Regional Municipality of Waterloo
Planning and Works Committee

Agenda
Tuesday, April 1, 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) E-14-028, Proposed Parking Changes on Lobsinger Line (Regional Road 15), East and West of Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10), in the Township of Wellesley
      i) Barb Esbaugh on behalf of St. Clements Community
   b) P-14-037, Regional Approval of the Cambridge West Master Environmental Servicing Plan (Staff Presentation)
      i) Sue Stubley

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-14-040, Traffic Management for 2014 Construction Contracts (Information) 25

b) East Boundary Road Corridor Study, City of Cambridge and North Dumfries Township, Information Package in Advance of Public Consultation Centre (Information) 34

c) E-14-024, Traffic Management System and Road Construction and Incident Management System (Approval) 55

d) E-14-041, Water Supply for the Fountain Street and Maple Grove Area Class Environmental Assessment: Notice of Completion (Approval) 64

e) P-14-033, Monthly Report of Development Activity for February 2014 (Approval) 70

f) P-14-034, Amendment to Regional Municipality of Waterloo Controlled Access By-law #58-87 for Access to Regional Road #58 (Fischer-Hallman Road), City of Waterloo (Approval) 75

g) P-14-036, Year End 2013 Population and Household Estimates for the Region of Waterloo (Approval) 81

Regular Agenda Resumes

5. Reports – Transportation and Environmental Services

Design and Construction

a) E-14-039, St. Andrews Street Improvements from Grand Avenue Southerly to the City of Cambridge Boundary and Cedar Street Improvements from Osborne Street Westerly to the City of Cambridge Boundary – Recommended Design 89

Rapid Transit

b) E-14-018, Road Assumption for the ION Rapid Transit Corridor 149

c) E-14-046/F-14-045, Request for Proposal: Stage 1 Light Rail Project - Independent Certifier 164

Transportation

d) E-14-036, Removal of the U-Turn Restriction along Fairway Road (Regional Road 53) between Highway 8 and Wilson Avenue, in the City of Kitchener 168
Water Services

e) **E-14-042**, Study of Manheim Water Treatment Plant Filter – University of Waterloo

f) **E-14-035**, Consultant Selection for the William Street and Strange Street Water Supply Systems Class Environmental Assessment and Preliminary Design

Inter-Departmental Reports

g) **E-14-026/P-14-035**, King-Victoria Multi-Modal Transit Hub, Assumption of Waterloo Street established by Registered Plan 374, between Breithaupt Street and Victoria Street North, City of Kitchener

h) **P-14-038/F-14-046**, Brownfields Financial Incentives Program – Tax Increment Grant Application – 350 Dundas Street South, City of Cambridge

Reports – Planning, Housing and Community Services

Community Planning

i) **P-14-043**, East Side Lands (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan (Staff Presentation)

Transportation Planning

j) **P-14-039**, Highway 8, Bus-Bypass Shoulders, Operating and Legal Agreements with the Ministry of Transportation

k) **CR-RS-14-026**, Surplus Declaration of Land, Storm Water Management Facility, West of Bearinger Road (Regional Road #58), City of Waterloo

6. Information/Correspondence

a) Township of North Dumfries Correspondence re: Ayr Waste Transfer Station

b) Council Enquiries and Requests for Information Tracking List

7. Other Business

8. Next Meeting – April 29, 2014

9. Adjourn
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 29, 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>May 27, 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>Thur., April 3, 2014</td>
<td>5:00 P.M.-8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>East Boundary Road Corridor Study, City of Cambridge and North Dumfries Township, Public Consultation Centre</td>
<td>Holy Spirit Catholic Elementary School Gymnasium 15 Gatehouse Drive, Cambridge, Ontario</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planning, Housing and Community Services**
Region of Waterloo
Transportation And Environmental Service
Transportation

To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: April 1, 2014 File Code: T01-20/15
Subject: Proposed Parking Changes on Lobsinger Line (Regional Road 15), East and West of Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10), in the Township of Wellesley

Recommendation:
That the Region of Waterloo amend Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended, to:

a) Remove No Parking Anytime on South Side of Lobsinger Line (Regional Road 15) 11 m West of Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10) to 11 m East of Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10);
b) Remove Limited 15 minute Parking on South Side of Lobsinger Line (Regional Road 15) 11 m East of Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10) to 40 m East of Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10) 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday to Saturday;
c) Add No Parking Anytime on South Side of Lobsinger Line (Regional Road 15) 46 m West of Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10) to 21 m East of Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10); and

d) Add Limited 15 minute Parking on South Side of Lobsinger Line (Regional Road 15) 21 m East of Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10) to 40 m East of Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10) 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday to Saturday;

Summary:
Nil

Report:
In a continuing effort to improve safety on the Regional road system, it is proposed that the existing “No Parking” restriction on the south side of Lobsinger Line (Regional Road 15) be extended to 46 metres west of Herrgott Road.
(Regional Road 10) to 21 metres east of Herrgott Road. Currently, northbound motorists along Herrgott Road have difficulty seeing approaching vehicles along Lobsinger Line due to parked vehicles. The extension of the “No Parking” restriction will improve the east/west sight distance for northbound motorists on Herrgott Road at its intersection with Lobsinger Line. The extension of the “No Parking” restriction will remove 4 on-street parking spaces on the south side of Lobsinger Line, in the Village of St. Clements, in the Township of Wellesley.

Figure 1 shows the proposed on-street parking spaces to be removed and the proposed By-law amendment, with the 4 spots proposed to be removed circled.

**Figure 1: Proposed Parking Changes and On-street Parking Removal**

It was noted that a minor discrepancy existed between no parking signs installed in the field and the Region’s Traffic and Parking By-law and a no parking sign will be relocated to match the existing parking by-law. Figure 2 illustrates this change.
Public Input

Information signs were installed on Lobsinger Line approaching the intersection of Herrgott Road for 2 weeks starting January 13, 2014 requesting comments from residents through the Region’s website or via telephone. An Internet questionnaire was also setup to receive comments and a phone number was provided. As a follow-up to the web survey, questionnaires were also mailed to residents and businesses that fronted both Lobsinger Line and Herrgott Road within the limits of St. Clements requesting comments on the proposed changes.

The questionnaire asked interested parties whether they were in support of, or in opposition to, extending the “No Parking” restriction and removing 4 on-street parking spaces on the south side of Lobsinger Line as shown in Figure 1.

A total of 55 responses were received where 40 are in favour of extending the “No Parking” restriction and removing the on-street parking, 12 are opposed and 3 respondents did not indicate a preferred choice. The majority of those who oppose the extension of the “No Parking” restriction and removal of the on-street parking spaces along Lobsinger Line indicate that businesses would suffer as a result of the parking loss.

It should be noted that of the 55 responses received, 17 respondents also indicated that they would like a traffic control signal at the Lobsinger Line / Herrgott Road intersection.
A review of the current turning movement count (January 24, 2013) indicates that traffic and pedestrian volume entering the intersection do not warrant traffic control signals. For traffic control signals to be considered, at least 1 of the following justifications must satisfy 100% or the Minimum Vehicle Volume Warrant and Delay to Cross Traffic Warrant must both satisfy 80%. Below summarizes the results of the traffic signal warrant analysis.

- Minimum Vehicle Volume - 67%
- Delay to Cross Traffic - 48%
- Collision Experience - 47%

A review of the collision history between 2008 and 2012 inclusive shows that there were 10 collisions where 3 would be expected. Of the 10 collisions, 6 are noted as angle type collisions and 3 are noted as turning movement type collisions. It is anticipated that removing the 4 parking spacing while restricting parking on the south side of Lobsinger Line will significantly improve the sight distance when entering the intersection from Herrgott Road and reduce angle and turning movement collisions at the Herrgott Road / Lobsinger Line intersection.

Resurfacing of Lobsinger Line is scheduled for 2019 and intersection improvements to address truck turning requirements will be considered at that time.

On December 2, 2013, Township of Wellesley Council passed a resolution in support of the proposed By-law amendments. A copy of the Township resolution is provided in Appendix A.

Those wishing to be advised of when this matter will be dealt with by the Regional Planning and Works Committee have been notified.

**Corporate Strategic Plan**

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

**Financial Implications**

The removal of signs and markings to remove the parking spaces will cost approximately $1500. Funds to implement the necessary changes are available in the Region’s 2014 maintenance budget.

**Attachments**

Appendix A - Township of Wellesley Council Resolution
Other Department Consultations/Concurrence

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

Prepared By: Satinderjit Bahia, Engineering Technologist (Traffic)

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services
December 2, 2013

Regional Municipality of Waterloo
150 Frederick St., 7th Floor
Kitchener, Ontario
N2G 4J3
Attention: Bob Henderson, Manager Transportation Engineering

Regarding: Township of Wellesley Resolution - Region of Waterloo Intersection Studies

Please be advised that the following resolution was passed at the Regular Committee Meeting held November 26, 2013 and later ratified at the Regular Council Meeting of the Wellesley Township Municipal Council held on December 2, 2013 at the Council Chambers in Crosshill:

“That the Council of the Township of Wellesley support the proposed Regional Parking By-law amendments to improve the intersection operations at the intersection at Lobsinger Line and Herrgott Road in the village of St. Clements, as follows:

Remove
☐ No parking anytime on south side of Lobsinger Line (Regional Road 15) 11m west of Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10) to 11m east of Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10)
☐ Limited 15 minute parking on south side of Lobsinger Line (Regional Road 15) 11m east of Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10) to 40m east of Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10) 8:00 am to 6:00pm Monday to Saturday

Add
☐ No Parking anytime on south side of Lobsinger Line (Regional Road 15) 46m west of Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10) to 21m east of Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10)
☐ Limited 15 minute parking on south side of Lobsinger Line (Regional Road 15) 21m east of Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10) to 40m east of Herrgott Road Regional Road 10) 8:00 am to 6:00pm Monday to Saturday.” Carried
If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at (519) 699-3946 at your earliest convenience.

Yours truly,

Grace Kosch, Clerk

cc: Kevin Beggs, General Manager of Community Services
Region of Waterloo
Planning, Housing and Community Services
Community Planning

To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: April 1, 2014   File Code: D03-30/Cambridge West
Subject: Regional Approval of the Cambridge West Master Environmental Servicing Plan

Recommendation:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the Final Draft, Cambridge West Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MHBC Planning, November, 2013) pursuant to Regional Official Policies Plan policy 3.1.5 and Regional Official Plan policy 7.F.6, as described in Report P-14-037, dated April 1, 2014, and more specifically:

a) That Regional staff collaborate with City of Cambridge and Grand River Conservation Authority staff to incorporate policies in the City’s planning documents for the Cambridge West lands to implement an environmental management framework pursuant to the applicable Source Water Protection policies in the Regional Official Plan and the proposed Grand River Source Protection Plan that would, among other matters:

i) require Hydrogeologic Assessments, Environmental Impact Studies, and Stormwater Management Plans to ensure the quantity, quality, and spatial distribution of groundwater recharge is maintained through the design of stormwater management facilities and buried infrastructure;

ii) require Salt Impact Assessments that include consideration of the design of stormwater management facilities to reduce need for winter de-icing practices for plans of subdivision, new employment, and multiple-unit residential land uses;

iii) require Salt Management Plans that mitigate the risks of winter de-icing for all new employment and multi-unit residential land uses with large parking lots; and,
iv) implement a monitoring framework in collaboration with other approval agencies to assess changes to the quantity and quality of surface water and groundwater as a result of development and to verify that the pre-development water balance is being maintained as the area is developed.

b) That the Cruickston Creek Headwaters, as described in Attachment 1, be identified as a proposed new Environmentally Sensitive Policy Area pursuant to Regional Official Policies Plan policy 4.3.4 and Regional Official Plan policy 7.A.10.

c) That staff continue to work with City of Cambridge staff to reflect linkages and Supporting Environmental Features identified in the Master Environmental Servicing Plan in the City’s planning documents.

d) That staff continue to collaborate with staff of the City of Cambridge and Grand River Conservation Authority to implement recommendations for the protection, stewardship, enhancement, and monitoring of the Greenlands Network within and contiguous to the study area in Cambridge and North Dumfries Township.

Summary:

A Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MESP) is a comprehensive study of an area about to undergo urban development. The focus of the Cambridge West MESP is part of the Devil’s Creek sub-watershed on the west side of Cambridge and the adjoining area of North Dumfries Township (Figure 1). The MESP combines a conventional watershed study with a plan for major public infrastructure. It informs the development of a community or secondary plan as well as subsequent development approvals.

Staff are recommending approval of the watershed study components of the of the Cambridge West MESP pertaining to matters of Regional interest as defined in Regional Official Policies Plan (ROPP) policy 3.1.4 and Regional Official Plan (ROP) policy 7.F.5. The recommended Regional approval would clear the way for Cambridge to adopt a secondary plan for the study area within the City boundary and process future plans of subdivision. All these approvals would be subject to applicable Regional and Cambridge Official Plan policies and the 2014 Provincial Policy Statement.

The areas of Regional interest in the sub-watershed component of the study are summarized as follows.

Hydrogeology and Source Water

The Region’s Water Resources Protection Master Plan (2008) guides source water protection activities until 2016. It delineates Wellhead Protection Sensitivity Areas (WPSAs) around municipal water supply wells. The ROP identifies these WPSAs and contains related polices to minimise risks to water quality and quantity from future land use and activities within vulnerable areas. Municipal water supply well, G4, is located adjacent to Devil’s Creek approximately 600 metres northeast of the Study Area. G4 is identified in the Water Resources Protection Master Plan as Groundwater Under the Direct Influence of Surface Water (GUDI), and has WPSAs that extend into the northern
portion of the study area. In addition, the Middleton Wellfield is located approximately two km southeast of the study area. Accordingly, the source water protection policies in the ROP and the Source Protection Plan would apply to future development applications on the subject lands.

Chloride is an issue at the Middleton Wellfield. Risks associated with salt application on roads, parking lots, and stormwater management ponds must therefore be managed. The proposed stormwater management approach would mimic existing drainage patterns. Lot-level infiltration and conveyance infiltration facilities would receive mostly “clean” run-off. Stormwater ponds discharging to the kettle lakes and wetlands would receive road and parking lot runoff treated to remove contaminants prior to discharge. As it is impossible to remove salt from stormwater, however, the study considered the feasibility of a winter bypass to direct salt-laden runoff to the storm sewer to the Grand River rather than to the natural kettles. A Chloride Impact Analysis showed that expected chloride levels under proposed conditions is not expected to have a significant impact on the wetlands or the Region’s municipal water supply wells, and therefore the study does not recommended a winter bypass at this time.

The MESP recommends a monitoring framework to be elaborated by the approval agencies and developers to monitor surface water and groundwater quantity and quality, and changes to the water table as a result of development.

Greenlands Network

The study has confirmed several Core Environmental Features identified in the ROP. In addition, detailed fieldwork along the western edge of the study area indicates that a network of wetlands and ponds fulfill sufficient criteria to warrant consideration as a new Environmentally Sensitive Policy Area (ESPA) tentatively called Cruickston Creek Headwaters. Using data provided by the consultants, staff have prepared the draft Technical Data Sheet contained in Attachment A. This was endorsed by the Ecological and Environmental Advisory Committee (EEAC) on October 29, 2013.

The stormwater management strategy proposes to drain most stormwater through existing storm sewers to the Grand River. Nevertheless, as noted above, it is also necessary to discharge sufficient volumes of treated stormwater to internally-drained wetlands to maintain their respective water balances. In recent months, there has been considerable concern among members of the public and local landowners about draining limited quantities of “clean” runoff from a small area south of Blenheim Road into Barrie’s Lake (ESPA 57). It has been demonstrated that this is required to sustain the water balance of the lake. Any future stormwater management facility would have to ensure that the physical and chemical characteristics of runoff would not adversely affect the biologically diverse lake ecosystem.

The Township of North Dumfries Council requested that the City of Cambridge require an independent third party peer-review of any proposal to drain stormwater to Barrie’s Lake. Such a peer-review would supplement technical review of future development-related stormwater management plans by the City, GRCA, and Regional staff. Moreover, because the lands are considered contiguous to the Barrie’s Lake ESPA, and
thus subject to ROP policy, such plans would also be reviewed by EEAC. On March 17, 2014, Cambridge Council approved the recommendation “that any development application which proposes drainage to Barrie’s Lake be subject to a third party expert peer review of the development’s detailed stormwater management plan prior to draft plan approval.” Regional staff concur with the recommendation.

**Regional Infrastructure**

Virtually all new infrastructure within the study area would be owned and managed by the City of Cambridge. Many individual items identified in the MESP would require the completion of Environmental Assessments by the City and/or developers.

At the Cambridge-North Dumfries boundary, the City’s Blenheim Road becomes Roseville Road (Regional Road 46). The MESP recommends that Blenheim Road be straightened to improve the crossing of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The re-aligned road would tie into the existing alignment of Roseville Road. Regional Transportation staff is of the opinion that this could improve sight-lines near the railway crossing. Staff would provide further input through a future Environmental Assessment process.

At present, the Blenheim-Roseville Road carries a 150 millimetre diameter Regional watermain from Cambridge to Brown’s Subdivision. It is proposed to replace this watermain with a 200 mm local watermain on the realigned section of Blenheim Road which would in turn re-connect to the Regional watermain to Brown’s (Attachment 2). The proposed new connection would necessitate relocation of the existing regional meter and re-chlorination station on Blenheim Road. This would require an amendment of the Municipal Drinking Water License and an amendment to the Drinking Water System Components Description. All costs for the relocation would be borne by the developer through an appropriate legal agreement.

The study also recommends that eco-passages be created beneath Roseville Road to allow wildlife to cross in greater safety. Although no upgrades of this road are planned in coming years, this recommendation would need to be addressed at the time when road upgrades are planned.

A draft of this report was shared with City of Cambridge, Township of North Dumfries, and GRCA staff on March 12, 2014 and their comments are reflected in this report.

**Report:**

A Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MESP) is a relatively new term in Waterloo Region. It is a comprehensive study of an area about to experience new urban development. It starts with a conventional watershed study and builds upon it a plan for major public infrastructure such as stormwater management facilities, sanitary sewers, watermains, and collector roads. All this information is valuable input to a community plan or secondary plan and Environmental Assessments for required infrastructure. It also informs the approval process for individual development applications. The Region recently approved the East Side Lands MESP, the first of such studies.
The purpose of this report is to submit for consideration by Regional Council the watershed study components of the Cambridge West MESP pertaining to the defined Regional interest. Watershed studies are defined in the Regional Official Plan (ROP) as “comprehensive scientific studies that describe how surface water and groundwater and terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems function within a defined drainage area. These investigations result in recommendations as to where and how development activity can safely occur so as to minimize flood risks, stream erosion, degradation of water quality, and negative impacts on natural systems. Recommendations may also identify opportunities for ecological enhancement and recreation”.

Since the completion of the Laurel Creek Watershed Study (1993), the first full-scale watershed study to be carried out in Waterloo Region, numerous other studies have been completed for areas of the three cities as well as some Township Urban Areas where significant new development was anticipated. Watershed studies have become a standard planning tool for newly developing areas. The new 2014 Provincial Policy Statement identifies watersheds as “the ecologically meaningful scale for integrated and long-term planning, which can be a foundation for considering cumulative impacts of development.” Since 1995, successive Regional Official Plans have required completion of watershed studies for major new areas of development (ROPP 3.1.5; ROP 7.F.3). ROPP policy 3.1.5 and ROP policy 7.F.6 direct that no area-specific Area Municipal Official Plan Amendments or community/secondary Plans may be adopted until the Region has approved the aspects of watershed studies that affect defined matters of Regional interest. The same policies require the Region to amend the ROPP or ROP to implement recommendations of the sub-watershed study. The four areas of Regional interest are:

(a) **sustainable** management of the quality and quantity of groundwater resources;
(b) surface water quality with reference to Regional water-taking requirements and the capability of receiving watercourses to cumulatively assimilate effluent from wastewater treatment plants to ensure the ecological integrity of the river system;
(c) identification, protection and management of Landscape Level Systems and Core Environmental Features; and
(d) implications of proposed **development** on the provision and upgrading of Regional **infrastructure**. [Bold in ROP policy 7.F.3]

The Cambridge West Master Environmental Servicing Plan was initiated in 2008 as the owners of lands on the west side of Cambridge prepared to advance the development of their properties. The landowners selected a study team comprising MHBC Planning, MTE, and Ecoplans Ltd. Staff from the City of Cambridge, GRCA, Township of North Dumfries, and Region participated in the process and helped shape the final study.

The “General Study Area” covers the entire Devil’s Creek sub-watershed on the west side of Cambridge and the adjoining Newman Creek (Cambridge) and Cruickston Creek (North Dumfries) watersheds along with some internally-drained kettle wetlands such as Barrie’s Lake. This area allowed the study team to study larger drainage patterns as
well as the Greenlands Network. Within this larger area, the “Development Study Area” coincides with the Urban Area, as defined by the ROPP and ROP, on the west side of Cambridge north of the C.P.R. tracks (See Figure 1).

Figure 1  Study Areas covered by the Cambridge West Master Environmental Servicing Plan
Regional staff has participated on the study team and reviewed the final draft of the Master Environmental Servicing Plan with respect to the areas of Regional interest, and are recommending that the study be approved as it affects those matters. Approval by Regional Council would clear the way for the City of Cambridge to adopt the secondary plan for the area, and that in turn would allow the City, GRCA, and Region to consider individual development applications. All these approvals would be subject to applicable Regional Official Plan, Cambridge Official Plan, and 2014 Provincial Policy Statement policies.

**Hydrogeology and Source Water**

The Water Resources Protection Master Plan approved by Council in 2008 guides source water protection activities over the period 2007-2016. It informs activities and programs leading to the eventual development of the Grand River Source Protection Plan (SPP) under the Clean Water Act, 2006; and integrates those initiatives in the Master Plan and SPP. On January 8, 2013, Council approved recommendations to support the proposed policies that apply to Waterloo Region as part of the submission of the Final Proposed Source Protection Plan for the Grand River Source Protection Area (January, 20113) to the Province.

The Master Plan has delineated Wellhead Protection Sensitivity Areas (WPSAs) around the Region’s municipal water supply wells. The ROP identifies the WPSAs and contains policies to minimise risks to water quality and quantity from future land use and activities within the vulnerable areas. Municipal water supply well G4 is located adjacent to Devil’s Creek approximately 600 metres northeast of the Study Area. G4 is identified in the Water Resources Protection Master Plan as “Groundwater Under the Direct Influence of Surface Water,” or GUDI; its WPSA extends into the northern portion of the study area. In addition to G4, the Middleton Wellfield is located approximately two km southeast of the study area. Accordingly, the source water protection policies in the ROP and the SPP would apply to development applications on the subject lands in the future.

Approximately 60% of the study area is internally drained into a number of “kettle” lakes and wetlands. As groundwater recharge is relatively high across the study area, future development has the potential to affect both the quantity and quality of surface water and groundwater resources. The sub-watershed study recommends that the existing quantity and distribution of recharge be preserved or enhanced through implementation of stormwater management plans. These will be based on lot-level infiltration facilities and conveyance infiltration facilities (i.e. low impact development or LID) draining to stormwater ponds which are proposed to discharge treated run-off to the kettle lakes and wetlands. The lot-level and conveyance infiltration facilities would receive mostly “clean” water while the stormwater ponds would receive runoff from roadways and parking lots. This run-off would be treated to remove sediments, oil and grease, and other contaminants prior to being discharged.

Groundwater must be protected from chloride impacts due to the application of winter salt on roads and parking areas. A chloride issue has been identified at the Middleton
Wellfield in the Approved Assessment Report for the Grand River Source Protection Area (August, 2013) which means the risks associated with any future development involving the application of road salt would need to be managed according to the policies in the SPP.

As it is not technically feasible at this time to remove salt from urban run-off, the study considered the potential to implement a winter bypass for the stormwater ponds. This would divert salt-laden runoff during the winter months to the storm sewer draining to the Grand River. A Chloride Impact Analysis showed that a winter bypass for development lands draining to SWM Ponds 1 and 2 would result in chloride concentrations in shallow groundwater of approximately 70 milligrams per litre (mg/L). Without the winter bypass, the concentrations would be approximately 86 mg/L in shallow groundwater and 100 mg/L in the wetlands. Both would be below the MOE’s Reasonable Use Criteria. The anticipated increases are not expected to have a significant impact on the wetlands or the Region’s municipal water supply wells. Moreover, the chloride impacts would be limited to surface water and the upper aquifer. These have a poor hydraulic connection within the study area with the underlying municipal water supply aquifer. Thus, the study does not recommended a winter bypass at this time. No winter bypass was considered for Devil’s Creek either as the relatively small drainage catchment would have only a minor impact on chloride levels in the creek.

The sub-watershed study recommends an environmental management framework addressing Source Water Protection Policies in the ROP and those in the proposed SPP to address potential impacts from stormwater management, spills, and the application and storage of winter salt. A recommended Monitoring Programme would monitor surface water and groundwater quantity and quality, along with changes to the water table as a result of development.

**Greenlands Network**

The ROP identifies Significant Habitat of Endangered and Threatened Species as Core Environmental Features. The study team observed six such species, most of which inhabit Core Environmental Features, and therefore do not require specific new official plan designations. If the Ministry of Natural Resources defines additional habitat through review of the future community plan, these areas would also be given an appropriate designation and protection.

Map 4 of the ROP identifies several natural features in the study area as Core Environmental Features within the Regional Greenlands Network. Boundaries of these features have been confirmed in the study. Following detailed fieldwork and mapping, the series of wetlands comprising the headwaters of Cruickston Creek have been determined to fulfill sufficient criteria in ROPP policy 4.3.2 and ROP policy 7.C.5 to warrant consideration as a new ESPA. The draft Technical Data Sheet contained in Attachment A was reviewed with the Ecological and Environmental Advisory Committee on October 29, 2013. The committee supported designation of the area as the Cruickston Creek Environmentally Sensitive Policy Area. As the lands are already a...
Core Environmental Feature in the ROP, they would be designated an ESPA in a future amendment to the ROP following the resolution of the pending appeals, including one on lands immediately west of the Development Study Area.

The Natural Environment component of the MESP contains numerous recommendations for the protection, stewardship, enhancement, and monitoring of the Greenlands Network. These would be implemented through the forthcoming secondary plan as well as through the approval of individual development applications. Foremost among the recommendations are buffers and stormwater management.

Given the rich diversity of significant wildlife in the wetlands, the delineation of adequate buffers was identified as an important consideration. The rich biological diversity of the marshes within the development lands and the eastern end of Barrie’s Lake has been determined to warrant buffers of 50 metres rather than the usual 30 metres for Provincially Significant Wetlands. These would be identified in the secondary plan to be adopted by the City and subsequently designed to buffer the waterfowl and turtles inhabiting them from the anticipated new development.

As mentioned above, stormwater management emerged as a significant issue through the course of the study. The stormwater management strategy proposes to drain most stormwater from the area through existing stormsewers to the Grand River. Nevertheless, there is also provision for discharging sufficient volumes of treated stormwater to each of the internally-drained wetlands to maintain the water balance that sustains them. Appropriate precautions would be required to ensure that the physical and chemical characteristics of the runoff would not adversely affect the lake and wetland ecosystems.

In recent months, concern has been expressed by members of the public and local landowners about draining limited quantities of runoff from a small area south of Blenheim Road into Barrie’s Lake (ESPA 57), an area with very high natural heritage values. The engineering consultants have demonstrated that some surface flow to the lake is required in order to sustain the water balance of the lake. Significant alteration of a water balance is considered to be an “adverse environmental impact” as defined in the ROP. In order to address concern about the potential for stormwater to contaminate the lake, consideration is being given to allow only relatively clean runoff from the roofs of approximately 30-45 homes and adjoining backyards to drain across the proposed 50 metre naturalised buffer toward the lake. This run-off could be further treated or “polished” in an enhanced vegetated swale (“bioswale”) before it enters the lake. This type of system would be able to closely mimic the “current condition” runoff volumes contributing to Barrie’s Lake, but without the agricultural run-off that is now draining toward the lake from the cultivated field in the area.

Following a presentation by Regional Community Planning staff to the Township of North Dumfries Council, the Township requested that the City of Cambridge require an independent third party peer-review of any proposal to drain stormwater to Barrie’s Lake. Such a peer-review would supplement technical review of future development-related stormwater management plans by the City, GRCA, and Regional staff. Moreover, because the lands are considered contiguous to the Barrie’s Lake ESPA, and
thus subject to ROP policy, such plans would also be reviewed by the Ecological and Environmental Advisory Committee. On March 17, 2014, Cambridge Council approved the recommendation “that any development application which proposes drainage to Barrie’s Lake be subject to a third party expert peer review of the development’s detailed stormwater management plan prior to draft plan approval.” While peer-reviews are seldom required in Waterloo Region, Regional staff concurs with the recommendation in that it has the potential to provide additional assurance to stakeholders and the general public that Barrie’s Lake would not be adversely affected.

The sub-watershed study has identified several smaller natural features such as hedgerows within the study area that do not meet the criteria for Regional significance, but that may qualify as Supporting Environmental Features or Locally Significant Natural Areas. Staff would work with Cambridge staff in the preparation of the future Community Plan to see that these features are appropriately protected.

Regional Infrastructure

Virtually all the infrastructure within the lands to be developed would be owned and managed by the City of Cambridge. The future collector roads and water servicing infrastructure are now going through the Environmental Assessment process as part of the MESP.

At the Cambridge-North Dumfries boundary, the City’s Blenheim Road becomes Roseville Road (Regional Road 46). The MESP recommends that the western end of Blenheim Road be straightened to improve the crossing of the Canadian Pacific Railway tracks. The re-aligned road would then tie into the existing Roseville Road. Regional Transportation staff is of the opinion that this has the potential to improve sight-lines along this stretch of road, and would provide further comments through the City’s Environmental Assessment process. The re-alignment of Blenheim Road and its associated water servicing infrastructure and construction of new collector road network are Schedule C projects. They would be completed and implemented through the secondary plan and subsequent plans of subdivision as part of the integrated EA and Planning Act process.

The Blenheim-Roseville Road carries a 150 mm regional watermain from the City of Cambridge to Brown’s Subdivision. It is recommended that the existing watermain be replaced with a local watermain on the realigned section of Blenheim Road. City standards require a minimum 200 mm diameter watermain. This new watermain would connect to a new 300 mm local watermain at the intersection of Blenheim and the proposed southern extension of Bismark Drive. A new connection from this future intersection to the municipal boundary would be required to connect to the existing regional 150 mm watermain supplying Brown’s Subdivision (see Attachment 2). Realignment of the road would also necessitate relocation of the existing regional meter and re-chlorination station on Blenheim Road. The relocation of the meter and re-chlorination station would require an amendment of the Municipal Drinking Water License (MDWL) #012-202 as well as an amendment to the Drinking Water System Components Description. All costs for the relocation of the new station would be borne by the developer, and would be implemented through an appropriate legal agreement.
The study also recommends that eco-passages be created beneath Roseville Road to allow wildlife to cross in greater safety. Although no upgrades of this road are planned in coming years, this recommendation would need to be addressed at the time when road upgrades are planned. This matter was first raised in Report E-13-068/P-13-059 dated May 28, 2013 dealing with the death and injury of significant numbers of turtles along this segment of road. At that time, Council supported recommendations to investigate the feasibility of erecting temporary exclusion fencing to prevent turtles from entering the road and whether suitable turtle breeding habitat could be created along the south side of Roseville Road in order to eliminate the need for the turtles to cross the road. Council also provided an allocation from the Community Environmental Fund to cover the costs.

In conclusion, staff recommend that the Region approve the portions of the Cambridge West Master Environmental Servicing Plan that pertain to the areas of defined Regional interest in watershed studies.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

Staff worked closely with City of Cambridge and Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) staff on the project team for the sub-watershed study and MESP. Township of North Dumfries staff also participated in the study. This collaboration would continue through the ensuing secondary plan and the review of individual development applications.

Environmental Planning staff made a presentation on the MESP to the Township of North Dumfries Council on November 18, 2013.

A draft of this report was shared with City of Cambridge, Township of North Dumfries, and GRCA staff on March 12, 2014 and their comments are reflected in this report.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

The completion and implementation of the sub-watershed study component of the Cambridge West MESP would help achieve the strategic objective to integrate environmental considerations into Regional decision-making processes.

Financial Implications

If relocation of the regional watermain under Blenheim-Roseville Road is required, it would be at the cost of the developers.

The recommended eco-passages beneath Roseville Road would be addressed at the time upgrades to the road are considered in some unspecified future date.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Community Planning and Hydrogeology and Source Water Protection staff have collaborated in the review of the watershed study. Hydrogeology and Source Water Protection staff has contributed significantly to the preparation of this report.
Transportation staff was consulted with regard to possible implications of the MESP on Roseville Road.

**Attachments:**

Attachment 1 - Draft Technical Data Sheet for recommended Cruickston Creek Headwaters Environmentally Sensitive Policy Area

Attachment 2 - Proposed relocation of Regional watermain from Cambridge to Brown’s Subdivision

**Prepared By:** Chris Gosselin, Manager of Environmental Planning

**Approved By:** Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Housing and Community Services
Cruickston Creek Headwaters

Proposed Environmentally Sensitive Policy Area

**Municipality:** North Dumfries Township  
**Location:** North Dumfries Township Con. 11 Pt Lot 14; Con 12 Pt Lots 17, 18;  
**General Location:** Western edge of City of Cambridge along North Dumfries Township boundary  
**Ownership:** Private  
**Size:** 48.73 hectares (120.4 acres)  
**Physiographic Region:** Outwash gravel  
**Eco-region:** Central Grand River  
**Soils:** Primarily organic

**General Description**

The Cruickston Creek Headwaters comprises inter-connected wetlands which drain along Cruickston Creek to the Grand River. They consist of a mixture of wooded swamps, marshes, and ponds which sustain an impressive diversity of waterfowl and other breeding birds. They serve as marsh bird, amphibian, and turtle breeding habitat, and also over-wintering habitat to significant numbers of turtles. The wetlands are surrounded by fringes of upland woodland containing some areas of old growth trees and woodland.

The wetlands form the eastern boundary of the Blair-Bechtel-Cruickston Environmentally Sensitive Landscape and provide a linkage between Barrie’s Lake and the Grand River. The northern part of the area lies within the rare Charitable Research Reserve.
E.S.P.A. Criteria Fulfilled (based on R.O.P. Policy 7.C.5)

B.2 contain critical habitats which are uncommon or remnants of once extensive habitats such as old growth forest, forest interior habitat, Carolinian forest, prairie-savanna, alvars, cliffs, bogs, fens, marl meadows, and cold water streams

The northern part of the area contains over five hectares of forest interior habitat. There is also a small area of old growth forest habitat.

B.3 provide a large area of natural habitat of at least 20 hectares which affords habitat to species intolerant of human intrusion

The total area is approximately 48.73 hectares.

B.4 provide habitat for organisms indigenous to the Region recognized as regionally, provincially, nationally significant

Plants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calla palustris</th>
<th>Wild calla</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carex laxiculmis</td>
<td>Spreading Sedge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex scabrata</td>
<td>Rough Sedge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carex sparganoides</td>
<td>Burreed Sedge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celtis occidentalis</td>
<td>Common Hackberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crataegus pringlei</td>
<td>Pringle’s Hawthorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalibarda repens</td>
<td>Dewdrop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equisetum palustre</td>
<td>Marsh Horsetail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackelia virginiana</td>
<td>Virginia Stickseed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juncus canadensis</td>
<td>Bog Rush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonicera hirsuta</td>
<td>Hairy Honeysuckle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polygonum sagittatum</td>
<td>Arrow-leaved Tearthumb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quercus ellipsoidalis</td>
<td>Northern Pin Oak (Hill’s Oak)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa carolina</td>
<td>Pasture Rose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubus hispidus</td>
<td>Swamp Dewberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synphyotrichum oolentangiensis</td>
<td>Sky-blue Aster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaccinium angustifolium</td>
<td>Late Sweet Blueberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zanthoxylum americanum</td>
<td>Northern Prickly Ash</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Breeding Birds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trumpeter Swan</th>
<th>Cygnus buccinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pied-billed Grebe</td>
<td>Podilymbus podiceps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Bittern</td>
<td>Ixobrychus exilis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Duck</td>
<td>Aix sponsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooded Merganser</td>
<td>Lophodytes cucullatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Rail</td>
<td>Rallis limicola</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sora     Porzana carolina
Common Moorhen Gallinula chloropus
Sandhill Crane Grus canadensis
Black-billed Cuckoo Coccyzus erythropthalmus
Least Flycatcher Empidonax minimus
Marsh Wren Cistothorus palustris
American Redstart Setophaga ruticilla

**Herpetofauna**

Western Chorus Frog Pseudacris triseriata
Snapping Turtle Chelydra serpentina

**Butterflies**

Common Sootywing Pholisora catullus
Giant Swallowtail Papilio cresphontes
Tawny Emperor Asterocampa clyton

**Odonates**

Amber-winged Spreadwing Lestes eurinus
Harlequin Darner Gomphaeschna furcillata
Swamp Darner Epiaveschna heros

C.2 perform a vital ecological function such as maintaining the hydrological balance over a widespread area by acting as a natural water storage, discharge or recharge area

The wetlands receive surface and groundwater discharge and function as the headwaters of Cruickston Creek.

C.3 provide a linking system of relatively undisturbed forest or other natural habitat for the movement of wildlife over a considerable distance

C.4 serve as major migratory stop-over or significant over-wintering habitat

The wetlands provide over-wintering habitat to large numbers of Midland Painted Turtles and as well as some Snapping Turtles. They also provide a limited migratory stop-over for birds.
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Region of Waterloo  
Transportation and Environmental Services  
Design and Construction  

To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee  
Date: April 1, 2014  
File Code: C04-30, 5555  
Subject: Traffic Management for 2014 Construction Contracts  

Recommendation:  
For Information Only  

Summary:  
NIL  

Report:  

As has been customary in past years, staff has produced this report for information purposes to provide details on the major road construction activity in the Region of Waterloo in the current year. The attached tables provide information on projects greater than one month in duration that will be undertaken in 2014 on major arterial Regional roads or on major Area Municipal streets. The tables also include the ongoing construction work on provincial highways within the Region of Waterloo that is being undertaken by the Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO).

Each year, Region staff consults with representatives of the three Cities to plan and coordinate the collective road construction programs in the coming years. At these meetings staff:

- Confirm respective priorities and needs;
- Consider combining construction contracts to reduce costs and minimize public inconvenience;
- Coordinate the proposed work to optimize the number of key major roads that are open and available to traffic;
• Organize the sequence of construction and detours to minimize public disruption; and
  
• Coordinate public notifications.

Region and City staff acknowledge that any road construction on an existing road will involve lane restrictions and a certain amount of disruption to traffic. In order to minimize the disruption while efficiently completing the required work, a number of basic traffic management principles are applied in the design of each individual construction project. All designs take into account the following traffic management principles:

• Accommodation of emergency services;

• Ensuring the safety of construction staff;

• Maintaining two-way traffic where practical;

• Maintenance of safe passage through construction;

• Minimizing disruption (motorists, pedestrians, cyclists, transit);

• Maintaining accesses for residences and businesses;

• Minimizing lane restrictions;

• Providing for municipal garbage collection; and

• Minimizing overall construction duration.

As a result of the joint efforts of staff at the Region and the Cities and Townships, the collective construction programs are planned and coordinated with the objective of minimizing overall public disruption while delivering the transportation needs of the broader community.

A list of the major construction activity for 2014 is contained in Appendix A. The list identifies construction contracts that affect area highways, major arterials or major Area Municipal streets and that are greater than one month in duration.

The Region’s website also provides a complete listing of all active 2014 Region construction projects for reference by the public. Included in the website listing are the limits and duration of each project as well as the traffic restrictions or detours in effect for each project.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

The Region’s coordination of construction programs with City staff is in harmony with **Focus Area 5 – Service Excellence** of the Strategic Plan by contributing to Objective 5.6 to strengthen and enhance partnerships with area municipalities.
The completion of the 2014 capital roads program will support **Focus Area 2 – Growth Management and Prosperity** of the Strategic Plan and in particular Strategic Objective 2.2 by continuing to develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs.

**Financial Implications:**

NIL

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

NIL

**Attachments:**

Appendix A - 2014 Construction on Major Roads

**Prepared By:** Gary MacDonald, Head, Transportation Rehabilitation Program

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

### 2014 Construction on Major Roads In The City Of Kitchener

#### Major Projects (more than one month in duration)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Managed by</th>
<th>Limits</th>
<th>Traffic Restrictions</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway 7/8 Widening</td>
<td>MTO</td>
<td>1.9 km West of Fischer-Hallman Road to Courtland Avenue</td>
<td>2014 Traffic Restrictions: (March - November)</td>
<td>Spring 2011 to Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Two separate weekend closures of Courtland Avenue for bridge deck work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Closure of Courtland Avenue on-ramp to westbound 7/8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Highway 7/8 nightly lane closures for paving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 7/85 Paving</td>
<td>MTO</td>
<td>Krug Street to Bridgeport Road</td>
<td>Nightly lane closures for paving</td>
<td>Summer 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Street Reconstruction</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Tyson Drive to Kitchener / Woolwich Boundary</td>
<td>• Bloomingdale Rd to Boundary - westbound Bridge Street closed</td>
<td>Spring to Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Managed by</td>
<td>Limits</td>
<td>Traffic Restrictions</td>
<td>Timing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Tyson Dr to Bloomingdale Rd - two-way traffic with flagging during working hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber Street Widening</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>College Street to Union Street</td>
<td>• One lane maintained in each direction with some flagging during working hours</td>
<td>Spring to Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Periodic short-term full intersection closures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ira Needles Boulevard Widening</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Highview Drive to north of University Avenue</td>
<td>Two weekend nighttime closures at each of the three roundabouts (Highland Ave, Victoria St and University Ave)</td>
<td>Spring to Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Avenue Bridge</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Victoria Street to Breithaupt Street</td>
<td>Full closure</td>
<td>Summer 2013 to Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow Street Reconstruction</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Westmount Road to Knell Drive</td>
<td>Full closure</td>
<td>Spring to Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen’s Boulevard</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Rex Drive to Belmont Avenue</td>
<td>One lane maintained in each direction</td>
<td>Spring to Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Other reconstructions managed by City staff are occurring on local City streets at various locations and may include full closures.
### Appendix A-2

#### 2014 Construction on Major Roads in the City of Waterloo

**Major projects (more than one month in duration)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Managed by</th>
<th>Limits</th>
<th>Traffic Restrictions</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway 85 Bridge</td>
<td>MTO</td>
<td>Bridgeport Road to King Street</td>
<td>2014 Traffic Restrictions: (March - November)</td>
<td>Spring 2011 to Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation and</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Woolwich) Interchange</td>
<td>• University Avenue reduced to one lane each direction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Highway 85 northbound off-ramp to University Avenue westbound closed (late Summer to Fall)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Nightly lane closures on Highway 85 for paving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Nightly ramp closures for paving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Avenue</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Highway 85 to Weber Street</td>
<td>Reduced to one lane in each direction</td>
<td>Spring to Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Weber Street to</td>
<td>Reduced to one lane in</td>
<td>Summer to Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Managed by</td>
<td>Limits</td>
<td>Traffic Restrictions</td>
<td>Timing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conestoga Mall</td>
<td>each direction</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmount Road Retaining Wall</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>From University Avenue northerly 300 metres</td>
<td>Full closure of northbound Westmount Road</td>
<td>Summer 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erb Street Improvements</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Caroline Street to Menno Street</td>
<td>Reduced to one lane in each direction</td>
<td>Summer to Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmount Road Roundabout</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>At the new extension of Laurelwood Drive</td>
<td>Reduced to one lane in each direction</td>
<td>Summer to Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington Road Improvements</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Davenport Road to University Avenue</td>
<td>• Full closure - Bridge St to University Ave</td>
<td>Spring to Summer 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• One lane maintained each direction - Davenport Rd to Bridge St</td>
<td>Spring to Summer 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Other reconstructions managed by City staff are occurring on local City streets at various locations and may include full closures.
Appendix A-3

2014 Construction on Major Roads in the City of Cambridge

Major projects (more than one month in duration)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Managed by</th>
<th>Limits</th>
<th>Traffic Restrictions</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway 401 Bridge Work</td>
<td>MTO</td>
<td>Speedsville Road bridge, Fountain Street bridge and Highway 8 Ramp bridge</td>
<td>• Speedsville Road closed (Spring to Fall 2014)</td>
<td>Spring 2014 to Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Two Highway 401 full closures (weekend overnight) at Speedsville Road, one for bridge demolition and one for girder placement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Highway 8 ramp to Highway 401 reduced to single lane (July/August) for bridge rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Fountain Street closed (2015)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapted Bus Rapid Transit</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Hespeler Road, Water Street and Ainslie Street (Eagle Street / Pinebush Road to Bus Terminal)</td>
<td>Periodic lane closures</td>
<td>Summer 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Other reconstructions managed by City staff are occurring on local City streets at various locations and may include full closures.
Appendix A-4

2014 Construction on Major Roads - Townships

Major projects (more than one month in duration)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Managed by</th>
<th>Limits</th>
<th>Traffic Restrictions</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spragues Road Reconstruction, Township of North Dumfries</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Brant / Waterloo Boundary to Wrigley Road</td>
<td>Southbound lane closed</td>
<td>Spring to Summer 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Other reconstructions managed by Township staff are occurring on local Township streets at various locations and may include full closures.
Regional Municipality of Waterloo

East Boundary Road Corridor Study

Dundas Street at South Boundary Road to Townline Road
City of Cambridge/Township of North Dumfries/Puslinch Township

Information Package

Public Consultation Centre
Thursday, April 3, 2014
5:00 P.M. to 8:00 P.M.
at
Holy Spirit Catholic Elementary School
15 Gatehouse Drive
Cambridge, Ontario

There is a Comment Sheet at the back of this package. If you wish, please fill it out and deposit it in the designated box provided at this Consultation Centre. All names, addresses and comments will be included in material made available to the general public.
1.0 What is the Purpose of this Public Consultation Centre (PCC)?

The Region of Waterloo is undertaking a Class Environmental Assessment (EA) study for the East Boundary Corridor from Dundas Street (Highway 8) at the proposed South Boundary Road Intersection to Townline Road in the City of Cambridge, the Township of North Dumfries and Puslinch Township (study area illustrated below). The study will follow the Class EA process (Schedule “C”) as outlined in the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment, June 2000 as amended in 2007 document.
The public is invited to this Consultation Centre which is a forum for you to provide input on the following:

- Identified study issues and problem statement;
- Alternative alignments being considered for the East Boundary Road Corridor; and
- Criteria to be used in the evaluation of the alternative alignments.

2.0 What is a Class Environmental Assessment?

The Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process is a formal process approved under the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act that must be undertaken in advance of any construction improvements to ensure that all reasonable alternatives are considered.

The Class EA provides the framework for municipalities to plan, design and construct municipal infrastructure projects. This project is being planned as a “Schedule C” Class EA project. For additional details regarding the Municipal Class EA process, please refer to Appendix A.

3.0 Who is Directing This Project?

A “Project Team” consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo, City of Cambridge, Township of North Dumfries, Puslinch Township, Wellington County, Grand River Conservation Authority, and MTE Consultants, as well as Region of Waterloo Councilor Jane Brewer, City of Cambridge Councilor Gary Price and Township of North Dumfries Councilor Neil Ritchie, is directing this project.

4.0 How does this Project Relate to the Objectives of the Regional Official Plan and the Regional Transportation Master Plan?

During the last 10 years, south Cambridge has experienced rapid residential growth, and the east side of Cambridge is being planned for new development. As a result, the transportation network needs to be upgraded to meet current demands and accommodate future growth as identified in many studies and policies as well as accommodating traffic that is trying to bypass the City of Cambridge.

The initial concept for a bypass around the “City of Cambridge” was first identified in 1967 as part of a Planning Study undertaken by the City of Galt. In 1972, the Ministry of Transportation developed a Highway 8 bypass, connecting Highway 8 and Highway 24 to Highway 401. When responsibility for these roads shifted to the Region of Waterloo in 1988, it was revised into an arterial corridor concept around the east, west, and south sides of the City of Cambridge as approved in the 1994 Cambridge Area Transportation Study (CATS). Included in the recommendations was a north-south bypass on the east
Class Environmental Assessment
East Boundary Road

the side of Cambridge that was just east of the City of Cambridge boundary in North Dumfries.

The 1999 Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) has also identified the need for a North-South arterial, east of Franklin Boulevard in the City of Cambridge and the Township of North Dumfries.

In response to the transportation network needs identified in the RTMP, the Region of Waterloo initiated a Class EA Study in the City of Cambridge in 2000, called the Cambridge Area Routes Selection Study (CARSS). This study also identified a number of routes for an East Side Arterial Corridor east and west of the City of Cambridge boundary.

In 2004 a Detailed Transportation Network Review (DTNR) undertaken by the Region confirmed the need for an East Boundary Road. In addition, the Region Transportation Master Plan (2010 Update) also recommended the need for an East Boundary Road.

The 1995 Regional Official Policies Plan (ROPP) that is currently in effect as well as the new Regional Official Plan (ROP) that has been approved by the Province in 2010 but is currently under appeal, both identify a Proposed Regional Corridor (as illustrated on Map 9 of the ROPP and Map 5b of the ROP) for the East Boundary Road that is consistent with the alignment identified under previous studies. It essentially ties into the South Boundary Road at Dundas Street, and connects into Shellard Sideroad to the east, goes through Puslinch Township and ties into Townline Road. This route is currently shown in both the Region of Waterloo and Wellington County Official Plans. In summary, the need for an East Boundary Road has been firmly established through many previous studies; however, the exact alignment has not been identified through a Class Environmental Assessment. The Project Team has developed the following problem statement for the project, identifying the traffic and transportation needs to be addressed.
Problem Statement

Regional transportation studies dating back to the 1960s have all identified a future need for an arterial road connection on the east side of Cambridge between the south end of the City to Highway 401. This arterial road has commonly been referred to as the “East Boundary Road”. Recent transportation demand modelling results have confirmed that an arterial road on the east side of Cambridge is needed to alleviate forecasted north-south roadway capacity deficiencies on Hespeler Road and Franklin Boulevard, as well as improve access to the Regional road network for residents of the Southeast Galt Community area, and provide an alternative for goods movements to avoid traffic congestion in downtown Cambridge.

A route for an “East Boundary Road” needs to be confirmed to facilitate any proposed developments in the area and to protect the land for this future roadway. With the recent approval of the South Boundary Road between Highway 24 and Dundas Street south of Myers Road and the upgrades to Townline Road south of Highway 401 completed, a route between Dundas Street in the south, to Townline Road must be identified for this Regional Road.

5.0 Where in the Class EA Process Are We?

As identified above, the project is being completed in accordance with the requirements of a Schedule “C” Municipal Class EA process. The requirements of the first two phases of the project (i.e. Phase 1: Identify Problem or Opportunity and Phase 2: Develop Alternative Solutions to the Problem) have already been addressed and documented in previously completed studies including the CARSS, the Cambridge Area Transportation Study, Regional Transportation Master Plan, and the Detailed Transportation Network Review (DTNR). These studies have considered alternative methods of addressing the transportation demands such as transit, carpooling, cycling and walking. They all concluded that the Preferred Solution is a new road on the east side of Cambridge.

Because these studies have: (1) already established the need and justification for an East Boundary Corridor and (2) have looked at alternative methods of addressing this need, and consulted with stakeholders, the requirements of the first two phases of the East Boundary Corridor Class EA project may be considered as being fulfilled.

This study is undertaking Phase 3: Alternative Design Concepts for the Preferred Solution, and Phase 4: The Environmental Study Report documenting the study for public review.
6.0 What are the Current Projects in the Area and What Impact Do They Have on This Project?

Franklin Boulevard

The Region of Waterloo completed the Franklin Boulevard Class EA study in 2011 from Myers Road to north of Pinebush Road, in the City of Cambridge. The approved plan that has been developed, addresses the existing traffic operations, future traffic demand and capacity improvements for Franklin Boulevard. Franklin Boulevard is currently the key north-south connection on the east side of Cambridge. Construction is proposed to start in 2015 and continue until 2020. However the traffic projections for Franklin Boulevard assume that an East Boundary Road (to the east of Franklin Boulevard) will be constructed in the future.

South Boundary Road

The Region of Waterloo completed the South Boundary Road Class EA study in 2013. The South Boundary Road Class EA established the corridor for a new road running along the south edge of the City of Cambridge from Water Street (Highway 24) to Dundas Street (Highway 8). The intersection of the South Boundary Road and Dundas Street was established as part of that study, and is the point where an East Boundary Road would connect in the south end. Detail design of the South Boundary Road is currently underway and construction of the west portion (Water Street to Franklin Boulevard) is scheduled to commence in 2015/2016 while the east portion (Franklin Boulevard to Dundas Street) is scheduled to start construction in 2022. Construction of the East Boundary Road is not currently scheduled in the Region’s 10 year Transportation Capital Program and will not be programmed until after South Boundary Road is complete.

Highway 24 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA

The Ministry of Transportation (MTO) had initiated a Highway 24 Transportation Corridor Planning and Class EA Study from Highway 403 in Brantford to Highway 401 in Cambridge to develop a plan that addresses traffic capacity, operation and safety needs between Brantford and Cambridge. This study was put on hold for a period of time, but the MTO now has plans to re-initiate it. The construction of a future Highway 24 does not significantly impact the need for an East Boundary Road, as the East Boundary Road will not only serve as an arterial through the east side of Cambridge, but also serve local access purposes. However, the Project Team will be in contact with the MTO to coordinate the East Boundary Road with the new MTO study.
7.0 When is an East Boundary Road Needed?

The East Boundary Road is currently not scheduled for construction in the Region of Waterloo’s Ten Year Transportation Capital Program. However the planning and identification of a proposed route is being undertaken now (as part of this study) to establish an East Boundary Road Corridor so that planning for future development can proceed knowing where the new road will be. Since the need for an East Boundary Road will be somewhat dependent on how and when development occurs, the construction of a new East Boundary Road will likely be phased and not all built at the same time.

8.0 What Are the Preliminary Alignment Concepts Being Considered for the East Boundary Corridor?

The Project Team looked at a number of constraints and opportunities in developing some Preliminary Alignment Concepts. Some of these constraints and opportunities include: Mill Creek, Moffat Creek, existing and new roadways, existing development, hydro corridors, heritage and archeological features, railways, wetlands and other natural environmental factors. The Project Team will continue to review and evaluate all constraints and opportunities during the EA process. These alignments are really just a “starting point”, and public input is welcomed on these preliminary alignments as well as suggestions of any additional alternatives. Please refer to Appendix “B” and the display at this PCC for a plan showing the Preliminary Alignment Concepts. The following sections include a description of the Preliminary Alignment Concepts that were developed by the Project Team.

8.1 “Do Nothing”

As part of any Class EA process, there is always a consideration of the “Do Nothing” alternative to assess what would happen if no action is taken to address the project concerns. This assessment provides a baseline against which the other project alternatives can be measured. Although the previous studies undertaken have already identified the need for a new East Boundary Road, the Do-Nothing alternative will continue to be considered for comparison purposes.

8.2 Route A - “Eastern Alignment”

Route A follows the route illustrated in the Region of Waterloo and Wellington County Official Plans. It ties into the current proposed location of the South Boundary Road at Dundas Street, goes eastward utilizing a portion of Ripplewood Road and ties into Shellard Sideroad. It then travels north on Shellard Sideroad going through Puslinch Township at the intersection of Gore Road and ties into Townline Road near Saginaw Parkway. This route will utilize and expand upon the existing crossings of Moffat Creek, Mill Creek and the CPR tracks. This route impacts existing communities along Shellard Sideroad.
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8.3 Route B – “Western Alignment”

Route B is a western alignment that ties into the South Boundary Road at Dundas Street and follows a proposed City collector road (Wesley Boulevard). It then follows the eastern edge of the Cambridge Landfill Site, utilizes a portion of the Hydro One Corridor and travels eastward tying into Townline Road at the Cambridge/North Dumfries Boundary. This route is intended to replace an already-approved crossing of Moffat Creek near the proposed Wesley Boulevard, and will require a new crossing of Mill Creek (near dammed portion of the creek) near the rear lots of Grandy Lane. It will also require a new crossing of the CPR tracks. The City of Cambridge has expressed significant concerns regarding this alignment and the impact it will have on their proposed community campus as well as other existing and proposed developments in the adjacent area. Construction of this route may make the community campus unviable. The City of Cambridge’s detailed concerns with Route B will be a significant factor in the evaluation process when all municipal, agency and public comments and concerns are taken into consideration.

8.4 Route C – “Central Alignment”

Route C ties into the South Boundary Road at Dundas Street, then travels northeast to eventually follow the Cambridge North Dumfries Boundary and tying into Townline Road. This route will require a new crossing of Moffat Creek as well as a new crossing of Mill Creek (at dammed portion) near the rear lots of Grandy Lane. It will also require a new crossing of the CPR tracks.

8.5 Route D – “Hydro One Corridor”

Route D ties into the South Boundary Road at Dundas Street then travels northeast to eventually follow the Hydro One Corridor until approximately Clyde Road where it ties into Route C near the Mill Creek crossing to tie into Townline Road. The northern portion of this alignment is shared with Route B. This route will require a new crossing of Moffat Creek as well as a new crossing of Mill Creek (at dammed portion) near the rear lots of Grandy Lane. It will also require a new crossing of the CPR tracks.

8.6 “Hyrbid” Alignment Concepts

A number of other short alignments connecting Route A and Route C are also being considered. In addition, a short alignment concept for Route A crossing Moffat Creek further east than Shellard Sideroad is also being considered.

8.7 CP Rail Crossings

All the proposed alignments must cross the existing CP Rail Line north of Clyde Road. Route A is proposed to use the existing Shellard Sideroad crossing location, but all other routes will require a new crossing location. Each proposed new crossing will be examined for either an “at-grade” (level) crossing, or a “grade separation” (bridge). The need for an at-grade or grade separated crossing will be dictated by the amount of
vehicle traffic and train traffic as part of detail design. Both an at-grade and grade separated crossing will be examined as part of this study, with the potential for an initial at-grade crossing (if traffic volumes dictate) with provisions for a future grade separation.

### 8.8 Roundabouts

Roundabout intersections will also be considered. Roundabouts are becoming more common in the Region of Waterloo. Roundabouts are characterized by the lack of traffic signals and a circulating roadway providing the ability for continual traffic flow through the intersection, as well as reducing severe collisions.

### 9.0 Will Cycling and Pedestrian Facilities be Incorporated into the Design?

The East Boundary Road will accommodate all modes of transportation such as walking, cycling, transit, and automobile. As part of this EA process the Region will consider sidewalks, multi-use trails and landscaping in the preliminary design. The Region of Waterloo is committed to providing a more integrated, sustainable and convenient transportation system. This improved system will provide improved access to jobs and services, and help to address increasing traffic congestion.

### 10.0 Have any Natural Environmental Inventories been Completed?

Preliminary environmental mapping of the study area has been compiled based on the review of background information from the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR), Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA), Region of Waterloo and various studies previously completed in the vicinity of the study area. GRCA and MNR (Land Information Ontario) GIS mapping was consulted and transferred to provide an understanding of the various land form based constraints within the study area. In addition, various natural heritage surveys were completed throughout the spring and summer of 2012 to gain an understanding of specific natural heritage features and functions that were identified during preliminary background information mapping. These surveys included spring amphibian call surveys, breeding bird surveys, preliminary Ecological Land Classification and cursory vegetation surveys, and species at risk observations.

In 2013, field work was completed at additional stations within the overall study area to provide additional natural heritage data that will be taken into consideration as the study moves towards formulation and assessment of preliminary alignment options.

Further environmental inventories are to be completed in the spring, summer and fall of 2014 (including botanical, breeding bird, and breeding amphibian survey) as well as additional observations of area wildlife.
11.0 Are there any Natural Environment Corridors in the Study Area?

Two large natural heritage system corridors traverse the Study Area. The Provincially Significant Mill Creek Wetland Complex Corridor surrounds Mill Creek and enters the north boundary of the study area at the intersection of Gore Road and Shellard Road. The Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW) at Moffat Creek enters the middle portion of the study area at Shellard Road. In the southeast corner of the study area, smaller wetland pockets associated with the Sheffield-Rockton Complex PSW surround headwater area of Fairchild Creek at Shellard Road near Dundas Street.

The Mill Creek PSW complex surrounds Mill Creek proper and its tributaries. Immediately to the northeast of the Study Area, a large portion of the Mill Creek PSW also contains the Galt (Mill) Creek and Forests Life Science Area of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI). While this ANSI lies just outside of the present Study Area boundary, its presence on adjacent lands should be taken into consideration during the EA study.

Traversing the mid-portion of the study area in a northeast to southwest direction, the Moffat Creek PSW surrounds the main stem of Moffat Creek. Smaller pockets of wetland also associated with this complex are located away from the creek, in the vicinity of the east end of Savage Drive and the south end of Doobie Drive.

In the southeast corner of the Study Area to the south of Old Beverly Road, are several wetland pockets of the Sheffield-Rockton PSW Complex. These wetland areas are associated with the headwaters of Fairchild Creek, a warmwater stream system that enters the Grand River downstream of Brantford. Please see the displays at the Public Consultation Centre to view maps of the significant natural environment within the study area.

12.0 Are there any Potential Developments in the Vicinity of the Study Area?

There are a number of proposed or partially completed developments within the Study Area, concentrated mainly in the southwest corner of the Study Area. Each of these developments are in various stages of approvals. The City’s “Southeast Galt Community Plan” is also located in this area. Please see the displays at the Public Consultation Centre to view maps of the significant natural environment within the study area.
A Cultural Heritage Resource Inventory identified several buildings within the Study Area that have either “medium” or “high” heritage significance. In general, the buildings are mid-1800 stone farmhouses built by earlier settlers in the area. Any impacts to buildings of heritage significance will be determined as the study progresses. Every effort will be made to avoid and/or mitigate negative impacts to identified areas of heritage significance.

Reports will be available at the PCC and will be accessible via the Region’s website Region of Waterloo after the PCC.

### 14.0 How Will the Various Alternative Alignments be Evaluated?

The various alternatives alignment concepts will be assessed against a set of evaluation criteria to determine which alignment, singly or in combination with other alignments, best addresses the need for an East Boundary Road and the surrounding transportation network. The evaluation criteria will include the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Element</th>
<th>Evaluation Criteria for East Boundary Road Class EA Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1) Natural Environment</strong></td>
<td>How does the alternative affect existing vegetation, water quality, source (ground) water resources, wildlife and aquatic habitat, wetlands, terrestrial resources, woodlands, species at risk, surface drainage and existing floodplains?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2) Social Environment</strong></td>
<td>Community impacts – What impacts will the alternative have on the local community i.e. noise, property requirements, etc.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access – How does the alternative impact access to existing residences, businesses and industries?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development/Property – Will the alternative fragment land and/or limit development opportunities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3) Heritage/Archaeological/Cultural Environment</strong></td>
<td>What are the potential impacts on the heritage significance of heritage structures or landscapes and the potential disturbance of archaeological resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4) Traffic Capacity, Operations and Safety</strong></td>
<td>How does the alternative serve the expected vehicular, transit, pedestrian and cycling traffic needs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the alternative efficiently and safely handle the forecasted traffic from existing and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation Criteria for East Boundary Road - Class EA Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Element</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>future development properties?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does the alternative compare with anticipated capital costs, property costs and utility relocation costs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 15.0 What Happens if Property is Required?

While it is the intent of the design process to minimize as much as possible the need to obtain property for the East Boundary Road or any of the sidestreets within the study limits, most of the alternative alignment concepts being considered require obtaining or widening the road allowance onto private property, obtaining temporary easements during the construction period or in some cases outright purchase of entire properties. In areas where property is required, the property owner will be contacted directly by the Region of Waterloo’s Land Purchasing Officer. Compensation will be provided at fair market rates based on recent similar area sales. Please refer to Appendix “C” for further information on the property acquisition process.

### 16.0 What are the Next Steps in the Project?

The Project Team will use the comments received from today’s Consultation Centre, along with other input received from the public and approval agencies as well as technical data, to further refine the alternative road alignment concepts and evaluation criteria and to identify a Preferred Alignment Concept. Some of the next tasks to be arranged include additional natural environmental inventories and further discussions with external agencies including Hydro One, MNR, GRCA, CP Rail and others. The Preferred Alignment Concept will be presented at a Second Public Consultation Centre to be held later in 2014 or early 2015.

### 17.0 How Will I Receive Further Notification Regarding This Project?

All property owners within the Study Area and members of the public registering at this Public Consultation Centre will receive any forthcoming additional information, and be notified of future meetings. Advertisements will also be placed in local newspapers advising the public of the upcoming Public Meetings and availability of the final Environmental Study Report for the East Boundary Road Class EA study.
18.0 How Can I Voice My Comments At This Stage?

In order to assist us in addressing any comments or concerns you might have regarding this project, we ask that you please fill out the attached Comment Sheet and leave it in the box provided at the registration table. Alternatively you can mail, fax or e-mail your comments to one of the Project Team members listed below, no later than April 17, 2014.

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

Mr. Marcos Kroker P.Eng.  
Acting Head, Transportation Expansion  
Region of Waterloo  
150 Frederick Street, 6th Floor  
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3  
Telephone: (519) 575-4750  
Fax: (519) 575-4430  
Email: kmarcos@regionofwaterloo.ca

Mr. Dave Hallman, P. Eng.,  
Vice President, Municipal MTE Consultants  
502 Bingemans Centre Drive  
Kitchener, ON N2B 3X9  
Telephone: (519) 743-6500 X1336  
Fax: (519) 743-6513  
Email: dhallman@mte85.com

19.0 How Can I View Project Information Following the PCC?

All of the PCC display materials in addition to other relevant project information, notifications of upcoming meetings and contact information are available for viewing at the Region of Waterloo municipal offices as identified above, or on the Regional Municipality of Waterloo’s website (Region of Waterloo).
Ontario Environmental Assessment Act

The purpose of the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act (EA Act) is to provide for “the betterment of the people of the whole or any part of Ontario by providing for the protection, conservation and wise management of the environment in Ontario”. Environment is applied broadly and includes the natural, social, cultural, built and economic components.

The key principles of successful environmental assessment planning include:

- Consultation with stakeholders and affected members of the public;
- Consideration of a reasonable range of alternatives;
- Assessment of the environmental impacts for each alternative;
- Systematic evaluation of alternatives; and
- Clear documentation of the process followed.

Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA)

The Municipal Class EA is a planning process approved under the Environmental Assessment Act that is used by municipalities to plan infrastructure enhancement projects while satisfying the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act. Under the Class EA process, projects are planned in one of three ways depending on their scope, complexity, and potential for adverse environmental impacts.

Schedule “A” - Includes routine maintenance, operation and emergency activities.
- The Municipality can proceed with this work without further approval or public consultation.

Schedule “B” - Includes projects with the potential for some adverse environmental effects.
- These projects are subject to a screening process that includes consultation with directly affected public and agencies.

Schedule “C” - Includes larger, more complex projects with the potential for significant environmental effects.
- These projects are subject to all phases of the Class EA and require a minimum of 3 points of public contact.
Public Involvement

Members of the public that have a stake in the project are encouraged to provide comment throughout the Class EA process. For Schedule “C” projects there are a minimum of three (3) opportunities for public contact. These typically include two Public Consultation Centre’s and the Notice of Study Completion.

Class EA Process for Schedule “C” Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in Project Status – Appeal Provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is recommended that all stakeholders (including the proponent, public and review agencies) work together to determine the preferred means of addressing a problem or opportunity. If you have any concerns, you should discuss them with the proponent and try to resolve them. In the event that there are major issues which cannot be resolved, you may request the Minister of the Environment by order to require a proponent to comply with Part II of the EA Act before proceeding with a proposed undertaking which has been subject to Class EA requirements. This is called a “Part II Order”. The Minister will make one of the following decisions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Deny the request (with or without conditions);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Refer the matter to mediation; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Require the proponent to comply with Part II of the EA Act, ordering a full Environmental Assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All stakeholders are urged to try to resolve issues since it is preferable for them to be resolved by the municipality in which a project is located, rather than at the provincial level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To request a Part II Order, a person must send a written request to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of the Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 St. Clair Avenue West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4V 1P5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The request must address the following with respect to the identified concerns:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental Impacts and specific concerns;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adequacy of the planning and public consultation process;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Involvement of the person in the planning process; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details of discussions held between the person and the proponent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Property Acquisition Process Information Sheet

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

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

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

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

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

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

The initial meetings will form the basis of an initial offer of settlement or agreement of purchase and sale for the required lands or interests.
Steps Toward Offer of Settlement or Agreement of Purchase and Sale
The general steps towards such an offer are as follows;

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

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

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

Put simply, an expropriation is the transfer of lands or an easement to a governmental authority for reasonable compensation, including payment of fair market value for the transferred lands, without the consent of the property owner being required. In the case of expropriations by municipalities such as the Region of Waterloo, the process set out in the Ontario Expropriations Act must be followed to ensure that the rights of the property owners provided under that Act are protected.
Comment Sheet
Regional Municipality of Waterloo
East Boundary Road Class Environmental Assessment
Cambridge/North Dumfries/Puslinch
Public Consultation Centre #1 – April 3, 2014

Please complete and hand in this sheet so that your views can be considered for this project. If you cannot complete your comments today, please take this home and mail, fax or e-mail your comments by April 17, 2014 to either:

Mr. Marcos Kroker P.Eng.
Acting Head, Transportation Exp.
Region of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street, 6th Floor
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3
Telephone: (519) 575-4750
Fax: (519) 575-4430
Email: kmarcos@region.waterloo.on.ca

Mr. Dave Hallman, P. Eng.,
Vice President, Municipal MTE Consultants
502 Bingemans Centre Drive
Kitchener, ON N2B 3X9
Telephone: (519) 743-6500
Fax: (519) 743-6513
Email: dhallman@mte85.com

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

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2. Do you have any additional suggestions for possible solutions or alternative alignments to address the problem/needs?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
3. Are there any other Evaluation Criteria that you think should be considered?

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

4. What are the 3 most important criteria that you feel should be considered when the alternatives are being analyzed?

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

5. Are there any other general comments you have on this project?

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

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

Name: ____________________________________________

Address: __________________________________________

Postal Code: ________________________________________

Phone & email: ______________________________________

Thank you for your interest and time.

Collection Notice

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

Transportation and Environmental Services

Transportation

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

Date: April 1, 2014

File Code: T08-70/ITS

Subject: Traffic Management System and Road Construction and Incident Management System

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve entering into a contribution agreement with Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada by its Minister of Transportation to fund the procurement and supply of a Hespeler Road Corridor Traffic Management System and Road Construction and Incident Management System as outlined in Report E-14-024 dated April 1, 2014.

Summary:

Nil

Report:

Today’s traffic professionals are focused on optimizing the transportation network by improving the way the components (i.e. traffic signals, roundabouts, pedestrian and cycling facilities, transit priority, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), intersection improvements, etc.) work together to reduce delays and best use available capacity.

Two projects that have been identified as priorities through the Region’s ITS Strategic Plan that can optimize the Region’s existing road network include:

1. Road Construction and Incident Management System; and
2. Hespeler Road Corridor Traffic Management System.

The Region of Waterloo is now in an ideal position to implement these important ITS projects. As such a proposal was prepared for Transport Canada in response to the Gateways and Border Crossing Fund which considers ITS initiatives for strategic trade corridors as a means of obtaining the needed funding. It was submitted as a joint proposal from:

- The Region of Waterloo;
- The University of Waterloo;
- The Ministry of Transportation of Ontario; and
- CIMA Canada Inc.

The proposal has been accepted and approved for funding by Transport Canada and requires Regional Council approval to proceed and to enter into an agreement with Transport Canada.

**Road Construction and Incident Management System**

The Road Construction and Incident Management System is a software application that will allow the Region to better coordinate and manage planned (maintenance, construction, detours, special events) or unplanned (maintenance) events that impact the Regional road network. An overview of the Incident Management system is provided in Appendix A.

Currently Regional staff does not have any devoted system in place to schedule and coordinate planned or unplanned events. Staff currently uses a permitting system which requires local knowledge and understanding of events to minimize conflict. The proposed system will have the ability to identify real time or future conflicts automatically as planned or unplanned events are added to the system. The system will also notify the public, Regional staff and stakeholders of events along the road network more quickly and reliably. The system will provide for the ability to better coordinate maintenance, closures and incidents both on Regional Roads as well as adjacent roads belonging to local municipalities and the Province.

It is proposed to leverage tools and products that have already been developed and partially funded by Transport Canada, Translink and other public agencies. Specifically, the Regional Condition Reporting System (RCRS) and iMOVE or other systems with...
functionality similar to the RCRS and IMOVE Systems can establish a Road Construction and Incident Management System for the Region of Waterloo. As a result, the proposed costs are associated with the actual customization and implementation of the systems as well as the integration of these systems with the other ITS systems currently in operation throughout the Region of Waterloo. The system once in operation is anticipated to:

- Improve the management of planned (maintenance and construction) and unplanned (maintenance, collisions) events;
- Provide an interface for the local municipalities resulting in a more complete inventory of road events;
- Include the ability to apply for and track permits;
- Provide traveller information to the public; and
- Provide important interfaces with contemporary traffic data collection devices including cell phone data and Bluetooth sensors.

**Hespeler Road Corridor Traffic Management System**

The proposed Hespeler Road Corridor Traffic Management System is a system of ITS components including closed circuit television cameras, vehicle detection stations and bluetooth tracking stations. These components complement one another to optimize traffic flow on Hespeler Road by automatically adjusting traffic signal timing based on real-time traffic demands. A summary of the Hespeler Road corridor traffic management system is provided for in Appendix B.

Hespeler Road (formerly Highway 24) was selected for a traffic management system because it is a major arterial road that links directly with Highways 401 and 8 in Cambridge and also Highway 403 in Brantford to the south. It carries a high volume of traffic, provides direct access to a large commercial area and is the primary access to the downtown area of the City of Cambridge. A Bus Rapid Transit system is also planned to be implemented in 2015 along the Hespeler Road corridor. It is anticipated that the proposed system will improve travel times for general traffic and the future transit system.

When incidents occur along Highway 401 and traffic is diverted onto the Hespeler Road corridor, the traffic management system will sense the change in traffic demands and modify the signal operations accordingly. Operators will have the ability confirm the new traffic demands using CCTV cameras, identify other potential by-pass routes and disseminate information to the public. It will also allow the Region’s operators to inform
MTO through centre- to-centre communication of Highway 401 related issues and resume planned operations when appropriate.

**Project Goals and Objectives**

The following are the project goals and objectives of the two identified ITS projects:

- Coordinate and manage planned and unplanned events throughout the Region;
- Disseminate information to the public, local municipalities and Regional staff;
- Integrate emerging technologies (Bluetooth, Cell phone data and others);
- Streamline the permit system for planned and unplanned events;
- Manage congestion resulting from events;
- Improve emergency vehicle response times;
- Improve traffic flow along Hespeler Road; and
- Enhance transit operations.

The work for these initiatives will be achieved through participation by different levels of government including Transport Canada, Ministry of Transportation (MTO), University of Waterloo, Region of Waterloo, area municipalities, private sector stakeholders and selected consultants.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

Strategic Objective 3.3 Optimize existing road capacity to safely manage traffic throughout Waterloo Region.

**Actions**

3.3.1 Identify and address priority transportation bottlenecks to reduce road congestion and improve safety, e.g. roundabouts, queue jump lanes for transit, turn lanes at signalized intersections, etc.

**Financial Implications**

The total estimated cost for development of the ITS applications is $586,000. Financial assistance by the Government of Canada through the Gateways and Border Crossings Fund in the form of a 50% subsidy ($293,000) will be provided for this project. The remaining $293,000 to be funded by the Region is provided for in the 2014 and 2015
Transportation Capital Programs.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:
Corporate Resources – Information Technology Services

Attachments
Appendix A – Road Construction and Incident Management System
Appendix B – Hespeler Road Corridor Traffic Management System

Prepared By: Egerton Heath, Supervisor, Traffic Systems Management

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Road Construction and Incident Management System

Contributions and Funding:
Transportation Canada $91,475
Region of Waterloo $91,475
In-Kind Contributions $15,600

Description (what the Region gets):
The Road Construction and Incident Management System will allow the Region to coordinate, manage and communicate roadway related events.

As part of the scope of this project, the Region will acquire:

- A report documenting the Region’s requirements for the system
- A market scan of available products and options
- The new RCIMS software, databases
- Installation, training and support

The project includes the ability to:

- Interface with other systems and data sources
- Allow access for a wide range of Regional (and non-Regional) staff
With the system, the Region can:

- Notify other Regional staff and stakeholders of the event along with the status and related information
- Communicate event details to the general public.
- Better coordinate maintenance, closures and incidents both on the Regional Roads as well as the adjacent roads belonging to municipalities and the Province

Other Factors:

- Does not require an increase in Regional staff
- Can be integrated into the Region’s existing and future traffic control systems
Hespeler Road Corridor Traffic Management System

Contributions and Funding:
Transportation Canada        $201,507
Region of Waterloo           $201,507
In-Kind Contributions        $34,400

Description (what the Region gets)
The Corridor Traffic Management System proposed for Hespeler Road will expand on the technologies that are currently operating along this corridor. The following additional components will be added:

- Three new closed circuit television cameras
- Five new vehicle detector stations
- Four new Bluetooth stations

The project includes:
- A process to automatically adjust the signal timing based on live traffic demands
- A review of vehicle detection technologies with the best option used for 5 new stations
- A complete Bluetooth system to provide “real-time” and historical travel time information

With the system, the Region can:
- Quickly identify incidents
- Continuously optimize the signal timing plans with the traffic demands
- Monitor the corridor
- Respond to changes in traffic demands
- Manage traffic during construction

Other Factors:
- Does not require an increase in Regional staff
- Can be integrated into the Region’s existing and future traffic control systems and communications infrastructure
Report: E-14-041

Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Water Services

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

Date: April 1, 2014
File Code: E02-60/4134

Subject: Water Supply for the Fountain Street and Maple Grove Area Class Environmental Assessment: Notice of Completion

Recommendation:

That The Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to the Water Supply for the Fountain Street and Maple Grove Area Class Environmental Assessment according to Report E-14-041 dated April 1, 2014:

a) Receive the report entitled “Water Supply Study for the Fountain Street and Maple Grove Area Class Environmental Assessment: Environmental Study Report” prepared by MTE Consultants Inc., dated March 28, 2014, and

b) Direct Transportation and Environmental Services staff to issue the Notice of Completion of Environmental Study Report, and to file the Environmental Study Report for public review in accordance with Municipal Class Environmental Assessment requirements.

Summary:

In 2005, the Region initiated the Integrated Urban System Optimization and Expansion Project (IUS Project) in order to meet the recommendations of the Region’s Water Supply Master Plan. The IUS Project identified Fountain Street and Maple Grove as one area to develop new water supplies and restore existing infrastructure. Accordingly, the Region completed a Schedule C Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) to define the preferred alternative of the water supply system.
The major components of the recommended water supply system include:

- Rehabilitation of existing Region well P16
- Construction of a new well at the Region’s Maple Grove property
- Construction of a water treatment plant at the Region’s Maple Grove property to disinfect and to remove iron and manganese.

The project included direct consultation with adjacent property owners and government agencies, as well as four public open houses. Based on the on-going update to the Region’s Water Supply Master Plan, the implementation schedule for preferred alternative is approximately 2021 to 2023.

**Report:**

**Background**

In 2000, the Region adopted the Long Term Water Strategy (LTWS) as its Water Supply Master Plan in order to ensure long-term water supply to the Region until the year 2041. An update of the Water Supply Master Plan, completed in 2007, confirmed the components were still relevant including the development of new groundwater supplies up to 23 ML/d between the years of 2018 and 2020.

In order to meet the recommendations of the LTWS, the Region initiated the Integrated Urban Supply Optimization and Expansion Project (IUS Project) in 2005. The Maple Grove and Fountain Street area is a potential source for new water supply and to restore the existing supply.

In April 2009, Regional Council approved retaining a consultant to carry out the Maple Grove Road and Fountain Street Water Supply System Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) (E-09-048 dated April 21, 2009).

The Class EA included hydrogeologic investigations and other studies to determine the preferred approach to meet future water demands in the Fountain Street and Maple Grove area. The study has been conducted as a Schedule C Environmental Assessment in accordance with the Municipal Engineers’ Association Class Environmental Assessment Process (October 2000, as amended in 2007 and 2011) including public consultation and preparation of the Environmental Study Report (ESR). The consulting assignment also included preparing a preliminary design report for the water supply system.
In late spring 2014, the Region will complete an update of the Water Supply Master Plan. This study has confirmed the long-term need for the new facility described in this report. The timeline for implementation, however, has been deferred to approximately 2021 to 2023.

**Municipal Class Environmental Assessment**

The objectives of the Fountain Street and Maple Grove Area Class Environmental Assessment were to:

- Provide additional water supply to meet anticipated future demands in the IUS.
- Recognize opportunity to restore capacity of existing infrastructure (Region well P16 on Fountain Street).
- Investigate the water supply potential at the Regional site located on Maple Grove Road.

A detailed hydrogeologic study including an aquifer test was completed. This included the testing of two wells: a test well (located behind the Waterloo Regional Police facility on Maple Grove Road) and the existing P16 well on Fountain Street. The hydrogeologic study concluded that the deep aquifer in this area could provide a sustainable supply of water up to 83L/s. Treatment requirements for this proposed source includes iron and manganese removal and the disinfection.

**Public and Agency Consultation**

Every stage in the EA process incorporated public consultation. The consultation included four Public Information Centers and mailings to adjacent property owners and agencies. In addition to the invitations mailed to interested parties, notices of the Centers were posted in the Waterloo Region Record and the Cambridge Times.

The Public information Centers occurred on October 7, 2009, March 1, 2012, September 20, 2012, and October 11, 2012, at the Region’s Operation Center on Maple Grove Road. During the public consultation process, concerns expressed by property owners and residents in the area related primarily to impacts on private water supply wells. These concerns were addressed by presenting the water quality and quantity measurements taken during the pumping test and by explaining the Region’s Well Interference Policy.
Residents in the study area were informed of the details of the testing prior to the start of pumping. Every owner of a private well monitored during the test was provided a copy of their results.

**Determining the Preferred Alternative for Water Source and Overall Configuration**

The Class EA evaluated a range of potential alternatives based on the ability to meet the water supply and quality objectives; and impacts to the natural, social, economic, jurisdictional and technical environments. The evaluation process included comments from the public and agencies during the public consultation process.

The three alternatives were:

**Alternative 1:** Upgrade well P16 on Fountain Street and develop a new production well at the Maple Grove site for a total rate of 83 L/s. This would require treatment plants at either or both locations for iron and manganese removal, and disinfection.

**Alternative 2:** Develop a new production well at the Maple Grove site at a rate of 60 L/s. This alternative would require a treatment plant for iron and manganese removal, and disinfection at this site.

**Alternative 3:** Upgrade well P16 on Fountain Street to provide 23 L/s. This alternative would require improvements to the existing treatment plant for iron and manganese removal, and disinfection.

The evaluation of the degree of positive impact of each alternative is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Alternative 1 P16 and Maple Grove</th>
<th>Alternative 2 Maple Grove</th>
<th>Alternative 3 P16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Environment</td>
<td>Moderate to high</td>
<td>Moderate to high</td>
<td>Moderate to high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Moderate to high</td>
<td>Moderate to high</td>
<td>Moderate to high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate to high</td>
<td>Moderate to high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdictional</td>
<td>Moderate to high</td>
<td>Moderate to high</td>
<td>Moderate to high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Moderate to high</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Moderate to high</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on this assessment, Alternative 1 is the preferred water source alternative.
Preferred Alternative for Water Supply Infrastructure

The next step in the Class EA process consisted of defining the preferred alternative for the water supply infrastructure. The four design concepts considered were:

- Alternative a.: Central water treatment plant located at P16 site
- Alternative b.: Central water treatment plant located at Maple Grove site
- Alternative c.: Separate water treatment plants located at both the P16 and Maple Grove sites
- Alternative d.: Central water treatment plant located at Freeport Tower site

The evaluation of the degree of positive impact of the four alternatives is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process Requirements</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Restrictions</td>
<td>Moderate to high</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate to high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Moderate to high</td>
<td>Moderate to high</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate to high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Moderate to high</td>
<td>Moderate to high</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate to high</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the greatest degree of positive impact, Alternative b., a central treatment plant at the Maple Grove site, is the preferred infrastructure alternative.

Preferred Alternative

Based on the public consultation and evaluation, combined treatment of water supplied from both P16 and the Maple Grove well is the preferred alternative. The major components of this alternative include the following:

- Utilization of production wells at both P16 and the Maple Grove site with a maximum combined flow of 83 L/s.
- Construction of an iron and manganese removal and disinfection facility at the Maple Grove site.

No land acquisition will be required.
Next Steps
An Environmental Study Report (ESR) for this study documents the background studies, systematic evaluation of alternatives and identification of the preferred alternative.

Subject to Regional Council approval of the recommendations of this report, Regional staff is recommending the completion of the Class Environmental Assessment Process by:

- Issuing the Notice of Completion by means of advertisements in local newspapers and mailings to affected property owners, municipalities, and agencies.
- Making the ESR available for public review for a 30-day public review.

Based on the ongoing update of the Water Supply Master Plan, the anticipated timeline for implementation of the Fountain Street and Maple Grove supply is approximately 2021 to 2023.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

Implementation of the Maple Grove Water Supply project will support the Region’s Strategic Plan Focus Area 2: “Growth Management and Prosperity, Strategic Objective 2.2 Develop, optimize, and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs.”

Financial Implications:

The Region’s 2014 Ten Year Water Capital Program provides $5.7 million between 2020 and 2023 for the design, administration, and construction of the Maple Grove water supply facility. Upon completion of detailed design, staff will develop more detailed cost estimates and update the 10-year Water Capital Program. Operating costs will also be evaluated and incorporated in future operating budgets and user rates. The source of funds for the project is 100% Regional Development Charges.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:
Nil

Attachments
Nil

Prepared By: Amy Domaratzki, Senior Hydrogeologist, Water Services
Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Region of Waterloo

Planning, Housing and Community Services

Community Planning

To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: April 1, 2014  File Code: D18-01


Recommendation:

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

- Approved the following part lot control exemption by-law;
- Accepted the following plan of subdivision;
- Draft approved the following plan of condominium;
- Modified the following plan of condominium; and
- Released for registration the following draft plan of condominium.

Report:

City of Cambridge

Draft Approval of Plan of Condominium 30T-13104

Applicant: Deercrest Park
Location: 635 Saginaw Parkway
Proposal: To permit the development of 90 residential townhouse condominium units.
Draft Approval of Plan of Condominium 30T-13104

Regional Processing Fee: Paid December 19, 2013
Commissioner’s Approval: February 3, 2014

Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-13105

Phase: Entire Plan
Draft Approval Date: November 28, 2013
Applicant: Old Galt Lofts Inc.
Location: 24 Cedar Street
Proposal: To convert an existing vacant three storey industrial building into 27 residential condominium apartment units.

Regional Processing Fee: Paid January 30, 2014
Commissioner’s Release: February 14, 2014

Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-13103

Phase: Entire Plan
Draft Approval Date: October 16, 2013
Applicant: Mattamy (Hespeler) Limited
Location: 125 Black Bridge Road
Proposal: To permit the development of 13 residential condominium townhouse units.

Regional Processing Fee: Paid February 18, 2014
Commissioner’s Release: February 18, 2014

Modification to Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-10106

Draft Approval Date: August 26, 2010
Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-13103

Applicant: Preston Meadows Developments Ltd.
Location: 505, 535, 565 Margaret Street
Proposal: To amend the current identification of common element visitor parking spaces on the draft approved plan to common element exclusive use.

Regional Processing Fee: Paid November 29, 2013
Commissioner’s Approval: February 27, 2014
Came Into Effect: Immediately

City of Waterloo

Part Lot Control Exemption By-law 2014-007

Applicant: Carey Homes
Location: Montpellier Drive
Proposal: To permit the creation of 1 semi-detached residential unit.

Regional Processing Fee: Paid February 5, 2014
Commissioner’s Approval: February 7, 2014

Plan of Subdivision Application 30T-14401

Date Accepted: February 14, 2104
Applicant: 2257818 Ontario Inc.
Location: 310 Erbsville Road
Proposal: To permit the development of 8 single detached residential units.

Regional Processing Fee: Paid February 4, 2014

Township of Wilmot

Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-11601

Phase: Entire Plan
Draft Approval Date: October 22, 2013
Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-11601

Applicant: PAB Holdings Limited
Location: 250 Hostettler Road, New Hamburg
Proposal: To permit the development of 13 residential townhouse units.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid February 7, 2014
Commissioner’s Release: February 27, 2014

Residential Subdivision Activity January 1, 2014 to February 28, 2014

<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>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>141</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>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Waterloo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>588</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, 2013 to February 28, 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>27</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Municipality</td>
<td>Units in Residential Registered Plans</td>
<td>Residential Units Draft Approved</td>
<td>Pending Plans (Units Submitted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>531</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>115</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>734</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: April 1, 2014

File Code: C13-20/CA, T15-40/58

Subject: Amendment to Regional Municipality of Waterloo Controlled Access By-Law #58-87 for Access to Regional Road #58 (Fischer-Hallman Road), City Of Waterloo

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve an amendment to Controlled Access By-law #58-87 for a private street access on the east side of Regional Road #58 (Fischer-Hallman Road) approximately 445 metres north of Columbia Street in the City of Waterloo, as described in Report No. P-14-034, dated April 1, 2014.

Summary:

The University of Waterloo is proceeding toward registration of Stage 1 of the plan of subdivision for the Northwest Campus lands in the City of Waterloo. The property is located north of Columbia Street and is bounded by Regional Road #58 (Fischer-Hallman Road), Regional Road #58 (Bearinger Road), Regional Road #50 (Westmount Road), and Waterloo North Hydro/Union Gas properties (please see Attachment A - Key Map).

As part of the Stage 1 registration, a private street (Street A) is proposed to intersect on the east side of Fischer-Hallman Road approximately 445 metres north of Columbia Street (please see Attachment B - Proposed Amendment to Controlled Access By-law #58-87). Since Fischer-Hallman Road is designated as a Controlled Access – Prohibited roadway in the Region’s Controlled Access By-law #58-87 from Laurelwood Drive to Regional Road #57 (University Avenue), an amendment to this by-law is required prior to issuance of an Access Permit for the private Street A.

Approval in principle for a Street A intersection with Fischer-Hallman Road was approved by Regional Council on June 16, 2010 through Report No. P-10-050, however...
at that time, Street A (identified as Access C in the report) was located to the south of its current proposed location.

Street A is not proposed to be constructed at this time; however, approval of the by-law amendment would be required to formalize the intersection of Street A with Fischer-Hallman Road and allow registration of Stage 1 of the plan of subdivision.

City of Waterloo staff and the University of Waterloo have been involved in the planning process for the Northwest Campus lands and are in support of the intersection of Street A with Fischer-Hallman Road.

Region of Waterloo staff have reviewed the location of proposed Street A with Fischer-Hallman Road and recommend support of the proposed by-law amendment.

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 University of Waterloo is proceeding toward registration of Stage 1 of the Plan of Subdivision for the Northwest Campus lands in the City of Waterloo. The property is located north of Columbia Street and is bounded by Regional Road #58 (Fischer-Hallman Road), Regional Road #58 (Bearinger Road), Regional Road #50 (Westmount Road), and Waterloo North Hydro/Union Gas properties (please see Attachment A - Key Map).

A portion of Stage 1 of these lands has currently been developed with the City of Waterloo YWCA and Library on Block 1. RBJ Schlegel Holdings Incorporated is in the process of constructing a long term residential care facility, retirement home and seniors’ apartments as well as a Centre for Learning, Research and Innovation in Long Term Care on Block 5.

As part of the Stage 1 registration, a private street (Street A) is proposed to intersect on the east side of Fischer-Hallman Road approximately 445 metres north of Columbia Street (Please see Attachment B - Proposed Amendment To Controlled Access By-law #58-87). Since Fischer-Hallman Road is designated as a Controlled Access – Prohibited roadway in the Region’s Controlled Access By-law #58-87 from Laurelwood Drive to Regional Road #57 (University Avenue), an amendment to this by-law is required prior to issuance of an Access Permit for Street A.

Approval in principle for a Street A intersection with Fischer-Hallman Road was approved by Regional Council on June 16, 2010 through Report No. P-10-050.
However at that time, Street A (identified as Access C in the report) was located to the south of its current proposed location. Street A was relocated to the north to provide increased separation from the existing intersection of Fischer-Hallman Road and Gatestone Boulevard, the abutting Union Gas, and Waterloo North Hydro properties.

Street A is not proposed to be constructed at this time; however, approval of the by-law amendment would be required to formalize the intersection of Street A with Fischer-Hallman Road and allow registration of Stage 1 of the plan of subdivision. The University of Waterloo has entered into an agreement with the Region of Waterloo to update transportation impact studies and provide engineering plans and funds for any intersection improvements and traffic control required in the future at the intersection of Street A with Fischer-Hallman Road.

The Region of Waterloo is currently proposing to widen Fischer-Hallman Road/Bearinger Road to four lanes from Columbia Street to Westmount Road in 2020, with the Environmental Assessment and design proposed to commence in 2016.

Region of Waterloo staff have reviewed the location of proposed Street A with Fischer-Hallman Road and recommend support of the proposed by-law amendment.

The University of Waterloo is in support of the proposed intersection of Street A with Fischer-Hallman Road.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

City of Waterloo staff has been involved in the planning process for the Northwest Campus lands and are in support of the intersection of Street A with Fischer-Hallman Road. A copy of this report has been sent to the City of Waterloo 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:

All costs to construct the intersection of Street A and any road improvements on Fischer-Hallman Road would be the responsibility of the University of Waterloo.

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 Fischer-Hallman Road.
Attachments:
Attachment A – Key Map
Attachment B – 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 A – Key Map
Attachment B – Proposed Amendment to Controlled Access By-law #58-87
Region of Waterloo

Planning, Housing and Community Services

Community Services

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

Date: April 1, 2014  File Code: D15-60 (A)

Subject: Year End 2013 Population and Household Estimates for the Region of Waterloo

Recommendation:

That Regional Council receive Report No. P-14-036, Year End 2013 Population and Household Estimates for the Region of Waterloo, dated April 1, 2014, for information, and make this report available to the community.

Summary:

Each year, an estimate of the year-end population and households is produced for the Region and each Area Municipality by Regional staff (please see Table 1). The Regional population as of year-end 2013 is estimated at 563,000 including university and college students temporarily residing in the Region.

The annual population growth rate of 1.2% was somewhat higher than the previous year (0.8%), but remains below the fifteen-year average rate of 1.75%. The estimated number of households is 201,080, a growth rate of 1.3%, similar to that for population. These levels show that the Region continues to grow at a healthy rate, reflecting the diversity of the local economy and the community’s desirability as a place to reside.

The Regional figures are based on Census population and household data; however, they additionally include an estimate of temporary post-secondary students and the Census undercount, at year-end, and therefore provide a more useful estimate of the total number of people and households that require services such as water, social services, transportation, and policing.

Tables in this report are proposed to be included in a Planning Information Bulletin to be distributed to Area Municipalities and other parties, as well as being posted on the Region’s website for broader community access.
Population estimates are used by many Regional and Area Municipal departments, agencies, boards, and community groups to understand land use, plan infrastructure and service programs, calculate service costs per resident, assess housing needs and track health-related trends.

Report:

Population and Household Estimates

Table 1 provides the year-end 2013 population and household estimates for all Area Municipalities, with 2012 comparators. The population estimate for year-end 2013 is 563,000. This represents an increase of 6,600 people or 1.2% over the population estimate for 2012 of 556,400. Of the Area Municipalities, Woolwich experienced the highest annual growth rate, at 3.2%, representing 770 additional people. In absolute growth, Waterloo grew the most, with 3,500 new residents, representing a growth rate of 2.7%.

The estimated number of households in the Region is 201,080. Households are equivalent to “occupied dwellings”. Growth in households from 2012 is 2,600 units (1.3%), slightly more than the growth in the previous year. In 2013, the largest increase in the households occurred in Waterloo, which grew by 1,210, a 3.0% increase over 2012, and accounting for over half of the Region’s growth of households. Fully half of Waterloo’s increase was in student households.

The calculated Persons Per Unit (PPU) for year-end 2013 remains at 2.72, representing the estimated Regional population in regular households in relation to the number of households in the Region. This PPU value includes the students who are resident in the Region, as well as the under-coverage rate applied to Regional population estimates. It should be noted that the average number of persons per unit (PPU) has been declining for several decades according to Census data. This trend has been the result of smaller and fewer families, increased economic well-being and independence, and an aging population. However, the overall PPU calculated using the above definition has resulted in relatively stable overall PPUs for the past five years, due to the increase in the number of post-secondary students in the Region, who often live in units with much higher PPUs.

Although the population and household estimates in this report are intended to provide a standard reference for all Regional activities, it is important to recognize that there are specific needs and perspectives that require variations on the basic definitions used in this report. These differences may apply to the actual timing of the estimates (e.g., mid-year rather than year end), to the geography (such as a service area rather than a municipality), or the content (for example, the exclusion of temporary students). These special considerations apply in many areas, such as health services, road signs, water and wastewater monitoring, and development charge studies. Therefore, values cited in some studies may appear to differ from this report, when in fact they are consistent after allowance is made for the kinds of differences noted above.
Table 1 - Year-end 2013 Population and Household Estimates for the Region of Waterloo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Region of Waterloo**</th>
<th>Cambridge</th>
<th>Kitchener</th>
<th>North Dumfries</th>
<th>Waterloo</th>
<th>Wellesley</th>
<th>Wilmot</th>
<th>Woolwich</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population Year-end 2013</strong></td>
<td>563,000</td>
<td>132,700</td>
<td>233,700</td>
<td>9,640</td>
<td>131,100</td>
<td>10,920</td>
<td>20,350</td>
<td>24,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population in Regular Households</td>
<td>546,500</td>
<td>130,800</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>9,620</td>
<td>121,100</td>
<td>10,920</td>
<td>20,100</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population in Collective Dwellings***</td>
<td>16,530</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>3,760</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9,930</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population Year-end 2012</strong></td>
<td>556,400</td>
<td>132,400</td>
<td>231,800</td>
<td>9,550</td>
<td>127,600</td>
<td>10,890</td>
<td>20,170</td>
<td>23,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Population</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Change 2012-2013 (%)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Households Year-end 2013</strong></td>
<td>201,080</td>
<td>47,810</td>
<td>89,240</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>41,930</td>
<td>3,210</td>
<td>7,280</td>
<td>8,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households Year-end 2012*</td>
<td>198,480</td>
<td>47,630</td>
<td>88,230</td>
<td>3,260</td>
<td>40,720</td>
<td>3,190</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>8,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Households</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Change 2012-2013 (%)</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons per Unit+</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Population (included above)</strong></td>
<td>22,550</td>
<td>-1000</td>
<td>-660</td>
<td>-90</td>
<td>24,660</td>
<td>-50</td>
<td>-170</td>
<td>-140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Arriving</td>
<td>29,780</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>2,890</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25,930</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in Student Residences</td>
<td>8,740</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,210</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in Other Accommodations</td>
<td>21,040</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17,730</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Although based on the Census of 2011, this number includes adjustments for students and other foreign/temporary residents, Census undercoverage, and vacancy rates. Due to various corrections and adjustments, direct comparisons to last year's estimates may not be valid.

** Municipal Totals may not add due to independent rounding.

*** Collective Dwellings include student residences, nursing homes, hospitals, penitentiaries, larger lodging houses, etc.

+ 'Persons per Unit' (PPU) calculation is based on the 'Population in Regular Households', not on 'Total Population'.

++ These are students who leave home to attend school. They represent the reverse flow of the temporary students arriving here from elsewhere.
The temporary student population represents a substantial component of the difference between Census and Regional population estimates, and contributes to the growth in total population. Reviews of the post-secondary student population are on-going and undertaken in conjunction with projects such as Waterloo’s Town & Gown Committee, and based on recent data from the University of Waterloo, Wilfrid Laurier University and Conestoga College. This work is resulting in a better understanding of the many facets of the student population in the Region.

There are now an estimated 58,860 post-secondary students enrolled in full-time programs of Conestoga College, the University of Waterloo, and Wilfrid Laurier University, on the campuses that are located in Waterloo Region, as shown in Table 2. Not included are the students at smaller schools such as business and technical training colleges, as well as thousands of students with part-time enrolments at our local schools, but who typically already live in the Region, or who commute in for these programs, and therefore do not add to the local population.

Table 2 - University and College Enrolment by Institution (Fall 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conestoga</th>
<th>Waterloo</th>
<th>Laurier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Enrolment</td>
<td>12,270</td>
<td>33,140</td>
<td>13,450</td>
<td>58,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuters, co-op work term, etc.</td>
<td>3,770</td>
<td>5,650</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident in Region</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>27,490</td>
<td>12,870</td>
<td>48,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Residents</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>18,820</td>
<td>9,930</td>
<td>29,780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With respect to the full-time students at the college and two universities, including undergraduate, graduate and post-graduate levels, an estimated 48,860 students are resident in the Region, while another 10,000 are estimated to live outside the Region, and either commute in for school, are on co-op work terms, or have other arrangements. Of those that reside in the Region, it is further estimated that 29,780 are temporary residents close to their campus, while their primary place of residence remains elsewhere, typically at the home of their parents.

Of these estimated 29,780 students residing temporarily in the Region as of year-end 2013, there are approximately 8,740 in student residences, and 21,040 living elsewhere in the community. Conversely, there are an estimated 7,240 students whose home is within the Region, but who reside elsewhere during the school year. After considering the flows of students, both into and out of the Region, the net effect of post-secondary students on the population of Waterloo Region is 22,550 people, as summarized in Table 1.

The household estimates contained in this report differ from the number of dwellings occupied by usual residents reported in the Census, due to the following adjustments:

- vacancy rates in rental accommodations, which have risen to 2.9% in 2013 (from 2.6% in 2012) as reported by Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation;
- some student households, since the Census figure does not include dwellings solely occupied by foreign and temporary residents; and
- growth during the time period from mid-May to year-end.
A more detailed description of the methodology used to create the year-end population and household estimates is contained in Appendix 1 to this report.

**Population and Household Trends**

Adjustments of population and dwelling estimates (that had previously been based on Census data) have been made as National Household Survey data has become available. The new data, as well as cancellation of building permits and other updates to historical data, necessitate retroactive adjustments to previous years’ population and household estimates.

Table 3 provides revised estimates for the 1991-2013 periods, together with a preliminary forecast for year-end 2014 based on recent building activity. It is anticipated that 2014 population increase will be similar to the 2013 growth, despite the recent tapering of new permit activity, due to the future occupation of large numbers of apartment units which were issued building permits in recent years.

The fifteen-year period from 1999 to 2013 approximates one complete cycle in the housing market, during which the Region’s population grew by an average of 8,360 per annum, or 1.70%. The most recent five-year period, from 2009 to 2013, has been characterized by more moderate growth in Waterloo Region, with average annual growth of 6,100 people (1.24%) and 2,452 households per year (1.27%).
Table 3 – Long-term Trends in Population and Households: Region of Waterloo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year-end</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Change (%)</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Change (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>399,400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>137,140</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>406,600</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>140,260</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>411,900</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>143,090</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>418,000</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>146,280</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>421,100</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>148,080</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>424,000</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>149,640</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>430,200</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>152,010</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>437,600</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>154,950</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>446,200</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>158,270</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>454,800</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>161,590</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>465,400</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>164,620</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>475,800</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>167,550</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>485,600</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>170,830</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>498,400</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>175,060</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>509,200</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>178,790</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>517,500</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>182,230</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>523,300</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>185,150</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>532,500</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>188,820</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>536,700</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>189,850</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>544,500</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>193,260</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>551,900</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>196,520</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>556,400</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>198,480</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>563,000</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>201,080</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014*</td>
<td>569,000</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>204,020</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5-yr average: 6,100 1.24 2,452 1.27
15-yr average: 8,360 1.70 3,075 1.75

* Projected.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

This report has been circulated to all Area Municipalities.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

Many of the objectives and actions contained in the Corporate Strategic Plan rely on estimates of population and households, including Strategic Objectives 2.2 “Develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs”, and 5.3 “Ensure Regional programs and services are efficient and effective and demonstrate accountability to the public.”
Financial Implications
Nil.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:
Nil.

Attachments:
Attachment 1 - Methodology for Estimation of Regional Year-end Population

Prepared By: Virgil Martin, Planning Information Specialist

Margaret Parkin, Manager, Planning Information and Research

Approved By: Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Housing and Community Services
Attachment 1

Methodology for Estimation of Regional Year-end Population

An estimate of the current population and households in the Region is prepared by Planning, Housing and Community Services staff each year. The estimate is primarily based on the most recent Census of Canada, which was May 2011. The Census data provides a 2011 count of 507,096 population and 191,595 occupied dwellings, and is further described in a series of Census Bulletins for Waterloo Region prepared by Regional staff and available on the Region’s website. Additional demographic and dwelling characteristics data, which shed further light on students and other aspects of population and dwellings, became available through the National Household Survey in 2013. The Census estimate of undercoverage for the 2011 Census will be available in 2014. Estimates of 2011, 2012 and 2013 population and households are being adjusted as required, as this data becomes available.

While the Region’s population and household estimates are anchored to 2011 Census estimates, in the subsequent inter-censal years (2012 – 2015), the households and their related populations are extrapolated using building activity. Building permits are received from the Area Municipalities, and an estimated occupancy date is assigned to each building permit. The estimated lag between building permit issuance and occupancy varies by dwelling type. These sources are supplemented by data from the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC), correlated with a visual inspection of recent aerial photography, and data such as vacancy rates published by Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC). As a result, the growth in households cannot be directly compared to building activity in each year.

Although the Census population and household counts provide the foundation data, the estimate of population contained in this report differs from the population reported by the Census in several ways. To best reflect the total number of people consuming services at year-end within the Region, adjustments are made to include:

- the Census net under-coverage (those people who were missed or double counted by the Census). Net under-coverage will not be available from Statistics Canada until 2014. Until then, a four per cent under-coverage is assumed, consistent with 2006, and with Places to Grow assumptions;
- temporary residents in the Region, most notably students who study at our post-secondary institutions; and
- growth during the time period from mid-May to year-end.
Region of Waterloo

Transportation and Environmental Services

Design and Construction

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

Date: April 1, 2014

File Code: C04-30, 5416, 5420

Subject: St. Andrews Street Improvements from Grand Avenue southerly to the City of Cambridge boundary and Cedar Street Improvements from Osborne Street westerly to the City of Cambridge boundary – Recommended Design

Recommendation:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to proposed improvements on St. Andrews Street and Cedar Street in the City of Cambridge:

a) approve the Recommended Design Alternative for both St. Andrews Street from Grand Avenue southerly to the Cambridge Boundary and Cedar Street from Osborne Street westerly to the Cambridge Boundary as outlined in Report E-14-039; and

b) amend Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended, upon completion of construction to accommodate the proposed improvements as follows:

i. Remove from Schedule 1, No Parking, Anytime on both sides of Cedar Street (Regional Road 97) from Barrie Street to Glenmorris Street;

ii. Remove from Schedule 1, No Parking, Anytime on the north side of St. Andrews Street (Regional Road 75) from Grand Avenue (Regional Road 76) to Churchill Drive;

iii. Remove from Schedule 1, No Parking, Anytime on the south side of St. Andrews Street (Regional Road 75) from Grand Avenue (Regional Road 76) to Fraser Street;
iv. Remove from Schedule 1, No Parking, Anytime on both sides of St. Andrews Street (Regional Road 75) from Cedar Street (Regional Road 97) to Fourth Avenue;

v. Add to Schedule 1, No Parking, Anytime on both sides of Cedar Street (Regional Road 97) from 135 metres west of Grand Ridge Drive to Osborne Street;

vi. Add to Schedule 1, No Parking, Anytime on both sides of St. Andrews Street (Regional Road 75) from Grand Avenue (Regional Road 76) to 475m south of Grand Ridge Drive;

vii. Add to Schedule 24, Reserved Cycling Lanes, Anytime on both sides of Cedar Street (Regional Road 97) from 135 metres west of Grand Ridge Drive to Osborne Street; and

viii. Add to Schedule 24, Reserved Cycling Lanes, Anytime on both sides of St. Andrews Street (Regional Road 75) from Grand Avenue (Regional Road 76) to 475m south of Grand Ridge Drive.

Summary:

The Region of Waterloo plans to reconstruct St. Andrews Street and Cedar Street in the City of Cambridge in 2016/2017. The reconstruction limits on St. Andrews Street are from Grand Avenue southerly 2.8 km to the Cambridge municipal boundary. The limits on Cedar Street are from Osborne Street westerly 1.2 km to the Cambridge municipal boundary. Please refer to Appendix ‘A’ for a project Key Plan. The two projects have been combined together for planning purposes since they are in such close proximity and since the construction phase will require careful coordination between the two streets for the maintenance of traffic and access for the public.

A Project Team was established to direct the project, consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo and the City of Cambridge, as well as City of Cambridge Councillors Gary Price and Pam Wolf, and the Region’s consultant IBI Group.

Improvements are required on both streets to address the deteriorated roadway condition, the lack of cycling facilities, the lack of pedestrian facilities in some sections, and to replace aged sections of watermain and storm and sanitary sewers.

The Project Team developed a preferred design for the project which was presented to the public at a Public Consultation Centre in October 2013. The preferred design included: full reconstruction of the existing roads; road widening to accommodate on-road cycling lanes; new sidewalk or multi-use trail where no sidewalk exists today; new turning lanes at a number of intersections; and new pedestrian refuge islands at select locations. An easterly shift in the alignment of St. Andrews Street was proposed in the
vicinity of Southwood Drive to accommodate the proposed cycling lanes and multi-use trail along the frontage of a commercial plaza on the west side of St. Andrews Street.

Approximately sixty (60) people attended the PCC and twelve (12) comment sheets were received, along with a petition signed by twenty-seven (27) tenants of #273-295 St. Andrews Street concerned with the proposed removal of shoulder parking adjacent to a townhouse complex. Subsequent to the PCC, Regional staff met with a tenant representative of the townhouse complex. Staff has also verified that the shoulders are used on a regular basis for overflow parking from the townhouse complex. Since there is ample available road allowance and no visibility or safety concerns, it is now proposed that a number of parking spaces be maintained behind the new proposed curb at this location.

The other main issues expressed by the public included concerns with safety and traffic congestion at two commercial plazas within the project limits. A new left turn lane is proposed near the commercial property on St. Andrews Street at Southwood Drive, which will alleviate congestion at this location. In addition, the removal of a redundant right turn lane on Cedar Street at the Westgate Centre plaza will simplify operations in and out of that plaza. A complete record of all comments received and the Project Team’s detailed responses is contained in Appendix ‘C’.

The Project Team is now recommending a final Design Alternative to Regional Council for approval, as described in detail in the body of this report. Subject to Council approval, Regional staff would commence with detailed design, property acquisitions and utility relocations to accommodate a construction start in 2016 with completion in 2017. The total estimated cost of the Regional portion of the project is $8,130,000. The City of Cambridge would be responsible to fund the sanitary sewer and watermain replacement, a share of the storm system replacement and existing sidewalk repairs in the estimated amount of $1,760,000.

Report:

1. Introduction

The Region of Waterloo plans to reconstruct St. Andrews Street and Cedar Street in the City of Cambridge in 2016/2017. The reconstruction limits on St. Andrews Street are from Grand Avenue southerly 2.8 km to the Cambridge municipal boundary. The limits on Cedar Street are from Osborne Street westerly 1.2 km to the Cambridge municipal boundary. Please refer to Appendix ‘A’ for a project Key Plan. The two projects have been combined together for planning purposes since they are in such close proximity and since the construction phase will require careful coordination between the two streets for the maintenance of traffic and access for the public.
A Project Team was established to direct the project, consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo and the City of Cambridge, as well as City of Cambridge Councillors Gary Price and Pam Wolf, and the Region’s consultant IBI Group.

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 both St. Andrews Street and Cedar Street. In general, the deterioration is due to the age of the asphalt combined with some areas of poor roadway drainage. The roadways will be fully reconstructed as part of this project.

b) Cycling Needs

There are currently no dedicated cycling facilities on either St. Andrews Street or Cedar Street. Both streets are designated cycling routes in the Region’s Active Transportation Master Plan and accordingly cycling facilities are being considered as part of this project.

The City of Cambridge also has an extensive network of cycling trails in the vicinity of St. Andrews Street and Cedar Street and is in full support of the initiative to include cycling facilities on both roads as part of this project.

Since the roads are to be totally reconstructed as part of this project, it is proposed that the roads be widened to accommodate on-road cycling lanes in accordance with the Region’s Corridor Design Guidelines for this classification of roadway. The Project Team is also proposing some multi-use trail installations on both roads in addition to on-road cycling lanes, in areas where there is sufficient road allowance and where school children are expected to make use of the multi-use trails on their way to and from school.

c) Pedestrian Needs

Currently, there are sections of St. Andrews Street and Cedar Street that do not have sidewalk. To promote and encourage walking and to reduce the use of cars, 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 St. Andrews Street and Cedar Street in support of not only the Region’s Strategic Plan but also the Transportation Master Plan, Context Sensitive Corridor Design Guidelines and the Active Transportation Master Plan.
Within the project limits, there is a high school (Southwood Secondary School) and an elementary school (St. Gregory Catholic Elementary School) and many children walk or cycle along St. Andrews Street or Cedar Street to their schools. As noted above in section b), the Project Team is proposing that wide multi-use trails be constructed in the boulevard areas in the vicinity of the schools in lieu of sidewalks to provide a comfortable user-friendly space for pedestrians and student cyclists.

It is noted that snow removal on all sidewalks is the responsibility of the abutting landowners in the City of Cambridge as per City By-Law 168-08.

d) Drainage

On both Cedar Street and St. Andrews Street, there are sections of road that do not have proper drainage facilities. There are areas with shoulders and shallow swales and there have been historical flooding problems reported at a number of private properties. As part of this project, it is proposed that these areas be reconstructed with curb and gutter, new storm sewers and catchbasins to properly collect and convey roadway drainage.

e) Underground Infrastructure Needs

There is aging infrastructure under both St. Andrews Street and Cedar Street. The City of Cambridge has requested that this project include full replacement of some sections of City watermain and sanitary sewer. In addition, the storm sewer is under-sized and in poor condition in many sections and it is recommended that the storm sewer be replaced in many areas where required due to condition or capacity.

f) Traffic Operational Issues at Various Locations

As part of the planning for this project, it was noted that there are a number of locations where operational improvements could be made to improve traffic flow and reduce collisions. The Project Team is recommending the installation of left turn lanes at 5 intersections on St. Andrews Street and at 2 intersections on Cedar Street. It is also proposed that Dale Avenue be reconfigured where it intersects Cedar Street to remove a free-flow right turn movement. In addition, the Project Team is recommending the removal of a right/through curb lane between the accesses to the Westgate Centre plaza on Cedar Street to reduce confusion for drivers using these accesses.

3. Public Consultation

Based on the project needs, the Project Team developed a preferred design for the project which was presented to the public at a Public Consultation Centre (PCC) on October 30th 2013, held at Southwood Secondary School. 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 fronting residents, property owners, and
businesses. 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 the PCC included: full reconstruction of the existing roads; road widening to accommodate on-road cycling lanes; new sidewalk or multi-use trail where no sidewalk exists today; new turning lanes at a number of intersections; and new pedestrian refuge islands at select locations.

An easterly shift in the alignment of St Andrews Street was proposed in the vicinity of Southwood Drive to accommodate the proposed cycling lanes and multi-use trail along the frontage of a commercial plaza on the west side of St Andrews Street. In addition a re-alignment of Dale Avenue was proposed to create a perpendicular intersection to Cedar Street. Also, at the Westgate Centre plaza, partial removal of the westbound right/through curb lane was proposed to reduce conflict between through traffic and plaza patrons exiting at the main entrance.

Please refer to Appendix ‘B’ for drawings of the Project Team’s preferred design alternative as presented at the PCC.

Approximately sixty (60) people attended the PCC with forty eight (48) signing the attendance register. Twelve (12) comment sheets were received along with three (3) emailed comments and a petition signed by twenty-seven (27) tenants of #273 - #295 St. Andrews Street concerned with the proposed removal of shoulder parking adjacent to the townhouse complex. Please refer to Appendix ‘C” for a summary of all written comments received from the PCC.

4. Main Issues Raised by the Public and Project Team Responses

The main issues raised by the public at the PCC and the Project Team’s response are summarized as follows:

a) Concern With The Loss Of Parking at #273-295 St. Andrews Street

Three (3) emailed comments and a petition signed by twenty-seven (27) tenants of #273-#295 St. Andrews Street were received noting concern that the proposed curb and gutter design adjacent to their townhouse complex would result in the elimination of shoulder parking for tenants and visitors. Subsequent to the PCC, Regional staff met with a representative of the townhouse complex. Staff also verified that the shoulders are used on a regular basis for overflow parking. Since there is ample available road allowance and no visibility or safety concerns and since there is considerable usage of shoulder parking in this area, it is now proposed that space for approximately nine (9) parked cars be provided behind the new proposed curb adjacent to #273-295 St.
Andrews Street. This parking would be behind a roll-over curb, and would not
detrimentally affect the function of St. Andrews Street. The cost to provide these
parking spaces would be minor since the granular base is already present under the
existing paved shoulder in this area.

b) Concerns With Safety And Traffic Congestion On St. Andrews Street Near
Southwood Drive

Four (4) comments expressed concern with the heavy volume of vehicles turning in and
out of the plaza at the corner of Southwood Drive and St. Andrews Street where there is
a PetroCanada gas station and convenience store as well as a Tim Horton’s restaurant.
Congestion at this location also leads to the “backing up” of vehicles along St. Andrews
Street.

The Project Team had earlier identified traffic operational concerns at this location and
is proposing a northbound dedicated left turn lane on St. Andrews Street at Southwood
Drive which will also extend along the frontage of the commercial site. This left turn
lane will accommodate storage for vehicles waiting to turn left into the commercial
property, without impeding northbound through vehicles.

It is also believed that the introduction of pedestrian refuge islands on St. Andrews
Street will encourage slower speeds and increase comfort for pedestrians crossing the
street and for drivers turning in and out of the commercial plaza.

c) Concerns With Safety On Cedar Street At The Westgate Centre Plaza

Two comments noted safety concerns for vehicles turning left out of the Westgate
Centre plaza onto Cedar Street. Both comments also suggested the installation of
traffic signals would be beneficial at this location.

During the planning for this project, the Project Team had reviewed the collision history
at this location. There were 19 collisions in the past 5 years at this location when 8
would be expected based on the roadway volumes and configuration. Because of the
steep grade on Cedar Street, it is also recognized that speeds are higher in the area
fronting the Westgate Centre plaza, which can compound the ability for drivers to judge
appropriate gaps in traffic.

Traffic signals are not warranted based on the Region’s signal warrant criteria.
However, the Project Team is recommending that a portion of the existing westbound
through/right curb lane (between the plaza accesses) be eliminated to reduce the points
of conflict and simplify operations in and out of the plaza. In addition, the proposed
narrower 3.35 metre lanes and the introduction of a raised pedestrian/cyclist refuge
island will provide some traffic calming and encourage slower speeds.
d) Concerns With The Initially Proposed Increase in The Left-Turn Lane Storage On St. Andrews Street At Cedar Street

Two comments expressed concern that by increasing the storage of the northbound left turn lane on St. Andrews Street at Cedar Street, there would be a significant loss of grassed frontage at their property.

The Project Team has re-visited the proposed design and following this further review, it has been determined that the existing storage length of the northbound left turn lane is adequate in its current state and will not need to be extended. The two residents who commented on the potential impacts to their properties have been contacted and are aware that the extension has been eliminated from the design and that the revised impacts at their properties are now minor.

5. Recommended Design Alternative

Based on a review of the technical information gathered for this project as well as a review of all public comments received, the Project Team is now recommending that Regional Council approve the following improvements on St. Andrews Street and Cedar Street in the City of Cambridge:

a) Proposed improvements on St. Andrews Street

• Full depth road reconstruction of St. Andrews Street;

• Widening to accommodate on-road reserved cycling lanes on both sides of St. Andrews Street from Grand Ridge Drive through the Cedar Street intersection to Grand Avenue, which will require “slivers” of property acquisitions as well as property easements for hydro poles and guyng. (Please refer to Appendix ‘D’ for the Region’s Property Acquisition Information Sheet);

• Replacement of the existing storm sewer from Southwood Drive to St. Gregory’s Drive, from Victoria Avenue to Gilholm Avenue and from Glebe Street to Grand Avenue;

• Replacement of the existing City of Cambridge watermain from Grand Ridge Drive to Southwood Drive and from Francis Street to Victoria Avenue;

• Replacement of the existing City of Cambridge sanitary sewer from Stanley Street to Francis Street and from Cedar Street to Fraser Street;

• Replacement of the existing sidewalk on both sides of St. Andrews Street with the exception of where multi-use trail is proposed;

• Construction of infill sidewalk on the east side of St. Andrews Street from 60 metres north of Grand Ridge Drive northerly to Fourth Avenue;
• Construction of a new 3.0 wide metre multi-use trail (in lieu of sidewalk) on the west side of St. Andrews Street from Grand Ridge Drive to St. Gregory’s Drive;

• Construction of designated left-turn lanes on southbound St. Andrews Street at Grand Ridge Drive, Fourth Avenue, Osborne Street and Stanley Street, and on northbound St. Andrews Street at Southwood Drive;

• Construction of raised centre islands at Grand Ridge Drive, Fourth Avenue, Southwood Drive, Osborne Street and Stanley Street in order to provide refuge areas for cyclists and pedestrians crossing St. Andrews Street and to encourage slower traffic speeds;

• Upgrades to Grand River Transit bus stops; and

• Enhanced boulevard landscaping where feasible.

In addition, an easterly shift in the alignment of St. Andrews Street is proposed in the vicinity of Southwood Drive to accommodate the proposed cycling lanes and multi-use trail along the frontage of the commercial plaza on the west side of St. Andrews Street. This easterly shift maintains the road within the current road allowance but requires the removal of a number of large trees within the Region’s right-of-way on the east side of St. Andrews Street. There are also areas on the west side of St. Andrews Street where other individual trees on steep sideslopes require removal to accommodate grading for the multi-use trail installation.

b) Proposed improvements on Cedar Street:

• Full depth road reconstruction of Cedar Street;

• Widening to accommodate on-road reserved cycling lanes on both sides of Cedar Street;

• Replacement of the existing storm sewer from Kent Street to Southwood Drive and Dale Avenue to Berkley Road;

• Replacement of the existing City of Cambridge watermain from Drew Avenue to Dale Avenue;

• Replacement of the existing City of Cambridge sanitary sewer from Drew Avenue to Southgate Road;

• Replacement of the existing sidewalk on both sides of Cedar Street with the exception of where multi-use trail is proposed;

• Construction of a 3.0 metre multi-use trail on the south side between Kent Street and Dale Avenue and on the north side between Dale Avenue and Westgate
Centre plaza in lieu of sidewalk;

- Construction of raised centre islands at Grand Ridge Drive, Kent Street, Dale Avenue and Westgate Centre plaza in order to provide refuge areas for cyclists and pedestrians crossing St. Andrews Street and to encourage slower traffic speeds;

- Upgrades to Grand River Transit bus stops; and

- Enhanced boulevard landscaping where feasible.

It is also proposed that Dale Avenue be reconfigured where it intersects Cedar Street to remove a free-flow right turn movement and to create a perpendicular intersection to Cedar Street to reduce turning travel speeds and to provide a more comfortable pedestrian crossing of Dale Avenue.

In addition, the Project Team is recommending the removal of a right turn lane between the accesses to the Westgate Centre plaza on Cedar Street to reduce confusion and to reduce conflicts between through traffic and plaza patrons exiting at the main entrance.

Appendix ‘B’ shows drawings of the Project Team’s Recommended Design Alternative, which includes cross-sections along various sections of the project and also includes plan views of the proposed changes at St. Andrews Street and Southwood Drive and Cedar Street at Dale Avenue and at the Westgate Centre plaza.

Letters advising the public of the recommendations included in this report were mailed and hand-delivered on March 14, 2014 to area residents and those who attended the PCC.

6. Project Cost

The total estimated Region of Waterloo cost for the recommended St. Andrews Street and Cedar Street improvements included in this report is $8,130,000. The City of Cambridge would be responsible to provide additional funds for the sanitary sewer and watermain replacement, a share of the storm system replacement and existing sidewalk repairs in the estimated amount of $1,760,000.

7. Project Schedule

Subject to Council approval, Regional staff would commence with detailed design, property acquisitions and utility relocations over the next 2 years with a planned construction start in 2016 and completion in 2017. As detailed design proceeds, a decision will be made as to which section of roadway should be completed first, based on a detailed assessment of construction scope and traffic management options. Work would not occur concurrently on both St. Andrews Street and Cedar Street at any time, so that the other road is always available for detouring. Based on the current extent of
underground infrastructure repair and replacement, it is expected that only one direction of traffic can be maintained during construction on St. Andrews Street with the other direction detoured along suitable alternate routes. On Cedar Street, it is expected that two directions of traffic can be maintained at all times. Regional staff will work with its consultant, City of Cambridge staff and emergency services personnel to develop staging and detour plans and will effectively communicate these plans to the public well in advance of construction.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

This project is in harmony with the Region’s Corporate Strategic Plan in that implementation of the St. Andrews Street and Cedar Street Improvements supports Focus Area 2.2 to develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs and Focus Area 3.2 to develop, promote and integrate active forms of transportation (cycling and walking).

Financial Implications

The Region’s 2014 Transportation Capital Program and Ten-Year Forecast includes combined funding of $8,130,000 in years 2014 to 2017 for these projects to be funded from the Roads Rehabilitation Reserve Fund. The City of Cambridge will fund the cost of the sanitary sewer and water main replacement, a share of the storm system replacement and repairs to the existing sidewalk in the estimated amount of $1,760,000. The City has confirmed that it has sufficient funding allocated for this work.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Staff from the Transportation Planning Division of the Planning, Housing and Community Services Department was consulted for the preparation of this report.

The Council and Administrative Services Division of the Corporate Resources Department will be required to prepare the amending By-law to prohibit parking and to reflect reserved lanes for cycling on both sides of St. Andrews Street from Grand Avenue southerly to the City of Cambridge boundary as well as on both sides of Cedar Street from Osborne Street westerly to the City of Cambridge boundary.
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Keyplan

REGIONAL ROAD No. 97 (CEDAR STREET)
OSBORNE STREET TO CAMBRIDGE BOUNDARY
REGIONAL ROAD No. 75 (ST. ANDREWS STREET)
GRAND AVENUE TO CAMBRIDGE BOUNDARY
CITY OF CAMBRIDGE
Appendix B-1

Typical Cross Section – St. Andrews Street

ST. ANDREWS STREET
GRAND AVE TO CEDAR ST.
Appendix B-2

Typical Cross Section – St. Andrews Street

ST. ANDREWS STREET
CEDAR ST. TO GRAND RIDGE DR.

Region of Waterloo

IBI GROUP
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Typical Cross Section – St. Andrews Street

ST. ANDREWS STREET
GRAND RIDGE DRIVE TO CITY LIMIT

Region of Waterloo
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Typical Cross Section – Cedar Street
Appendix B-5

Typical Cross Section
Appendix B-6

Typical Cross Section – Cedar Street

CEDAR STREET
CITY LIMITS TO KENT ST.

Region of Waterloo
Appendix B-7

Proposed Road Re-Alignment – St. Andrews Street at Southwood Drive
Appendix B-8

Proposed Lane Configuration at Westgate Centre – Cedar Street
Appendix B-9

Proposed Road Re-alignment – Cedar Street at Dale Avenue
Appendix C

October 29, 2013 PCC - Public Sign In

Number of households = 48

Number of Individuals Attended = 58

Comments Received = 6 plus a petition signed by 27 residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Information Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen &amp; Sharon Darling</td>
<td>306 Grand Ridge Dr., Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 4X1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Brenton</td>
<td>290 Cedar Cres, Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 1X1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Brombal</td>
<td>96 St. Andrews St., Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 1M8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Owens</td>
<td>59 Westwood Cr., Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 3V7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Ewing</td>
<td>304 St. Andrews St., Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 3V7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley</td>
<td>113 Victoria Ave., Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 1X8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine Ewin</td>
<td>304 St. Andrews St., Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 3V7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Edward</td>
<td>30 Applewood Cr., Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 4K2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda McGlinchey</td>
<td>101 Byton Lane, Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S4 R2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denis Moreau</td>
<td>101 Byton Lane, Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 4R2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Postal Code</td>
<td>Information Requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hans Kools &amp; Sharon Kools</td>
<td>158 St. Andrews, Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 1N3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Armstrong</td>
<td>69 Fourth Ave., Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 2E3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve and Cheryl Williams</td>
<td>115 Fourth Ave., Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 2E5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Marcy</td>
<td>6 Stephen St., Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 3R8</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross and Marg Brethet</td>
<td>14 Byron Ave., Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 1S4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristie McEwen</td>
<td>229 St Andrews St., Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 1N6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Fox</td>
<td>87 Fairlake Dr., Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 4Z4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin Stevens</td>
<td>550 Grand Ridge Dr., Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 4X9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl Poll</td>
<td>5 Southgate Rd., Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 3P6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Wolf</td>
<td>23 Lansdowne Rd. North, Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 2S7</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey Mascoll</td>
<td>1 Glenmorris St., Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 2X9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Hube</td>
<td>1 Parkwood Dr., Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 3K4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbi &amp; Glenn Drinkwater</td>
<td>2 Dale Ave., Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 3M6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Little</td>
<td>327 St. Andrews St., Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 1P4</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pana Carm</td>
<td>86 St. Andrews St., Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 1M4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Postal Code</td>
<td>Information Requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliza Kimmich</td>
<td>254 Cedar St., Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 1W8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Carr</td>
<td>8 Crestwood Dr., Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 3N9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane &amp; Rob Shipley</td>
<td>312 St. Andrews St., Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 1P3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristine &amp; Mike Gratton</td>
<td>126 Cedar St., Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 1W4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirsta Jungermann</td>
<td>Box 20070, Cambridge</td>
<td>N1R 8C8</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne &amp; Judy Anderson</td>
<td>120 St. Andrews, Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 1M9</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne &amp; Judy Anderson</td>
<td>1512 Wrigley Rd., Ayr</td>
<td>N0B 1E0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Adshade &amp; Pat Ethelston</td>
<td>136 Fairlake Dr., Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 4Z3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Coady</td>
<td>105 St. Andrews St. Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 1P1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Stuempfle</td>
<td>156 Johanna Dr., Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 4C3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean M. Howitt</td>
<td>72 St. Andrews St., Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 1M4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laney Marshall</td>
<td>68 St. Andrews St., Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 1M4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Beilor</td>
<td>487 Grand Ridge Dr., Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 4S9</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Holman</td>
<td>1282 Greenfield Rd., R.R. 4 Cambridge</td>
<td>N1R 5S5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Winkler</td>
<td>89 Byton Lane, Cambridge</td>
<td>N1S 4R2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comments received from persons not signing in at PCC #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Information Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ken and Marlene Mitchelmore</td>
<td>326 The Glen Road Woodville Ontario</td>
<td>K0M 2T0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Cycling Focus Group</td>
<td>Email from Shannon Noonan</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey Diamond President : Terrace Manor Limited</td>
<td>1407 Yonge Street Suite 303</td>
<td>M4T 1Y7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Comments resulting from PCC #1

St Andrews Street (generally ordered south to north)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve &amp; Sharon Darling</td>
<td>306 Grand Ridge Dr., Cambridge</td>
<td>We do not wish or require a walkway from our gate on St. Andrews St. to the sidewalk as we never use it. We use our driveway and gate which fronts onto Grand Ridge. We would also like to confirm that new sidewalk on St. Andrews will be maintained by sidewalk snow plow as it is now by City for kids to walk to Tait St. school and St. Gregory. This gate is kept locked at all times. Thank you.</td>
<td>Agreed – a link will not be installed. Sidewalk snow clearing is a City responsibility. This request will be forwarded to the City of Cambridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Little</td>
<td>327 St. Andrews St.</td>
<td>I am concerned about the drainage (surface) from my property. I have very little height above the existing road and I drain toward it – with no active storm sewer. I am hoping that the new road will be lower than the existing.</td>
<td>Drainage is always a consideration of the final design of a reconstruction project. Drainage in the vicinity of your project has already been identified as an issue. During final design drainage will be reviewed and appropriate drainage will be ensured (i.e., storm sewers, swales, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petition signed by 27 residents</td>
<td>273 – 295 St. Andrews St.</td>
<td>Please be advised that we the tenants of 273-295 St Andrews Street in Cambridge are concerned by the proposed removal of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>on-street parking in front of this 12 unit townhouse complex. For decades, residents of this complex have utilized and enjoyed the on-street parking for our day time visitors and also for overflow parking during times of construction / renovation or when tenants moving in or out have moving trucks which cause disruption to normal parking. Removal of this on-street parking would cause significant difficulties and challenges for us as residents and our guests as there are no other parking options nearby. With this in mind we ask that the Region reconsider the proposal and create on-street parking in front of the complex as we have been accustomed to for so many years.</td>
<td>While the current on-street parking will be removed, the Region will be replacing it with a new on-street (boulevard) parking area in proximity to the current location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooke Goad</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>I received my notice in the mail about the Region of Waterloo's upcoming construction plans for St. Andrews and Cedar Streets in Cambridge. I contacted you by phone a while ago when we received the earlier notice about adding a pedestrian crosswalk to the section of St. Andrews between Southwood and Grandridge Drives. I notice</td>
<td>No response required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I received my notice in the mail about the Region of Waterloo's upcoming construction plans for St. Andrews and Cedar Streets in Cambridge. I contacted you by phone a while ago when we received the earlier notice about adding a pedestrian crosswalk to the section of St. Andrews between Southwood and Grandridge Drives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brooke Goad</td>
<td>None given</td>
<td>that it is not one of the proposed improvements and I would like to take this opportunity to again insist that it is much needed.</td>
<td>The Project Team has also identified safety and traffic speed as an issue in this area and believes that the proposed works will improve the situation. A northbound (west per your directions) left turn lane from St Andrews onto Southwood is proposed – this lane will extend along the frontage of the PetroCan site and thus also facilitate left turns into the site. Further, the narrower traffic lanes and the introduction of pedestrian refuge islands (at Southwood, Fourth and Grand Ridge) in the centre of the road will better facilitate pedestrian crossings as well as calm (slow) traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are so many families in our neighbourhood with young children as well as many retired and even elderly couples and individuals who are at risk when crossing this very busy section of the road. The corner of St. Andrews and Southwood is particularly busy with it being an intersection at the top of the hill where you will find the driveways to an apartment complex and a gas station with a busy Tim Hortons drive through, 2 or more bus stops and government funded housing. Not far along St. Andrews is a strip mall containing 2 restaurants and a corner store as well as other shops and services. At St. Andrews and Grandridge I see many people crossing as they walk with their children, dogs or push baby strollers however, because it is the last suburban cross street before St. Andrews becomes Hwy 24A to Paris, cars are often speeding up to 80 as they are still</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Brooke Goad        | None given                                | I am unable to attend the Public Consultation Centre on Sept. 25 at Southwood Secondary School but as a committed member of my community I wanted to contact you and make my concerns known.  
  Please feel free to contact me by email or telephone at any time.  
  Thank you in advance for your consideration |                                                                                                                                                    |
| Krista Jungermann  | 19 Caledon Cr. (opposite of Francis St.)  | How far in will the trees/shrubs be cut?  
  Would an alternate hedge be planted as a visual privacy hedge?                                                                                     | The preliminary design has the western (i.e., property line) side of the multi-use path located approximately 7m from the existing St Andrews Street curb. Some grading will likely be required to match the path into the existing ground. Thus the limits of construction will be approximately 10m back from the existing curb. As a result, vegetation in this area will be impacted.  
  When existing vegetation is impacted during a reconstruction project, the Region will typically install new |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Shappit</td>
<td>199 St. Andrews St., Cambridge</td>
<td>I am concerned the road will almost be on top of our houses. Will the City still be doing the snow removal on the south side of St. Andrews Street? Is this really necessary?</td>
<td>Through the project review, the Region has determined that there is a need for creating bicycle lanes, traffic calming and better pedestrian access across St Andrews Street via a pedestrian island. Accordingly, the road needs to be widened to accommodate these facilities. Therefore the road will be widened adjacent to 199 St Andrews Street. At this location, on the north side of the street, the curb will be shifting approximately 3m, and on the south side (i.e., 199 St Andrews’ side) the curb will shift approximately 1m. The existing sidewalk will be also be replaced. The City of Cambridge Snow Removal By-law requires residents to clear snow and ice from sidewalks abutting their property within 36 hours of a snow fall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Kools &amp; Hans Kools</td>
<td>158 St. Andrews St., Cambridge</td>
<td>We Sharon Kools &amp; Hans Kools of 158 St. Andrews Street, Cambridge, On N1S 1N3 do have grave concerns with the proposed widening of St. Andrews Street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sharon Kools & Hans Kools
158 St. Andrews St., Cambridge

- Particularly as it greatly affects our home’s value. Your proposed widening would in fact bring the road 3 meters closer to our house (according to a best guess by a 12 inch scale) provided by Ken Brisbois.

The reason for this widening and the need for land expropriation or easement is to provide a lengthened left turn lane at the intersection of St. Andrews & Cedar streets. We were informed that a study has been done to prove the need for a longer turn lane. WHEN was the study done? WHAT were the findings? We have lived on this street for 30 years and have never seen a back up of traffic turning left onto Cedar Street. In fact why would you be driving into the city and then make a u turn and drive back out of the city? If the left turn lane was not lengthened it would not effect the home owners so greatly.

At the meeting there were conflicting answers to our questions: expropriation or easement? Our tree on our property: does it stay? If the road is moved closer to the tree, what effect will that have on it. We

- The road design adjacent to 158 St Andrews Street has been revised, and in particular the left turn lane. We have found that the storage length of the proposed left turn lane does not need to be extended and will remain approximately as it exists today. This will reduce the impact on the regional boulevard in front of this property, and the “mature tree” will not be removed. Further, no easements or property acquisition are required from this property.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>understood that our tree was on our property, because the city has consistently contacted us requesting to cut down the tree. If it is the city's tree why were they asking permission? We do not want the tree taken down! or damaged.</td>
<td>With the above noted modification there is not a requirement for any easements or property acquisition on your property. Further, the tree will be protected and not removed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                       |                          | The boundary lines: apparently they could not find one of the steel stakes, that we subsequently found that evening very easily. We are greatly concerned with this plan also because in 1992 there was a proposal by The Buck Variety to expand their current parking lot onto a piece of land they purchased adjacent to the Buck Variety. In order to expand the parking they demolished the house that was on the land and then applied to the city for permission. At that time they were informed that (quoted from a letter from Cumming Cockburn Limited, Scott D. Lang, P.Eng in 1993) “the Region of Waterloo required the owners of Buck Variety to widen a portion of St. Andrews Street to provide a left turn lane for access to the parking lot. Since the pavement widening extends across the frontage of your property the Region of Waterloo has
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>also made it a condition of their approval that all affected property owners fronting onto the proposed widening be contacted for any concerns.” We have the original plan: JOB No. 6856 LD DWG. NO. 6856.LD-1 showing the road widening and the “removal of existing hydro pole “by others” and “guide wire to be relocated by others” This plan of 1992 (which never went ahead) is VERY similar to the current proposed plan. This doesn't sit well with us as it seems that the tax payers would be paying for ease of access to this retail store. We were against the previous proposal and are strongly against the current one as it is not warranted!!  An advanced left turn signal at that intersection would clear (if any) back up and be more cost effective.  We are very proud of our city and we take pride in our home and so do most of our</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Kools</td>
<td>158 St. Andrews St., Cambridge</td>
<td>Traffic signals are controlled by a prescribed “Warranting process” that determines the necessity for a signal and the configuration of them (i.e., advanced turn). The Region has reviewed this intersection and determined an advanced green is not required. Hopefully the above discussion has addressed the concerns and alleviated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Kools &amp; Hans Kools</td>
<td>158 St. Andrews St., Cambridge</td>
<td>We would like to be consulted further on this matter before any more decisions are made. We have been in contact with our neighbour (landlord) who has concerns also and I have forwarded your e-mail contacts to him as he did not receive any notification at his home address. It was indicated to us that notices were sent out to the residence and to the registered property owners.</td>
<td>Your name is on the project contact list and you will continue to be notified as the project progresses. We suspect the neighbour referenced is 154 and 156 St. Andrews Street. They have also been in contact with us and we have responded to them. Again, we believe the above addresses the concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken and Marlene Mitchelmore</td>
<td>326 The Glen Road</td>
<td>Email received November 1, 2013</td>
<td>My wife and I are the owners of 154 and 156 St. Andrews Cambridge and have just heard that road widening will adversely affect our property. On principal we would like to formally object to a proposal of this nature. We are however requesting the following information to further inform our decision making process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thescope of work and timeline

The rationale behind the proposal.

When the plan what proposed and by whom.

The process for the proposal’s approval.

We live in the Lindsay area which is approximately 3 hours from Cambridge so please email, post and or advise if information can be found on the internet.

**Email received November 14, 2013**

We are opposed to the St. Andrews Street and Cedar Street Improvements as set out in this document for the following reasons:

- The value of our properties will be severely diminished due to the acquisition of land which will substantially reduce the already limited front lawn areas of 156 and 154 St Andrews.

- This proposal involves the removal of the only mature tree on the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ken and</td>
<td>326 The Glen Road</td>
<td>properties and does not allow for replanting due to the reduced front yard areas thus diminishing privacy and the potential aesthetic attributes and the curb appeal of each home.</td>
<td>The road design adjacent to 154 and 156 St Andrews Street has been revised, and in particular the left turn lane. We have found that the storage length of the proposed left turn lane does not need to be extended and will remain approximately as it exists today. This will reduce the impact on the regional boulevard in front of this property, and the &quot;mature tree&quot; will not be removed. Further, no easements or property acquisition are required from this property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlene</td>
<td>Woodville, Ontario K0M 2T0</td>
<td>The acquisition of our land restricts/eliminates our ability to extend the existing front porch areas. We have invested a great deal of capital to upgrade the interior finishes in each home with the intention of replacing/extending the existing, front entry, concrete steps and landing, all in an effort to improve the quality of our retirement investment. We see no reason to extend the left turning lane at Cedar.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Fox</td>
<td>87 Fairlake Dr</td>
<td>Thanks for the opportunity to review the proposed improvements to the above streets. The recent Open House at Southwood HS was very informative and the handout was well done. I am glad to see this project being planned. Please note my comments below:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St Andrews St:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There should be flashing yellow lights installed in the school zones in the lower sections similar to lights in other school zones in Cambridge such as along Concession Rd in Preston. The 40km speed limit is in effect only when the lights are flashing instead of having a 40km limit all the time. With new pavement, it will be even harder to stay within the present 40km limit on the downhill.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The entrance to the Petro Can Station and Tim Hortons at the top of the hill is a problem. Even as I drove home from the Open House at 6pm, there was a long lineup of cars behind 1 car coming from the west and trying to make a left turn into the gas station. Cars in the station were lined up several deep at the pumps and there was no room for cars to come into the station. I am not sure the proposed design will effectively prevent this, as well as the morning line up out in the street for the Tim Hortons drive-through. I do not have a solution for what seems to be a station and Tim's that is too</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Project Team has identified safety and traffic speed as an issue in this area and believes that the proposed works will improve the situation. A northbound (west per your directions) left turn lane from St Andrews onto Southwood is proposed – this lane will extend along the frontage of the PetroCan site and thus also facilitate left turns into the site. Further, the narrower traffic lanes and the introduction of pedestrian refuge islands in the centre of the road will calm (slow) traffic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Name | Address | Comment | Response
--- | --- | --- | ---
<p>| | big for the small property it was built on. This area needs more creative options. | Detoured traffic during construction has been identified as an issue by the project team. During final design and as part of the Construction conditions, traffic management will be addressed in order to alleviate impacts on the adjacent road network to as great an extent as possible. However, given the generally narrow roadway on St Andrews, and given the surrounding road network, we are limited in options, and thus some impact during the construction period is inevitable. We will continue to communicate with the public as the project progresses, and ask your patience during construction. At the end of construction, the road and servicing improvements will serve the area well for many years and be an improvement over existing conditions. | |
| Brian Fox | 87 Fairlake Dr, Cambridge, ON N1S 4Z4 | General: I expect there will be increased traffic trying to avoid the construction zones, for example, Grand Ridge Dr. This may cause some issues in school zones and for people trying to back out of their driveways especially at the down the hill east of Stirling-McGregor | The City of Cambridge has a by-law stating: “At the intersection of two streets and |
| | | All residences along Cedar and St Andrews on corner properties should be required to remove their hedges and fences that block | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the line of sight for at least 40 feet back from corners. An example of this is the house on the south side of St Andrews at Inverness which has a low fence that comes close to the corner and really interferes with the line of sight.</td>
<td>within the triangle formed by joining the point on the edge of the travelled portion of each street distant 15 metres from the point of intersection of the edges of the travelled portions of the two streets, as shown in Figure 7, no shrub, foliage, wall or structure shall be provided or maintained in such a location or manner so as to obstruct the view of the driver of a vehicle approaching the intersection and, in no case, shall such shrub, foliage, wall or structure be provided or maintained at a height of more than 0.75 metres.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Fox</td>
<td>87 Fairlake Dr Cambridge, ON N1S 4Z4</td>
<td>One of the goals of this project should be to maintain good traffic flow not to slow it down unless required at specific spots for safety</td>
<td>The roadway is used by many different users (i.e., vehicles, cyclists, pedestrians). It is important to design the road’s facilities to accommodate all users in an efficient and safe manner. The road also has a design speed, and is posted at 40kph and 50kph depending on the section of the road. If vehicles exceed the design speed it becomes unsafe. The proposed improvements are designed to encourage traffic to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Conyard</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to comment on the improvements that are planned for St. Andrews St. I am a resident who resides in the area and use this street many times per day. I drive along St. Andrews St as well as walk and ride my bike. It is interesting to learn that there will be multi use trail along St Andrews St. I expect that it will be well used by many of the residents in this area. It will be important to be placed back from the road and be a paved surface that can accommodate people traveling in both directions. The surface of the trail is important as it is on a hill. I hope that it will be cleared of snow in the winter. I am curious to know if there will be a sidewalk along the east side of St. Andrews St.? I am very glad to learn that there will be a widening of St. Andrews St to help with making left hand turns at Fourth and Southwood Drive. There is such a short distance between Fourth and Southwood Dr that this entire portion should be four lane. Be wary that there will be many vehicles.</td>
<td>Yes, there will be sidewalk or a multi-use path on both sides of St Andrews Street between Grand Ridge Drive and Grand Avenue South.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Holman</td>
<td><a href="mailto:holmanj@sympatico.ca">holmanj@sympatico.ca</a></td>
<td>turning in and out of the PetroCan gas station. I hope that this area will be safer with the changes that are made. I hope that the information meeting is well attended. Unfortunately I will be away for this meeting.</td>
<td>Thanks for adding my comments to the ongoing development and considerations for the region and city of Cambridge project for Cedar St and St Andrews St reconstruction projects. I will provide some bullets on things that we discussed at the public meeting. St Andrews St reconstruction: Consider altering the proposed configuration of St Andrews St between Fraser St and Grand Ave to facilitate both a dedicated cycling lane and a vehicle lane of traffic. Shared roads are what we presently have, and with vehicle operators possibly not realizing that they are going from a dedicated vehicle lane and shared road and how to operate with bicycles in transition, We will review the proposed northbound left turn lane onto Southwood Drive and attempt to increase the storage length for Southwood Drive so that it extends past the Petro Can site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>also this includes cyclists young and old being unfamiliar with this navigation. I realize through conversations with your project peers that there might be one hydro pole that needs to be relocated, and perhaps the Glebe St corner needing &quot;tweaking&quot; or the city to restrict the road of truck traffic. Looking at other streets in the city and around the region there should be just enough space to facilitate accommodating both vehicle and bicycle lanes. It might take some outside the box planning, and cooperation, but it might be possible. The intersection of Southwood Dr and St Andrews St at the Petro Canada and adjacent plaza might need a shared turning lane given the traffic turning into these businesses at peak times and traffic backing up. The pedestrian refuge might need to be oriented accordingly. Possibility of coordinating paving the shoulder of St Andrews St to the Township of North Dumfries, Alps road to be able to provide a cycling route refuge for cyclists to</td>
<td>The limit of this current project is the City limits and we will be extending the bike lanes to this limit. The Region’s policy is to add 1.5m paved shoulders to rural regional roads, and this will happen when the sections beyond the City limits get resurfaced in the future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
get out of town to the country roads where MANY people ride. This could potentially be a shared cost planning between the township and the region. This would make cyclists safer heading out of town to less travelled roads where they cycle and enjoy the countryside.

Cedar Street (generally ordered east to west)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harvey Diamond</td>
<td>Westgate Centre</td>
<td>Comments or concerns regarding this project:</td>
<td>As part of the Construction contract for Cedar Street will be a condition that access to the Westgate Mall will be maintained at all times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President Terrace</td>
<td></td>
<td>Our major concern is that during construction, there will always be clear access to the Westgate Centre and the disruption to our Tenants will be minimal.</td>
<td>The Project Team has identified safety and traffic speed as an issue in this area and believes that the proposed works will improve the situation. The existing westbound curb lane will be removed and converted into a right turn lane into the main entrance of the mall, and an acceleration lane at the most western</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We would want access for the large delivery trucks into and out of the</td>
<td>entrance. Reducing the number of lanes will help reduce the points of conflict and decisions coming out of the mall. Further, pedestrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Westgate Centre to not in any way be impeded by the “multi-use trail”.</td>
<td>refuge islands and narrower traffic lanes will help to calm (slow) traffic also improving safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We would like the storm and sanitary services for the apartment building</td>
<td>The multi-use path will not impede access to Westgate Centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>directly west of us to be extended from the Westgate Centre entrance to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the apartment building so that the owners of the apartment building can</td>
<td>The City of Cambridge is exploring the servicing of the Apartment building and if a solution is found, possible servicing works within the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>install their own services rather than sharing our services.</td>
<td>Cedar Street right-of-way may be incorporated into the Region’s Cedar Street project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Re: upgrading our services. We would like to know the costs involved.</td>
<td>If there are any costs to be covered by adjacent property owners, they will be advised before construction commences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey Diamond</td>
<td>President Territory Manor Limited</td>
<td>Last but not least, the faster the work can be done the better it will be for everyone involved</td>
<td>Understood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Hales</td>
<td>Director, Construction and Property Standards Realstar Management Partnership 77 Bloor Street West, Suite 2000 Toronto, ON M5S 1M2</td>
<td>Realstar recently took on management of 190 Cedar Street, when new Ownership took possession of this property in December 2012. As noted in the attached drawings provided to me by the City of Cambridge (and to the Owner’s surprise after taking possession), there is currently no direct sanitary/storm sewer discharge between 190 Cedar and Cedar Street. Instead, the storm/sanitary from 190 Cedar flows through the below grade storm/sanitary sewer network at the Westgate Centre (130 Cedar Street), located just east of 190 Cedar, then into Cedar Street’s storm/sanitary sewers. If the City were planning to install storm/sanitary sewers at appropriate</td>
<td>The City of Cambridge is exploring the servicing of the Apartment building and if a solution is found, possible servicing works within the Cedar Street right-of-way may be incorporated into the Region’s Cedar Street project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>elevations along Cedar Street in front of 190 Cedar in the near future, we would contemplate a direct connection to the City storm/sanitary sewer system, rather than to continue to flow through the Westgate Centre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Can you confirm whether the storm/sanitary sewers in Cedar are being extended in front of 190 Cedar and would they allow a municipal tie-in for us?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do you have any idea (even conceptually) what the storm/sanitary sewer elevations would be expected to be in front of 190 Cedar? This would be helpful in our planning to understand if a gravity system would be feasible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Fox</td>
<td>87 Fairlake Dr</td>
<td>Thanks for the opportunity to review the proposed improvements to the above streets. The recent Open House at Southwood HS was very informative and the handout was well done. I am glad to see this project being planned. Please note my comments below:</td>
<td>Traffic speed was identified as an issue on Cedar Street. The proposed improvements have been designed to calm traffic by narrowing traffic lanes and introducing median islands that will cause traffic to slow. This should help with the road’s safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cambridge, ON N1S 4Z4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cedar St:</td>
<td>The Project Team has also identified safety and traffic speed as an issue in the vicinity of the Westgate Centre and believes that the proposed works will improve the situation. The existing westbound curb lane will be removed and converted into a right turn lane into the main entrance of the mall, and an acceleration lane at the most western entrance. Reducing the number of lanes will help reduce the points of conflict and decisions coming out of the mall. Further, pedestrian refuge islands and narrower traffic lanes will help to calm (slow) traffic also improving safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The entrance to Grand Ridge Dr. from Cedar St. when coming from the west is a difficult turn now since the corner is very tight and it is near the bottom of a downhill slope on Cedar. When the road is snowy or icy, you have to come into the turn very slowly to avoid fish tailing. This right turn corner needs to be widened and sloped so the turn can be made more gradually and safely.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the main exit and create a transition lane to make a left into before moving into the main lane going down the hill. Perhaps a Pedestrian Crossing with Flashing lights could be put in instead of a Refuge Island. The exits are one of the main reasons I avoid going to the Plaza. It would be worth not making a bike lane on one side of the road here if more room was needed for lane expansion. General: I expect there will be increased traffic trying to avoid the construction zones, for example, Grand Ridge Dr. This may cause some issues in school zones and for people trying to back out of their driveways especially at the down the hill east of Stirling-McGregor</td>
<td>Traffic signals are controlled by a “Warranting process” that determines the necessity for a signal and the configuration of them (i.e., advanced turn). The Region has reviewed this intersection and determined that a traffic light is not warranted. Detoured traffic during construction has been identified as an issue by the project team. During final design and as part of the Construction conditions, traffic management will be addressed in order to alleviate impacts on the adjacent road network to as great an extent as possible. However, given the narrow sections of roadway, and given the surrounding road network, we are limited in options, and thus some impact during the construction period is inevitable. We will continue to communicate with the public as the project progresses, and ask your patience during construction. At the end of construction, the road and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All residences along Cedar and St Andrews on corner properties should be required to remove their hedges and fences that block the line of sight for at least 40 feet back from corners. An example of this is the house on the south side of St Andrews at Inverness which has a low fence that comes close to the corner and really interferes with the line of sight.

One of the goals of this project should be to maintain good traffic flow not to slow it down

The City of Cambridge has a by-law stating:

“At the intersection of two streets and within the triangle formed by joining the point on the edge of the travelled portion of each street distant 15 metres from the point of intersection of the edges of the travelled portions of the two streets, as shown in Figure 7, no shrub, foliage, wall or structure shall be provided or maintained in such a location or manner so as to obstruct the view of the driver of a vehicle approaching the intersection and, in no case, shall such shrub, foliage, wall or structure be provided or maintained at a height of more than 0.75 metres.”

If there are areas of concern, the City By-Law enforcement should be notified.

The roadway is used by many different users (i.e., vehicles, cyclists, ...
April 1, 2014  

Report: E-14-039

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Adshade</td>
<td>136 Fairlake Dr., Cambridge</td>
<td>I like the idea of adding bike lanes. I’m concerned about the safety of turning left from Westgate Centre plaza onto Cedar St. It is very dangerous and difficult presently</td>
<td>We have received positive feedback in general for the proposed bike lanes. The Project Team has identified safety and traffic speed as an issue in this area and believes that the proposed works will improve the situation. The existing westbound curb lane will be removed and converted into a right turn lane into the main entrance of the mall, and an acceleration lane at the most western entrance. Reducing the number of lanes will help reduce the points of conflict and decisions drivers need to make coming out of the mall. Further, pedestrian refuge islands and narrower traffic lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Adshade</td>
<td>136 Fairlake Dr., Cambridge</td>
<td>Maybe adding lights would be a good idea there?</td>
<td>will help to calm (slow) traffic also improving safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic signals are controlled by a prescribed “Warranting process” that determines the necessity for a signal and the configuration of them (i.e., advanced turn). The Region has reviewed this intersection and determined a signal is not required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Thoms</td>
<td>None given</td>
<td>Have you considered the following: Southwood School sportsfield is used by other schools for competitive events and elementary school sports days. When this happens cars are parked along Cedar Street westwards from Southwood on both sides towards Kent Street. The south side of Cedar Street is used in the morning and in the afternoon to pick up students. Regional police successfully and routinely use radar for speeding motorists. The geometry of two descending roads makes it</td>
<td>Yes, we have had discussions with the School regarding this also. They have advised there is sufficient parking available on site. Further, Cedar Street is a Regional arterial road and preference is not to have parking on arterial roads. Again, for safety reasons, the preference is not to have stopping or parking on arterial roads. There is sufficient access to the school from Southwood Drive. Speed is a known issue on the road and one of the objectives of the proposed improvements is to calm traffic. This is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Thoms</td>
<td></td>
<td>very easy to go faster than the posted speed limit especially after an 80 Km/Hr road.</td>
<td>being accomplished with narrower traffic lanes, and the construction of pedestrian refuge island which will cause traffic to slow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Southwood school fence does not extend the full length of the school property and students routinely try to cross Cedar Street at the eastern limit of the fence.</td>
<td>With the construction of the proposed multi-use path the fence will be relocated and extended along the entire school frontage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School buses turn onto Kent Street. Will the island let them turn?</td>
<td>Yes, the design will ensure buses can manoeuvre properly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Turning from the west onto Kent Street it is normal to be passed by drivers heading east on the shoulder.</td>
<td>With the proposed construction a curb will be constructed and there will not be a shoulder for vehicles to pass on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The turn onto Kent Street from the east must be made slowly not only because of the turn but drivers cannot see until they are part way through the turn if any students/skateboarders/pedestrians are on the east side of Kent Street hidden from initial view. I have been overtaken by Westbound trucks making this right turn.</td>
<td>In the final design stage we will review sightlines and make improvements if required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Thoms</td>
<td>None given</td>
<td>Points 6 and 7 will probably result in rear end collisions if the island is placed at the intersection.</td>
<td>The proposed design is expected to calm traffic and improve safety. As well, preventing vehicles from passing on the shoulders which are not meant to be used for vehicular passage will also improve safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What is projected use of the island in numbers of pedestrians per day?</td>
<td>This data is not available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would It not be more cost effective to fence the Southwood School property so that students are forced to cross at the traffic signals?</td>
<td>The pedestrian refuge island has a couple of purposes. One is that it will help calm traffic by narrowing the lanes and creating “side friction” thereby slowing traffic. Secondly, there may be pedestrians going to or coming from Grand Ridge Drive to Kent Street and the Pedestrian Refuge will facilitate their crossing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl Poll</td>
<td>5 Southgate Rd.</td>
<td>Westbound bus stop should stay where it is.</td>
<td>GRT controls the location of the bus stops – We are currently not aware of any significant changes for the Southwood/Cedar stops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Why the need for multi-use trail “AND” bike lane??</td>
<td>Multi-use trails are typically used by pedestrians and recreational and younger cyclists. Bike lanes, especially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Holman</td>
<td>None given</td>
<td>Thanks for adding my comments to the ongoing development and considerations for the region and city of Cambridge project for Cedar St and St Andrews St reconstruction projects. I will provide some bullets on things that we discussed at the public meeting. Cedar St Reconstruction: Maintain bicycle lane (on the north side of Cedar St) nearest to the curb between Osborne St through to the city limits, instead of between a straight lane of traffic and right hand turn lane into Sobey's plaza. This will eliminate unpredictability of cyclists and vehicle traffic turning into addresses between Osborne and Dale Ave given the steepness of the grade and varying level of comfort of cyclists while navigating traffic. In the proposed plan, if a bicyclist is riding uphill slowly, and a vehicle wants to turn right into the Sobey's plaza and they attempt to speed up and make a lane change into</td>
<td>There will always be conflicts between cyclists and vehicles at intersections no matter where the bike lane is located. However, it is a Regional standard to locate the bike lane between a right turn lane and the through traffic lane. This avoids conflict between a bike going straight through an intersection and a right turning vehicle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the right hand turn lane they could potentially collide with a cyclist. Additional to this it puts cyclists in a precarious situation possibly riding in between two vehicles in traffic where many might not be comfortable with that. As a season cyclist I am comfortable with this and ride in a defensive and assertive manner, but many unseasoned cyclists might not ride in this type of manner. Consider and approach the city of Cambridge including the approximately 300-500m of road between St Andrews and Osborne St to allow for continuity for the cycling lanes with a change from having bicycling lanes to not having bicycle lanes at a major intersection with traffic lights. This prevents people from having to hop onto sidewalks, or navigate traffic for such a small stretch of road that will only be re-done in a short number of years. Also this relieves impact on traffic in the area as the entire section of road is only limited for traffic at one time, instead of doing it a number of years later. Ultimately these projects should or could consider traffic impact and the</td>
<td>Cedar Street is a Regional Road and thus the Region would be responsible for this. The section of Cedar Street between Osborne Street and St Andrews Street is scheduled to be resurfaced in 2019. At that time the Region will consider completing the Bike Lane link on this section of road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>inconvenience for the travelers of the road in addition to the residents having to have a road or section of roads under construction in consecutive years. I appreciate your point about finances and longevity of previous construction projects</td>
<td>Street lighting will be reviewed at the time of final design to ensure adequate illumination is provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consider suitable lighting at the pedestrian crossing at Dale Ave and at the pedestrian “area of refuge” in the middle of the road</td>
<td>Again, street lighting will be reviewed at the time of final design to ensure adequate illumination is provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consider suitable lighting and crossing just west or in front of 190 Cedar St where most pedestrians are “j-walking” and there has been incidents of pedestrians being struck in recent years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Property Acquisition Process Information Sheet

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

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

Property Impact Plans

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

Initial Owner Contact by Regional Real Estate Staff

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

Initial Meetings

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

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

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

Steps Toward Offer of Settlement or Agreement of Purchase and Sale

The general steps towards such an offer are as follows;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: April 1, 2014
File Code: A02-30/PW
Subject: Road Assumption for the ION Rapid Transit Corridor

Recommendation:

1. That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo commence the process to consider amending the existing Road Consolidation By-law 01-059 (Regional Road System) to assume the following road segments from the Cities of Waterloo and Kitchener including all the commitments to the Cities outlined in report E-14-018.

City of Waterloo Segments:

a) Caroline Street South, from Erb Street West to Allen Street West (the “Caroline Segment”) including the Caroline Street South and William Street West intersection (approx. 700m); and

b) Allen Street West, from Caroline Street South to King Street South (the “Allen Segment”) (approx. 105m).

City of Kitchener Segments:

a) King Street West from Victoria Street to Francis Street (the “King Segment”) (approx. 160m);

b) Francis Street North from King Street West to Duke Street West (the “Francis Segment”) (approx. 140m);

c) Duke Street from Francis Street North to Frederick Street (the “Duke Segment”) (approx. 620m);
d) Borden Avenue from Charles Street to the Huron Park Spur (the “Borden Segment”) (approx. 840m); and

e) Hayward Avenue from the Huron Park Spur to Courtland Avenue (the “Hayward Segment”) (approx. 230m).

2. Provide notice to the public of the proposed transfer of the road segments Caroline and Allen from the City of Waterloo and the road segments King, Francis, Duke, Borden and Hayward from the City of Kitchener in accordance with the Region’s Notice Policy;

3. That the Regional policy outlining the criteria for assuming existing City roads be amended to include “Roads that include light rail transit”.

4. And commence the process to amend Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072 to reflect the addition of traffic regulations on the sections of road to be assumed by the Region of Waterloo.

Report:

1.0 Introduction

In June 2011, Council approved the technology, route, stations, staging and funding for Stage 1 of the Region’s ION rapid transit service. Stage 1 includes 19 km of Light Rail Transit (LRT) from Conestoga Mall to Fairview Park Mall and 17 km of adapted Bus Rapid Transit (aBRT) from Fairview Park Mall to the Ainslie Street Terminal. Stage 2 will extend LRT from Fairview Park Mall to the Ainslie Street Terminal.

The approved LRT alignment includes sections of what are currently City of Kitchener and City of Waterloo local roads. The Region is required to secure the legal right to construct, operate and maintain LRT on these local roads in order to proceed with the LRT project. As a result, Regional staff recommends that the Region assume the following City of Kitchener and City of Waterloo road segments:

City of Waterloo Segments:

a) Caroline Street South, from Erb Street West to Allen Street West (the “Caroline Segment”) including the Caroline Street South and William Street West intersection (approx. 700m); and

b) Allen Street West, from Caroline Street South to King Street South (the “Allen Segment”) (approx. 105m).

City of Kitchener Segments:

a) King Street West from Victoria Street to Francis Street (the “King Segment”) (approx. 160m);

b) Francis Street North from King Street West to Duke Street West (the “Francis Segment”) (approx. 140m);
c) Duke Street from Francis Street North to Frederick Street (the “Duke Segment”) (approx. 620m);

d) Borden Avenue from Charles Street to the Huron Park Spur (the “Borden Segment”) (approx. 840m); and

e) Hayward Avenue from the Huron Park Spur to Courtland Avenue (the “Hayward Segment”) (approx. 230m).

Once Regional Council approves commencing the process to consider amending the existing Road Consolidated By-Law 01-059 (Regional Road System) to assume these road segments, Region staff will proceed to provide public notice as required by the Region’s Notice Policy and place the proposed by-law on the agenda of an upcoming Council Meeting. Attachment A illustrates the road segments that will be added to the Regional Road System.

It should be noted that the current Regional policy relating to criteria for assumption of roads does not address light rail transit (LRT). Through the implementation of the LRT project, it has become clear that this policy needs to be amended to include LRT as a criterion for assuming local roads in the cities in order for the Region to construct, operate and maintain LRT. By amending this policy, these local roads will now meet the criteria for transfer to Regional jurisdiction.

Moreover, the proposed amendment to the Region’s criteria for assuming local (city) roads is principally directed at roads that include LRT tracks that run in a longitudinal fashion. The amendment is not intended to include local (city) roads that are bisected by the LRT line. The Region will, however, consider its requirements at the intersection of LRT and local (city) roads on a case-by-case basis depending on site specific conditions/design and will bring forward report(s) requesting further amendments, as required.

2.0 Consultation with the Cities of Waterloo and Kitchener

Ongoing discussions and consultations have occurred between Regional staff and the Cities of Waterloo and Kitchener. A meeting was held on October 4, 2013 with City of Waterloo staff, and October 7, 2013 with City of Kitchener staff to discuss the extents of the roads to be assumed and any concerns the Cities may have. Following these meetings, letters (Attachment B) were sent to staff from each City outlining the description of the roads to be assumed, road classifications, and a common understanding of the road assumption process.

Staff from both Cities have agreed to the items outlined in Attachment B with the following conditions:

- Access to all properties will be provided;
- The Region is agreeable to preserving all existing points of ingress and egress at the interface of the roads assumed with adjacent lands that have been approved by the Cities as of the effective date of the By-law;
- With redevelopment likely to occur along the LRT corridor, the Region will
coordinate with City staff on any required relocation of existing access point(s) to a mutually agreed upon location that does not pose a safety hazard or create operational concerns for LRT and the general traffic;

- New accesses will be provided with preference to consolidate where required or needed. The Region will also consider preapproving certain access points along the assumed Caroline Street segment for specific redevelopment sites identified by the City to expedite the siteplan application approval process;

- The Region agrees not to widen the assumed Caroline Street road segment unless requested or approved by the City of Waterloo Council. Consultation between the Region and City staff will occur on any widenings considered in the future;

- The Region will permit the continued encroachment of outdoor patios, approved in accordance with the City of Kitchener’s and Waterloo’s practice, on the assumed roads provided these patios do not pose a safety hazard. The continuance of existing patio encroachments and the grant of new patio encroachments shall be in accordance with mutually agreeable safety standards and as recommended by the Cities of Kitchener and Waterloo and approved by the Region of Waterloo;

- The cities will continue to apply their zoning by-laws to regulate land uses abutting Regional roads. It should also be noted that under the Municipal Act (section 58(1)), the Region does have authority to regulate abutting land uses within 45 meters of a Regional road. However, both Regional staff and city staff have not identified any specific instances where the infrastructure needs of rapid transit will conflict with development. Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 58 of the Municipal Act, the Region will respect the zoning regulations conferred to the City of Waterloo under Section 34 of the Planning Act and will work to meet the provisions of the City’s zoning by-law, however both the City and Region recognize the flexibility included in the zoning by-law that Regional uses need only to substantially conform to the applicable regulations, with this latter provision being carried forward into any successor city zoning by-laws or amendments thereto. Both levels of municipal government have shared interests in exercising their respective jurisdictional responsibilities for transportation (moving people) and development (shaping the community); and

- The Region will assume the ownership of storm sewers on the assumed road segments and the Cities will continue to maintain ownership and maintenance obligations for water and sanitary mains. One exception to this approach will be the deep storm sewer on Duke Street which serves a City purpose. The ownership of this particular deep storm sewer has always remained with the City even when Duke Street was a Regional road in the past.

Subject to Council approval, the Roads Consolidated By-law will be amended and the assumption of these roads will be effective upon the passing of the by-law. The City of Waterloo has also requested that the Region and the City of Waterloo enter into an agreement documenting the above noted items. Region staff will work with City of Waterloo staff to finalize an agreement and present it to Regional Council for approval when it is done.
Corporate Strategic Plan:

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

Financial Implications

The costs associated with the preparation of property reference plans as part of this road assumption process are contained within the $818 million rapid transit project budget.

The total mileage of the Regional Road System will be increased by approximately 5.59 lane kilometres and may require a slight adjustment to the 2015 Transportation Operations budget.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Rapid Transit Division staff will be required to prepare the appropriate property reference plans prior to the passing of the Roads Consolidated by-law amendments.

Corporate Resources Division staff will be involved in the preparation of the Roads Consolidated and Traffic and Parking by-law amendments and Planning Division staff will undertake any amendments required to the Regional Official Policies Plan.

City of Waterloo and Kitchener staff are in support of the commitments outlined in report E-14-018.

Attachments

Attachment A – Road Segments that will be added to the Regional Road System.

Attachment B – City Road Assumption Letters

Prepared By: Danielle Tobey, Planner, Rapid Transit

Liviu Cananau, Solicitor, Property, Rapid Transit

Robert Gallivan, Manager, Transportation Program Development

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Attachment A – Road Segments that will be added to the Regional Road System.
Attachment B – City Road Assumption Letters

Cameron Rapp
Commissioner – Integrated Planning & Public Works, & Deputy CAO
City of Waterloo
100 Regina Street South
P.O. Box 337, Station Waterloo
Waterloo, Ontario, N2J 4A8

Dear Cameron Rapp:

Re: Rapid Transit City of Waterloo Road Assumption

We thank City of Waterloo staff for attending the meeting held on October 4, 2013, as well as, previous meetings in connection with the proposed assumption of City roads for the Rapid Transit Project. The Region has consulted with the City in order to reach a consensus on assumptions prior to Regional Council’s consideration of the matter.

Regional staff are cognizant of the sensitive nature of the proposed road assumptions given their proximity to the City’s Uptown and the special business/development considerations related thereto. As a departure from previous road assumption processes, and without committing to this approach for future road assumptions, the Region would like to give the City assurance in relation to the various concerns articulated by the City specifically in connection with the proposed road assumptions.

Description of Roads Being Assumed

The City roads proposed to be assumed by the Region can be described as follows:

1. Caroline Street South, from Erb Street West to Allen Street West (the “Caroline Segment”) including the Caroline Street South and William Street West intersection (approximately 700m); and
2. Allen Street West, from Caroline Street South to King Street South (the “Allen Segment”) (approximately 105m).

The road limits being assumed can be viewed on the map attached as Appendix A.

Road Classifications

When the Caroline Segment and the Allen Segment road assumption is approved by Regional Council, they will be designated as Neighbourhood Connectors – Main Streets as per the Context Sensitive Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines (2010).

DOCS# 1489588
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Neighbourhood Connectors – Main Streets have an ideal right of way width of 26 metres, or 20 metres in constrained corridors, and prioritize active transportation and transit. They are typically located within the established urban areas, such as the City’s Uptown, and can often be considered special character streets.

**Common Understanding of the Road Assumption Process**

The Region would like to offer the following assurances in connection with the concerns brought forward by the City in relation to the proposed road assumptions:

a) It is not the intention of the Region to widen the roads assumed from the City as part of the Rapid Transit Project. Any future widening (driving surface and/or road allowance) would be required to comply with the Context Sensitive Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines. The Region will consult with the City on any potential future widening of these roads.

b) The Region of Waterloo will work with all stakeholders, including the BIAs and property owners as required, on issues including, but not limited to: tree plantings, street closures for festivals, and Christmas lights.

c) Existing accesses, including CIGI access, will remain. All new accesses will take Rapid Transit design into account. Access will be provided to all properties along the corridor with preference to locate new accesses on side streets and/or be consolidated, where possible and needed.

d) The Region will cover all costs associated with the assumption of roads (i.e. surveying).

e) The Region recognizes that any City capital dollars currently budgeted for streetscaping improvements will not be transferred to the Region and these streetscaping improvements will not be incorporated into the Regional capital budget. The Region may consider including these improvements as part of their future Regional capital programming if and when deemed necessary.

f) It is the intention of the Region to accommodate and encourage growth along the Rapid Transit corridor and it will continue to involve the City in all necessary planning approvals to achieve this goal.

g) Concerns with regard to the Region’s planning approval process have been conveyed to the appropriate Regional staff. Further discussion with regards to the approval process will be scheduled and arranged by the Region between the appropriate Regional and City staff members.

h) The Region will consult with the City on any newly proposed ancillary uses of lands that form part of the road allowance but are outside of the footprint of land used for vehicular movement (i.e. patio encroachments, streetscaping, awnings, etc.). Approval for these items will follow existing Regional processes with the understanding that urban areas have special considerations. Therefore the Region will work with property owners and the City on a case by case basis.

i) Maintenance for the roads assumed will become the responsibility of the Region and would be dealt with similar to all other Regional roads in the City of Waterloo.

j) The existing design for Caroline Street South, as part of the Rapid Transit Project, includes a multi-use path and does not preclude the addition of bike lanes in the future, outside of the scope of the Rapid Transit Project.

k) The Region would like to know what obligations it would be assuming as part of the proposed road assumptions, and therefore:

   - the Region would appreciate a copy of any agreements that the City has entered into in respect of the Caroline Segment and the Allen Segment.
   - the Region also asks that the City refrain from entering into any new agreements without consensus from the Region.

l) Liability for any roads assumed will run with the ownership of the roads subject to the usual statutory exceptions provided in the *Municipal Act (Ontario)* (the “Act”). Please advise if the City has any specific liability concerns that are not addressed by the transfer of liability regime provided at law in Ontario.
Upon receiving acknowledgement from the City of the above mentioned assurances, the Region will formalize the content of this letter, including assurances, in a communique which may be in the form of a Memorandum of understanding (MOU).

Next Steps

It is the intent of the Region of Waterloo to complete the road assumption process by the end of 2013. This would require that a report outlining the process and the Regional and City understanding be presented to Regional Council on December 3, 2013.

Given the required timing of the Region’s consideration of the proposed road assumptions, we kindly ask that you respond with your comments by no later than Wednesday, November 6th, 2013.

Yours truly,

Darshpreet Bhatti, Director, Rapid Transit

/ct

CC.  Phil Hewitson, Active Transportation and LRT Manager, City of Waterloo
     Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services, Region of Waterloo
     John Hammer, Director, Transportation, Region of Waterloo
     John Cicutin, Acting Director, Transportation Planning, Region of Waterloo
     Liviu Cananau, Solicitor, Rapid Transit, Region of Waterloo
     Masood Mirza, Senior Project Manager, Rapid Transit, Region of Waterloo
Re: Rapid Transit City of Kitchener Road Assumption

We thank City of Kitchener staff for attending the meeting held on October 7, 2013, as well as, previous meetings in connection with the proposed assumption of City roads for the Rapid Transit Project. The Region has consulted with the City in order to reach a consensus on assumptions prior to Regional Council’s consideration of the matter.

Regional staff are cognizant of the sensitive nature of the proposed road assumptions given their proximity to the City’s Downtown and the special business/development considerations related thereto. As a departure from previous road assumption processes, and without committing to this approach for future road assumptions, the Region would like to give the City assurance in relation to the various concerns articulated by the City specifically in connection with the proposed road assumptions.

Description of Roads Being Assumed

The City roads proposed to be assumed by the Region can be described as follows:

1. King Street West from Victoria Street to Francis Street (the “King Segment”)(approx. 160m);
2. Francis Street North from King Street West to Duke Street West (the “Francis Segment”)(approx. 140m);
3. Duke Street from Francis Street North to Frederick Street (the “Duke Segment”)(approx. 620m);
4. Borden Avenue from Charles Street to the Huron Park Spur (the “Borden Segment”)(approx. 840m);
5. Hayward Avenue from the Huron Park Spur to Courtland Avenue (the “Hayward Segment”)(approx. 230m); and
6. Wilson Avenue from Kingsway Drive to Fairway Road (the “Wilson Segment”)(approx. 160m).

The road limits being assumed can be viewed on the maps attached as Appendix A.
Road Classifications

If the assumption of the above segments is approved by Regional Council, they will be designated as:

1. The King Segment: Neighbourhood Connector – Main Street
2. The Francis Segment: Neighbourhood Connector – Main Street
3. The Duke Segment: Neighbourhood Connector – Main Street
4. The Borden Segment: Residential Connector
5. The Hayward Segment: Residential Connector
6. The Wilson Segment: Neighbourhood Connector – Main Street

Neighbourhood Connectors – Main Streets have an ideal right of way width of 26 metres, or 20 metres in constrained corridors, and prioritize active transportation and transit. They are typically located within the established urban areas, such as the City’s Uptown, and can often be considered special character streets.

Residential Connectors have an ideal right of way width of 26 metres and have a strong focus on active transportation and are transit supportive. They are streets for people and cyclists, and should find a balance with the vehicular needs of the community.

Common Understanding of the Road Assumption Process

The Region would like to offer the following assurances in connection with the concerns brought forward by the City in relation to the proposed road assumptions:

a) It is not the intention of the Region to widen the roads assumed from the City as part of the Rapid Transit Project. Any future widening (driving surface and/or road allowance) would be required to comply with the Context Sensitive Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines. The Region will consult with the City on any potential future widening of these roads.

b) Existing accesses will remain. All new accesses will take Rapid Transit design into account. Access will be provided to all properties along the corridor with preference to locate new accesses on side streets and/or be consolidated, where possible and needed.

c) The Region will cover all costs associated with the assumption of roads (i.e. surveying).

d) It is the intention of the Region to accommodate and encourage growth along the Rapid Transit corridor and it will continue to involve the City in all necessary planning approvals to achieve this goal.

e) Concerns with regard to the Region’s planning approval process have been conveyed to the appropriate Regional staff. Further discussion with regards to the approval process will be scheduled and arranged by the Region between the appropriate Regional and City staff members.

f) The Region will consult with the City on any newly proposed ancillary uses of lands that form part of the road allowance but are outside of the footprint of land used for vehicular movement (i.e. patio encroachments, streetscaping, awnings, etc.). Approval for these items will follow existing Regional processes with the understanding that urban areas have special considerations. Therefore the Region will work with property owners and the City on a case by case basis.

g) Recommendations made in the City of Kitchener Cycling Master Plan have been or will be included in the Draft Region of Waterloo Active Transportation plan as appropriate. The Draft Regional Plan was completed in consultation with the City.

h) Maintenance for the roads assumed will become the responsibility of the Region and would be dealt with similar to all other Regional roads in the City of Kitchener.

i) The Region would like to know what obligations it would be assuming as part of the proposed road assumptions, and therefore:

   a. the Region would appreciate a copy of any agreements that the City has entered into in respect of the segments being assumed.
b. the Region also asks that the City refrain from entering into any new agreements without
consensus from the Region.

j) Liability for any roads assumed will run with the ownership of the roads subject to the usual statutory
exceptions provided in the Municipal Act (Ontario) (the “Act”). Please advise if the City has any specific
liability concerns that are not addressed by the transfer of liability regime provided at law in Ontario.

k) The Region would like to know what City capital programs are currently attributed to the road segments
to be assumed.

Upon receiving acknowledgement from the City of the above mentioned assurances, the Region will formalize the
content of this letter, including assurances, in a communiqué which may be in the form of a Memorandum of
understanding (MOU).

Next Steps

It is the intent of the Region of Waterloo to complete the road assumption process by January 2014. This would
require that a report outlining the process and the Regional and City understanding be presented to Regional
Council.

Given the required timing of the Region’s consideration of the proposed road assumptions, we kindly ask that you
respond with your comments by no later than December 4, 2013.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Darshpreet Bhatti
Director, Rapid Transit

/dt

cc. Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services, Region of Waterloo
John Hammer, Director, Transportation, Region of Waterloo
John Cicuttin, Acting Director, Transportation Planning, Region of Waterloo
Liviu Cananau, Solicitor, Rapid Transit, Region of Waterloo
Derick Finn, Manager, Rapid Transit Engineering, Region of Waterloo
Barbara Robinson, Director of Engineering, City of Kitchener
Justin Readman, Director of Transportation Services, City of Kitchener
Region of Waterloo  
Rapid Transit  
Transportation and Environmental Services  
Finance Department  
Financial Services & Development Financing  
Procurement & Supply Services

To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee  
Date: April 1, 2014  
File Code: A02-30/PW  
Subject: Request for Proposal: Stage 1 Light Rail Project – Independent Certifier

Recommendation:

That, pursuant to Subsection 50(3) of By-law 04-093, as amended (the “Purchasing By-law”), the Regional Municipality of Waterloo authorizes the Chief Administrative Officer to accept a consultant proposal submitted pursuant to RFP 2014-20 (Independent Certifier) provided that such proposal is compliant and that it best meets the criteria of subsection 19(1)(a) of the Purchasing By-law;

And Further That the Chief Administrative Officer is authorized to finalize the terms and conditions of, and execute, an Agreement with the accepted proponent, with such Agreement to be satisfactory to the Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services and the Regional Solicitor.

Summary: Nil

Report:

In March, 2014 Regional Council approved a Project Agreement between the Region and the single purpose legal entity (Project Co) to be established by GrandLinq to undertake the Stage 1 LRT Project. Council also delegated to the Regional Chief Administrative Officer and Regional Chair the authority to finalize and execute the Project Agreement and associated ancillary agreements, and to execute documents and certificates in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Project Agreement on behalf of The Regional Municipality of Waterloo.
Under the Stage 1 LRT Project Agreement, The Region and Project Co, (the PA Parties), are required to jointly procure and appoint an Independent Certifier (IC) to perform certain services in connection with the Project Agreement.

An IC is required under the Project Agreement, the Provincial Transfer Payment Agreement, and the Federal Contribution Agreement to certify the applicable milestones under each agreement. Certification of each milestone under the Project Agreement is the basis for payment claims made by GrandLinq to the Region. Likewise, the IC will be responsible for the certification of the milestones and the preparation of various reports that will be the basis for the Region’s claims for funding from both the Federal and Provincial Governments.

The IC is an independent professional organization/firm with expertise in cost estimating, schedule verification and inspection of large scale construction projects. The IC is to be jointly retained by the PA parties in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Independent Certifier Agreement, being a schedule to the Project Agreement, which Project Co and The Region will enter into before Commercial and Financial Close (anticipated at the end of April / early May).

The PA Parties jointly appoint the IC, and the IC carries out the certification services in accordance with the Independent Certifier Agreement. The IC will make observations and evaluations of Design and Construction Works and any Public Infrastructure Works (includes utilities and road works that fall outside the long-term maintenance obligations of Project Co) in order to:

- certify all monthly progress payments made by the Region to Project Co in respect of the earned value of the works performed;
- confirm the completion of the Public Infrastructure Works in accordance with the Project Agreement;
- review the details and provide an opinion related to any delay and/or compensation events that may arise;
- review the details and provide an opinion related to any variations/change order that may arise; and
- confirm the achievement of substantial completion (point at which the system has been completed in accordance with the Project Agreement) and create a list of minor deficiencies that may need to be addressed.

The IC will be the link between the Region and GrandLinq and its duty of care to both parties in mitigating risk. The use of an IC is a standard requirement for Infrastructure Ontario’s DBFOM model of project delivery.

In order to meet scheduled Commercial and Financial Close timelines, the IC must be jointly procured by the Region and GrandLinq by mid April, 2014. Consequently, on March 24, 2014 the Region placed advertisements on its website and in The Record, Merx, Biddingo and Daily Commercial News inviting submissions from potential consultants by April 11, 2014. Given this timeline, it is recommended that the Chief...
Administrative Officer be delegated authority to accept the successful proponent, provided that the accepted proposal is compliant and best meets the criteria of subsection 19(1)(a) of the Purchasing By-law.

A consultant selection process will be carried out in accordance with the Region’s Purchasing By-law for the procurement of goods and services which includes price as a key factor. The evaluation criteria are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFP Review</td>
<td>Pass/Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical elements of the Proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Team Leader’s Qualifications</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Respondent Team Members Qualifications</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Comparable Projects</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Understanding and Methodology, including Value-Added Services</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price Form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Total Fixed Fee</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Hourly Rates</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview [if applicable]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next Steps**

The tentative timetable for the IC procurement is outlined below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue RFP</td>
<td>Monday, March 24, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final date for submission of Respondents’ questions</td>
<td>Tuesday, April 1, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for issuing Addenda to the RFP</td>
<td>Monday, April 7, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RFP Submission Deadline</strong></td>
<td>Friday, April 11, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of Negotiations Respondent</td>
<td>Tuesday, April 22, 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Once the Accepted Proponent is identified by the Region and GrandLinq, the Region and GrandLinq will need to enter into an agreement with the IC to fulfill the requirements of the Project Agreement prior to Commercial and Financial Close.

Due to time constraints with respect to the Commercial and Financial Close deadline, staff recommend that Council authorize the Regional Chief Administrative Officer ("CAO") to approve, enter into an Agreement for, and execute an agreement with respect to the retainer of an Independent Certifier in connection with the construction of Stage 1 Light Rail Transit.

Financial Implications:

In 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 (on third of eligible project costs to a maximum of $265 million) and the Region ($253 million). The capital cost estimate confirmed by council on March 19, 2014. The RT project and improvements to conventional transit are financed through annual tax rate increases.

Each PA party will pay one-half of the fees to the IC performing the certification services in accordance with the Independent Certifier Agreement. These costs are accounted for in the approved project budget of $818 million and are also reflected in GrandLinq’s bid.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

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

Attachments: Nil

Prepared By: Mireya Rodriguez, Finance Manager, Rapid Transit
Erin Gray, Financial Analyst, Financial Services and Development Financing
Michelle Palmer-Novakovic, Acting Manager, Procurement & Supply Services

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Craig Dyer, Chief Financial Officer
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Transportation

To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: April 1, 2014
File Code: T01-20/53
Subject: Removal of the U-Turn Restriction along Fairway Road (Regional Road 53) between Highway 8 and Wilson Avenue, in the City of Kitchener

Recommendation:

That the Region of Waterloo amend Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended, to: remove from Schedule 14, U-Turn Prohibition on Fairway Road (Regional Road 53) from Wilson Avenue to Highway 8; in the City of Kitchener, as outlined in report E-14-036, dated April 1, 2014.

Summary:

Nil

Report:

Staff received a request to consider the removal of the westbound U-turn restriction at the Fairway Road / Fairview Mall / Best Buy Access. It was noted and observed that motorists are utilizing the Best Buy access or property to either access Wabanaki Drive or to turn around and travel east along Fairway Road.

Fairway Road between Highway 8 and Wilson Avenue is a 4-lane cross section including a continuous right-turn lane between Highway 8 and the Fairway Mall access. The eastbound and westbound directions are separated with a raised centre median excluding the Wabanaki Drive intersection where flexible posts have been installed for emergency vehicle access. This section of Fairway Road has a posted speed limit of 60 km/h.

The Region’s Traffic and Parking By-law currently restricts motorists from making a U-turn between Highway 8 and Wilson Avenue which impacts only the Fairway Road / Fairview Mall / Best Buy signalized intersection. Records do not provide a reason for
the implementation of this restriction however it is recognized that it has been in place for quite some time. It is suspected that it was installed prior to the installation of the raised centre median and to discourage Fairview Mall traffic destined for Highway 8 from exiting onto Fairway Road by the access closest to Highway 8.

The removal of the U-turn restriction may encourage motorists to make U-turns at the signalized intersection and assist in discouraging motorists from utilizing the Best Buy access to circumvent the U-turn prohibition. Figure 1 illustrates the existing U-turn restriction and observed actions of motorists.

**Figure 1: Existing U-Turn Prohibition and Observed Actions of Motorists**

A network wide collision analysis indicates no unusual collision patterns associated with U-turns at signalized intersections. Based on this assessment U-turn collisions are not anticipated to become problematic at the Fairway Road / Best Buy / Fairview Mall intersection. Staff will continue to monitor the impacts of this change on the general traffic operations and in particular Fairview Mall traffic operations.

City of Kitchener staff supports the proposal to remove the No U-turn restriction along this section of Fairway Road. Staff at Fairview Mall have also been consulted and oppose removing the restriction citing that collisions may increase with the removal of the restriction. Staff of the Best Buy development however support the removal of the
restriction noting that dozens of motorists use their parking lot as a short cut. Those wishing to be advised of when this matter will be dealt with by Regional Planning and Works Committee have been notified.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

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

Financial Implications:

The cost to remove the signs will be approximately $500 and is available in the Region’s 2014 maintenance budget.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

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

Attachments:

Nil

Prepared By: Jyoti Nair, Engineering Technologist (Traffic)

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services
Region of Waterloo

Transportation and Environmental Services Department

Water Services Division

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

Date: April 1, 2014

File Code: E02-60

Subject: Study of Mannheim Water Treatment Plant Filter-University of Waterloo

Recommendation:

That The Regional Municipality of Waterloo accept the proposal of the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering at the University of Waterloo to support applicable study at the Mannheim Water Treatment Plant and Hidden Valley High Lift Reservoir at a total price of $171,350 including all applicable taxes.

Summary:

Filtration is a key component of the water treatment process at the Mannheim Water Treatment Plant. A new backwash filter process (backwash is used to clean the filter of particles and return it to optimum condition) was implemented to improve efficacy and effectiveness of the treatment based on study work with the University of Waterloo.

Further improvement of treatment at the Mannheim WTP including pre-treatment and filter performance will provide more cost-efficient, high quality water and help the Region meet its MOE regulatory requirement of continuous improvement. As the study is unique and highly technical, staff recommend the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering at the University of Waterloo as the sole source provider for this study.

Report:

The Region of Waterloo has supported studies with the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering at the University of Waterloo for 10 years through in-kind and consulting support to ensure safe water. In December 2011, the Region of Waterloo and the University of Waterloo undertook a study at the Mannheim WTP entitled; Concurrent Optimization of Coagulation and High Rate Biological Filtration. This study consisted of:
1. Develop lab procedures for evaluating a) particulate characterization and b) particulate settling rates.

2. Establish a jar test protocol specific to the MWTP based on the outcomes from deliverable #1.

3. Measure and characterize specific particulate in various waters to enable improved coagulant selection.

4. Evaluate outcomes from #2 and #3 to recommend coagulant selection/dosing to improve MWTP pre-treatment performance.

5. Establish backwash protocols for various filter media at pilot-scale and full-scale. The objective was to improve filter performance.

A new filter backwashing procedure called extended terminal subfluidization wash (ETSW) was examined. This procedure is an advanced filter backwashing strategy that can be used to improve treatment.

This procedure removes the backwash particles that are normally left within the media. This procedure has been successfully implemented at multiple pilot-scale and full-scale water treatment plants.

The Mannheim filter treatment and backwash procedures have improved as a result of this study. The quality of water is at a higher standard and is achieved with more cost effective techniques. This study supports further research for continued treatment improvements. The project timeframe is proposed is a two year period from April 2014 to December 2016, in two phases as follows:

**Scope of Work – Phase One (2014-2015)**

The overall goals of the proposed work are 1) to enable enhanced high rate biological filtration process performance and 2) to cost-effectively maximize reservoir pretreatment performance for the Mannheim WTP (MWTP). This will be achieved by providing the following deliverables:


2. Characterization of the physical and geochemical properties of sediment in each of the four cells of the Hidden Valley Reservoir.

3. Evaluation of total and dissolved phosphorous concentrations in each of the four cells of the Hidden Valley Reservoir.
These analyses will be used to characterize reservoir water quality at multiple points during the warm season. Water quality will be evaluated in each of the cells of the reservoir.

**Scope of Work – Phase Two (2015-2016)**

The overall goals of the phase two proposed work are 1) to enable enhanced high rate biological filtration process performance and 2) to cost-effectively maximize reservoir pretreatment performance for the Mannheim WTP (MWTP). This will be achieved by providing the following deliverables:

2. Determination of the phosphorous release potential from the sediments in each of the four cells of the Hidden Valley Reservoir.
3. Assessment of low coagulant addition for phosphorous sequestration in the Hidden Valley Reservoir.

The expertise available at the University of Waterloo is unique and staff are recommending the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering at the University of Waterloo as the sole source provider.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

This initiative supports the strategic goal of effective, efficient operations. The proposed study contributes to our strategic priorities to ensure the safety, quality and reliability of drinking water supply and treatment for the Region or Waterloo Focus Area 1: Protect and enhance the environment.

**Financial Implications:**

Based on the evaluation of the proposal received, Water Services and Finance staff recommends that the Region of Waterloo accepts the sole source purchase from the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering at the University of Waterloo for the completion of the study as outlined above.

The 2014 approved Capital Program and Ten-year forecast includes $1,542,000 the Mannheim WTP Filter Upgrades for 2014. This is to be funded by RDC and the Water Reserve Fund.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Nil
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services Department
Water Services Division

To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: April 1, 2014
File Code: E-13-20/8275
Subject: Consultant Selection for the William Street and Strange Street Water Supply Systems Class Environmental Assessment and Preliminary Design

Recommendation:
That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into a Consulting Services Agreement with XCG Consultants Ltd. of Kitchener, Ontario, to provide consulting engineering services for undertaking the William Street and Strange Street Water Supply Systems Class Environmental Assessment (EA) and Preliminary Design, at an upset limit of $514,896 plus applicable taxes, as requested in Report E-14-035, dated April 1, 2014.

Summary:
The Region’s master plan for water distribution contains an alternative to combine source water from the William Street Water Supply System in Waterloo with source water from the Strange Street Water Supply System. Combining the two sources will create treatment efficiencies and better supply flexibility. This also presents an opportunity to examine the historical features of both sites.
To carry out the above, it is recommended that XCG Consultants Ltd. of Kitchener, Ontario, provide consulting engineering services for undertaking the William Street and Strange Street Water Supply Systems Class Environmental Assessment (EA) and Preliminary Design, at an upset limit of $514,896 plus applicable taxes.

Report:

Water Distribution Master Planning Background

The Region of Waterloo (Region) recently completed the Water Supply and Distribution Operations Master Plan (MP) for the Region’s Integrated Urban System (IUS). The IUS consists of source, treatment, pumping, storage and bulk distribution of water to the cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo as well as the communities of St. Jacobs, Elmira, St. Agatha, Breslau and Lloyd Brown. The MP investigated optimal water distribution throughout the IUS.

One alternative in the MP is to send source water from the William Street Water Supply System (WSS) in Waterloo to the Strange Street WSS in Kitchener, where the combined source water would be treated. This alternative creates treatment efficiencies and water supply flexibility.

Treatment Efficiencies

A Class Environmental Assessment was completed for the Strange Street WSS (E-12-052 dated May 8, 2012). That study identified the need to construct a treatment facility for Strange Street source water as part of the preferred alternative. The treatment is for removal of the parameters, iron and manganese, based on recommended aesthetic objectives set out by the Ontario Ministry of Environment.

At the William Street WSS, water quality monitoring of the raw water indicates that some of the wells are approaching the aesthetic objectives for both iron and manganese.

Given the need for treatment of source water for both WSSs and due to the close proximity of both WSSs there is the potential for treatment efficiencies by combining both sources and constructing only one new treatment facility.

Water Supply Flexibility

As the water distribution system in the IUS grows, there is a greater need to create loops in the water distribution system. These loops are then able to carry treated water to further distances at adequate pressure in the IUS.

With these two new trunk water mains, there is greater flexibility to convey water from the Strange Street WSS to either Waterloo or Kitchener.
In creating this flexibility, there is greater utilization of local supplies to satisfy local water demands. This in turn reduces dependency on supplemental water from water sources that are further away, such as from the Mannheim area.

Other Opportunities:

The pump station structures at both the William Street and Strange Street WSSs may have cultural and historical value to them. At the same time, both structures provide housing to important water supply infrastructure. This is a good opportunity to reconfirm the historic significance of the structures on both properties and seek long term solutions for their continued upkeep.

Class Environmental Assessment:

To investigate the MP alternative for William Street and Strange Street WSSs, a Schedule C Environmental Assessment (Class EA) under the Municipal Engineers Association is necessary.

The Class EA will investigate:

- Preferred alternative for water supply scheme
- Preferred alternative for connecting water main routing (including LRT crossing)
- Preferred alternative for end usage of both sites

A preliminary design of the facility will be included.

Consultant Selection

A Request for Consultant Services for the William Street and Strange Street Water Supply Systems Class Environmental Assessment (EA) and Preliminary Design was advertised in the Kitchener-Waterloo Record and on the Region’s website on November 29, 2013. The Region received six Letter of Interest submissions. Three firms were short listed based on the Quality and Equity Factors, and asked to submit detailed work plans and upset fees for this assignment. There were:

- Cima Canada Ltd
- Stantec Consulting Ltd. and
- XCG Consultants Ltd

The individuals in Project Team involved in the consultant were:

J. Cavalcante, Manager, Engineering and Planning, Water Services
J. Medd, Project Manager, Design and Construction
T. Middleton, Senior Hydrogeologist, Source Water Protection Programs, Water Services
O. Vrentzos, Manager, Operations, Water Operations, Water Services
K. Yajima, Senior Project Engineer, Engineering and Planning, Water Services
The evaluation criteria used for selecting the successful consultant was consistent with the Region’s Purchasing By-law and consultant selection policies. The evaluation criteria and their respective weightings are:

**Quality Factors (80%)**
- Project Approach and Understanding (25%)
- Experience of the Project Manager (20%)
- Experience of Project Support Staff (20%)
- Experience on Similar Projects (15%)

**Equity Factors (5%)**
- Current Regional Workload (3%)
- Local Office (2%)

**Price Factor (15%)**
- Upset Price (15%)

The Letters of Interest and Detailed Work Plans submitted by the three short listed consultants demonstrated a good understanding of the project, capable project teams, and experience on similar projects. After reviewing the Letters of Interest, Detailed Work Plans, schedules, and upset fees XCG Consultants Ltd. had the highest overall score. XCG’s cost for this proposal was the second highest of the three short listed consultants. However, their approach and understanding of the potential issues for this project was better than the other two consultants.

Based on this evaluation, the project team recommends that XCG Consultants Ltd. be retained to undertake this assignment at an upset fee limit of $514,896 plus applicable taxes.

**Scope of Work**

The scope of work for this assignment includes:

- Commence Class EA and Related Preparatory Work
- Review Background Information
- Conduct Cultural Inventory
- Conduct Condition Assessment of Existing Infrastructure
- Establish Well Capacity and Water Quality
- Develop Evaluation Criteria
- Develop Alternatives for Site Location
- Develop Alternatives for Raw Water Main Alignment
- Develop Alternatives for Future Property Usage
- Summarize Alternatives and Hold Alternatives Workshop
- Conduct Preliminary Design and Report
Hold Public Consultation Centres
Prepare Draft Environmental Study Report
Prepare Final Environmental Study Report

Schedule

Subject to Council's approval of this assignment, the proposed schedule for the Class EA is approximately twenty four (24) months commencing in April 2014 and ending in March 2016.

Consultant Upset Limit

The upset limit for consulting fees and disbursements for the William Street and Strange Street Water Supply Systems Class EA and Preliminary Design is $514,896 plus applicable taxes. A breakdown of the successful consultant's upset fee is included in Appendix A attached to this report.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

The William Street and Strange Street Water Supply Systems Class Environmental Assessment (EA) and Preliminary Design supports the Corporate Strategic Focus Area 2: “Growth Management and Prosperity”, Strategic Objective 2.2: “Develop, Optimize and Maintain Infrastructure to Meet Current and Projected Needs.”

Financial Implications:

The 2014 Ten Year Water Capital program provides a total project budget of $13.5 million for the implementation of the William Street and Strange Street Water Supply system upgrades. Of this amount, $1.4 million was budgeted in the years 2014 – 2016 for the Class Environmental Assessment and Preliminary Design to be funded by the Water Reserve Fund and Development Charge Reserve Fund.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Nil

Attachments

Appendix A: Breakdown of consultant's upset fee

Prepared By: Kaoru Yajima, Senior Project Engineer, Water Services
Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Appendix A

Breakdown of Consultant’s Upset Fee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Commence Class EA and Related Preparatory Work</td>
<td>$11,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Review Background Information</td>
<td>$34,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Conduct Cultural Inventory</td>
<td>$40,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Conduct Condition Assessment of Existing Infrastructure</td>
<td>$28,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Establish Well Capacity and Water Quality</td>
<td>$125,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Develop Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td>$9,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Develop Alternatives for Site Location</td>
<td>$39,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Develop Alternatives for Raw Water Main Alignment</td>
<td>$21,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Develop Alternatives for Future Property Usage</td>
<td>$23,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Summarize Alternatives and Hold Alternatives Workshop</td>
<td>$18,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Conduct Preliminary Design and Report</td>
<td>$62,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hold Public Consultation Centres</td>
<td>$52,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Prepare Draft Environmental Study Report</td>
<td>$29,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Prepare Final Environmental Study Report</td>
<td>$18,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Upset Fee</td>
<td>$514,896</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report: E-14-026/P-14-035

Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Transportation
Planning, Housing and Community Services
Community Planning

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

Date: April 1, 2014

File Code: C13-20

Subject: King-Victoria Multi-Modal Transit Hub, Assumption of Waterloo Street established by Registered Plan 374, between Breithaupt Street and Victoria Street North, City of Kitchener

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the commencement of the process to transfer Part of Waterloo Street, established by Registered Plan 374, lying between Victoria Street (Regional Road No. 55) and Breithaupt Street in the City of Kitchener, designated as Part 6 on Reference Plan 58R-17870, being PIN 22319-0002 (LT) and Part 1 on Reference Plan 58R-18101, being Part of PIN 22319-0001 (LT), from the City of Kitchener to the Regional Municipality of Waterloo as described in Report E-14-026/P-14-035:

1. Provide notice to the public of the proposed transfer of part of Waterloo Street between Victoria Street and Breithaupt Street from the City of Kitchener in accordance with the Region’s Notice Policy;

2. Commence the process to consider amending the Road Consolidation By-Law 01-059 (Regional Road System) to assume part of Waterloo Street between Victoria Street and Breithaupt Street from the City of Kitchener, effective upon passing of the by-law; and

3. Commence the process to amend Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072 to reflect the addition of existing traffic regulations on the section of road to be assumed by the Region of Waterloo.
Summary:

The King-Victoria Multi-modal Transit Hub (the Transit Hub) will serve as the focal point of Waterloo Region’s higher order transit services, a result of the development of ION Light Rail Transit from north Waterloo to south Kitchener, and the extension of GO Transit rail service to the Region. In addition to its role in the transportation system, the Transit Hub will also serve as the key anchor along Waterloo Region’s Central Transit Corridor, with an opportunity to integrate transit station functions with a high density mixed-use destination.

The planned relocation of the GO train and VIA Rail platform from its temporary location at Weber Street to its permanent location at the Transit Hub will necessitate the assumption of Waterloo Street from Victoria Street to Breithaupt Street.

In order to accommodate the construction of the King Street grade separation, it may be necessary to close public access to Waterloo Street as early as fall 2015. According to the Municipal Class EA process, closure of an existing road is a Schedule A+ undertaking, and is pre-approved subject to public notification of the intent to close a road prior to implementation. The public was notified of this planned closure through a Notice of Study Commencement first posted on September 25, 2012 and secondly on October 2, 2012 in the Record newspaper. Information was also provided to the public at a King-Victoria Transit Hub Open House held by the Region on September 28, 2012.

Actual closure of the section between Victoria Street and Briethaupt Street will require By-law approval, and that bylaw will be advertised as per standard municipal requirements.

Report:

Waterloo Street is currently a local street under the jurisdiction of the City of Kitchener. However, as part of the future Transit Hub lands, the Province requires the Region of Waterloo to have full ownership of Waterloo Street prior to the filing of the Record of Site Condition. Therefore, staff is recommending that the Region pass a by-law to assume Waterloo Street from Victoria Street North to Breithaupt Street (approximately 0.32 lane kilometres). The City of Kitchener Council passed a resolution in support of the Region assuming this part of Waterloo Street (please see Appendix C). Once Regional Council approves commencing the process to consider amending the existing Road Consolidated By-Law 01-059 (Regional Road System) to assume this road segment, Region staff will proceed to provide public notice as required by the Region’s Notice Policy and place the proposed by-law on the agenda of an upcoming Council Meeting.

The Region intends to maintain public access to Waterloo Street until it is required for the future construction of the GO train and VIA Rail platform and associated pedestrian improvements. However, to accommodate the construction of the King Street grade separation, it may be necessary to close public access to Waterloo Street as early as fall 2015. This will require staff to prepare an additional report to Council recommending the closure of Waterloo Street and that it be included as part of the development parcel. Prior to the closure, the City of Kitchener will continue to maintain Waterloo Street. Once the road is closed, the appropriate easements will be provided to the City of
Kitchener to access and maintain their utilities and for Breithaupt Block and Boehmer Box to operate and maintain their commercial driveway access from Breithaupt Street.

Notwithstanding that the part of Waterloo Street south of the railway line will be closed to vehicles as early as fall 2015, it will remain a primary access point for pedestrians and cyclists. The preliminary preferred option for Waterloo Street is to include a new pedestrian underpass along the Waterloo Street corridor to provide a direct entrance into the Transit Hub. Pedestrian improvements could also be extended to Breithaupt Street to form a strong pedestrian and cyclist connection through the Transit Hub site to the adjacent neighbourhood. In addition to providing an entrance structure for the pedestrian underpass, the section of Waterloo Street between the railway tracks and Breithaupt Street will provide commercial driveway access to Breithaupt Block and the Boehmer Box loading facility. Bus access from Victoria Street into the Transit Hub will be implemented as part of project construction. Although the final design will be determined at a later phase, a Preliminary Victoria Street Level Concept sketch of the Transit Hub can be seen in Appendix A below:

A traffic impact study completed in November 2012 concluded that traffic volumes on the affected segment of Waterloo Street are very low and limited to local traffic only (73 vehicles/hour at a.m. peak and 72 vehicles/hour at p.m. peak). The closure will likely divert most traffic to the Duke Street and Victoria Street North intersection, which has adequate capacity to handle the diverted volumes without worsening existing levels of service.

As part of the Development Process and in anticipation of the closure of Waterloo Street, Regional staff completed the required Schedule A+ Environmental Assessment, which consisted of notifying surrounding property owners and residents of the planned closure. The public was notified of this planned closure through a Notice of Study Commencement first posted on September 25, 2012 and secondly on October 2, 2012 in the Record newspaper. Information was also provided to the public at a King-Victoria Transit Hub Open House held by the Region on September 28, 2012.

A separate municipal by-law process will be required before Waterloo Street can be legally and physically closed.

That part of Waterloo Street to be assumed by the Region of Waterloo is shown in Appendix B.

**Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination**

On March 4, 2013, the City of Kitchener passed a resolution in support of the Region of Waterloo’s assumption of the portion of Waterloo Street from Breithaupt Street to Victoria Street North (please see Appendix C).

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

This initiative directly supports Strategic Action 3.4.1, “Implement the multimodal transportation hub at Victoria and King Streets”.
Financial Implications:

The costs associated with the preparation of property reference plans as part of this road assumption process are contained within the Multi-modal Transit Hub project.

The total mileage of the Regional Road System will be increased by approximately 0.32 lane kilometres. The City of Kitchener will maintain Waterloo Street for the duration of 2014 at no additional cost to the Region. As part of the 2015 budget review process there may be a slight adjustment to the Transportation Operations Maintenance budget.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Staff from Corporate Resources (Legal Services) was consulted in the preparation of this report.

Corporate Resources staff will be involved in the preparation of the Roads Consolidated and Traffic and Parking by-law amendments and Planning Division staff will undertake any amendments required to the Regional Official Policies Plan.

Attachments:

Appendix A – Preliminary Street Level Concept sketch of the Transit Hub

Appendix B – Section of Waterloo Street to be assumed by the Region of Waterloo

Appendix C – Council Resolution from the City of Kitchener supporting the transfer of Waterloo Street from Breithaupt Street to Victoria Street North to the Region of Waterloo

Prepared By: Andrea Buckley, Sr. Project Manager, Transportation Infrastructure

John Hill, Principal Planner

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

Approved By: Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Housing and Community Services
Appendix B

The Transit Hub Site

Part of Waterloo Street to be assumed by the Region of Waterloo between Victoria St. N (55) and Breithaupt Street. Approximately 0.32 lane kms.
March 5, 2013

Kevin Eby, Director of Community Planning
Regional Municipality of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street, 8th Floor
Kitchener ON N2G 4J3

Dear Mr. Eby

Re: Council Resolution:
Official Plan Amendment - OP/12/02/K/HH
Zone Change Application - ZC12/15/K/HH
490-520, 510 King Street West and 16, 50 and 60 Victoria Street North
(Multimodal Hub), Regional Municipality of Waterloo

This is to advise that the Council of the Corporation of the City of Kitchener at its meeting held on Monday, March 4, 2013 passed the following resolution:

"That Official Plan Amendment Application OP12/02/K/HH (Regional Municipality of Waterloo, 490-520 King Street West, 16-60 Victoria Street North) requesting a new Special Policy Area and associated policies be adopted, in the form shown in the Official Plan Amendment attached to Community Services Department report CSD-13-009 as Appendix "A", and accordingly forwarded to the Region of Waterloo for approval; and,

That Zone Change Application ZC12/15/K/HH (Regional Municipality of Waterloo, 490-520, 510 King Street West, 16, 50, 60 Victoria Street North) for the purpose of changing the zoning from Warehouse District Zone (D-6) with and without site-specific provisions to Warehouse District Zone (D-6) with Special Regulation Provision 638R, Special Use Provisions 426U and 427U and Holding Provision 68H be approved in the form shown in the "Proposed By-law" dated January 18, 2013 attached to Report CSD-13-009 as Appendix "B"; and,

That the Urban Design Brief for the Region of Waterloo Multi-Modal Transit Hub, dated January 2013, and attached to Report CSD-13-009 as Appendix "C", be adopted; and,

That the City of Kitchener supports the transfer of Waterloo Street from Breithaupt Street to Victoria Street North to the Region of Waterloo, pursuant to Section 52 of the Municipal Act, provided that the transferred road is retained in Regional ownership and is used primarily for pedestrian or vehicular movement; and further,
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That the City of Kitchener participate in the procurement process to be undertaken by the Regional Municipality of Waterloo for the selection of a private sector development partner(s) for future development of the site."

Yours truly,

[Signature]

D. Livingstone
Committee Administrator, Legislated Services

cc: H. Holbrook
A. Pinard
Region of Waterloo
Planning Housing and Community Services
Community Planning
Finance
Treasury Services and Tax Policy

To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: April 1, 2014
File Code: F25-20

Subject: Brownfields Financial Incentives Program – Tax Increment Grant Application – 350 Dundas Street South, City of Cambridge

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions regarding the property municipally known as 350 Dundas Street South in the City of Cambridge, as described in Report P-14-038/F-14-046, dated April 1, 2014:

a) Approve a joint Tax Increment Grant for an amount not to exceed $318,090 net of other future assistance, to be financed from the incremental tax revenue for the property following remediation, redevelopment and reassessment;

b) Provide the Tax Increment Grant subject to the completion of remediation and redevelopment of the property and upon final confirmation of any additional brownfield related financial assistance provided under the Region’s Brownfield Financial Incentive Program or through the City of Cambridge; and

c) Authorize the Region’s Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services and Chief Financial Officer to execute any associated agreements with the registered owner of 350 Dundas Street South and the City of Cambridge, with the form and content of such agreement(s) to be satisfactory to both the Regional and City of Cambridge Solicitors.
Summary:

In November 2013, the Region of Waterloo received a joint Tax Increment Grant (TIG) application from Freure Blair Crossing Limited (the applicant) in regard to the remediation and redevelopment of the property municipally known as 350 Dundas Street South in Cambridge. The property is 1.18 hectares and includes frontage on Dundas Street South. Contamination, including petroleum hydrocarbons and polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons, may have been imported by a previous landowner. Region of Waterloo approval of the joint TIG would facilitate remediation of a property in a wellhead protection area (WPSA-4) and development of 53 residential townhouse units adjacent to a future iXpress corridor and support the region’s shift towards higher density living and a greater use of public transportation.

If approved, this TIG would represent the fourth successful joint TIG application in the City of Cambridge with approved grants to date contributing to the anticipated development of at least 390 residential units in the City and a realized building permit value to date of approximately $35.5 million.

The applicant has submitted estimated environmental remediation costs for the site of $1,507,000. This amount, plus a 10% allowance for indirect costs afforded under the joint TIG program ($150,700), less assistance pending under the Regional Development Charge Exemption ($492,317) and City of Cambridge Development Charge Brownfield Exemption ($628,474) results in a maximum eligible joint TIG of $536,909. The TIG would be cost-shared between the Region and the City of Cambridge with grant proportions determined by each municipality’s share of the municipal taxes levied on the property in the year the application was submitted (2013) with approximately 59% (maximum of $318,090) being provided by the Region and the remaining 41% (maximum of $218,819) provided by the City of Cambridge. The annual payments, which would last an estimated five years, would not start until after the property is fully remediated, redeveloped and ultimately reassessed by the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC), likely not before 2016.

City of Cambridge staff has prepared a report recommending the joint TIG application, which was approved by Cambridge City Council on March 3, 2014.

The Region’s portion of the joint TIG (maximum of $318,090) would be funded from the incremental tax revenue following remediation and redevelopment of the property.

As a condition of approval under the joint TIG program, an Interim Tri-Partite Remediation and Redevelopment agreement between the applicant, the Region and the City of Cambridge would be required.

Report:

Application Details - 350 Dundas Street South, Cambridge

On November 6, 2013, the Region of Waterloo received a joint Tax Increment Grant (TIG) application for the remediation and redevelopment of Freure Blair Crossing Limited (the applicant) for the property municipally known as 350 Dundas Street South
in Cambridge. The subject property is 1.18 hectares (2.9 acres) and includes frontage on Dundas Street South (please see Attachment 1 for a site map). The property was the site of an abandoned single family home, which was demolished by the current owner, and a subsequent Phase Two Environmental Site Assessment confirmed the presence of contaminated soil, which likely resulted from the use of contaminated fill by a previous landowner. The proposed redevelopment is for 53 townhouse units.

In 2013, the property was rezoned to permit multiple residential with specific provisions allowing reduced setbacks and private amenity area. The applicant has submitted site plan and Committee of Adjustment applications to the City of Cambridge that accommodate the proposed site development. The Region’s approval of the joint TIG would facilitate remediation of a property in a wellhead protection area (WPSA-4) and development of 53 residential townhouse units adjacent to a future iXpress corridor and support the region’s shift towards higher density living and a greater use of public transportation. If approved, this TIG would represent the fourth successful joint TIG application in the City of Cambridge with approved grants to date contributing to the anticipated development of at least 390 residential units in the City and a realized building permit value to date of approximately $35.5 million.

**Estimated Environmental Remediation Costs**

The Region’s joint TIG program for brownfield redevelopment requires an applicant to provide an estimate of the costs of remediation at the time an application is submitted. This estimate forms the basis of a commitment for TIG payments to offset these costs subject to the program requirements. Applicants are asked to provide this estimate in the form of a Remedial Work Plan prepared by a Qualified Person under Ontario Regulation 153/04 (as amended).

As part of the application process, City of Cambridge and Regional staff reviewed a Remedial Work Plan and found it to be acceptable. The work plan confirms the cost estimates in the TIG application for future eligible environmental remediation.

Estimated environmental remediation costs for the site total $1,507,000. This amount, plus a 10% allowance for indirect costs afforded under the joint TIG program ($150,700), less assistance pending under the Regional Development Charge Exemption ($492,317) and City of Cambridge Development Charge Brownfield Exemption ($628,474) results in a maximum eligible joint TIG of $536,909.

As a condition of final approval of eligible costs, invoices must be submitted by the applicant and must be approved for eligibility by City of Cambridge and Regional staff.

**Joint TIG Calculations and Payment Schedule**

The interim joint TIG payments and schedule are determined based on the following key pieces of information:

- An estimate of the anticipated assessed value and classification of the property upon completion of remediation and redevelopment;
The estimated increase in municipal (Regional and City) taxes (known as the tax increment) based on the anticipated assessed value and classification upon completion of the remediation and redevelopment; and

An estimate of the total net eligible remediation costs (including a 10% allowance for indirect remediation costs but less the total of any additional government financial assistance received for the project).

This information is collectively used to determine the maximum potential joint TIG the site could receive (based on estimated net eligible remediation costs) as well as the estimated eligible joint TIG amount the site can achieve (based on the estimated tax increment). The grant is paid to the applicant on an annual basis for a maximum period of 10 years or until total eligible remediation costs have been recovered, which ever comes first. The resulting annual grant payment is equal to the increment between the pre-remediation and redevelopment municipal property taxes and the post-remediation and redevelopment municipal property taxes. In other words, the City and Region’s total liability for making grant payments are capped by the lesser of the equivalent of 10 years of tax increment, which is determined following MPAC’s reassessment of the property, or the total actual net eligible remediation costs as determined by a review of the applicant’s final costs submission.

The TIG would be cost-shared between the Region and the City of Cambridge with proportions determined by each municipality’s share of the municipal taxes levied on the property in the year the application was submitted (2013) with approximately 59% (maximum of $318,090) being provided by the Region and the remaining 41% (maximum of $218,819) provided by the City of Cambridge. The annual payments, which are estimated to last five years, would not start until after the property is fully remediated, redeveloped and ultimately reassessed by the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC), likely not before 2016.

Table 1 summarizes the estimated annual tax increment, maximum potential joint TIG and the estimated eligible TIG amount for this application, including a break down of the Regional and City of Cambridge portions.

Table 2 identifies the preliminary estimated payment period. The final joint TIG grant payment schedule will not be confirmed until the actual remediation costs are reviewed and the MPAC assessment is received following the redevelopment of the property. Regardless of the actual remediation costs, the Region’s share of the TIG is capped at $318,090.

For more detailed information on the tax increment calculations and methodology please see Attachment 3.
Table 1: Estimated Tax Increment Grants for 350 Dundas St, Cambridge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maximum Potential TIG</th>
<th>Estimated Eligible TIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated Annual Tax Increment*</td>
<td>10 Years of Tax Increments*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>$44,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>$64,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total*</td>
<td>$108,955</td>
<td>$1,089,550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* rounded to the nearest dollar

Table 2: Estimated TIG Payment Schedule for 350 Dundas St, Cambridge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total TIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$44,405</td>
<td>$64,550</td>
<td>$108,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$44,405</td>
<td>$64,550</td>
<td>$108,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$44,405</td>
<td>$64,550</td>
<td>$108,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$44,405</td>
<td>$64,550</td>
<td>$108,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$41,199</td>
<td>$59,890</td>
<td>$101,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total TIG*</td>
<td>$218,819</td>
<td>$318,090</td>
<td>$536,909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rounded to the nearest dollar

Joint TIG Application Review

As part of staff’s review, the site and proposed redevelopment were evaluated based on the following standard eligibility criteria developed by the Region and Area Municipalities for the joint TIG program:

1. The site must be located within the designated Area Municipal Community Improvement Plan (CIP) Project Area where the CIP allows for implementation of the Regional Brownfield Financial Incentive Program;
2. The applicant must be the registered owner of the site or an assignee of the owner;
3. The applicant cannot be responsible for causing the on-site contamination that requires remediation;
4. The remediation and redevelopment undertaken must result in a minimum increase of $100,000 in the assessed value of the property.
5. The Environmental Site Assessments must be completed by a “Qualified Person” (as per Ontario Regulation 153/04);
6. Redevelopment plans must meet all approved policy and should comply, where feasible and appropriate, with applicable design guidelines;
7. The site must not be in a position of tax arrears or have any outstanding municipal financial obligations; and
8. Application for a TIG must be made prior to issuance of building permit(s) for the redevelopment.

City of Cambridge and Regional staff have reviewed the application for 350 Dundas Street under the above eligibility criteria, and are satisfied that the site and proposed redevelopment have met the requirements of the joint TIG program.

Interim Tri-Partite Remediation and Redevelopment Agreement

As a condition of approval under the joint TIG program, an Interim Tri-Partite Remediation and Redevelopment Agreement (the “Interim Agreement”) between the land owner(s), the Region of Waterloo and the City of Cambridge will be required. Upon confirmation of the estimated eligible costs under the joint TIG program, the Interim Agreement would be developed and would establish a number of conditions including, but not limited to, the following:

- The owner must pay all property taxes levied upon the property during remediation and redevelopment (failure to pay and keep in good standing all municipal property taxes will deem the owner in default);
- The owner must submit a Record of Site Condition prepared by a “Qualified Person”, as that term is defined by regulation under the Environmental Protection Act, that permits the use of the site as proposed by the Owner to the Ontario Ministry of the Environment; and
- The owner must demonstrate that the remediation and redevelopment of the site has resulted in a minimum $100,000 increase in the assessed value of the property.

Once the remediation, redevelopment and reassessment of the property are complete and actual costs, through invoice review and realized reassessment values have been verified, the Interim Agreement will be superseded by the Final Agreement. This Final Agreement would include the final TIG payments and payment schedule based on the actual costs and the realized reassessment value and classification of the development.

The final TIG payment amounts and schedule may change as it is based on the actual net eligible remediation costs and realized assessment at the time the development is completed. However, the maximum amount of eligible remediation costs cannot exceed $536,909 of which $318,090 is the Region’s maximum commitment based on Municipal/Regional tax allocation percentages at the time the application was submitted (2013).

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

City of Cambridge and Regional staff have jointly reviewed the application and are satisfied that the application meets the eligibility and application requirements. City of
Cambridge staff prepared a report recommending the joint TIG application which was subsequently approved at Cambridge City Council on March 3, 2014 (please see Attachment 2). A draft of this report was circulated to City staff on March 25, 2014 and they are in concurrence with its recommendations.

The details contained in the City and Region’s reports are based on estimates only. City and Region staff will reconcile any differences as part of the development of the interim and finalized tri-partite TIG agreement upon confirmation of actual costs and the realized reassessment value of the development.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

A tax increment grant which may be approved for 350 Dundas Street South property is consistent with the 2011-2014 Corporate Strategic Plan which directs that the Region:

- Implement a sustainable Brownfield Program to promote the redevelopment of previously contaminated sites (Action 2.1.1);
- Work with area municipalities to develop and implement a comprehensive strategy to promote intensification and reurbanization within existing urban areas (Action 2.1.2).
- Protect the quality of our drinking water sources (Strategic Objective 1.4)

**Financial Implications**

The Region’s share of the maximum potential TIG is $318,090 based on the estimated net eligible remediation costs. The Region’s actual share of the TIG will be confirmed once the actual remediation costs are reviewed and the property is reassessed by Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC).

Under the funding model for joint tax increment grants adopted by Regional Council in 2013, the annual TIG payments would be funded from the increased tax revenue on the property occurring in the same year. In other words, the tax revenue resulting from the increased assessment following the redevelopment of a brownfield property is used to fund the annual tax increment grant payment. Grant payments would not be expected to commence before 2016 as the first grant payment is contingent on the completion of the redevelopment and a reassessment of the property by MPAC, and it is expected that the grant will be paid over five years.

Once the TIG is fully paid, the increased assessment resulting from the redevelopment would benefit the overall tax levy. Through the Big Shift Toolbox’s Brownfield Financial Incentives Program, staff note that in addition to the Joint TIG, this site is also eligible for City and Regional Development Charge exemptions which have been factored into the TIG calculation.

A listing of approved TIGS and the applicable funding sources can be found on page 246 of the final 2014 Program Budget Book. Following approval, this TIG will be reflected in the Region’s 2015-2024 capital plan.
Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Staff from Transportation and Environmental Services (Water Services), Finance and Legal Services were involved in the review of the joint TIG application and the preparation of this report and are in support of the staff recommendation.

Attachments:

Attachment 1 – Site Map (2013 Aerial Image)
Attachment 2 – City of Cambridge Staff Report
Attachment 3 - Detailed TIG Calculation Methodology

Prepared By: John Hill, Principal Planner/Brownfields Coordinator
              Angela Hinchberger, Director, Treasury Services and Tax Policy

Approved By: Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Housing and Community Services
              Craig Dyer, Chief Financial Officer
Attachment 1 – Site Map (2013 Aerial Image)
Attachment 2 – City of Cambridge Staff Report

REPORT

To: GENERAL COMMITTEE
Date of Meeting: February 24, 2014
Prepared By: Deanne Friess, Senior Reurbanization Planner
Department: Planning and Development Department
Date to Management Committee: February 12, 2014
Report No.: 14-011-PLN
File No.: D.18.04.04.15.03
Ward No.: 7

Recommendations:

THAT Council approve the Tax Increment Grant for the property known as 350 Dundas Street South in the City of Cambridge in an amount not to exceed $1,657,700.00;

AND THAT the Tax Increment Grant be reduced by any other financial assistance approved for site remediation;

AND FURTHER THAT Council authorize the Mayor and Clerk to execute a multi-party Tax Increment Grant Agreement with the registered owners of 350 Dundas Street South, namely Freure Blair Crossings Limited, and the Regional Municipality of Waterloo.

Background:

Tax Increment Program

In 2008 the City of Cambridge, in collaboration with the Region of Waterloo established a Tax Increment Grant (TIG) Program to assist property owners with the remediation and redevelopment of contaminated properties within the City core area boundaries. In 2010 Council approved the expansion of the Community Improvement Plan for the TIG to include the entire City of Cambridge boundary.
The TIG is a grant equal to the full amount or portion of the amount that municipal and regional property taxes increase after a property is reassessed following the remediation and redevelopment of a property. The tax increment is calculated using the change in the current assessment value following the completion of clean-up and redevelopment of the property. The difference in taxes, or the increment, is used to provide a grant to the applicant for eligible costs associated with environmental remediation. Payments through the TIG program are provided in annual installments until all eligible remediation costs (minus other brownfield-related assistance granted) are recouped or up to a 10 year limit. The financial assistance received by the developer is paid for by the increased tax assessment generated by the new development.

Proposed Development

The subject property at 350 Dundas Street South is 1.18ha (2.92 ac) in size and includes frontage on Dundas Street South. The subject site has formerly been used for residential purposes however the soil/fill on the site is contaminated likely from fill material brought to the site. The majority of the property is currently vacant.
The property is proposed to be redeveloped with 53 residential townhouse units, an internal road network and a stormwater management area. The proposed Site Plan is included in Appendix A.

Existing Policy/By-law:

In 2013 the subject property was rezoned from single family residential (R4) to multiple residential (H)RM3 s.4.1.278. The site specific provisions allow reduced setbacks and private amenity area, an increased density and an increase in the number of attached townhouse units per block. The holding provision on the site may be removed following submission of a Record of Site Condition acknowledged by the Ministry of Environment. The applicant has submitted site plan and Committee of Adjustment applications to accommodate the proposed site development.

Financial Impact:

The TIG is a grant equal to up to the full amount that municipal and regional property taxes increase after a property is reassessed following the remediation and redevelopment of a property. The difference in taxes is used to provide a grant to the applicant for eligible costs associated with environmental remediation. Therefore the financial assistance received by the developer is paid for by the increased tax assessment generated by the new development and does not come from the City's capital budget. Based on the eligible remediation costs and the estimated future remediation costs the total amount of the TIG shall not exceed $1,657,700 minus any other financial assistance. This amount includes the remediation costs and an additional 10% allowance for indirect costs. The applicant has also applied for the City and Regional Development Charge exemption for contaminated properties. The applicant will be compensated for a significant portion of the remediation costs through this financial assistance program. Therefore the total amount TIG will be significantly reduced prior to registration of the TIG legal agreement.

Public Input:

N/A

Internal/External Consultation:

The City of Cambridge planning and finance staff have been involved with the Region of Waterloo in the evaluation of the eligible costs and estimates. All estimated costs will be evaluated with the Region of Waterloo staff following completion of a Record of Site Condition.
Comments/Analysis:

Tax Increment Grant Application

The 2013 Municipal Property closed roll value of the property was $318,750 with current taxes of $1,376.68 for the City and $2,001.25 for the Region. The projected post-remediation value is $10,600,000 which would generate approximately $45,781 in City taxes and $66,551 in Regional taxes. The TIG payment proportions are determined by the Region and City's share of the taxes levied on the property.

The total estimated eligible remediation costs are $1,507,000 as justified in the Remedial Work Plan submitted for the City and Regional staff review. An additional 10% allowance for consultant fees will be added to these costs. Council's approval of the TIG application is requested prior to completion of the remediation, redevelopment and reassessment of the development project. Therefore the grant amount can be adjusted downward to reflect any financial assistance received through other programs and potential lower future remediation costs. The breakdown of all the remediation costs is included below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase One Environmental Site Assessment</td>
<td>$ 6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase Two Environmental Site Assessment</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Eligible Remediation Costs</td>
<td>$1,401,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$1,507,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% Consultant Allowance</td>
<td>$ 150,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (before deductions)</td>
<td>$1,657,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the TIG application, the applicant has applied for City and Regional Development Charge Exemptions. The following summary estimates the total amount of the Development Charges and the remaining TIG. The Development Charges payable are subject to indexing every 6 months. Therefore depending on when the building permits are issued the actual value of the Development Charge fees will likely differ from the estimate below and the total TIG will be adjusted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (before deductions)</td>
<td>$1,657,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Charge Exemption</td>
<td>$ 492,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Development Charge Exemption</td>
<td>$ 628,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total TIG</td>
<td>$ 536,909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the assessment values and remediation costs, the tax increment grant payment schedule is included Appendix B.

Appendices
Appendix A – Proposed Site Plan
Appendix B – Tax Increment Grant
### APPENDIX B

#### Tax Increment Grant (TIG) (2013)

**Project Name:** 260 Dundas Street  
**Owner:** Fence Blair Crossing Limited  
**Address:** 501 Kug Street, Suite 201, Kitchener ON N2K 1L3

#### Tax Increment Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Prior to Remodeling (2013)</th>
<th>** After Project Completion</th>
<th>Increment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential/New Multi-Residential (RT/NT)</td>
<td>318,740</td>
<td>4,630,600</td>
<td>3,281,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Residential (MT)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (CT,DT,ST,GT,CH)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Vacant/Excess (CL,UX)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Commercial (KT,YT,KT)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Commercial Vacant/Excess (KU)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial (IT,II,IP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Vacant/Excess (UJK,UKJ)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Industrial (IT,KT)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Industrial Vacant/Excess (AJJXKJUGIO)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Tax Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/Municipal</th>
<th>Residential/New Multi-Residential</th>
<th>Multi-Residential</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Commercial Vacant/Excess</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
<th>Industrial Vacant/Excess</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00431900</td>
<td>0.0042200</td>
<td>0.00812200</td>
<td>0.00812200</td>
<td>0.00842200</td>
<td>0.00842200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Annual Taxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area Municipal</td>
<td>$3,377,800</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>$825,900</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Municipal</td>
<td>$4,203,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Costs Eligible for TIG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Eligible Remodeling Costs</th>
<th>19% Allowance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,500,000.00</td>
<td>$550,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total TIG (before deductions)

| Total TIG                           | $1,857,700.00 |

#### Less Other Brownfield Financial Assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional ESA Grant</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional DC Brownfield Exemption</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>$922,317.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Municipal DC Brownfield Exemption</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>$554,734.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>$383,649.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Other Brownfield Financial Assistance

| Total Other Brownfield Financial Assistance | $(1,150,690.03) |

#### Total TIG

| Total TIG                           | $537,009.00 |

### Amount of Tax Increment Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Increment Grant</th>
<th>Maximum Potential TIG</th>
<th>Eligible TIG Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Municipal</td>
<td>$44,405</td>
<td>$444,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>$44,405</td>
<td>$444,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total TIG</td>
<td>$158,955</td>
<td>$1,069,520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TIG Payment Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total TIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$44,405</td>
<td>$64,660</td>
<td>$109,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$44,405</td>
<td>$64,660</td>
<td>$109,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$44,405</td>
<td>$64,660</td>
<td>$109,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$44,405</td>
<td>$64,660</td>
<td>$109,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$41,109</td>
<td>$69,800</td>
<td>$109,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total TIG</strong></td>
<td>$218,819</td>
<td>$310,560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2012 MPAC Assessment Value based on 2013 Closed Roll Phase 1 Assessment Value.
**Estimate only. Actual post project assessment will be determined by MPAC at time of development completion.
Attachment 3 – Detailed Joint TIG Calculation Methodology

The anticipated joint Tax Increment Grant payments and schedule are determined for each application based on the following steps:

The first step includes the preparation of the anticipated assessment increment. These are based on the pre-remediation MPAC assessment values and the estimated post-remediation and redevelopment assessment values for each phase of development as provided by the applicant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Value “Pre”*</th>
<th>Assessment Value “Post”*</th>
<th>Assessment Increment*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$318,750 (2013)</td>
<td>$10,600,000 (est.)</td>
<td>$10,281,250 (est.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These values are based on estimates and will be confirmed by MPAC upon project completion.

Estimates are then prepared to identify the anticipated increase in municipal taxes (Region and City) that would be generated by the remediation and redevelopment for each phase, referred to as the ‘tax increment’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Municipal Taxes “Pre”*</th>
<th>Municipal Taxes “Post”*</th>
<th>Total Tax Increment*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>$1,378</td>
<td>$45,781</td>
<td>$44,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>$2,001</td>
<td>$66,551</td>
<td>$64,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$3,378</td>
<td>$112,333</td>
<td>$108,955</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tax amounts do not include the education portion of annual taxes levied and are rounded to the nearest dollar.

The final step is to determine the estimated total eligible remediation costs for the joint TIG program which includes a 10% allowance for indirect remediation costs to be applied on top of eligible remediation cost estimates. This total is reduced by an amount equal to any other government financial assistance received for the project. At this time additional financial assistance from other sources is not anticipated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Rem. Costs</th>
<th>Indirect Rem. Allowance (10%)</th>
<th>Less Other Assistance</th>
<th>Total Eligible Rem. Costs Through TIG*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,507,000</td>
<td>$150,700</td>
<td>$1,120,791</td>
<td>$536,909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rounded to the nearest dollar.

These steps culminate in the maximum eligible joint TIG for this application which is then cost shared between the Region and City based on the proportion of each municipality’s share of the municipal taxes levied on the property. The following table summarizes the maximum joint TIG and estimates of the Regional and City financial commitments for this application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum TIG*</th>
<th>Maximum Regional Portion (60.0%)*</th>
<th>Maximum City Portion (40.0%)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$536,909</td>
<td>$318,090</td>
<td>$218,819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rounded to the nearest dollar.
The City and Region’s total liability for making grant payments are capped by the lesser of the equivalent of ten (10) years of tax increment, which is determined following MPAC’s reassessment of the property, or the total actual net eligible remediation costs incurred by the applicant.

Payments related to the development do not commence until at least one (1) year following the re-assessment of the development by the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC).

The TIG is not an exemption from the property taxes levied, but a grant payable to the owner according to the payment schedule in accordance with an agreement between the parties. Therefore the applicant is required to pay all applicable property taxes for the property at all times during and after remediation and redevelopment or until such time as ownership is transferred to the intended end-user (if applicable).

The joint TIG Program applies only to the municipal portion of the tax bill and does not include the education portion that is remitted to the Province.

The final amounts of the TIG payments will be determined by the actual MPAC assessment value and classification and the final net eligible remediation costs, thus the final schedule of payments is subject to change.
Report: P-14-043

Region of Waterloo

Planning, Housing and Community Services

Community Planning

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

Date: April 1, 2014  File Code: D07-30

Subject: East Side Lands (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the East Side Lands (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MESP) report and supporting documentation, including Option 3b as the Preferred Option, as described in the East Side Lands (Stage 1) MESP prepared by Dillon Consulting Limited, and as summarized in Report P-14-043, dated April 1, 2014;

That as a co-proponent with the City of Cambridge, the Regional Municipality of Waterloo issue the Notice of Completion and file the East Side Lands (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MESP) Report and supporting documentation for a minimum 30 day public review in accordance with the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process;

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo continue to support the planning for the Regional infrastructure recommended in the East Side Lands (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MESP);

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo negotiate the transfer of Speedsville Road between Regional Road 38 (Maple Grove Road) and Regional Road 39 (Eagle Street) to the Region of Waterloo and transfer of Beverly Street and Samuelson Street/Clyde Road between Regional Road 8 (Dundas Street North) and Regional Road 36 (Franklin Boulevard) to the City of Cambridge;

That in conjunction with the road transfer negotiation noted above, the Regional Municipality of Waterloo continue negotiations with the City of Cambridge and the Township of Woolwich for a separate cross-border servicing agreement to service lands including and in the vicinity of the Region of Waterloo International Airport;
That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo request that the City of Cambridge take the following actions:

a) That as a co-proponent with the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, issue the Notice of Completion and file the East Side Lands (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MESP) Report and supporting documentation for a minimum 30 day public review in accordance with the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process;

b) Initiate Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments for the “Quick Start” Lands (as shown on Attachment 8) or lands otherwise determined so that the lands are designated, zoned and serviced for employment uses by 2015;

c) Include the City of Cambridge’s water and wastewater, stormwater and transportation projects recommended in the East Side Lands (Stage 1) MESP in the associated City of Cambridge Capital Budget programs for future years; and

d) Following the minimum 30 day public review, initiate an update to the City of Cambridge Development Charges By-law for the East Side Lands (Stage 1) MESP and incorporate the City infrastructure identified in the East Side Lands (Stage 1) MESP in the Capital Budget Program;

And that the Regional Municipality of Waterloo continue to work in cooperation with the City of Cambridge to advance the development of the East Side Lands (Stage 1), including opportunities for strategic investment and marketing as previously endorsed by Regional Council.

Summary:

A key element in attracting and retaining employers in a competitive global economy is ensuring that the Region has an adequate supply of development ready employment land. Regional Council recognized the importance of development-ready employment land in the Region’s 2011-2014 Strategic Plan by including the action to advance the East Side Employment Lands to development readiness.

In order to advance these lands to development readiness, a Master Environmental Servicing Plan has been undertaken. This MESP and supporting documentation was approved by City of Cambridge Council on March 24, 2014. The City of Cambridge is the co-proponent with the Region of Waterloo.

The East Side Lands (see Attachment 1) represent a key opportunity for the Region to market itself to existing and new businesses. 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 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 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 be able to accommodate approximately 8,000 to 10,000 new jobs and increase Regional property tax revenue annually by $5 million dollars by 2031. An additional $65 million to $80 million in City of Cambridge tax revenue is also forecast to be realized by 2031.

The following aspects of the East Side Lands (Stage 1) are particularly noteworthy:

- Opportunity to address the current shortage of large lots for employment uses in the Region of Waterloo;
- Regional Council began to designate the Stage 1 Lands in 2009, creating the Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve (PISR) lands in the City of Cambridge, south of the Region of Waterloo International Airport in the Regional Official Plan;
- The East Side Lands create opportunities for both existing businesses and new businesses;
- Canada’s Technology Triangle (CTT) has been actively supporting and promoting these lands being made development-ready, as did the consultants who recently completed the review of economic development in the Region on behalf of the Region and all seven area municipalities;
- Infrastructure investment can be phased so that the entire capital investment can be staged over a number of years;
- The Provincial government has significant land holdings in the Stage 1 Lands and is actively working with the Region and the City of Cambridge to complete the East Side Lands (Stage 1) MESP and advance their lands to market.

East Side Lands (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MESP)

On November 24, 2010 Regional Council retained Dillon Consulting Limited to provide consulting services for the East Side Lands (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MESP) and Community Plan. The MESP is funded jointly by the Region of Waterloo and the City of Cambridge and co-managed by the Region of Waterloo, the City of Cambridge and the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) in consultation with the City of Kitchener and the Township of Woolwich.

Master Environmental Servicing Plans are long range plans which integrate infrastructure requirements for existing and future land use with environmental assessment planning principles. The East Side Lands (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MESP) looks at related transportation, water and sewer infrastructure required to provide servicing and permit the development of the Stage 1 lands. Integrating the planning of infrastructure with the subwatershed study process allows for the full impact of decisions to be evaluated and understood.

The primary focus of the MESP is on the Stage 1 lands (see Attachments 1 and 2) which include 477 gross hectares (1,179 gross acres) of land designated in the new Regional Official Plan as Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve (PISR). Of this area, approximately 252 gross hectares (622 gross acres) were designated as part of Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 28 in 2007. This MESP will advance the Stage 1 lands through the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process towards development readiness.
for new employment opportunities.

The PISR designation in the Regional Official Plan provides for industrial and business park uses requiring municipal services in parcel sizes of predominantly 8 hectares (20 acres) or greater as well as for smaller parcels as a result of design limitations due to the location of environmental features, property configurations, new roads or existing development. The provision of larger parcel, municipally-serviced employment lands has been identified as a key step to maintain and enhance Waterloo Region’s economic competitiveness.

This MESP describes a set of infrastructure projects that are distributed geographically over the study area and may be implemented over a period of time. Projections of timing for individual infrastructure projects are contained in the MESP. These projections of timing are not binding and the individual infrastructure projects can be constructed when they are actually needed at the discretion of the proponent. The suggested ownership of each individual infrastructure project (City/Region) is also not binding and discussions can continue to occur on ownership after completion of the MESP.

The group of infrastructure projects presented in the MESP are related through the purpose of providing a servicing and transportation strategy for the East Side Lands (Stage 1) with full recognition of the impacts to the environment. This MESP provides a comprehensive, integrated approach to determine the necessary transportation, environmental, water and wastewater servicing, subwatershed, stormwater management and community planning information required to inform specific development applications.

Throughout the MESP process, a comprehensive consultation program with the public, landowners and government agencies was conducted which included four Public Information Centres (PICs). There were a number of issues identified throughout the consultation including: impact to natural features and wells, flooding / drainage issues, traffic, maintaining Riverbank Drive as a Scenic Heritage Road, land use compatibility, need for employment lands / economic competitiveness and access issues for specific development lands.

The Preferred Option

Five servicing options to provide water, wastewater and transportation infrastructure for the Stage 1 lands were developed as part of the MESP and presented at the second PIC. The proposed options were evaluated against the following criteria: development and sustainability, cost, land use, socio-economic and cultural environment, natural environment and transportation.

The Preferred Option of the Project Team (Region, City, GRCA staff and consultants) to provide water, wastewater and transportation infrastructure for the Stage 1 lands is Option 3b (see Attachment 3). This option was selected as preferred as it provides full water and wastewater servicing to the Stage 1 lands and Creekside lands (see Attachment 9), a north-south transportation connection through the East Side Lands (Stage 1) from Middle Block Road to King Street East, reduces traffic on Riverbank Drive, provides two municipal roads for the Creekside lands, avoids impacts to a Provincially Significant Wetland and Core Environmental Feature, and major avoids structural and operational impacts to the
Region’s Operations Centre.

The Regional and City infrastructure required to implement the Preferred Option is included as Attachments 5, 6 & 7. The estimated base cost for the new infrastructure is approximately $110 million, which includes both Regional and City capital costs. The costs will not all be incurred up front as infrastructure will be phased in as required to support development. The capital costs for the Regional infrastructure identified is between approximately $10 and $50 million. These projects are included in the Region’s 2014 Capital Program and can be funded by the Development Charge Reserve Fund.

The MESP satisfies the Environmental Assessment (EA) requirements for the majority of the infrastructure projects that fall under Municipal Class EA Schedules A, A+ or B, with the exception of the pumping stations, and no further EA work is required. For the pumping stations and Schedule C projects, further EA work separate to this MESP process is required including an Environmental Study Report. The Regional EA for the Region’s pumping station (SPS#2 as shown on Attachment 3) is currently underway (please refer to Report E-13-021) and is anticipated to be complete in 2015. It is expected the pumping station will be operational by 2017. In the interim, there is existing capacity in the Preston Wastewater Treatment Plant to service the Stage 1 lands, including the “Quick Start” lands. When the Regional Pumping Station is operational, some or all of the flow can be redirected to the Kitchener Wastewater Treatment Plant.

The Project Team, including staff from the City of Cambridge and the GRCA, unanimously supported the selection of the Preferred Option. Staff from the City of Kitchener and Township of Woolwich has advised they are supportive of the Preferred Option.

**Proposed Next Steps**

Subject to Regional Council approval of the recommendations of this report, a Notice of Completion of the MESP and supporting documentation will be jointly filed with the City of Cambridge according to Class EA requirements, by means of advertisements in local newspapers, the Region’s website and mailings to affected property owners and others who requested notice, municipalities and agencies. The Notice of Completion will be made available for a minimum 30 day public review period.

Part II Orders (“bump up” requests) can be submitted for individual projects (Schedule B projects only). If no Part II Orders are received, the MESP will be deemed complete and the Ministry of Environment will file the Notice of Completion. If a Part II Order is received, the proponent will be responsible for trying to resolve the issue. It ultimately lies with the Minister of Environment to make a ruling. There are no Part II orders allowed for Schedule A, A+ or C projects. Once the MESP is complete, all Schedule A and A+ projects can immediately proceed to detailed design and implementation subject to funding. Provided there are no Part II orders, the Schedule B projects can proceed without any further EA work (with the exception of the pumping stations).

After the completion of the MESP, several important next steps must follow to implement the Preferred Option 3b, including the completion of EA requirements for specific projects by the applicable municipality. In addition, the City of Cambridge must amend its Official Plan, Zoning By-law and Development Charges By-law. As the majority of the
implementation falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Cambridge, Regional Staff recommend Regional Council request City of Cambridge Council prioritize these next steps and to budget for them accordingly.

Finally, the Region’s EA process for the Regional Pumping Station and forcemain will continue, the transfer of Speedsville Road to the Region and Beverley Street/Samuelson Street/Clyde Road to the City of Cambridge should be completed in 2014 and a cross-border wastewater servicing agreement between the Township of Woolwich and the City of Cambridge will be negotiated in 2014 to provide wastewater servicing to the Region of Waterloo International Airport and other strategic investment lands.

Report:

One of the key elements of implementing the Regional Growth Management Strategy and the Region’s Strategic Plan, is planning for the development of the East Side Community and ensuring the availability of new employment lands. In 2006, the Region of Waterloo, in co-operation with the Prosperity Council of Waterloo Region and economic development officers from the local municipalities completed an “Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory and Demand Analysis.” This report identified the need to expand the Regional Official Policy Plan’s City Urban Area designation to provide for 300 net hectares (741 net acres) of fully serviced land in parcels greater than 8 hectares (20 acres) in size.

In June 2007, Regional Council approved Regional Official Policies Plan Amendment No. 28 (ROPPA 28) to designate approximately 150 net hectares of land for large lot employment uses. As a result of an Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) Settlement, additional land west of Fountain Street and south of Allendale Road, and east of Speedsville Road were included. In June 2009, Regional Council adopted the new Regional Official Plan (ROP) which includes the land designated as part of ROPPA 28, plus additional land for a total of approximately acres 300 net hectares (741 net acres) as Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve (PISR) (please see Attachment 2).

The main purpose of the PISR designation is to ensure that an adequate supply of development ready employment land is available within the Region of Waterloo for new large-lot manufacturing or business park uses requiring municipal water and wastewater services. Lands designated as PISR will be developed in parcels 8 hectares (20 acres) or greater unless otherwise restricted by design limitations associated with environmental features, property configurations, the provision of new roads or existing development. It is anticipated that some smaller lots will result due to these design limitations.

To continue to advance the PISR lands towards development readiness, a Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MESP) was identified as the preferred way to address the outstanding studies and the Environmental Assessment work required. Given the multi-jurisdiction, multi-disciplinary approach to a MESP, the Region worked with the City of Cambridge and the Grand River Conservation Authority to develop the Terms of Reference for East Side Lands (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MESP) and Community Plan. The City of Kitchener and the Township of Woolwich were also consulted throughout the development of the MESP.

In addition to designating the land, a number of other related Regional initiatives to
advance the development of the Broader East Side Lands, have been completed over the past few years, including the Wastewater Treatment Master Plan and associated AECOM East Side Servicing Review, environmental monitoring of the East Side Watersheds, and completion of the Regional Transportation Master Plan.

**East Side Lands (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MESP)**

On November 24, 2010 Regional Council retained Dillon Consulting Limited to provide consulting services for the East Side Lands (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MESP) and Community Plan. The MESP is being jointly funded by the Region of Waterloo and the City of Cambridge and co-managed by the Region of Waterloo, the City of Cambridge and the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA). The MESP advances the lands through the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process towards development readiness to provide for new employment opportunities. The MESP was conducted in accordance with the Municipal Engineers Association Class Environmental Assessment Process (2007) including public consultation and preparation of the MESP Report.

The primary focus of the MESP is on the Stage 1 lands (see Attachment 1), which are strategically positioned north of Highway 401 near the Region of Waterloo International Airport. The MESP also considered the impact on infrastructure from the Broader East Side Lands area to be developed beyond 2031. The Stage 1 lands include the 477 gross hectares (1,179 gross acres) of land designated in the new Regional Official Plan as Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve (PISR). Of this, approximately 250 gross hectares (618 gross acres) were designated as part of the Regional Official Policies Plan (ROPP Amendment No. 28). The Stage 1 lands also include the Study Area for the subwatershed study for Freeport Creek and the area that drains directly to the Grand River, which is included as a technical appendix to the MESP.

The MESP provides a comprehensive, integrated approach to answer the broader questions about the necessary transportation, environmental, water and wastewater servicing, subwatershed, stormwater management and community planning information required to inform specific development applications.

**The Preferred Option**

Five servicing options to provide water, wastewater and transportation for the Stage 1 lands were developed as part of the MESP and presented at the second PIC. As required by the Class EA process, the options were evaluated against the following criteria: development and sustainability, cost, land use, socio-economic and cultural environment, natural environment and transportation.

The Preferred Option of the Project Team (Region, City and GRCA staff and consultants) to provide water, wastewater and transportation servicing for the Stage 1 lands is Option 3b (see Attachment 3). This option was selected as preferred as it provides full municipal water and wastewater servicing to the Stage 1 and Creekside lands, a north-south transportation connection through the East Side lands from Middle Block Road to King Street East, reduces traffic on Riverbank Drive, provides two municipal roads for the Creekside lands, avoids impacts to a Provincially Significant Wetland and Core
Environmental Feature, and avoids structural and operational impacts to the Regional Operations Centre complex. The evaluation results summary table for all options is included as Attachment 4.

For a list of all infrastructure projects (both Region and City) required to implement the Preferred Option, please see Attachments 5, 6 & 7. The estimated base cost for the new infrastructure specifically required for this option is approximately $110 million, which includes both Regional and City capital costs. Infrastructure will be phased in as required to support development and not all of the costs will be incurred upfront.

The following Regional water and wastewater infrastructure projects are required to implement the Preferred Option and are included in the 2014 Capital Program:

- 450 mm watermain along Fountain Street (from Kossuth Road to Maple Grove Road), (Schedule A);
- Forcemain to direct wastewater to the Preston Wastewater Treatment Plant (Schedule A+ Pre-approved); and,
- Proposed new Regional Sewage Pumping Station (SPS#2) and Forcemain to Kitchener Wastewater Treatment Plant (Schedule B).

For Schedule A, A+ and B projects (with the exception of the pumping stations), the MESP satisfies the EA requirements and no further EA work is required. For the pumping stations and forcemain, further EA work is required including an Environmental Study Report. The Regional EA for the Region’s pumping station (SPS#2) and forcemain to the Kitchener Wastewater Treatment Plant is currently underway (refer to Report E-13-021) and is anticipated to be complete by 2015. It is expected the pumping station will be operational by 2017. The 2014 Capital Program includes the pump station SPS #2 and the forcemain to the Kitchener WWTP.

The transportation infrastructure projects required to implement Option 3b are included in Attachment 5. Upgrades to Fountain Street and Maple Grove Road are also required and were assumed in the analysis as they were identified in the Regional Transportation Master Plan and are already budgeted as part of the Region’s 10 Year Transportation Capital Program.

Timing for the proposed infrastructure projects is based on the anticipated rate of uptake and development of the Stage 1 area of about 20 hectares per year. Since it is intended to only construct infrastructure as it is required to service development areas, the construction projects will be spread over the planning period for financial considerations and for managing cash flow. As it is not possible to dictate or predict where and when development will occur within the Stage 1 lands, the staging plan for constructing infrastructure to support this development is flexible and can be adjusted accordingly throughout the planning period. The proposed timing for each of the individual infrastructure projects should be regularly reviewed and updated based on the actual and anticipated development patterns within the Stage 1 lands. In this way, the servicing of the area can be synchronized with the actual development.

**Water and Wastewater Servicing**
The main objective of the Water and Wastewater component was to develop a water and wastewater servicing strategy for the Stage 1 lands, including: alignment and size of major trunk water mains; connection and impacts on the Integrated Urban Water System (IUS); the need for other ancillary facilities such as pumping stations, pressure reducing valves (PRVs), re-chlorination stations, alignment, size and depths of major sanitary trunk sewers; and location, size and depth of required pumping stations.

The proposed infrastructure is to be planned in a timely, systematic, cost-effective manner while minimizing environmental impacts. Infrastructure is also being planned to take into account future development (oversizing) of the balance of the East Side Lands. All options for water and wastewater servicing were developed to build on and leverage the existing system.

The MESP recommends that the existing water supply mains be used to supply water to the Stage 1 lands. Timing for some water main extensions will be dependent on absorption rates of employment lands in the Stage 1 area and adjacent lands. Given the existing transmission and distribution system in the Stage 1 area, phasing of water servicing for specific areas can be accomplished through construction of local mains, as required, as shown on Attachment 6. All areas of the Stage 1 lands can be serviced for water by extending the existing system. Timing for some of the proposed water projects will be dependent on other infrastructure improvements, such as road improvements.

The MESP recommends directing wastewater via gravity and City pumping station (SPS #1) to the Preston Wastewater Treatment Plant (PWWTP) in the interim until the Regional Pumping Station (SPS #2) is constructed. The ultimate long term plan is to direct wastewater from the Stage 1 lands to the Kitchener Waste Water Treatment Plan via the Regional Pumping Station. This was confirmed as part of the Region’s Wastewater Treatment Master Plan (2007). Since 2011, the Region has been diverting wastewater flows generated in the Industrial Road Area of the City of Cambridge from the Preston Waste Water Treatment Plant (PWWTP) to the Galt Waste Water Treatment Plant to free up capacity at the PWWTP. Through the MESP, sufficient capacity was confirmed at the PWWTP to accommodate the Stage 1 lands as well as other planned development in the PWWTP catchment area (see Attachment 7 for the list of wastewater projects).

**Transportation**

Transportation analyses related to the East Side Lands has occurred over the past several years, including the completion of the Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) in 2010. The RTMP included recommendations for several transportation projects in the 0 to 20 year frame that are key to the East Side Lands Transportation Network. The RTMP also included preliminary long-term transportation needs of the East Side Lands by identifying key corridors that require protection and widening. The MESP built upon previous studies to provide recommendations for an internal collector road system and connections to Regional Roads.

The MESP recommends a North-South collector from Middle Block Road, crossing Allendale Drive through to the Creekside lands connecting to King Street. Based on the detailed evaluation, the North-South collector to King Street will distribute traffic and
reduce demand on Riverbank Drive while providing improved network connectivity for transit, walking and cycling. Other local roads may be considered through individual development applications. As development applications are submitted, more detailed transportation analysis will need to occur to recommend required intersection improvements and to confirm planned capital project timing.

The widening of Fountain Street, Maple Grove Road, and various intersection improvements are also required to service the area. These Regional projects were assumed in the analysis as they were identified in the Regional Transportation Master Plan and are budgeted as part of the Region’s 2014 ten year Transportation Capital Program funded by the Regional Development Charge Reserve Fund. Additional City of Cambridge transportation infrastructure projects required to implement Option 3b are included in Attachment 5.

**Speedsville Road**

A critical element required to support the development of this area is a well defined road system. While Fountain Street will continue to function as a major north-south arterial, Speedsville Road has also been identified for some time as an important future major north-south arterial. The Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) (approved by Regional Council in 2010) and the Transportation Assessment prepared for the East Side Lands (Stage 1) MESP determined that a widening and upgrade of Speedsville from 2 to 4 lanes from Maple Grove Road to Eagle Street is ultimately required in order to accommodate the full build out of the Stage 1 lands. The upgrade will bring the road up to urban standards and include provisions for pedestrians and cycling facilities. Speedsville Road has also been identified in the RTMP in the long term to connect to the new Highway 7 through a realignment of the Shantz Station Road and Kossuth Road intersection. However, as the “Quick Start” lands do not require Speedsville Road to be upgraded and widened, any improvements required for Speedsville Road will be included in the 2015 ten year capital program and in a future Development Charge Background Study when the project timing has been determined.

The assumption of Speedsville Road would satisfy the criteria for designation as a Regional Road as it has a current traffic volume greater than 5000 Average Annual Daily Traffic and provides the necessary arterial capacity in a major travel corridor and in general, is used for inter-municipal traffic. In addition, the assumption of Speedsville Road would support the creation of new employment lands designated as “Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve” in the Regional Official Plan. The costs to upgrade Speedsville Road between Eagle Street and Maple Grove Road to support the East Side Lands are estimated to be in the range of $40 million.

The City of Cambridge is supportive of the transfer of Speedsville Road as noted in City of Cambridge Report No. 14-017-PLN dated March 24, 2014.

As part of the transfer of Speedsville Road from Eagle Street to Maple Grove Road to the Region, the heavy truck prohibition may be lifted. Area residents and businesses affected by this change will be notified of the change in ownership of the road and possible changes to the truck prohibition at a community update meeting scheduled for this spring by the City of Cambridge.
“Quick Start” Lands and Staging of Development

In order to respond to the potential for immediate development demands, lands that can be easily serviced with minimal infrastructure are identified on Attachment 8 and are referred to as the “Quick Start” lands. Approximately 85 net hectares (210 net acres) adjacent to Fountain Street can be serviced by gravity sanitary mains without the need for any pump stations, forcemains or significant road upgrades. Depending upon the extent of servicing and the specific area, it is estimated that the capital cost to service these “Quick Start” lands would be between $1.5 million and $5 million. This “Quick Start” infrastructure could continue to be used for servicing throughout the Stage 1 development period (until 2031) and beyond if needed.

The area west of the “Quick Start” lands extending towards Riverbank Drive could be serviced with on-site, wastewater pumping stations feeding into the gravity sewers previously identified with the “Quick Start” lands. Localized road improvements may be needed to service this area.

The infrastructure projects associated with the “Quick Start” lands are City of Cambridge projects and are marked with an asterisk (*) on Attachment 8. All fall under Schedules A (pre-approved projects) or A+ (pre-approved but require public consultation before implementation). These EA requirements are satisfied by the MESP. They are all City projects and no further EA work will be required. Following completion of the MESP, the City could proceed with detailed design and implementation subject to financing. It is estimated that the “Quick Start” lands could be designated in the City of Cambridge Official Plan and be appropriately zoned, serviced and ready for development in 2015.

It should be noted that there are numerous options as to where a “Quick Start” lands can be located. For ease of reference, only one “Quick Start” scenario was identified. It is recommended that Regional staff continue discussions with the City of Cambridge regarding the identification and preparation of “Quick Start” lands for development. This will permit further work to proceed on determining the exact location and size of the “Quick Start” lands.

The provision of wastewater servicing to the Region of Waterloo International Airport and other lands in the vicinity is premised on the identified “Quick Start” scenario on Attachment 8. The development of these “Quick Start” lands includes the extension of the Fountain Street gravity sewer to Middle Block Road. A new pumping station with a forcemain from the airport along Fountain Street to the extension of the Fountain Street gravity sewer at Middle Block Road would be required. Regional staff is continuing discussions with City of Cambridge staff and Township of Woolwich staff to negotiate a separate cross-border servicing agreement.

Freeport Creek and Tributary to the Grand River Sub-Watershed Study

The Freeport Creek and Tributary to the Grand River Sub-Watershed Study is part of the MESP-coordinated approach to developing the East Side lands (Stage 1). This allows for the integration of the environmental components of the subwatershed plan with the
planning and infrastructure components. The subwatershed study was approved by Regional Council on August 20, 2013.

Public and Stakeholder Consultation

The following is a chronology of the opportunities for public and stakeholder consultation:

- **May 30, 2011 - Notice of Commencement**
  
  Advertisements were placed in local newspapers informing the public of the commencement of the East Side Lands (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan and Community Plan. In addition, the area municipalities, relevant agencies, landowners within the Study Area and First Nations were notified by letter.

- **Project Team Meetings**
  
  The MESP was co-managed by Region, City of Cambridge and GRCA staff. The Project Team consisted of representatives from the consultant team, the Region’s Planning, Housing and Community Services Department, Transportation and Environmental Services Department, and the Region of Waterloo International Airport. Staff from the City of Cambridge and the GRCA were also represented and staff from the City of Kitchener and Township of Woolwich were also consulted at relevant points in the project. A total of nine Project Team Meetings were held throughout the project in addition to numerous meetings with relevant staff to address specific issues.

- **Public Information Centres (PICs)**
  
  A total of four PICs were held at École Secondaire Père-René-de-Galinée on Maple Grove Road in Cambridge. The PICs were advertised in the local papers and individual notice was sent to landowners within the Stage 1 Study Area, First Nations and anyone who requested notice.

  The first Public Information Centre (PIC) was held on June 14, 2011 to introduce the project, present background information and identify next steps. The PIC was an open house format with a presentation.

  The second PIC was held on June 26, 2012. The PIC was an open house format with a presentation and opportunity for questions and answers. The purpose of the meeting was to respond to issues identified at the first PIC, present the servicing and transportation options and evaluation criteria and seek public input. Draft environmental mapping was also presented for comment.

  Landowners within the Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve area and the developer of the Creekside lands were invited to a special meeting with the consultants and members of the Project Team to give them an opportunity to review the panels and ask questions.

  The third and fourth PICs were held on January 31, 2013 and December 12, 2013 and followed the same format as the second PIC. The purpose of the meetings was to present and seek input on the Preferred Option and the detailed evaluation.
• **Spring 2014: Notice of Completion**

Upon Council approval, Regional and City of Cambridge staff will issue the Notice of Completion of the MESP and supporting documentation. Advertisements will be placed in the local newspapers and the Region’s website informing the general public of the 30 day review period for the MESP and supporting documentation. Notice will be sent to those individuals who requested to be notified. All comments received will become part of the project file.

**Summary of Public Information Centres (PICs)**

Approximately 75-100 people attended each of the PICs. Participants included local residents, business owners, engineering / planning consultants, landowners and developers.

There were a number of issues identified throughout the consultation including: impact to natural features and wells, flooding / drainage issues, traffic, Riverbank Drive as a scenic heritage road, desire to maintain agricultural land, and use compatibility, need for employment lands / economic competitiveness, questions / concerns about timing of development and access issues for specific development lands (Creekside). A detailed summary of the comments and responses from PICs 1-4 is appended as Attachment 10.

**Fiscal Impact Analysis**

A Fiscal Impact Analysis was prepared as part of the East Side MESP to understand the costs associated with developing the Stage 1 lands as well as the associated economic benefits. The analysis looked at the costs of infrastructure required to implement the Preferred Option, with and without amortization as well as the associated tax revenues. Regional and City of Cambridge staff worked together and agreed on the infrastructure and cost assumptions used in the analysis.

The City of Cambridge will use the Fiscal Impact Analysis that was prepared for the MESP and a Supplementary Financial Analysis that was developed using a cost-sharing approach between the Region, the City of Cambridge and benefitting developers, as the basis for proposing updates to the City-wide Development Charges By-law and the Area Specific Development Charge for the Stage 1 Lands. Based upon this supplementary work, the potential City area-specific Development Charge rates needed to pay for growth and infrastructure for non-residential development varies between $130/m² to $160/m² (combined with current Regional development charge rate). Locally, these proposed rates are comparable with the combined rates of the City of Kitchener’s (149.50/m²) and the City of Waterloo’s ($156.92 m²) development charge rates. Other comparable surrounding municipalities’ rates include the City of Guelph ($131.55/m²), City of Hamilton ($170.12/m²), and the City of Burlington ($173.67/m²).

**Other Employment Lands in Proximity to East Side Lands**

**Boxwood Subdivision**

The Boxwood Business Park includes approximately 44 hectares (110 acres) of serviced
industrial land the City of Cambridge and is expected to be offered for sale in 2014. The lands are located east of the Toyota assembly plant and south east of the PISR lands. The Boxwood Business Park is the next phase of the Cambridge Business Park expansion and land is zoned for general industrial use, allowing manufacturing, processing, production assembly and some office uses. The Boxwood Business Park has available lots ranging in size from 1-20 acres and will complement the larger parcels within the PISR lands.

**Creekside Lands**

The Creekside (Phase 1) lands are approximately 30 net hectares (74 acres) and are located south of the PISR lands, west of Fountain Street and north of King Street East (please see Attachment 9). These lands have been within the Urban Area boundary for many years and currently only permit agricultural uses and golf related uses. At the request of the developer and the City, there is a deferral on the designation of the property in the City’s recently adopted Official Plan, which is currently under appeal. The Creekside lands are included in the Stage 1 Study Area for the purposes of the Study Area boundary for the Freeport Creek and Tributary to the Grand Subwatershed Study. The Creekside (Phase 1) lands were also considered as part of some of the servicing and transportation options. Ultimately, the Preferred Option included connecting the Creekside lands in the overall servicing and transportation solution identified.

The Creekside lands have experienced a number of issues that have delayed them from developing for more urban uses, including limited/constrained access, servicing and outstanding work related to the natural environment. The Creekside lands, however, do represent an opportunity for the shorter term location of future employment uses subject to the resolution of these issues.

The MESP includes a substantial amount of technical work to answer some of the broader questions about how the Creekside lands can develop, including a plan for two municipal roads that provide access to the property, completion of the subwatershed study work required to designate the developable land in the City of Cambridge Official Plan and a plan for municipal water and wastewater services. As determined through the MESP, the PWWTP has available capacity to provide wastewater servicing to the Creekside lands.

The Creekside developer submitted an application to amend the City’s Official Plan in 2010. The developer recently submitted a revised Official Plan Amendment which scopes the range of permitted uses to employment and employment related uses and recreational/automobile sales. The application is currently under appeal at the Ontario Municipal Board and the City of Cambridge is in discussions to resolve the appeal.

**Proposed Next Steps**

Subject to Regional Council approval of the recommendations of this report, a Notice of Completion of the MESP and supporting documentation will be issued according to Class EA requirements, by means of advertisements in local newspapers, the Region’s website and mailings to affected property owners and others who requested notice, municipalities and agencies. Upon Regional Council approval, the MESP will be made available for a minimum 30 day public review period.
Part II Orders (“bump up” requests) can be submitted for individual projects (Schedule B projects only). If no Part II Orders are received, the MESP is complete and the Ministry of Environment will file the Notice of Completion. If a Part II Order is received, the proponent will be responsible for trying to resolve the issue. It ultimately lies with the Minister of Environment to make a ruling. There are no Part II orders allowed for Schedule A, A+ and C projects. Once the MESP is complete, all Schedule A and A+ projects can immediately proceed to detailed design and implementation subject to funding. Provided there are no Part II orders, the Schedule B projects can proceed without any further EA work (with the exception of the Pumping Stations and Regional forcemain).

Following completion of the MESP, several important next steps must follow to implement the Preferred Option, including the completion of EA requirements for specific projects by the applicable municipality and the City of Cambridge updating their Official Plan, Zoning By-law and Development Charges By-law. The Region’s EA process is currently underway for the Regional Pumping Station and forcemain, will be formally tabled with Regional Council later this year, as described in this report.

As the majority of the remaining implementation falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Cambridge, Regional Staff recommend Regional Council formally request City of Cambridge Council prioritize these next steps and budget for them accordingly.

The analyses completed to date also provide the transportation and servicing requirements for the balance of the East Side Lands. It is anticipated another MESP could be completed for lands beyond the Stage 1 lands.

The Region and the City of Cambridge will continue to negotiate the transfer of Speedsville Road and the transfer of Beverly Street and Samuelson Street/Clyde Road to the City of Cambridge in conjunction with the negotiations with the City of Cambridge and the Township of Woolwich for a separate cross-border servicing agreement to service lands including and in the vicinity of the Region of Waterloo International Airport.

Finally, as described in Report CA-13-005/P-13-121, the Region of Waterloo will actively promote the East Side Lands for new investment which will substantially improve the inventory of large lot employment lands.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

This project is being jointly managed by the City of Cambridge and the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA). Representatives from the City of Cambridge and GRCA are also members of the Project Team and staff from the City of Kitchener and Township of Woolwich have been involved at relevant points in the project.

The Project Team, including staff from the City of Cambridge and the GRCA, unanimously supported the selection of the Preferred Option. Staff from the City of Kitchener and Township of Woolwich have advised they are also supportive of the Preferred Option.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

The East Side Lands (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MESP) supports the implementation of Region of Waterloo 2011-2014 Strategic Focus Area 2: Growth
Management and Prosperity, Strategic Objective 2.2, Develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs, Strategic Objective 2.3: Support a diverse, innovative and globally competitive economy and Action 2.3.1: Advance New East Side Employment Lands toward Development Readiness.

Financial Implications

The Region's 2014 approved Capital Program includes $43 million for Regional infrastructure projects within the East Side Lands study area. This includes the Regional infrastructure projects identified in the MESP (approximately $10 million) as well as additional Region infrastructure projects in the study area that were previously identified and included in the 2014 Capital Program such as improvements to Fountain Street and Maple Grove Road. Any improvements required for Speedsville Road will be included in the 2015 ten year capital program and in a future Development Charge Background Study when the project timing has been determined.

Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Transportation and Environmental Services staff was also part of the Project Team recommending the Preferred Option. Staff from Hydrogeology and Source Water Protection, Water Services and Corporate Services (Finance and Legal) was consulted through the process and preparation of this report.
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### Attachment 4 – Summary of Evaluation Results (preferred option in **bold**)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Category</th>
<th>Option 1: No Freeport Creek Crossing</th>
<th>Option 2: Access to the Creekside Lands with No Freeport Creek Crossing</th>
<th>Option 3a: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connections to King Street and Maple Grove Road</th>
<th>Option 3b: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connection to King Street</th>
<th>Option 3c: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connection to Maple Grove Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Development and Sustainability   | Options 1 and 2 are least preferred for the development and sustainability criteria as:  
- It limits transportation access for the Stage 1 Lands to Middle Block Road and Allendale Road.  
- It is noted that all water and sanitary servicing options provide for logical extension to the Broader East Side Lands. | Options 1 and 2 are least preferred for the development and sustainability criteria as:  
- It limits transportation access for the Stage 1 Lands to Middle Block Road and Allendale Road.  
- It is noted that all water and sanitary servicing options provide for logical extension to the Broader East Side Lands. | Option 3a is most preferred for the development and sustainability criteria category as:  
- It provides the most efficient transportation servicing, and  
- It provides maximum access potential for the Stage 1 Lands with access to both King Street and Maple Grove Road.  
- It is noted that all water and sanitary servicing options provide for logical extension to the Broader East Side Lands. | Options 3b and 3c are less preferred than Option 3a for the development and sustainability criteria category as:  
- They provide very good access potential for the Stage 1 Lands, however Option 3b only provides access to King Street.  
- It is noted that all water and sanitary servicing options provide for logical extension to the Broader East Side Lands. | Options 3b and 3c are less preferred than Option 3a for the development and sustainability criteria category as:  
- They provide very good access potential for the Stage 1 Lands, however Option 3c only provides access to Maple Grove Road.  
- It is noted that all water and sanitary servicing options provide for logical extension to the Broader East Side Lands. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Category</th>
<th>Option 1: No Freeport Creek Crossing</th>
<th>Option 2: Access to the Creekside Lands with No Freeport Creek Crossing</th>
<th>Option 3a: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connections to King Street and Maple Grove Road</th>
<th>Option 3b: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connection to King Street</th>
<th>Option 3c: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connection to Maple Grove Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Option 1 is least preferred for the land use criteria category as: It does not provide servicing for the Creekside lands, and It relies on private sector investment for infrastructure. The net developable area for this option is also least preferred. Option 1 provides approximately 311 hectares of</td>
<td>Option 2 is considered preferred when compared to Option 1 for the land use criteria category as: It provides servicing for the Creekside lands. However it is less preferred than Options 3a, 3b and 3c as: Access from the Stage 1 Lands to the south would need to be constructed through private sector investment if deemed necessary and this</td>
<td>Options 3a, 3b and 3c are preferred for the land use criteria category as: They provide servicing for the Creekside lands, and They increase development potential by providing a connection for the Stage 1 Lands to the south and to the Creekside lands. The net</td>
<td>Options 3a, 3b and 3c are preferred for the land use criteria category as: They provide servicing for the Creekside lands, and They increase development potential by providing a connection for the Stage 1 Lands to the south and to the Creekside lands.</td>
<td>Options 3a, 3b and 3c are preferred for the land use criteria category as: They provide servicing for the Creekside lands, and They increase development potential by providing a connection for the Stage 1 Lands to the south and to the Creekside lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria Category</td>
<td>Option 1: No Freeport Creek Crossing</td>
<td>Option 2: Access to the Creekside Lands with No Freeport Creek Crossing</td>
<td>Option 3a: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connections to King Street and Maple Grove Road</td>
<td>Option 3b: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connection to King Street</td>
<td>Option 3c: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connection to Maple Grove Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developable area in the PISR lands, however the Creekside lands have not been included in the net developable area for this option it does not provide any servicing for the Creekside lands.</td>
<td>could impact development timing and availability of land. The net developable area for Options 2, 3a, 3b and 3c are all similar. Option 2 provides approximately 311 hectares of developable area in the PISR lands and 35 hectares for the Creekside lands. It is noted that all options provide full servicing of the Stage 1 Lands.</td>
<td>developable area for Options 2, 3a, 3b and 3c are all similar. Option 3a provides approximately 308 hectares of developable area in the PISR lands and 34 hectares for the Creekside lands. It is noted that all options provide full servicing of the Stage 1 Lands.</td>
<td>The net developable area for Options 2, 3a, 3b and 3c are all similar. Option 3b provides approximately 308 hectares of developable area in the PISR lands and 35 hectares for the Creekside lands. It is noted that all options provide full servicing of the Stage 1 Lands.</td>
<td>The net developable area for Options 2, 3a, 3b and 3c are all similar. Option 3c provides approximately 308 hectares of developable area in the PISR lands and 36 hectares for the Creekside lands. It is noted that all options provide full servicing of the Stage 1 Lands.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Economic and Cultural</td>
<td>Option 1 is least preferred for the socio-economic and</td>
<td>Options 2, 3a and 3c are more preferred than Option 1 for the</td>
<td>Options 2, 3a and 3c are more preferred than</td>
<td>Option 3b is preferred for the socio-economic</td>
<td>Options 2, 3a and 3c are more preferred than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria Category</td>
<td>Option 1: No Freeport Creek Crossing</td>
<td>Option 2: Access to the Creekside Lands with No Freeport Creek Crossing</td>
<td>Option 3a: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connections to King Street and Maple Grove Road</td>
<td>Option 3b: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connection to King Street</td>
<td>Option 3c: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connection to Maple Grove Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>cultural environment criteria category as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It increases the potential for disruption to existing businesses on Middle Block Road and Allendale Road due to a potential increase in traffic on these roads,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It does not allow closure of Riverbank Drive at CPR crossing and thus does not limit traffic impacts to residents on Riverbank Drive, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It does not promote human health improvements resulting from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>socio-economic and cultural environment criteria category as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They reduce the potential disruption impact to existing residents and businesses on Middle Block Road and Allendale Road,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They provide alternative mode choice opportunities which can positively impact human health, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They provide for an option to cul-de-sac Riverbank Drive at the rail tracks to limit traffic impacts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>However they are less preferred than Option 1 for the socio-economic and cultural environment criteria category as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They reduce the potential disruption impact to existing residents and businesses on Middle Block Road and Allendale Road,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They provide alternative mode choice opportunities which can positively impact human health, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They provide for an option to cul-de-sac Riverbank Drive at</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and cultural environment criteria category as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It reduces potential disruption impacts to existing residents and businesses on Middle Block Road and Allendale Road,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It provides alternative mode choice opportunities which can positively impact human health, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It provides for an option to cul-de-sac Riverbank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria Category</td>
<td>Option 1: No Freeport Creek Crossing</td>
<td>Option 2: Access to the Creekside Lands with No Freeport Creek Crossing</td>
<td>Option 3a: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connections to King Street and Maple Grove Road</td>
<td>Option 3b: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connection to King Street</td>
<td>Option 3c: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connection to Maple Grove Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increased mode choice.</td>
<td>Option 2: Access to the Creekside Lands with No Freeport Creek Crossing</td>
<td>Option 3a: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connections to King Street and Maple Grove Road</td>
<td>Drive at the rail tracks to limit traffic impacts.</td>
<td>Drive at the rail tracks to limit traffic impacts, and</td>
<td>Drive at the rail tracks to limit traffic impacts, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It does, however, have the advantage of not impacting the Region’s Operations Centre but this advantage is outweighed by the disadvantages noted.</td>
<td>Option 3a: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connections to King Street and Maple Grove Road</td>
<td>Option 3b as: They impact the Region’s Operation Centre, an important existing business in the area.</td>
<td>However they are less preferred than Option 3b as: They impact the Region’s Operation Centre, an important existing business in the area.</td>
<td>It results in no impacts to Region’s Operations Centre.</td>
<td>It results in no impacts to Region’s Operations Centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is noted that there are no listed built heritage or archaeological features identified within the Stage 1 lands. Riverbank Drive has been identified as a scenic road in the Cambridge Heritage Master Plan. Impacts to cultural heritage and archaeology are similar for each option.</td>
<td>Option 3c: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connection to Maple Grove Road</td>
<td>Option 3b as: They impact the Region’s Operation Centre, an important existing business in the area.</td>
<td>It is noted that there are no listed built heritage or archaeological features identified within the Stage 1 lands. Riverbank Drive has been identified as a scenic road in the Cambridge Heritage Master Plan. Impacts to cultural heritage and archaeology are similar for each option.</td>
<td>It is noted that there are no listed built heritage or archaeological features identified within the Stage 1 lands. Riverbank Drive has been identified as a scenic road in the Cambridge Heritage Master Plan. Impacts to</td>
<td>It is noted that there are no listed built heritage or archaeological features identified within the Stage 1 lands. Riverbank Drive has been identified as a scenic road in the Cambridge Heritage Master Plan. Impacts to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria Category</td>
<td>Option 1: No Freeport Creek Crossing</td>
<td>Option 2: Access to the Creekside Lands with No Freeport Creek Crossing</td>
<td>Option 3a: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connections to King Street and Maple Grove Road</td>
<td>Option 3b: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connection to King Street</td>
<td>Option 3c: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connection to Maple Grove Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Plan. Impacts to cultural heritage and archaeology are similar for each option.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan. Impacts to cultural heritage and archaeology are similar for each option.</td>
<td>cultural heritage and archaeology are similar for each option.</td>
<td>scenic road in the Cambridge Heritage Master Plan. Impacts to cultural heritage and archaeology are similar for each option.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Option 1 is least preferred for the transportation criteria category as: It provides the least amount of internal roads and relies on the existing road network, It does not provide transportation servicing for the Creekside lands, It relies on the private sector to</td>
<td>Option 2 is more preferred than Option 1 for the transportation criteria category as: It provides good east-west network connections for automotive, transit and other non-motorized travel options for the Creekside lands, and It provides two municipal</td>
<td>Option 3a is preferred for the transportation criteria category as: It provides maximum internal network connectivity for automotive, transit and other non-motorized travel options for the Stage 1 Lands, It provides three municipal</td>
<td>Options 3b and 3c are more preferred than Option 1 and Option 2 for the transportation criteria category as: They provide very good network connectivity for automotive, transit and other non-motorized travel options,</td>
<td>Options 3b and 3c are more preferred than Option 1 and Option 2 for the transportation criteria category as: They provide very good network connectivity for automotive, transit and other non-motorized travel options,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria Category</td>
<td>Option 1: No Freeport Creek Crossing</td>
<td>Option 2: Access to the Creekside Lands with No Freeport Creek Crossing</td>
<td>Option 3a: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connections to King Street and Maple Grove Road</td>
<td>Option 3b: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connection to King Street</td>
<td>Option 3c: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connection to Maple Grove Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>provide additional access, and</td>
<td>transportation access points and full servicing to the Creekside lands.</td>
<td>transportation access points and full servicing to the Creekside lands, and</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>They provide two municipal transportation access points and full servicing to the Creekside lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It does not provide for community</td>
<td>However it is less preferred than Option 3a, 3b and 3c as:</td>
<td>It does not provide community connectivity from the Stage 1 Lands south to the Creekside lands and this may require private investment.</td>
<td>It provides multiple access options from the Stage 1 Lands to the south.</td>
<td>However they are less preferred than Option 3a as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>connectivity in the form of</td>
<td>It does not provide community connectivity from the Stage 1 Lands south to the Creekside lands and this may require private investment.</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>However they are less preferred than Option 3a as:</td>
<td>They provide one access from the Stage 1 Lands to the south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>continuous capacity for transit and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other non-motorized travel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria Category</td>
<td>Option 1: No Freeport Creek Crossing</td>
<td>Option 2: Access to the Creekside Lands with No Freeport Creek Crossing</td>
<td>Option 3a: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connections to King Street and Maple Grove Road</td>
<td>Option 3b: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connection to King Street</td>
<td>Option 3c: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connection to Maple Grove Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Natural Environment | Option 1 is preferred for the natural environment criteria category as:  
It has the least impact to the natural environment,  
It has no impacts to the Region of Waterloo Core Environmental Feature south of the Regional Stormwater Management facility,  
It has no impact to the Provincially Significant Wetland adjacent to the Region’s Operations Centre and Freeport Creek, and  
It has no crossing of | Option 2 is less preferred than Option 1 for the natural environment criteria category as:  
The east-west road will severely impact the linear Region of Waterloo Core Environmental Feature south of the Regional Stormwater Management facility, and  
Impacts to the Provincially Significant Wetland adjacent to the Region’s Operations Centre.  
However it is more preferred than Option 3a and 3c as:  
It has no crossing of | Option 3a and 3c are least preferred for the natural environment criteria category as:  
The east-west road will severely impact the linear Region of Waterloo Core Environmental Feature south of the Regional Stormwater Management facility,  
The east-west road will impact the Provincially Significant Wetland adjacent to the Region’s Operations Centre, and  
However it is more preferred than Option 3a and 3c as:  
It has no crossing of | Option 3b is less preferred than Option 1 for the natural environment criteria category as:  
The east-west road will severely impact the linear Region of Waterloo Core Environmental Feature south of the Regional Stormwater Management facility,  
The east-west road will impact the Provincially Significant Wetland adjacent to the Region’s Operations Centre, and  
However it is more preferred than Option 3a and 3c as:  
It has no crossing of | Option 3a and 3c are the least preferred for the natural environment criteria category as:  
The east-west road will severely impact the linear Region of Waterloo Core Environmental Feature south of the Regional Stormwater Management facility,  
The east-west road will impact the Provincially Significant Wetland adjacent to the Region’s Operations Centre, and  
It has no crossing of |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Category</th>
<th>Option 1: No Freeport Creek Crossing</th>
<th>Option 2: Access to the Creekside Lands with No Freeport Creek Crossing</th>
<th>Option 3a: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connections to King Street and Maple Grove Road</th>
<th>Option 3b: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connection to King Street</th>
<th>Option 3c: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connection to Maple Grove Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freeport Creek and no associated impacts.</td>
<td>Freeport Creek and no associated impacts.</td>
<td>There are anticipated natural environmental impacts associated with the loss of wetland area at the proposed new crossing of Freeport Creek.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Operations Centre, and</td>
<td>There are anticipated natural environmental impacts associated with the loss of wetland area at the proposed new crossing of Freeport Creek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>However, the north-south road between Allendale Road and Middle Block Road in all options will severely impact the wildlife corridor/linkage between the Hespeler West PSW Complex (Hespeler West Wetland) and the Tributary to the Grand (Allendale Creek) Natural Features and the Grand River Valley.</td>
<td>The north-south road between Allendale Road and Middle Block Road in all options will severely impact the wildlife corridor/linkage between the Hespeler West PSW Complex (Hespeler West Wetland) and the Tributary to the Grand (Allendale Creek) Natural Features and the Grand River Valley.</td>
<td>The north-south road between Allendale Road and Middle Block Road in all options will severely impact the wildlife corridor/linkage between the Hespeler West PSW Complex (Hespeler West Wetland) and the Tributary to the Grand (Allendale Creek) Natural Features and the Grand River Valley.</td>
<td>The north-south road between Allendale Road and Middle Block Road in all options will severely impact the wildlife corridor/linkage between the Hespeler West PSW Complex (Hespeler West Wetland) and the Tributary to the Grand (Allendale Creek) Natural Features and the Grand River Valley.</td>
<td>The north-south road between Allendale Road and Middle Block Road in all options will severely impact the wildlife corridor/linkage between the Hespeler West PSW Complex (Hespeler West Wetland) and the Tributary to the Grand (Allendale Creek) Natural Features and the Grand River Valley.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Category</th>
<th>Option 1: No Freeport Creek Crossing</th>
<th>Option 2: Access to the Creekside Lands with No Freeport Creek Crossing</th>
<th>Option 3a: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connections to King Street and Maple Grove Road</th>
<th>Option 3b: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connection to King Street</th>
<th>Option 3c: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connection to Maple Grove Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Features and the Grand River Valley.</td>
<td>the wildlife corridor/ linkage between the Hespeler West PSW Complex (Hespeler West Wetland) and the Tributary to the Grand (Allendale Creek) Natural Features and the Grand River Valley.</td>
<td>Wetland) and the Tributary to the Grand (Allendale Creek) Natural Features and the Grand River Valley.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost*</td>
<td>Option 1 is preferred for the cost criteria category as it is the lowest cost option. It has an approximate capital cost of $96 million directly related to this option. Operation and maintenance costs</td>
<td>Options 2 and 3a, 3b and 3c have similar costs and are all less preferred for the cost criteria category. Option 2 has an approximate capital cost of $111 million directly related to this option. Operation and maintenance costs for</td>
<td>Options 2 and 3a, 3b and 3c have similar costs and are all less preferred for the cost criteria category. Option 3a has an approximate capital cost of $119 million directly related to</td>
<td>Options 2 and 3a, 3b and 3c have similar costs and are all less preferred for the cost criteria category. Option 3b has an approximate capital cost of $111 million</td>
<td>Options 2 and 3a, 3b and 3c have similar costs and are all less preferred for the cost criteria category. Option 3c has an approximate capital cost of $116 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost**The numbers provided are for comparison purposes only. The capital costs provided are for the total cost of all operations and maintenance costs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Category</th>
<th>Option 1: No Freeport Creek Crossing</th>
<th>Option 2: Access to the Creekside Lands with No Freeport Creek Crossing</th>
<th>Option 3a: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connections to King Street and Maple Grove Road</th>
<th>Option 3b: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connection to King Street</th>
<th>Option 3c: Access Through the Creekside Lands with Connection to Maple Grove Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>identified infrastructure.</td>
<td>for all options are similar.</td>
<td>all options are similar.</td>
<td>this option. Operation and maintenance costs for all options are similar.</td>
<td>directly related to this option. Operation and maintenance costs for all options are similar.</td>
<td>directly related to this option. Operation and maintenance costs for all options are similar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 5 – List of Infrastructure Projects to Implement Preferred Option 3b – Transportation Infrastructure

Preferred Option Infrastructure Projects

Municipal Class EA Schedules:

**Schedule A:** Pre-approved projects.

**Schedule A+:** Pre-approved but require public notice before implementation.

**Schedule B:** Environmental screening process required.

**Schedule C:** Full planning and documentation process required and an Environmental Study Report must be prepared (beyond this project).

The EA requirements for all Schedule A, A+ and B projects have been satisfied through this project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>MEA Class Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle Block Road</td>
<td>Upgrade and widen to 4 lanes</td>
<td>N-S Collector</td>
<td>Fountain Street</td>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td>Schedule B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-S Collector</td>
<td>New 4 lane and Freeport Creek crossing structure</td>
<td>Middle Block Road</td>
<td>South of Freeport Creek</td>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td>Schedule C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-W Collector</td>
<td>New 4 lane and potential CPR crossing structure</td>
<td>King Street</td>
<td>N-S Collector</td>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td>Schedule B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Block Road</td>
<td>Upgrade 2 lanes</td>
<td>Fountain Street</td>
<td>Speedsville Road</td>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td>Schedule B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allendale Road</td>
<td>Upgrade 2 lanes and potentially widen to 4 lanes</td>
<td>N-S Collector</td>
<td>Fountain Street</td>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td>Schedule B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speedsville Road</td>
<td>Upgrade 2 lanes</td>
<td>Middle Block Road</td>
<td>Maple Grove Road</td>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td>Schedule B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speedsville Road</td>
<td>Upgrade and widen to 4 lanes</td>
<td>Maple Grove Road</td>
<td>Eagle Street</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Schedule B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 6 - **List of Infrastructure Projects to Implement Preferred Option – Water Infrastructure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Servicing by:</th>
<th>Size (mm)</th>
<th>MEA Class Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Watermain along Middle Block Road*</td>
<td>New N-S Collector</td>
<td>Fountain Street</td>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td>300 mm</td>
<td>Schedule A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watermain along Allendale Road*</td>
<td>New N-S Collector</td>
<td>Fountain Street</td>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td>300 mm</td>
<td>Schedule A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watermain along Middle Block Road</td>
<td>Fountain Street</td>
<td>Speedsville Road</td>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td>400 mm</td>
<td>Schedule A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watermain along Speedsville Road</td>
<td>Middle Block Road</td>
<td>Maple Grove Road</td>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td>400 mm</td>
<td>Schedule A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watermain along Fountain Street*</td>
<td>Banat Road</td>
<td>Middle Block Road</td>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td>300 mm</td>
<td>Schedule A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watermain along Fountain Street</td>
<td>Kossuth Road</td>
<td>Maple Grove Road</td>
<td>Region of Waterloo</td>
<td>450 mm</td>
<td>Schedule A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watermain (loop for N-S collector and E-W collector through Creekside lands)</td>
<td>N-S Collector</td>
<td>Existing Regional Watermain</td>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td>300 mm</td>
<td>Schedule A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Quick Start” projects have been identified with an asterisk (*)
### List of Infrastructure Projects to Implement Preferred Option 3b – Wastewater Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Servicing by:</th>
<th>Size (mm)</th>
<th>MEA Class Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary sewer</td>
<td>N-S collector</td>
<td>Fountain Street</td>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td>300 mm</td>
<td>Schedule A+</td>
<td>Includes short section of sewer east of Fountain Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Block Road*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary Sewer</td>
<td>Middle Block Road</td>
<td>Maple Grove Road</td>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td>450 mm</td>
<td>Schedule A+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountain Street*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary sewer</td>
<td>N-S collector</td>
<td>Fountain Street</td>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td>300 mm</td>
<td>Schedule A+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allendale Road*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary sewer</td>
<td>Middle Block Road</td>
<td>Maple Grove Road</td>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td>300 mm</td>
<td>Schedule A+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speedsville Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary sewer</td>
<td>Middle Block Road</td>
<td>Maple Grove Road</td>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td>300 mm</td>
<td>Schedule A+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speedsville Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary sewer</td>
<td>Maple Grove Road</td>
<td>New SPS#1</td>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td>525 mm</td>
<td>Schedule A+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speedsville Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Oak sanitary</td>
<td>Boxwood Pumping Station</td>
<td>New SPS #1</td>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td>300 mm</td>
<td>Schedule A+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sewer to divert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Diameter</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed new SPS#1 (East Side Stage 1 lands, Hunt Club, Boxwood)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule B</td>
<td>New facility requires acquisition of land and separate EA process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcemain to direct sewage to Preston WWTP</td>
<td>New SPS#1</td>
<td>Existing forcemain on Cherry Blossom Road</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Schedule A+</td>
<td>Being looked at as part of a separate process. Ultimate plan is for direction of forcemain to be reversed to convey flows from SPS#1 to SPS#2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trunk sewer along Fountain Street</td>
<td>South of Kossuth Road</td>
<td>Middle Block Road</td>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td>900 mm</td>
<td>Schedule A</td>
<td>Oversized for Broader East Side Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trunk sewer along Middle Block Road</td>
<td>Fountain Street</td>
<td>N-S Collector</td>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td>900 mm</td>
<td>Schedule A</td>
<td>Oversized for Broader East Side Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trunk sewer along N-S collector</td>
<td>Middle Block Road</td>
<td>Allendale Road</td>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td>900 mm</td>
<td>Schedule A</td>
<td>Oversized for Broader East Side Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trunk sewer to SPS#2</td>
<td>Allendale Road</td>
<td>SPS#2</td>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td>1050 mm</td>
<td>Schedule A</td>
<td>Oversized for Broader East Side Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed New Regional SPS#2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Region of Waterloo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule B</td>
<td></td>
<td>EA underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultimate forcemain extension to service the Broader East Side Lands</td>
<td>SPS32</td>
<td>Kitchener WWTP</td>
<td>Region of Waterloo</td>
<td>Schedule B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Separate process underway.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Quick Start” projects have been identified with an asterisk (*)
Attachment 8 – “Quick Start” Lands
Attachment 9 – Map of Creekside Lands
Attachment 10 – Summary of Responses from PICs 1-4

Public Information Centre #1: Summary of Key Issues and Responses

The following is a summary of key issues based on the June 14, 2011 Public Information Centre held at the École secondaire Père-René-de-Galinée (450 Maple Grove Road, Cambridge ON). A number of comments and questions from this meeting were received from members of the community. The Project Team’s responses to all written comments received are provided in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Concern regarding land use changes in the area.</td>
<td><strong>Land Use Changes</strong> – Existing land uses will be able to remain and there will be appropriate setbacks and buffers established to integrate the new employment uses with sensitive land uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Traffic concerns at Riverbank Drive and Allendale Road.</td>
<td><strong>Traffic</strong> – Potential traffic impacts for existing residents is a key indicator of the “Potential Impacts on Existing Area Businesses and Residents” criterion, and this will be evaluated for each option. The options vary in their ability to reduce traffic on the existing road network, and some options include the ability to cul-de-sac Riverbank Drive at the rail track, which could have a positive impact on local traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Concerns with level of detail available at PIC #1.</td>
<td><strong>Consultation</strong> – PIC #1 was an introductory meeting for the purpose of providing background information, explaining the process and providing an opportunity for community input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Concern from resident on Riverbank Drive about traffic, drainage,</td>
<td><strong>Traffic</strong> - Potential traffic impacts for existing residents is a key indicator of the “Potential Impacts on Existing Area Businesses and Residents” criterion, and this will be evaluated for each option. The options vary in their ability to reduce traffic on the existing road network, and some options include the ability to cul-de-sac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loss of frontage and adjacent land uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverbank Drive at the rail track, which could have a positive impact</td>
<td><strong>Drainage</strong> - As part of the Master Environmental Servicing Plan and Community Plan, a Subwatershed Study and Master Drainage Plan is being completed for the Freeport Creek and Tributary to the Grand subwatersheds. These studies will provide recommendations for how drainage should be managed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on local traffic.</td>
<td><strong>Loss of Frontage</strong> – Widening of Riverbank Drive is not anticipated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use</strong> – The Study area for the Master Environmental Servicing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan and Community Plan is the Stage 1 lands which are approximately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>855 gross hectares. Of those lands, approximately 477 gross hectares</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have been designated in the Regional Official Plan as Prime Industrial/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Reserve to accommodate future serviced large lot industrial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development. Specific uses would be determined as part of future City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning processes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Interested in information on impacts to wells, water levels, water</td>
<td><strong>Impacts to Wells, Water Levels, Water Quantities and Hydrological Flow</strong> - The Subwatershed Study and Master Drainage Plan will consider impacts to wells, water levels, water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantities and hydrological</td>
<td>levels, and hydrological flow.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
East Side (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan and Community Plan – PIC #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>flow.</td>
<td>quality and hydrological flow. The evaluation of options will also consider a number of natural environmental criteria including potential impacts to surface water and aquatic environment, groundwater resources and wetlands. Future development applications will also consider these potential impacts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation – A comprehensive consultation program has been designed for the Master Environmental Servicing Plan and Community Plan project to provide opportunities for landowners in the study area and any other interested parties to participate in the public consultation process. People who are not landowners can contact designated staff to have their name included on a mailing list for this project. Notices will be provided in local newspapers prior to all Public Information Centres. Project information is posted on the Region’s website at www.regionofwaterloo.ca/eastside

Cultural Heritage – The City of Cambridge Heritage Master Plan identifies Riverbank Drive as a scenic heritage road. Impact on built heritage and archaeology is a criterion for the evaluation of options.

Land Use - The Study area for the Master Environmental Servicing Plan and Community Plan is the Stage 1 lands which are approximately 855 gross hectares. Of those lands, approximately 477 gross hectares have been designated in the Regional Official...
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan as Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve to accommodate future serviced large lot industrial development. <strong>Land Need</strong> – The need for large lot employment lands was first identified as background work to the Regional Growth Management Strategy (2003) and reconfirmed in the Regional 2006 Business Park and Vacant Land Inventory. The need is still relevant today.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic</strong> – Traffic for existing residents is a key indicator of the “Potential Impacts on Existing Area Businesses and Residents” criterion, and this will be documented in the advantages and disadvantages of each option. The options vary in their ability to reduce traffic on the existing road network. <strong>Residential Servicing</strong> – Existing land uses will be able to remain and there will be appropriate setbacks and buffers established to integrate the new employment uses. The servicing of existing homes on Riverbank Drive is not a primary objective of the study. To date the objective of minimizing impacts to these residences has been a key issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Concerns with traffic. Concerned that existing residents will be required to connect to municipal servicing and associated cost.

We are also commencing a Sanitary Sewer Master Plan Study for the entire city. Part of this study is to review the needs and by-laws
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>addressing existing homes and septic tanks. Currently, if services are available, residences must connect.</td>
<td>Based on the outcome of the public processes for both of these studies there may be requirements to connect. However, at this time, the MESP is considering options that likely won’t impose this immediate requirement. Once trunk sanitary sewers are in the industrial area, the City would be better positioned to provide services to the residential area in the future as needed or requested. Ultimately, at some point in the future it is expected that services will be provided. Based on current objectives of the studies this is not expected in the 10 year future, and may be many years beyond that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Questions around the components of the study and whether type of industrial land use, transportation road access, evaluation of stormwater and drainage and impacts to surrounding land uses will be considered.</td>
<td><strong>Components of the MESP</strong> – The MESP will be developed to identify how to effectively and efficiently service the Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve lands in an environmentally sustainable manner. The MESP process includes the development of a Transportation Master Plan, Water/Wastewater Master Plan and Subwatershed Plan and Master Drainage Plan. <strong>Land Use</strong> – These lands are designated for employment uses in the Regional Official Plan to accommodate future serviced large lot industrial development. The City of Cambridge Official Plan provides further direction on land use types and will need to be updated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### East Side (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan and Community Plan – PIC #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>following the completion of this Master Environmental Servicing Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community Plan** – The Community Plan will synthesize the findings of the subwatershed, traffic and transportation and servicing studies to provide a comprehensive plan for the use of land in the Stage 1 study area. It will be completed in sufficient detail to guide and direct the preparation of development applications for the community.

**Impacts to Existing Land Use** - Impacts to existing land use is a key consideration in the evaluation of options as part of the “Potential impacts on existing area businesses and residents” criteria. Alternatives that limit potential negative impacts on existing area businesses and residential are preferred and alternatives that promote positive impacts are preferred. The Community Plan will provide recommendations for land use compatibility.
Public Information Centre #2: Summary of Key Issues and Responses

The following is a summary of key issues based on the June 26, 2012 Public Information Centre held at the École secondaire Père-René-de-Galinée (450 Maple Grove Road, Cambridge ON). A number of comments and questions from this meeting were received from members of the community. The Project Team’s responses to all written comments received and questions posed at the PIC are provided in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Information Centre (PIC) and Presentation Format</td>
<td>Noted, thank you. Based on this feedback the Project Team will hold a landowner meeting prior to PIC #3 as well in order to provide similar opportunity for landowners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner meeting prior to PIC was successful</td>
<td>The Project Team appreciates this feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very informative presentation that was polite to all concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Designation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## East Side (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan and Community Plan – PIC #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concern with land use and believes prime agricultural use should be maintained and not developed</td>
<td>Through the Regional Official Plan, the principle of land use has been established for the Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve lands. The study area for the Master Environmental Servicing Plan and Community Plan is the Stage 1 lands which consist of approximately 855 gross hectares (2,112 gross acres). Of those lands, approximately 477 gross hectares (1,178 gross acres) are designated in the Regional Official Plan as Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve to accommodate future serviced large lot industrial development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification of the land included in the PISR designation</td>
<td>The study area for the Master Environmental Servicing Plan and Community Plan is the Stage 1 lands which consist of approximately 855 gross hectares (2,112 gross acres). Of this, approximately 477 gross hectares (1,178 gross acres) are designated in the Regional Official Plan as Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve (PISR) to accommodate future serviced large lot industrial development. The Regional Official Plan has delineated the extent of land to be included in the PISR designation and should be referenced for clarifications. The PISR lands are also identified on the “East Side Lands - Project Location” PIC panel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern with the need for large lot industrial land due to current industry trends</td>
<td>The need for large lot employment lands was first identified as background work to the Regional Growth Management Strategy (2003) and reconfirmed in the Regional 2006 Business Park and Vacant Land Inventory Study and subsequent updates. The Region of Waterloo must ensure there is a supply of strategically located, large lot employment lands to meet the needs of future industrial growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestion to incent existing vacant industrial lots in Cambridge versus servicing more land</td>
<td>The City of Cambridge supports the development of vacant industrial lands within the City. In addition to these efforts, the need for additional large lot employment land was identified as background work to the Regional Growth Management Strategy (2003) and reconfirmed in the Regional 2006 Business Park and Vacant Land Inventory Study and subsequent updates. There is a long term plan to ensure the Region of Waterloo has large strategically located employment lands to accommodate future growth. The purpose of the MESP and Community Plan is to provide a framework for the creation of such new lots and does not preclude future programs that can be implemented to promote other Cambridge industrial lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question as to the size of the lots and consideration for need for smaller lots</td>
<td>Based on the Region’s Business Park and Vacant Land Inventory there is an identified land need of 300 net hectares (741 net acres) for large lot employment purposes. While the intent of the Regional Official Plan policy is to maximize larger parcels, there is recognition that some lots may be less than</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 hectares (approximately 20 acres) where compromised by environmental features, property configurations, provision of new roads or existing development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question as to how the development would occur since the land is privately owned</td>
<td>For PISR land that is privately owned, it would be up to the current and future land owners to develop the land. The Region and the City will support the development of the PISR lands by putting in place the planning framework and developing a plan for the municipal services required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Natural Environment

Concerns around some lands identified on the Development Constraints Map.

A key component of the MESP project is the undertaking of a Subwatershed Study and Master Drainage Plan for the Stage 1 lands. This task involves the mapping, evaluation, and characterization of the network of natural environmental features and their ecological functions. This is essential in order to assess the environmental impacts of the servicing options for the Stage 1 lands. A fundamental principle of the infrastructure options is that options should avoid impacts on the network of natural features, and where unavoidable, impacts should be minimized and mitigated. The Potential Development Areas map presented at PIC #2 was in draft form and all features are still under review and subject to change as the Subwatershed Study and Master Drainage...
### East Side (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan and Community Plan – PIC #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan are still being developed. PIC #3 will present the final draft Potential Development Areas map for this project.</td>
<td>The Provincial Policy Statement gives strong direction for the protection of significant natural environmental features and the linkages among them. Policies in municipal Official Plans and planning decisions must be consistent with these directions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns around and support for the priority given to the preservation of natural features as well as specific concerns for the significance of crossing Freeport Creek.</td>
<td>This project must be consistent with Provincial policy as well as satisfying the requirements of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process, as outlined by the Municipal Engineers Association. The review of options against natural environmental criteria is a key component to the evaluation of options and decision making process, as outlined by the Municipal Class EA document. The evaluation of servicing options for the Stage 1 lands considered the evaluation results under six criteria groups: development and sustainability; cost; land use; socio-economic and cultural environment; natural environment; and transportation network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification of hatched area and process to delineate these on the Potential Development Areas Map</td>
<td>The area delineated with a hatched line on the Potential Development Areas map is regulated by the GRCA pursuant to Ontario Regulation 150/06. This area is currently under</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>review and PIC #3 will present a revised Regulation limit and Potential Development Areas Map. Analysis to determine opportunities for development within the GRCA regulated areas would be conducted on a site specific basis at the development approvals stage in accordance with GRCA policies. Applicable Provincial and Municipal policies would also need to be considered. More information on the GRCA Regulation and Policies can be obtained at <a href="http://www.grandriver.ca">www.grandriver.ca</a> in the Planning and Regulations Section.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooding and drainage issues from Regional Stormwater Management pond</td>
<td>The City of Cambridge has recently completed maintenance work on the central Stormwater Management Pond. Further discussion with the City of Cambridge Transportation and Public Works Department is encouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tile under driveway of 4455 Fountain Street N</td>
<td>This is an existing localized drainage issue. For drainage issues on Fountain Street, the Region’s maintenance department should be consulted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern with floodline delineation</td>
<td>Floodplain mapping is currently being completed and will be presented at PIC #3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely servicing of the Creekside Lands and alternative to service through SPS-2 if the Regional Pump Station takes</td>
<td>The purpose of the MESP is primarily to service the PISR lands and to consider the ability for other lands to be serviced. The Creekside lands (see PIC panel for location)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>too long to develop</td>
<td>are considered to be other lands that would benefit from the servicing for the PISR lands, and have been considered in the evaluation of each option. As evident in the evaluation, the benefits of servicing the Creekside lands include increasing total serviceable land and efficiency of servicing. Staging of the Creekside lands will be considered during development of a detailed staging plan for the preferred option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern with long timeline for infrastructure development, staging of infrastructure (what lands will be first) and need for additional requirements prior to development</td>
<td>The purpose of the MESP is primarily to service the PISR lands and to consider the ability for other lands to be serviced. One of the fundamental principles of the infrastructure options was that options should provide optimal flexibility for the staging of the lands to allow some lands to be developed before others. Staging will take into consideration costs and timing to provide services with the ultimate servicing strategy servicing the entire PISR lands. The staging plan will be developed for the preferred option and presented at PIC #3. There is a strong interest to provide a servicing solution that allows some lands to develop before major infrastructure construction is needed. This was presented at PIC #2 and will be refined for PIC #3. Methods to expedite the development approvals process are being considered as part of the implementation plan for the Stage 1 lands. As this is a large area of land with significant servicing requirements, a number of activities will need to be...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>implemented after the MESP and Community Plan before development. The implementation plan will outline these activities and a suggested approach.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No requirement for grade separation at CPR tracks</td>
<td>CPR is a stakeholder and discussions with CPR will be needed as the project proceeds. The study team is considering options with and without a grade separation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of future LRT plans in MESP documents</td>
<td>The Region of Waterloo Rapid Transit project is an important transit project in the Region. The MESP will consider the future Rapid Transit plans along with all other transportation and transit plans as part of the background information and review of options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for traffic lights at Middle Block Road and Fountain Street</td>
<td>The transportation component of the MESP considers the need for new roads as well as existing road improvements in order to improve traffic and the efficient movement of people and goods within the Stage 1 lands. In the future, detailed turning movement forecasts and traffic control will be decided. At this time, there is nothing to preclude the installation of signals at Middle Block Road and Fountain Street when, or if, they become warranted according to Regional policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider rail spurs to provide goods movement option</td>
<td>For sites adjacent to the existing rail line, planning for rail spurs would be conducted at the site plan stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern around location of pump stations</td>
<td>The general location of the Regional Pump Station was identified in the Region of Waterloo Wastewater Master Plan. The specific location for the pump station and forcemain will not be determined through this process. There will be a separate Environmental Assessment conducted by the Region of Waterloo with the associated legislative requirements for notification and public input. It is expected that the EA process would start in early 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification is needed on which side of the road the sewer will be on and where sewage is pumped to in short and long term basis</td>
<td>Sewers will be located within the road right-of-way and location will be decided on a case-by-case basis. The sewage from the East Side Stage 1 lands will be collected and treated at either the Kitchener or Preston Wastewater Treatment Plants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question as to whether there may be a new Highway 401 interchange due to large amounts of truck traffic</td>
<td>Highway 401 is under Provincial jurisdiction. The province has completed a review of the interchanges and because of the inability to meet highway design criteria have decided to not pursue any new accesses or interchanges in this area at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question as to whether the residents on Riverbank Drive might be able to connect to the proposed sewer if it went behind their property</td>
<td>The MESP considers the location of trunk sewers, and has shown a trunk sewer alignment option behind the Riverbank Drive residential properties on some of the options. This sewer is a trunk sewer, and typically residents would not connect to a trunk sewer. The City of Cambridge would evaluate this on a case by case basis and consider this as an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>option if this was deemed to be desirable. The scope of this MESP has not considered servicing the residential properties on Riverbank Drive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the approved (but currently under appeal) Regional Official Plan, the Broader East Side Lands are considered to be beyond the 2031 planning time horizon. There has not been a specific time horizon established as land use planning is typically done on a 20 year time horizon. The Region will consider land needs as part of their five year review of the Regional Official Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project team has not specifically considered an access for the Creekside lands from Riverbank Drive. It is a fundamental principle of the infrastructure options that Riverbank Drive is a local road and it is not desirable to increase the volume of traffic utilizing this road, therefore no major servicing was considered on Riverbank Drive, only minor local improvements. The value of Riverbank Drive as a scenic heritage road was identified in the Cambridge Heritage Master Plan and has been recognized throughout this project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Official Plan Amendment has been submitted for the Creekside (Stage 1) lands and is in the review process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Community Plan will consider the general land uses of the Stage 1 lands. After the completion of the MESP and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Plan, the City of Cambridge will need to amend its Official Plan and Zoning By-law for this area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question as to whether the City or Region would need a municipal-owned right-of-way for any services</td>
<td>The City of Cambridge would have a city-owned easement for maintenance purposes where needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question as to whether the servicing from the Toyota plant will assist the servicing for the Stage 1 Lands</td>
<td>The sanitary and water investments from the Toyota plant will assist in allowing the servicing of the Stage 1 lands to move forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question as to the cost implications of each option</td>
<td>The cost implications will be included for each option on the PIC #3 panels and included in the MESP document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Specific Impacts on Private Residents and Industry

Clarification of the plans for expropriation of private lands

Where a development application is submitted for a property abutting a public road and widening may be needed now or in the future, in part to accommodate the increased traffic generated from the development application, the City may require a road widening as a condition of approval for the development, subject to the maximum Right-of-Way limits established in the Official Plan.

In a proposed plan of subdivision, the local road would be...
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>constructed by the developer and then eventually transferred to the City of Cambridge as part of the development approvals process. If a new road was proposed through an undeveloped area, the market value of the land would be established through a property appraisal and then negotiating the purchase of the land from the property owner. In the event an agreement on price cannot be reached and there is an established need for the property the provisions of the <em>Expropriations Act</em> are followed. The same process is followed where there is an established need to widen a public road and there is no development application made for a property abutting the road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some support and some concern with the option to cul-de-sac Riverbank Drive</td>
<td>One of the fundamental principles of the infrastructure options was that Riverbank Drive is a local road and it is not desirable to increase the volume of traffic utilizing this road, therefore no major servicing will be considered on Riverbank Drive, only minor local improvements. The value of Riverbank Drive as a scenic road was identified in the Cambridge Heritage Master Plan and has been recognized throughout this project. A number of the evaluation criteria consider the potential for impact to both the cultural value of and the residents along Riverbank Drive. As part of this MESP, there will be no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>decisions made with respect to a cul-de-sac of Riverbank Drive. The option to be able to cul-de-sac Riverbank Drive due to providing an alternative transportation access to King Street provides potential to mitigate traffic concerns on Riverbank Drive. Even without developing a cul-de-sac on Riverbank Drive, alternative access to King Street will assist in mitigating traffic concerns on Riverbank Drive. The decision to cul-de-sac Riverbank would involve a future public process undertaken by the City of Cambridge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of industry on existing residents</td>
<td>Impacts to existing land uses are a key consideration in the evaluation of options as part of the “Potential impacts on existing area businesses and residents&quot; criterion. Within that criterion, alternatives that limit the potential negative impacts on existing area businesses and residential areas are preferred and alternatives that promote positive impacts are preferred. The Community Plan will provide recommendations for land use compatibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on private residential wells</td>
<td>A hydrogeological review is a component of the Subwatershed Study and Master Drainage Plan. Site specific development applications will also consider the localized impacts on wells.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts to property values</td>
<td>Impacts to existing land uses is a key consideration in the evaluation of options as part of the “Potential impacts to existing residents” and “Potential impacts to area businesses”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact on private residential wells

Effect of industry on existing residents

Impacts to property values

Impacts of industry on existing residents
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>criteria. Within that criterion, alternatives that limit the potential negative impacts on existing area businesses and residential areas are preferred and alternatives that promote positive impacts are preferred. The Community Plan will provide recommendations for land use compatibility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure inclusion of Hunt Club and Arriscraft lands within the MESP and area specific development charge</td>
<td>The purpose of the MESP is to primarily service the PISR lands and optimize the ability for other lands to be serviced. The plans for the Hunt Club and Arriscraft lands have been considered as part of the infrastructure analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback on Specific Options Received from Public

**Option 1:** No access to Creekside lands, impacts to residents on Riverbank due to location of sewers, doesn’t resolve traffic issues, not efficient transportation network, less damaging and most advantageous

**Option 2:** impacts to residents on Riverbank due to location of sewers, not efficient transportation network, less damaging and most advantageous

Varying perspectives were provided on each of the options. This feedback has been considered as part of the evaluation process, and the evaluation results have been revised where appropriate. The preferred option will be presented at PIC #3 for public review and comment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 3a</strong>: preferred transportation and servicing network,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provides maximum access, sewers can be located in road ROWs,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alternative for traffic and Riverbank. Not concerned about crossing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeport Creek. Development and new investment can occur in short-term,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phasing makes sense, efficient use of existing infrastructure,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greater efficiency for access and servicing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 3b</strong>: less efficient transportation route than 3a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 3c</strong>: does not resolve traffic issues on Riverbank Drive,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less efficient transportation route than 3a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Information Centre #3: Summary of Key Issues and Responses

The following is a summary of key issues based on the January 31, 2013 Public Information Centre held at the École secondaire Père-René-de-Galinée (450 Maple Grove Road, Cambridge ON). A number of comments and questions from this meeting were received from members of the community. The Project Team’s responses to all written comments received and questions posed at the PIC are provided in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>East Side (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan and Community Plan – PIC #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of detailed information provided at PIC #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit noise producing businesses in area near homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buffering requirements between sensitive uses and new employment uses for these transition areas and the rest of the Stage 1 Lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private land should be fenced off from new development to not allow access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is an absence of analysis of the impacts of the development constraints on the original land use planning objectives for the PISR designation (parcels greater than 8 hectares with half being parcels 20-40 hectares in size)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about property values due to proposed industrial land use next to existing residential areas and how the City compensation for loss of property values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land between Banat Road and Hammer’s bush should be half acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>estate lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing noise issues due to existing industrial facilities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Environment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green roofing requirement for industrial areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffer areas to be naturalized with trees, grasslands, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure no well contamination to home wells</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### East Side (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan and Community Plan – PIC #3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>recommendations for protecting these supplies will be identified. Site specific development applications will also consider the localized impacts on wells.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build community areas and parks, walking trails, etc</td>
<td>Provision for community areas, parks and walking trails will be confirmed during the City of Cambridge Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water retention ponds/wetlands closer to buffer areas</td>
<td>The Subwatershed Study and Master Drainage Plan identify the approximate area and location of storm management facilities. The decision on the precise location and number of these facilities will occur as part of future development applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An assessment of the potential impacts of development on the source water resources of the Region should be provided, as should any potential constraints on employment uses that will result from source water protection requirements</td>
<td>The Subwatershed Study and Master Drainage Plan consider the impacts of the development on the source water resources and recommend measures to protect these resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues relating to the floodline and culvert at Middle Block Road and Fountain Street.</td>
<td>These comments are being reviewed by the GRCA and City of Cambridge and will be responded to separately.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**East Side (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan and Community Plan – PIC #3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike lanes should be built on new roadways</td>
<td>The MESP identifies a typical cross section for the proposed roads including bike lanes along the new roads. Finalization of the new road cross section will be confirmed through detailed design and during the Draft Plan and Site Plan processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverbank Road cul-de-sac is not needed as new bridge at Fairway Road has reduced traffic significantly</td>
<td>As part of this MESP, there will be no decisions made with respect to a cul-de-sac of Riverbank Drive. The <strong>option</strong> to be able to cul-de-sac Riverbank Drive was an evaluation criterion in the review of the options. The decision to cul-de-sac Riverbank Drive, if deemed valid for consideration, would require future public process undertaken by the City of Cambridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need detailed costs for options</td>
<td>The MESP will outline the comparable costs for each servicing option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servicing strategy appears to be different from that contemplated by the RGMS</td>
<td>Comment noted. Further detail on the servicing strategy will be provided as part of the MESP document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing assessment of the implications of the proposed servicing scheme on treatment plant capacity and the impacts on the servicing of</td>
<td>Based upon the City’s identification of the remaining treatment plant capacity, it is anticipated that there will be enough capacity in the Preston treatment plant to accommodate the forecasted growth of the Stage 1 Lands to 2031. As an</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**East Side (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan and Community Plan – PIC #3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>other lands within the Region</td>
<td>alternative, there is sufficient servicing capacity in the Kitchener treatment plant to service the Stage 1 Lands. Please refer to the Region of Waterloo 2012 Water and Wastewater Monitoring Report which provides details on the wastewater treatment plant capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to identify the area to be ultimately serviced by the proposed Regional pump station</td>
<td>The MESP will provide a description of the area being serviced by the proposed Regional pump station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creekside lands should be included within the &quot;Quick Start&quot; lands</td>
<td>Comment noted. The Creekside lands are included within the City of Cambridge urban area and can proceed at the same time as the &quot;Quick Start&quot; lands if all of the required planning approvals for the Creekside proposal are in place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community Plan**

| Does not confirm or otherwise deal with land use or land use policies related to implementation | The Community Plan serves as the link between the policy directions in the Regional and City Official Plans, the Master Environmental Servicing Plan for the Stage 1 Lands and the subsequent planning, environmental and development approvals required for the lands to be made available for development. The City of Cambridge will need to conduct an Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment to confirm the land use policies and zoning standards relating to the Stage 1 Lands. |
## East Side (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan and Community Plan – PIC #3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decisions regarding the Region’s urban boundary should be made prior to decisions regarding a detailed community plan and servicing</td>
<td>Servicing studies and subwatershed studies for large land areas assist in informing the viability of future development as well as help to determine appropriate staging options. The environmental constraints shown include floodplains, Core Environmental Features and Supporting Environmental Features with their recommended buffers and linkages, as well as environmental constraints that are subject to a scoped Environmental Impact Statement (as identified on the PIC #3 panels). These environmental constraints are considered non-developable. For the purposes of the MESP, the lands outside of the identified environmental constraints, but within the GRCA Regulation Limit, were considered developable. Please note that a permit from the GRCA is required prior to undertaking any development, as defined in the Conservation Authorities Act, within the regulated areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent of the actual constrained areas is unclear. The draft Community Plan appears to identify development within the areas regulated by GRCA and it is not clear whether areas identified as “environmental constraints” includes all required buffers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not clear if transition areas have been mapped based on the Province's Land Use Compatibility Guideline</td>
<td>The Community Plan serves as the link between the policy directions in the Regional and City Official Plans, the Master Environmental Servicing Plan for the Stage 1 Lands and the subsequent planning, environmental and development approvals required for the lands to be made available for development. Land use compatibility has been recognized as an important consideration for the Stage 1 Lands. The Community Plan identifies that transition areas, setbacks, buffers, provision for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### East Side (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan and Community Plan – PIC #3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>outdoor storage, fencing, design standards and landscaping will be given consideration during implementation to ensure land use compatibility. The City of Cambridge will need to conduct an Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment to confirm the land use policies relating to the transition areas and the Province’s Land Use Compatibility Guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Feedback on Preferred Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In support of option 3A, Intermarket is willing to modify their plans to pay for the road connection to Maple Grove Road, alter the alignment to have no impact on the wetland adjacent to the Regional Operations yard and have minimal impacts on the Regional Operations yard facilities.</td>
<td>Comment noted. The connection to Maple Grove Road is not anticipated to be required for the East Side Lands development. Separate communications with the Region of Waterloo, City of Cambridge and the GRCA will be required to consider this road to satisfy specific development needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed &quot;Quick Start&quot; servicing plan will help unlock future development opportunities in the short-term in an area that is contiguous to existing employment uses and well connected</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### East Side (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan and Community Plan – PIC #3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>by the existing road network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs for infrastructure related to East Side Lands, including the &quot;quick Start&quot; will be recovered through Development Charges</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed servicing along Speedsville Road north of Maple Grove Road will unlock future development potential for the east side of the Provincial land</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the confirmation that that the Preston Wastewater Treatment Plan will have sufficient capacity to accommodate new development activity within the Stage 1 East Side Lands</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Information Centre #4: Summary of Key Issues and Responses

The following is a summary of key issues based on the December 12, 2013 Public Information Centre held at the École secondaire Père-René-de-Galinée (450 Maple Grove Road, Cambridge ON). A number of comments and questions from this meeting were received from members of the community. The Project Team’s responses to all written comments received and questions posed at the PIC are provided in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Information Centre</strong></td>
<td>A total of four Public Information Centres were held for this project. There is not another open house planned at this time. To stay involved with the project, community members are encouraged to provide input when the reports are presented to Council. In order to have your input considered in the March 2014 City of Cambridge staff report, please provide comments by January 12, 2014 to one of the project contacts as outlined on the information handout and project website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether there are plans for future open houses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use and Community Plan</strong></td>
<td>Cannot predict timing and market but select parcels may be serviceable by the end of 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The planned start date for the Quick Start lands.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## East Side (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan and Community Plan – PIC #4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design and details of the transition zones, inclusion of buildings in the zones, impact of transition zone design on designated heritage routes (Riverbank Road) and heritage buildings including those undesignated on Middle Block Road.</td>
<td>The design and details of the transitions zones, such as length and width, will be developed as part of the preparation of proposed amendments to the 2012 Cambridge Official Plan and Zoning By-law which will be led by City staff. In the community plan they are generally shown to provide an indication of the areas that they will apply to. Typically, buildings are not a part of transition zones. The preferred transportation alternative in the Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MESP) would alleviate much of the through traffic on Riverbank Drive, as recommended by the Heritage Master Plan. The MESP also identifies the need for further heritage work (both cultural and archaeological) which will be undertaken. It is important to note that even though Riverbank Drive is identified as a Scenic Heritage Road, not all views and vistas will be able to be protected in conjunction with the development of the Stage 1 lands because this area is intended to be developed for large lot employment uses. The views that can be protected will generally need to be identified through the Official Plan and more specifically through Zoning By-law amendment process. The zoning standards that are set for this area will set the required property setbacks which determine the future location of buildings. The Official Plan and Zoning amendment processes will include public consultation. However, feedback on what the transition zones should look like is welcome at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For transition areas consider: walking trail (stone dust); use native plants</td>
<td>Comment noted. As identified above, the design and details of the transitions zones will be considered during the Cambridge Official Plan amendment and Zoning By-law amendment processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(community planting event?); design connection corridor between environmentally sensitive land.</td>
<td>The Official Plan amendment referenced above will need to include policies that address cultural heritage resources in the Stage 1 lands. In the future, properties may be added to the City’s Heritage Registry within the Stage 1 lands either as properties of interest or designated under the Ontario Heritage Act. Should development applications be submitted for those properties, a determination will be made by City staff in consultation with the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee, about whether a Heritage Impact Assessment is required as part of the development application review. If a Heritage Impact Assessment is required, the normal process for a Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee review of the Heritage Impact Assessment would take place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The treatment of heritage buildings within the development area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of industries that would locate here and meaning of “Prestige Industrial” land use.</td>
<td>Prestige Industrial refers to non-heavy industry and higher-profile businesses. A range of uses will be allowed including office campuses for research and development, environmental sustainability, “green” technology, food science, information technology, etc. The Official Plan amendment and Zoning Bylaw amendment referenced above would identify specific standards for building types, landscaping, urban design, lighting, outdoor storage, odour, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### East Side (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan and Community Plan – PIC #4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing land use designation of nearby businesses, such as the Loblaws distribution centre and Challenger Freight Motors.</td>
<td>The lands being occupied by the Loblaws distribution centre and Challenger Freight Motors are designated as Business Industrial in the 2012 Cambridge Official Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of the 2031 date, and whether it is a planning horizon or end date.</td>
<td>The infrastructure projects are phased over time to meet the planning horizon date of 2031, which is consistent with the Region and Cambridge Official Plan. There may be a need to adapt the timeline if the reality of uptake in land is different than the projected growth. An important recommendation of the Financial Impact Analysis is to continue to monitor development and adjust the market forecasts and infrastructure plan appropriately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibility for this land to not be developed in any form in the future.</td>
<td>The East Side Stage Lands have been identified as a future growth area, and specifically the Stage 1 lands have been identified to accommodate growth within the Region. Portions of the Stage 1 lands had been added to the Region’s Urban Area through Regional Official Policy Plan Amendment 28, and the remaining area is being added with the 2009 Regional Official Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of the study area and whether it includes the land north-west of Fountain Street and Middle Block Road</td>
<td>The lands north-west of Fountain Street and Middle Block Road are not within the Region’s Urban Area and not included within this study area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### East Side (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan and Community Plan – PIC #4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverbank Drive residents and others in the area are on well water. Please keep this in mind when determining what type of industry will be welcome in the area.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverbank Drive is an important corridor, running along the river, between the Freeport and Fairway extension bridges. It begs to be treated as one corridor to ensure that whatever transition zones are created are consistent and are in keeping with the scenic value of the road.</td>
<td>Comment noted. The Community Plan and Master Environmental Servicing Plan identify the cultural heritage significance of Riverbank Drive and infrastructure solutions that support the conservation of this feature. The Cambridge Official Plan amendment and Zoning By-law amendment will provide more detailed policies to promote the conservation of Riverbank Drive as a Scenic Heritage Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Environment, Subwatershed And Stormwater Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed 30 m setback from property lines for regulatory/flood plain purposes is excessive and not consistent with setback of other properties in the area.</td>
<td>A prescribed 30 metres setback for Regulatory Floodplain purposes is not being proposed. New development must be located outside the floodplain. The limit of the floodplain is determined through a geodetic survey. We note that the GRCA regulates the floodplain and a 15 metres allowance under Ontario Regulation 150/06.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need to value the man-made wetland, must protect the Provincially Significant Wetland and enhance what is there.</td>
<td>Comment noted. The Subwatershed Study and Master Drainage Plan have assessed all of the natural heritage features within the study area and have identified the need to protect, enhance and restore the Provincially Significant Wetland and other natural features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned new culvert timing.</td>
<td>This culvert work is not a part of this project. The replacement of the Middle Block Road culvert is included in the City’s 10 year capital forecast in 2017. The final timing of construction will be dependent on the availability of funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study area for the Subwatershed Study is too narrow.</td>
<td>The Hespeler West Subwatershed Study was been incorporated into the analysis for this project for the area east and west of Fountain Street. The scope of work for this project included the incorporation of the approved Hespeler West Subwatershed Study. No additional site analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has been conducted in the Hespeler West Subwatershed area east of Fountain Street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of the stormwater ponds.</td>
<td>There are a range of sizes for a stormwater management pond. The size of the stormwater management pond will be dependent on the size of the area it is servicing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of the proposed road crossing of Freeport Creek to connect into the Creekside lands as identified in preferred Option 3B.</td>
<td>The proposed road crossing of Freeport Creek would be maintained in the approximate existing crossing location with final details to be determined during the road design to mitigate impact on the Provincially Significant Wetland and Freeport Creek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of Provincially Significant Wetland designation for the wetland adjacent to the Regional Operations Centre and the Creekside Lands.</td>
<td>The wetland adjacent to the Regional Operations Centre has been evaluated as a Provincially Significant Wetland as approved by the Ministry of Natural Resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether a separate study will be undertaken on the Provincially Significant Wetland adjacent to the</td>
<td>The Subwatershed Study and Master Drainage Plan has recommended that a separate environmental assessment study is undertaken on the Provincially Significant Wetland adjacent to the Regions Operations Centre (Pond 130) in order to identify a recommended long term stormwater management solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Operations Centre, as it is needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site specific floodplain mapping concerns relating to 3763 King Street.</td>
<td>GRCA staff will be meeting with the land owner and consultants to address this site specific concern relating to the floodplain mapping.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Financial impact assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The phasing of the work should be re-evaluated to avoid spending 45% of planned expenditures at the onset for Speedsville Road.</td>
<td>Timing for the widening and reconstruction of Speedsville Road is under discussion between the Region and the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The financial analysis for the MESP does not include recoveries from other adjacent developments that benefit from the improvements considered in the MESP study. These developments include, but are not limited to Boxwood</td>
<td>The land that will contribute to the area specific development charge will be confirmed when the City conducts its Development Charge Background Study. The Development Charge Background study will consider all land that is benefiting from the proposed infrastructure for inclusion in the Area Specific Development Charge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Hunt Club. It is important that the benefiting developments pay for the appropriate infrastructure.</td>
<td>Comments noted. The City of Cambridge is undergoing a city-wide Development Charge review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed Development Charge range is too high compared to neighbouring and competitor municipalities. The expenses in the study include cost scenarios that exceed planned growth, and if this happens the Development Charges will be ahead of planned growth and so these “possible” costs should not be included in the costs to be recovered. The financial analysis is flawed in its conclusion that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the DCs in the By-law will result in a shortfall to planned costs. Current DC’s rates will generate over $100 million in DCs and taxes – and this can cover the costs identified in the Study including Speedsville Road and with no recovery from adjacent land owners of some $20 million; or a reduction for “possible” expenses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The building coverage ratios identified as 20 to 25% are too conservative; many developments will have higher coverage ratios than this.</td>
<td>The 20% to 25% building coverage ratio scenarios were identified based on historical data from the City of Cambridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cost of widening Speedsville Road should</td>
<td>The cost of Speedsville Road widening is not placed entirely on developers and this is noted in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not be placed entirely on developers and should not impact the Quick</td>
<td>Financial Impact Analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start lands as it is on the other side of the Stage 1 lands.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The impact of this development on property taxes.</td>
<td>The Development Charge Act is in place to ensure that growth pays for growth. The Financial Impact Analysis has identified the infrastructure required for development, which would be funded through Development Charges. The Financial Impact Analysis (and PIC #4 panels) identifies the impacts to the tax base, which demonstrates a positive impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lands south of Freeport Creek (commonly referred to as the</td>
<td>Comment noted. The land that will contribute to the area specific development charge will be confirmed when the City conducts its Development Charge Background Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creekside lands) should be included in the existing Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charge by-law, not in the Area Specific Development Charge proposed by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the MESP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Impact Analysis package is confusing and</td>
<td>The Financial Impact Analysis document is a technical document which provides very detailed financial calculations. To assist in the communication of this information, the infrastructure costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**East Side (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan and Community Plan – PIC #4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the key points aren’t summarized.</td>
<td>have been included in the MESP. This information was also presented and on the panels for PIC #4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Infrastructure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whether the preferred infrastructure option will have an impact on Riverbank Drive residents and their connection to municipal water and sewer.</td>
<td>The Master Environmental Servicing Plan does not consider servicing the residential homes along Riverbank Drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why there is a gap in the sewer line along Middle Block Road shown on the infrastructure option maps.</td>
<td>This point on Middle Block Road is the high part of the gravity sewer. The sewers are proposed to flow in two different directions (east and west) from this point. The exact placement of the sewers will be determined during detailed design and the sewer would be built to where it is needed in order to service the whole study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of the new Regional sewage pump station.</td>
<td>A separate Environmental Assessment process is being undertaken by the Region to determine the location of the sewage pump station and forcemain to the Kitchener Wastewater Treatment Plant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway track availability for shunting and potential</td>
<td>Based on current traffic and projected volumes, there is adequate road and rail capacity for a safe, at-grade crossing of the King Street connection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### East Side (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan and Community Plan – PIC #4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>impacts on traffic for the King Street connection crossing rail.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region of Waterloo

Planning, Housing, and Community Services

Transportation Planning

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

Date: April 1, 2014  File Code: D09-00(A)

Subject: Highway 8, Bus Bypass Shoulders, Operating and Legal Agreements with the Ministry of Transportation

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into legal and operating agreements with Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario (by its Ministry of Transportation) to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services, the Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services, and the Regional Solicitor to allow for the use of the bus bypass shoulders by Grand River Transit on Highway 8 between Fairway Road and Sportsworld Drive, as described in Report No. P-14-039, dated April 1, 2014.

Summary:

The widening on Highway 8, from 1.0 km north of the Grand River southerly to the Sportsworld interchange (completed in 2013) provided for an additional 1.25 metres along the shoulders and bridge structures to accommodate 4.25 m bus bypass shoulders (BBS). With Council approval in 2008, the Region agreed to provide additional capital funds to the MTO for the widening required to allow for bus bypass shoulders (please see Report No. P-08-075, September 30, 2008).

The BBS on this area of Highway 8 will keep Grand River Transit (including Ion aBRT) on a consistent schedule so congestion from highway incidents can be avoided. Transit buses will be allowed to use the shoulders for traveling if the main stream of vehicles is moving at less than 60 km/hr. The BBS on Highway 8 between Sportsworld Drive and north of the Grand River are now completed and ready for use.

The use of the BBS is scheduled to begin May 1, 2014 subject to approval and signing of the legal and operating agreements and the completion of the necessary driver training for GRT bus operators. Similar agreements will be required with the planned...
BBS along Highway 401 between Highway 8 and Hespeler Road. The BBS along Highway 401 will be constructed as part of the Highway 401 expansion project which is scheduled to begin in 2014. The Highway 401 BBS will also improve the reliability and travel times of the Ion aBRT.

Report:

Schedule reliability and travel time competitiveness are both key factors that attract “choice riders” to public transportation. In many urban areas, traffic congestion regularly delays bus service and adversely affects schedule reliability. Many communities, including Waterloo Region, are adopting various measures such as bus signal priority to improve speed and reliability of bus service. Another effective measure is the implementation of bus bypass shoulders (BBS) in areas of heavy congestion (Please see Attachment 1). BBS allow transit vehicles to use the shoulders of the road to “bypass” regular congestion and queues caused by highway incidents. Currently, City of Mississauga Transit has been operating successfully using Highway 403 BBS with no issues for several years.

Bus-Bypass Shoulders are defined as the area adjacent to the general purpose lane used by police, emergency services and for disabled vehicles. According to the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) guidelines, authorized transit buses will be allowed to use the shoulders for traveling if the main stream of vehicles is moving at less than 60 km/hr. Transit vehicle operators require special training and licensing to be authorized to operate a bus on a bus bypass shoulder.

An area of delay and poor reliability for GRT, both today and expected in the future, is on the stretch of Highway 8 between Fairway Road and Sportsworld Drive in Kitchener. Any incident in this corridor or on Highway 401 causes significant delays for buses. In order to mitigate this impact on GRT operations, BBS were proposed. In most cases these BBS would be available for transit use should any delays or incidents affect traffic flow on Highway 8.

The Ministry of Transportation recently completed the widening of Highway 8, from 1.0 km north of the Grand River southerly to Highway 401, including BBS (please see Attachment 2 for a map).

Due to the longevity of the MTO works on Highway 8, there was no further opportunity to complete BBS as part of another project. As such, there was significant cost savings involved in constructing the bus bypass shoulders as part of this Highway 8 widening project instead of as a stand alone project in the future. Therefore, the Region agreed to provide additional capital funds to the MTO to cover the widening required to accommodate bus bypass shoulders. This was approved by Regional Council in 2008 (please see Report No. P-08-075, September 30, 2008).

The widening on Highway 8, (completed in 2013) provided for an additional 1.25 metres along the shoulders and bridge structures to accommodate 4.25 m bus bypass shoulders. In 2008, the estimated cost to widen the shoulders on the bridge structures and the shoulders along Highway 8 from Fairway Road to Sportsworld Drive was $4.3 M; however actual costs were about $3.4 M because of some design changes and lower unit costs. The design changes included the re-grading of the area north west of
the Grand River Bridge that then allowed for significantly smaller retaining wall structures.

Even with the recent widening of Highway 8, peak hour congestion may still occur and congested conditions are forecast to reoccur within 12 - 15 years. Also, if a vehicle incident occurs during the peak periods, traveled lanes will be blocked. This ongoing risk of operational problems along Highway 8 means that the BBS will contribute to the long term speed and reliability of GRT services that use this stretch of Highway 8.

**Bus Bypass Shoulders Operation**

In order to start using the Highway 8 bus by-pass shoulders, the Region of Waterloo must meet certain eligibility criteria (Please see Attachment 3 for details), including the training of operators to review key operating parameters such as the purpose, design and layout of the BBS, signs and markings, operating speed restrictions, safe merging, BBS access and egress, and emergency procedures.

The Region of Waterloo is currently finalizing operating and legal agreements with MTO for use of the Highway 8 BBS. These agreements would include provisions such that:

- The design, specification and construction of the BBS would be completed by MTO;
- The Region would reimburse MTO in the amount of $3,349,461.00 for the final costs to construct the BBS, as previously agreed upon;
- The BBS form part of Highway 8 and as such are owned by MTO;
- MTO is responsible for all maintenance of the BBS including signage, pavement, pavement markings and snow removal;
- The Region and MTO agree to the use of the BBS by Grand River Transit in accordance with operational protocols;
- Other operators may be permitted to use the BBS by MTO by amendment to the Regulation with notice to the Region;
- The maintenance of the BBS will be covered by MTO for five years, after which MTO has requested the ability to negotiate a cost sharing for the maintenance with the Region of Waterloo. Any amendment to the legal agreement to provide for cost sharing will be brought back to Regional Council for consideration.
- MTO may suspend or terminate the Region’s use of the BBS in the event there are continued violations of the operating protocol or if continued use of the BBS causes a significant traffic safety or operational concern, upon 90 days’ notice or less in the case of an emergency.

The BBS on Highway 8 between Sportsworld Drive and north of the Grand River are now completed and ready for use. The use of the BBS is scheduled to begin May 1, 2014 subject to approval and signing of legal and operating agreements and the completion of the necessary driver training. Similar agreements will be required with the planned BBS along Highway 401 between Highway 8 and Hespeler Road. The BBS on Highway 401 (approved as part of the Rapid Transit Environmental Assessment) will also improve the reliability and travel times of the Ion aBRT.
Corporate Strategic Plan:

The construction of the Highway 8 bus bypass shoulders supports the Strategic Focus Area 5: Provide High Quality, Integrated Multi-Modal Regional Transportation Network (Automobile, Rapid Transit, and Conventional Transit).

Financial Implications

The 2014 Transportation Capital Program includes funding of $3.6 million in 2014 to cover costs for this project and would be funded from the Development Charge Reserve Fund. During the 2014 mid year review of the Transportation Capital Program the budget would be revised to reflect actual costs of $3.4 million.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Staff from Grand River Transit and Rapid Transit were consulted and provided input into the agreements.

Attachments:

Attachment 1 – Example of a Bus Bypass Shoulder Lane
Attachment 2 – Map of Highway – Limits of Bus Bypass Shoulders
Attachment 3 – Eligibility Criteria for Use of BBS

Prepared By: Paula Sawicki, Manager, Strategic Transportation Planning

Approved By: Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Housing and Community Services
Attachment 1 – Example of a Bus Bypass Shoulder Lane
Attachment 2 – Map of Highway – Limits of Bus Bypass Shoulders
Attachment 3 – Eligibility Criteria for Use of BBS

Region of Waterloo - Grand River Transit must provide regular, scheduled service available to the public. Transit vehicles that are permitted to use the BBS are as follows:

- Buses & articulated buses (40’ – 60’ in length)
- MobilityPLUS buses (25’ – 30’ in length)

Buses must have radio or telephone contact with the Region of Waterloo - Grand River Transit’s central dispatcher, in order to report blocked shoulders or other emergency situations involving the shoulder.

Region of Waterloo - Grand River Transit must have a Commercial Vehicle Operator's Registration (CVOR) Certificate, and must have a Carrier Safety Rating (CSR) of either excellent or satisfactory. The Ministry’s West Region designated contact must be provided with proof of this rate.

Region of Waterloo - Grand River Transit supervisory and driver staff must complete Manager and Driver Training as Provided by Region of Waterloo - Grand River Transit, before commencing operations. The curriculum will include:

- Purpose of BBS
- Review of BBS layout, signs and markings
- Operating Speed Restrictions
- Safe Merging
- BBS Access and Egress
- Emergency Procedures

After completion of training, each supervisor and bus driver must sign an acknowledgement form indicating that they have been trained and will abide by the rules of this Operating Protocol. Region of Waterloo - Grand River Transit must retain a copy of each signed form for MTO’s review.
Region of Waterloo
Corporate Resources
Legal Services

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

Date: April 1, 2014 File Code: L07-40

Subject: Surplus Declaration of Land, Storm Water Management Facility, West of Bearinger Road (Regional Road #58), City of Waterloo

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo declare the lands described as Part Lot 30, GCT, Geographic Township of Waterloo, designated as Parts 1, 2 & 3 on Reference Plan 58R-10886, City of Waterloo, Region of Waterloo surplus to the needs of the Region, as detailed in Report No. CR-RS-14-026 dated April 1, 2014, and provide the standard public notification as required by the Region’s property disposition by-law and to the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor.

Summary:
Nil.

Report:

The subject lands have an area of 0.22 hectares (0.5436 acres) and the existing storm water management facility located on the lands receives storm drainage from Bearinger Road (Regional Road #58), Laurelwood Drive and a small portion of lands owned by the University of Waterloo on the east side of Bearinger Road. The subject lands are being declared surplus in anticipation of a transfer to the University of Waterloo to be consolidated with the University’s abutting parcel to facilitate the construction of an expanded storm water management facility (the “SWM Facility”).

Under the terms of the agreement with the University of Waterloo, the expanded SWM Facility will accommodate storm drainage from other parts of the University’s lands east of Bearinger Road and any additional storm drainage that arise from potential future improvements to Bearinger Road in addition to the current drainage. Immediately
following the transfer of the subject lands the Region will obtain an easement over the new expanded SWM Facility for its storm drainage.

The Region’s property disposition by-law requires advertising of any proposed conveyance of Regional land in the local newspaper.

The subject lands are shown on Appendix ‘A’ attached.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

Ensuring existing Region of Waterloo storm water management needs are provided is reflected in Focus Area 2, Growth Management and Prosperity: Manage growth to foster thriving and productive urban and rural communities.

**Financial Implications**

The Region’s share of the cost to build the expanded SWM is $231,250 ($172,000 for construction costs plus $59,250 land costs). There is currently $200,000 funding provided in the 2014 Transportation Capital Program and the additional funds required will be added at mid-year review.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Staff from Transportation Planning and Design and Construction departments have been consulted in the preparation of this report.

**Attachments**

Appendix “A” – location map of land

---

**Prepared By:** Fiona McCrea, Solicitor, Property

**Approved By:** Gary Sosnoski, Commissioner, Corporate Resources
March 25, 2014

Regional Municipality of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street. 2nd Floor
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3

Attention Kris Fletcher, Clerk

Re: Ayr Waster Transfer Station

The closure of the Ayr Waste Transfer Station was discussed at last evening’s Council meeting. After discussion the following resolution was passed:

"THAT report AD-14-01 be received; and,
THAT the list of comments received during a recent public survey on the announced closure of the Ayr Waste Transfer Station be forwarded to the Region of Waterloo for response; and,
THAT correspondence be sent to the Region requesting that the closure of the Ayr Waste Transfer Station be delayed until at least April 30, 2014 to allow staff time to explore options with the Region."

A copy of staff report AD-14-01 is attached.

Please contact me if you have any concerns regarding the above.

Sincerely,

Rodger Mordue
CAO/Clerk

cc. Jon Arsenault, Regional Director of Waste Management
TO: Mayor and Members of the Council
Rodger Mordue, CAO

FROM: Julia Sippel, Administrative Assistant

DATE: March 20, 2014

SUBJECT: Report AD-14-01

PURPOSE: Ayr Waste Transfer Station Survey Results

RECOMMENDATIONS:

THAT Council receives report AD-14-01

BACKGROUND:

Recently the Region of Waterloo decided to close the Ayr Waste Transfer Station previously open on Saturdays from 8am – 4pm and located at Reidsville Road and Greenfield Road. The date of closure is April 1, 2014. The Township of North Dumfries provided a survey to the public to fill out in order to obtain an understanding of the public’s use of the waste station.

The survey consisted of 6 questions, the results of which are attached as Appendix A. We received 170 responses in a short two week timeframe. Two of the questions were comment based. The first asking what type of waste the public is bringing to the station. Typical responses included household waste, large items, yard waste, and hazardous waste as well as some recycling items. The last question allowed the public to outline their concerns regarding the closure. The full list of comments is included in Appendix A however the top concerns were as follows:

- Closing of the station will result in increased roadside dumping.
- The other waste stations are too far for people to travel from this area and will increase pollution from driving.
- Although the residents of North Dumfries are not paying for LRT Transit through taxes, this cut to service is an indirect way for the residents of North Dumfries to subsidy LRT Transit in the Region.

A number of questions were also asked by the public, and are attached as Appendix B. Answers to these questions will be sent out via the Eblast and posted on our website for the public once they become available.
## Ayr Waste Station Survey Results

### Have you ever used the waste station?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How often do you use the station?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Once every 3 months</th>
<th>Every 6 months</th>
<th>Once per year</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you want it to stay open?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would you like the Township to provide financial support to keep it open?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• With respect to question #5 I already financially support the transfer station through my taxes! I live on Reidsville Road and we already pick up tires, computers etc. from the ditch on a regular basis that people throw off when the transfer station is not open. This problem will only increase and add an additional cost to the Township for having the road crews cleaning things up. Maybe they can but an LRT car at the transfer station and when it’s full ship it to Kitchener! Just another example of big government cutting back a service that is truly needed!
• That waste will be dumped on the side of the road if people have to drive to Waterloo to dispose of anything.
• I am concerned where people are going to get rid of their waste. | | Hopefully not down some of our side Roads.
• It is a lengthy drive through Cambridge to the transfer station there, especially if there is a trailer to haul. The Ayr location is definitely a much faster and better location for us in this area. It seems that the amount of money saved is small compared to the inconvenience that will come when it is closed. Every time we go there, many others are using the facilities at the same time. This is a busy and well used station. Please keep it open.
• It is absolutely a great convenience for the township and so many are disturbed about it closing. Nice to be self-sufficient in our community. Save it, save it, save it.
• Location for disposal of larger recycling items- Location for disposal of hazardous items- Location for disposal of larger household waste items... need something within a reasonable distance.
• We will see more junk on the roads, ditches and people will have more fires to burn things.
• Concern with accessibility to the next near Waste Transfer Station.
• If this transfer station is closed people will not drive to Waterloo or Cambridge to get rid of their junk. They will dump it on country side roads. This is a proven fact since we often find large items dumped in our ditches. It will get even worse if the dump is closed permanently. There is an extra cost for people to drive further and there will be costs for road side cleanup that will need to be done by the township.
• I think it is unfortunate that it is closing as I personally made use of the facility. If it has to close, I would like to see a location where residents in the urban parts of the Township (for example in Ayr, where I live) can go and dispose of excess leaves in the fall. I am also curious to know why the Elmira Transfer Station was spared closing.
• You’ll see even more trash in ditches.
• We pay taxes to the Region but seem to get VERY little when compared to our urban neighbours. Forget LRT, we don’t even get transit. Now our transfer station and household hazardous waste days are gone...but urban ROW councilors spend $240K on trimming grass that looks untidy on boulevards...
• Please keep it open.
• Cambridge and Kitchener are very far to drive.
• I am concerned about garbage being dumped on the side of the road or as in our case, in our driveway. I have picked up roadside litter for 13 years and will not be doing so if I have to deliver it all the way across town. I would also like to know why Woolwich township gets two transfer stations and the rest, none.
• If you close the landfill, things will start showing up on the side of the road.
• Yes I have concerns! Our closest landfill will be 30 minutes away. | | I’m sure we will see more illegal dumping on private & township property!
• Feel that people will dump on the side of the road as it is difficult to get to Cambridge or Waterloo.
• I’m very concerned that the three will be a few folks who will think its ok to dump unwanted items on nearby ditches. I would like to believe that this would never happen in today’s educated society but the reality may be quite different. Please keep it open!
• Yes I think people will dump their garbage on the side of the road
• I am concerned there will be increased illegal dumping of garbage.
• I would be very concerned that people would dump garbage at the side of the road because the Cambridge waste station is too far away. Then this garbage would not be picked up weekly and might be strewn across neighbourhoods.
• People will just dump their garbage and other items alongside of the road. This is a very poor decision. There is ways to make this financially feasible.
• Yes, it is too far to expect Ayr residents to drive to Cambridge to use their station. It costs a lot on gas and is bad for the environment
• Other than inconveniencing me...not really. I hope the people that work there don’t lose their jobs as they are all wonderful people to deal with.
• Would be good idea to leave open bit ever second weekend to reduce the cost
• I don’t agree with having to travel into Cambridge to use the transfer station there if ours is closed. I use it quite frequently and would be very disappointed if it closes.
• Do not close!
• What tonnages of materials were received per hour of operation in comparison to other rural stations and the overhead costs for same.is it possible the station should have opened more hours. Seldom in the past has it been managed in a responsible way relative to efficiency or fee collection
• Closing this station will result in more trash being dumped along roadways and in people’s fields. It is a proven fact that people will just dump stuff on the side of the road if there is no service provided.
• Very convenient and needed!
• increase in roadside dumping
• A lot of the small towns you this facility as the larger cities they are too far away for us. Please keep it open we really do need it.
• Picking garbage along our roadside in the rural totaled 18 bags last spring that we took and paid the fee on. The region is making it more difficult to keep our township looking nice. First cutting back on the grass cutting, which I do twice a year to keep the weeds down, but now make it more difficult to get rid of the garbage from their roadsides that I pick. I’m concerned this will promote illegal dumping.
My primary concern would be people dumping their waste along township roadways rather than taking it to a dump out of town. If people start to dump their toxic materials such as paint, chemicals, oils...then the potential cost of cleanup could be quite significant, not to mention the impacts on the fragile ecosystems.

I have concerns of dumping that will likely occur in the regions back roads due to this closure. It happens too frequently already and the transfer station is still open. ||||Also many of the past years there does not appear to be any financial regulation at the ND transfer station. Loads are estimated and cash is paid with no receipts or paper trail. Every time I have been to the site it is busy. I would think many of the fees charged should help cover a site only open once a week. Is there any audited financials on how much money this site generates versus expenses?

We use the transfer station a fair bit. Closing it would cause us to use the closest facility in Cambridge. It is further away and less convenient, unavailable on weekends. I suspect that closing the number of rural transfer stations would create more traffic at the Cambridge facility so it could result in long waits.

A more solid fiscal rationale is required - this is where politics and reality collide! Either close ALL of the rural transfer stations or none - do NOT pick and Choose eg. Woolwich stays open 2 days/week????!!!

Yes as fear is people with dump garbage in rural areas rather than driving to Cambridge to pay to dump. Township people then have work of cleaning up. Catch 22 also the time and cost involved in getting to next closest dump, maybe we could have more scheduled large garbage pick-ups.

Roadside dumping - we currently live on a main road just at the edge of the village and the Tim’s cups, pop cans, McDonald’s garbage is unbelievable. I would never think of throwing my garbage onto a lawn in town. We will see a lot more old couches bags of garbage and yard waste just dumped on the road side.

The waste will still need to go somewhere; more items will be put out in the weekly collection. Some not appropriate and will clutter the streets like at large pickup time. |||For construction type or larger loads the other locations make sense but for the times people miss the normal pickup I think people need somewhere nearby to take it.

Without a reasonably close place to drop off garbage outside of pick up days, more will be left on the sides of rural roads than is already there. no one minds paying a small fee, but no one will drive very far to dump their garbage

Every visit I’m there I always see lots of people using the facility. Now everyone in North Dumfries will have to travel a minimum of 20 mins to another transfer station. The cost of gas involved for everyone to do the round trip exceeds the cost of keeping our current station open. I do not have a problem paying more for each of my visits to our current transfer station.

I pay my taxes like everyone else plus there is new developments coming in adding 400 plus residences to Ayr. If the transfer station closes we need to have an alternate station to go to

This spring there is major cleanup from properties due to the ice storm. Please keep it open.

Too far to other transfer stations, particularly pulling a trailer. ||||Garbage will probably be dumped on rural roads.

It is ridiculous the amount of money we spend on non-essential items and no one cares. Why doesn’t the Region take the money from this light rail project and invest it in infrastructure...where it is really needed.

Others may deposit garbage in unauthorized places.

If money is the issue, perhaps the dump should have shorter hours, say 9 - noon every week or, alternatively, only open once a month. It concerns me that as Ayr grows in population its services seem to be shrinking. I’m equally concerned about the discontinued toxic waste pick up. Please reconsider both of these issues.

How far would we have to travel for a dump? This has ALWAYS been a busy place.

You are going to spend more money on picking up garbage littering the rural roads surrounding the township. I’ll put money on it. If you think people are going to drive all the way into Waterloo or Cambridge you’re in for a surprise. Good luck.

Where the hell do they expect us to truck it? Cambridge and Waterloo are both 30 K or more

Roadside dumping would increase, biweekly pickup of yard waste and large item pickup may need to be more frequent, increased distance to Kitchener or Cambridge landfills would be inconvenient and difficult for most residents

Illegal dumping of garbage will increase due not only to increased time needed to travel to other sites but in increased fuel costs to get there. Rural areas need transfer stations closer to home.

We already support this station financially with our taxes.

This will be a great inconvenience to Ayr residents who will now have to take material a considerable distance to another transfer station. So much for the Region supporting smaller communities. In addition, there will likely be an increase in waste being left at roadside and other areas in the Ayr area.

My spouse and I are moving to Ayr in a few months. We currently live in Kitchener - and have to drive all the way to Waterloo to drop off our waste. It is really helpful to have a statin close by - as it makes it easy to drop the stuff off at the station (rather than into the forest as I have seen some people do!)

I didn’t realize there was a transfer station there. I have dropped off hazardous waste at a different location in Ayr before but have no idea where those waste items were taken. Perhaps there?

This is a generation of throw it away, doesn’t fix it. We will see more trash, broken furniture and appliances tossed at the side of the roads in this area. A lot of this ‘new’ generation has little respect for nature and takes little responsibility for the cleanup of roadside garbage

To use the transfer stations in either Cambridge or Waterloo from the Ayr area would mean a roundtrip of either 34 or 48km. To drive so far away to drop off large item trash when a transfer station is located a mere 3.5km away is actually an environmentally issue, i.e. pollution from more traffic driving farther. On the flipside, some residents unfortunately might dump their garbage along the side of the roads, in our parks and walking trails instead.

Closure will increase the roadside dumping. What will that clean-up cost the Township/Region

This proposal is an outrage! The Region of Waterloo has a mandate to provide waste management services to the communities within the Region; to force residents of Ayr to travel to Cambridge or Waterloo for such services is wrong. The Region is about to spend in excess of
Most people will not drive to Waterloo to dispose of garbage. It will end up in regular waste stream or dumped in the country.

The next nearest is in Cambridge south, much farther away. This would be more costly in time and expense.

I am concerned about having to drive to the Cambridge Waste Station and the distance that require.

Concerned that waste will end up on the side of roads in the area. Cambridge is too far to go.

Why keep one open and close the rest. We need ours - we’re quite a drive from the nearest 68 City68 option. As a result, we have lots of 68out of the way68 areas, and you can bet we’re going to see more garbage dumped at the side of the roads. When doing a big clean, it’s easier for me to throw it in a truck and take care of myself than to waste the regular route person’s time loading up the truck (which also ties up traffic) Please don’t raise our taxes by much! - but I would support financial assistance to keep it open

If closed, how far would North Dumfries residents need to drive to rid of waste? A closure would most likely mean more unwanted waste in our beautiful Nith River or on the sides of our road.

if it is closed people will start to dump things on the roadside

Seems as though we have to work an unfair ratio of 5 days on and 2 days off. I don’t want to spend half of my day off running to Cambridge when a perfectly good facility is already here. My fear is that people will just dump their garbage down the country roads; we’ve seen it time and time again.

Waterloo and Cambridge are too far to travel!

It would be much more difficult to transport waste to Cambridge or another location should this site close. It’s safer not having to take it too far from home.

We need to have a close by area to use.

Honestly I think the Region is being shortsighted here. I think you will see an increase in items being left on the side of the road throughout the township. Nearest landfill in Cambridge or Waterloo is too far to go and our population is increasing. Please keep this facility open.

Where is the next closest transfer station located?

It seems that the Region has little problem reducing services to taxpayers in rural areas to supplement the LRT on the backs of people that will use the service.

How much does it really cost to keep it open?

It’s a very convenient location. Closing it would be bad for the rural communities.

It’s an awfully long drive to Cambridge or Waterloo to use their facility. Will the waste pick up take EVERYTHING put to roadside if we do not have anywhere to take it?

I would also like the transfer station to handle hazard household waste, i.e. paint, oil etc. I don’t imagine too many people are interested in driving to KW to get rid of this waste. Yes I feel this may lead to dumping on our side roads

if it closes travelling to waterloo dump will occur.....gas consumption and efficiency to the township will occur

Where would we have to drive to the next closest station and how much would it cost?

Closure will end up with a lot of garbage being dumped along the roadside so the township staff will end up having to clean it up!!!! Net savings is a negative..

It’s convenient, is a valuable service and waste transfer stations, such as this, are better for the environment, both in terms of reduced vehicle emissions and by giving people more options to recycle.

People NEED a place to dispose of their waste in a regulated area. If there is NO area for them to DISPOSE of unwanted items our community may find that more items being dumped on the sides of the roads or wherever.

Having a transfer station in town saved the trip into Cambridge or Waterloo, which was very much appreciated.

If it closes, there will be a lot more dumping on our rural roads.

The time it would take to go to Cambridge plus the gas and the lineup waiting to get in . I am a senior on Canada pension, not a lot of money left. Any time we have been to the dump there is always a lot of people there. If the fee goes up some that is still better than going all the way to Cambridge so be it. Hope the dump will stay open as we have lost our hazard waste day.

If they are going to close it i can see people tossing garbage along our side roads which will then have to be picked up by township anyway

This is a regional responsibility and they shouldn’t be closing the only one in the township. North Dumfries already pays for this service in taxes to the Region, so a service given to all other members of the region should not cost North Dumfries residents extra money.

I lived in a small town before where they didn’t have a dump. We could only use the one in the next town over once a year (for a fee). It was very common to see garbage, furniture, etc. just thrown in ditches or alongside of the road, in forests or anywhere people decided to dump it. If you close the dump I’m very sure the same thing will happen here.

As with the elimination of the hazardous waste pick-up it’s difficult to ensure responsible disposal when it becomes more difficult to do so

There will be no place to dispose of used motor oil or other hazardous waste, especially since there are no longer any collections done at the Ayr News. There will probably be an increase in garbage being disposed on township roads and on the railway tracks.

I would like to ensure a local location to drop hazardous waste oil to ensure it is convenient keeping waste oil out of our water supply.

It is a disincentive to have to use the Cambridge disposal site; hence some people will not keep their properties tidy if it is really inconvenient to have to use the Cambridge landfill site.

If people have to drive to Kitchener or someplace out of the way, they are more likely to dump their garbage at the side of the road which pollutes the environment and makes more work for the local communities to have to clean up the mess. Not to mention if the garbage contaminates the soil around it. If we want to encourage people to put garbage in its place, we need to make it easy for them to do it. I’d rather the money that is proposed for the speed bumps in North Dumfries is considering be used to keep the Waste Transfer Station open.

Closing the station will likely result in more illegal dumping and side roads, etc.
• Yes. We have a large lot and would have no other way to dispose of our compostable waste. Each time we cut the lawn only (not including cleanup), we generate 5 to 7 bags of clippings per cut. We cannot keep all those bags for the yard waste curbside pickup. The smell would be horrific, as well as the sheer quantity would be unmanageable. Closure of our transfer station means weekly trips by car to Cambridge. For this amount of yard waste, we will need two cars to take it all. That's very expensive and just not fair to ND residents. There's also the issue of seniors that will not be expected to drive unreasonable distances just to responsibly dispose of waste that exceeds weekly pickup limits.

• This decision seems intent on targeting rural residents in this Region. For the small amount of Regional savings, rural residents are being significantly inconvenienced - not sure I see the same thing happening to urban residents. I am concerned for the extra costs of cleaning up garbage that will be dumped on the sides of the township roads to save the cities a few bucks.

• By removing this transfer station it will force people to either drive to Cambridge or Waterloo to dispose of waste properly or I fear that a lot of the waste will end up along back country roads because people won't want to drive that far. ||||I would like to see an accurate listing of expenses and revenue associated with the transfer station to handle (paper yard waste bags break up when they get wet) when they sit around for 2 weeks. Also, I question the accuracy of the transfers; I am afraid that roadside dumping will once again become a problem in our township; some waste becomes quite smelly and hard to handle (paper yard waste bags break up when they get wet) when they sit around for 2 weeks. Also, I question the accuracy of the projected savings from closing the facility. I would like to see an accurate listing of expenses and revenue associated with the transfer station and projected cost associated with cleaning up roadside dumping.

• Saying yes to #5 needs to be qualified that I would support reasonable financial assistance. I have several concerns with the closure including that having individuals driving to the Waterloo Waste Management facility is very environmentally unfriendly compared to bulk transfers; I am afraid that roadside dumping will once again become a problem in our township; some waste becomes quite smelly and hard to handle (paper yard waste bags break up when they get wet) when they sit around for 2 weeks. Also, I question the accuracy of the projected savings from closing the facility. I would like to see an accurate listing of expenses and revenue associated with the transfer station and projected cost associated with cleaning up roadside dumping.

• I worry that if the transfer station is closed the litter level and waste dumping will increase drastically along country roads and fields.
1. Also no one has said where the nearest transfer station will be?? What are the hours? Cost??

2. I am also curious to know why the Elmira Transfer Station was spared closing.

3. What tonnages of materials were received per hour of operation in comparison to other rural stations and the overhead costs for same? Is it possible the station should have opened more hours?

4. Is there any audited financials on how much money this site generates versus expenses?

5. Closure will increase the roadside dumping. What will that clean-up cost the Township/Region?

6. Don't we already pay taxes towards it?

7. Will the region be picking up yard waste weekly now rather than bi-weekly?

8. I would like to see an accurate listing of expenses and revenue associated with the transfer station and projected cost associated with cleaning up roadside dumping.
<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>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>1-Jun-2014</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>