessment ESA Grants (20 applications). Future potential expenditures relate to the approval of approximately $9.3 million in Tax Increment Grants (six applications) and up to $9.3 million in Regional Development Charge exemptions for brownfields (seven applications).

Sites receiving assistance through the program have contributed to a significant amount of investment in the community. This includes the development of approximately 391 new residential units and approximately 32,806 square meters (353,118 square feet) of non-residential floor area that together represent a building permit value of approximately $65.6 million. Further, it is estimated that an additional 1,270 residential units and 77,000 square feet of non-residential floor area may be realized once the remaining approved projects are completed.

On November 25, 2013, the City of Waterloo approved a Brownfields Community Improvement Plan (CIP) and a recommendation to develop a Joint Tax Increment Grant program in cooperation with the Region of Waterloo. These decisions mean that in 2014, the joint TIG will be available in Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo. Funding is available to help the four Townships prepare CIPs as a necessary first step to expanding the joint TIG program to the Townships.

Building on the significant experience with the program to date, Regional and Area Municipal staff have continued to identify areas for which clarification, refinement and a “tightening” of the administration of the BFIP should be considered. Benefits include ensuring careful and prudent allocation of funds, greater certainty for program applicants related to the process and additional clarity around eligible costs.

This has resulted in two key recommendations in this report. The first recommendation is that Council endorse the BFIP “Eligible Remediation Cost Submission Requirements” document as part of the formal administration of the program. This document would replace the earlier informal guideline document and provide additional clarity for potential program applicants with respect to the types of eligible remediation costs (including specific definitions), documentation standards and review process (including peer review by Qualified Persons if required) that would be required as part of the program.

The second recommendation is that Council endorse staff’s plan to initiate a broader consultation with the Area Municipalities and industry stakeholders to obtain feedback on the several additional program areas identified for possible revision. Following this consultation, staff proposes to prepare a report outlining recommended refinements to the BFIP for Regional Council’s consideration later in 2014.

Report:

Brownfields Financial Incentive Program Background

In October 2006, Regional Council approved the framework for a Regional Brownfields Financial Incentive Pilot Program. The goal of the program was to encourage the
remediation and redevelopment of existing brownfield sites in a manner that serves to:

- promote compact growth that utilizes existing infrastructure;
- reduce the outward expansion of the urban area;
- mitigate potential risk to Regional groundwater sources by promoting remediation of environmentally impacted properties;
- generate increased tax revenue from previously under-utilized or abandoned properties; and
- support the adaptive reuse of buildings, including heritage properties.

The goals and outcomes of the BFIP align with Provincial and Regional Policies including the Province’s Places to Grow Growth Plan, the Regional Growth Management Strategy (RGMS), and the Regional Official Plan (approved by Regional Council in 2009).

The BFIP consists of three incentive programs for developers:

1. Phase Two Environmental Site Assessment Grants (ESA) - applicable region-wide. A cost sharing program that funds up to 50 per cent of eligible costs associated with the completion of environmental site investigation, in the form of a Phase Two ESA report, to a maximum of $40,000;

2. Regional Development Charge Exemptions (RDC) - applicable region-wide. Development charge exemptions for brownfields are provided through the RDC By-law up to a maximum of the total eligible remediation costs incurred for the remediation of environmentally impacted sites in areas where RDCs would otherwise be due; and

3. Tax Increment Grants (TIG) - currently applicable in the three cities. A joint program that further offsets remediation costs by providing grants to developers who remediate and redevelop a brownfield site. The TIG program is operated jointly with the Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo (as of November 2013) and shares a common set of eligibility requirements and identical program characteristics including:

   - the maximum amount of the TIG is determined at the time of approval based on the estimated eligible costs for remediation less any other applicable financial incentives;

   - TIG payments are made annually with the annual payment equal to the increase in municipal taxes resulting from remediation and redevelopment;

   - annual TIG payments are provided each year until the eligible remediation costs have been recouped, or 10 annual payments have been made, which ever occurs first;

   - the property owner continues to pay all taxes due during the TIG payment period; and

   - payments only begin after the property has been remediated, redeveloped and reassessed.
Legislative authority for the provision of Tax Increment Grants is provided through Section 28 of the Planning Act which authorizes a lower or upper tier municipality to provide grants or loans to land owners for the purposes of promoting community improvement activities, including environmental remediation, for properties located within a defined project area that forms part of a Community Improvement Plan (CIP) approved by Council. The Region participates in the TIG program through the Area Municipalities’ CIPs.

On November 25, 2013, the City of Waterloo approved a Brownfields Community Improvement Plan (CIP) and a recommendation to develop a joint TIG program in cooperation with the Region of Waterloo. Regional and City staff are now in the process of finalizing details for the implementation and administration of the program in the City of Waterloo.

Regional funding is available to help the four Townships prepare Community Improvement Plans as a necessary first step to expanding the joint TIG program to the Townships.

**Brownfields Financial Incentive Program Approvals to Date**

Regional Council’s financial commitment in the BFIP to date includes a total of approximately $534,000 in approved Phase Two Assessment ESA Grants, approvals for future potential expenditures of approximately $9.3 million in Tax Increment Grants, and up to $9.3 million in Regional Development Charge exemptions for brownfields.

A total of 33 applications have been approved (20 Phase Two ESA grants; seven RDC exemptions and six TIGs) and staff has responded to over 100 inquiries from the public regarding the BFIP program. TIGs approved by the Region and Area Municipalities include The Tannery (Kitchener), Waterscape on the Grand River (Cambridge), 750 Lawrence St. (Cambridge), the Breithaupt Block (Kitchener), 55 Mooregate Cr. (Kitchener) and 19 Guelph Ave. (Cambridge). Please see Attachment 1 for a summary of the related Capital Budget and Forecast.

The funding commitment has contributed to the development of approximately 391 new residential units and approximately 32,806 square meters (353,118 square feet) of non-residential floor area that together represent a building permit value of approximately $65.6 million. It is estimated that program approved sites still in the planning review process could result in the development of an additional 1,270 residential units and 77,000 square feet of non-residential floor area.

In January 2013, Regional Council approved a sustainable, long-term funding model for the TIG program, financing the Regional portion of future TIG commitments through the incremental tax revenue following site remediation and redevelopment (see Report P-13-004/F-13-007). To date, two TIGs (55 Mooregate Cres. and 19 Guelph Ave.) have been approved under this funding model.

**BFIP Refinements Recommended for Immediate Implementation (in this report)**

Regional and Area Municipal staff have continued to identify areas for which
clarification, refinement and a “tightening” of the administration of the BFIP should be considered. These areas include:

- Improved BFIP information documents to ensure clarity and certainty of process to potential applicants;
- Revised BFIP administration processes, including mandatory pre-application consultation; and
- Revised procedures and standards for the submission and review of remedial work plans, cost estimates and final financial information.

To this end, staff have developed the BFIP “Eligible Remediation Cost Submission Requirements” document (please see Attachment 2) in consultation with the Area Municipalities. This document, which would replace the earlier informal guideline document, provides additional clarity with respect to the types of eligible remediation costs (including specific definitions), documentation standards and review process (including peer review by Qualified Persons if required) that would be required as part of the program. This resource will assist potential applicants in ensuring that they are able to meet these requirements in a timely and straightforward manner.

It is recommended that Regional Council endorse this document as part of the formal administration of the program. If approved, these requirements would be implemented immediately, made available on the Region’s website at: www.regionofwaterloo.ca/brownfields, and communicated to potential program applicants as part of the pre-application consultation process. Any future revisions to the document would also be subject to Council endorsement.

Future Potential BFIP Refinements (for consideration by Council at a later date)

Throughout the course of implementing the BFIP, staff has gained considerable insight into how the program is viewed and used by the development community, and the degree to which approved applications have aligned with Regional and Area Municipal strategic goals. Based on this experience and through ongoing consultation with Area Municipal partners, several potential additional areas of refinement have been identified that could expedite the review of BFIP applications, result in more sustainable approaches to remediation, and further align project funding with Regional and Area Municipal objectives/priorities.

The potential areas for future refinement include:

1) Program Eligibility Requirements
   Currently there is some variability between eligibility requirements for the different BFIP programs. It is proposed that some program eligibility requirements be rationalized to provide more consistency and reflect applicable provincial legislative changes that have come into force and effect since the BFIP was first introduced in 2006. Staff is also suggesting that consideration be given to augmenting the brownfield definition with a series of criteria that will assist staff in determining whether projects are eligible for the BFIP.
2) Consideration for Regional and Area Municipal Objectives
It is proposed that options be examined that will further align the BFIP with Regional and Area Municipal objectives. Options could include prioritizing locations where developers would be eligible to apply for Regional Development Charge Exemptions for Brownfields, or developing an incentive structure where full funding would only be available to projects that fulfill a stated number of established Regional and/or Area Municipal objectives/priorities.

3) Accounting for Financial Assistance for Brownfields
It is suggested that the current practice of deducting previous financial assistance received from either the Region or Area Municipality from the final total funding commitment, be reviewed to determine whether it would be more appropriate to have the previous financial assistance provided by the Region or Area Municipality subtracted from the applicable Regional or Area Municipal share of the funding commitment. The latter approach provides a more direct method of calculating and determining the financial contributions by each respective municipality.

4) Application, Administration and Communication Processes
Staff would like to consider implementing a “streamlined” application for the administration of the TIG Program and RDC Brownfield Exemption program through the use of one generic application that would be tailored as appropriate for each site and municipality. Further, an application for either program could be required to be submitted before any remediation takes place on the site (currently only required for the joint TIG program), allowing for appropriate communication and coordination with the applicant regarding program requirements. This further revised application process would also allow for an upfront review of the proposed remediation approach (including a third party peer review by a Qualified Person if deemed appropriate) before funds are spent by the applicant on remediation.

5) Eligible Remediation Costs
In addition to the clarifications outlined in the “Eligible Remediation Cost Submission Requirements” document, staff is also considering several revisions to the existing eligible remediation cost framework including:

- Implementing a “scaled” eligible remediation cost framework whereby only a portion of the total eligible remediation costs would be reimbursed with the remaining portion available if the project met certain Regional and/or Area Municipal objectives/priorities;
- Refining, reorganizing and eliminating certain costs currently considered “eligible” under the BFIP program, which are difficult to confirm, such as labour costs and certain equipment rentals;
- Implementing an “upset” limit related to the transportation and tipping fees associated with the disposal of contaminated soil in order to encourage more sustainable approaches to its management; and
- Eliminating the program allowances for the TIG and RDC program which equal 10 and 20 per cent of total eligible costs, respectively.
Next Steps

Implementing the suggested refinements proposed above (but not yet recommended in this report) could represent a significant shift in the direction of the BFIP program. Overall, the program would better address some of the emerging opportunities and challenges occurring within the changing local context. Staff suggest that these changes would help “raise the bar” on both the remediation and the final product by encouraging a more sustainable approach to remediation (for example moving away from various “dig and dump” approaches to soil management), and by adding incentive for projects to meet both Regional and Area Municipal objectives/priorities.

Further, for the above revisions to the BFIP program to occur, continued coordination with the Area Municipalities is critical. While many of the changes are administrative in nature, any significant revisions to the joint TIG program may have larger implications. For example, the joint TIG program is currently implemented through Area Municipal Community Improvement Plans (in which the Region participates). Therefore, depending on the nature of the changes, the cities may have to amend their existing CIPs.

In addition, communication and consultation with the development and technical community would be key. Staff would ensure that there is an adequate transition period from the current program to any future program – especially given the changes to eligibility requirements and eligible remediation costs that are proposed.

Staff is now requesting that Council endorse staff’s plan to initiate a broader stakeholder consultation to obtain feedback on the above proposed revisions and to develop a more comprehensive revised BFIP package for Council consideration later in 2014.

The timing would also be appropriate to resume discussions with the Townships regarding the development and implementation of a CIP that would provide the required framework for participation in the joint TIG program. In 2012, staff received letters from each of the Township Councils indicating a desire to move forward in partnership and engage a consultant to assist in this process. The BFIP budget continues to include $50,000 in funding set aside for the Area Municipalities to develop the required CIPs. Staff would consult with township staff to determine if there is still interest in pursuing this option and what a terms of reference could include.

Lastly, discussions with the Area Municipalities will take into consideration opportunities for reviewing the Region’s role in providing various financial incentives, particularly as the development industry responds to changing market forces. An overview of potential tools and resources was provided in May 2013 (see Report P-13-057) with key issues including; alignment with the Community Building Strategy, development potential at the King and Victoria Transit Hub and the examination of opportunities for Tax Increment Financing (TIFs). The Region has also been approached regarding the potential for participation within the Northdale Community Improvement Plan in the City of Waterloo. A future report relating to the overall incentive framework will be brought back for Council consideration later in 2014.
Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

Regional staff consults with planning, finance and legal staff from the Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo on a regular basis regarding the implementation of the joint Tax Increment Grant program. All Area Municipal staff reviewed drafts of this report and support the program refinements that have been recommended to “tighten” the program, including the “Eligible Remediation Cost Submission Requirements” document. They also support the recommendation to undertake a more in-depth review of the BFIP, including stakeholder consultation. To this end, staff would invite the Area Municipalities to resume regular meetings of the “Brownfields Working Group” for more detailed discussions on potential revisions to the program.

Promotion of the BFIP continues to occur through a coordinated approach by the Region and Area Municipalities. Information about the program has been coordinated with the “Big Shift Toolbox” at www.regionofwaterloo.ca/bigshift, and is also posted on each of the city websites.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

The Regional BFIP directly addresses Focus Area 2 of the Corporate Strategic Plan: Growth Management and Prosperity (Manage growth to foster thriving and productive urban and rural communities), Strategic Objective 2.1 (Encourage compact, livable urban and rural settlement form) and its specific Actions:

- Implement a sustainable Brownfield Program to promote the redevelopment of previously contaminated sites (Action 2.1.1); and
- Work with area municipalities to develop and implement a comprehensive strategy to promote intensification and reurbanization within existing urban areas (Action 2.1.2).

Financial Implications:

The Region’s Brownfields Financial Incentive Program is funded through a number of sources including $5.0 million from one-time funds ( $2.5 million approved in the 2006 Regional budget and $2.5 million transferred from the Environmental Insurance Reserve Fund) and $250,000 from the Capital Levy Reserve Fund for ESA grants. This $5.25 million has been almost entirely committed with the exception of approximately $250,000 reserved for future ESA grants. Of the $5.25 million of one-time funds, $4,328,609 has been committed to TIGs, $784,469 has been spent or committed to ESA grants, $50,000 has been reserved for amendments to Area Municipal CIPs and $86,922 was spent on program development.

The RDC exemption is funded through program budgets (Roads, Water and Wastewater, other) in a manner similar to other development charge exemptions offered by the Region rather than through the BFIP budget.

In January 2013, Council approved a sustainable, long-term funding model for the financing of the Regional portion of Tax Increment Grant approvals based on funding
the grant from the incremental tax revenue following remediation and redevelopment (please see Report: P-13-004/F-13-007). All future TIGs will be funded from incremental tax revenue.

The 2014 – 2023 capital budget and forecast for the BFIP showing approved expenditures, expected timing and sources of financing is shown in Attachment 1.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Staff from Water Services, Corporate Resources, Legal Services and Finance has been involved in the review and development of the potential revisions to the BFIP program. Staff will continue to involve various departments as appropriate given the cross-departmental nature of the BFIP program.

Attachments:

Attachment 1 - BFIP 2014 – 2023 Capital Budget and Forecast
Attachment 2 - Eligible Remediation Cost Submission Requirements Document

Prepared By: Brooke Lambert, Principal Planner

Angela Hinchberger, Director, Financial Services, Treasury & Tax Policy

Approved By: Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Housing and Community Services

Craig Dyer, Chief Financial Officer
## BFIP 2014 – 2023 Capital Budget and Forecast

### Attachment 1

#### BFIP 2014 – 2023 Capital Budget and Forecast

**THE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO**  
**TEN YEAR CAPITAL FORECAST (000’s) 2014-2023**

### EXPENDITURES

<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>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99054 5.1 Breithaupt Tax Increment Grant</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>954</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99055 170 Water (North 1) Tax Increment Grant</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99056 170 Water (North 2) Tax Increment Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>207</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99057 130 Water (South Parcel) Tax Increment Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>534</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>1,602</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99058 36 Francis Tax Increment Grant</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>538</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99059 750 Lawrence Tax Increment Grant (Note 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99061 Environmental Site Assessment Grants</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>264</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99062 Community Improvement Plans</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99063 19 Guelph Tax Increment Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1,296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL PROPOSED EXPENDITURES**  
| 686 | 604 | 1,290 | 525 | 564 | 535 | 535 | 520 | 291 | 735 | 735 | 724 | 6,454 |

### SOURCES OF FINANCING

Reserve and Reserve Funds:

| 3980140 Brownfield Incentive Program Reserve | 264 | 236 | | | | | | | | | | 2,102 |
| 3980180 Water Capital RF | 146 | 201 | 347 | 32 | 69 | 69 | 64 | | | | | 581 |
| 3980460 Federal Gas Tax Reserve Fund | 146 | 201 | 347 | 32 | 69 | 69 | 64 | | | | | 581 |
| Other Reserves | 146 | 201 | 347 | 32 | 69 | 69 | 64 | | | | | 581 |
| Capital Levy Reserve Fund | 250 | 250 | | | | | | | | | | |

**Revenue (Taxation)**

| | 166 | 328 | 328 | 328 | 291 | 201 | 201 | 190 | 2,361 |

**TOTAL PROPOSED SOURCES OF FINANCING**

| 688 | 603 | 1,291 | 526 | 564 | 535 | 535 | 520 | 291 | 735 | 735 | 724 | 6,456 |

---

1. Subject to confirmation of other additional brownfield related financial assistance. It is expected that the Environmental Site Assessment grants and Brownfield Development Charges Exemptions will cover the full amount of eligible remediation costs.
Region of Waterloo
Brownfield Financial Incentives Program

Eligible Remediation Cost Submission Requirements

1. Overview

The following document outlines the requirements associated with the submission and review of eligible remediation costs as they relate to the Region’s Brownfield Financial Incentive Program (BFIP) -- specifically the Joint Tax Increment Grant (TIG) program and the Regional Development Charge Exemption for Brownfields.

All eligible remediation costs must be related to the remediation of the site as specified by a Remedial Work Plan/Action Plan prepared by a Qualified Person (QP) to allow filing of a Record of Site Condition (RSC) as per Ontario Regulation 153/04, as amended.

Eligible Remediation Costs have been defined as work related to the following categories:

- Phase One Environmental Site Assessments;
- Phase Two Environmental Site Assessments;
- Environmental Remediation Work; and
- Indirect Remediation Costs.

A detailed listing of potential eligible remediation costs by category has been included in Appendix A.

**NOTE:** Development (or redevelopment) related costs are not eligible. Any costs that may be related to both remediation and redevelopment will be subject to further review and apportioned appropriately and may only be partially eligible. Further, in any cases where the applicant may need to make a distinction between costs associated with remediation and/or redevelopment, photographic documentation may be required.
2. Review of Remedial Work Plan/Action Plan and Cost Estimate

Applicants to the BFIP must submit the proposed Remedial Work Plan/Action Plan and cost estimate, prepared by a QP to the Region of Waterloo/Area Municipality for review before starting any remedial work on the site. If the proposed remediation approach for the site also includes the excavation and disposal of contaminated soil, the preparation and submission of a Soil Management Plan may also be required.

If the applicant/owner intends to undertake some of the consulting or remedial work using a wholly owned company or a subsidiary or otherwise related firm, cost estimates for the work should be provided by at least two other competitive bidders. Applicants should also be prepared to demonstrate the anticipated costs savings or benefit this approach provides.

NOTE: Applicants must comply with Section 6 of the Ontario Regulation 153/04, as amended. Failure to do so may render certain environmental consulting services or remediation activities undertaken by a related company or supervised by a related Qualified Person ineligible.

Further, in all instances, it is the applicant’s responsibility and duty to manage, mitigate and minimize remedial costs. The Region reserves the right to review the recommended remedial approach with the applicant if deemed necessary. If applicable, Regional/Area Municipal Staff may also request that a Third Party review of the Remedial Work Plan/Action Plan and Cost Estimate be conducted by a QP at the applicant’s cost.

Following this review, Regional Staff will issue a “Letter of Acknowledgement” outlining the results of the review, any requests for additional information or clarification and applicable next steps.

NOTE: Any costs expended in advance of the “Letter of Acknowledgment” relating to the receipt and review of the Remedial Work Plan/Action Plan by Regional Staff may not be considered eligible under the BFIP.

3. Organization and Submission of Eligible Remediation Costs

It is the responsibility of the applicant to ensure that all invoices and supporting information is accurate, complete and sufficient to allow for a third party audit of the costs (to be paid for and submitted by the applicant), as well as a final review by Regional/Area Municipal Staff.

As a result, it is strongly recommended that applicants ensure that the supporting
information and financial accounting is organized in a clear and easily understandable manner at the outset of the remediation work. Providing direction to any qualified persons, contractors, and financial service providers regarding the requirements of these programs at the beginning of the process can significantly reduce the time and effort to meet the submission requirements. Please see Appendix A for eligible remediation costs by category and Appendix B for an example invoice.

4. Eligible Remediation Cost Submission Requirements & Review Process

**STEP 1 – Background Documentation**

The Applicant must ensure the Region/Area Municipalities have access to electronic copies of all supporting documentation required for the applicable incentive program. This may include, but is not limited to:

- Remedial work plan/action plan;
- Soil management plan (if applicable);
- Original cost estimates;
- Any additional correspondence/clarification from the Qualified Person;
- Risk management plan;
- Risk assessment (if applicable);
- Record of site condition; and
- Certificate of property use.

**STEP 2 – Eligible Remediation Cost Invoice Package**

The Applicant is responsible for the preparation of the “Eligible Remediation Cost Invoice Package”. This package includes hard copies of all paid invoices as well as a summary of the invoices, prepared by the Applicant in Excel format.

All invoices must include the following information:

- Invoice number;
- Invoice date;
- Project site address/location;
- Vendor/description;
- Invoice amount (less HST);
- Description of remedial activities; and
- Proof of payment.

**NOTE:** Invoices that do not provide highly detailed information about the individual activities carried out and their specific costs and/or culminate in total eligible costs in excess of the estimate provided in the Remedial Work Plan may not be accepted. For an
example of an acceptable invoice, please see Appendix B.

The Excel summary should be prepared in a table format and include the following for each invoice:

- Item;
- Invoice number;
- Invoice date;
- Vendor;
- Invoice amount (excluding HST);
- Activities included;
- Eligible remediation cost category (see pg. 1);
- Description;
- Percentage of costs eligible; and
- Any other comments/pertinent information.

For an example of the invoice summary table, please see Appendix C.

**STEP 3 – Third Party Audit**

The Applicant is responsible for obtaining a third party audit of the Eligible Remediation Cost Invoice Package. The audit should confirm the link between direct remediation costs submitted and the work plan followed to achieve filing of the Record of Site Condition. Further, it should be carried out in accordance with the standards set out in Section 5815 of the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants Handbook – Special Reports - Audit Reports on Compliance with Agreements, Statutes and Regulations.

**NOTE:** Results of the audit should be provided in a letter prepared by an appropriate accredited professional. The audit letter must include the following:

- Confirmation of a review of all the documents listed above as part of Step 1;
- A statement confirming that all eligible remediation costs have been incurred and that no further costs related to the project are anticipated;
- A statement confirming that the invoices submitted relate to the Risk Management Plan followed in order to achieve a Record of Site Condition and to meet the requirements of the Certificate of Property Use (CPU) for the site; and
- A statement that the costs conform to the defined Eligible Remediation Costs as defined by the applicable incentive program.

**STEP 4 – Eligible Remediation Cost Review & Decision**

Once Steps 1-3 are complete, the Applicant is ready to submit the Eligible Remediation Cost Invoice Package and Audit Letter to Region/Area Municipality in order to determine the final eligible remediation cost total. Staff will undertake an internal review of invoices
and final costs. If necessary, a third party review by a Qualified Person may also be required.

Following the review process, final eligible remediation cost totals will be confirmed by Senior Management at the Region of Waterloo (and if applicable) Senior Management at the Area Municipality.

NOTES:

1) Calculation of Total Eligible Remediation Costs for the RDC Exemption will be limited to only those eligible remediation costs required to obtain the Record of Site Condition and included at the time of the audit. Future or anticipated costs will not be considered.

2) For the TIG program, costs must be incurred prior to the approval of the final TIG legal agreement. A signed addendum outlining the final total eligible remediation costs will be added at time of final review.

Appendices:

Appendix A - Eligible Remediation Cost Categories
Appendix B - Example Invoice
Appendix C - Example Eligible Remediation Cost Invoice Summary Table

For any questions, please contact:

John Hill, Principal Planner/Brownfields Coordinator
Region of Waterloo
Planning, Housing and Community Services
150 Frederick Street, 8th Floor
Kitchener, ON, N2G 4J3
519-575-4500 Ext. 3417
519-575-4449 (fax)
jhill@regionofwaterloo.ca
Appendix A

Eligible Remediation Cost Categories

**NOTE:** The costs listed in this document represent a guideline only, and do not constitute an exhaustive list of all possible eligible remediation costs. All invoices submitted as part of the BFIP are subject to internal and external review and will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

1. **Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment**

   - Documents Review
     - FOI request
     - Aerial photos and mapping (over time, development, topographic maps, physiographic maps, geological maps, well records)
     - Previous environmental studies
     - Relevant government information (certificate of approval, certificates of property use, inventory of coal gasification plants, national pollutant release inventory, waste management inventory, retail fuel storage tank info, etc.)
     - Other relevant documents (insurance, ownership/land title)
   - Interviews
   - Site reconnaissance
   - Conceptual model development
   - Report

   **NOTE:** It is the responsibility of the applicant to ensure that all Phase 1 ESA work is conducted in accordance with the O.Reg 153/04 (as amended) under the Environmental Protection Act (EPA). Applicants should refer to the Regulation (Schedule D) for specific Phase 1 requirements.

2. **Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessment**

   - Field Work
     - Site visit/investigation
     - Utility locates
     - Drilling/excavation/ other methods of intrusive sampling
     - Geological study
       - Soil sampling – stockpile sampling/sampling of excavation
       - Test pit excavation and observation
       - Geophysical testing
     - Hydrogeology study

---

2 Per CAN/CSA Z768-01, O. Reg. 511/09 amendment to O. Reg 153/04 as of July 1, 2011. 3 Per O. Reg. 511/09.
Water level and well condition survey
Observation of borehole drilling, well abandonment, well repairs
Surveying – elevation survey of wells and associated data analysis
Groundwater sampling
  o Field supervision (monitoring, sample selection and quality control)
  o Field equipment (consumables)
Data compilation/analysis
  o Data reduction, analysis and review
  o GIS support, site plans preparation
Contract and laboratory fees
  o Soil and water chemical analysis
Administrative assistance
Disbursements
Reporting
Qualified Person review
Supplemental Phase 2
  o Delineation of contamination
Project management
  o Meetings
  o Bid preparation
  o Region application
  o Bid preparation

Peer Review
  o Data gap analysis

NOTE: It is the responsibility of the applicant to ensure that all Phase 2 ESA work is conducted in accordance with the O.Reg 153/04 (as amended) under the Environmental Protection Act (EPA). Applicants should refer to the Regulation (Schedule E) for specific Phase 2 requirements.

3. Environmental Remediation Work

Environmental remediation work must be identified in a remediation work plan and cannot include work completed prior to 12 months of filing a TIG application.

Remediation work would include, but is not limited to:

a) Remedial Action Plan/ Remedial Work Plan

  - Options review/assessment
  - Remedial cost analysis
  - Development of plan

---

4 Prepared by a Qualified Person as defined by Ontario Regulation 153/04
b) Risk Assessment

- Preliminary RA data gap analysis
- Risk assessment pre-submission for
  o Site characterization
  o Report review
  o Data evaluation
  o Preparation of figures
  o Toxicological profiles
  o Report preparation
  o Project management
- Data gap assessment
  o Service clearances
  o Surveying
  o Drilling services
  o Monitoring well supplies
  o Chemical analysis
  o Field equipment
- Analysis
  o Hydrogeological assessment
  o Ecological risk assessment (ERA)
  o Human health risk assessment (HHRA)
  o Risk management plan
  o Public communication plan
  o Reporting and MOE submission

c) Environmental Rehabilitation

- Alternative Techniques
  o Activated carbon treatment
  o Air stripping
  o Bioremediation
  o Capping
  o Chemical dehalogenation
  o Chemical oxidation
  o Soil excavation
  o Fracturing
  o In-situ flushing
  o In-situ thermal treatment
  o Incineration

---

5 Prepared by a Qualified Person as defined by Ontario Regulation 153/04
6 Defined as the use of various techniques to reduce, eliminate or mitigate contaminants of concern or designated substances in the ground (soil, water) or buildings to allow for the filing of a Record of Site Condition (RSC) and fulfilling the conditions of a Certificate of Property Use (CPU) if applicable.

7 Listed on US Environmental Protection Agency – [www.clu-in.products/citguide](http://www.clu-in.products/citguide) “Citizen’s Guides to Cleanup Methods”. Not intended to be a comprehensive list.
Monitored natural attenuation
- Permeable reactive barriers
- Phytoremediation
- Pump and treat
- Soil vapour extraction and air sparging
- Soil washing
- Solidification/stabilization
- Solvent extraction
- Thermal desorption
- Vitrification

- Geotechnical studies and shoring costs associated with the environmental rehabilitation; and
- The treatment of Designated Substances\(^8\) on a case-by-case basis, where required to address other contamination.

**Risk Mitigation Measures (RMMs)\(^9\)**

- Pump and treat systems
- Capping (must be remediation related)
  - Hard cap, soil cap, landscaping
- Monitoring
  - Indoor air monitoring plan
  - Groundwater
  - Soil vapour
  - Outdoor air
- Soil and groundwater management plan
- Health and safety plan
- Subsurface barriers

**NOTE:** Only the costs associated with the implementation of these measures (such as the design costs, capital costs and installation) will be considered eligible. **Operating and maintenance costs, including monitoring, are not eligible.** Determination of eligibility will be made on a case by case basis.

**NOTE:** If capping is required on the site for remediation purposes as well as redevelopment, the applicant should be prepared to demonstrate what percentage of the cost is attributed to the remediation of the site and not the overall landscaping plan.

---

\(^8\) “Designated Substance” means a biological, chemical or physical agent or combination thereof prescribed as a designated substance to which the exposure of a worker is prohibited, regulated, restricted, limited or controlled; *(Occupational Health and Safety Act)*. O.Reg. 490/09 Designated Substances. O. Reg. 278/05 Designated Substances - Asbestos on Construction Projects and in Building and Repair Operations.

\(^9\) Risk Management Measures (RMMs) are those measures required on a specific site in order to allow filing a Record of Site Condition and outlined by a Certificate of Property Use (CPU).
Eligible costs will be limited to the basic elements needed to meet the technical requirements of the cap as per the CPU.

d) Disposal of contaminated soil\textsuperscript{10}

- Trucking fees
- Tipping fees

NOTE: Costs related to the disposal of contaminated soil may be subject to the submission and review of a soil management plan. Costs related to “impacted soil”\textsuperscript{11} are not eligible. Applicants should be prepared to provide documentation related to the segregation and tracking of contaminated soil (including hours and weigh tickets). Inadequately tracked activities may be deemed ineligible.

e) Placing of clean fill and grading

f) Building demolition related to remediation

NOTE: The applicant should be prepared to demonstrate how the demolition was required as part of the remedial plan and not simply part of the overall redevelopment of the site.

4. Indirect Remediation Costs

- Planning fees
- Legal costs
- Financing fees associated with remediation
- Insurance premiums
- Assessment estimates
- Preparation of record of site condition
- Certificate of approval

NOTE: The Brownfields Financial Incentive Program allows for a flat percentage allowance to be applied (10 percent for TIGs and 20 per cent for RDC exemptions). Receipts for these costs are not required and any invoices related to the indirect costs above, will not be included in the base eligible cost calculations.

\textsuperscript{10} Soil that does not meet the applicable generic Ontario Ministry of Environment (MOE) site condition standards (SCS) for soil as defined in Ontario Regulation 153/04 (as amended) OR the lowest effects-based property specific standards (PSS) developed through the use of a risk assessment approach completed in accordance with Ontario Regulation 153/04 (as amended), whichever is less stringent.

\textsuperscript{11} Soil that does not meet the revised Ontario Ministry of the Environment Table 1 “Full Depth Background Site Condition Standards” BUT does meet the applicable generic MOE site condition standards (SCS) as defined in Ontario Regulation 153/04 (as amended) under the Environmental Protection Act of Ontario OR the lowest effects-based property specific standards ("PSS") developed through the use of a risk assessment in accordance with Ontario Regulation 153/04 (as amended), for the purposes of filing of a RSC with the MOE in accordance with Ontario Regulation 153/04, whichever is less stringent.
# Appendix B

## Example Invoice

**Invoice 4 of 37**

**Date:** 28/09/13  
**Invoice #:** 12345

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPANY NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Name]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Address]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY, PROV/POSTAL CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[City, Prov/Postal Code]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Phone]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>LINE TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 2</td>
<td>COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE EXCAVATION AND REMOVAL OF CONTAMINATED, NON-HAZ. SOILS AT [SITE ADDRESS] BETWEEN JUNE 1 AND JUNE 30, 2013</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>LUMP SUM</td>
<td>00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 2</td>
<td>PROJECT MANAGEMENT, PREPARATION AND LOCATES (W/D DETAILS)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>LUMP SUM</td>
<td>00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 2</td>
<td>SITE PREPARATION (W/D DETAILS)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>LUMP SUM</td>
<td>00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 2</td>
<td>EQUIPMENT RENTAL (1 BULLDOZER @ 8.0 HRS)</td>
<td>8.0 HRS</td>
<td>@ 00.00</td>
<td>00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 5</td>
<td>SITE EXCAVATION</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>LUMP SUM</td>
<td>00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 5</td>
<td>EXCAVATE/LOADING OF CONT. NON HAZ SOILS</td>
<td>865.18 TNS</td>
<td>@ 00.00</td>
<td>00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 5</td>
<td>TRANSPORT AND DISPOSAL OF CONT. NON HAZ SOILS</td>
<td>865.18 TNS</td>
<td>@ 00.00</td>
<td>00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 5</td>
<td>LABOUR</td>
<td>9.0 HRS</td>
<td>@ 00.00</td>
<td>00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 5</td>
<td>EQUIPMENT RENTAL (2 SHOVEL @ 9.0 HRS)</td>
<td>18.0 HRS</td>
<td>@ 00.00</td>
<td>00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 6</td>
<td>EXCAVATE/LOADING OF CONT. NON HAZ SOILS</td>
<td>1351.29 TNS</td>
<td>@ 00.00</td>
<td>00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 6</td>
<td>TRANSPORT AND DISPOSAL OF CONT. NON HAZ SOILS</td>
<td>1351.29 TNS</td>
<td>@ 00.00</td>
<td>00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 6</td>
<td>LABOUR (2 @ 9.0 HRS)</td>
<td>18.0 HRS</td>
<td>@ 00.00</td>
<td>00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE 6</td>
<td>EQUIPMENT RENTAL (3 SHOVEL @ 8.0 HRS)</td>
<td>24.0 HRS</td>
<td>@ 00.00</td>
<td>00.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GST/HST #:** 000000000000000000  
**SUBTOTAL:** 00000.00  
**HST:** 00.00  
**TOTAL:** 00000.00

Project Manager: John Smith  
Qualified Person: John Doe, B.SC, M.Sc, C.Chem, Senior Analyst

Thank you for your business!
## Appendix C

### Example Eligible Remediation Cost Invoice Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Invoice #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Amount (excluding HST)</th>
<th>Activities Included</th>
<th>Eligible Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Sept 1</td>
<td>Consultant X</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Geological Study</td>
<td>Phase Two ESA</td>
<td>Work to determine...</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Oct 1</td>
<td>Consultant X</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Remedial Action Plan</td>
<td>Environmental Remediation Work</td>
<td>RAP dated September...</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Nov 1</td>
<td>Firm Y</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Bio-Remediation</td>
<td>Environmental Remediation Work</td>
<td>Remediation of soil...</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region of Waterloo
Planning Housing and Community Services
Community Planning

To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: January 28, 2014
File Code: D13-40
Subject: Mid-Year 2013 Region of Waterloo Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory

Recommendation:
For information.

Summary:
Manufacturing is a cornerstone of Waterloo Region’s diverse economy, employing approximately 55,900 persons at year end 2012. This represents 20.2% of the labour force, making Waterloo Region second only to Windsor as the most manufacturing intensive economy in Ontario.

A robust and stable supply of vacant industrial and business park lands is integral to attracting and retaining investment in manufacturing and related businesses. The Region of Waterloo, in collaboration with the Area Municipalities, Canada’s Technology Triangle Inc., Communitech and the Greater Kitchener-Waterloo and the Cambridge Chambers of Commerce, prepared an Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory (Inventory) in 2005, 2008 and now in 2013, to provide stakeholders with accurate information about the amount and type of vacant industrial and business park land in Waterloo Region. The Inventory only contains vacant land that is designated strictly for industrial and business park uses. It does not include lands in downtowns or in employment designations that primarily permit office, arterial commercial, commercial campus, power centre, service commercial or institutional uses. Specifically, this Inventory does not include lands for potential redevelopment or vacant employment properties within the Central Transit Corridor.

The Mid-year 2013 Inventory (please see Attachment 1) indicates that the supply of vacant industrial and business park land is robust and stable. There are currently 2,771 acres in the Inventory, down slightly from 2,851 acres in 2008. This includes 612 acres of shovel ready lands, an increase of 141 acres since 2008. The term shovel ready
refers to parcels that possess appropriate land use designations and zoning to accommodate industrial and business park development and that are on the market, either for sale or as a build-to-suit/land lease opportunity. Almost 91% of the shovel ready land supply is fully municipally serviced.

The Mid-year 2013 Inventory also demonstrates that there is a very small supply of large lot parcels (over 25 acres), particularly in shovel ready categories. Of the 114 shovel ready parcels, only four are larger than 25 acres and no parcels are larger than 50 acres. This is similar to the conditions that existed in the 2005 and 2008 Inventories. Consequently, the Inventory reinforces the need to advance development of the East Side Lands for more large lots to be available on the open market and to attract new investment.

The Inventory is also demonstrating that almost 75% of all new floor space built between 2008 and mid-year 2013 was in the form of additions to existing businesses located on land designated for industrial and/or business park uses.

The Mid-year 2013 Inventory is a resource for the preparation of a region-wide Economic Development Strategy by the Region of Waterloo, in partnership with the Area Municipalities, Canada’s Technology Triangle Inc. and a variety of economic development stakeholders. Accordingly, the Inventory is a significant part of the shift to a new Regional Economic Development Strategy and advancing a full range of employment land to market availability in Waterloo Region.

Copies of the full Mid-year 2013 Region of Waterloo Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory (including maps) are available in the Regional Councillor’s library and in Planning, Housing and Community Services. Following Regional Council’s consideration of the Inventory, the final document would be made available on the Region’s website at www.regionofwaterloo.ca/bigshift and hard copies would be available for viewing/borrowing at City and Regional (Township) libraries and at Regional Headquarters.

Report:

Manufacturing is a cornerstone of Waterloo Region’s diverse economy, employing approximately 55,900 persons at year end 2012. This represents 20.2% of the labour force, making Waterloo Region second only to Windsor as the most manufacturing intensive economy in Ontario. Manufacturing employment also exceeds employment in other key sectors in the Waterloo Region economy including: Trade (39,900 employees), Healthcare and Social Services (24,900 employees) and Finance, Insurance and Real Estate (24,400 employees).

A robust and stable supply of vacant industrial and business park lands is integral to attracting and retaining investment in manufacturing and related businesses. The Region of Waterloo, in collaboration with the Area Municipalities, Canada’s Technology Triangle Inc., Communitech and the Greater Kitchener-Waterloo and the Cambridge Chambers of Commerce has prepared an Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory (Inventory) in 2005, 2008 and now in 2013 to provide stakeholders with accurate information about the amount and type of vacant industrial and business park land within Waterloo Region.
This Mid-year 2013 Inventory (please see Attachment 1) reports on industrial and business park land activities within Waterloo Region since the last Inventory was completed in 2008. It was updated using a database within a Geographic Information System (GIS) environment at the parcel level. Sources used in the update were the same used to create and update the Inventory in 2005 and 2008 and include: data collected from Area Municipalities; listings on ICX (a website subsidiary of the Multiple Listing Service [MLS]); building permit data and, in some cases, aerial photography and site visits. Parcels were removed from the Inventory if a building permit was issued on a parcel prior to June 30, 2013. The Inventory contains land that is designated strictly for industrial and business park uses. However, it does not include lands with designations that primarily provide for other types of employment such as commercial office, or mixed use nodes or downtown designations.

The preparation of the Inventory allows trends in industrial and business park land, and building activity and availability, to be identified and tracked. The Inventory includes area totals and some basic analysis by location, size and by category of land. It also includes some limited analysis of building permit data for employment uses.

Key Findings of the Inventory

- The Mid-year 2013 Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory remains robust and stable and has decreased only slightly since 2008, from 2,851 acres to 2,771 acres. Almost 75% of the total Inventory is designated for full municipal services;

- There are 612 acres of shovel ready lands in the Inventory, an increase of 141 acres since 2008. The term shovel ready refers to parcels that possess appropriate land use designations and zoning to accommodate industrial and business park development and that are on the market, either for sale or as a build-to-suit/land lease opportunity. Almost 91% of the shovel ready land supply is fully municipally serviced;

- The Mid-year 2013 Inventory also demonstrates that there is a very small supply of large lot parcels (over 25 acres), particularly in shovel ready categories. Of the 114 shovel ready parcels, only four are larger than 25 acres and no parcels are larger than 50 acres. This is similar to the situation that existed in the 2005 and 2008 Inventories. The continued scarcity of large lot parcels emphasizes the need to expedite the ongoing efforts to service and make available land for manufacturing and related uses in the East Side Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve (which are not included in the Inventory) in order to ensure the community is well-positioned to attract new businesses requiring large land holdings;

- There are an additional 936 acres of land considered to be in the pipeline. The pipeline refers to Inventory lands that are appropriately designated for industrial and business park uses, but may require a zoning by-law amendment or servicing improvements before they are shovel ready. Lands within the pipeline are expected to be shovel ready in the next 1-10 years. Some lands considered to be in the pipeline at mid-year 2013 (e.g. approximately 100 acres in Boxwood Business Campus, Cambridge) are now considered shovel ready. Other lands in
the pipeline that are poised to become shovel ready in the near future include 141 acres located north of Highway 7/8 and west of New Hamburg in Wilmot Township and approximately 50 acres on Old Mill Road in Cambridge;

- Between 2008 and mid-year 2013, an annual average of 7.33 parcels were absorbed into the market (removed from the Inventory) due to building permits being issued. The majority of these parcels were in Cambridge. This average is significantly lower than the average between 2005 and 2008, when the economy was stronger and approximately 23 parcels were absorbed per year;

- Based on the average yearly absorption of land between 2008 and Mid-year 2013 (34.4 acres/year), there would be a sufficient amount of shovel ready land to accommodate 18 years of growth. If absorption trends increase dramatically and become closer to the average experienced during the boom years of 2005 to 2008 (approximately 100 acres per year), there would be sufficient shovel ready land to accommodate 6 years of growth. However, these figures do not speak to other considerations, particularly the specific locational needs of businesses;

- The majority (1.2 million square feet or 30%) of new floor space constructed on designated industrial and business park lands in Waterloo Region between 2008 and mid-year 2013 was for industrial use. New floor space constructed for office uses (over 945,000 square feet) and service uses (over 718,000 square feet) were the next two largest uses; and

- Almost 75% of all new floor space built between 2008 and mid-year 2013 was in the form of additions to existing businesses located on land designated for industrial and/or business park uses.

**Shovel Ready Land and Land in the Pipeline**

Shovel ready land in the Inventory is captured in Categories 1, 2 and 3. Beyond the immediately available time frame are pipeline lands that could potentially be shovel ready in 1 to 2 years (Category 6) and within 2 to 10 years time (Category 7). At mid-year 2013 the shovel ready land and land in the Pipeline amounts to 1,548 acres which optimistically could accommodate about 15 years worth of aggressive absorption. A partial summary of the Mid-Year 2013 and 2008 Inventories by category of land can be found in Table 1 below for comparison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Summary of the Mid-Year 2013 and 2008 Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Year 2013 Inventory (Acres)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoel Ready</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Vacant Land Accommodating Employment Growth

There are 481 acres of other vacant land identified in the Inventory as Categories 4 and 5 that can immediately accommodate industrial and business park growth or that could be brought to the market with little or no effort. This land is all appropriately designated and in most cases appropriately zoned, but the land is being held by existing businesses and is not on the market. There are many reasons why this land is not on the market. For example, some land may be awaiting building permits, owners may be holding the property for long term expansion plans, or simply, the owner has no desire to develop the land at this time. Due to the many unknowns associated with this land, it can not be “categorized” as shovel ready or even as being in the pipeline, but it does continue to represent opportunity for industrial and business park growth for this region.

A full analysis of all Inventory Categories can be found in the Mid-year 2013 Region of Waterloo Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory document attached to this report (see Attachment 1).

Opportunities for Employment Growth Outside of the Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory

The scope of this Inventory addresses a subset of employment land (i.e. vacant industrial and business park lands) associated with manufacturing and related uses (vacant industrial and business park lands). Outside of this subset there are many opportunities to accommodate employment growth in Waterloo Region. These opportunities include:

1) Re-urbanization of underutilized parcels on land designated for industrial and business park uses;
2) Redevelopment or the reuse/repurpose of vacant industrial buildings;
3) Vacant lands found in other employment land designations such as arterial commercial corridors, commercial campuses or ‘power centres’, service commercial areas and in institutional designations;
4) Vacant lands found in other land use designations (not exclusively designated for employment) such as mixed use corridors, mixed use nodes, neighbourhood centres, downtowns, Rapid Transit Station Areas, agricultural lands and residential areas (home based businesses);
5) Vacant lands found at the Region of Waterloo International Airport that are zoned and available for airport related uses;
6) The 370 acres of developable land in North Cambridge designated as Prime Industrial / Strategic Reserve following the approval of Regional Official Policies Plan Amendment 28. Much work has been done through the East Side Lands (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan to bring this land to market including approximately 200 acres referred to as the “Quick Start Lands”. However, the lands are not included in the Inventory as they have not yet been designated for industrial and business park uses in the City of Cambridge Official Plan; and
7) Vacant lands soon to be designated for industrial and business park uses (such as lands associated with the Arriscraft and the Hunt Club Plan of Subdivision in Cambridge).
Area Municipal Consultation / Coordination

Since the initiation of the first Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory in 2005, Regional staff has held numerous meetings with Area Municipal staff (i.e. planners and economic development officers), as well as interested parties and the Prosperity Council of Waterloo Region’s Regional Growth Management Strategy Liaison Task Force. Area Municipal staff provided and verified data used to update to the Mid-year 2013 Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory, and their efforts to complete this valuable resource are appreciated.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

The comprehensive review of the Region’s vacant industrial and business park lands within the Mid-year 2013 Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory is consistent with Strategic Objective 2.3 of the Corporate Strategic Plan to support a diverse, innovative and globally competitive economy.

Financial Implications:

The Inventory could be used to support new investment in employment growth which would increase assessment in Waterloo Region.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Staff from the Region of Waterloo International Airport and Information and Technology Services (GIS) were consulted during the preparation of the Mid-year 2013 Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory.

Attachments:

Attachment 1: Region of Waterloo Mid-year 2013 Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory

Prepared By:  Bridget Coady, Principal Planner

Approved By:  Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning Housing and Community Services
Attachment 1

Region of Waterloo

Mid-year 2013 Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory
Summary

This report represents the third update to the Region of Waterloo Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory (Inventory). The purpose of the Mid-year 2013 Inventory is to provide economic development stakeholders with an accurate representation of the vacant land available for industrial and business park uses within Waterloo Region. Further, the preparation of this Inventory allows trends in industrial and business park land, building activity and availability, to be identified and tracked. The original Inventory in 2005 and its update in 2008 were developed and refined in cooperation with the Region of Waterloo Economic Development Liaison Committee, which consisted of members from each Area Municipality, Canada’s Technology Triangle Inc., Communitech and the Greater Kitchener-Waterloo and the Cambridge Chambers of Commerce. The Mid-year 2013 Inventory was completed using the same methodology originally endorsed by the Economic Development Liaison Committee. The methodology compares unbuilt parcels of industrial and business park land with building permits and real estate listings over the last four years and then the results are verified through data provided by Area Municipal economic development officials.

Key findings:

- The Mid-year 2013 Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory remains robust and stable and has decreased only slightly since 2008, from 2,851 acres to 2,771 acres. Almost 75% of the total Inventory is designated for full municipal services;

- There are 612 acres of shovel ready lands in the Inventory, an increase of 141 acres since 2008. The term shovel ready refers to parcels that possess appropriate land use designations and zoning to accommodate industrial and business park development and that are on the market, either for sale or as a build-to-suit/land lease opportunity. Almost 91% of the shovel ready land supply is fully municipally serviced;

- There are an additional 936 acres of land considered to be in the pipeline. The pipeline refers to Inventory lands that are appropriately designated for industrial and business park uses, but may require a zoning by-law amendment or servicing improvements before they are shovel ready. Lands within the pipeline are expected to be shovel ready in the next 1-10 years. Some lands considered to be in the pipeline at mid-year 2013 (e.g. approximately 100 acres in Boxwood Business Campus, Cambridge) are now considered shovel ready. Other lands in the pipeline that are poised to become shovel ready in the near future include 141 acres located north of Highway 7/8 and west of New Hamburg in Wilmot Township and approximately 50 acres on Old Mill Road in Cambridge;

- The Inventory does not include the approximately 370 acres of developable land in North Cambridge designated as Prime Industrial / Strategic Reserve following the approval of Regional Official Policies Plan Amendment 28. Much work has been done through the East Side Lands (Stage 1) Master Environmental
Servicing Plan to bring this land to market including approximately 200 acres referred to as the “Quick Start Lands”. However, the lands are not included in the Inventory as they have not yet been designated for industrial and business park uses in the City of Cambridge Official Plan;

- The Mid-year 2013 Inventory also demonstrates that there is a dearth of large lot parcels (over 25 acres), particularly in shovel ready categories. Of the 114 shovel ready parcels, only four are larger than 25 acres and no parcels are larger than 50 acres. This is similar to the situation that existed in the 2005 and 2008 Inventories. The continued scarcity of large lot parcels emphasizes the need to expedite the ongoing efforts to service and make available land for manufacturing and related uses in the East Side Lands (Stage 1) Area;

- Between 2008 and mid-year 2013, an annual average of 7.33 parcels were absorbed into the market (removed from the Inventory) due to building permits being issued. The majority of these parcels were in Cambridge. This average is significantly lower than the average between 2005 and 2008 when the economy was strong and approximately 23 parcels were absorbed per year;

- Based on the average yearly absorption of land between 2008 and Mid-year 2013 (34.4 acres/year), there would be a sufficient amount of shovel ready land to accommodate 18 years of growth. If absorption trends increase dramatically and become closer to the average experienced during the boom years of 2005 to 2008 (approximately 100 acres per year), there would be sufficient shovel ready land to accommodate 6 years of growth. However, these figures do not speak to other considerations, particularly the specific locational needs of businesses;

- The majority (1.2 million square feet or 30%) of new floor space constructed on designated industrial and business park lands in Waterloo Region between 2008 and mid-year 2013 was for industrial use. New floor space constructed for office uses (over 945,000 square feet) and service uses (over 718,000 square feet) were the next two largest uses; and

- Almost 75% of all new floor space built between 2008 and mid-year 2013 was in the form of additions to existing businesses located on land designated for industrial and/or business park uses.
1.0 Introduction

In March 2006, the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, in co-operation with the Region of Waterloo Economic Development Liaison Committee (consisting of representatives from each Area Municipality, Canada’s Technology Triangle Inc., Communitech and the Greater Kitchener-Waterloo and the Cambridge Chambers of Commerce), completed an inventory of industrial and business park vacant land based on year-end 2005 data. This Inventory originated out of a desire to confirm the amount of immediately available industrial and business park land within the region to accommodate employment growth. The scope of this Inventory highlighted a very specific subset of land that is associated with the manufacturing and related uses. The continued availability of this type of land remains very important both to accommodate growth and to market Waterloo Region as a community that is “open for business”.

The industrial and business park land use designation (as defined within Area Municipal Official Plans) provides great flexibility to accommodate a wide variety of manufacturing and related uses, as most industrial manufactures have very unique building and land requirements. This flexibility combined with proximity to major transportation corridors make this land very attractive to non-manufacturing uses – uses that might otherwise locate outside of industrial and business park lands and that generally do not have the same land use compatibility constraints. This demand for industrial and business park land and the constant pressures for its conversion to accommodate uses other than that of manufacturing, underscores the need to continue monitoring the availability of this relatively small subset of vacant land.

This report reflects industrial and business park land activities within Waterloo Region since the last Inventory update of 2008 and was once again completed with the cooperation of economic development representatives from each Area Municipality. The Mid-year 2013 Inventory will be used by the Region of Waterloo for their planning needs and would be made widely available to all economic development stakeholders within the region.
2.0 Methodology

2.1 Participants
The Regional Economic Development Liaison Committee, which included representatives from each Area Municipality, Canada’s Technology Triangle Inc., Communitech and the Greater Kitchener-Waterloo and the Cambridge Chambers of Commerce, worked hand in hand with Regional staff to develop the methodology used in the first Inventory completed in 2006 and then helped to refine the methodology for the 2008 Inventory. The Mid-year 2013 Inventory was reviewed by economic development officers and other representatives from each local municipality.

2.2 Type of Land Included within the Inventory
Only vacant lands within established industrial areas and business parks, which were designated for industrial and business park uses at mid-year 2013 are included within the Inventory. This Inventory does not include lands available or potentially available to accommodate future employment growth through infill, intensification, adaptive re-use or redevelopment, lands in urban core areas or within what are traditionally considered residential areas. The Inventory also does not include any vacant lands which are designated and zoned principally for commercial uses, institutional development, or are currently designated for agricultural uses within the Area Municipal Official Plan. Further, the Mid-year 2013 Inventory does not include any of the East Side Study Area lands or Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve.

2.3 Process for Identifying Specific Land for Inclusion in the Inventory
The original Inventory was created using a database within a GIS (Geographic Information System) environment at the parcel level. The sources initially used to create the Inventory were the same used to update the data to mid-year 2013. Information was collected from the Area Municipalities, listings on ICX (a website subsidiary of MLS), building permit data and in some cases aerial photography (flown in 2012). Parcels were removed from the Inventory based on the issuance of a building permit prior to mid-year, in this case, June 30, 2013. Parcels were also removed if it was determined through consultation with the Area Municipalities that a specific parcel was designated for uses other than industrial and business park uses.

2.4 Categories of Vacant Parcels
Categories of vacant parcels were developed and assigned initially by the Region of Waterloo Economic Development Liaison Committee in 2005 and 2006. Categories were assigned based on the ability of the parcel to accommodate employment from both timing and tenure perspectives. During the update to the 2008 Inventory, refinements were made to the category names as a part of establishing a benchmark Inventory. The Mid-year 2013 Inventory was updated using the refined categories and through data provided from Area Municipal economic development officers for each parcel. Further changes to the Mid-year 2013 Inventory include an attempt to denote the “shovel readiness” of each category through their reordering from most shovel ready to least. A description of the categories within the Inventory is listed below.
SHOVEL READY LAND (AVAILABLE IMMEDIATELY FOR SALE OR FOR LONG TERM LEASE) CATEGORIES 1, 2 AND 3

Category 1 - Vacant parcels available immediately – These parcels are currently on the market, zoned appropriately, with no known restrictions to development. An example of lands found in Category 1 would be Inventory ID #586. This parcel is located south of the 401 at the intersection of Townline Rd. and Pinebush Rd. in Cambridge. (See below).

Category 2 - Vacant parcels available immediately as Build to Suit – These parcels are no longer available for sale but are still immediately available to accommodate new or expanding businesses as design-build or land lease opportunities. An example of lands within this Category would be Inventory ID#s 9, 487 and 704, located immediately south of the 401 in Cambridge at the intersection of Pinebush Rd and Franklin Blvd. (See below).
Category 3 - Vacant parcels available immediately in the University of Waterloo Research and Technology Park – This vacant land is owned by the University of Waterloo and available only to University associated firms on long term lease. An example of lands found within in Category 3 is Inventory ID# 511, located in the University of Waterloo R&T park at the northeast corner of Wes Graham Way and Hagey Blvd. (See below).

PIPELINE (LAND THAT IS ANTICIPATED TO COME ON THE MARKET IN THE FUTURE) CATEGORIES 5, 6, AND 7

Category 5 - Vacant parcels without significant restrictions to development, not on the market and not expected to be developed by the current owner - Many of these parcels have the potential to be placed on the market at any time, but are not currently available for sale and no knowledge exists as to when they may come on to the market. Within the Inventory, an example of Category 5 land would be ID#s 624 and 625 on Industrial Rd. south of Langs Dr. and north of Bishop St. in Cambridge. (Below).
Category 6 - Vacant parcels available in one to two years – These parcels, with no known restrictions to development, are anticipated to be on the market, with appropriate planning approvals, later in 2013 or 2014. An example of lands found within this category includes Inventory ID#s 498 and 499 commonly referred to as the Boxwood Subdivision in Cambridge. (See below).

Category 7 - Vacant parcels with expectation of availability in over 2 years – These parcels, with no known restrictions to development, are anticipated to be on the market beyond 2014. All parcels within this category have the potential to be available within 10 years based on demand. An example of lands found in Category 7 includes Inventory ID#s 74, 75 and 76, located at the corner of Wilmot Line and Erb St. W in Waterloo. (See below).
AVAILABLE FOR USE BY OWNER (CATEGORY 4)

Category 4 - Vacant parcels no longer on the market, which are anticipated to be utilized by the current owner - These parcels were purchased after December 31, 2004 for the specific purpose of expansion or development by the current owner. Although no longer on the market, these parcels will accommodate employment growth through new development. These lands remain within the Inventory until a building permit is issued on the parcel. Issuance of a building permit is the trigger for parcel removal as it has been found that parcels in this category may become available on the market more than once, and by different owners, prior to a building being erected. An example of land found in this category is ID# 711 at the corner of Wilson Ave. and Wabanaki Dr. in Kitchener. (See below).
CONSTRAINED LANDS (CATEGORY 8)

Category 8 - Vacant parcels not on the market, or not considered shovel ready for reasons other than timing – These parcels have restrictions to development that include contamination, servicing difficulties (e.g. capacity, or due to topography), or grading issues. An example of lands found within Category 8 would be Inventory ID# 414 found at Guelph St. and Highway 85 in Kitchener. (See below)

POTENTIALLY IN TRANSITION TO OTHER USES (CATEGORY 9)

Category 9 - Vacant parcels without significant constraints where development applications have been submitted for conversion - This category includes parcels currently designated and/or zoned for industrial or Business Park uses which are subject to a development application proposing a non-industrial end use. This also includes lands where a municipality anticipates the use of the lands for municipal purposes. Placement in this category does not constitute endorsement of the application, but rather the recognition that an application has been filed. Examples of land found within Category 9 include Inventory ID#s 447 and 52, found along the eastern side of Northumberland Street in Ayr (See below).
2.5 Mapping, Attributes, Review and Modifications

During the development of this Inventory Area Municipal staff evaluated each parcel, assigning the appropriate category to the parcel as applicable. The associated mapping of parcels in initial years of the Inventory was provided to the entire Economic Development Liaison Committee for review to assist in insuring the proper identification of parcels within the Inventory. Comments were collected from the Committee and the Inventory was revised accordingly. The Inventory has evolved through the yearly updates, with parcels having been added, moved between categories and removed based on the established criteria, with the allotment of parcels being further refined year over year. In 2013, having a solid methodology and broad understanding of the Inventory process, parcels were again provided to economic development officers, or appropriate staff from each Area Municipality, for review and comment.

Provincially significant constraints such as Provincially Significant Wetlands and Environmentally Sensitive Policy Areas were removed from the area of land available for development identified for each Inventory parcel. Where applicable, other features such as steep slopes or locally significant woodlands were also removed. Each parcel was assigned an identification number, with other information about the parcel being documented as follows:

- the municipal address and/or legal description;
- the physical size of each parcel;
- ownership information;
- the physical extent of any constraints to development located within the parcel;
- zoning category applicable to the parcel;
- whether the parcel is designated for serviced or unserviced development; and
- any additional comments, such as proximity to major arterials, Hwy 401 exposure, whether it is located on a rail line, or the topography of the parcel, ownership and potential uses etc.

The term ‘designated serviced’ in this report refers to all Inventory parcels in the City or Township Urban Areas as designated by the Regional Official Policies Plan, where municipal services are provided. It may also refer to some Rural Industrial/Commercial Areas such as the Mercedes/Stockyards Area, if the industrial commercial area has access to full municipal services. ‘Designated Serviced’ does not necessarily mean that the services are currently located at the lot line of a parcel, but rather that the land either is, or will be serviced within an appropriate planning horizon. If a parcel is categorized as ‘Unserviced’, the parcel is located outside of either the City or Township Urban Areas and is to be developed utilizing private services (septic systems and private wells). The term “publically owned” refers to lands owned by public entities such as Area Municipalities, the Region of Waterloo, public utilities and Provincial Ministries. By converse, the term “privately owned” in this report refers to all other forms of ownership other than by a public entity.

**THIS INVENTORY REFLECTS THE STATUS OF PARCELS AS OF June 30, 2013. A complete copy of the Inventory can be found in Appendix 4 to this Report.**
3.0 Analysis of the Inventory

The following summarizes the data collected as of June 30, 2013. The Inventory is based on the categories identified in Section 2.4 of this report.

3.1 Region Wide Inventory of Vacant Industrial and Business Park Lands

Overall, there are 2,770.76 acres (1,121.28 hectares) of vacant industrial and business park land found in the Mid-year 2013 Inventory. This total is slightly less than the 2008 Inventory which amounted to 2,851.72 acres. A brief summary of Mid-year 2013 Inventory Category totals in comparison with the 2008 Inventory can be found below in Table 1. While this is the total area of land currently listed in the Inventory, not all land is equal. All categories of land are different, with the potential to accommodate future employment and growth varying considerably depending on the characteristics of individual properties. Further in-depth category analysis can be found in Section 4.0 of this report and a complete listing of every parcel in the Inventory can be found in Appendix 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Percent of 2013 Inventory</th>
<th>Designated Serviced Total</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Percent of 2008 Inventory</th>
<th>Designated Serviced Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>369.16</td>
<td>13.32%</td>
<td>312.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>265.67</td>
<td>9.32%</td>
<td>194.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>211.95</td>
<td>7.65%</td>
<td>211.95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>205.29</td>
<td>7.20%</td>
<td>205.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.69</td>
<td>1.11%</td>
<td>30.69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>330.81</td>
<td>11.94%</td>
<td>266.45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>303.19</td>
<td>10.63%</td>
<td>278.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>149.78</td>
<td>5.41%</td>
<td>87.89</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>186.77</td>
<td>6.55%</td>
<td>186.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>492.06</td>
<td>17.76%</td>
<td>431.47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>476.77</td>
<td>16.72%</td>
<td>413.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>444.57</td>
<td>16.05%</td>
<td>305.64</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>622.17</td>
<td>21.82%</td>
<td>248.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>506.98</td>
<td>18.30%</td>
<td>376.47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>679.46</td>
<td>23.83%</td>
<td>478.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>234.77</td>
<td>8.47%</td>
<td>33.49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>112.40</td>
<td>3.94%</td>
<td>108.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Categories</td>
<td>2,770.76</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2057.02</td>
<td>Total Categories</td>
<td>2,851.72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2114.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.1 Overall / Effective Inventories by Category

Figure 1 below indicates how land in the overall Inventory was divided among the
Categories 1 – 9. Category 8 (lands with constraints to development) is the largest single category in terms of area at 506.98 acres, whereas Category 3 (University of Waterloo Research Park) is the smallest in the Inventory with 30.69 acres. The ‘effective inventory’ of vacant industrial and business park lands, which is comprised of Categories 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7, totals 2,029.02 acres (821.12 hectares) of land, or 73.2% of the total overall Inventory. The effective inventory represents vacant parcels of land that at the time of the Inventory are considered currently available and/or has the potential, in the near future, to accommodate forecasted employment. Categories 8 and 9, which capture parcels having constraints or parcels proposed for conversion, includes 741.74 acres (300.17 hectares) of land, or 26.7% of the overall Inventory. Notwithstanding the fact that some of the land from within these categories will end up being developed for industrial and business park uses, these parcels are not considered part of the effective inventory due to the uncertainty surrounding their future uses.

![Figure 1: Acres of Vacant Inventory Land By Category](image)

**Total Acres: 2770.76 acres**

**Effective Inventory: 2029.02 acres**

### 3.1.2 Vacant Parcel Inventory – Location and Servicing

Within the three Cities, as seen in Figure 2, there are a total of 1,620.52 acres of vacant industrial and business park lands in the Inventory. All of this land is designated for serviced development. The effective inventory (Categories 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7) found in the Cities totals 1,371.59 acres at mid-year 2013.
Figure 3 shows all vacant land by category found in the Townships of Woolwich, North Dumfries, Wilmot and Wellesley. The total developable area within the Inventory in the Townships is 1,150.24 acres (465.48 hectares), of which 436.5 acres (38%) is designated for serviced development. The effective inventory found in the Townships totals 657.42 acres.
3.1.3 Publicly Owned vs. Privately Owned Industrial and Business Park Lands

Figure 4 indicates ownership by category for all land within the Inventory. In total, 2,242.93 acres (81%) of lands in the Inventory are privately owned. Since the original Inventory, the amount of publicly owned land has decreased significantly from over 1,000 acres at year end 2005, to 527.83 acres at mid-year 2013.

![Figure 4: Publicly Owned vs. Privately Owned Inventory Land by Category](image-url)
4.0 In Depth Inventory Category Analysis

4.1 Categories 1, 2 and 3 – Shovel Ready Land (Available Immediately for Sale or for Long Term Lease)

Parcels of land within Categories 1, 2 or 3 are lands which are considered shovel ready and can be defined as land that is designated for industrial and business park uses and are currently on the market for sale or lease. As noted in the descriptions outlined in Section 2.4, Categories 1, 2 and 3 represent the Region’s capacity to meet immediate industrial and business park land needs. Category 1 parcels are parcels of vacant land currently on the market, while Category 2 parcels are on the market but indicate land that is available for build to suit and land lease opportunities. Category 3 lands are located within the University of Waterloo Research and Technology Park, and available only to University associated firms for long term lease.

Although Category 2 and 3 lands are not available for purchase, these lands still represent significant opportunities to accommodate new or expanding businesses.

4.1.1 Location of Shovel Ready Lands within Categories 1, 2 and 3

Figure 5 illustrates the distribution of the 611.8 acres of land within Categories 1 and 2 and 3 between the Cities and the Townships. There are 114 parcels of shovel ready land with the majority located in Kitchener (47 parcels) and Cambridge (21 parcels). In total, the Cities account for 459.35 acres (75%) of land designated as Category 1, 2 or 3, with the City of Cambridge having the most at 192.53 acres (31%). Lands within the Townships account for 152.44 acres or 25%. As of mid-year 2013, lands within Categories 1, 2 and 3 represent 22% of the overall Inventory.

Figure 5 above, can be compared with Figure 5a below, which shows the location of shovel ready Inventory lands in 2008 for Categories 1 and 2. Of note, in 2008 there were no lands found in Category 3. In 2008 the amount of shovel ready land was
470.96 acres which indicates that between 2008 and mid-year 2013, shovel ready land increased by 30%. This increase in shovel ready land is as a result of parcels transitioning out of other categories found in the Inventory and because of the addition of new parcels due to demolitions and land severances among other reasons.

The Inventory is demonstrating an increasing distribution of land in Category 2 between the municipalities. In 2005, 98% of the land found in Category 2 was located in the City of Cambridge with only a few acres located in the City of Kitchener. By mid-year 2013 the majority of Category 2 land continues to be located in Cambridge, however, it is now found in each of the Cities and within the Township of Wilmot as well. The Inventory is also demonstrating that parcels are remaining in Category 1 for a great deal of time. Examples of parcels that have been in Category 1 since 2005 are Inventory ID#s 191, 196 and 220 in the Grand River West Business Park in Kitchener (pictured below).
4.1.2 Servicing of Land within Categories 1, 2 and 3

Figure 6 compares parcels of land in Categories 1, 2 and 3 related to servicing. All parcels within Category 2 are designated as serviced. Lands within Categories 1, 2 and 3 which are designated for serviced development totals 555.61 acres or 90.8% of all shovel ready land.

![Figure 6: Serviced vs Unserviced Land found in Categories 1, 2 and 3](image)

4.1.3 Categories 1, 2 and 3 Summary by Ownership and Parcel Size

Only 18.22 acres of the total lands found in Categories 1, 2 and 3 are publicly owned at mid-year 2013 (or 2.8%). These lands are all found in Category 1 within the City of Kitchener. When compared to the public ownership of Categories 6, 7 (Inventory lands that are anticipated to come on the market in the future) with 233.97 and 192.53 acres respectively, it can be understood how truly small this amount is.

Figure 7 below shows the total number of parcels in Categories 1, 2 and 3 (114) broken down by the size of the parcel. The largest grouping of parcels by size are those smaller than 2 acres with 49 parcels, the majority of which are found in Category 2 (30 or 61%). The number of parcels less than 2 acres in size is up from 2008, when only 38 parcels were of this size. Much of the reason for the increase in parcels of this size is due to the subdivision of a few larger parcels in the Grand River West Business Park in Kitchener between 2008 and 2012. There is one parcel considered shovel ready that is listed as over 50 acres in size, however, this parcel is linked to a mapping limitation and will be subdivided shortly leaving only a portion in a large lot format and therefore there will be no shovel ready parcels greater than 50 acres in size. In 2008 there were no parcels greater than 50 acres and in 2005 only 3 parcels were greater than 50 acres. This trend continues to convey the need to maintain large lot shovel ready parcels, particularly those large lots being brought forward through the East Side Lands process.
4.2 Categories 6 and 7 and 5 – Lands Anticipated to Come on to the Market in the Future

Categories 6 and 7 represent vacant parcels, without significant constraints to development, where there is an expectation the land will be brought to market within a reasonable period of time. Lands within Category 6 are expected to be brought to market within two years, while lands within Category 7 are expected to be available for development in between two to ten years. These lands referred to as lands in the ‘Pipeline’ are all appropriately designated for industrial and business park uses, but may require a zone change or servicing upgrades before they are to be shovel ready.

Lands in Category 5 are not on the market and have not been placed on the market since prior to the 2005 Inventory, in many instances they are not anticipated to be developed by their current owner. While the timeframe associated with development of Category 5 lands is unknown, there are no apparent constraints to the immediate use of the lands, should the owner decide to build, or for the immediate sale of the lands, should the owner decide to bring them to market. For these reasons, Category 5 lands could also be considered a source for shovel ready land, however, they can not be marketed as such because these lands may be held as longer-term investments or for the future expansions of existing businesses and there is no timeframe known for their development. Category 5 lands represent an opportunity to accommodate both immediate and longer-term employment growth within the Region.

4.2.1 Analysis of Land within Categories 6, and 7 and 5

At mid-year 2013 there are 1,086.41 acres of land within Categories 6 (492.06 acres), 7 (444.57) and 5 (149.78) between the Cities and the Townships. In total, the Cities account for 655.69 acres (60%) of land found in Categories 6, 7 and 5, while 430.72 acres are located within the Townships. At mid-year 2013, land within these categories
amounts to 39.2% of the total Inventory. There are 825 acres (76%) of land within Categories 6, 7 and 5 designated for serviced development, while 261.41 acres are designated for privately serviced development. Lands in Categories 6, 7 and 5 are mostly held in private ownership (654.84 acres or 60.27%).

As the timeframe expected until a parcel is developed increases (from shovel ready to shovel ready in over 2 years) so too does the proportion of land found as larger parcels sizes. Roughly half of the 49 parcels found in Categories 6, 7 and 5 are over 10 acres in size, with 9 in the 25 to 50 acres classification and 6 over 50 acres in size. This highlights the trend to subdivide parcels into sizes smaller than 2 acres to increase marketability.

### 4.3 Category 4 – Available for Use by Owner

Lands within Category 4 are stand-alone parcels which have been purchased by businesses to provide for future use, expansion or development. These parcels are no longer available for sale, but are immediately available for development by the purchaser/owner to accommodate employment. Category 4 is meant to represent a transitional place-holder, where parcels are categorized for a year or two after being sold and prior to a building permit being issued. There are, however, some parcels that have been placed in this category and remain there for several years, or are put back on the market – moving from Category 4 back into a shovel ready category. Category 4 should not be dismissed as a potential source of shovel ready land. An example of Category 4 land at mid-year 2013 which has remained in the category since prior to 2005 are Parcel ID#s 188, 189, and 190 found in the Grand River West Business Park in Kitchener as seen below.

![Image of Category 4 land parcels]

Of the 330.81 acres of land found within Category 4 at mid-year 2013, 256.54 acres (77.5%) of the land is located in the Cities and 74.27 acres (22.4%) are located in the Townships. There are 69 parcels in Category 4, with the majority in Kitchener (29 parcels) and Cambridge (16 parcels). At mid-year 2013, land within Category 4 accounts for 11.94% of the total Inventory. There are 266.45 acres (80.5%) of land
within Category 4 designated for serviced development, while 64.36 acres (19.5%) are designated for privately serviced development.

4.4 Categories 8 and 9 – Lands with Constraints or Potentially in Transition to Other Uses

Parcels in Category 8 are subject to significant constraints to development such as contamination, topographical challenges, servicing restrictions or transportation limitations. Lands in Category 9, although currently designated, zoned and potentially well suited for industrial and business park uses, are currently subject to planning applications to convert the lands to other uses.

In total there are 741.75 acres of land within Categories 8 (506.98 acres) and 9 (234.77 acres). Of which, 248.93 acres (33.55%) of lands are located in the Cities, and 492.82 acres (66.45%) are located within the Townships. At mid-year 2013, land within Categories 8 and 9 accounts for 26.8% of the total Inventory. Of the land in Categories 8 and 9, a total of 409.96 acres are designated for serviced development and 331.79 acres are unserviced.

It is important to maintain Categories 8 and 9 within the Inventory as they can tell us a lot about particular portions of our industrial and business park vacant land supply. For example, Category 8 highlights land that could most benefit from municipal incentives to increase marketability, to help move it into a shovel ready category. An example of this type of land would be Inventory ID# 508 a parcel of over 50 acres in size on Old Mill Road in Cambridge. In 2005, this parcel was classified as Category 8 due to the difficulties involved in extending municipal services to the area. Now as the land has progressed through the development application review process, and plans to bring municipal services to the area are being completed, the categorization has changed from an 8 to a 6. Conversely, a category 8 categorization may also highlight parcels where an industrial land designation no longer makes sense and where another land use may make better sense. Lands within Category 9 should be watched carefully and tracked year to year as this category represents direct loss from the supply of industrial and business park lands. Not all lands in this category will be approved for redesignation, but all will have been carefully studied and merits for redesignation evaluated.
5.0 2008 to Mid-year 2013 Building Permit Analysis

The series of tables (2 through 6) below show building permit activity on all lands designated in Area Municipal Official Plans for industrial and business park use by year and by type of permit issued. The permits included in this analysis represent new build activity on greenfield parcels as well as what is considered reurbanization on already built parcels in the form of redevelopment and additions. Permits for interior finish were not included in this analysis so that square footage associated with each permit is truly representative of newly added space for employment uses. All years demonstrate a decreased amount of building activity in comparison with the 91 permits on industrial and business park lands in the single year of 2008. The total square feet added each year, with the exception of 2010 has also decreased considerably when compared with the 1,535,014 square feet added in 2008.

Inflation has not been accounted for in comparing year over year Total Values and Price per Square Foot data.

### Table 2: Building Permits Issued in 2009 on Land Designated for Industrial and Business Park Uses in the Region of Waterloo by Type of Permit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Type</th>
<th>Number of Permits</th>
<th>Total Square Feet</th>
<th>Total Value</th>
<th>Price/Sq Ft</th>
<th>% of Total Sq Ft</th>
<th>% of Total $</th>
<th>% of Total Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>108,970</td>
<td>$14,000,000</td>
<td>$128.48</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>433,828</td>
<td>$28,823,407</td>
<td>$66.44</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>298,140</td>
<td>$49,341,000</td>
<td>$165.50</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>68,631</td>
<td>$6,058,500</td>
<td>$88.28</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69,184</td>
<td>$24,323,000</td>
<td>$351.57</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63,200</td>
<td>$3,802,500</td>
<td>$60.17</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009 Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,041,953</strong></td>
<td><strong>$126,348,407</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3: Building Permits Issued in 2010 on Land Designated for Industrial and Business Park Uses in the Region of Waterloo by Type of Permit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Type</th>
<th>Number of Permits</th>
<th>Total Square Feet</th>
<th>Total Value</th>
<th>Price/Sq Ft</th>
<th>% of Total Sq Ft</th>
<th>% of Total $</th>
<th>% of Total Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>391,279</td>
<td>$101,024,000</td>
<td>$258.19</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>262,267</td>
<td>$37,451,500</td>
<td>$142.80</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>524,811</td>
<td>$94,996,161</td>
<td>$181.01</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,521</td>
<td>$775,000</td>
<td>$103.04</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>116,776</td>
<td>$46,781,200</td>
<td>$400.61</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>206,525</td>
<td>$10,280,267</td>
<td>$49.78</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010 Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>81</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,509,179</strong></td>
<td><strong>$291,308,128</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8 summarizes Tables 2 through 6 showing the total square feet of building permits issued by building permit type on designated industrial and business park lands in the region between 2008 and mid-year 2013. It is evident that the amount of new space constructed in the region’s industrial and business parks is dominated by industrial uses. The total square feet attributed to new industrial space is over 35% greater than the next largest type of building activity (office space).
Between 2008 and mid-year 2013, a total of 64 building permits were issued on lands that were previously listed in the Inventory as summarized below in Table 7. On average this represents approximately 14.22 permits issued per year on Inventory lands and is significantly lower than the number of permits issued on Inventory lands in the single years of 2007 (24) and 2008 (21). The total amount of land absorbed through the issuance of these permits between 2008 and mid-year 2013 was 153.15 acres, this is compared to 106.81 acres absorbed from Inventory during the single year of 2008. The land absorbed amounted to 33 parcels being removed form the Inventory between 2008 and mid-year 2013 (or 7.33 parcels per year).

### Table 7: Building Permit Activity on Parcels Previously Listed in the Inventory 2008 to Mid-year 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total Area of Vacant Parcels (acres)</th>
<th>No. of Parcels on which building permits were issued</th>
<th>Total sq ft of the Building Permits</th>
<th>Value of Building Permits*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>510,586</td>
<td>$31,775,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>250,090</td>
<td>$17,555,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>107,639</td>
<td>$12,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dumfries</td>
<td>20.23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57,676</td>
<td>$3,660,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12,854</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,403</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>38.23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>159,827</td>
<td>$15,686,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>153.15</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,104,075</strong></td>
<td><strong>$81,426,245</strong>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Value does not account for inflation between 2008 and mid-year 2013 Therefore this total may be conservative.
In comparing Table 7 with Tables 2 through 6, it is evident how building activity on Industrial and Business park lands is distributed between traditional greenfield development (a completely vacant parcel or those parcels captured within the Inventory), versus what would be considered reurbanization development (additions/infill/redevelopment) on already built parcels. As permits for interior finishing were included in the “Value of the Building Permits in Table 7(any square footage that may have been associated with those permits were not included in the Table 7), this factor can not be compared between the six tables. The total square feet added over the four and a half years, however, can be compared. Between 2008 and mid-year 2013 3,173,687 square feet of industrial and business park space was constructed on already built-up land, or in the form of reurbanization (Total square feet of all building permits issued on lands designated for industrial and business park use over the four years [Tables 2-6], less total square feet of building permits issued on vacant lands found within the 2008 Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory over the four and a half years [Table 7]). The total reurbanization activity amounted to 74.2% of all newly added space, and did not fall below 56% of newly added space in any single year. This is a significant finding, demonstrating the importance of industrial and business park reurbanization to accommodate growth – particularly in times of economic downturn.
6.0 Other Lands Accommodating Employment Growth

As mentioned in the introduction to this Report, the scope of this Inventory highlights a very specific subset of land that is associated with the needs and desires of manufacturing and manufacturing-type uses. In focusing in on this industrial subset it is sometimes easy to lose sight of all the lands that are currently accommodating new employment growth within Waterloo Region, and lands that will accommodate employment growth in the future.

6.1 Opportunities outside of the Inventory

The following is a list summarizing the many opportunities, outside of the Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory that are available to accommodate employment growth within Waterloo Region:

1) Re-urbanization of underutilized parcels on land designated for Industrial and Business Park Uses.

Conservatively, the Region estimates that there are over 700 acres of underutilized lands which could be immediately used to accommodate employment growth. This land is not currently for sale and is often part of a larger parcel being used by the current owner or being held by the current owner for expansion purposes. Although this land is unavailable for sale, in most cases, this land has street frontage and could easily be severed off and sold to another business. Because this land can not be readily quantified, the Region assumes that the land will ultimately be used for expansion of the existing business occupying the land. Although it does not appear on the Inventory, this land plays a very important role in accommodating employment growth throughout this region. This is supported in the analysis of Section 5 above, where 74.2% of all building activity over the years 2008 to mid-year 2013 on industrial and business park lands occurred as reurbanization. Examples of how this type of land has been utilized for expansion purposes over the years are shown below.
2) Redevelopment or the reuse/repurpose of vacant industrial buildings
Redevelopment happens regularly in Waterloo Region’s industrial/business parks. This activity includes redevelopment by private businesses which purchase parcels in preferred locations and remove existing, obsolete buildings to develop the land in a way that is better suited their needs. The activity also includes instances where larger parcels become available due to a company closing, eg. B.F. Goodrich in Kitchener, and where several parties may come together (both private and public) to remove and renovate existing buildings and redevelop for new industrial uses. In most instances redeveloped land will never be included on the Inventory because the land is rarely vacant (without a structure) for more than one year and the vacant land is rarely placed back on the market. However, as some larger parcels present themselves over the next few years with upcoming plant closures (e.g. Schneiders), there will be a substantial opportunity to accommodate new employment growth.

3) Vacant Lands found in other employment land designations
There is a great deal of vacant land within the region that is designated specifically for employment uses but which does not appear on the Inventory. This land includes vacant parcels designated in arterial commercial corridors, planned commercial campuses or ‘power centres’, service commercial areas and in institutional designations. This land is very important to sustain employment growth within the region, but is not reflected or monitored within the findings of this Inventory. An example of vacant lands which are designated for employment
uses, but which are not included in the Inventory can be seen below.

South Kitchener, at Homer Watson Blvd. and Hwy 401

4) Vacant Lands found in other land use designations (not exclusively designated for employment)
Employment growth will not only occur on vacant land specifically designated for employment uses. Employment growth will occur in other areas of our municipalities such as mixed use corridors, mixed use nodes, neighbourhood centres, downtowns, rapid transit station areas, agricultural lands and as home based businesses in our residential areas. None of the vacant lands found in these land use designations are included in the Inventory but these lands also will provide significant opportunities for employment growth in the coming years.

5) Vacant Lands found at the Region of Waterloo International Airport
At mid year 2013, there was approximately 25 acres of unserviced (or privately serviced) vacant lands at the Region of Waterloo International Airport available for a mix of aviation related groundside commercial opportunities including airside aviation maintenance. Although the employment uses that would potentially locate on these lands are a very small segment of the total employment market, the Region is able to accommodate this potential growth through short and long-term land leases and design build opportunities.

6) Vacant Lands Soon to be Designated for Industrial and Business Park Uses
There are a number of areas within the Region where land is being re-designated to industrial and business park uses through forthcoming Official Plan Review processes and Official Plan Amendments. These lands were not included in the
Inventory because they were not designated for industrial and business park uses at mid-year 2013. Despite this, appropriate studies are being completed for these lands, services are being constructed, lots are being subdivided and in many cases this land will be available to accommodate employment growth within the next 10 years. Examples of these lands include approximately 16.8 acres as part of the Hunt Club Subdivision in Cambridge, and approximately 370 acres of developable land designated as Prime Industrial / Strategic Reserve through ROPP Amendment 28 in the East Side Lands, Cambridge.

6.2 East Side Lands
In the future, additional lands designated for employment uses will be located in the East Side Study Area. The East Side Lands are strategically located in proximity to Provincial Highways (401, 8, and 7), the CPR rail line, a future GO Transit station in Breslau and the Region of Waterloo International Airport. The recent opening of the Fairway Road Bridge has better connected the East Side Lands with the broader region and the future construction of Highway 7 will also improve connectivity to the East Side Lands. It is expected that the area will increasingly become a key location to attract employers with recent announcements by Toyota to expand its Cambridge facility, the Region’s new Airport Master Plan (currently underway) and future plans for Light Rail Transit. At full build out, the East Side Lands (Stage 1) (approximately 300 net hectares (741 net acres)) are expected to accommodate approximately 8,000 to 10,000 new jobs.
7.0 Key Findings

- The Mid-year Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory remains robust and stable and has decreased only slightly in quantity between 2008 and mid-year 2013, from 2,851 acres to 2,771 acres. Almost 75% of the total Inventory is designated for full municipal services;

- There are 612 acres of shovel ready lands in the Inventory, an increase of 141 acres since 2008. The term shovel ready refers to parcels that possess appropriate land use designations and zoning to accommodate industrial and business park development and that were on the market (either for sale or as a build-to-suit/land lease opportunity) at the time that the Inventory was completed. Of this shovel ready land supply, 91% is fully municipally serviced;

- There are an additional 936 acres of land considered to be in the pipeline. The pipeline refers to Inventory lands that are appropriately designated for industrial and business park uses, but may require a zoning by-law amendment or servicing improvements before they are shovel ready. Lands within the pipeline are expected to be shovel ready in the next 1-10 years. In fact, some lands considered to be in the pipeline at the time of the inventory may now (January 2014) be considered shovel ready (e.g. over 100 acres in Boxwood Business Campus, Cambridge). Other lands in the pipeline are poised to become shovel ready in the near future (e.g. 141 contiguous acres located north of Highway 7/8 and west of New Hamburg in Wilmot and approximately 50 acres on Old Mill Road in Cambridge);

- The Inventory does not include the approximately 370 acres of developable land designated as Prime Industrial / Strategic Reserve through ROPP Amendment 28. Much work has been done through the East Side Lands (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan to bring this land to market, including approximately 200 acres, referred to as the “Quick Start Lands”. However, the lands are not included in the Inventory as the lands have not yet been designated for industrial and business park uses in the City of Cambridge Official Plan;

- The Mid-year 2013 Inventory also demonstrates that there is a dearth of large lot parcels (over 25 acres), particularly in shovel ready categories. Of the 114 shovel ready parcels, only 4 are larger than 25 acres and no parcels are larger than 50 acres. This is similar to the situation that existed in the 2005 and 2008 Inventories. The continued scarcity of large lot parcels emphasizes the need to expedite the ongoing efforts to service and make available land for manufacturing and related uses through the East Side Lands (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan;

- Between 2008 and mid-year 2013, an annual average of 7.33 parcels were absorbed into the market (removed from the Inventory) due to building permits being issued. The majority of these parcels were in Cambridge. This average is
significantly lower than the average between 2005 and 2008 when the economy was strong and approximately 23 parcels were absorbed per year;

- Based on the average yearly absorption of land between 2008 and Mid-year 2013 (34.4 acres/year), there would be a sufficient amount of shovel ready land to accommodate 18 years of growth. If absorption trends increase dramatically and become closer to the average experienced during the boom years of 2005 to 2008 (approximately 100 acres per year), there would be sufficient shovel ready land to accommodate 6 years of growth. However, these figures do not speak to other considerations, particularly the specific locational needs of businesses;

- The majority (30%) of new floor space constructed on designated industrial and business park lands in Waterloo Region between 2008 and mid-year 2013 was for industrial use at over 1.2 million square feet. New floor space constructed for office uses (over 945,000 square feet) and service uses (over 718,000 square feet) make up the next two largest uses; and

- Almost 75% of all newly added floor space on designated industrial and business park lands between 2008 and mid-year 2013 was in the form of reurbanization, (i.e., through additions of floor space to existing businesses on already built-upon industrial land).
Appendix 1 – Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory – Categories of Vacant Parcels

SHOVEL READY LAND (AVAILABLE IMMEDIATELY FOR SALE OR FOR LONG TERM LEASE)

1. Vacant parcels available immediately – These parcels are currently on the market, appropriately zoned, with no known restrictions to development.

2. Vacant parcels available immediately as Build to Suit – These parcels are no longer available for sale but are still immediately available to accommodate new or expanding businesses as design-build or land lease opportunities.

3. Vacant parcels available immediately in the University of Waterloo Research and Technology Park – This vacant land is owned by the University of Waterloo and available only to University associated firms on long term lease.

PIPELINE (LAND THAT IS ANTICIPATED TO COME ON THE MARKET IN THE FUTURE)

6. Vacant parcels available in one to two years – These parcels, with no known restrictions to development, are anticipated to be on the market, with appropriate planning approvals, in 2014 or 2015.

7. Vacant parcels with expectation of availability in over 2 years – These parcels, with no known restrictions to development, are anticipated to be on the market beyond 2015. All parcels within this category have the potential to be available within 10 years based on demand.

5. Vacant parcels without significant restrictions to development, not on the market and not expected to be developed by the current owner - Many of these parcels have the potential to be placed on the market at any time, but are not currently available for sale and no knowledge exists as to when they may come on to the market. For example, parcels in this category include parcels where the owner is known to be holding a parcel as a longer term investment.

AVAILABLE FOR USE BY OWNER

4. Vacant parcels no longer on the market, which are anticipated to be utilized by the current owner - These parcels were purchased after December 31, 2004 for the specific purpose of expansion or development by the current owner. Although no longer on the market, these parcels will accommodate employment growth through new development. These lands remain within the Inventory until a building permit is issued on the parcel. Issuance of a building permit is the trigger for parcel removal as it has been found that parcels in this category may become available on the market more than once, and by different owners, prior to a building being erected.
CONSTRAINED LANDS

8 Vacant parcels not on the market, or not considered shovel ready for reasons other than timing – These parcels have restrictions to development that include contamination, servicing difficulties (e.g. capacity, or due to topography), or grading issues.

POTENTIALLY IN TRANSITION TO OTHER USES

9 Vacant parcels without significant constraints where development applications have been submitted for conversion - This category includes parcels currently designated and/or zoned for industrial or Business Park uses which are subject to a development application proposing a non-industrial end use. This also includes lands where a municipality anticipates the use of the lands for municipal purposes. Placement in this category does not constitute endorsement of the application, but rather simply the recognition that an application has been filed.
## Appendix 2 - Comparison of Categories for the 2005, 2008, and Mid-year 2013 Inventory

### Comparison of Categories for the 2005, 2008 and Mid-year 2013 Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2005 Inventory</th>
<th>2008 Inventory</th>
<th>Mid-Year 2013 Inventory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Acres</td>
<td>Percent of 2005 Inventory</td>
<td>Designated Serviced Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>729.21</td>
<td>22.30%</td>
<td>222.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>211.61</td>
<td>6.50%</td>
<td>211.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>91.11</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
<td>91.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>294.11</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
<td>257.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>190.41</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
<td>190.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>722.83</td>
<td>22.10%</td>
<td>582.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>284.61</td>
<td>8.70%</td>
<td>217.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2523.89</td>
<td>77.10%</td>
<td>1773.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>559.79</td>
<td>17.10%</td>
<td>459.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>189.96</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
<td>189.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>749.75</td>
<td>22.90%</td>
<td>649.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Totals</td>
<td>3273.64</td>
<td>2422.42</td>
<td>2851.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 3 - Summary of the Mid-year 2013 Region of Waterloo Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory & Detailed Summaries by Parcel

**Region of Waterloo Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory – Mid-Year 2013**

**SUMMARY SHEET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat.</th>
<th>Region of Waterloo</th>
<th>Cambridge</th>
<th>Kitchener</th>
<th>Waterloo</th>
<th>Woolwich</th>
<th>North Dumfries</th>
<th>Wilmot</th>
<th>Wellesley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Acres</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Designated</td>
<td>Serviced</td>
<td>Total Acres</td>
<td>Designated</td>
<td>Serviced</td>
<td>Total Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>369.16</td>
<td>13.32%</td>
<td>312.97</td>
<td>46.27</td>
<td>130.59</td>
<td>130.59</td>
<td>43.24</td>
<td>43.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>211.95</td>
<td>7.65%</td>
<td>211.95</td>
<td>146.53</td>
<td>42.34</td>
<td>42.34</td>
<td>19.69</td>
<td>19.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.69</td>
<td>1.11%</td>
<td>30.69</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30.69</td>
<td>30.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>330.81</td>
<td>11.94%</td>
<td>266.45</td>
<td>152.31</td>
<td>77.88</td>
<td>77.88</td>
<td>26.35</td>
<td>26.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>149.78</td>
<td>5.41%</td>
<td>87.89</td>
<td>19.67</td>
<td>34.41</td>
<td>34.41</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>7.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>492.06</td>
<td>17.76%</td>
<td>431.47</td>
<td>224.16</td>
<td>37.55</td>
<td>37.55</td>
<td>26.34</td>
<td>26.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>444.57</td>
<td>16.05%</td>
<td>305.64</td>
<td>74.84</td>
<td>88.09</td>
<td>88.09</td>
<td>142.71</td>
<td>142.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>506.98</td>
<td>18.30%</td>
<td>376.47</td>
<td>120.40</td>
<td>90.04</td>
<td>90.04</td>
<td>10.04</td>
<td>10.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>234.77</td>
<td>8.47%</td>
<td>33.49</td>
<td>28.45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2770.76</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>2057.02</td>
<td>812.63</td>
<td>500.91</td>
<td>500.91</td>
<td>306.98</td>
<td>306.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Acres Net of Constraints

Data as of June 30th 2013
### Appendix 4

City of Cambridge Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Mun</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Cat</th>
<th>Legal Description</th>
<th>Privately Owned</th>
<th>Designated Serviced</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Constrained Area</th>
<th>Area Avail. for Development</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Detailed Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Pinebush Road, Lot 422, Concept 4 (May be subdivided per Concession 1, 2, 3), Diamo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 600 LOT 1-3 PT LTS 4,5 S RANGE PT LOTS 1-5 N RANGE RPSBR8095 PTS 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>31.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>31.22</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>M1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Highridge Ct</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1382 PT LOT 21 RPSBR9355 PART 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Sold in 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>129 Pinebush Rd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>REG COMP PLAN 1382 PT LOT 26 RPSBR2913 PARTS 1 TO 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>8 industrial lots are proposed, build to suit. Although Draft Approved for B lots, property is available for build to lease. MTO road improvements may affect this property. Same Owner as ID#487 and #704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>350 Pinebush Road Lot 1 - 307-91004</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PARTS 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>13.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13.99</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Build to lease or sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Holiday Inn Dr, Lot 406</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>MUN COMP PLAN 907 PT LOT 12</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>11.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>305 Industrial Road (Northeast)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 1227 LOT 12</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Build to suit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Industrial Road, PLAN 1427 LT 5 PT BLK 24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 1427 LT 5 PT BLK 24</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Build to suit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Dobbie Drive PLAN 1335 PT LOT 56, RP SB11417 PARTS 2,3,4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 1335 PT LOT 56 RP SB11417 PARTS 2,3,4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Eastern Industrial Park - Rail access. Parcel has been listed for sale since 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Jamieson Parkway, Lot 428, 485, 487, 488, 489, 491</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>REG COMP PLAN 1843 LOT 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>19.94</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>19.94</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Restricted services - build to suit lease only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Jamieson Parkway, Lot 428, 485, 487, 488, 489, 416</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 582232 BLK 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>No longer listed for sale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>120 SALTSMAN DR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 582302 BLK 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>12.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12.43</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Build to suit land for sale, two buildings are proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Salsman Dr COR BEASLEYS BROKEN FRONT/PT LOT 21 RPSBR11561 PARTS 24 TO 25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>BEASLEYS BROKEN FRONT CON PT LOT 21 RPSBR12234 PTS 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Build to Suit for sale, vacant land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>507 Franklin Blvd Corner of Franklin Blvd and Savage Drive Lot 467</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1135 PT LOT 46 RPSBR8709 PARTS 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>20.77</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20.77</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Eastern Industrial Park, continues to be vacant with no building permits, however iCXY listing was removed in late 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>30 Highridge Ct (Southern half)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1135 PT LOT 52 RP SB14105 PART 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>M4</td>
<td>Rail access - no building permit yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>111 Savage Drive (Eastern portion)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PLAN 1135 PT LOT 51 RP SB14105 PART 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>M4</td>
<td>Stand-alone parcel. Access to Dobbie Drive - purchased by nearby business for expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>1180 MAIN ST</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>CON 11 PT LOT 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>43.92</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>43.02</td>
<td>M4</td>
<td>Access to Main, Franklin and Moorefield St. Related for sale in April 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>467</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Franklin Blvd (West side)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>REG COMP PLAN 1135 PT LOT 28 RPSBR13772 PART 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Mun</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>Legal Description</td>
<td>Privately Owned</td>
<td>Designated Serviced</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Constrained Area</td>
<td>Area Avail. for Development</td>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Detailed Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Franklin Blvd (West side)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>CON 11 PT LOT 5 REG COMP PLAN 1335 LOT 27 PT LOT 28 R6P763772 PART 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>469</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Franklin Blvd at Main St</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>CON 11 PT LOT 5 R6P763772 PART 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Franklin Blvd. (East side)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>CON 11 PT LOT 5 REG COMP PLAN 1335 LOT 28 R6P763772 PART 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>471</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Farmington Blvd (East side)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>CON 12 PT LOT 5 REG COMP PLAN 1335 LOT 28 R6P763772 PART 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Wittmer St. - land locked behind Wittmer St.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1364 LOT 22</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11.39</td>
<td>M4</td>
<td>Rail access, Hwy 401 exposure. Purchased in 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>478</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>475 Wittmer St.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1364 LOT 21</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>36.41</td>
<td>16.81</td>
<td>19.60</td>
<td>M4</td>
<td>Purchased in 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Bishop at Canamera Parkway</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>REG COMP PLAN 1380 PT LOT 1 REG COMP PLAN 1383 PT LOT 24 KP S8R14592 PARTS 1 AND</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>24.06</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>23.57</td>
<td>(H)M2 &amp; (H)M3</td>
<td>Parcel is proposed to be subdivided for design build opportunities. Same Owner as #199 and #704.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>487</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>230 Pinehurst Rd Lot 188</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 904 LOT 2 RP 67R1201 PART 1 TO PART 6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>MTU road improvements may affect this property. Same Owner as ID#9 and #704.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Beaverdale Rd (Rear portion)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CON BEASLEYS BROKEN FRONT PT LOTS SPEEDOYILE RD</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Hwy 401 exposure, NW of Hwy 24/401 interchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Bowwood Drive Lot 800 / 1510 SPEEDOYILE RD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>CON BEASLEYS BROKEN FRONT PT LOTS 27</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>180.28</td>
<td>27.30</td>
<td>152.98</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>City owned - Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>499</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Bowood Dr. Lot 810</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>CON BEASLEYS BROKEN FRONT PT LOTS 27</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>17.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17.10</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>City Owned. On the market in 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>700 Maplegrove Rd (Northern portion)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CON BEASLEYS BROKEN FRONT PT LT 30</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Access to Bowood Dr and Vondrau Dr. Build to lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>800 Maplegrove Rd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CON BEASLEYS BROKEN FRONT PT, LOT 30 R6P767272 PART 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>25.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>25.08</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Access to Bowood Dr. and Maple Grove. Owner will use for their own purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Royal Oak Rd (Across from Toyota employee centre)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CON BEASLEYS BROKEN FRONT PT LT 2 PT LT2 RPSR88875 PT PART 2 AND PARTS 5 TO 8</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Rail access, stand-alone complete parcel purchased for expansion by the owner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>140 OLD MILL RD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>SVY BEASLEYS OLD PT LOT 6 PT PART 1 RP S8R12575</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>63.20</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>54.09</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>ZCA and Plan of Subdivision in process, proposing 14 industrial lots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>North of Maple Grove, West of 100-200 Maplegrove Rd</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>CON BEASLEYS BROKEN FRONT PT LOTS 9 &amp; 12 R6P76448 PARTS 18.18 TOG WITH ROW</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>87.13</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>84.22</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Land locked - this parcel is smaller than represented on the map - the area reflects this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>534</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Canamera Pkwy at Lingard Rd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1383 PT LOT 25 RP S8R14644 PART</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>M2 &amp; M3</td>
<td>No Servicing. Requires a pumping station and to remain. Listed for Sale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>810 Clyde Rd</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Con 12 PT LOT 1; R6P7672834 Parts 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>25.23</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>23.55</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>No Servicing. Requires a pumping station and to remain. Listed for Sale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>572</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>500 Thompson Drive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Con 12 PT LOTS 5 RP 1386, Parts 49, 50 and 51, S8R15462</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>To be built upon by owner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>500 Jameson Parkway</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Plan S8R1531 Lot 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Design Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>579</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>520 Jameson Parkway</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Plan S8R1531 Lot 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Design Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>350 Jameson Parkway</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Plan S8R1531 Lot 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Design Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>581</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>45 Commerce Court</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Plan S8R1531 Lot 6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Design Build. This property has recently sold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>584</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Langs Drive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Plan 1375 PT LOT 13; R6P763440 PART 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>Municipal water only. Requires other services. For sale woodlot is not netted out of area (not prov sign)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>806 Clyde Rd</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Con 12 PT LOTS 1&amp;2 RP S8R14686 Parts</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Holding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>589</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>2310 Townline Rd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>RCP 1380 PT LOT 1 RCP 1383; PT LOTS 4 AND 35 RP S8R12105 PT PART 17</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>M2 &amp; M3</td>
<td>This property is back on the market in a prime location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>Legal Description</td>
<td>Privately Owned</td>
<td>Designated Serviced</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Constrained Area</td>
<td>Area Avail. for Development</td>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Detailed Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>345 Franklin Blvd</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>CON 11 PT LOT 2 PT LOT 5; PLAN 1135 PT LOT 28 PT LOT 49</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>54.29</td>
<td>18.11</td>
<td>36.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Owned by Kiritoff Holdings (7), no listing for this property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Elgin St</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CON 12 PT LOT 7 PT LOT 8; RP67R2915 PARTS 1-4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Land is a part of the owners current industrial building on Elgin St. Can only be accessed through their current driveway entrance and is on a steep grade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Townline Rd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>REG COMP PLAN 1374 PT LOT 42; RP67R2458 PTS 1-82</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>M1 (R1)</td>
<td>Available as 'build to suit' by the developer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>INDUSTRIAL RD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>REG COMP PLAN 1374 PT LOT 42; RP67R2458 PTS 8-4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>If brought to market, may be developed in conjunction with id no. 625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>INDUSTRIAL RD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>REG COMP PLAN 1374 PT LOT 42; RP67R2458 PTS 3-8</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>If brought to market, may be developed in conjunction with id no. 624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>470 DOBBIE DR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>PLAN 1126 PT LOT 43 AND 44 RP S8R15531 PTS 4 AND 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>600 Fountain St</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CON BEASLY'S BROKEN FRONT PT LOT 24 IRREG 2.98AC 182.68'FR 724.03D</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Parcel is listed as build to lease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>703</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Shepherd Ave</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 908 PT LOT 15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Sold in 2011, future home to a trucking business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>240 Pinhush Rd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CON BEASLY'S BROKEN FRONT PT LOT 19 RP S8R0842 PTS 2 TO 11415 AND &lt;null&gt;</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Same Owner as ID9 and #487, MTO road improvements may affect this property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>737</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>445 Dobie Dr</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>CON BEASLY'S BROKEN FRONT PT LOT 19 RP S8R0842 PTS 2 TO 11415 AND</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>28.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>28.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>is subject to a plan of subdivision and zone change application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 4

**City of Kitchener Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory**

**Categories**

1. Vacant parcels available immediately
2. Vacant parcels available immediately as design build
3. Vacant parcels available immediately in the University of Waterloo R&D Park
4. Vacant parcels no longer on the market that are expected to be developed by the current owner
5. Current owner
6. Vacant parcels available in one to two years
7. Vacant parcels with the expectation of availability in over two years
8. Vacant parcels with constraints other than timing
9. Conversion to other uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Num</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Cat</th>
<th>Legal Description</th>
<th>Privately Owned</th>
<th>Designated Serviced</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Constrained Area</th>
<th>Area Avail. for Development</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Detailed Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>McIntyre Dr PLAN 1471 PT LOT 14 RPS8R10560 PART 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1471 PT LOT 14 RPS8R10560 PART</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>B-1</td>
<td>Stand-alone parcel purchased for owner’s expansion, currently used for storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>40 ADAM FERRE PL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1478 LOT 26 RP S8R1111 PART 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>B-1</td>
<td>Stand-alone parcel not available - future expansion of parcel adjacent to left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Strasburg Rd PLAN 1471 PT LOT 17 RPS8R6642 PART 1 &amp; 2 SUBJ TO ROW - 30T-B3006</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>PLAN 1471 PT LOT 17 RPS8R6642 PART 1 &amp; 2 SUBJ TO ROW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>37.66</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>37.55</td>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Mun. Draft Apprvd - Req for upgrading of Battler Rd to full mun standards across the entire frontage. Subject to conditions of the Strasburg Crk Master Watershed Plan - merged with IDMS19, Central Maintenance Facility Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>1655 Strasburg Rd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PART 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Requirement for upgrading of Battler Rd to full municipal standards across the entire frontage. Subject to conditions of the Strasburg Crk Master Watershed Plan. Used to be a part of a 12.5 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>74 Bleams Rd</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Plan 1490 PT LOTS: Pts 2 &amp; 3 RPS8R3505</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>M-2</td>
<td>This site is impaired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Seneda Rd GCT SUB LT 59 PT LT 10 PL 40 PT LT F RPS8R6980 PART 1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>GCT SUB LT 59 PT LT 10 PLAN 40 PT LT F RPS8R6980 PART 1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>M-2</td>
<td>City owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>36 CRESTVIEW PL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 20</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Lands sold in 2005 but no building permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>120 CENTENNIAL RD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1686 LOT 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>M-2</td>
<td>Lands sold in 2005 but no building permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>120 CENTENNIAL RD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1698 LOT 6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>M-2</td>
<td>Lands sold in 2005 but no building permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>112 CENTENNIAL RD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1689 LOT 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>M-2</td>
<td>Sold in 2005 approved site plan building permit under review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>201 CENTENNIAL CRT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1698 LOT 7</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>M-2</td>
<td>Sold in 2005 approved site plan building permit under review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>New Dundee Rd SURVEY BEASLYS OLD PT LOT 7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>SURVEY BEASLYS OLD PT LOT 7</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Unservicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>1800 STRASBURG RD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 1382 PT LOT 1 RPS8R12683 PARTS 2 &amp; 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Weber Supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>211 McIntyre Dr Part 36 (the Eastern Portion)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1471 PT LYT 24 RPS8R5668 PT 36</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>B-1</td>
<td>Owned by business on adjoining property to the left for future growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>21 RIVERVIEW PL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 22</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Sold in 05 building permit pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>2380 SHIRLEY DR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Sold in 05 building permit is pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>2300 SHIRLEY DR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 24</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Sold in 05 approved site plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>2340 SHIRLEY DR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Sold in 05 but no building permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Mun</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>Legal Description</td>
<td>Privately Owned</td>
<td>Designated Serviced</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Constrained Area</td>
<td>Area Avail. for Development</td>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Detailed Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>44 CRESTVIEW PL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 19</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>To be sold with lots 6, 7 and 18, 13 acres in total at $205,000 per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>40 Cedarview</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 7</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>To be sold with Parts 6, 18 and 19, 13 acres in total at $205,000 per acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>34 Cedarview</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 8</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Parcel sold in 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>48 CRESTVIEW PL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 38</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>To be sold with Lots 6, 7 and 19, 13 acres in total at $205,000 per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>2260 SHIRLEY DR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 11</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Parcel sold in 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>22 Cedarview</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 10</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Parcel sold in 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>28 Cedarview</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 9</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Subdivision approved as 12 lots can be developed as 3-3 larger lots without the Cedarview Pl cul-de-sac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>27 Cedarview</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 7</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Parcel sold in 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>2218 SHIRLEY DR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Parcel sold in 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>21 Cedarview</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Parcel sold in 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>33 Cedarview</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Parcel sold in 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>39 Cedarview</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>To be sold with lots 7, 18 and 19, 13 acres in all at $205,00 per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>2295 SHIRLEY DR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 36</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Land sold in 2005 but no building permit. Truck trailers on property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>2315 SHIRLEY DR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 37</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Land sold in 2005, small office building permit issued. Truck trailers being stored on property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>27 RIVIERVIEW PL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Land sold in 2006, small office building permit issued. Truck trailers being stored on property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Sportsworld Dr - NE of Hwy 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>CON BEASLY'S BROKEN FRONT PT LOTS 21 &amp; 22</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>B-3</td>
<td>Constrained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Sportsworld Dr - East of Hwy 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>CON BEASLY'S BROKEN FRONT PT LOTS 21 &amp; 22</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>B-3/P-2</td>
<td>Partially treed constrained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>131 Goodrich Drive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>M-2</td>
<td>Access to Wilson and to Goodrich - unsevered. Former Michelin Tire Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>131 Goodrich Drive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15.87</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>15.87</td>
<td>M-2</td>
<td>Rail Access - frontage and access to Goodrich Drive. Former Micheline Tire Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Grand Crest Place</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1420 LOT 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>M-2</td>
<td>This is a stand-alone assessment parcel, purchased for expansion by the owner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Grand Crest Place</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1420 LOT 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>M-2</td>
<td>This is a stand-alone assessment parcel purchased for expansion by the owner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>333 Manitou Dr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>M-4</td>
<td>Frontage on Manitou and access to Sesagea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Manitou at Homer Watson (North east corner)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 1489 PT LOT 53 RPS885097 PART 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>B-3</td>
<td>Rail access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>60 WASHBURN DR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1471 PT LOT 12 RPS894892 PART 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Access to Riverbend Dr and Shirley Ave. Severe grading issues - rolling hills and treed. Owned by MTG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Shirley Ave</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>GERMAN COMPANY TRACT PT LOT 122</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>69.23</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>69.03</td>
<td>M-4</td>
<td>Access to Riverbend Dr and Shirley Ave. Severe grading issues - rolling hills and treed. Owned by MTG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Riverbend Drive</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PLAN 763 PT LOT 38 PLAN D70 PT LOT 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>M-4</td>
<td>No frontage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>508 Riverbend Drive</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 59 RPS898680 PTL11,12,13 RPS88192 PT 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Constrained, slope stability review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>526 LANCASTER ST W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 40 PT LOT 8 &amp; PT LOT 6 TRACT GERMAN COMPANY SUB LOT 58 LOT 16</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>M-2</td>
<td>Access to both Maple and Birch - a complete parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Maple Ave or Bird Ave</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 40 PT LOT 8 &amp; PT LOT 6 TRACT GERMAN COMPANY SUB LOT 58 LOT 16</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>M-2</td>
<td>Partial constrained by future Hwy 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>211 SPRING VALLEY RD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>M-2</td>
<td>Partial constrained by future Hwy 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>Legal Description</td>
<td>Privately Owned</td>
<td>Designated Serviced</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Constrained Area</td>
<td>Area Avail for Development</td>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Detailed Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Spring Valley Rd</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PLAN 40 PT LOT D</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>M-2</td>
<td>Most or all of parcel is part of future Hwy 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>32 FORRELL RD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 121</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>34.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>34.41</td>
<td>Gravel pit, potentially serviceable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>5 Forwell Rd (Southern portion)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 123</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>M-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>300 BRIDGE ST E</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>GCC PT LOT 112 RP SBR8724 PARTS 1 TO</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>116.39</td>
<td>64.17</td>
<td>52.22</td>
<td>P-3 / B-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>280 HIDDEN VALLEY RD 30T-81028</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>PLAN 986 LOT 34 PLAN 961 PT LOT 15</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>16.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16.12</td>
<td>B-1</td>
<td>Priority post 2006-this parcel may be larger than is represented requires access from River Rd ext w/hwy 8 interchange &amp; a pumping station EA Pending. On the market for $291,005/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Hidden Valley Rd 30T-81028</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>38.58</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>35.86</td>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Priority post 2006-parcel may be larger than is represented requires access from River Rd ext w/hwy 8 interchange &amp; a pumping station EA Pending.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>593</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Hesh Cres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SBRM24 BLK 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Was previously part of a 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>594</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Hesh Cres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SBRM24 BLK 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Was previously part of a 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>BINGEMANS CENTRE DR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 122</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>This is a completely separate parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>SHIRLEY DR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN SBRM24 PT BLK 1 RP SBR16128 PT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>SHIRLEY DR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN SBRM24 PT BLK 1 RP SBR16128 PT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>SHIRLEY DR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN SBRM24 PT BLK 1 RP SBR16128 PT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>SHIRLEY DR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN SBRM24 PT BLK 1 RP SBR16128 PT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>633</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>SHIRLEY DR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN SBRM24 PT BLK 1 RP SBR16128 PT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>SHIRLEY DR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN SBRM24 PT BLK 1 RP SBR16128 PT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>635</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>SHIRLEY DR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN SBRM24 PT BLK 1 RP SBR16128 PT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>SHIRLEY DR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN SBRM24 PT BLK 1 RP SBR16128 PT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>637</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>SHIRLEY DR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 32</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Parcel has severe slope constraints that will make it difficult to develop for industria, parcel will likely receive an application for redesignation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>638</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>SHIRLEY DR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 33</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>639</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>COURTLAND AVE E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>KITCHENER PLAN 1206 PT BLK F PLAN 1221 PT BLK F RP SBR12301 PT 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Parcel has severe slope constraints that will make it difficult to develop for industria, parcel will likely receive an application for redesignation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>15 Trillium Drive</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PLAN 1478 PT LOT 5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>13.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13.67</td>
<td>&lt;Null&gt;</td>
<td>This site is subject to a development application, however, it is currently designated for Industrial and Business Park Uses. Budd Park will be held as a Strategic Reserve for large lot users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>711</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>N/E Corner of Wilson and Wabanaki Drive roll num: 30120403323812</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>RCP 1524 PT LOT 10 RP SBR16576 PT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>&lt;Null&gt;</td>
<td>This site is subject to a development application, however, it is currently designated for Industrial and Business Park Uses. Budd Park will be held as a Strategic Reserve for large lot users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>1011 Homer Watson Blvd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;Null&gt;</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>63.81</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>63.81</td>
<td>&lt;Null&gt;</td>
<td>This site is subject to a development application, however, it is currently designated for Industrial and Business Park Uses. Budd Park will be held as a Strategic Reserve for large lot users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>718</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Hesh Cres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SBRM24 BLK 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Was previously part of a 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>719</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Shirley Ave</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SBRM24 BLK 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Was previously part of a 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Shirley Ave</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SBRM24 BLK 6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Was previously part of a 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>721</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Shirley Ave</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SBRM24 BLK 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Was previously part of a 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>722</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Shirley Ave</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SBRM24 BLK 6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Was previously part of a 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>723</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Shirley Ave</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SBRM24 BLK 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Was previously part of a 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Mnr</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>Legal Description</td>
<td>Privately Owned</td>
<td>Designated Services</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Constrained Area</td>
<td>Available for Development</td>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Detailed Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>724</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Shirley Ave</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SMBM424 Bk 6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Used to be part of 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Shirley Ave</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SMBM424 Bk 6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Used to be part of 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>726</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Shirley Ave</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SMBM424 Bk 6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Used to be part of 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>727</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Hesh Cres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SMBM424 Bk 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Used to be part of 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>728</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Hesh Cres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SMBM424 Bk 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Used to be part of 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>729</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Hesh Cres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SMBM424 Bk 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Used to be part of 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Hesh Cres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SMBM424 Bk 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Used to be part of 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>731</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Hesh Cres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SMBM424 Bk 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Used to be part of 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>732</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Hesh Cres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SMBM424 Bk 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Used to be part of 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>733</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Hesh Cres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SMBM424 Bk 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Used to be part of 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>734</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Hesh Cres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SMBM424 Bk 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Used to be part of 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>735</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Hesh Cres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SMBM424 Bk 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Used to be part of 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Trillium Drive and Huron Road (Ss</td>
<td></td>
<td>PLAN 1478 PT LOT 5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Used to be a portion of ID#710</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# City of Waterloo Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory

## Categories
|
| 1 | Vacant parcels available immediately |
| 2 | Vacant parcels available immediately as design build |
| 3 | Vacant parcels available immediately in the University of Waterloo R&T Park |
| 4 | Vacant parcels no longer on the market that are expected to be developed by the current owner |
| 5 | Current owner |
| 6 | Vacant parcels available in one to two years |
| 7 | Vacant parcels with the expectation of availability in over two years |
| 8 | Vacant parcels with constraints other than timing |
| 9 | Conversion to other uses |

## Table
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Mn</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Cat</th>
<th>Legal Description</th>
<th>Privately Owned</th>
<th>Designated Serviced</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Constrained Area</th>
<th>Area Available for Development</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Detailed Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>100 Wilmot Line</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>TRACT GERMANY COMPANY PT LOT 41 RPSR6857 PARTS 10 AND 11 SUBTIC TO &amp; TOG WITH ROW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>78.88</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>78.88</td>
<td>OP-IND Z-</td>
<td>Currently unserviced, owned by the City of Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>Wilmot Line TRACT GERMANY COMPANY PT LOT 41 RPSR6857 PART 13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>TRACT GERMANY COMPANY PT LOT 41 RPSR6857 PART 13</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>OP-IND Z-</td>
<td>Currently unserviced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>395 Erb St W</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>TRACT GERMANY COMPANY PT LOT 41 PT LOT 42 ONTARIO HYDRO ROW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>25.56</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>25.56</td>
<td>OP-IND AC</td>
<td>Currently unserviced, owned by the City of Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>65 Ira Needles Blvd</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>TRACT GERMANY COMPANY PT LOT 40</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Unserviced - sanitary servicing constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>87 Ira Needles Blvd</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>TRACT GERMANY COMPANY PT LOT 40 RP SBR6504 PARTS 1 AND 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Unserviced - sanitary servicing constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>73 Ira Needles Blvd</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>TRACT GERMANY COMPANY PT LOT 40</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Unserviced - sanitary servicing constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>101 Ira Needles Blvd</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>TRACT GERMANY COMPANY PT LOT 40</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Sanitary servicing available via The Boardwalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>350 Northfield Dr E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>GERMAN COMPANY TRACT PT LOT 63 RPSR12714 PART 1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Sold, pending due diligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>517 Colby Dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 1440 LOT 14</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>I-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>41 Ira Needles Blvd</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>GERMAN COMPANY TRACT PT LOT 40 RP SBR6478 PART 7</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>17.53</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17.53</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Not serviced - sanitary servicing constraints. Occupied by West Hill Meadows Golf Course. Front portion of property is not included as it is designated Arterial Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>450 Weber St</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRACT GERMANY COMPANY PT LOTS 7 AND 12 PLAN 1155 PT RESERVE E RP SBR13797 PART 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11.58</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11.58</td>
<td>I-6</td>
<td>Vacant land owned by Intelligent Mechatronic Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>340 University Ave E (Adjacent to the North)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>I-6</td>
<td>Separate parcel with access issues - exposure to Hwy 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>580 Weber Street North - Northern Frontage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRACT GERMANY COMPANY PT LOTS 9 AND 10 RP SBR14706 PART 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>I-6</td>
<td>Severed from NCR, may be a part of whole NCR land sale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>640 Colby Dr</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PLAN 1440 LOT 60</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>I-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>University Ave East</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PLAN S8M228F PT BLK 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>18.52</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>18.52</td>
<td>I-6</td>
<td>Blackberry Campus, unavailable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>University Ave East at Northfield Dr.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PLAN S8M229F BLK 2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>I-6</td>
<td>Owned by the City of Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>University Ave East</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>PLAN S8M229F PT BLK 3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>24.58</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>24.54</td>
<td>I-6</td>
<td>Owned by the City of Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>465 Wes Graham Way</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PLAN S8M350 BLK 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>B-1</td>
<td>UW R&amp;T Park - some restrictions apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>415, 425, 435 Wes Graham Way</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PLAN S8M272 BLK 8</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>16.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16.42</td>
<td>B-1</td>
<td>UW R&amp;T Park - some restrictions apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Mun</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>Legal Description</td>
<td>Privately Owned</td>
<td>Designated Serviced</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Constrained Area</td>
<td>Area Avail. for Development</td>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Detailed Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>380 Hagey Blvd and 4.20 Wes Graham Way</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PLAN SMB272 BLK 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>B-1</td>
<td>Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>925 Erb Street West</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tract German Company Pt Lot 41</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Currently unserviced, owned by the City of Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>2305 University Ave East</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Plan SMB228 Blk 5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>I-25</td>
<td>City-owned. Topographic challenge to site, 7.5 metre change across site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>441 Albert Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tract German Company Pt Lot 12</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>I-25</td>
<td>Activated lands limited generally to business park uses with some light manufacturing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>Country Squire Rd and Woolwich St</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>37.21</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>36.72</td>
<td>I-6</td>
<td>Owner is not interested in selling the property at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>10 Northland Road</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;Null&gt;</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>I2-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 4

Township of Woolwich Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Muni</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Cat</th>
<th>Legal Description</th>
<th>Privately Owned</th>
<th>Designated Serviced</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Constrained Area</th>
<th>Area Avail. for Development</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Detailed Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>33 Henry St</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 7 PT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>16.85</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>16.76</td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Jacobs Serviced on rail line, access issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>3015 SAWMILL RD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>LOT 35 PT LOT 36</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>44.13</td>
<td>9.93</td>
<td>34.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Jacobs, Farmstead, owned by MTO. Servicing constraints exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>1620 King St N Hwy B5 PLAN 1547 LOT 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 1547 LOT 10 RPSR 398 PART 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Jacobs Serviced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>881 Wibber St. N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stockyards - Commercial power centre - Private services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>713 KING ST N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 5 RP</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stockyards - services from Waterloo, commercial. Owner intends to retain and develop property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LT10 RPSR 5190 PART 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bast Place - Regional Rd 15 Industrial Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>Three Bridges Rd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 1546 PT BLK 6 RPSR5964 PT 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bast Place - Regional Rd 15 Industrial Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>Three Bridges Rd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 1546 PT BLK 6 RPSR5964 PART 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bast Place - Regional Rd 15 Industrial Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>5179 Fountain St. N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 58M179 LOT 2 SUBJ TO RDW</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>South Breslau Industrial Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>380 WOOLWICH ST S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 115 RPSR51244 PARTS 8 &amp; 9</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>South Breslau Industrial Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>258 WOOLWICH ST S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 115 RPSR51244 PARTS 8 &amp; 9</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>South Breslau Industrial Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>1033 KENNING PL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 89</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>25.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>25.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elmira - servicing constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>Union St and Orono Parkway PLAN 58M154 LOT 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 58M154 LOT 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>Located in south Elmira. Lots are fully served, including cable and fibre. 2 acre lot sold in 2001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>1436 ARTHUR ST S</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 5%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>33.44</td>
<td>16.38</td>
<td>17.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unserved - owned by MTO, St. Jacobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>Greenhouse Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 108 RPSR86829 PART 2 IR REAR LAND</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>71.22</td>
<td>57.02</td>
<td>14.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Breslau East - disincentives to development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>45 Benjamin Rd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 18 RPSR78396 PTS 5,6,13 TO 16</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stockyards serviced commercial. Site plan is approved for a hotel and a building permit is pending in mid 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>61 FIRST ST E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 1330 PT LOT 92</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elmira (3 acres in size)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>Legal Description</td>
<td>Privately Owned</td>
<td>Designated Serviced</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Constrained Area</td>
<td>Area Avail for Development</td>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Detailed Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>South Corner of Union and Arthur St 1</td>
<td>GERMAN COMPANY TRACT PT LOT 85 RPSBR13295 PARTS 5 TO 7</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>Elmir - no parcel data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>151 Spinnaker Way Unit 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 58M143 LOT 2 PT LOT 3 RP SBR14619 PTS 1 TO 3 PT 4 and 11 PT PT 10</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>Elmir - recent purchase (05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>55 Earl Martin Drive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 58M216 PT LOT 1 RP SBR14190 PARTS 2 AND 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>Individual Parcel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>583 ARTHUR ST S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 1330 LOT 90 TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 87</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>This represents two separate parcels to be split in 06</td>
<td>Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>144 Southfield Rd</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PLAN 1330 LOT 121 TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 121</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>20.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20.99</td>
<td>A long narrow parcel which would be difficult to develop -</td>
<td>served in future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>17 FIRST ST E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 1330 LOT 121 TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 121</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>Zoning only permits development on rear portion of the</td>
<td>lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>2615 VICTORIA ST</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 106 RPSBR10662 PART 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>Stand alone parcel for current owner's expansion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>Corner of Woolwich Street and</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 58M179 LOT 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>Parcel is a large island of land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>307 WOOLWICH ST S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 116 RPSBR10364 PART 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>238 Woolwich St</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LT 115 RPSR 6124 PART 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>South of 33 Henry St</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>Rail Access - complete parcel same owner as 116 -</td>
<td>Frontage issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>538</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>25 1/4 St East side of River along 86</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>27.58</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>27.58</td>
<td>Utilities lands long term constraints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>Earl Martin Drive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Plan 58M216 PT LOT 1 RPSBR14190</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>599</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>98 Union Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>M2 Vacant parcel but with some small buildings on it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>310 Union St</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 58M358 LOT 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>Used to be a part of a 31 acre parcel, separated. Located</td>
<td>in south Elmira. Lots are fully serviced, including cable and fibre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>290 Union St</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 58M358 LOT 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>Used to be a part of a 31 acre parcel, separated. Located</td>
<td>in south Elmira. Lots are fully serviced, including cable and fibre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>270 Union St</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 58M358 PT LOT 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>Located in south Elmira. Lots are fully served, including cable and fibre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>270 Union St</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 58M358 PT LOT 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Located in south Elmira. 5 minutes from Waterloo. Lots are</td>
<td>fully served, including cable and fibre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>270 Union St</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 58M358 PT LOT 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Located in south Elmira. 5 minutes from Waterloo. Lots are</td>
<td>fully served, including cable and fibre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>705</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>461 Arthur St S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;Null&gt;</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>Located in south Elmira. 5 minutes from Waterloo. Lots are</td>
<td>fully served, including cable and fibre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>100 Circle Pkwy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;Null&gt;</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>Located in south Elmira. 5 minutes from Waterloo. Lots are</td>
<td>fully served, including cable and fibre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>&lt;Null&gt;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;Null&gt;</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>Located in south Elmira. 5 minutes from Waterloo. Lots are</td>
<td>fully served, including cable and fibre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>&lt;Null&gt;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;Null&gt;</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>Located in south Elmira. 5 minutes from Waterloo. Lots are</td>
<td>fully served, including cable and fibre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>709</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>23 Union St</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;Null&gt;</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>Located in south Elmira. 5 minutes from Waterloo. Lots are</td>
<td>fully served, including cable and fibre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>736</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>Donway Crt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;Null&gt;</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>A local structure has been removed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4

Township of North Dumfries Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Mun</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Cat</th>
<th>Legal Description</th>
<th>Privately Owned</th>
<th>Designated Serviced</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Constrained Area</th>
<th>Area Avail for Development</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Detailed Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>170 GREENFIELD RD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>CON 9 PT LOT 36 RPS6R9336 PARTS 1 &amp; 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>Z9</td>
<td>Ayr - no swm outlet determined yet, consideration for redesignation to commercial uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>Con 9, PT Lot 36, Parts 2 and 6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>CON 9 PT LOT 36 RPS6R9336 PARTS 2 &amp; 6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>Z9</td>
<td>Ayr - no swm outlet determined yet, consideration for redesignation to commercial uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>Con 8, PT Lot 35-36 Part 1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>CON 8 PT LOTS 35-36 RPS6R9383 PT PART 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>Z9</td>
<td>Ayr - full municipal services available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>2855 GREENFIELD RD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>CON 8 PT LOT 34 PT LOT 35</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>92.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>92.33</td>
<td>Z9</td>
<td>Ayr - there is a flood plain that divides this lot - major constraints - used for agriculture no interest in development, stated desire to continue agricultural use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>Con 8, PT Lot 32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>CON 8 PT LOT 32</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>8.98</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>Z11</td>
<td>Ayr, used for fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>226 BOIDA AVE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CON 10 PT LOT 30 RPS6R722767 PART 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>Z11</td>
<td>This parcel has been severed into two smaller parcels - still available for development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>Darrell and Harmony CON 10 PT LOT 30 - 30T-87043</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1479 LOT 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>Z11</td>
<td>H401/R97 - could be subdivided, but owner has stated intent is to hold for future options and no intent to sell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>435 WAYDOM DR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1408 LOT 21</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>Z11</td>
<td>H401/R97 Stant-alone parcel purchased for owner's expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>Township Rd 8 PLAN 1407 LOT 5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1407 LOT 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>Z11</td>
<td>H401/R97 Stant-alone parcel purchased for owner's expansion, used by owner adjacent to the south. Currently used to park business vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>16:RPS6R73713 PART 6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1462 PT BLK 16 RPS6R73713 PART 6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>Z11</td>
<td>H401/R97 road access to future subdivision to west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>Cedar Creek Road CON 11 PT LOT 32:RPS6R73012 PART 1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PLAN 1411 LOT 32 RPS6R73012 PART 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>16.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16.27</td>
<td>Z11</td>
<td>Parcel is part of a larger aggregate extraction operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>2788 CEDAR CREEK RD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PLAN 1407 LOT 2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>H401/R97 - No access (MTO proximity to onramp), owned by MTO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>60 Wanless Crt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1462 PT BLK 16 RPS6R73491 PART 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>Z11</td>
<td>Complete separate parcel being used for trailer parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>360-380 Waydom Dr (Rear lot)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1462 LOT 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>Z13</td>
<td>H401/R97 owned by area business for parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>2206 Cedar Creek Rd</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Con 11; PT LOT 28; RPS6R15460 Part 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>34.81</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>34.81</td>
<td>Z11</td>
<td>401 exposure and Cochran Dr Access. Pregrading complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>Cedar Creek Rd W of W-bound on ramp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CON 10 PT LOT 33 RPS6R125028 PART 1 TOG WITH ROW</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>Z11</td>
<td>Plans withdrawn, site vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>Legal Description</td>
<td>Privately Owned</td>
<td>Designated Serviced</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Constrained Area</td>
<td>Area Avail for Development</td>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Detailed Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>Northumberland St at Greenfield Rd</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Con 9 PT LOT 35and 36; RPS8R14834 Part 1 and 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>Z9</td>
<td>OP review considers potential for redesignation to permit development on or of full municipal services as well as consideration for commercial uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>460 Melair Drive (Northern portion) 4 AND 5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 680 PT LOT 5 RP SBR13846 PARTS 4 AND 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>Z9</td>
<td>Separate parcel for expansion only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>2509 Cedar Creek Rd</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>CON 10 PT LOT 29</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>45.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>45.01</td>
<td>Z11</td>
<td>Site specific zoning / OP designation permits trucking / transportation use only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>2691 Greenfield Rd?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>CON 8 PT LOT 32 PT LOT 32 RP 6/R1478 Part 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>36.61</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>36.61</td>
<td>Z9</td>
<td>Land available for severances or may be held for future business expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>40 Wanless Court</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Plan 1462 Lot 15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>Z11</td>
<td>To be utilized by current owner (40 Wanless Court)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>713</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>335 Waydorn Drive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1408 LOT 17</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>&lt;Null&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>714</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>335 Waydorn Drive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1408 LOT 16</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>&lt;Null&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>715</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>&lt;Null&gt;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>CON 10 N PT LOT 32 RP SBR11984 PT 1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>&lt;Null&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>716</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>2588-2616 Cedar Creek Road</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>CON 11 PT LOT 30</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>Previous location of Tu Lane Service Centre, all buildings have been removed. Excellent location and visibility to 401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>717</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>&lt;Null&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NORTH DUMFRIES CON 11 PT LOT 28 RP SBR15460 PT 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>&lt;Null&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 4

### Township of Wilmot Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Mun</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Cat</th>
<th>Legal Description</th>
<th>Privately Owned</th>
<th>Designated Serviced</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Constrained Area</th>
<th>Area Avail. for Development</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Detailed Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Hamilton Rd/Hwy 7/8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>CON NORTH OF BLEAMS RD PT LOT 20 C SOUTH OF SNYDERS RD PT LOT 20</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>109.04</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>108.71</td>
<td>Ind/Ag</td>
<td>Locally significant woodlot included as constrained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Nafziger Rd/Hwy 7/8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>CON NORTH OF BLEAMS RD PT LOT 19 C SOUTH OF SNYDERS RD PT LOT 15</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>10.49</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>New Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Bergy Crt.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 885 PT LOT 10 RPS8R7075 PARTS 3 &amp; 4 RPS8R2027 PART 3</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>New Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Victoria St.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SMITHS PLAN PT BLK 12 MUN COMP 885 PT LOT 7 RPS8R12441 PART 1</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>100 Bergy Crt.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>PLAN 1048 LOTS 1 - 6 PT LOTS 7 - 14 PLAN 273 PT BLK 1</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>South east corner of Foundry St</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CON SOUTH OF SNYDERS RD PT LOT 15</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>Same estate as 143 - currently being farmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Parcel south of 1547 Gingrich Rd</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>CON NORTH OF BLEAMS RD PT LOT 16 RP S8R325 PART 2</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>Baden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>146 FOUNDRY ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CON SOUTH OF SNYDERS RD PT LOT 15 PLAN 627 PT MILL ST TOG WITH ROW</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>23.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>23.26</td>
<td>Ag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Arnold St</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 532A LY302 PT LOTS 303,308,PT SCOTT ST CLSD,RPS8R-1848 PT 7</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>Only northern portion of the parcel can be developed due to grade at rear (only developable portion identified in the inventory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Arnold St</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>PLAN 12 PT LOT 24 PLAN 532A LOT 306 PT LOT 305 PT SCOTT ST CLSD RPS8R</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>Currently being used as a parking lot for an abutting property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Arnold St</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 12 PT LOTS 23,24 RPS8R1848 PART 4</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>Only northern portion of the parcel can be developed due to grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Heritage Dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 1450 BLK 3; PLAN 885 PT LOT 9; &amp; RPS8R5175 PARTS 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>592</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Gingerich</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Plan 1512 LOTS 13-18 Lots; 12-21 &amp; PT Deck Dr &amp; Old &amp; PT Reserve 23; RPS8R6442</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>Adjacent to 1439 Gingerich. Large amount of top soil is stock piled on this site (property owned by 1439 Gingerich - Erb Transport)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Hamburg: Sold in 2006, owner to build one building to accommodate his business, remainder of property is build to suit. Building and Land Use permits will not be issued by MTO for the remainder of the property until Corridor Study is completed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Mun</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Cat</th>
<th>Legal Description</th>
<th>Privately Owned</th>
<th>Designated Serviced</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Constrained Area</th>
<th>Area Avail for Development</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Detailed Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>607</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Nafziger Rd/Hwy7/8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>CON NORTH OF BLEAMS RD PT LOT 19 C</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>21.52</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>21.52</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>Locally significant woodlot included as constrained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>1439 Gingerich Rd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Plan 1512 Lots 10-11, Pt Lots 4-9, 12, Pt Reserve Blk 24 &amp; PT Decker Clsd. RPSBR</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>3.38 acres already developed, 1 acre environmentally contained, 3.69 acres build to suit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix 4

## Township of Wellesley Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory

### Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Num</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Cat</th>
<th>Legal Description</th>
<th>Privately Owned</th>
<th>Designated Serviced</th>
<th>Area Constrained</th>
<th>Area Avail. for Development</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Detailed Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Wel</td>
<td>Herrigott Rd, Section East Con</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CON 12 ES PT LOT 2 RP S8R14275 PARTS</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>Dry Industrial (DI) Stand-alone parcel expansion purposes only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Wel</td>
<td>Hutchison Rd Section West</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SECTION WEST CON 2 PT LOT 12 RP S8R12390 PART 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>Dry Industrial (DI-4) West of Wellesley, Storm water management required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Wel</td>
<td>1039 Industrial Cres</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1667 LOT 25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Dry Industrial (DI-5) St. Clements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Wel</td>
<td>1023 Industrial Cres</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1667 LOT 21</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Dry Industrial (DI-5) St. Clements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>Wel</td>
<td>Hergott Rd</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Section East, Concession 7, Part Lot 2 RP S8R-16222, Part 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>17.23</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>15.68</td>
<td>Dry Industrial (DI-H2) Future southern expansion of existing business park, M2 - environmental impact analysis required from GRCA. Constrataint area is approx. until more is known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>Wel</td>
<td>Hutchison Rd Section West</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>SECTION WEST CON 2 PT LOT 12 RP S8R12390 PART 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>27.29</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>27.14</td>
<td>Dry Industrial (DI-4) West of Wellesley, Storm water management required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640</td>
<td>Wel</td>
<td>2393 Herrigott Rd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1667 LOT 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>Dry Industrial &lt;Null&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>641</td>
<td>Wel</td>
<td>1045 Industrial Cres</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1667 LOT 20</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Dry Industrial &lt;Null&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>738</td>
<td>Wel</td>
<td>2411 Gerber Rd</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>SECTION EAST CON 12 PT LOT 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>Dry Industrial &lt;Null&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>739</td>
<td>Wel</td>
<td>2411 Gerber Rd</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>CON 1 EAST SEC PT LOT 14</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>Dry Industrial &lt;Null&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Summary

The Region of Waterloo is already the fourth largest community in Ontario and the tenth largest community in Canada. Provincial forecasts continue to identify Waterloo Region as a major growth centre for the future, with an estimated population of 730,000 and an additional 80,000 jobs being anticipated by the year 2031. The Regional Official Plan (ROP), approved by Regional Council, establishes the vision and means of accommodating this growth, and is founded on limiting outward growth, higher densities of development, and the protection of agricultural lands and environmental systems. In order to accommodate growth and to achieve this vision, an effective supporting transportation system is essential.

The year 2014 marks the fifteenth anniversary of the Region’s first transportation master plan (completed in 1999) that focused on investing in a variety of modes of transportation (i.e. private vehicles, public transit, walking and cycling). The previous transportation master plans of 1976 and 1986 were more focused on moving large volumes of private vehicles on Regional roads, compared to today’s focus of moving people in a variety of ways.

In the year 2000, the Region of Waterloo created Grand River Transit, initially assuming fleet and facilities from the Cities of Cambridge and Kitchener and growing the system to its present form.
In 2010, the Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) was completely revised and updated, and further refined to reflect the construction of Rapid Transit (ION), approved in 2011 and scheduled to be operational in 2017.

The purpose of this report is to provide highlights of transportation investment and the measurable results of that investment, focusing on the last fifteen years. Among those results are as follows:

- Grand River Transit annual ridership has already achieved the RTMP forecast for 2016, four years ahead of schedule, and is now 22 million;
- Current ridership on iXpress and Route 7 between Conestoga Mall and Fairview Park Mall is 20,000 rides per day, which is approaching the 2017 target ridership of 25,000 on the ION light rail;
- Since 2006, cycling lanes have nearly doubled to almost 300 km;
- Since 2004, almost $250 million has been invested in expansion of the Regional road network;
- Since 2009, the Province has invested about $150 million in Regional highways;
- The Transportation Management Association has been promoted to more than 8% of the Region-wide workforce, and in one year 5% of TMA-participating employees surveyed have shifted from driving alone to more sustainable modes of travel;
- All Grand River Transit buses are now fully accessible; and
- The EasyGo electronic traveller information system has increased to over 5 million uses annually, compared to less than 1 million in 2008.

This report will be posted on the Region’s website as part of the Big Shift Toolbox, to help the community and prospective investors understand the Region’s focus on transportation infrastructure that will sustain compact urban redevelopment.

Report

Overview

The Region of Waterloo is already the fourth largest community in Ontario and the tenth largest community in Canada. Provincial growth forecasts continue to identify Waterloo Region as a major growth centre for the future, with an estimated population of 730,000 and an additional 80,000 jobs being anticipated by the year 2031. The Region’s approach to accommodating new growth is defined in the Regional Official Plan (ROP), approved by Council in 2009. It is founded on limiting outward expansion of new development, higher densities of development, and the protection of agricultural lands and sensitive environmental areas (e.g. areas of groundwater recharge and discharge, the source of about 80% of our water consumption). In short, new growth is to be accommodated in a more compact way, with a significant focus on new development within existing built-up areas and excellence in urban design. Over 50% of new residential development is already occurring in built-up areas, and higher densities of development that meet or exceed the Provincial Growth Plan are already being achieved.
The accommodation of growth in a more compact way is dependent on an effective supporting transportation system. The 2010 Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP), approved by Regional Council, identified a plan for moving people that shifted toward even greater investment in transit, cycling and walking. A key element of the RTMP is rapid transit, and the ION system that was approved in 2011 will move people between Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo beginning in 2017. Absent this strategy, the Region would be faced with having to construct 500 new lane kilometers of new roadways. This is not only a costly proposition, but it would also require major new land takings in a variety of neighbourhoods and communities throughout the Region.

Regional Transportation Master Plan

The Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) was approved by Regional Council in 2010 and provides strategic direction for planning, designing and building a regional transportation network that supports a compact urban form, vibrant urban centres, protects the environment and enhances the quality of life for citizens. It recognizes that the estimated 170,000 more people and 80,000 more jobs by 2031 need to be accommodated by the transportation system. The RTMP focuses on moving people instead of moving automobiles, and investments in public transit and active transportation are needed to avoid constructing 500 lane-kilometres of new roads.

The development of the RTMP reflected four major goals for the transportation system:

1. Optimize the system: Make the most of the existing transportation network and minimize the need for new infrastructure that does not promote the other goals. For example, optimize traffic signal timings instead of adding travel lanes.

2. Promote choice: Offer competitive alternatives for moving people and goods in an integrated and seamless manner, and reduce single occupant vehicle trips. For example, improve the public transit and active transportation networks.

3. Foster a strong economy: Provide a transportation system that supports the retention of existing businesses and attracts sustainable economic activity. For example, eliminate bottlenecks in road networks that delay trucks.

4. Support sustainable development: Encourage sustainable growth in both urban and rural areas, and reduce transportation contributions to climate change. For example, implement Rapid Transit and transit-supportive land uses and densities.

The RTMP provides a comprehensive planning framework for sustainable transportation in Waterloo Region, and presents an ambitious but realistic action plan. Rapid Transit within the Central Transit Corridor is the foundation of the RTMP, and the ION system will support the built-form objectives developed in the Provincial Growth Plan and in the ROP. An enhanced network of express and local bus routes integrated with the ION system and improvements to the active transportation network will further enhance transportation choice. Strategic road improvements will continue to be needed as well.
The following sections highlight a variety of Regional investments and the results of those investments.

**Grand River Transit**

Public transit ridership is directly related to investments in service. While the Regional population continued to grow during the 1990s, cutbacks in service led to stagnant ridership. However, this trend reversed itself after Grand River Transit (GRT) was established in 1999 and investments in service were sustained (please see Attachment 1). The table below shows how GRT ridership growth has outpaced most other Canadian transit systems:

### Canadian Transit Ridership Growth 1999-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit System</th>
<th>Ridership (millions)</th>
<th>Annual Growth Rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand River Transit</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>101.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudbury</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thunder Bay</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>392.6</td>
<td>514.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario average</td>
<td>589.3</td>
<td>821.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian average</td>
<td>1,437.0</td>
<td>2,025.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The transit system is well positioned to support the introduction of ION rapid transit, which was approved in 2011 and will start providing light rail transit service in 2017. The projected year one daily ridership on the ION LRT is 25,000. Today, Route 7 and iXpress between Fairview Park Mall and Conestoga Mall, which would be replaced by LRT, already carry about 20,000 daily rides. The larger-capacity LRT vehicles operating in their own right-of-way will carry existing and future transit riders more efficiently, comfortably and reliably, and will also allow the redeployment of 19 buses and 50,000 service hours annually to improve the GRT network, such as by adding an iXpress route on Ottawa Street.

Waterloo Region residents have been very receptive to express bus service, with iXpress ridership quickly meeting or exceeding targets as shown in the table below. While iXpress 200 will be replaced by ION, iXpress 201 and 202 are key corridors that will be fully integrated with ION. The success of the iXpress corridors suggests that the
regional transit network is evolving into an attractive transportation system, and this process will continue once ION is operational and additional iXpress corridors are implemented.

**iXpress Ridership (Target and Actual)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Average Daily Ridership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target (Year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,000 (2013)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on achieving peak hour transit mode share targets, the RTMP also established annual transit ridership targets. The RTMP 2016 annual ridership target of 20.2 million rides was achieved in 2012. GRT carried 22 million rides in 2013 and is on-track to achieve the 2021 RTMP target of 28 million by 2019 (please see Attachment 2).

Annual transit trips per capita has also been growing rapidly, as shown in Attachment 3. Since 2000, this number has grown from 26 to 49, and the transit system is well-positioned to meet the RTMP target of 79 annual transit trips per capita by 2034. This is a realistic target for the Region: Winnipeg (73 trips per capita) and Quebec City (83 trips per capita) both currently achieve similar annual riderships with similar service area populations, and neither have significant higher-order transit systems.

Public transit also plays an important role in accommodating inter-regional travel demand. GO Train service between Kitchener and Toronto started service in December 2011 with four trains per day. GO Bus service between the Region and Mississauga launched in October 2009, with about 350 riders per day, but has grown rapidly and by June 2012 carried more than 800 riders per day, with double this demand on Thursdays and Fridays. Additionally, while detailed ridership data is unavailable, Greyhound operates approximately 40 buses per day between Kitchener and Toronto.

Continued investment in public transit since 1999 has led to the following results:

- GRT ridership has increased from 9.5 million to 22 million;
- Revenue service hours have increased from 340,000 to 640,000 annually;
- The bus fleet has grown from 140 buses to 251 buses;
- The bus fleet has changed from 50% accessible to 100% accessible;
- All buses have automated audio and visual next bus stop announcements;
- MobilityPLUS ridership on conventional buses has increased from 45,000 in 2004 to more than 140,000 (more than 30% of total MobilityPLUS ridership);
- An additional 180 shelters and 490 concrete landing pads have been constructed;
- Existing passenger terminals at Conestoga Mall, Fairview Park Mall and Cambridge Centre have been expanded;
New passenger terminals at Highland Hills Mall, Forest Glen Plaza, Sportsworld and The Boardwalk have been constructed;

- Since 2005, the UPass program has expanded from 10,000 to more than 40,000 students, and now generates about 6,500,000 annual trips;
- Annual fare increases and service improvements that increase ridership have combined to increase the cost-recovery ratio from 37.6 in 2010 to 40.6 in 2013;
- Since 2010, the net operating cost per rider has declined from $2.11 to $1.97;
- The EasyGo traveller information system has grown to over 5 million uses per year, up from less than 1 million in 2008; and
- Real-time passenger information displays at iXpress stations have grown from 25 displays in 2007 and will be 112 displays by early 2014.

### Active Transportation (Walking and Cycling)

Walking and cycling are also important modes of travel that support the policy direction of Places to Grow, the ROP and the RTMP. Region-wide, the goal is to increase the share of walking and cycling during the PM peak hour from 7.8% in 2006 to 12.0% in 2031. Within future high density growth nodes and transit station areas, transportation design choices will prioritize walking and cycling.

To achieve this, the RTMP recommended updating the Cycling Master Plan and adding a Pedestrian Master Plan to create an Active Transportation Master Plan (ATMP). Walk Cycle Waterloo Region (the ATMP) aims to create a comprehensive network that promotes transportation choice and provides a comfortable experience for users of all ages and experience levels. Similar to building the public transit network, creating a comprehensive active transportation network will require sustained investment. For example, the Region is about halfway to its goal of ensuring all Regional roads in urban areas have sidewalks on both sides. A sustained commitment to funding the ATMP would enable this goal to be essentially completed within ten years.

Active transportation has seen measurable growth:

- A review of 2,600 turning movement counts completed since 2004 suggests that walking demand has been increasing by about 2% per year, and cycling demand by about 5% per year, while automobile demand has been increasing by about 0.5% per year;
- Since 2006, the cycling facilities on Regional roads (including on-road bike lanes, multi-use trails, shared lanes and paved shoulders) have nearly doubled from 149 km to 289 km; and
- Between 2001 and 2005, bike racks were added to all GRT buses.

### Transportation Demand Management

To complement the supply of transportation infrastructure, Transportation Demand Management (TDM) aims to reduce and optimize the demand on the transportation system. This is accomplished in a variety of ways, such as encouraging changes in mode choice, time of travel, need to travel or other behaviours. The Region’s TDM program is called TravelWise and provides services such as online carpool matching...
software, discounted GRT Corporate Passes and an Emergency Ride Home service. The Region also invests in Grand River CarShare.

In 2012, the TravelWise program established a Transportation Management Association (TMA), which aims to connect employers interested in TDM initiatives and achieve meaningful, long-term changes to transportation behaviour. Current members of the TMA include the Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo, the University of Waterloo and Wilfrid Laurier University, Blackberry, SunLife Financial and many other organizations.

TDM is another rapidly evolving aspect of Regional transportation:

- The Region has completed 4 individualised marketing campaigns since 2009 in various neighbourhoods around the Region;
- Grand River CarShare, started locally in 1998 with 1 car and 10 members, now has 23 vehicles and more than 600 members in the Region, and 14 vehicles and more than 400 members in Hamilton, St. Catharines, London and Guelph;
- The TMA has grown to 20 participating organizations representing over 23,000 employees, or about 8.2% of today’s workforce; and
- In one year, TMA workplaces saw an average decrease of 5% in the portion of employees driving alone to work, and increases in cycling, walking, carpooling and public transit.

Regional Investment in Roads and Bridges

Despite the significant investments described above, many Regional residents will continue to use private automobiles and many Regional businesses will continue to move goods by truck, so a well functioning system of roads will continue to be critical to the Regional economy. The RTMP includes strategic road improvements designed to accommodate increased travel demand in areas not well served by public transit. Future road improvements will also be implemented to improve traffic operations and remove bottlenecks.

Since 2004, the Region has completed 82 expansion projects on Regional roads and bridges, totalling an investment of $247 million (please see Attachment 4), including:

- The Fairway Road bridge ($50 million) has provided a new link across the Grand River;
- The Hespeler Road railway bridge ($25 million) has improved safety and reduced delays for both drivers and trains;
- The Maple Grove Road widening and railway grade separation ($18 million) has improved safety and reduced delays for both drivers and trains providing an important goods movement improvement for the East Side Lands;
- Ira Needles Boulevard ($35 million) is a major north-south Regional road on the west side of Kitchener and Waterloo that provides access to The Boardwalk; and
- The Weber Street widening and railway bridge (ongoing, $32 million to-date) will increase capacity, reduce delays and improve safety.
The Region continues to look for opportunities to improve the performance of Regional roads other than adding lanes. Modern roundabouts are increasingly being used as a means of improving traffic flow while reducing injury collisions at intersections. Regional road corridors with traffic signals can be optimized to improve the progression of traffic, saving travel time at very low cost. Traffic signals can also be outfitted with accessibility improvements such as audible signals and pedestrian countdown timers to improve safety for all users.

Recent improvements on Regional roads include the following:

- Since 2010, 12 control area optimization studies have been completed, resulting in average travel time savings of 13.7% for vehicles;
- Since 2004, 19 roundabouts have been constructed;
- In the past five years, 66 signalized intersections have been outfitted with pedestrian countdown signals; and
- Since 2012, the Region has installed 17 accessible traffic signals and is replacing equipment at 42 locations to meet the requirements of the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act.

**Provincial Investment in Roads**

Although the Region is generally self-contained, with about 90% of travel by Regional residents remaining within the Region, inter-regional travel on Provincial highways is still important to the Regional economy. Within the past five years, the Ministry of Transportation has widened Highway 8 south of Fairway Road ($60 million) and will soon complete the widening of Highway 7/8 between Highway 8 and Fischer-Hallman Road ($90 million). Major commitments have also been made to widen Highway 401 between Highway 8 and Hespeler Road and to construct the new Highway 7 between Kitchener and Guelph.

**Community Consultation and Broader Collaboration**

The Region continues to improve the processes it uses to consult with stakeholders and collaborate with other levels of government. The public was extensively consulted on the RTMP itself, Rapid Transit and the ongoing ATMP. The Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines, which establish preferred designs for different classifications of Regional road and aim to improve stakeholder expectations in advance of Regional road projects, were also completed and updated recently.

Inter-regional transportation projects involving other levels of government are also significant opportunities for improved collaboration. The Region has been working with the Cities of Brantford and Guelph, and Brant and Wellington Counties, on an inter-regional transportation planning initiative. Data collection has completed and a Terms of Reference is being drafted to continue this work.

Additionally, the Region recently committed to signing the Charter for the Western Golden Horseshoe Municipal Network. Along with the Regions of Halton, Niagara, and Peel, and the City of Hamilton, the Municipal Network aims to improve communications
between municipalities and the Province on matters of inter-regional transportation and economic development.

This report will be posted on the Region’s website as part of the Big Shift Toolbox, to help the community and prospective investors understand the Region’s focus on transportation infrastructure that will sustain compact urban redevelopment.

**Update on Key RTMP Action Items**

The RTMP identified key actions that would operationalize the implementation of the RTMP and contribute to achieving the 2031 transportation vision. Attachment 5 provides a general update on the action items.

**Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination**

This report has been forwarded to all Area Municipalities, and Regional staff continue to work together to ensure that upper and lower tier initiatives are well coordinated. For example, area municipal Councillors and staff regularly participate on Regional project teams, such as:

- Annual transit service improvement plan committees;
- Transit supportive strategy for Cambridge;
- Parking coordination committee; and
- Regional road projects.

Area municipal and Regional collaboration on the above project teams effectively manages a range of community and technical issues that typically arise with transportation projects.

**Corporate Strategic Plan**

The RTMP progress monitoring exercise described in this report contributes towards accomplishing the objectives of Focus Area #3 (Sustainable Transportation: Develop greater, more sustainable and safe transportation choices) of the “Region of Waterloo Strategic Focus 2011–2014”.

**Financial Implications**

This report was compiled by staff using ongoing data sources from Planning, Transportation, Ministry of Transportation, and the Area Municipalities. The RTMP implementation plan continues to be financed on an annual basis through the RTMP Reserve Fund, which is to be financed by an annual urban tax levy increase. Improvements to Regional roads continue to be funded through a combination of federal gas tax subsidies, Regional Development Charges and reserve funds financed through the urban tax levy.
Other Department Consultations/Concurrence

Staff from Transportation and Environmental Services contributed in the preparation of this report.
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Attachment 1 – Regional Public Transit Ridership, Service and Population

Impact of Service and Population on Transit Ridership

Region becomes responsible for transit service

Ridership (Millions)

Population of Hours of Service

Revenue Hours

Service Area Population

2013
2012
2011
2010
2009
2008
2007
2006
2005
2004
2003
2002
2001
2000
1999
1998
1997
1996
1995
1994
1993
1992
22.0
20.0
18.0
16.0
14.0
12.0
10.0
8.0
Attachment 2 – Regional Public Transit Ridership (Actual and Forecast)
Attachment 3 – Annual Regular Service Passengers/Capita
## Regional Road Projects (2004 to 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Project and Examples</th>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
<th>Total Cost To-date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addition of Left-turn and Right-turn lanes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$6.4 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signal Installations</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$1.1 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Improvements (Growth-Related)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$46.9 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hespeler Road (north of Dundas Street) railway grade separation</td>
<td></td>
<td>$24.9 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawmill Road and Arthur Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.1 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountain Street and Dickie Settlement Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.7 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td>$18.2 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Widening</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$94.1 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber Street (College Street to Guelph Avenue - includes railway bridge)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$31.6 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townline Road (Can-Amera Parkway to Saginaw Parkway)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8.8 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischer-Hallman Road (Erb Street to Columbia Street)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6.1 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer Watson Boulevard (at Highway 401)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8.8 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Grove Road (Cherry Blossom Road to Highway 8 - includes railway bridge)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$18.2 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20.6 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Expansion</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$98.4 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairway Road Extension (west of Zeller Drive to Fountain Street)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50.3 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ira Needles Boulevard (Highway 7/8 to Erbsville Road)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$34.7 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmount Road (Old Post Road to Northfield Drive)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7.4 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5.9 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expansion Projects</strong></td>
<td>82</td>
<td><strong>$247.0 M</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Rehabilitation and reconstruction projects (totalling more than $280 M) are not incorporated above but have included:

- Northumberland Street (Greenfield Road to Alps Road) $0.4 M
- Katherine Street (Tribe Road to Waterloo/Wellington Boundary) $0.9 M
- Manser Road/Ament Line (within the Town of Linwood) $4.4 M
- Snyders Road (Trussler Road to Notre Dame Drive) $1.8 M
Attachment 5 – Update on Key RTMP Action Items

1. Create an Active Transportation Plan – The Region’s Active Transportation Master Plan (ATMP), “Walk Cycle Waterloo Region” will be finalized and presented to Council in the new year. In 2014, an implementation plan will be developed to address the funding requirements for active transportation infrastructure and related program initiatives that have been identified in the plan.

2. Include TDM in the Transportation Impact Study Guidelines – The Transportation Impact Study guideline was amended so that a range of TDM measures would be considered during the development process which could also result in facilitating intensification through reduced parking requirements. Please see report P-13-088, September 10, 2013 “Proposed Revisions to the Regional Transportation Study Impact Guidelines”.


4. Implement Smart Card Fare Payment System - A key initiative recommended in the RTMP was to implement a smart card fare payment technology. Recently, Council has given staff direction to acquire an electronic transit fare payment system through a Request for Proposal process. The RFP is expected to be issued early 2014.

5. Prepare 3-Year TravelWise Action Plan – The TravelWise 3-year TDM action plan was completed in 2011. Important results have been achieved including establishment of a growing transportation management association, progress on incorporating TDM measures in the development review process thereby potentially reducing auto use and parking requirements, thereby, facilitating intensification.

6. Study Commuter Parking Opportunities – The opportunity for park and ride and kiss and ride continues to be explored at different locations throughout the region. In 2013, the Region partnered with MTO and Metrolinx to develop a combined car-pool and transit facility at Sportsworld Drive. This location provides excellent access to highways 8 and 401, GO bus service and GRT service including aBRT in 2014. Staff continue to explore park/kiss and ride options near rapid transit stations at Northfield and Fairview Park Mall. Commuter parking is available near the VIA station and will be provided at the future GO Train station near Greenhouse Road in Breslau.

7. Develop Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Strategic Plan – Staff have developed an ITS strategic plan which will be presented to Council in early 2014.

8. Establish Parking Coordination Committee – A Parking Coordinating Committee was established in 2011 with staff from the region and three urban area municipalities. This committee was instrumental in developing the TDM and parking management initiatives that were incorporated into the updated
Transportation Impact Study. The committee is currently working on a parking policy for station areas to facilitate intensification.

9. Develop Goods Movement Study – The terms of reference for this study continue to be developed with anticipation of starting the study in 2014.

10. Work with Province on Strategic Transportation Study for GTA West – Staff continue to collaborate with the MTO, City of Guelph, County of Wellington, City of Brantford, and County of Brant. A comprehensive data collection process has been completed and the scope and objectives of the study continue to be developed. It is expected this study will be initiated in 2014.

11. Work with Province, Metrolinx/GO Transit, VIA on improved Interregional Transit Connections – Staff continue to advocate and discuss with Metrolinx for improved two-way GO Train service on the Kitchener line and extension of the Milton line service to Cambridge. Similarly, restoring recent VIA cuts has been requested of the federal government.

12. Initiate the Environmental Assessment for improved connection to Highway 401 – Staff has forecasted travel demand and survey existing motorists. The need and justification for this project will be revisited with the RTMP update in 2015.

13. Regular reports monitoring RTMP progress – Interim reports similar to this report and the 5 year RTMP update report will be submitted to Council.

14. Financing opportunities/strategies to fund infrastructure – Council approved, subject to annual budget deliberations, an annual urban tax rate increase of 1.2% in 2011 and 1.5% for the years 2012 to 2018, to implement rapid transit and to fund the capital and operating costs of GRT service improvements. Staff continue to monitor the status of the investment strategy developed by Metrolinx which includes numerous new revenue tools such as a regional fuel and gas tax or business parking levy.

15. Pursue modification to the provincial Development Charges Act – Staff continue to work with the province for the amendment of the Development Charges Act so that development charge funding would be available for the rapid transit project.

16. Incorporate policies into the Regional Official Plan (ROP) – The new ROP contains numerous policies regarding transit-supportive development, rapid transit and transportation demand management.

17. Ongoing collaboration with Province and area municipalities on transportation issues – There are numerous avenues through which staff collaborate with the province and area municipal staff including regular meetings with MTO and Metrolinx/GO on highway projects, transportation studies and with area municipal staff through project teams such as for road improvement and TDM/parking management coordination.
January 23, 2014

Regional Council  
Region of Waterloo  
150 Frederick St  
Kitchener, Ontario  N2G 4J3

The Grand River Accessibility Advisory Committee is an advisory committee for the Region of Waterloo Council as well as five other local municipal councils. It was established as a requirement of the Ontarians with Disabilities Act (2001).

**GRAAC's Mandate**
The Grand River Accessibility Advisory Committee shall assist the participating municipalities in fulfilling the purpose of the Ontarians with Disabilities Act and the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act by providing vision and advice with regard to the removal of barriers.

**The Issues:**
A report from Region of Waterloo’s Traffic Engineering, scheduled to be on the Planning and Works Committee agenda on Tuesday, January 28, 2014, proposes that the Region adopt a practice to designate up to 2% of existing on-street parking spaces within downtown core areas as on-street accessible parking.

**GRAAC’s Response:**
The Grand River accessibility advisory committee appreciates the move by the Region in adopting a consistent practice for the allocation of accessible on-street parking. The members of GRAAC are concerned about how the accessible on-street parking spaces will be distributed, recognizing that, for many people with disabilities, an accessible parking space is one that is closest to the individual's destination.

In 2013 the members of GRAAC were consulted by the City of Kitchener regarding accessible on-street parking, and they recommended a minimum of 4% of spaces be designated accessible. This 4% is also in alignment with the minimum allocation of accessible off-street parking outlined in the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act Design of Public Spaces Standard.
GRAAC’s Recommendations:

1. The Region adopts a practice to designate at least 4% of existing on-street parking spaces within downtown core areas as accessible on-street parking.

2. The Region adopts a practice for allocating accessible on-street parking spaces in a scattered distribution, ensuring the spaces are not grouped together in a single location.

We welcome the opportunity to work with Regional staff on this important issue and invite staff to attend a future meeting of the Grand River Accessibility Advisory Committee.

Yours Sincerely,

The Members of the Grand River Accessibility Advisory 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>05-Jun-13</td>
<td>G. Lorentz</td>
<td>Staff to review signage on Trussler Road/Ira Needles Boulevard</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-Jun-13</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Operation of Raised Crosswalks Study</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>Mid 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Dec-13</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Business Plan for Waste Management</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-Jan-14</td>
<td>S. Strickland</td>
<td>Staff to report back on Tim Mollison's suggested GRT Route changes</td>
<td>Planning, Housing and Community Services</td>
<td>29-Apr-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Haalboom</td>
<td>Staff continue to lobby the Province for changes to the Highway Traffic Act providing right of way to pedestrians and on an as needed basis provide an update to Council</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>as required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>