Regional Municipality of Waterloo

Planning and Works Committee

Agenda

Tuesday, June 17, 2014

9:00 a.m.

Regional Council Chamber

150 Frederick Street, Kitchener

1. **Motion To Go Into Closed Session**

   That a closed meeting of the Planning and Works and Community Services Committees be held on Tuesday, June 17, 2014 at 8:45 a.m. in the Waterloo County Room, in accordance with Section 239 of the “Municipal Act, 2001”, for the purposes of considering the following subject matters:

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

2. **Motion To Reconvene Into Open Session**

3. **Declarations Of Pecuniary Interest Under The Municipal Conflict Of Interest Act**

4. **Delegations**

   a) **Memo, Provincial Highway 401 Expansion Project** – Highway 8 East to Hespeler Road

      i. Scott Howard, Ministry of Transportation
b) **CR-RS-14-045**, Authorization to Expropriate Lands (2\textsuperscript{nd} Report) in the City of Kitchener and Waterloo Designated as Part of Phase 4 of Stage 1 of the Rapid Transit Project Relating to Lands that are Necessary for Light Rail Transit as well as Road Improvement Works Approved for Northfield Drive East in Waterloo

i. Dr. Steve Cheng

---

### 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.

5. **Request to Remove Items From Consent Agenda**

6. **Motion To Approve Items Or Receive for Information**

   a) **P-14-068**, Monthly Report of Development Activity for May 2014 (Approval)

   b) **P-14-069**, Sixth Annual Report of the Laurel Creek Headwaters Environmentally Sensitive Landscape Public Liaison Committee (Information)

   c) **P-14-077**, Grand River Transit Cost Recovery Trends (Information)

   d) **CR-RS-14-047**, Closing and Surplus Declaration and Transfer to the City of Kitchener of Part of King Street East (Regional Road No. 8) Formerly King’s Highway No. 8) in the City of Kitchener (Approval)

   e) **CR-RS-14-048**, Authorization to Expropriate Lands (2\textsuperscript{nd} Report) for Franklin Blvd Improvements Project – Year 1, North Phase (Pinebush Road to South of Bishop Street) and Year 1, South Phase (North of Clyde Road to South of Main Street), In the City of Cambridge (Approval)

   f) Weber Street (Regional Road 8) Reconstruction - Borden Avenue to Queen Street, City of Kitchener - Information Package in Advance of Public Consultation Centre

   g) King Street Improvements, Bishop Street to Eagle Street, City of Cambridge - Information Package in Advance of Public Consultation Centre

   h) Regional Road 17 (Hawkesville Road-Sawmill Road) Reconstruction King Street to Waterloo-St. Jacobs Tracks – Information Package in
Advance of Public Consultation Centre

i) Memo, 2014 Canadian Institute of Transportation Engineers and Ontario Traffic Conference Joint Annual Conference – Region of Waterloo

Regular Agenda Resumes

7. Reports – Planning, Housing and Community Services

Transportation Planning

a) P-14-072, Pedestrian Access Improvements Environmental Assessment Between the Hanson/Hayward Industrial and Alpine Village Areas – Public Consultation Centre

b) P-14-073, Cambridge to Milton Passenger Rail Business Case and Implementation Strategy Interim Report

Inter-Departmental Reports

c) P-14-071/F-14-072, Brownfields Financial Incentives Program – Tax Increment Grant Application – 83 Elmsdale Drive, City of Kitchener

Reports – Transportation and Environmental Services

Rapid Transit

d) E-14-038, Stage 1 Light Rail Project – Kitchener Utilities Gas Infrastructure Relocation Cost Sharing

Transit Services

e) E-14-068, MobilityPLUS – Fleet Repairs

Transportation

f) E-14-076, Revised 2014 Transportation Base and System Expansion Capital Budgets

g) E-14-087, Region of Waterloo International Airport – Master Plan Update (Staff Presentation)

Waste Management

h) E-14-086, Battery Recycling Opportunities in Waterloo Region

Design and Construction

i) E-14-078, Bridge Street Reconstruction (University Avenue to...
Woolwich Street) Cities of Kitchener and Waterloo – Recommended Design Concept

j) E-14-079, Consultant Selection Detailed Design and Services During Construction - River Road Extension King Street to Manitou Drive, Kitchener (C2014-13) 332

k) E-14-081, Amendment to Consulting Assignment – Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road Improvements, Township of Wilmot 341

l) E-14-082, Consultant Selection C2014-16 – Geotechnical Consulting and Material Testing Services - Franklin Boulevard Improvements, City of Cambridge 346

Water Services

m) E-14-077, Consulting Assignment to Update Well Head Protection Areas 353

n) E-14-080, Greenbrook Water Treatment Plant Update 359

o) E-14-085, Option to Extend Agreement with Ontario Clean Water Agency (“OCWA”) 363

8. Information/Correspondence

a) Correspondence from Township of Wilmot re: Speed Limits 373

b) Council Enquiries and Requests for Information Tracking List 375

9. Other Business

10. Next Meeting – August 12, 2014

11. Adjourn
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning and Works Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 12, 2014</td>
<td>1:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Planning and Works Committee</td>
<td>Council Chamber 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Floor, Regional Administration Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 9, 2014</td>
<td>1:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Planning and Works Committee</td>
<td>Council Chamber 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Floor, Regional Administration Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning, Housing and Community Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue., June 17, 2014</td>
<td>4:30 P.M. –</td>
<td>Improved Access to Transit/Hanson Area – Public Consultation Centre</td>
<td>The Family Centre Gymnasium 65 Hanson Avenue Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed., June 25, 2014</td>
<td>4:00 P.M. –</td>
<td>Highway 401 Expansion King Street to Hespeler Road – Public Information Centre</td>
<td>Best Western Plus Cambridge 730 Hespeler Road Cambridge, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation and Environmental Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed., June 18, 2014</td>
<td>5:00 P.M. –</td>
<td>Regional Road 17 (Hawkesville Road-Sawmill Road) Reconstruction King Street to Waterloo-St. Jacobs Tracks Public Consultation Centre</td>
<td>Calvary United Church 48 Hawkesville Road, St. Jacobs, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed., June 18, 2014</td>
<td>4:30 P.M. –</td>
<td>King Street Improvements, Bishop Street to Eagle Street, City of Cambridge - Public Consultation Centre</td>
<td>St. Peter’s Lutheran Church 810 King Street East Cambridge, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thur., June 19, 2014</td>
<td>7:00 P.M. –</td>
<td>ION Community and Transit Talk Series presents: Taras Grescoe (Author of</td>
<td>Knox Church 50 Erb Street West Waterloo, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:30 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed., June 25, 2014</td>
<td>5:30 P.M.</td>
<td>Weber Street (Regional Road 8) Reconstruction - Borden Avenue to Queen Street, City of Kitchener - Public Consultation Centre</td>
<td>Region of Waterloo Administration Building Main Lobby 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri., June 27, 2014</td>
<td>1:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Official ION Ground-breaking</td>
<td>ION Maintenance Yard 518 Dutton Drive Waterloo, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:30 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri., July 4, 2014</td>
<td>5:00 P.M.</td>
<td>ION Light Rail Transit Vehicle returns to Waterloo Region</td>
<td>Corner of King and Ontario Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat., July 5, 2014</td>
<td>12:00 P.M.</td>
<td>ION Light Rail Transit Vehicle returns to Waterloo Region</td>
<td>Corner of King and Ontario Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun., July 6, 2014</td>
<td>11:00 A.M.</td>
<td>ION Light Rail Transit Vehicle returns to Waterloo Region</td>
<td>Corner of King and Ontario Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon., July 7, 2014</td>
<td>10:00 A.M.</td>
<td>ION Light Rail Transit Vehicle returns to Waterloo Region</td>
<td>Corner of King and Ontario Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning, Housing and Community Services

Transportation Planning

Date: June 17, 2014

Memorandum

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

From: Paula Sawicki, Manager, Strategic Transportation Planning

Subject: Provincial Highway 401 Expansion Project - Highway 8 East to Hespeler Road

File No: T04-40/401

The Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO) is hosting a Public Information Centre (PIC) to present approved improvements, with a focus on construction staging and environmental mitigation, for Highway 401 from Regional Road 8/King St Easterly to Regional Road 24/Hespeler Road. The PIC is to be held:

Wednesday, June 25, 2014
4:00 P.M. - 8:00 P.M.
Best Western Plus Cambridge
730 Hespeler Road
Cambridge, Ontario

The Notice of Public Information Centre is attached. Councilors and staff are also invited to attend a preview session from 3:00 P.M. – 4:00 P.M.
Within the study area, Highway 401 currently has three lanes in each direction. Continuous increases in traffic volumes are approaching the operational capacity of the freeway. In this regard, MTO has developed a plan, which involves widening Highway 401 from 6 to 10 lanes, including High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes and Bus Bypass shoulders. The HOV lanes and the Bus Bypass shoulders will help to increase the capacity of the highway during congested periods and improve the effectiveness of carpooling and transit.

To accommodate this widening, the pavement and bridges within the project limits require rehabilitation and/or replacement. The project also incorporates other improvements, such as:

- Overhead and electronic message signs to improve traffic flow,
- High mast lighting,
- Noise barriers,
- Upgrades to existing roadside safety measures, and
- Drainage improvements, including culvert and sewer replacements and roadside ditches.

MTO has updated the Noise Impact Study report following a pavement design analysis and a review of the optimum lighting pole locations and shield lighting.

An Ecological Assessment within the project area was also completed. Policies and plans have been developed to minimize the project's impact on aquatic communities and habitats, and terrestrial habitats.

This project is scheduled to take place over a four (4)-year period (2014-2017). During construction, three traffic lanes will be maintained in each direction during peak periods. Some components of work will be completed at night and may include lane closures and/or reductions. The interchange ramps at Highway 8 and at Hespeler Road will be maintained for continuous traffic flow during construction as well as during the realignment of Leisure Lodge Road/Rogers Drive. Short-term closures may be required.

The work also involves the reconstruction of the Speedsville Road and Fountain Street bridges over Highway 401, which was not originally designed to span 10 lanes. The Speedsville Road Bridge was closed on May 5, 2014 and will be reconstructed during 2014. The Fountain Street Bridge will be reconstructed during 2015.

Following this Public Information Centre (PIC) session, information and comments received from external agencies, municipalities and the public will be reviewed and incorporated into the detailed design where appropriate. A Design and Construction Report (DCR) will be prepared documenting the detailed design in accordance with the Class EA study and made available for a 30-day public review period. DCR review locations will be advertised in local newspapers and those on the study mailing list will be notified.
Widening of Highway 401 is consistent with Strategic Objective 3.4 (Encourage improvements to intercity transportation services to and from Waterloo Region) and Action 3.4.2 (Actively participate in the Ministry of Transportation's long term strategic plan for South Central Ontario).

The Project Manager is Scott Howard and he may be contacted at 519-873-4568 or Scott.Howard@ontario.ca.
NOTICE OF PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE
Detailed Design and Class Environmental Assessment
Highway 401 Reconstruction and Widening
G.W.P. 4-00-00
City of Cambridge and City of Kitchener, Region of Waterloo

THE PROJECT
The Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO) has retained Delcan Corporation, a Parsons Company to carry out the Detailed Design and Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Study for the reconstruction and widening of Highway 401 from 0.5 km west of Regional Road 8/King Street easterly to Regional Road 24/Hespeler Road. The MTO is also taking the opportunity to rehabilitate the bridge at Highway 8 and Sportsworld Drive.

The purpose of this PIC is to present and discuss the approved improvements with a focus on construction staging and environmental mitigation.

PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE
One Public Information Centre (PIC) will be held in association with this project.

The PIC is scheduled for:
Date: Wednesday, June 25, 2014
Time: 4:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
Location: Best Western Plus Cambridge Hotel, 730 Hespeler Rd, Cambridge, ON

The PIC will consist of an informal drop-in centre with displays showing the detailed design of the improvements and the proposed construction staging plans. MTO and Delcan staff will be on hand to answer any questions and receive your input.

Following the PIC, a Design and Construction Report (DCR) will be prepared and made available for a 30-day review period. Notification of the DCR submission and review locations will be published in this newspaper and mailed to persons on the project contact list.

COMMENTS
We are interested in receiving any comments that you may have about this project by July 9, 2014. Comments and information regarding this project are being collected to assist the project team in meeting the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the public record.

Please send comments or requests regarding this project to either of the following:

Mr. Scott Howard
Senior Project Manager, Planning & Design
Ministry of Transportation, West Region
659 Exeter Road
London, Ontario N6E 1L3
Tel: 519-873-4568
Toll free: 1-800-265-6072 (519-873-4568)
Fax: 519-873-4600
E-mail: scott.howard@ontario.ca

Mr. Henry Huotari, P. Eng.
Consultant Project Manager
Delcan Corporation, a Parsons Company
214-1069 Wellington Road South
London, Ontario, N6E 2H6
Tel: 519-286-5517
Fax: 519-681-4995
Email: Henry.Huotari@parsons.com
Region of Waterloo
Corporate Resources
Legal Services

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

Date: June 17, 2014    File Code: L07-90

Subject: Authorization to Expropriate Lands (2nd Report) in the City of Kitchener and Waterloo designated as Part of Phase 4 of Stage 1 of The Rapid Transit Project Relating to Lands that are necessary for Light Rail Transit as well as Road Improvement Works Approved for Northfield Drive East in Waterloo

Recommendation:

That The Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the expropriation of lands for the construction of the Northfield Works, as well as, for part of Phase 4 of Stage 1 of the Rapid Transit project comprised of property and interests located at various locations along the Light Rail Transit alignment in the Cities of Kitchener and Waterloo, in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo as detailed in Report CR-RS-13-089 dated November 20, 2013 and more specifically listed below:

Fee Simple Partial Takings:

LRT

1. Part Lot 39, Plan 1405, being Part 4 58R17920, Part of PIN 22281-0086, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 580 Colby Dr., Waterloo, ON N2V 1A2)

2. Part Lot 36, Plan 1405, being Part 1 58R17920, Part of PIN 22281-0083, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 661 Colby Dr., Waterloo, ON N2V 1C2)
3. Part Lot 37, Plan 1405, being Part 2 58R17920, Part of PIN 22281-0084, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 663 Colby Dr., Waterloo, ON N2V 1C2)

4. Part Lot 38, Plan 1405, being Part 3 58R17920, Part of PIN 22281-0085, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 665 Colby Dr., Waterloo, ON N2V 1C2)

5. Part Lot 7, Plan 1230, being Part 8 58R17920, Part of PIN 22280-0072, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 55 Northfield Dr., W., Northfield [aka 53-55 Northfield Dr. W.] Waterloo ON N2L 4E6)

6. Part Lot 1, Plan 1405 and all of 1 foot reserve "A", Plan 1405 being Parts 5 and 6, 58R17920, Part of PIN 22281-0049, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 583 Colby Dr., Waterloo, ON N2V 1A1)

7. Part Lot 8, GCT, being Part 7 58R17920, Part of PIN 22280-0071, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 65 Northfield Drive W., [aka 525/565 Conestogo Rd.] Waterloo, ON N2J 4J2)

8. Part Lot 198, Plan 385 being Part 4 58R17923, Part of PIN 22411-0246, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 57 Erb Street W., Waterloo, ON N2L 6C2)

9. Part of Mill Square, Plan 385 being Part 2 58R17921, Part of PIN 22411-0126, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 13 - 35 King Street S., Waterloo, ON N2J 1N9)

10. Part Lot 151, Plan 385 being Part 3, 58R17917, Part of PIN 22411-0052, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 20 William Street W., Waterloo, ON N2L 1J3)

11. Part Lot 103 Plan 385, being Part 1 58R17881, Part of PIN 22420-0231, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 227 King Street S., Waterloo, ON N2J 4C5)
12. Part Lot 56, Plan 385, being Parts 1, 2 and 3 58R17925, Part of PIN 22415-0015, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 232 King Street S., [aka 232-234 King St. S.] Waterloo, ON N2J 1R3)

13. Part Lots 288 and 289, Plan 385, being Part 2 58R17881, Part of PIN 22328-0004, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 244 King Street S., Waterloo, ON N2J 1R4)

14. Part Lot 289, Plan 385, being Part 3 58R17881, Part of PIN 22328-0005, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 980 King St. W., Waterloo, ON N2J 1R3)

15. Part Lots 289 and 290, Plan 385, being Part 4 58R17881, Part of PIN 22328-0006, City of Kitchener-Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 976 King Street W., Kitchener-Waterloo, ON N2G 1G4)

16. Part Lot 305, Plan 385, being Parts 7, 8 and 9 58R17850, Part of PIN 22327-0099, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 872 King Street W., Kitchener, ON N2G 1E8)

17. Part Lots 305 and 306, Plan 385, being Parts 5 and 6 58R17850, Part of PIN 22327-0098, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 858-870 King Street W., [aka 858-876 King St. W.] Kitchener, ON N2G 1E8)

18. Part Lots 29 and 30, Plan 377, being Part 2 58R17907, Part of PIN 22425-0228, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 641 King Street W., [aka 637-641 King St. W.] Kitchener, ON N2G 1C7)

19. Part Lot 7, Plan 41, being Part 1 58R17922, Part of PIN 22317-0054, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 400 King Street W., Kitchener, ON N2G 1B7)

20. Part Lots 21 and 22 Plan 41, being Part 2 58R17922, Part of PIN 22317-0061, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 24 Water Street N., [aka 20 Water St. N.] Kitchener, ON N2H 5A5)

21. Part Lot 7, between Young and Ontario Streets, Plan 401, being Parts 1, 2 and 3 58R17882, Part of PIN 22316-0217, City of Kitchener, Regional
22. Part Lot 7, between Young and Ontario Streets, Plan 401, being Part 5 58R17882, Part of PIN 22316-0027, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 60-62 Ontario Street N., Kitchener, ON N2H 4Y4)

23. Part Lot 19, South of King St., Plan 365, being Part 1 58R17924, Part of PIN 22502-0255, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 28 Madison Avenue S., Kitchener, ON N2G 3M3)

24. Part Lot 20, South of King St., Plan 365, being Part 2 58R17924, Part of PIN 22502-0257, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 471 King Street E., Kitchener, ON N2G 2L7)

25. Part Lots 33 and 34, Plan 634, being Part 1 58R17910, Part of PIN 22504-0344, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 355 Charles Street E., Kitchener, ON N2G 2P8)

26. Part Lot 36, Plan 634, being Part 2 58R17910, Part of PIN 22504-0053, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 50 Stirling Avenue S., [aka 50 & 56 Stirling Avenue S.], Kitchener, ON N2G 3N9)

27. Part Lots 3 and 4, Plan 404, being Part 1 58R17911, Part of PIN 22506-0225, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 432 Charles Street E., Kitchener, ON N2G 4K5)

28. Part of Park Lot 4, Plan 404, being Part 2 58R17911, Part of PIN 22506-0013, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 445-449 Charles Street E., Kitchener, ON N2G 2R1)

29. Part of Park Lot 25, Plan 404, being Part 3 58R17911, Part of PIN 22506-0012, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 475 Charles Street E., Kitchener, ON N2G 2R1)

30. Part of Park Lot 25, Plan 404, being Parts 4, 5 and 6 58R17911, Part of PIN 22506-0011, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 485 Charles Street E., Kitchener, ON N2G 2R1)
31. Part of Park Lot 25, Plan 404 being Parts 7 and 8 58R17911, Part of PIN 22506-0233 (formerly Part of PIN 22506-0009), City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 50 Borden Avenue S., Kitchener, ON N2G 3R5)

32. Part Lot 1, Plan 935, being Part 1 58R17912, Part of PIN 22579-0125, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 275 Ottawa Street S., Kitchener, ON N2G 3T7)

33. Part Lot 2, Plan 935, being Part 2 58R17912, Part of PIN 22579-0124, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 281 Ottawa Street S., Kitchener, ON N2G 3T7)

34. Part Lot 49, Plan 385, being Part 5, 58R17961, Part of PIN 22415-0007, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 212 King Street S., Waterloo, ON N2J 1R1)

35. Part Lot 48, Plan 385, being Part 4, 58R17961, Part of PIN 22416-0048, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 208 King St. S., Waterloo, ON N2J 1P9)

36. Part Lot 94, Plan 385, being Part 8, 58R17961, Part of PIN 22417-0011, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 207 King St. S., Waterloo, ON N2J 1R1)

37. Part Lots 93 & 94, Plan 385, being Part 9, 58R17961, Part of PIN 22417-0010, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 203 King St. S., [aka 203-205 King St. S.] Waterloo, ON N2J 1R1)

38. Part Lot 46, Plan 385, being Part 2, 58R17961, Part of PIN 22416-0046, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 200 King St. S., Waterloo, ON N2J 1P9)

40. Part Lot 50, Plan 385, being Part 6, 58R17961, Part of PIN 22415-0008, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 214 King St. S., [aka 214-216 King St. S.] Waterloo, ON N2J 1R3)

41. Part of Lots 95, 96 and 97, Plan 385, being Part 7, 58R17961, Part of PIN 22420-0231, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 215-217 King St. S., Waterloo, ON N2J 1R2)

42. Part of Lots 51 and 52, Plan 375, being Part 1, 58R17962, Part of PIN 22427-0015, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 25 Water Street S., [aka 25-45 Water St. S.] Kitchener, ON N2G 4Z4)

43. Part of Block “G”, Plan 1221, being Parts 1, 2 and 5, 58R17971, Part of PIN 22595-0640 City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part Courtland & Blockline, Kitchener, ON)

44. Part Lot 14, Plan 242, being Part 1, 58R17990, Part of PIN 22505-0123, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 397 Courtland Ave. E., Kitchener, ON N2G 2W3)

The Northfield Works

45. Part of Block 1, Plan 1702 being Parts 1 and 2, 58R17880, Part of PIN 22283-0006, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Part 580 King St. N., [aka 574-584 King St. N.], Waterloo, ON N2L 6L3)

And that staff be instructed to register a Plan of Expropriation with respect to the said properties, or such lesser portions of any of the said properties as may be determined through the preliminary design process, within three months of the granting of approval to expropriate said properties, in accordance with the “Expropriations Act” (Ontario) (the “Act”);

And that the registered owners be served with a Notice of Expropriation and a Notice of Possession with respect to the said properties after the registration of the Plan of Expropriation;
And that if no agreement as to compensation is made with an owner, the statutory Offer of Compensation and payment be served upon the registered owners of applicable properties in the amount of the market value of the interests in such lands as estimated by the Region’s appraiser in accordance with the Act;

And further that the Regional Solicitor be authorized to discontinue expropriation proceedings with respect to any above-referenced lands in the event that the Region is able to otherwise obtain registered title to such lands or if Regional staff determine that the expropriation is not advisable.

Summary:

Nil

Report:

A. Project Authorizations

On June 15, 2011 Regional Council approved LRT as the preferred rapid transit technology from Conestoga Mall in the City of Waterloo through the City of Kitchener to the Ainslie Street Terminal in the City of Cambridge (the “Rapid Transit Project”). Stage 1 of the Rapid Transit Project will include LRT service from Conestoga Mall in the City of Waterloo to Fairview Park Mall in the City of Kitchener, as well as, aBRT service from Fairview Park Mall in the City of Kitchener to the Ainslie Street Terminal in the City of Cambridge.

B. Project Details

The Region initiated a Transit Project Assessment (“TPA”) with respect to Stage 1 of the Rapid Transit Project (“Stage 1”) in November of 2011, which has been completed and has provided results that are permissive of the construction and operation of Rapid Transit within the approved rapid transit corridor.

The functional design for Stage 1 has been completed and three proponents (the “Shortlisted Proponents”) were short listed through a competitive Request for Qualifications process issued in late 2012 to bid on the
Design/Build/Finance/Operate/Maintain concession (the “DBFOM Concession”) that has been approved for the delivery of the project. The Shortlisted Proponents submitted bids as part of the Region’s Request for Proposals (“RFP”) in connection with the DBFOM Concession in late 2013. Grandlinq GP (“Grandlinq”) was selected as the preferred proponent for the DBFOM Concession and a Project Agreement was signed between Grandlinq and the Region on May 6, 2014. Grandlinq is currently working on completing LRT design and is expected to commence preliminary phases of construction this year.

The Region has undertaken a separate procurement for the construction of aBRT. The target commencement date for aBRT service is late 2014.

The land acquisition/expropriation process for the Rapid Transit Project has been divided into several separate and distinct phases. At this time, all lands that form part of Phases 1 and 2 and 3 of the land acquisition/expropriation process for the Rapid Transit Project have either been acquired or expropriated with the exception of lands owned by the City of Kitchener and the City of Waterloo which are the subject of ongoing negotiation.

The Region has also commenced the expropriation process in connection with Phases 4 and 5 of the land acquisition/expropriation process for the Rapid Transit Project. Regional Real Estate Services staff are currently engaged in negotiations with all land owners that are affected by Phases 4 and 5. It is to be noted that the expropriation of Phase 4 and 5 lands required for aBRT has been fast tracked in order to meet aBRT construction timelines. Each of Phases 4 and 5 has, therefore, been bifurcated into separate aBRT and LRT streams.

C. Phase 4 LRT Properties

The land requirements identified in this Report have been designated as part of Phase 4 ("Phase 5") of the land acquisition/expropriation process for the Rapid Transit Project. For clarity, the property list that is contained in the Recommendation to this Report only includes Phase 4 properties that are required for LRT. Phase 4 aBRT properties formed the subject of an earlier report in order to accommodate earlier aBRT construction timelines.

The commencement of the expropriation process for the properties that are the subject of this Report was approved by Regional Council on November 20, 2013 pursuant to Report CR-RS-13-089. The appropriate forms were served to initiate formal proceedings under the Act for these properties. All of the affected property owners were previously contacted by Legal Services staff and informed of the project, as well
as, the Region’s intention to commence the expropriation process and the Region’s Expropriation Information Sheet was provided to each of them. The Region did not receive any Notices for a Hearing of Necessity for properties that are the subject matter of this Report and, therefore, no Hearings of Necessity were held.

Legal Services staff contacted all property owners that are affected by this Report and informed them of the Region’s intention to continue with the expropriation process including this Report CR-RS-14-045 in order to ensure that the construction timeline is maintained. Legal Services staff will continue to correspond with all property owners affected by LRT in order to reach a negotiated settlement with as many as possible.

The next step in the expropriation process for the above-listed properties is for Council to approve the expropriation of those property interests. This approval will ultimately be endorsed upon a certificate of approval on the Plan of Expropriation (the “Plan”) for those properties not acquired under agreement. The Plan must then be registered within three months of Regional Council’s approval. Ownership of affected properties vests with the Region upon the registration of the Plan. Notices of Expropriation are then served upon all registered owners, including tenants as shown on the assessment roll.

Once ownership by the Region is secured through the registration of the Plan, it is possible to service Notices of Possession upon affected parties. The date for possession can be no sooner than three months following the date of service of the Notices of Possession. The Notices of Expropriation and Notices of Possession may be served at the same time. In order to meet the construction time line, possession of all the lands that are the subject of this Report will be secured by the end of 2014. Accordingly, Legal Services staff will be proceeding expeditiously to register the Plans and serve the Notices of Expropriation and Notices of Possession following approval by Regional Council.

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

It is to be noted that the expropriation of land is on an “as is” basis and upon the
registration of the Plan, the Region assumes responsibility for the lands, subject to minor caveats.

The subject lands are shown on the maps attached as Appendix “A” hereto. The fee simple owners of the subject properties are set out in Appendix “B” hereto. Regional staff have conducted recent corporate profile searches of affected corporate fee simple property owners, as applicable, the results of which are also included in Appendix “B” hereto. It is to be noted that Appendix “B” does not include a list of affected mortgagees, tenants, execution creditors, guardians of property, or persons with a limited estate or interest in said lands such as easement holders.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

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

Financial Implications

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

Land acquisition is being carried out by the Region outside of the DBFOM. This has been accommodated within the overall Rapid Transit Project budget.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Rapid Transit staff and Finance staff have been consulted in the preparation of this Report.

Attachments

Appendix “A” – Maps

Appendix “B” – Corporate Profile Searches.

Prepared By: Liviu Cananau, Solicitor, Property (Rapid Transit)
APPENDIX “A”
“Appendix “B”

**Numbers are cross-referenced to the Property List as shown on Pages 1-5 on main body of this report

**Fee Simple Partial Taking:**

1. 580 Colby Dr., Waterloo, ON N2V 1C2
   Privately owned: Martina Elizabeth Morell and Thomas Paul Morell

2. 661 Colby Dr., Waterloo, ON N2V 1C2
   Owner: Ropp & Koebel Hold Corp.
   Annual Return: January 27, 2014
   Directors/Officers: Anthony Koebel; Kevin Ropp

3. 663 Colby Dr., Waterloo, ON N2V 1C2
   Owner: W. I. K. Metals Incorporated
   Annual Return: September 24, 2012
   Directors/Officers: Theodore Giesbrecht; Harald Keuper; Anika Kueper;

4. 665 Colby Dr., Waterloo, ON N2V 1C2
   Owner: Herbis Trading Limited
   Annual Return: August 22, 2013
   Directors/Officers: Olaf Christiansen; Nina Christiansen; Adolf Gubler;

5. 55 Northfield Dr., Waterloo, ON N2L 4E6
   Owner: 7137796 Canada Inc.
   Annual Return: 2014
   Directors/Officers: Gerald Benson

6. 583 Colby Dr., Waterloo, ON N2V 1A1
   Owner: Lynn Forbes Investments Ltd.
   Annual Return: July 27, 2013
   Directors/Officers: Lynn M. Forbes; Michael Sweeney

7. 565 Conestogo Rd., Waterloo, ON N2L 4C9
   Owner: Kraus Brands Inc./Kraus Brands LP
   Annual Return: August 22, 2013
Directors/Officers: Christopher William Emmott; Stephen Joseph Malinowski; Paul Patrick McGowan; Patricia Saltys; Hugh Whitcomb; Walter Michael Harold Eckhardt

8. 57 Erb St. W., Waterloo, ON N2L 6C2
   Owner: The Centre for International Governance Innovation
   Annual Return: 2014
   Directors/Officers: James Balsillie; Scott Burk; Andres Rozental; Maureen O’Neil; Scott Clark; Arif Lalani

9. 15 King St. S., Waterloo, ON N2J 1N9
   Owner: CME (Waterloo) Holdings Inc.
   Annual Return: June 15, 2013
   Directors/Officers: Seymour Joffe; Harry Rosenbaum

10. 20 William St. W., Waterloo, ON N2L 1J3
    Owner: 1759180 Ontario Inc.
    Annual Return: April 19, 2011
    Directors/Officers: Steven Deriu; Aimee Elizabeth Deriu

11. 227 King St. S., Waterloo, ON N2J 4C5
    Owner: Sun Life Assurance Company of Canada
    Annual Return: n/a
    Directors/Officers: Dean A. Connor

12. 232-234 King St. S., Waterloo, ON N2J 1R3
    Owner: 1561492 Ontario Limited
    Annual Return: April 26, 2014
    Directors/Officers: Peter Van Der Heyden

13. 244 King St. W., Waterloo, ON N2J 1R4
    Privately Owned: Steve Cheng

14. 980 King St. W., Waterloo, ON N2J 1R3
    Privately Owned: Leila Bakievna Izmailova

15. 976 King St. W., Kitchener-Waterloo, ON N2G 1G4
    Privately Owned: Jeffrey Robert Alfred Cuddy and Robert Shaun Malone
16. 872 King St. W., Kitchener, ON N2G 1E8
   Owner: CTV Television Inc. (now Bell Media Inc.)
   Annual Return: 2010
   Directors/Officers: Andre Serero; Ivan Fecan

17. 864-876 King St. S., Kitchener, ON N2G 1E8
    Owner: South West Ontario Television Inc. (now Bell Media Inc.)
    Annual Return: n/a
    Directors/Officers: Ivan Fecan; Bruce Cowie; John a. Pollock

18. 637-641 King St. W., Kitchener, ON N2G 1C7
    Owner: Fini Canada Real Estate Inc.
    Annual Return: July 13, 2013
    Directors/Officers: Peter Dietrich Kruse; Russell Norman Lawson

19. 400 King St. W., Kitchener, ON N2G 1B7
    Owner: 2040799 Ontario Limited
    Annual Return: March 1, 2014
    Directors/Officers: Aldo Dibattista; George H. Elliott; James W. Hallman

20. 24 Water St. N., Kitchener, ON N2H 5A5
    Owner: Bell Canada/The Bell Telephone Company of Canada
    Annual Return: 2014
    Directors/Officers: Carole Sandra Taylor; Edward C. Lumley; James P.E. Prentice; Robert Simmonds; Barry K. Allen; Andre Berard; Sophie Brochu; Anthony s. Fell; Robert E. Brown; Ronald Alvin Brenneman; George A. Cope; David F. Senison; Ian Greeenberg; Thomas C. O'Neill; Paul R. Weiss

21. 56 Duke St. W., Kitchener, ON N2H 3W7
    Owner: The Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of the Diocese of Hamilton in Ontario
    Annual Return: August 3, 2013
    Directors/Officers: David Douglas Crosby

22. 60-62 Ontario St. N., Kitchener, ON N2H 4Y4
    Privately Owned: Ljiljana Tucakov and Petar Tucakov

23. 28 Madison Avenue S., Kitchener, ON N2G 3M3
    Privately owned: Maria Elena Mejia
24. 471 King St. E., Kitchener, ON N2G 2L7
   Owner: 2263223 Ontario Inc.
   Annual Return: April 27, 2013
   Directors/Officers: Lee Piccolo;

25. 355 Charles St. E., Kitchener, ON N2G 2P8
   Owner: Kitchener Housing Inc. (Non-Share Corporation)
   Annual Return: January 25, 2014
   Directors/Officers: n/a

26. 50 Stirling Avenue S., Kitchener, ON N2G 3N9
   Privately Owned: Robert Anthony Depasquale

27. 432 Charles St. E., Kitchener, ON N2G 4K5
   Owner: Ray of Hope Inc. (Non-Share Corporation)
   Annual Return: October 4, 2013
   Directors/Officers: Noel Churchman; Sandra MacGillivray; Reta Malloy; Gerry N. Martin; Dave McKee; Dan Murray; Dave Roach; Michelle Scott; Lyle Shapansky; Tiffany Svensson; Wm. Harry Whyte; Douglas Witmer; Jeff Wong

28. 445-449 Charles St. E., Kitchener, ON N2G 2R1
   Owner: MTD Products Limited
   Annual Return: December 28, 2013
   Directors/Officers: Edward Henderson; Jean Hlay; Terry R. Hollister; Jim Milinski; Robert Moll; John W. Norman

29. 475 Charles St. E., Kitchener, ON N2G 2R1
   Privately Owned: David Johnson

30. 485 Charles St. E., Kitchener, ON N2G 2R1
   Owner: Western Ontario District of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada
   Annual Return: August 20, 2011
   Directors/Officers: Howard Courtney; Lorrie Gibbons; Mark Hazzard; Kenneth Brian Raymer; Kevin Shepherd; James Steward; Matt Tapley

31. 50 Borden Avenue S., Kitchener, ON N2G 3R5
   Owner: Woodhouse Investments Inc.
   Annual Return: December 9, 2013
Directors/Officers: Jay Boyer; Daniel Loosemore; Kenneth J. Woodhouse; Douglas B. Woodhouse; Douglas Barrie Woodhouse; Joseph Woodhouse

32.275 Ottawa Street S., Kitchener, ON N2G 3T7
Privately Owned: Adrian Cristea and Alina Cristea

33.281 Ottawa Street S., Kitchener, ON N2G 3T7
Privately Owned: Xiao Qin Su and Cheng He

34.212 King St. S., Waterloo, ON N2J 1R3
Privately Owned: Gale Marie Braun and Mark Irvin Braun

35.208 King Street S., Waterloo, ON N2J 1P9
Privately Owned: John Paul Rocchetta and Cheri Lynn Chevalier

36.207 King St. S., Waterloo, ON N2J 1R1
Owner: 1455092 Ontario Inc.
Annual Return: June 22, 2013
Directors/Officers: Richard Kitts

37. 203-205 King St. S., Waterloo, ON N2J 1R1
Privately Owned: Chi Mui Lit and John Lit

38.200 King St. S., Waterloo, ON N2J 1P9
Owner: Thamnar Investments Corporation
Annual Return: June 29, 2013
Directors/Officers: Stephen Alexander Hartman; Cindy Margaret Hartman

39. 202 King St. S., Waterloo, ON N2J 1P9
Privately Owned: Josef Weiner and Barbara Weiner

40.214 King St. S., Waterloo, ON N2J 1R3
Owner: Cyrmet Management Services Limited
Annual Return: April 26, 2014
Directors/Officers: Metod Dziak; Agnes Dziak;

41.217 King St. S., Waterloo, ON N2J 1R2
Owner: Sun Life Assurance Company of Canada
Annual Return: n/a
Directors/Officers: Dean A. Connor

42. 25 Water St. S., Kitchener, ON N2g 4Z4
   Owner: The Manufacturers Life Insurance Company
   Annual Return: n/a
   Directors/Officers: Donald A. Guloien

43. Courtland @ Blockline, Kitchener
   Owner: J & J Scherer Properties Inc.
   Annual Return: April 5, 2014
   Directors/Officers: Steven Scherer

44. 397 Courtland Avenue e., Kitchener, ON N2G 2W3
    Privately Owned: Kristine Anne-Marie Chapman and Robin Douglas Chapman

45. 574-584 King St. N. Waterloo, ON N2L 6L3
    Owner: Capital City Shopping Centre Limited
    Annual Return: July 12, 2013
    Directors/Officers: Kuy-Ly ang; Mark Banting; George Buckles; Marv Holmen; Rafael Kalach Atri; Jose Kalach Atri; Rafael Moises Kalach Mizrahi; Thomas Murphy; Randall M. Scharfe;
Region of Waterloo
Planning, Housing and Community Services
Community Planning

To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: June 17, 2014
File Code: D18-01
Subject: Monthly Report of Development Activity for May 2014

Recommendation:

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

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

Report:
City of Cambridge
Plan of Condominium Application 30CDM-14101
Date Accepted: May 9, 2014
Applicant: Reid's Heritage Homes
Location: 12 Poplar Drive
Proposal: To permit the development of 49 residential townhouse units to be constructed in phases. The first two blocks are
Plan of Condominium Application 30CDM-14101

currently under construction

Regional Processing Fee: Paid May 8, 2014

Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-10106

Phase: Phase 6
Draft Approval Date: December 3, 2010
Applicant: Preston Meadows
Location: 505, 535 and 565 Margaret Street
Proposal: To permit the development of 56 residential apartment units.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid May 2, 2014
Commissioner's Release: May 22, 2014

Official Plan Amendment Number 3

Applicant: Perkins Family Holdings
Location: 275 Ainslie Street South
Proposal: To amend the Low/Medium Density Residential designation as it applies to the property to permit on a site-specific basis Business and Professional Offices including a dentist office.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid May 22, 2014
Commissioner's Approval: May 28, 2014
Comes Into Effect: June 18, 2014

City of Kitchener

Official Plan Amendment Number 100

Applicant: Victoria Trio Inc.
Location: 820 Victoria Street North
Proposal: To add a Special Policy to the existing Official Plan designation to permit a Religious Institution.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid April 4, 2014
Commissioner's Approval: May 6, 2014
May 27, 2014
Official Plan Amendment Number 100

Came Into Effect:

City of Waterloo

Part Lot Control Exemption By-law 2014-035

Applicant: City of Waterloo
Location: Avens Street
Proposal: To permit the creation of access easements as they apply to 14 residential townhouse units.

Regional Processing Fee: Paid May 15, 2014
Commissioner’s Approval: May 22, 2014

Draft Plan of Condominium Application 30CDM-14402

Date Accepted: May 5, 2014
Applicant: Lester Village Inc.
Location: 251 to 253 Lester Street
Proposal: To permit the conversion of two existing rental buildings containing 52 apartment units to condominium apartments.

Regional Processing Fee: Paid March 19, 2014

Registration of Draft Plan of Subdivision 30T-10401

Phase: Stage 1
Draft Approval Date: September 15, 2010
Applicant: University of Waterloo
Location: Fischer-Hallman Road, Bearinger Road, Westmount Road
Proposal: To establish 14 blocks for University use, Research use, parks and stormwater management.

Regional Processing Fee: May 14, 2014
Commissioner’s Release: May 22, 2014
**Draft Approval of Plan of Subdivision 30T-05404**

Applicant: 1353843 Ontario Limited (Cook Homes)
Location: 353 Woolwich Street
Proposal: To permit the development of 69 residential single detached units.

Regional Processing Fee: Paid April 4, 2014
Commissioner’s Approval: May 1, 2014
Came Into Effect: May 22, 2014

**Draft Approval of Plan of Condominium 30CDM-13404**

Applicant: Waterloo Living 3 Inc.
Location: 260, 262 and 264 Regina Street North
Proposal: To permit the development of 63 residential condominium apartment units.

Regional Processing Fee: Paid February 27, 2014
Commissioner’s Approval: May 29, 2014
Came Into Effect: June 19, 2014

**Official Plan Amendment Number 6**

Applicant: City of Waterloo
Location: 150 Northfield Drive West
Proposal: To expand the boundary of Specific Provision Area 42 to include 150 Northfield Drive West. Specific Provision Area 42 has a planned function as a Business Employment Area with primarily office uses, but also provides for a broad range of secondary retail and commercial uses.

Commissioner’s Approval: May 20, 2014
Regional Processing Fee: Paid December 19, 2013
Came Into Effect: June 10, 2014

**Township of Wellesley**

**Draft Plan of Condominium Application 30CDM-14501**

Date Accepted: May 1, 2014
Applicant: Lotco II Limited
Draft Plan of Condominium Application 30CDM-14501

Location: Ferris Drive and Greenwood Hill Road

Proposal: To permit the development of 3 residential single detached units, 32 residential semi-detached units and 13 residential townhouse units.

Regional Processing Fee: Paid April 1, 2014

Residential Subdivision Activity January 1, 2014 to May 31, 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>103</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69</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>103</td>
<td>69</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 May 31, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Units in Residential Registered Plans</th>
<th>Residential Units Draft Approved</th>
<th>Pending Plans (Units Submitted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Kitchener</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>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>
</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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Municipal Consultations/Coordination:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate Strategic Plan:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Implications:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prepared By: Andrea Banks, Program Assistant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Approved By: Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Housing and Community Services |
To:        Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date:     June 17, 2014        File Code:  D04-30/LaurelCreek
Subject:  Sixth Annual Report of the Laurel Creek Headwaters Environmentally Sensitive Landscape Public Liaison Committee

Recommendation:
For information.

Summary:
On December 4, 2007, Regional Council established the Laurel Creek Headwaters Environmentally Sensitive Landscape Public Liaison Committee pursuant to Minutes of Settlement endorsed by Council on August 23, 2007, and subsequently accepted by the Ontario Municipal Board. At the May 24, 2014 meeting, the Committee adopted its 2013 Annual Report for submission to Regional Council as required by its approved Terms of Reference. The annual report is attached and lists some of the Committee’s major achievements in 2013.

Some notable highlights of 2013 include:

- The Committee welcomed Wayne Buck, president of the Waterloo Stewardship Council (formerly known as Waterloo Stewardship Network) as the new representative to the Committee.
- Following up on concerns raised in 2012, the Committee prepared a letter to area councils requesting involvement and/or funding for a traffic study in the ESL out of concerns for the impact that increasing traffic levels might have on the environment. Subsequently, a study funding proposal was prepared by Regional staff, which was approved and the study is to commence in 2014.
- The Committee continued work on a survey intended for distribution to residents of the ESL. The survey is intended to discover the level of awareness of the ESL.
and to provide landowners with information that they can use to improve their knowledge of the ESL and to enhance their stewardship practices.

- By the end of 2013, all of the ESL signs had been installed at key entrance points to the ESL.
- In recent years, the ESL Committee has become aware of the spread of Phragmites which is a non-native, invasive species of wetlands. The Committee looked into possible avenues of control and/or eradication. Funding was attained through a grant from the Region’s Community Environmental Fund (CEF), and a control program is being developed for implementation in 2014.

**Report:**

On December 4, 2007, Regional Council established the Laurel Creek Headwaters Environmentally Sensitive Landscape Public Liaison Committee pursuant to Minutes of Settlement endorsed by Council on August 23, 2007, and subsequently accepted by the Ontario Municipal Board. The minutes of Settlement resolved the appeal by the Environmentally Sensitive Property Owners (ESPO) and Wilhard Barth of Regional Official Policies Plan (ROPP) Amendment No. 22 which designated the first two Environmentally Sensitive Landscapes (ESLs).

The ESL Public Liaison Committee consists of twelve members. Nine are residents or landowners within the Laurel Creek Headwaters Environmentally Sensitive Landscape. The additional three members are representatives of the Waterloo Stewardship Network, an agricultural organization, and the Ecological and Environmental Advisory Committee. In 2013 the Committee was made up of the following members:

- Leanne Baer  Wellesley Township landowner
- Wilhard Barth  Wilmot Township landowner
- Bruce Bieth  Wellesley Township landowner
- Dianne Ensing  Wilmot Township landowner, Committee Vice-chair
- Ed Ries  Wilmot Township landowner
- Jane Schneider  Wilmot Township landowner
- Deb Swidrovich  City of Waterloo landowner
- Kevin Thomason  Wilmot Township landowner
- Vacant  Landowner/resident

The three other members nominated by their organizations are:

- Ron Weber  Waterloo Wellington rep., National Farmers Union of Ontario
At the beginning of 2013, Greg Michalenko was elected and Dianne Ensing re-elected as Committee Chair and Vice-chair respectively. The Public Liaison Committee met five times in 2013. The Committee is appreciative of the KW Optimist Club for allowing them to use their Camp Heidelberg facilities for most of their meetings.

Section 6 of the Committee’s Terms of Reference requires submission of an annual report to Council on its activities over the previous year. At the May 22, 2014 meeting, the Committee endorsed Attachment 1 as its sixth annual report to Regional Council. The following list includes some of the activities undertaken by the Laurel Creek ESL Public Liaison Committee during 2013.

**Waterloo Stewardship Council** - The Committee welcomed Wayne Buck, president of the Waterloo Stewardship Council (formerly known as Waterloo Stewardship Network) as the new representative to the Committee. The Waterloo Stewardship Council had recently been reconstituted as a registered organization after the dissolution of the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources’ Ontario Stewardship program.

**Wilmut Line - Presentations to Area Municipal Councils and ESL Roads Study** - Following up on concerns raised in 2012, the Committee prepared a letter to area councils requesting involvement and/or funding for a traffic study in the ESL out of concerns for the impact that increasing traffic levels might have on the environment. Subsequently, a study funding proposal was prepared by Regional staff, which was approved and the study is to commence in 2014.

**ESL survey and Newsletter** - The Committee continued work on a survey intended for distribution to residents of the ESL. The survey is intended to discover the level of awareness of the ESL and to provide landowners with information that they can use to improve their knowledge of the ESL and to enhance their stewardship practices.

**ESL signage** - By the end of 2013, all of the ESL signs had been installed at key entrance points to the ESL. The oval signs are painted and stained, and appear to hold up reasonably well to weathering. Several of the earlier signs do require some touching up particularly in areas that are exposed to wind and sun.

**Phragmites** - In recent years, the ESL Committee has become aware of the spread of Phragmites which is a non-native, invasive species of wetlands. As there is no concerted effort on part of townships or other larger groups, the Committee looked into possible avenues of control and/or eradication. Funding was attained through a grant.
from the Region’s Community Environmental Fund (CEF), and a control program is being developed for implementation in 2014.

The Committee identified concerns with a retail shopping proposal (Costco), although not strictly in the purview of the Committee. The Committee also identified concerns about illicit dumping of garbage, primarily household and construction debris.

**Activities Planned for 2014**

In 2014 the Committee will continue to monitor the proposed Costco development. They will also work on upkeep and maintenance of prior stewardship projects and continue efforts at reaching out to the residents with the ESL. It is hoped that a simplified survey and an ESL newsletter distributed to residents within and adjacent to the Laurel Creek Headwaters ESL, will be effective to gain useful information the Committee can use to determine next steps and future activities.

**Conclusion**

The Committee remains active and is dedicated to promoting the features and stewardship values of the ESL and working with the local residents to ensure that the special character of the landscape is protected and enhanced. The Committee is looking forward to an increased awareness of the ESL as outreach to residents of the ESL is increased in 2014.

**Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination**

The Annual Report will be provided to the City of Waterloo, and the Townships of Wilmot, Woolwich and Wellesley. Committee members and support staff continue to collaborate with Area Municipalities to address the various issues that arise that are of interest and concern to the ESL Committee.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

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

**Financial Implications:**

The Committee does not have a specific budget allocation at this time. The Committee meets at the Optimist Club of Kitchener-Waterloo’s facility near Heidelberg and Planning, Housing and Community Services makes a voluntary contribution to the club
to help cover the cost of providing heat and light for the meeting space.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Other Departments are contacted on an as needed basis when relevant interests arise.

**Attachments:**

Attachment 1 - Laurel Creek Headwaters Environmentally Sensitive Landscape Public Liaison Committee Sixth Annual Report (Spring 2014).

**Prepared By:** Albert Hovingh, Principal Planner, Environmental and Stewardship

**Approved By:** Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Housing and Community Services
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1. **Introduction**

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

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

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

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

The ESL Public Liaison Committee consists of twelve members. Nine are residents or landowners within the Laurel Creek Headwaters Environmentally Sensitive Landscape. The additional three members are representatives of the Waterloo Stewardship Council, an agricultural organization, and the Ecological and Environmental Advisory Committee.

In 2013 the Committee was made up of the following members, with one landowner/resident vacancy:

Leanne Baer       Wellesley Township landowner
Wilhard Barth     Wilmot Township landowner
Bruce Bieth       Wellesley Township landowner
Dianne Ensing     Wilmot Township landowner, Committee Vice-chair
Ed Ries           Wilmot Township landowner
Jane Schneider    Wilmot Township landowner
Deb Swidrovich    City of Waterloo landowner
Kevin Thomason    Wilmot Township landowner
Vacant            Landowner/resident

The three other members nominated by their organizations are:

Ron Weber         Waterloo Wellington rep. of the National Farmers Union of Ontario
Wayne Buck        Waterloo Stewardship Network
Greg Michalenko  Region of Waterloo, EEAC, Committee Chair

At the beginning of 2013, Greg Michalenko was elected and Dianne Ensing re-elected as Committee Chair and Vice-chair respectively.

The Public Liaison Committee met five times in 2013. The Committee is appreciative of the KW Optimist Club for allowing us to use their Camp Heidelberg facilities for our meetings.

Staff from Region’s Planning, Housing, and Community Services provide ongoing support functions to the Committee.

2. Laurel Creek Headwaters ESL

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

Rolling topography and extensive wetlands make much of the area unsuitable for agriculture, and so a significant proportion of the landscape has been left in its natural state. The natural areas within this landscape consist of a mix of upland and lowland forest. Upland forests are dominated primarily by Sugar Maple and Beech. Associated with this are some long-established Hemlock stands. Most of the wetlands are Provincially Significant, and typically consist of fine cedar swamps. Other swamp communities associated with the creek systems consist of high quality Tamarack swamp, Hemlock-Cedar-Balsam Fir-Yellow Birch wetland forest, and Silver Maple swamp. There are also small areas of marsh and open wet meadows. The area has been observed to sustain many significant species of plants and animals.
In addition to a number of farms, the area contains many rural residences on smaller properties. Whether their properties are large or small, however, local landowners demonstrate a commitment to the stewardship of their lands and the natural features upon them.

3. Events and Activities in 2013

3.1. Waterloo Stewardship Council

The Committee welcomed Wayne Buck, president of the Waterloo Stewardship Council (formerly known as Waterloo Stewardship Network) as the new representative to the Committee. The Waterloo Stewardship Council had recently been reconstituted as a registered organization after the dissolution of the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources’ Ontario Stewardship program. The WSC now operates on a reduced scale and scope due to change in funding situation, but continue to be interested in carrying on with the work that was started in the past and to continue relationship with ESL Committee.

| Bloodroot; Conservation Drive (photo: D. Lehman) | Bullfrog (photo: D. Lehman) |

3.2. Wilmot Line - Presentations to area councils and ESL Roads Study

Following up on concerns raised in 2012, the Committee prepared a letter to area councils requesting involvement and/or funding for a traffic study in the ESL out of concerns for the impact that increasing traffic levels might have on the environment. Throughout the spring, the information was presented to 4 municipalities, and also to the Regional Planning and Works Committee. The presentation and letter were met with a generally positive reception.

Subsequently, a study funding proposal was prepared by Regional staff, which was approved. A Terms of Reference was prepared and additional funding was sought from a number of sources. The study is to commence in 2014.
3.3. ESL survey and Newsletter
The Committee continued work on a survey intended for distribution to residents of the ESL. The survey is intended to discover the level of awareness of the ESL and to provide landowners with information that they can use to improve their knowledge of the ESL and to enhance their stewardship practices.

The Committee feels that a good approach might be to use a combination of a smaller, simplified survey along with a newsletter to generate landowners’ interest in joining a mailing list, and to express where their interest is. Using the information generated by the survey, the ESL Committee could develop workshops and focus the Committee’s activities in areas where they would be of benefit to the greatest number of residents.

3.4. ESL signage
By the end of 2013, all of the ESL signs had been installed at key entrance points: Kressler Road, Erbsville Road, Weimar Line, Wilmot Line, Maplewood Drive, Conservation Drive, Wideman Road and Carmel-Koch.

The oval signs are painted and stained, and appear to hold up reasonably well to weathering. Several of the earliest signs do require some touching ups particularly in areas that are exposed to wind and sun.
3.5. Phragmites

In recent years, the ESL Committee has become aware of the spread of Phragmites which is a non-native, invasive species of wetlands. As there is no concerted effort on part of townships or other larger groups, the Committee looked into possible avenues of control and/or eradication.

Funding was sought through an application to the Region’s Community Environmental Fund (CEF), and when that was successful, the Committee approached Dr. Steven Murphy at the University of Waterloo for assistance in developing a program designed to control Phragmites. The control program is to be initiated in 2014.

4. Committee concerns

4.1 Retail shopping proposal (Costco).

At the end of 2013, a new issue arose when it became known that Costco was planning a new warehouse and gas bar in the vicinity of the Canadian Tire on Erbs St. The Committee’s concerns included the recognition that there may be major implications for traffic and development in this area and that limited road access may result in increased movement through ESL, particularly on Wilmot Line. While not strictly in the purview of the Committee, the Committee will continue to follow the progress of the application.

4.2 Garbage dumping.

The illicit dumping of garbage, primarily household and construction debris, continues to be a problem at some locations within the ESL. The Committee spent some time trying to develop effective approaches to reducing this issue, but it is recognized that it is very difficult to monitor and police all areas that can potentially be used as illegal tipping sites. The Committee has considered developing an ongoing photographic record of...
garbage dumps to emphasize the serious nature of the problem. City and Township staff generally respond reasonably quickly when informed of new tipping.

5. Activities Planned for 2014

5.1. Retail Shopping Proposal.

In 2014 the Committee will keep abreast of the ongoing process of the proposed Costco development and will provide input, both as a Committee, where and as warranted, and as interested and concerned individuals. The focus of the comments will continue to be that the proposed development should not have negative impacts on the environment or on the intended purposes of the ESL designation for the large geographic area.

5.2. Stewardship Projects

A number of stewardship projects that were started in previous years will require some upkeep and maintenance. Roadside plantings will require tending and with the changed structure of the Waterloo Stewardship Council, these activities may well require volunteer efforts on behalf of the ESL Committee or the coordination of volunteers from the community.

5.3. Survey and Newsletter

In 2014, the Committee will continue its efforts at reaching out to the residents with the ESL and to determine how the Committee can provide assistance with stewardship needs and concerns. It is hoped that a simplified survey and an ESL newsletter distributed to residents within and adjacent to the Laurel Creek Headwaters ESL, will be effective to gain useful information the Committee can us to determine next steps and future activities.
6. Conclusion

The Committee remains active and is dedicated to promoting the features and stewardship values of the ESL and working with the local residents to ensure that the special character of the landscape is protected and enhanced. The Committee is looking forward to an increased awareness of the ESL as outreach to residents of the ESL is increased in 2014.

Respectfully submitted,

Greg Michalenko, Chair (2013)

Laurel Creek Headwaters Environmentally Sensitive Landscape Public Liaison Committee

May 2014
Region of Waterloo
Planning, Housing and Community Services
Transportation Planning

To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: June 17, 2014 File Code: D28-70(A)
Subject: Grand River Transit Cost Recovery Trends

Recommendation:
For Information

Summary:
During the May 27, 2014 Planning and Works Committee meeting, staff was asked by Councillor Strickland for an update on the cost recovery of Grand River Transit.

Grand River Transit (GRT) cost recovery has been improving each year, based on the policy direction set in the 2011-2014 GRT Business Plan and including a goal of balancing passenger and municipal contributions. In 2010 the cost recovery ratio (R/C) was 0.38, and in 2013 it was 0.41. On average, between 2010 and 2012, the R/C ratios of comparable Ontario transit systems decreased. GRT is one of a few systems in the Province showing an improved R/C. This is notable, in light of the continuing service improvement program. Typically during a period of service expansion, the R/C ratio can be expected to decrease. In the longer term, service improvements increase ridership levels which, combined with periodic fare increases, improves the system’s financial performance.

Report:
This report is in response to a request from Councillor Strickland at the May 27, 2014 Planning and Works Committee meeting for an update on Grand River Transit (GRT) cost recovery.
The 2011 – 2014 Grand River Transit Business Plan set a goal of achieving 50% cost-recovery (R/C), defined as a balance between the municipal contribution to transit operating costs and the contribution made by passenger revenue. This approach excludes any contribution to operating costs made by the Provincial gas tax subsidy from the R/C calculation. This targeted balance is shown in Chart 1.

Industry practice in calculation of cost-recovery ratio is to measure the contribution made by passenger and other system revenues (e.g advertising revenue) against total operating costs. This calculation is used in preparation of performance measures for reporting to the Canadian Urban transit Association (CUTA) and the Ontario Municipal Benchmarking Initiative (OMBI). The graph illustrates a 50% R/C defined by the GRT Business Plan as passenger and other system revenue equalling the municipal operating contribution. This would equate to approximately 44% R/C using the CUTA method where the provincial operating subsidy is not included in the R/C calculation.

Based on the goal of achieving a balance of contributions to transit operating costs, the 2011 – 2014 Business Plan set R/C targets for the years 2011 – 2014. As shown in Table 1, actual cost recovery for the years 2011 – 2013 exceeded the Business Plan targets, and is on track to achieve a balanced cost-recovery between passenger revenue and municipal contribution by the 2016 target year. The Business Plan is scheduled to be updated in 2015 and would include a review of fare policy direction.

### Table 1: Targeted and Actual Cost Recovery Ratio, 2011 - 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010 (Base)</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target Revenue / Cost Ratio</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Revenue / Cost Ratio</td>
<td>0.376</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>0.408</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison with other Ontario transit systems

Since 2000, cost recovery among Ontario transit systems that are comparable with Grand River Transit has decreased by an average of 1.2% per year. Over this period, GRT cost recovery also declined an average of 1.2% per year. However, since 2010, some agencies, including GRT have shown an increase to R/C. As shown in Table 2, since 2010, the general trend has been for an average decrease of 0.2% per year. During this period, GRT cost recovery has increased by an average 1.2% per year.

Table 2: Cost Recovery Trends among Comparable Ontario Transit Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-2.2%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudbury</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRT</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thunder Bay</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount of Service 2010 - 2013

The above noted improvements in cost recovery are being generated while the Region continues to invest in transit service. The number of service hours per capita has increased from 1.33 in 2010 to 1.56 in 2013. The average among comparable systems was 1.60 hours per capita in 2012 (2013 figures are not yet available for other systems).

Average Fare

The average fare for GRT service has increased from $1.22 in 2010 to $1.32 in 2013, as a result of annual fare increases, as recommended by the Business Plan. Table 3 compares the change to individual fares with the overall change to the average fare.
Table 3: Key GRT Fares and Average Fare 2010 - 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Annual Average Rate of Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Fare</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Ticket</td>
<td>$1.80</td>
<td>$1.95</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$2.30</td>
<td>$0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Monthly Pass</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$63.00</td>
<td>$68.00</td>
<td>$72.00</td>
<td>$4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Fare</td>
<td>$1.22</td>
<td>$1.22</td>
<td>$1.26</td>
<td>$1.32</td>
<td>$0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The system average fare increased at an average of 3 cents per year between 2010 and 2013. This rate of increase is lower than that of individual fares types. The primary reason for the lower rate of increase to the average fare is increased U-Pass ridership. A continuing trend in UPASS ridership increases slows the rate of increase to the average fare. Another contributor to the variance is the switching between fare types by customers, choosing those that offer the lowest per trip cost that match their transit needs. A continuing decrease in the number of cash fares received shows customers making these choices, and increasing their commitment to use transit by purchasing tickets or passes.

Ridership by Fare Type, 2010 & 2013

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination:

This report will be circulated to all of the Area Municipalities.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

Grand River Transit Cost Recovery Trends supports Council's Strategic Action 5.3.2: “Further Integrate Performance Measurement into Regional Programs”.
Financial Implications:
Nil.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:
Transportation and Environmental Services and Finance were consulted in the preparation of this report.

Attachments:
Nil.

Prepared By: Gethyn Beniston, Project Manager

Approved By: Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Housing and Community Services
Region of Waterloo
Corporate Resources
Legal Services

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

Date: June 17, 2014       File Code: L07-40

Subject: Closing and Surplus Declaration and Transfer to the City of Kitchener of Part of King Street East (Regional Road No. 8) east of the intersection of Morrison Road and west of the Grand River in the City of Kitchener

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo:

(a) Close and declare surplus a portion of King Street East described as Part of Lot 12 Beasley’s Old Survey designated as Parts 1, 2 and 3 on Plan 58R-18102, a part of (PIN 22713-1275 (LT)) known municipally as 3563 King St East and provide the standard public notification as required by the Region’s property disposition by-law; and

(b) Approve a transfer to the Corporation of the City of Kitchener of fee simple ownership of lands described as Part of Lot 12 Beasley’s Old Survey designated as Parts 1, 2, and 3 on Plan 58R-18102, a part of (PIN 22713-1275 (LT)) known municipally as 3563 King St East, reserving a drainage easement in favour of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo over that part of the lands designated as Part 2 on Plan 58R-18102, for nominal consideration for continued use as part of the Freeport Sewage Pumping Station, and

(c) Declare surplus an easement interest in lands described as Part of Lot 176, Streets and Lands, closed by By-Law No. 5115 as in instrument No. 271476 designated as Part 4 on Plan 58R-18102, a part of (PIN 22713-0983 (LT)) known municipally as 3565 King St East, and provide the standard public notification as required by the Region’s property disposition by-law; and
(d) Approve a transfer to the Corporation of the City of Kitchener and Kitchener Wilmot Hydro Inc. of an easement over lands described as Part of Lot 176, Streets and Lands, closed by By-Law No. 5115 as in instrument No. 271476, designated as Part 4 on Plan 58R-18102, a part of (PIN 22713-0983 (LT)) being part of the property known municipally as 3565 King St East, for nominal consideration, for access by vehicles, persons and equipment to electrical infrastructure serving the Freeport Sewage Pumping Station.

Summary:

NIL

Report:

The City of Kitchener’s Freeport Pumping Station, known municipally as 3563 King St East, is situated on land composed of Regional road allowance, specifically an untraveled portion of King Street East (see Appendix “A”). King Street East, was formerly King’s Highway No. 8 and was transferred from the Province of Ontario to the Region of Waterloo in 1974. At the time of transfer from the province, the pumping station which was then under the jurisdiction of the then provincial Ministry of Environment (MOE), was already situated on the land. Ownership and jurisdiction over the pumping station was subsequently reassigned from MOE to the City of Kitchener.

In 2014, the City is undertaking upgrades to the pumping station including reconfiguration of the internal tank and associated infrastructure. The upgrades require the placing of a new electrical transformer on the easterly boundary of the subject parcel in an area which cannot be easily accessed by maintenance trucks and equipment and, thus, an access easement over driveway portion of the adjacent Region owned property at 3565 King St East is required.

As the pumping station is operated by, and under the jurisdiction of, the City of Kitchener, it is the opinion of staff from both the Region and the City that the lands should be under the ownership of the City of Kitchener. Ownership by the City would provide administrative and operational efficiencies for both on-going operations/maintenance and any potential future expansion/modifications. Ownership by the City would also alleviate the Region from any potential liability for taxation and reduce the risks of legal liabilities.

A surplus circulation has been undertaken with no objections to the proposed disposal/transfers received. When the portion of road has been closed and the requirements of the Region’s property disposition by-law have been met the lands and interests will be transferred to the City subject to the reservation of an easement in favour of the Region. As the lands and interests are to be used for the provision of mandated services to the public, it is recommended that the price for the lands and
interests be nominal. As per Regional practise with nominal transfers to area municipalities, a covenant requiring Region approval for any future sales, or transfers of ownership, of the lands will be applied.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

One of the focus areas of the Corporate Strategic Plan is to foster a culture of citizen/customer service that is responsive to community needs.

Financial Implications:

The Corporation of the City of Kitchener will be responsible for all associated costs of the road closing, surplus declaration and conveyances.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Transportation Planning Division of the Planning, Housing and Community Services Department were consulted in the preparation of this report.

Attachments

Appendix A – Property Sketch and Aerial Photograph

Prepared By: Tom Penwarden, Manager of Real Estate Services

Approved By: Gary Sosnoski, Commissioner, Corporate Resources
Region of Waterloo
Corporate Resources
Legal Services

To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: June 17, 2014  File Code: L07-90

Subject: Authorization To Expropriate Lands (2ND Report) For Franklin Blvd Improvements Project – Year 1, North Phase (Pinebush Road To South Of Bishop Street) And Year 1, South Phase (North Of Clyde Road To South Of Main Street), In The City Of Cambridge

Recommendation:

That Council of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the expropriation of lands for the purpose of construction of road improvements to Franklin Boulevard, in the City of Cambridge, in the Region of Waterloo as detailed in Report CR-RS-13-087 dated October 22, 2013 described as follows:

Fee Simple Partial Taking:

1. PT LT 6-7 PL 837 being Part 1 on 58R-17759 being Part of 03766-0271 (210 Pinebush Road, Cambridge);
2. PT LT 9 & 11, RCP1384 being Part 25 on 58R-17759, being Part of 03796-3637 (225 Pinebush Road, Cambridge);
3. PT LT 31 RCP 1382 being Part 46 on 58R-17759, being Part of 22642-0047 (209 Pinebush Road, Cambridge);
4. PT LT 2 RCP 1383, being Part 10 on 58R-17760, being Part of 03796-0047 (210 Sheldon Drive, Cambridge);
5. PT LT 21 RCP 1383 being PTs 23 and 29 on 58R-17760 being Part of 03796-0069 (1201 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
6. PT LT 24 RCP 1383 being PT 3 on 58R-17761, being Part of 03796-0101 (1111 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
7. PT LT 29 RCP 1379 being PT 35 on 58R-17760 being Part of 03790-0051 (1200 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
8. PT LT 1 RCP 1380 being Parts 17 on 58R-17761, being Part of 03796-0115 (1700 Bishop Street, Cambridge);
9. PT LT 15 RCP 1378 being Part 31 on 58R-17761, being Part of 03794-0025 (1680 Bishop Street, Cambridge);
10. PT LT 56 PLAN 1126 being Part 4 on 58R-17762, being Part of 03825-0443 (310 Clyde Road, Cambridge);
11. PT LT 20 PL 1126 being Part 33 on 58R-17762, being Part of 03821-0150 (287 Clyde Road, Cambridge);
12. PT LT 46 RCP 1135 being Part 5 on 58R-17763, being Part of 03826-0171 (399 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
13. PT LT 19 PL 1126 being Part 35 on 58R-17762, being Part of 03821-0149 (285 Clyde Road, Cambridge);
14. PT LT 47 RCP 1135 being Part 6 on 58R-17763, being Part of 03826-0173 (401 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
15. PT LT 46 RCP 1135 being Part 3 on 58R-17763, being Part of 03826-0172 (501 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
16. PT LT 5 CON 11 being Parts 2 and 3 on 58R-17767, being Part of 03826-0200 (600 Main Street, Cambridge);
17. PT LT 41 and 42 RCP 1135 being Parts 13, 14, 16, 17 and 20 on 58R-17763, being Part of 03821-0787 (430-440 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
18. PT LT 5 CON 10 being Part 15 on 58R-17767, being Part of 03845-0007 (605 Main Street E, Cambridge);
19. PT LT 22 & 24 PL 1126 being Part 24 on 58R-17762, being Part of 03826-0017 (531 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
20. PT LT 9 RCP 1384 being Part 7 on 58R-17760, being Part of 03796-0027 (1245 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
21. PT LT 33, RCP 1135 being Part 9 on 58R-17763, being Part of 03826-0174 (395 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
22. PT LT 29 & 34 RCP 1135 being Parts 1 and 3 on 58R-17766, being Part of 03826-0189 (385 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
23. PT LT 21 RCP 1383 being Parts 12, 15, 16 and 20 on 58R-17760, being Part of 03796-0068 (225 Sheldon Drive, Cambridge);
24. PT LT 5 CON 11 being Part 1 on 58R-17767, being Part of 03826-0218 (North East Corner of Franklin & Main Street, Cambridge);
25. PT LT 9 RCP 1384 being Part 8 on 58R-17760, being Part of 03796-0032 (1225 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
26. PT LT 24, PL 1126 being Parts 25 and 26 on 58R-17762, being Part of 03821-0152 (532 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
27. PT LT 44 RCP 1135 being PT 6 on 58R-17764, being Part of 03821-0390 (500 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
28. PT LT 44 RCP 1135 being Parts 24, 26 and 28 on 58R-17763, being Part of 03821-0381 (470-472 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
29. PT LT 39 & 40 RCP 1135 being Part 10 on 58R-17763, being Part of 03822-0039 (416 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
30. PT LT 5 CON 10 being Parts 25 and 28 on 58R-17767, being Part of 03824-0045 (200 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
31. PT LT 29 RCP 1135 being Parts 9, 11 and 12 on 58R-17766, being Part of 03826-0190 (365 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
32. PT LT 5 CON 11 being Parts 40 and 41 on 58R-17767, being Part of 03824-0043 (500 Main Street, Cambridge);
33. PT LT 28 RCP 1135 and PT LT 5 CON 11 being Part 33 on 58R-17766, being Part of 03824-0042 (350 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
34. PT LT 38 RCP 1135 being Parts 69, 75 and 78 on 58R-17766, being Part of 03822-0083 (384-390 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
35. PT LT 18 PL 1126 being Part 37 on 58R-17762, being Part of 03821-0148 (283 Clyde Road, Cambridge);
36. PT LT 37 RCP 1135 being Part 67 on 58R-17766, being Part of 03822-0084 (378 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
37. PT LT 36 RCP 1135 being Parts 64 and 70 on 58R-17766, being Part of 03822-0086 (364 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
38. PT LT 35 RCP 1135 being Parts 47 and 51 on 58R-17766, being Part of 03822-0087 (354 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
39. PT LT 28 RCP 1135 being Parts 36, 38 and 40 on 58R-17766, being Part of 03824-0041 (352 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
40. PT LT 28 RCP 1382 being Part 39 on 58R-17760, being Part of 22642-0066(R) (200 Sheldon Drive, Cambridge);
41. PT LT 28 RCP 1382 being Part 38 on 58R-17760, being Part of 22642-0133 (1220 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
42. PT LT 2, RCP 1384 being Part 9 on 58R-17759, being Part of 03765-0106 (220 Pinebush Road, Cambridge);
43. PT LT 2 RCP 1149 being Part 51 on 58R-17759, being Part of 22642-0046 (201 Pinebush Road, Cambridge);
44. PT LT 1 RCP 1149 being Part 54 on 58R-17759, being Part of 22642-0045 (193 Pinebush Road, Cambridge);
45. PT LT 3 RCP 1149 being Part 49 on 58R-17759, being Part of 22642-0054 (203 Pinebush Road, Cambridge).

Temporary Easement:

The right and easement, being a temporary easement in gross, for the free and unobstructed right, interest and easement, terminating on the 31st day of December, 2017, on, over, under and through the following properties for the purposes of construction, grading, and landscaping as required in connection with improvements to Franklin Boulevard and for such purposes, the free, unimpeded and unobstructed
access to the lands at all times by employees, agents, contractors, workmen and anyone authorized by it, and vehicles, supplies and equipment at all times and for all purposes and things necessary for or incidental to the exercise and enjoyment of the right and easement:

1. PT LT 6-7 PL 837 being Parts 2 and 3 on 58R-17759 being Part of 03766-0271 (210 Pinebush Road, Cambridge);
2. PT LT 9 & 11, RCP1384 being Parts 22, 24, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 33, 57, 58 and 61 on 58R-17759, being Part of 03796-3637 (225 Pinebush Road, Cambridge);
3. LT 31 RCP 1382 being Parts 38, 42, 44, 45 and 47 on 58R-17759, being Part of 22642-0047 (209 Pinebush Road, Cambridge);
4. PT LT 2 RCP 1383, being Part 9 on 58R-17760, being Part of 03796-0047 (210 Sheldon Drive, Cambridge);
5. PT LT 24 RCP 1383 being Parts 2, 7, 38 and 39 on 58R-17761, being Part of 03796-0101 (1111 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
6. PT LT 29 RCP 1379 being Parts 33 and 34 on 58R-17760 and Part 1 on 58R-17768, being Part of 03790-0051 (1200 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
7. PT LT 1 RCP 1380 being Parts 15, 16, 18, 20, 21 on 58R-17761, being Part of 03796-0115 (1700 Bishop Street, Cambridge);
8. PT LT 56 PL 1126 being Part 7 58R-17762, being Part of 03825-0443 (310 Clyde Road, Cambridge);
9. PT LT 20 PL 1126 being Part 32 on 58R-17762, being Part of 03821-0150 (287 Clyde Road, Cambridge);
10. PT LT 46 RCP 1135 being Part 4 on 58R-17763, being Part of 03826-0171 (399 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
11. PT LT 19 PL 1126 being Part 34 on 58R-17762, being Part of 03821-0149 (285 Clyde Road, Cambridge);
12. PT LT 47 RCP 1135 being Part 7 on 58R-17763, being Part of 03826-0173 (401 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
13. PT LT 46 RCP 1135 being Parts 1 and 2 on 58R-17763, being Part of 03826-0172 (501 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
14. PT LT 5 CON 11 being Parts 4, 5 and 6 on 58R-17767, being Part of 03826-0200 (600 Main Street, Cambridge);
15. PT LTS 41 and 42 RCP 1135 being Parts 12, 15, 18, 19 and 21 on 58R-17763, being Part of 03821-0787 (430-440 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
16. PT LT 22 & 24 PL 1126 being Part 23 on 58R-17762, being Part of 03826-0017 (531 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
17. PT LT 9 RCP 1384 being Parts 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 on 58R-17760, being Part of 03796-0027 (1245 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
18. PT of LT 33, RCP 1135 being Part 8 on 58R-17763, being Part of 03826-0174 (395 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
19. PT LT 29 & 34 RCP 1135 being Parts 2 and 4 on 58R-17766, being Part of 03826-0189 (385 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
20. PT LT 21 RCP 1383 being Parts 18, 19, 21 and 22 on 58R-17760, being Part of 03796-0068 (225 Sheldon Drive, Cambridge);
21. PT LT 5 CON 11 being Part 42 on 58R-17767, being Part of 03826-0218 (North East Corner of Franklin & Main Street, Cambridge);
22. PT LT 23 PL 1126 being Parts 18, 19 and 21 on 58R-17762, being Part of 03826-0011 (299 Clyde Road, Cambridge);
23. PT LT 24 RCP 1383 being Part 1 on 58R-17761, being Part of 03796-0100 (1165 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
24. PT LT 28, RCP 1135 being Parts 26, 27, 29 and 30 on 58R-17766, being Part of 03826-0206 (East Side Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
25. PT LT 24, PL 1126 being Parts 27, 28 and 29 on 58R-17762, being Part of 03821-0152 (532 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
26. PT LT 28, RCP 1135 being Parts 21, 22, 24 and 25 on 58R-17766 and PT LT 5 CON 11 being Part 8 on 58R-17767, being Part of 03826-0192 (East side Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
27. PT LT 44 RCP 1135 being Parts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7 on 58R-17764, being Part of 03821-0390 (500 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
28. PT LT 23 PL 1126 being Parts 16 and 17 on 58R-17762, being Part of 03826-0012 (301 Clyde Road, Cambridge);
29. PT LT 44 RCP 1135 being Parts 25 and 27 on 58R-17763, being Part of 03821-0381 (470-472 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
30. PT LT 39-40 RCP 1135 being Part 11 on 58R-17763, being Part of 03822-0039 (416 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
31. PT LT 23 PL 1126 being Part 13 on 58R-17762, being Part of 03826-0014 (305 Clyde Road, Cambridge);
32. PT LT 23 PL 1126 being Part 12 on 58R-17762, being Part of 03826-0015 (307 Clyde Road, Cambridge);
33. PT LT 23 PL 1126 being Parts 10 and 11 on 58R-17762, being Part of 03826-0016 (309 Clyde Road, Cambridge);
34. PT LT 5 CON 10 being Part 23, 24, 26, 27, 29 and 30 on 58R-17767, being Part of 03824-0045 (200 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
35. PT LT 5 CON 11 being Parts 36, 37 and 38 on 58R-17767, being Part of 03824-0043 (500 Main Street, Cambridge);
36. PT LT 28 RCP 1135 and PT LT 5 CON 11 being Part 34 on 58R-17766, being Part of 03824-0042 (350 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
37. PT LT 5 CON 10 being Parts 11 and 12 on 58R-17767, being Part of 03845-0008 (615 Main Street, Cambridge);
38. PT LT 38 RCP 1135 being Parts 68, 76 and 77 on 58R-17766, being Part of 03822-0083 (384-390 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
39. PT LT 18 PL 1126 being Part 36 on 58R-17762, being Part of 03821-0148 (283 Clyde Road, Cambridge);
40. PT LT 5 CON 10 being Part 9 on 58R-17767, being Part of 03845-0009 (635 Main Street, Cambridge);
41. PT LT 5 CON 10 being Part 33 on 58R-17767, being Part of 03824-0024 (495 Main Street, Cambridge);
42. PT LT 5 CON 10 being Part 32 on 58R-17767, being Part of 03824-0026 (503 Main Street, Cambridge);
43. PT LT 37 RCP 1135 being Parts 65 on 58R-17766, being Part of 03822-0089 (374 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
44. PT LT 36 RCP 1135 being Part 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, and 63 on 58R-17766, being Part of 03822-0086 (364 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
45. PT LT 35 RCP 1135 being Parts 48 and 49 on 58R-17766, being Part of 03822-0087 (354 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
46. PT LT 44 RCP 1135 being Part 22 on 58R-17763, being Part of 03821-0379 (460-462 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
47. PT LT 44 RCP 1135 being Parts 23, 29 and 30 on 58R-17763, being Part of 03821-0380 (466 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
48. PT LT 28 RCP 1135 being Parts 35, 37, 39, 41 and 43 on 58R-17766, being Part of 03824-0041 (352 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
49. PT LT 2 RCP 1149 being Parts 52 and 53 on 58R-17759, being Part of 22642-0046 (201 Pinebush Road, Cambridge);
50. PT LT 1 RCP 1149 being Part 55 on 58R-17759, being Part of 22642-0045 (193 Pinebush Road, Cambridge);
51. PT LT 3 RCP 1149 being Part 50 on 58R-17759, being Part of 22642-0054 (203 Pinebush Road, Cambridge);
52. PT LT 30 RCP 1382 being Parts 34, 36, 37 on 58R-17759, being Part of 22642-0049 (1250 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
53. PT LT 28 RCP 1135 being Parts 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20 on 58R-17766, being Part of 03826-0191 (345 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
54. PT LT 5 CON 11 being Part 7 on 58R-17767, being Part of 03826-0199 (620 Main Street, Cambridge);
55. PT LT 23-24 RCP 1383 being Parts 3, 4 and 5 on 58R-17768, being Part of 03796-0095 (1177 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
56. PT LT 1 RCP 1380 being Parts 9 and 10 on 58R-17761, being Part of 03796-0116 (1710 Bishop Street North, Cambridge);
57. PT LT 37 RCP 1135 being Part 66 on 58R-17766, being Part of 03822-0084 (378 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
58. PT LT 22 RCP 1383 being Part 2 on 58R-17768, being Part of 03796-0094 (1185 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
59. PT LT 22 RCP 1383 being Parts 30 and 31 on 58R-17760, being Part of 03796-0070 (1195 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
60. PT LT 25 PL 1126 being Parts 8 and 9 on 58R-17762, being Part of 03826-0018 (311 Clyde Road, Cambridge);
61. PT LT 28 RCP 1382 being Parts 40, 41 and 43 on 58R-17760, being Part of 22642-0066(R) (200 Sheldon Drive, Cambridge);
62. PT LT 28 RCP 1382 being Parts 36 and 37 on 58R-17760, being Part of 22642-0133 (1220 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
63. PT LT 2, RCP 1384 being Parts 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20 and 21 on 58R-17759, being Part of 03765-0106 (220 Pinebush Road, Cambridge);
64. PT LT 21 RCP 1383 being Parts 24, 25, 26 and 28 on 58R-17760, being Part of 03796-0069 (1201 Franklin Blvd., Cambridge);
65. PT LT 29 RCP 1135 being Parts 10, 13 and 14 on 58R-17766, being Part of 03826-0190 (365 Franklin Blvd., Cambridge)
66. PT LT 5 CON 10 being Part 14 on 58R-17767, being Part of 03845-0007 (605 Main Street E, Cambridge);
67. PT LT 15 RCP 1378 being Part 30 on 58R-17761, being Part of 03794-0025 (1680 Bishop Street, Cambridge);

**Permanent Easement - Aerial:**

The right and easement, being an easement in gross, for itself, its successors and assigns and anyone authorized by it, in perpetuity to, at any time enter upon the following properties for purposes of constructing, installing, inspecting, repairing, altering, enlarging, replacing, correcting, operating, and maintaining aerial hydro installations and infrastructure overhead, including cables, pipes, conduits of all kinds, all appurtenances thereto, and maintaining required clearance areas for same, herein referred to as the aerial utility plant, which may be determined necessary from time to time through, over, upon, along and across the lands, and for all such purposes together with the free, unimpeded and unobstructed access for itself, its successors and assigns, servants, agents, contractors, workmen and anyone authorized by it, and vehicles, supplies and equipment at all times and for all purposes and things necessary for or incidental to the exercise and enjoyment of the right and easement:

1. PT LT 6-7 PL 837 being Parts 3, 4, and 5 on 58R-17759 being Part of 03766-0271 (210 Pinebush Road, Cambridge);
2. PT LT 31 RCP 1382 being Parts 38, 39, 43, and 44 on 58R-17759, being Part of 22642-0047 (209 Pinebush Road, Cambridge);
3. PT LT 21 RCP 1383 being Parts 24, 26, 27, and 28 on 58R-17760 and Parts 5 and 6 on 58R-17769, being Part of 03796-0069 (1201 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
4. PT LT 24 RCP 1383 being Parts 6, 7, and 38 on 58R-17761, being Part of 03796-0101 (1111 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
5. PT LT 1 RCP 1380 being Parts 11, 14, and 15 on 58R-17761, being Part of 03796-0115 (1700 Bishop Street, Cambridge);
6. PT LT 15 RCP 1378 being Parts 29 and 30 on 58R-17761, being Part of 03794-0025 (1680 Bishop Street, Cambridge);
7. PT LT 20 PL 1126 being Part 31 on 58R-17762, being Part of 03821-0150 (287 Clyde Road, Cambridge);
8. PT LT 5 CON 10 being Parts 13 and 14 on 58R-17767, being Part of 03845-0007 (605 Main Street E, Cambridge);
9. PT LT 9 RCP 1384 being Part 2 on 58R-17760, being Part of 03796-0027 (1245 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
10. PT LT 21 RCP 1383 being Parts 11, 17, 19, and 21 on 58R-17760 and Parts 2, 3 and 4 on 58R-17769 being Part of 03796-0068 (225 Sheldon Drive, Cambridge);
11. PT LT 23 PL 1126 being Parts 18, 20, 21 and 22 on 58R-17762, being Part of 03826-0011 (299 Clyde Road, Cambridge);
12. PT LT 23 PL 1126 being Part 16 on 58R-17762, being Part of 03826-0012 (301 Clyde Road, Cambridge);
13. PT LT 5 CON 10 being Parts 24, 29, 30 and 31 on 58R-17767, being Part of 03824-0045 (200 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
14. PT LT 5 CON 11 being Parts 37 and 39 on 58R-17767, being Part of 03824-0043 (500 Main Street, Cambridge);
15. PT LT 5 CON 10 being Part 12 on 58R-17767, being Part of 03845-0008 (615 Main Street, Cambridge);
16. PT LT 5 CON 10 being Part 10 on 58R-17767, being Part of 03845-0009 (635 Main Street, Cambridge);
17. PT LT 36 RCP 1135 being Parts 59 and 60 on 58R-17766, being Part of 03822-0086 (364 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
18. PT LT 35 RCP 1135 being Parts 49, 50 and 52 on 58R-17766, being Part of 03822-0087 (354 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
19. PT LT 28 RCP 1135 being Parts 37, 39, 41, 42 and 46 on 58R-17766, being Part of 03824-0041 (352 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
20. PT LT 15 RCP 1378 being Part 28 on 58R-17761, being Part of 03794-0026 (1100 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
21. PT LT 30 RCP 1382 being Parts 34 and 35 on 58R-17759, being Part of 22642-0049 (1250 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
22. PT LT 2, RCP 1384 being Parts 17, 19, and 20 on 58R-17759, being Part of 03765-0106 (220 Pinebush Road, Cambridge);
23. PT LT 1, RCP 1380 being Part 10 on 58R-17761, being Part of 03796-0116 (1710 Bishop Street North, Cambridge).

Permanent Easement - Anchor:
The right and easement, being an easement in gross, for itself, its successors and assignees and anyone authorized by it, in perpetuity to, at any time enter upon the following properties for purposes of constructing, laying down, installing, inspecting, repairing, altering, enlarging, replacing, correcting, operating, and maintaining hydro installations and infrastructure, both under ground and overhead, including cables, pipes, conduits of all kinds, all necessary poles, supporting wires and braces and other equipment and appurtenances thereto, herein referred to as the utility plant, which may be determined necessary from time to time through, over, upon, along and across the lands, and for all such purposes together with the free, unimpeded and unobstructed access for itself, its successors and assigns, servants, agents, contractors, workmen and anyone authorized by it, and vehicles, supplies and equipment at all times and for all purposes and things necessary for or incidental to the exercise and enjoyment of the right and easement:

1. PT LT 6-7 PL 837 being Part 6 on 58R-17759 being Part of 03766-0271 (210 Pinebush Road, Cambridge);
2. PT LT 9 & 11, RCP1384 being Parts 23, 28, 29, 31, 32, 56, 57, 60 and 61 on 58R-17759, being Part of 03796-3637 (225 Pinebush Road, Cambridge);
3. PT LT 31 RCP 1382 being Parts 40, 41, 42, 48 and 59 on 58R-17759, being Part of 22642-0047 (209 Pinebush Road, Cambridge);
4. PT LT 24 RCP 1383 being Parts 4, 5, 8, and 39 on 58R-17761, being Part of 03796-0101 (1111 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
5. PT LT 29 RCP 1379 being Parts 32 and 34 on 58R-17760 being Part of 03790-0051 (1200 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
6. PT LT 1 RCP 1380 being Parts 12, 13, 18, 19 and 20 on 58R-17761, being Part of 03796-0115 (1700 Bishop Street, Cambridge);
7. PT LT 15 RCP 1378 being Part 32 on 58R-17761, being Part of 03794-0025 (1680 Bishop Street, Cambridge);
8. PT LT 56 PLAN 1126 being Parts 5 and 6 on 58R-17762, being Part of 03825-0443 (310 Clyde Road, Cambridge);
9. PT LT 20 PL 1126 being Parts 30 and 38 on 58R-17762, being Part of 03821-0150 (287 Clyde Road, Cambridge);
10. PT LT 5 CON 10 being Part 16 on 58R-17767, being Part of 03845-0007 (605 Main Street E, Cambridge);
11. PT LT 9 RCP 1384 being Parts 3, 4 and 5 on 58R-17760, being Part of 03796-0027 (1245 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
12. PT LT 21 RCP 1383 being Parts 13 and 14 on 58R-17760 and Part 1 on 58R-17769 being Part of 03796-0068 (225 Sheldon Drive, Cambridge);
13. PT LT 5 CON 11 being Part 32 on 58R-17766 being Part of 03826-0218 (North East Corner of Franklin & Main Street, Cambridge);
14. PT LT 28, RCP 1135 being Parts 27, 28, 30 and 31 on 58R-17766, being Part of 03826-0206 (East Side Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);
15. PT LT 28, RCP 1135 being Parts 22 and 23 on 58R-17766, being Part of 03826-0192 (East side Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);

16. PT LT 5 CON 10 being Parts 26 and 27 on 58R-17767, being Part of 03824-0045 (200 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);

17. PT LT 36 RCP 1135 being Parts 55, 56, 57, 58, 61, 63, 71, 72, 73 and 74 on 58R-17766, being Part of 03822-0086 (364 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);

18. PT LT 35 RCP 1135 being Parts 53 and 54 on 58R-17766, being Part of 03822-0087 (354 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);

19. PT LT 28 RCP 1135 being Parts 43, 44, and 45 on 58R-17766, being Part of 03824-0041 (352 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);

20. PT LT 2 RCP 1149 being Part 52 on 58R-17759, being Part of 22642-0046 (201 Pinebush Road, Cambridge);

21. PT LT 15 RCP 1378 being Parts 26 and 27 on 58R-17761, being Part of 03794-0026 (1100 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);

22. PT LT 30 RCP 1382 being Part 37 on 58R-17759, being Part of 22642-0049 (1250 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);

23. PT LT 22 RCP 1383 being Part 30 on 58R-17760, being Part of 03796-0070 (1195 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge);

24. PT LT 28 RCP 1382 being Part 41 on 58R-17760, being Part of 22642-0066(R) (200 Sheldon Drive, Cambridge);

25. PT LT 2, RCP 1384 being Parts 11, 12, 14, 15, and 16 on 58R-17759, being Part of 03765-0106 (220 Pinebush Road, Cambridge).

Full Taking:

1. PT LT 21-22 PL 1126 being Parts 2 and 3 on 67R-745 except PT 1 on 67R3788, being all of 03821-0151 (289 Clyde Road, Cambridge);

2. PT LT 22 PL 1126 as in WS654737, being all of 03826-0010 (297 Clyde Road, Cambridge);

3. PT LT 56 PL 1126 as in 383969 except 423005, being all of 03825-0139 (300 Clyde Road, Cambridge).

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

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

And that if no agreement as to compensation is made with an owner, the statutory Offer of Compensation and payment be served upon the registered owners of the property in the amount of the market value of the interests in the land as estimated by the Region’s appraiser in accordance with the Expropriations Act;
And further that the Regional Solicitor be authorized to discontinue expropriation proceedings or any part thereof, in respect of the above described lands, or any part thereof, upon the registration on title of the required documentation to complete the transaction.

Summary:
Nil.

Report:
Regional Council approved the reconstruction of the Franklin Boulevard (Regional Road 36) corridor from Pinebush Road to Myers Road, in the City of Cambridge. The Environmental Assessment was approved by Council in March 2010 and by the Ministry of Environment in July 2011. This study investigated the need to increase traffic capacity on Franklin Boulevard and approved constructing roundabouts at the major intersections and reconstructing Franklin Boulevard with 4 lanes and raised centre median.

The detailed design of Year 1 reconstruction work is currently being finalized, which includes Franklin Boulevard from south of Main Street to north of Clyde Road (South Section) and from south of Bishop Street to north of Pinebush Road (North Section) in the City of Cambridge. Construction of the Year 1 improvement works on Franklin Boulevard are currently scheduled for 2015 in the Region’s 2014 Transportation Capital Program. The location of this project is shown on the key plan included in Appendix A.

Council approved the commencement of expropriation of the subject properties and easements on August 22, 2013 as detailed in report CR-RS-13-065. The appropriate forms under the Expropriations Act were served in order to initiate formal proceedings under the Act for these properties and easements. All of the affected property owners were previously contacted by Legal Services staff and informed of the project as well as the Region’s intention to commence the expropriation process and the Region’s Expropriation Information Sheet was provided to each of them. The affected property owners have also been provided with offers to purchase. Legal Services staff also contacted all property owners and informed them of the Region’s intention to continue with the expropriation process in order to ensure that the construction timeline is maintained, including this report being presented to Council, as detailed in the Region’s Expropriation Information Sheet.

Land acquisitions are required from 79 property owners and include 3 full buyouts, 50 partial takings, 71 temporary easements for construction, grading and landscaping, and 37 permanent easements for hydro anchor or aerial utilities. The Region has entered into and completed agreements with 4 owners to acquire 3 partial takings, 3 temporary easements and 2 permanent easements.
In order to address concerns raised by a tenant at 345 Franklin Boulevard Region the Region’s design consultant has refined the design of the road improvements so that the originally proposed partial taking could be reduced to a temporary easement for construction, grading and landscaping. This change is noted as property number 53 under Temporary Easement. The property owner and the tenant have been informed by Legal Services staff of this recommended change to a lesser interest to be expropriated.

The Region did not receive a notice for a Hearing of Necessity within the statutory time frame established by the Expropriations Act from any of the affected property owners which has allowed for the Region to expedite the expropriation process more efficiently. As the Year 1 improvements on Franklin Boulevard will include construction of over five kilometers of roadway and six roundabouts, the work is expected to span the entire construction season. Council approval of the expropriations is being sought at this time to permit registration of the Plans of Expropriation this summer and possession of the required lands and interests in the fall of 2014 so that the majority of advance utility relocation work can be completed before winter which will help to maintain the overall construction time line. Legal Services staff has been negotiating property acquisitions over the past several months and intends to continue negotiations with property owners to achieve settlements of their claims under the Act.

Upon Council approval of the expropriation of the property required for Year 1 improvements, such approval will be endorsed upon on a certificate of approval on the Plan of Expropriation for those properties not acquired under agreement. The Plan will then be registered within three months of the approval. Ownership of the property vests with the Region upon the registration of the Plan. Notices of Expropriation and Notices of Possession are then served upon all registered owners, including tenants as shown on the assessment roll. The Region will take possession of the required lands at least 3 months after service of the Notice of Possession.

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

The expropriation process is proceeding to ensure that the Region has possession of the land, temporary easements and permanent easements required for advance utility relocations in 2014/2015 and construction of the Year 1 Franklin Boulevard roadway improvements in 2015.
The expropriation of the lands is on an “as is” basis and upon closing the Region assumes all responsibility for the lands.

The Year 1 Franklin Boulevard Improvement Areas are shown attached as Appendix “A”. The number of property interests required for the Year 1 roadway improvements is too extensive to show on a site plan. An electronic copy of the 79 property impact plans, dated February 26, 2013, depicting all of the required property interests (including those that have been acquired by agreement and removed from the expropriation process and the proposed taking from 345 Franklin Blvd. which has subsequently been reduced to a temporary easement as noted in this report) is available in the Councillors’ office for review.

A list of the individual and corporate owners of the fee simple interest in the subject lands is attached as Appendix “B”. Regional staff have conducted corporate profile searches of affected corporate property owners and the directors and officers are listed for each. This list does not include tenants, easement holders or holders of security interests in the subject lands.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

Year 1 Franklin Boulevard Improvements, when complete, will support Focus Area 2 – Growth Management and Prosperity and meets strategic objective number two which is to develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs.

**Financial Implications**

The Region’s current Ten Year Transportation Capital Program includes a total of $54.220 million for this project in years 2014 through 2021 funded from the Development Charge Reserve Fund which includes funding for property acquisitions associated with the Franklin Boulevard Improvements.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

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

**Attachments**

Appendix “A” - Year 1 Franklin Boulevard Improvements (2015 Construction)

Appendix “B” – List of Owners (Fee Simple Interest) (November 4, 2013)

**Prepared By:** Fiona McCrea, Solicitor, Property

**Approved By:** Gary Sosnoski, Commissioner, Corporate Resources
Appendix “A”

Year 1 Franklin Boulevard Improvements (2015 Construction)
Appendix “B”

1. 210 Pinebush Road, Cambridge
   Owner: Zico Ltd.
   Annual Return: December 22, 2012
   Directors/Officers: Charles Zukowski; Deborah Stone-Zukowski
   Partial Taking, Temporary Easements and Permanent Easements

2. 225 Pinebush Road, Cambridge
   Owner: SREIT (Pinebush) Ltd.
   Annual Return: August 26, 2013
   Directors/Officers: James Hewitt, Anna Kennedy, Rob Kumer, Joseph Mazzocco
   Partial Taking, Temporary Easements and Permanent Easements

3. 209 Pinebush Road, Cambridge
   Owner: Hespin Limited
   Annual Return: May 25, 2013
   Directors/Officers: John Skiropolis and Steve Skiropolis
   Partial Taking, Temporary Easements and Permanent Easements

4. 210 Sheldon Drive, Cambridge
   Owner: Galt Tile Limited
   Annual Return: January 3, 2009
   Directors/Officers: Ted Slaweki
   Partial Taking and Temporary Easement

5. 1201 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge
   Owner: 423399 Ontario Limited
   Annual Return: June 15, 2013
   Directors/Officers: Sidney Barish, Allen Werger and Jermone Weger
   Partial Takings, Temporary Easements and Permanent Easements

6. 1111 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge
   Owner: Crossroads Business Centre Corp.
   Annual Return: June 29, 2013
   Directors/Officers: Tim Sittler
   Partial Taking, Temporary Easements and Permanent Easements
7. 1200 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge  
    Owner: Syngenta Canada Inc.  
    Annual Return: January 3, 2013  
    Directors/Officers: Chris Legge, Stephane Chalifour, Jay Bradshaw  
    Partial Taking, Temporary Easements and Permanent Easements

8. 1700 Bishop Street, Cambridge  
    Owner: Magnacap Inc.  
    Annual Return: August 24, 2013  
    Directors/Officers: Jan Eberhardt, Angela Munch  
    Partial Taking, Temporary Easements and Permanent Easements

9. 1680 Bishop Street, Cambridge  
    Owner: Refreshments Plus Inc.  
    Annual Return: September 28, 2013  
    Directors/Officers: Chuck Clynick, Samuel Silvestro  
    Partial Taking, Temporary Easements and Permanent Easements

10. 310 Clyde Road, Cambridge  
    Owner: Skyline Real Estate Holdings Inc.  
    Annual Return: April 27, 2013  
    Directors/Officers: Roy Ashdown, Mike Bonneveld, Wayne Byrd, Martin Castellan, Jason Castellan  
    Partial Taking, Temporary Easement and Permanent Easements

11. 399 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge  
    Owner: 7095163 Canada Inc.  
    Annual Return: February 15, 2013  
    Directors/Officers: Tim McIntyre, Donald McIntyre  
    Partial Taking and Temporary Easement

12. 401 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge  
    Owner: Dana Canada Corporation  
    Annual Return: August 24, 2011  
    Directors/Officers: John Kichinko  
    Partial Taking and Temporary Easement

13. 501 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge  
    Owner: 1260868 Ontario Limited  
    Annual Return: September 14, 2013  
    Directors/Officers: Tim McIntyre and Donald McIntyre
Partial Taking and Temporary Easements

14. 430 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge
   Owner: Cathnor Corporation
   Annual Return: January 12, 2013
   Directors/Officers: Stan Draper, Norman Murphy, Catherine Murphy, Julie Wynen
   Partial Takings and Temporary Easements

15. 1245 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge
    Owner: Store All GP Inc.
    Annual Return: March 30, 2013
    Directors/Officers: Amy Campbell and Tony Campbell
    Partial Taking, Temporary Easements and Permanent Easements

16. 395 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge
    Owner: Manchester Properties (Kitchener) Limited
    Annual Return: July 20, 2013
    Directors/Officers: Harold Freure and David Freure
    Partial Taking and Temporary Easement

17. 385 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge
    Owner: 7093896 Canada Inc.
    Annual Return: February 13, 2013
    Directors/Officers: Richard Hahn, Larry Korf, John Kokula, Duane Gasser
    Partial Takings and Temporary Easements

18. 220 Pinebush Road, Cambridge
    Owner: Hoopp Realty Inc.
    Annual Return: March 28, 2013
    Directors/Officers: Mike Catford, David Miller, James Keohare, Lisa Lafave, Barbara Thomson, Richard Varkey, Jeffery Wendling
    Partial Taking, Temporary Easements and Permanent Easements

19. 225 Sheldon Drive, Cambridge
    Owner: 423400 Ontario Limited
    Annual Return: June 15, 2013
    Directors/Officers: Sidney Barish, Allen Werger, Jermone Werger
    Partial Taking, Temporary Easements and Permanent Easements
20. 1165 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge  
   Owner: Johnny Group Inc.  
   Annual Return: April 27, 2013  
   Directors/Officers: Rae-Ann Frazer, Darrell Frazer, Brad Frazer  
   Temporary Easements

21. 1225 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge  
   Owner: 1333911 Ontario Limited  
   Annual Return: July 20, 2013  
   Directors/Officers: Murray Ewing  
   Partial Taking

22. Main Street East, Cambridge (vacant land)  
   Owner: Kirtaff Holdings Inc.  
   Annual Return: March 9, 2013  
   Directors/Officers: John Taylor  
   Temporary Easements and Permanent Easements

23. 500 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge  
   Owner: Hendrix Genetics Limited  
   Annual Return: July 20, 2013  
   Directors/Officers: Thijs Hendrix, David Libertini, Peter Martchenko, Ronald Slavink, Antoon Van Den Berg, Jeff Wilson  
   Partial Taking and Temporary Easements

24. 470 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge  
   Owner: G & M Fig Holdings Inc.  
   Annual Return: November 10, 2012  
   Directors/Officers: George Figuearedo and Mary Lou Figuearedo  
   Partial Takings and Temporary Easements

25. 416 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge  
   Owner: 1614196 Ontario Limited  
   Annual Return: February 9, 2013  
   Directors/Officers: Pieter Dejonge  
   Partial Taking and Temporary Easement
26. 200 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge  
   Owner: RioCan Holdings Inc.  
   Annual Return: June 29, 2013  
   Directors/Officers: Raghanath Davloor, Jonathan Gitlin, Donald MacKinnon,  
   Edward Sonshine, Frederic Waks, Robert Wolf  
   Partial Takings, Temporary Easements and Permanent Easements

27. 365 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge  
   Owner: Tudisco Realty Investments Inc.  
   Annual Return: April 6, 2013  
   Directors/Officers: Peter Tudisco, Anthony Tudisco  
   Partial Takings and Temporary Easements

28. 615 Main Street, Cambridge  
   Owner: 1759157 Ontario Inc.  
   Annual Return: April 24, 2008  
   Directors/Officers: Basam Aburaheh  
   Temporary Easements and Permanent Easements

29. 384-390 Franklin, Cambridge  
   Owner: Bolt and Nut Supply Limited  
   Annual Return: June 1, 2013  
   Directors/Officers: Paul Hill and Fran Hill  
   Partial Takings and Temporary Easements

30. 345 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge  
   Owner: Taylor White Enterprises  
   Annual Return: March 9, 2013  
   Directors/Officers: John Taylor, Linda Taylor, Mary Corbett, Patrick Taylor  
   Temporary Easements

31. 620 Main Street, Cambridge  
   Owner: JK Simmons Holdings  
   Annual Return: July 20, 2013  
   Directors/Officers: James Simmons, Kim Simmons  
   Temporary Easement
32. 1177 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge  
Owner: Skyline Commercial Real Estate Holdings Inc.  
Annual Return: April 27, 2014  
Directors/Officers: Roy Ashdown, Mike Bonneveld, Wayne Byrd, Marin Castellan and Jason Castellan  
Temporary Easements

33. 1710 Bishop Street North, Cambridge  
Owner: Kadfil Investments Inc.  
Annual Return: March 9, 2013  
Directors/Officers: John Kadar, Magdalene Kadar and Victor Kadar  
Temporary Easements and Permanent Easements

34. 1185 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge  
Owner: Spaceco Leasing Inc.  
Annual Return: March 2, 2013  
Directors/Officers: Arthur Clarmo, Spencer Dalton, Myron Matlow, Gordon Mills, Alex Reitz  
Temporary Easements

35. 378 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge  
Owner: Mahnaz 3H Inc.  
Annual Return: March 26, 2013  
Directors/Officers: Mahnaz Ghaenizadeh  
Partial Taking and Temporary Easement

36. 1195 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge  
Owner: Skyline Commercial Real Estate Holdings Inc.  
Annual Return: April 27, 2014  
Directors/Officers: Roy Ashdown, Mike Bonneveld, Wayne Byrd, Marin Castellan and Jason Castellan  
Temporary Easements and Permanent Easements

37. 374 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge  
Owner: 1054464 Ontario Inc.  
Annual Return: February 16, 2013  
Directors/Officers: Jylanne Teemu  
Temporary Easements
38. 311 Clyde Road, Cambridge
   Owner: Harmony Holdings
   Annual Return: August 18, 2009
   Directors/Officers: Steve Campisi, Tony Campisi, Maddalena Frenette, Kelly Raimonda
   Temporary Easements

39. 354 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge
   Owner: Chrislex Enterprises Ltd.
   Annual Return: May 10, 2013
   Directors/Officers: Walter Ferguson
   Partial Takings, Temporary Easements and Permanent Easements

40. 460-462 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge
    Owner: 1718 Holdings Inc.
    Annual Return: March 23, 2012
    Directors/Officers: Christopher Buchhaupt
    Temporary Easements

41. 466 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge
    Owner: Community Living Cambridge
    Annual Return: October 15, 2013
    Directors/Officers: Akash Ayra, Val Brookes, Denise Gruber, Silvana Henneman, Ed Hermanovics, Colleen Kennedy, Terry Lake, Helen MacMillan, Andrew Melchers, Elaine Parker, Don Smith, Dana Sotorinik, Dorothy Spencer and Georgina Thompson
    Temporary Easements

42. 1250 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge
    Owner: Spaceco Leasing Inc.
    Annual Return: March 2, 2013
    Directors/Officers: Arthur Clamro, Spencer Dalton, Myron Matlow, Gordon Mills, Alex Reitz, Peter Stevens.
    Temporary Easements and Permanent Easements

43. 201 Pinebush Road, Cambridge
    Owner: Jadesse Holdings Ltd.
    Annual Return: August 13, 2013
    Directors/Officers: Peter Simpson and Rebecca Simpson
    Partial Taking, Temporary Easements and Permanent Easements
44. 193 Pinebush Road, Cambridge  
   Owner: 1094645 Ontario Limited  
   Annual Return: October 6, 2012  
   Directors/Officers: Terry Davis, Derwin Davis and Shirley Davis  
   Partial Taking and Temporary Easements

45. 203 Pinebush Road, Cambridge  
   Owner: JP Page Enterprises Inc.  
   Annual Return: September 21, 2013  
   Directors/Officers: Elaine Skropolis and Artemis Skropolis  
   Partial Taking and Temporary Easements

46. 1100 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge  
   Owner: 1842028 Ontario Limited  
   Annual Return: March 1, 2013  
   Directors/Officers: Ellenor Mayot, Michelle Lapierre  
   Permanent Easements

47. 1220 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge  
   Owner: Slotegraaf Limited  
   Annual Return: September 7, 2013  
   Directors/Officers: Pamela Slotegraaf, John Slotegraaf, Steve Brenton  
   Partial Taking and Temporary Easements

48. 200 Sheldon Drive, Cambridge  
   Owner: Redway (1998) Ltd.  
   Annual Return: January 5, 2013  
   Directors/Officers: Mario Forgione  
   Partial Taking, Temporary Easements and Permanent Easement

49. 287 Clyde Road, Cambridge  
   Owner: Ha Ninh Trong  
   Partial Taking, Temporary Easements and Permanent Easements

50. 285 Clyde Road, Cambridge  
    Owner: John Billings, Katherine Billings  
    Partial Taking and Temporary Easements

51. 600 Main Street East, Cambridge  
    Owner: Ivan Hajak  
    Partial Takings and Temporary Easements
52. 605 Main Street East, Cambridge
   Owner: Basem Aburaneh
   Partial Taking, Temporary Easements and Permanent Easements

53. 531 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge
   Owner: Jeffrey Bruce Neumann
   Partial Taking and Temporary Easements

54. Franklin Blvd, Cambridge (vacant land corner of Franklin and Main)
   Owner: Mary Alma Corbett
   Partial Taking, Temporary Easement and Permanent Easement

55. 299 Clyde Road, Cambridge
   Owner: Randall Scott MacLeod
   Temporary Easements and Permanent Easements

56. Franklin Blvd (Vacant Land)
   Owner: Edmund Patrick Taylor
   Temporary Easements and Permanent Easements

57. 532 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge
   Owner: Eusebio Manuel Cordeiro and Maria Aida Cordeiro
   Partial Taking and Temporary Easements

58. 301 Clyde Road, Cambridge
   Owner: Edon Alim Rafeek Persaud
   Temporary Easement and Permanent Easement

59. 305 Clyde Road, Cambridge
   Owner: Mark William Skopliak
   Temporary Easement

60. 307 Clyde Road, Cambridge
    Owner: Maria Sequeira
    Temporary Easement

61. 309 Clyde Road, Cambridge
    Owner: Dale William Romahn
    Temporary Easements
62. 500 Main Street, Cambridge
   Owner: Linda Margaret Taylor
   Partial Taking, Temporary Easements and Permanent Easements

63. 350 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge
   Owner: Edmund Patrick Taylor
   Partial Taking and Temporary Easements

64. 283 Clyde Road, Cambridge
   Owner: Jose Carlos Oliveira
   Partial Taking and Temporary Easement

65. 635 Main Street, Cambridge
   Owner: Clifford Ronald Billard and Joan Dianne Billard and Darlene Vincent
   Temporary Easement and Permanent Easement

66. 495 Main Street, Cambridge
   Owner: Thiep Trong Nguyen
   Temporary Easement

67. 503 Main Street East, Cambridge
   Owner: Manoj Garg and Sandhya Garg
   Temporary Easement

68. 364 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge
   Owner: Luis C. Fernandes and Maria Joana Fernandes
   Partial Taking, Temporary Easements and Permanent Easements

69. 352 Franklin Blvd, Cambridge
   Owner: Mary Alma Corbett
   Partial Taking, Temporary Easements and Permanent Easements

70. 289 Clyde Road, Cambridge
   Owner: James Watermain
   Full Taking

71. 297 Clyde Road, Cambridge
   Owner: Nam Be Thi Huynh and An Van Vo
   Full Taking
72.300 Clyde Road, Cambridge
Owner: George Moore
Full Taking
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Weber Street (Regional Road 8) Reconstruction
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Public Consultation Centre
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There is a comment sheet at the back of this package. If you wish, please fill it out and deposit it in the designated box provided at this Information Centre.
1. **What Is The Purpose Of This Public Consultation Centre?**

Roadway reconstruction and other improvements are proposed on Weber Street between Borden Avenue and Queen Street (an overall length of 1500 metres) in the City of Kitchener. (Please refer to the key plan in Appendix A.)

The public is invited to this Consultation Centre to provide comments and input regarding the planning and design of the proposed improvements. The Consultation Centre is a forum for you to:

- review the design being considered for the road improvements on Weber Street;
- review the proposed construction timing and detour routes under consideration;
- ask questions of Region staff; and
- provide comments on the proposed road improvements.

The comment sheet attached to the back of this Information Package will help us to obtain your input regarding the design being considered for this project. We ask that you fill it out and put it in the box at the Consultation Centre or send it to the address indicated on the comment sheet. Your comments will be considered along with all other technical information obtained to assist us in developing the best possible design for improvements on Weber Street between Borden Avenue and Queen Street.

2. **Who Is Directing This Project?**

This road reconstruction project is being directed by a Project Team consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo and the City of Kitchener as well as City of Kitchener Councilor Dan Glenn-Graham.

3. **Why Are We Considering Improvements On Weber Street?**

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

**Deteriorated Road Condition**

Pavement conditions on this section of road are poor in most areas with the deterioration primarily due to age. The road pavement will be fully reconstructed and will be reinstated to approximately the same width as exists today. Please refer to Appendix B for a typical cross-section showing the proposed lane widths and sidewalk widths as part of the Weber Street Reconstruction.
Sanitary Sewer Needs

Weber Street’s sanitary sewer system is over 45 years old and is reaching the end of its service life. The sanitary sewer and all sanitary services require replacement throughout the length of the project.

Watermain Needs

Weber Street’s watermain system is over 40 years old and is experiencing frequent leaks and breaks. It is proposed that the watermain be replaced throughout the length of the project along with all water services.

Storm Sewer Needs

Weber Street’s storm sewer system is also reaching the end of its service life and requires replacement for most of the length of the project.

Pedestrian Needs

Due to its age and deteriorated condition, all of the Weber Street sidewalk will be replaced throughout the length of the project with the exception of the newer sections west of Scott Street.

A local citizen’s group had earlier requested that the channelized right turn lane to Simeon Street from westbound Weber Street be eliminated due to safety concerns for pedestrians walking to and from Sheppard Public School (located north-east of the intersection of Weber Street and Simeon Street). The Region of Waterloo and the City of Kitchener have assessed the pedestrian situation at this intersection and agree that this channelized right turn should be eliminated to reduce right turning vehicle speeds and to eliminate the extra pedestrian crossing point. The City of Kitchener is currently designing the reconstruction of Simeon Street with construction expected to start in 2015. It is proposed that the channelized right turn lane be eliminated as part of the City’s 2015 Simeon Street construction project.

The Project Team is also proposing that the channelized island at the north-east corner of Weber Street and Frederick Street be eliminated as part of the reconstruction of Weber Street. The island would be replaced by a tighter corner radius of the curb, which would shorten the crossing times for pedestrians across both Frederick Street and Weber Street.

Traffic Signal, Lane Markings and Turn Lane Needs

Traffic signal equipment improvements are proposed as part of this project along the Weber Street corridor at these locations; Borden Avenue, Cameron Street, Cedar Street/Krug Street, Scott Street, Frederick Street and Queen Street. In addition to the traffic signal upgrades, modifications to the pavement markings at Queen Street, Cedar Street and Frederick Street will be undertaken to improve operations at these intersections.
The Project Team has also evaluated each intersection to assess the need for additional turn lane requirements and no new turn lanes are proposed throughout the corridor.

**Grand River Transit (GRT) Needs**

GRT proposes to upgrade a number of bus stops along the project route to include expanded concrete pads and new bus shelters.

4. **Are Cycling Lanes Being Considered For This Project?**

The road allowance width on this section of Weber Street is narrow and the buildings are right behind the sidewalk in many locations with no room available to widen the road for the addition of cycling lanes. The Region’s approved Active Transportation Master Plan (ATMP) acknowledged this constrained corridor on Weber Street and in fact did not designate any section of Weber Street in Kitchener as an official cycling route because of the challenges with introducing any pavement widening. Cycling facilities are instead provided on adjacent local streets and trails in lieu of cycling facilities on Weber Street. Cycling lanes are therefore not being considered on Weber Street from Queen Street to Borden Avenue as part of this project.

5. **When Will Construction Occur?**

In order to minimize traffic disruption in general in the vicinity of this project, it is proposed that the construction on Weber Street not occur concurrently with any nearby ION Rapid Transit construction on the parallel arterial roadways of Duke Street and Charles Street. The Project Team will keep track of the ION construction timing as it becomes known. Based on the currently projected ION construction timing, the Weber Street work is scheduled to start in 2017, after the completion of ION work on Charles and Duke Streets.

Because the Weber Street Reconstruction includes full replacement of the roadway, storm sewers, sanitary sewers, watermains and all services, the work will require two full construction seasons to complete the full 1500 metre length. It is proposed that the two years of construction be split at Cameron Street to best manage local traffic and to minimize disruption for residences, businesses and road users. Stage 1 from Queen Street to Cameron Street is scheduled to be completed in 2017 and Stage 2 from Cameron Street to Borden Avenue is scheduled for 2018. (Please refer to the key map in Appendix A for the staging limits.)

6. **Will Detours Be Required And How Will Traffic And Property Access Be Maintained During Construction?**

The replacement of the sewers and water lines will require deep trench excavations. Because of the narrow road allowance, it is only possible to keep one lane of traffic in one direction open on Weber Street while the construction is occurring. It is proposed that the westbound direction remain open in a single lane and that eastbound traffic be detoured around the construction.
area. Please refer to Appendix C and C-1 for maps showing the proposed detour routes for the 2 years of construction.

Access to individual properties and businesses will be available in the westbound direction at all times. However, there will have to be short periods of interrupted access to individual properties when the deep excavation work is occurring in the immediate vicinity of a driveway or access, or when freshly poured concrete curbs or sidewalk is curing. Adequate advance notifications will be provided for any driveway/access interruptions and alternative parking arrangements will be made as required on adjacent side-streets.

7. How Will Private Properties, Trees, Driveways, Retaining Walls And Lawns Be Affected?

Some trees between Borden Avenue and Cameron Street will have to be removed to accommodate the construction on Weber Street. That is because the tree root systems are located in the immediate vicinity of the proposed construction of the new storm sewers, curb and sidewalks. It is the Region of Waterloo’s practice to replace removed trees with new trees in the ratio of two new trees for each removed tree.

The overall level of the reconstructed roadway will be maintained at approximately the same elevation as exists today and there will be minimal change in grading at the finished front lawns and driveways at property line. The existing cross-slope on Weber Street however is steep in many areas due to numerous pavement overlays over the years. This condition will be corrected as part of the reconstruction and the cross-slope will be lowered to a more conventional (flatter) degree of sloping.

Most driveways and grassed areas will have to be disturbed to some degree to accommodate sidewalk replacement and/or water/sanitary service replacements to property line. All driveways or grassed areas that are disturbed during construction will be repaired to equal or better condition. Grassed areas will be repaired with topsoil and sod. Driveways will be reinstated with the same material (ie. asphalt or concrete) as exists today. The anticipated grading limits at each private property are shown on the plan view drawings at this evening’s Consultation Centre.

Underground service replacements which may pose a conflict with existing trees or retaining walls will require utilization of trenchless service installation options to maximize tree and retaining wall protection. Additionally, trees and their tree root zones will be fenced off during construction in order to minimize any potential construction equipment damage to existing trees (with exception of trees scheduled for removal) along the Weber Street reconstruction project.
8. Are Any Changes Proposed Through The S-Curves Between Stirling Avenue And Borden Avenue?

In addition to the elimination of the channelized right turn lane at Simeon Street (noted above in Section 3), other changes were considered on Weber Street through the “S-curves” between Stirling and Borden Avenues. Vehicle collisions are occurring in this area through the S-curves largely due to the lack of banking on the sharp curves; the Project Team had therefore explored ways to improve this condition. The right-of-way is significantly constrained in this area with the St. Peters Lutheran Cemetery on the south side and with residential homes in close proximity on the north side. As part of the reconstruction however, there is the possibility to introduce some banking (“superelevation”) on the curves to improve safety and comfort for drivers.

9. How Does This Project Address The Region’s Transportation Master Plan?

The Regional Official Plan gives direction to balance new and retrofitted roads for all modes of transportation including walking, cycling, autos and transit. In addition, Regional Council also approved the Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) and the Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines in 2010 that support the integration of active and sustainable transportation on all Regional Roads. This project supports the RTMP goals of optimizing our transportation system, promoting transportation choice, supporting sustainable development and fostering a strong economy.

As part of this project, the planned Weber Street Reconstruction is improving the roadway to ensure movements of goods, to relieve traffic problems and in support of improved transit. Also by incorporating improved sidewalks this project is promoting pedestrian-friendly routes for walking.

Because of the narrow road allowance on Weber Street, the corridor is not included as a designated cycling route in the Region’s Active Transportation Master Plan and accordingly, no separate cycling facilities are planned as part of this project.

10. What Bus Service Will Be Affected By The Work?

Grand River Transit (GRT) Routes 1 and 8 have service along Weber Street through the proposed construction zone. During stage 1 construction in 2017 (Queen to Cameron), Route 1 will be detoured along Duke Street East and Cedar Street North and Route 8 will be detoured along King Street East and Cameron Street. During Stage 2, Route 1 will be unaffected and Route 8 will be detoured along Cameron Street North, East Avenue and Borden Avenue.

Four other GRT routes cross Weber Street at the Queen Street or Frederick Street intersections. These four routes are Routes 4, 8 (Franklin/East), 15 and 23. It will be a condition of the contract that one of the Queen Street or Frederick Street intersections must remain open.
to cross traffic at all times to accommodate these routes crossing through the construction area. During Stage 1 construction in 2017 therefore, these four routes will be affected and will require a short detour routing via Duke Street, Queen Street and Otto Street or Duke Street, Frederick Street and Otto Street.

Please refer to the display boards at the PCC to review the proposed bus detour routes that will be put in place during the two years of construction.

11. Are Any Heritage Resources Impacted by this project?

Heritage resources, including buildings, can be designated or listed under the Ontario Heritage Act. Please refer to Appendix 'D' for definitions of the various heritage classifications under the Ontario Heritage Act. The Project Team has identified that there are no designated properties, 16 municipally registered/listed properties and 25 pre-1900 residential properties adjacent to Weber Street within the project limits. Construction related to the Weber Street Reconstruction will be confined to the public right-of-way and is therefore not expected to adversely impact any abutting properties, including municipally registered or listed heritage properties.

The Regional Heritage Planning Advisory Committee and the City of Kitchener Heritage Committee will be circulated detailed project information and will be providing heritage related comments as the project moves through design stages.

12. What About Dust Control During Construction?

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

13. What About Garbage Collection And Recycling During Construction?

The Contractor performing the work on this reconstruction project will collect all the garbage and recycling on a weekly basis and transfer it to a location out of the construction zone for pick up. The homeowner or tenant will be asked to label all recycling bins and garbage cans with their address so that they can be returned to the home owner's property after the recycling and garbage has been picked up each week.

14. What About Working Hours?

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

15. **Can My Existing Water Service Be Upgraded?**

As part of the watermain replacement work, all water services will be replaced to property line. If property owners wish to increase the size of the water service to their property beyond the standard 25mm size (e.g. to achieve increased flow) they are encouraged to have this work included under this project. Undertaking these improvements in conjunction with the proposed construction typically results in cost savings to the property owner as compared to undertaking the work independently at another time in the future. Subject to a mutual agreement between the City of Kitchener and the property owner, existing water services may be approved for an upgrade at the property owner’s expense for the increased size.

If you wish to discuss an increase in the size of your water service to a size greater than the typical new standard of 25mm diameter, please indicate so on your comment sheet. From this information, staff will contact you at a later date to discuss your plans and to provide a cost estimate for your desired improvements.

16. **Can My Existing Sanitary Service Be Upgraded?**

As part of the sanitary sewer replacement work, all sanitary services will be replaced to property line. If property owners wish to increase the size of the sanitary service to their property beyond the standard 100mm size (e.g. to achieve increased flow) they are encouraged to have this work included under this project. Undertaking these improvements in conjunction with the proposed construction typically results in cost savings to the property owner as compared to undertaking the work independently at another time in the future. Subject to a mutual agreement between the City of Kitchener and the property owner, existing sanitary services may be approved for an upgrade at the property owner’s expense for the increased size.

If you wish to discuss an increase in the size of your sanitary service to a size greater than the typical new standard of 100mm diameter, please indicate so on your comment sheet. From this information, staff will contact you at a later date to discuss your plans and to provide a cost estimate for your desired improvements.

17. **What If My Existing Sanitary Service Has Had Previous Back Ups?**

If property owners have had a history of sewer blockages or slow drains this should be communicated to the Project Team on the comment page attached so that the problem can be potentially addressed as part of this project.
18. Will The New Road Result In Increased Noise Due To Traffic?

As the project is reconstructing the already existing 4 lanes of roadway, the Project Team does not expect any increase in noise levels from traffic. In fact, improvements to the asphalt pavement compared to the existing irregular and cracked surface will tend to decrease vehicular noise levels after reconstruction.

19. Will The Posted Speed Limit Be Increased?

The Region will retain the existing posted speed limit of 50 km/hr on this section of Weber Street following construction.

20. What Is The Estimated Cost Of This Project And How Will It Be Funded?

The preliminary estimated cost of the project is broken down as follows:

Region of Waterloo (roadway, portion of storm sewer, sidewalk, traffic control upgrades) $4,000,000

City of Kitchener (watermains, sanitary sewer, portion of storm sewer) $1,200,000

Total Estimated Project Cost $5,200,000

There is no direct cost to the residents on Weber Street, unless water, sanitary or storm service upgrades are requested as detailed in Sections 13 and 14.

21. What Are The Next Steps Before Finalizing The Design?

Prior to finalizing the project design, we are asking for the public's input on the proposed improvements. This Public Consultation Centre is your opportunity to ask questions, provide suggestions and voice any concerns.

22. When Will A Final Decision Be Made For This Project?

The Project Team will be reviewing the public comments received from today's Public Consultation Centre and using them as input for confirming the Final Recommended Design for this project. It is anticipated that this Final Recommended Design will be presented to Regional Planning and Works Committee and Council in early 2015 for ultimate project approval. In advance of these meetings, the Final Recommended Design will be communicated via mail out to all adjacent property owners and tenants as well as all public specifically registering or submitting a comment sheet at the June 25, 2014 Public Consultation Centre. Any members of the public who wish to make a further comment on the Final Recommended Design will have
the opportunity to do so at the Planning and Works Committee Meeting in early 2015. The project would then proceed to detailed design for construction in 2017 and 2018.

23. How Can I Voice My Comments At This Stage?

In order to assist us in addressing any comments or concerns you might have regarding this project, we ask that you please fill out the attached comment sheet and leave it in the box provided at the registration table. Alternatively, you can mail, fax or e-mail your comments to the Region of Waterloo no later than July 9, 2014.

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

Mr. Jerry Borovicka, C.E.T.
Project Manager, Design and Construction  Telephone:  519-575-4092
Regional Municipality of Waterloo  Facsimile:  519-575-4430
150 Frederick Street  Email: jborovicka@regionofwaterloo.ca
APPENDIX B

TYPICAL SECTION
(FROM QUEEN STREET TO BORDEN AVENUE)
Appendix D

Cultural Heritage Definitions

**Designated Properties – Protected from demolition and other adverse impacts**

A designation confers a legal status on a property by a specific municipal by-law under the Ontario Heritage Act. Designation may fall under one of two categories under the Ontario Heritage Act: Part IV (individual designation) or Part V (district designation). Designation is an Area Municipal responsibility. The Area Municipal Council has the legal authority to refuse an application that will adversely affect the property's heritage attributes.

**Municipally Registered/Listed Properties – Interim protection from demolition**

The municipal register is the official list or record of cultural heritage properties that have been identified as being important to the community. The register includes all properties in the municipality that are designated under Part IV (individual designation) and Part V (district designation) of the Ontario Heritage Act. In addition, the municipal register may include properties of cultural heritage value or interest that have not been designated under the Ontario Heritage Act. This is commonly known as “listing.” The Area Municipal Council must be given at least 60 days notice of intention to demolish or remove a building or structure on the property. This allows time for the municipality to decide whether to begin the designation process to give long term protection to the property.

**Pre-1900 Residential Properties – For information**

Residential structures in the project area that were built prior to 1900 have been identified. These identified historic structures have no formal heritage protection. However, historic buildings that have maintained their heritage value could be candidates for further heritage protection. Property data is taken from the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC). The date that is assigned to a property represents the oldest structure on the lot.
Comment Sheet
Regional Municipality Of Waterloo

Weber Street Reconstruction
Queen Street To Borden Avenue

Public Consultation Centre – June 25, 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 July 9, 2014 to:

Mr. Jerry Borovicka C.E.T. 6th Floor, 150 Frederick Street
Project Manager, Kitchener, ON N2J 4G3
Design and Construction Division email: jborovicka@regionofwaterloo.ca
Regional Municipality of Waterloo Facsimile: 519-575-4430

Comments or Concerns regarding this project:

Would you like to have your water service upgraded (partial cost to homeowner) as part of this project? Yes □ No □

Would you like to have your sanitary service upgraded (partial cost to homeowner) as part of this project? Yes □ No □

Does anyone in your home have any physical/medical disabilities? Yes □ No □
if yes please explain special needs required

Which Bus Detour Route would you prefer during Stage 2 construction activities?
Option 1 □ Option 2 □

Other Comments:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Name: __________________________________________________________

Address: __________________________________________________________

Postal Code: ____________________________

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.
Regional Municipality of Waterloo

King Street Improvements
Bishop Street to Eagle Street
City of Cambridge

Information Package

Public Consultation Centre

Wednesday June 18, 2014
4:30 P.M. to 8:00 P.M.
at
St. Peter’s Lutheran Church
Cambridge

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 Public Consultation Centre.
1. **Why is the Region of Waterloo Undertaking this Project?**

The Region of Waterloo is currently considering improvements to King Street from Bishop Street to Eagle Street in the City of Cambridge. Please refer to Appendix “A” of this Information Package for a Key Plan of the project area. King Street is an arterial roadway under the jurisdiction of the Region of Waterloo. The watermain and sanitary sewer beneath this section of King Street are owned and operated by the City of Cambridge.

This project has been initiated to address the deteriorated roadway and underground infrastructure on this section of King Street. The need for this reconstruction also presents an opportunity to incorporate enhanced facilities for pedestrians and cyclists along this section of King Street.

This project is classified as a Schedule A+ undertaking in accordance with the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment planning process and is pre-approved to proceed to construction provided that appropriate public consultation is undertaken.

2. **Who is Directing the Planning of these Improvements?**

The planning of these infrastructure improvements is being undertaken by a “Project Team” consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo, the City of Cambridge and City of Cambridge Councillor Karl Kiefer. The Region has retained the consulting engineering firm of IBI Group to assist with the planning, design and contract administration of this project.

3. **What is the Purpose of this Public Consultation Centre?**

The public is invited to this Public Consultation Centre (PCC) to:

- review the improvements being considered for this project;
- ask questions of staff from the Region of Waterloo and the City of Cambridge; and
- provide comments and input regarding the planning and design of the improvements being considered.
A Comment Sheet is attached to the back of this Information Package. Interested members of the public are requested to fill out this Comment Sheet and put it in the box at the Consultation Centre, or send it to the address indicated on the Comment Sheet. All comments received will be considered along with other information received over the course of the project to assist the Project Team in completing the planning and design for this project.

4. **What Improvements are Being Considered?**

The Project Team is considering the following improvements (the “Preferred Design Concept”) to King Street from Bishop Street to Eagle Street to address the deteriorated condition of the pavement and underground infrastructure and to provide other enhancements to the roadway corridor:

- Complete replacement of the pavement structure including new concrete curbs on each side of King Street;
- Replacement of the storm sewers and the City’s watermain and sanitary sewers within the project limits;
- Construction of new 1.60 metre wide on-road cycling facilities on each side of King Street within the project limits;
- Replacement of all sidewalk and widening the sidewalk to at least 1.8 metres;
- Replacement of transit landing pads and installation of concrete pads for future Grand River Transit shelters; and
- Installation of enhanced boulevard landscaping and streetscaping features.

Please refer to Appendix ‘B’ for a drawing of the Project Team’s Preferred Design Concept for King Street.

In developing the Preferred Design Concept, the Project Team considered a number of other design alternatives, including an alternative that incorporated Cycle Tracks (segregated cycling lanes) in lieu of on-road cycling lanes. This alternative was screened out by the Project Team primarily because it requires extensive utility relocations and removal of a significant amount of on-road parking, and has a higher capital cost than the Project Team’s Preferred Design Concept with on-road cycling lanes.
5. How do the Improvements being Considered Relate to the Objectives of the Regional Official Plan, the Regional Transportation Master Plan and the Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines?

The Project Team is planning these improvements to address both the deteriorated roadway and underground infrastructure on King Street as well as to include enhancements to the roadway corridor consistent with Regional Bylaws, policies, plans and practices. The Regional Official Plan gives direction to balance new and retrofitted roads for all modes of transportation including walking, cycling, autos and transit. By considering improvements to cycling, pedestrian and transit facilities on King Street, the planning of this project supports the Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) goals of optimizing our transportation system, promoting transportation choice and supporting sustainable development.

The Region’s Context Sensitive Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines (CDG) is a document approved by Regional Council to guide the planning and design of Regional Roads. The CDG identifies design parameters for desired elements within the road allowance for various roadway classifications. According to the CDG, this section of King Street is a Neighbourhood Connector – Main Street and should be designed to include active transportation modes including walking and cycling. Additionally, the Region’s Active Transportation Master Plan recommends that on-road cycling lanes be included in the reconstruction of this section of King Street.

6. How is On-Road Parking Affected under the Preferred Design Concept?

The Project Team developed the Preferred Design Concept with a view to incorporate new cycling facilities and transit improvements while minimizing the removal of existing on-road parking on King Street. Under the Project Team’s Preferred Design Concept, twenty-four (24) of the existing two hundred and sixteen (216) existing on-road parking spaces on King Street would be removed in order to accommodate the proposed transit improvements, streetscape improvements and on-road cycling lanes on each side of King Street. The twenty-four (24) existing on-road parking spaces that would be removed under the Preferred Design Concept are located as follows:
As part of the planning for this project, the Project Team surveyed the usage of on-road parking on King Street within the project limits. This survey was completed over a six-day period in June 2013 (Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays) between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM. The results of this study are summarized in Appendix ‘C’.

On-road parking is more heavily used between Dover Street and Lowther Street. Although less than half of the available spaces are used on average, there are certain peak times when available spaces are limited. The Project Team’s Preferred Design Concept minimizes the number of on-road parking spaces eliminated between Dover Street and Lowther Street.

On average, on-road parking is not extensively used between Lowther Street and Bishop Street. Average usage is less than 30%, and peak usage does not exceed 75%.

Based on this survey, the Project Team believes that a sufficient number of on-road parking spaces will remain available along the King Street corridor under the Preferred Design Concept to accommodate the observed parking demand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block along King Street</th>
<th>Existing Number of Spaces</th>
<th>Number of spaces to be removed under the Preferred Design Concept</th>
<th>Remaining number of spaces under the Preferred Design Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bishop to Chestnut</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut to Montrose</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montrose to Union</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union to Dolph</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolph to Lowther</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowther to Church</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church to Westminster</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster to Argyle</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyle to Waterloo</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo to Dover</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. **How will the Proposed Improvements Enhance the Pedestrian Environment on this Project?**

All existing sidewalk within the project limits will require removal due to the reconstruction of the road, sewers and watermain. Where the existing sidewalk is less than 1.8m in width, it will be replaced with sidewalk that is a minimum of 1.8m in width to provide increased space for all pedestrians including wheelchair users. Raised tactile domes will also be provided at all intersection sidewalk ramps to assist visually impaired pedestrians. Additionally, the proposed landscape and streetscape enhancements will result in a more pedestrian friendly environment.

8. **Will Property be Required from Abutting Owners?**

During the early planning stages of this project, the Project Team retained an Ontario Land Surveyor to undertake a comprehensive search of all existing property boundaries along King Street from Bishop Street to Eagle Street. This search revealed that there are a number of existing locations along this section of King Street where existing sidewalks are partially or wholly located on privately-owned property rather than within the Region’s road allowance.

It is in the best interest of both the Region and abutting property owners to ensure that all public roadway elements (including sidewalks) are situated within the Region-owned public right-of-way for King Street. Accordingly, the Region intends to purchase these sections of properties from abutting property owners as part of this project. Additionally, there are four (4) small strips of additional property that the Region would need to acquire to undertake the proposed improvements to King Street.

Following Council approval of the Preferred Design Concept, Regional Real Estate staff will contact the affected property owners to discuss the necessary property acquisitions. It is the Region’s standard practice to negotiate agreements of purchase and sale with the affected property owner based on an independent appraisal of the land’s fair market value. If agreements cannot be reached in time to meet the project schedule, the Region may acquire the needed lands through Expropriation. For further information, please see the Property Acquisition Process Information Sheet in Appendix ‘D’. A detailed list of the properties affected and the size of the proposed property taking is included in Appendix ‘E’.
9. Are any Heritage Resources Impacted by the Improvements?

Heritage resources, including buildings, can be designated or listed under the Ontario Heritage Act. Please refer to Appendix ‘F’ for definitions of the various heritage classifications under the Ontario Heritage Act. The Project Team has identified 4 designated properties, 16 municipally listed properties and 37 pre-1900 residential properties adjacent to King Street within the project limits. Construction of the proposed improvements will be confined to the roadway corridor and is therefore not expected to adversely impact any abutting properties, including designated or listed heritage properties.

The Regional Heritage Planning Advisory Committee and the City of Cambridge Heritage Committee has been circulated detailed project information and will be providing heritage related comments as the project moves through the public consultation and design stages.

Additionally, under the Region’s Scenic Roads and Special Character Streets Resource Document, this section of King Street has been identified as Very Scenic. This Resource Document provides guidelines to preserve the scenic nature of the road and is being used in the design of King Street. The Project Team has considered these guidelines in developing the Preferred Design Concept for the proposed improvements to King Street and believes that the improvements proposed maintain and enhance the scenic character of this section of King Street.

10. How will Private Property, Trees, Driveways and Lawns be Affected?

Construction will be confined to the Region’s road allowance (following the Region’s acquisition of property from abutting owners as described above). Disturbed driveways, lawns and boulevard areas will be fully restored to preconstruction conditions or better. Driveways will be regraded as necessary to blend smoothly with the reconstructed roadway.

As part of the improvements, drainage improvements, such as new boulevard catch basins, will be provided as appropriate in order to improve drainage of boulevard areas.

11. What Landscaping and Streetscaping Features are Proposed?

Under the cost-sharing arrangement between the Region and the Area Municipalities, the Region is generally responsible for basic landscaping and
streetscaping elements such as boulevard treatments and trees. The Area Municipality is generally responsible for the cost of additional landscaping and streetscaping features such as benches, planter boxes, decorative street lighting and similar features.

For this project, the City has undertaken a separate study to develop a plan for enhanced landscape and streetscape features along King Street, including consideration of street trees, gateway entrance features, planting beds, benches, bike rings, garbage receptacles, way finding signs, and decorative street lighting. The City’s study has been finalized and has been approved in principle by City Council (but remains subject to final budget approval). Subject to the City approving funding for enhanced boulevard landscaping and streetscaping on King Street, the Region will include the approved landscaping and streetscaping features in the King Street reconstruction project. The plans presented at this Public Consultation Centre show the City’s proposed landscaping and streetscaping features for this section of King Street.

It is expected that approximately forty-six (46) trees will have to be removed during construction to accommodate the proposed improvements. All of these trees are located within the Region’s right-of-way and are smaller trees in generally fair to poor condition. The plans presented at this Public Consultation Centre show trees that likely will require removal in order to construct the roadway improvements. As part of the proposed landscape and streetscape improvements, over one hundred (100) new trees would be planted.

12. **When will Construction Occur?**

The reconstruction of King Street between Eagle Street and Bishop Street is currently scheduled to be undertaken in 2017 in the Region’s approved 2014 Transportation Capital Program. Due to the extent of the work, some construction will carry over into 2018. The timing of this project is subject to receipt of all technical and financial approvals, acquisition of required property and final approval of Regional Council.

13. **Can My Existing Water Service be Upgraded?**

If property owners wish to replace their water service from the watermain to the property line with a larger diameter service they are encouraged to have this work included in this project. Undertaking these improvements in conjunction with the proposed construction typically results in cost savings to the property owner as compared to undertaking the work independently at another time in the future.
Subject to a mutual agreement between the City of Cambridge and the property owner, existing water services may be upgraded from the mains under the road to the property line at the property owner’s expense.

Additionally, property owners may wish to consider replacing their water service between the property line and their building at the same time as this construction. If property owners wish to pursue this additional work, please indicate so on the comment sheet and staff will contact you later to discuss how you can make arrangements to have this work completed. The property owner will be responsible for all the costs to replace the water service on private property.

14. Can My Existing Sanitary Service be Upgraded?

If property owners wish to replace their sanitary service from the sewer main to the property line with a larger service they are encouraged to have this work included in this project. Undertaking these improvements in conjunction with the proposed construction typically results in cost savings to the property owner as compared to undertaking the work independently at another time in the future. Subject to a mutual agreement between the City of Cambridge and the property owner, existing sanitary services may be upgraded in size from the sanitary sewers under the road to the property line at the property owner’s expense.

Additionally, property owners may wish to consider replacing their sanitary service between the property line and their building at the same time as this construction. If property owners wish to pursue this additional work, please indicate so on the comment sheet and staff will contact you later to discuss how you can make arrangements to have this work completed. The property owner will be responsible for all the costs to replace the sanitary service on private property.

15. How will Traffic and Access to Properties be Accommodated during Construction?

Two-way traffic will be maintained along King Street throughout the construction, with one lane of traffic in each direction provided at most times, although traffic may be restricted to one lane with two-way traffic maintained via flagging operations for short periods. In order to maintain one lane of traffic in each direction, the existing parking lane would be utilized to convey through traffic. To mitigate the temporary loss of on-street parking during construction (due to the
conversion of the existing parking lane to a through lane), two measures will be implemented:

a) Construction will be completed in stages so that the extent of on-street parking temporarily removed is minimized; and

b) Signage will be provided to direct patrons of businesses along King Street to nearby municipal parking lots.

While detailed construction staging plans have not yet been developed, it is anticipated that construction would be completed in either three or four stages. A detailed construction staging plan will be developed during the detailed design stage of this project and area property owners will be provided with details of the construction timing, staging and traffic management plans well in advance of construction.

Emergency Services, Grand River Transit service, pedestrian access and local driveway access will be maintained during construction, although short-term disruptions to driveways will be required occasionally as work occurs immediately adjacent to the driveway.

16. What About Garbage Collection And Recycling During Construction?

The Contractor performing the work on this reconstruction project will collect all the garbage and recycling on a weekly basis and transfer it to a location out of the construction zone for pick up. The homeowner or tenant will be asked to label all recycling bins and garbage cans with their address so that they can be returned to the home owner’s property after the recycling and garbage has been picked up each week.

17. What is the Estimated Cost of this Project and How will it be Funded?

The Region of Waterloo is funding the roadworks portion of this project from its Roads Rehabilitation Reserve Fund. The estimated cost of the proposed roadworks including road reconstruction, new sidewalk, on-road cycling facilities, as well as driveway and boulevard restoration, is approximately $6,300,000. The City of Cambridge is funding the costs for the enhanced landscaping/streetscaping work, sanitary sewer and watermain replacement as well as a share of the storm sewer replacement at a total estimated cost of $3,600,000.
18. **What are the Next Steps for this Project?**

Prior to finalizing the preliminary design of this project for Regional Council’s approval, the Project Team is asking for the public’s input on the improvements being considered. This Public Consultation Centre is your opportunity to ask questions, provide suggestions, and make comments. The Project Team will use the comments obtained from the public during this Public Consultation Centre to refine the proposed design in conjunction with other technical data.

19. **When will a Decision be made on the Improvements to be Included in this Project?**

The Project Team will review the public comments received from this Public Consultation Centre and use them as input for identifying a Recommended Design for the King Street Reconstruction Project. The Recommended Design will be presented to Region of Waterloo Planning and Works Committee and Council in late 2014 for approval. In advance of this meeting, letters will be sent to all adjacent property owners and tenants (as well as to all members of the public specifically registering at this Public Consultation Centre) so that anyone wishing to speak to Committee or Council about this project can do so before final approval.

20. **How will I Receive Further Notification Regarding this Project?**

Adjacent property owners and members of the public registering at this Public Consultation Centre will receive all forthcoming public correspondence, and will be notified of any future meetings.

21. **How can I Provide my Comments?**

In order to assist the Project Team in addressing any comments or concerns you might have regarding this project, we ask that you fill out the attached Comment Sheet and leave it in the comment box provided at the registration table. Alternatively you can mail, fax or e-mail your comments to the Project Team member listed below, no later than Friday, June 27, 2014.
We thank you for your involvement and should you have any questions or concerns please contact:

Mr. Dave Brown, C.E.T.  
Project Manager  
Region of Waterloo  
150 Frederick Street, 6th Floor  
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3  
Telephone: (519) 575-4757 x3686  
Fax: (519) 575-4430  
Email: DaBrown@regionofwaterloo.ca

Mr. Kelly Cobbe, P.Eng.  
Project Manager  
IBI Group  
410 Albert Street, Suite 101  
Waterloo, ON N2L 3V3  
Telephone: (519) 585-2255  
Fax: (519) 585-2269  
Email: kcobbe@ibigroup.com

22. **How can I view project information following the PCC?**

All of the PCC display materials and other relevant project information, notifications of upcoming meetings and contact information are available for viewing at the Region of Waterloo municipal office as identified above. Alternatively, you may visit the Region’s website at www.regionofwaterloo.ca.
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Key Plan
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Preferred Design Concept
Appendix C

Existing Parking Usage Study

Parking usage percentages for on-street parking on King Street are shown as an average or peak usage per 30 minute time interval between the hours of 7am and 7pm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block along King Street</th>
<th>Weekday Usage (Tue/Thur)</th>
<th>Weekend Usage (Saturday)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily Average (7am to 7pm)</td>
<td>Peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover Street to Waterloo Street</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Street to Argyle Street</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyle Street to Westminster Drive</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Drive to Church Street</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Street to Lowther Street</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowther Street to Dolph Street</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolph Street to Union Street</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Street to Montrose Street</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montrose Street to Chestnut Street</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Street to Bishop Street</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</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 and final design is near completion, 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 completion of 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.
## Location of Proposed Property Acquisitions

### Waterloo Street North To Dover Street North

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Area (m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(West) 417 King St East</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West) 435 King St East Public Library</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West) 451 King St East</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West) 458 King St East</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West) 457 King St East</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West) 465 King St East</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Argyle Street North To Waterloo Street North

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Area (m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(West) 507, 531 King St East</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>179.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West) 553 King St East</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West) 567 King St East (Canadian International Bank Of Commerce)</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Westminster Street North To Argyle Street North

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Area (m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(East) 620 King St East</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(East) 626, 632 King St East</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(East) 634 King St East</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(East) 638 King St East</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(East) 640 King St East</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(East) 644, 648 King St East</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Westminster Street North To Argyle Street North

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Area (m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(East) 650 King St East</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(East) 652, 654 King St East</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(East) 658, 660 King St East</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(East) 668 King St East</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West) 615 King St East (Central Park)</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>143.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West) 637 King St East (Royal Bank Of Commerce)</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West) 639, 641 King St East</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West) 645, 647 King St East</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West) 649, 653, 657 King St East</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West) 699 King St East (Toronto Dominion Bank)</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Church Street North To Westminster Street North

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Area (m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(East) 704, 706, 708, 710 King St East</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(East) 718, 720 King St East</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(East) 728 King St East</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(East) 730 King St East</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(East) 736 King St East</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(East) 742 King St East</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(East) 744, 746 King St East</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(East) 750, 752, 754 King St East</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(East) 756, 758, King St East</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(East) 764, 766, 768, 770, 772, 774, 776, 778, 780 King St East</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Street North To Westminster Street North</td>
<td>Length (m)</td>
<td>Width (m)</td>
<td>Area (m2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West) 703, 705 King St East</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West) 707, 709 King St East</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West) 717 King St East</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West) 721 King St East</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West) 727, 729 King St East</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West) 731 King St East</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West) 739 King St East</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West) 741, 743, 745 King St East</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West) 749 King St East</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West) 753, 755, 757 King St East</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West) 769 King St East</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lowther Street To Church Street North</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Area (m2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(East) 840, 842, 844, 846, King St East</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(East) 856, 858, 860, 862, 864, 866, 868 King St East</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>102.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West) 807 King St East (Bank Of Montreal)</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West) 825, 827, 829, 833 King St East</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>83.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West) 837 King St East</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West) 839, 841, 843, 845, 847, 849, 851, 853, 855 King St East</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>106.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West) 863 King St East (Canada Post)</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolph Street North To Lowther Street North</td>
<td>Length (m)</td>
<td>Width (m)</td>
<td>Area (m²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(East)916 King St East (Abandoned KFC Restaurant)</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(East)930 King St East</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(East)938, 940, 942, 950 King St East</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(East)953 King St East</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(East)960 King St East</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(East)986 King St East</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(East)1030, King St East</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West)901, 903, 905, 907, 909 King St East</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West)854, 852, 995, 997, 999, 1001, 1003, 1005, King St East</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West)1025 King St East</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West)1037 And 1035 King St East</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union Street North To Dolph Street North</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Area (m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(West)1145 King St East (LCBO)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Montrose Street North To Union Street North</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Area (m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(West)1273 King St East</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West)1257 King St East</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(West)1251 King St East</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chestnut St North To Montrose St North</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Area (m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut St North To Montrose St North</td>
<td>Length (m)</td>
<td>Width (m)</td>
<td>Area (m²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bishop Street North To Chestnut St North</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Area (m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Currently Identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Currently Identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Cultural Heritage Definitions

Designated Properties – Protected from demolition and other adverse impacts

A designation confers a legal status on a property by a specific municipal by-law under the Ontario Heritage Act. Designation may fall under one of two categories under the Ontario Heritage Act: Part IV (individual designation) or Part V (district designation). Designation is an Area Municipal responsibility. The Area Municipal Council has the legal authority to refuse an application that will adversely affect the property's heritage attributes.

Municipally Registered/Listed Properties – Interim protection from demolition

The municipal register is the official list or record of cultural heritage properties that have been identified as being important to the community. The register includes all properties in the municipality that are designated under Part IV (individual designation) and Part V (district designation) of the Ontario Heritage Act. In addition, the municipal register may include properties of cultural heritage value or interest that have not been designated under the Ontario Heritage Act. This is commonly known as “listing.” The Area Municipal Council must be given at least 60 days notice of intention to demolish or remove a building or structure on the property. This allows time for the municipality to decide whether to begin the designation process to give long term protection to the property.

Pre-1900 Residential Properties – For information

Residential structures in the project area that were built prior to 1900 have been identified. These identified historic structures have no formal heritage protection. However, historic buildings that have maintained their heritage value could be candidates for further heritage protection. Property data is taken from the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC). The date that is assigned to a property represents the oldest structure on the lot.

Scenic Roads – Identified as possessing cultural value and require additional design consideration

Certain transportation corridors are characterized by natural, cultural heritage and recreational features that contribute to their scenic value or special character. Area municipalities are responsible for the designation of those municipal roads that possess scenic or cultural value. Likewise, the Region has identified sections of Regional road corridors that are considered scenic. The Special Character Streets and Scenic Roads Resource Document is a supplement to the Implementation Guidelines for Regional Transportation Corridor Design. It identifies and provides recommendations for the
treatment of Scenic Roads and Special Character Streets that are part of the Regional road system within the Region of Waterloo. These recommendations should be considered before undertaking any work on a road that has been identified as possessing scenic value.
Comment Sheet

Regional Municipality of Waterloo

King Street Improvements

Bishop Street to Eagle Street

City of Cambridge

Please complete and hand in this sheet so that your comments 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 Friday, June 27, 2014 to:

Mr. Dave Brown, C.E.T. Mr. Kelly Cobbe, P.Eng.
Project Manager Project Manager
Region of Waterloo IBI Group
150 Frederick Street, 6th Floor 410 Albert Street, Suite 101
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3 Waterloo, ON N2L 3V3
Telephone: (519) 575-4757 x3686 Telephone: (519) 585-2255
Fax: (519) 575-4430 Fax: (519) 585-2269
Email: DaBrown@regionofwaterloo.ca Email: kcobbe@ibigroup.com

Comments or concerns regarding this project:

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________


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

Regional Road 17
(Hawkesville Road-Sawmill Road) Reconstruction
King Street to Waterloo-St. Jacobs Tracks

St. Jacobs
Township of Woolwich

Information Package

Public Consultation Centre
Wednesday, June 18, 2014
5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Location:

Calvary United Church
48 Hawkesville Road, St. Jacobs

There is a Comment Sheet at the back of this package. If you wish, please fill it out and deposit it in the designated box provided at this Information Centre.
1. What Is The Purpose Of This Public Consultation Centre?

The Region of Waterloo plans to reconstruct Regional Road 17 (Hawkesville Road – Sawmill Road) in the community of St. Jacobs in 2017 from King Street westerly to the Waterloo-St. Jacobs railway crossing for a total combined distance of approximately 725 metres. Please refer to Appendix A for a keyplan of the Project Area.

The proposed improvements on Regional Road 17 are considered a Schedule “A” undertaking in accordance with the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment document. This means the project is pre-approved to proceed provided that appropriate public consultation is conducted.

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

1. Review the proposed designs for Regional Road 17.

2. Ask questions of staff from the Region of Waterloo, and the Township of Woolwich.

3. Provide any comments you may have on the design under consideration.

We kindly request that you fill out the Comment Sheet attached to the back of this Information Package and place it in the box at this PCC or send it to the address indicated on the Comment Sheet by Wednesday, July 2, 2014. Your comments will be considered by the Project Team in conjunction with all other relevant information in confirming the proposed design for road improvements to Regional Road 17.

2. What Improvements Are Proposed On Regional Road 17?

Proposed roadway improvements for Regional Road 17 include:

- Full reconstruction of Regional Road 17 from King Street west to Northside Drive, south to Hawkesville Road, and west along Hawkesville Road to the United Calvary Church, including storm sewer installation, curb and gutter, sidewalks, on-road cycling/buggy lanes, and water and sanitary sewer system improvements where deemed necessary by the Township of Woolwich;

- Full reconstruction of Regional Road 17 to a rural cross section, from the United Calvary Church west to the Waterloo-St. Jacobs railway crossing, including drainvage improvements and on-road cycling/buggy lanes;

- Utility relocation where necessary, to accommodate these improvements.

Construction on this project is planned for the spring to fall period of 2017.
3. **Who Is Directing This Project?**

This project is being directed by a Project Team consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo and the Township of Woolwich, and Township of Woolwich Councillor Mark Bauman.

4. **Why Are We Considering Road Improvements?**

There are a number of needs driving this project. The following sections describe these needs and how the Preferred Design would address these needs:

**Deteriorated Road Condition**

The pavement condition on many sections of Regional Road 17 is fair to poor. In general, the deterioration is simply due to the age of the asphalt combined with areas of poor roadway drainage. As part of this project, the existing asphalt would be fully replaced to provide an improved riding surface and minor adjustments would be made to the roadway grading to improve drainage.

**Curb and Gutter**

Curb and gutter currently only exists at the corners of a couple of intersections along Northside Drive. The remaining roadway sections vary from fully paved shoulders, to partial paved shoulders, to granular shoulders, and some with no edge treatment.

The proposed design would provide curb and gutter within all of the village limits and a granular shoulder outside the village limits. The proposed curb and gutter is proposed to improve the collection of storm water runoff, and to better define the edge of the roadway. Aesthetics would be improved along the roadway as the curb and gutter will delineate the roadway from the boulevard area and allow for various boulevard treatments including, impressed concrete, or grassed boulevards (with trees where space permits) to enhance the overall streetscape.

**Pedestrian Needs**

Currently, there is no sidewalk along Regional Road 17. Sidewalk will be constructed as part of this project to provide continuous pedestrian facilities along both sides of Hawkesville Road within the village limits, along both sides of Northside Drive, and along the south side of Sawmill Road towards King Street.

**Snow removal on all sidewalks is the responsibility of the abutting landowners as per Township of Woolwich By-Law 55-2009.**

**Cycling and Horse and Buggy Needs**

Regional Road 17 is designated as a core on-road cycling route in the Regional Active Transportation Master Plan. To accommodate cyclists, it is proposed that
the reconstruction of Regional Road 17 include a reserved lane for cycling (1.5 metres in width) in both directions throughout the project limits.

The 1.5m space for cyclists is also available for use by horse and buggy traffic and would be designated as a reserved cycling/buggy facility. A standard buggy measures 1.54 metres (5 feet) in width and there are some larger buggies that are wider than 1.54 metres. It is recognized that the buggies would have to encroach slightly into the driving lane but the 1.5 metre cycling/buggy lane width is considered appropriate in that it would discourage parking on the dedicated cycling/buggy lane. The use of a cycling/buggy lane wider than 1.5 metres might encourage car parking in the lane area which would reduce the effectiveness and safety for cyclists and buggies.

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

**Storm Sewer**

There are currently no existing storm sewers along Regional Road 17. Rainwater run off is directed into various ditches and culverts. It is proposed to install new storm sewers and associated catch basins within the village limits of the project to provide improved collection and discharge of road drainage.

During installation of the storm sewer, any existing private drains that are encountered during the construction will be reconnected to the new storm sewer provided they conform to the Region of Waterloo’s Sewer Use By-Law. Under Regional By-Law Number 1-90 (Sewer Use By-Law), private connections are permitted to storm sewers if the discharges meet the quality criteria as outlined in Section 7 of the By-Law.

**Note:**

*If residents are aware of private storm sewer connections from their property to either the existing storm sewers or the existing road ditches (i.e. sump pump discharges, foundation drains etc.) you are encouraged to make this information known to the Region’s Project Manager so that by-law conformance can be confirmed well in advance of construction.*

**Lighting**

Existing lighting within the project limits will be reviewed to ensure it meets current Region standards. It is not anticipated that there will be any major changes, additions or in-fills to the existing lighting.
5. **Will A New Watermain Or Sanitary Sewer Be Included In This Work?**

At this time, the replacement of the existing watermain or sanitary sewer is not needed or planned as part of this project; however the Township of Woolwich has requested that the water services be replaced to the property line.

If property owners wish to increase the size of the water service to their property beyond the standard 25mm size (e.g. to achieve increased flow) they are encouraged to have this work included under this project. Undertaking these improvements in conjunction with the proposed construction typically results in cost savings to the property owner as compared to undertaking the work independently at another time in the future. Subject to a mutual agreement between the Township of Woolwich and the property owner, existing water services may be approved for an upgrade at the property owner’s expense for the increased size.

**If you wish to discuss an increase in the size of your water service to a size greater than the typical new standard of 25mm diameter, please indicate so on your comment sheet.** From this information, staff will contact you at a later date to discuss your plans and to provide a cost estimate for your desired improvements.

The Township of Woolwich is undertaking a camera inspection of the existing sanitary sewer to determine if repairs are necessary. The necessary repairs would be incorporated into this project.

**Note:**

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

6. **How Does This Project Address The Region Of Waterloo’s Transportation Master Plan?**

The Regional Official Plan gives direction to balance new and retrofitted roads for all modes of transportation including walking, cycling, autos and transit. In addition Regional Council also approved the Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) and the Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines that support the integration of active and sustainable transportation on Regional Roads. This project supports the RTMP goals of optimizing our transportation system, promoting transportation choice, supporting sustainable development.
and fostering a strong economy. This project includes facilities for all modes of transportation by providing new sidewalks and on-road cycling/buggy lanes.

7. **Is Any Private Property Required To Complete The Work?**

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

8. **When Will Construction Occur?**

Following this PCC, the Project Team will be compiling the public comments and if necessary holding a subsequent Public Input Meeting before making a final recommendation to Regional Council for project approval early in 2015.

Following project approval, detailed design will be completed and utility relocations undertaken. Construction tenders are scheduled for early 2017 and the earliest construction start would be Spring 2017.

Immediately prior to construction, another Public Information Centre will be held to provide more information on specific construction details and timing. The following sections (13–19) provide a summary of some of the more common construction questions that arise.

9. **Will The Roads Be Closed And Will There Be Detours?**

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

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

As is customary when any Regional Road detours are required, motorists will be advised of the construction timing and traffic restrictions through advance signage and on the Region’s web site.
10. **How Will Access Be Maintained To Properties During Construction?**

During the construction, access to private driveways will be over temporary gravel surfaces and will be maintained at all times to the greatest extent possible. The Contractor will, however, be required to temporarily block access into and out of all driveways on Regional Road 17 and side streets when completing any deep excavations or concrete pours (for curb and sidewalks) across each driveway/side street. Where a disruption to a residential driveway is expected, the Contractor will be required to hand-deliver a notice at least 48 hours in advance advising you of the time and duration of the driveway disruption.

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

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

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

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

**Pedestrian Access**

Pedestrian access will be maintained on at least one side of Regional Road 17 for the duration of the construction. Where the pedestrian area is close to deep excavations, it will be separated from the work area by plastic fencing. Pedestrians may be required to cross Regional Road 17 at mid-block locations on some occasions to use the opposite side of the street.
11. **How Will Trees, Driveways And Lawns Be Affected?**

It is expected that a number of trees will have to be removed during construction to accommodate the proposed improvements. The plans presented at the Public Consultation Centre show trees that likely will require removal as well as additional tree planting being considered. In addition to all new boulevard trees to enhance the streetscape, it is the Region’s practice to plant two replacement trees for each tree removed as a result of any road projects.

There will be some work required at private driveways and front yards to tie into new curb and gutter and sidewalk. Restoration to driveways will be done using materials which match those which are existing (asphalt will be replaced with asphalt, etc). However, all driveway aprons (portion between sidewalk and curb) will be completed in concrete.

Any grassed areas disturbed during construction will be repaired to equal or better condition with topsoil and sod.

12. **How Will Garbage / Recycling Be Collected During Construction?**

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

13. **What About Dust During Construction?**

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

14. **Will There Be Any Impacts To The Natural Environment?**

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

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

16. **Will The Posted Speed Limit Be Increased?**

The Region will retain the existing posted speed limits of 50 km/hr on Regional Road 17 following construction.

17. **What Is The Estimated Cost Of This Project And How Will It Be Funded?**

The Region of Waterloo is funding the road improvements on this project and the total budget for the Region’s share of the proposed Regional Road 17 improvements is $1,985,000.

18. **When Will Final Decisions Be Made For This Project?**

Prior to finalizing the final recommended design concept for Regional Road 17 for Regional Council's approval the Project Team will review the public comments received from this evening’s Public Consultation Centre (and a subsequent Public Input meeting if one is held) and use them as input for recommending a final Design Concept for the Regional Road 17 Reconstruction project. This Final Recommendation will be presented to Regional Planning and Works Committee and Council early in 2015 for approval. In advance of these meetings, letters will be sent to all adjacent property owners and tenants (as well as to all members of the public specifically registering at this Public Consultation Centre) so that anyone wishing to speak to Committee or Council about this project can do so before final approval. Immediately prior to construction, another Information Centre will be held to advise residents and property owners regarding specific construction timing and detour requirements.

19. **How Can I Voice My Comments At This Stage?**

In order to assist us in addressing any comments or concerns you might have regarding this project, we ask that you please fill out the attached Comment Sheet and leave it in the box provided at the registration table. Alternatively, you can mail, fax or e-mail your comments to the Region of Waterloo not later than Wednesday, July 2, 2014.
We thank you for your involvement and should you have any questions or concerns, please contact:

Mr. Jeff Medd, C.E.T.
Project Manager
Regional Municipality of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street, 6th Floor
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3
Phone: 519-575-4757 x3344
Facsimile: 519-575-4430
Email: jmedd@regionofwaterloo.ca
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[Diagram showing a typical cross section of a road, including details such as right of way, traffic lanes, bike lanes, boulevards, sidewalks, and curbs.]
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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 and final design is near completion, 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 completion of 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

Regional Road 17 (Hawkesville Road-Sawmill Road) Reconstruction
St. Jacobs
Township of Woolwich

Public Consultation Centre – June 18, 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 Wednesday July 2, 2014 to:

Mr. Jeff Medd, C.E.T. 6th Floor, 150 Frederick Street
Project Manager, Kitchener, ON N2J 4G3
Design and Construction Division email: jmedd@regionofwaterloo.ca
Regional Municipality of Waterloo Facsimile: 519-575-4430

Do you have drainage issues or special features on your property that the Design Team should be aware of?  □ Yes □ No

Please describe ________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

Are your sump pump discharge or roof leaders piped to the existing storm sewer or road/ditch?  □ Yes □ No

Comment _____________________________________________________________

Do you support the proposed urbanization (curbs & gutters, sidewalks, Boulevards, cycling/buggy lanes)?  □ Yes □ No

Comment _____________________________________________________________

Do you wish to increase, at your expense, the size of your water or sanitary service?  □ Yes □ No

Comment _____________________________________________________________
Comment Sheet
Regional Municipality Of Waterloo

Regional Road 17 (Hawkesville Road-Sawmill Road) Reconstruction
St. Jacobs
Township of Woolwich

Other comments or concerns regarding this project:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Name: __________________________________________
Address: _______________________________________
Postal Code: _____________________________________
Phone Number: ___________________________________

Collection Notice

Personal information requested on this form is collected under the authority of the Municipal Act and will be used to assist the Region of Waterloo in making a decision on this project. Any personal information such as name, address, telephone number, and property location included in a submission from the public may become part of the public record file for this matter. Questions regarding this collection should be forwarded to the staff member indicated above.
To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

From: Paula Sawicki, Manager, Strategic Transportation Planning

Subject: 2014 Canadian Institute of Transportation Engineers and Ontario Traffic Conference Joint Annual Conference – Region of Waterloo

File No: A04-40(A)

The Canadian Institute of Transportation Engineers (CITE) and the Ontario Traffic Conference (OTC) jointly held their annual conference in the Region of Waterloo from June 1 to June 4, 2014. Paula Sawicki was the Local Arrangement Committee Chair. Other Regional staff (Garrett Donaher, Richard Parent) formed the Committee along with staff from the OTC, City of Kitchener and members from the private sector.

This conference is the major annual event for CITE and OTC. In 1977, the first CITE Annual Meeting was held in Ottawa, and on an annual basis, meetings have been held at various locations throughout the country such as Winnipeg, Halifax, Vancouver, and Victoria. Over 340 transportation professional delegates and exhibitors attended the 2014 conference. The prime focus of the event was to exchange technical information through presentations of papers and roundtable discussions. The conference also provided an opportunity for CITE Executive and Board members to get together for the formal meetings of the Canadian District and for networking of delegates.

In an ever-changing world, transportation is a key element in the quality of life in the urban and rural environments and in the lives of citizens. Transportation systems planned, built, and maintained in coordination with area municipal and private partners in city building allow us to create the kind of communities that attract and retain people.
and businesses now and into the future. Sharing professional experiences within the CITE and OTC communities gives transportation professionals the best tools for planning and designing transportation systems. This year's conference theme was innovation, a perfect fit for Waterloo Region known the world over for its culture of innovation. The program that was executed was developed to celebrate and share the work the regional transportation community is doing to advance the field of expertise.

This event created an excellent opportunity to demonstrate to transportation professionals from across the country what the Region of Waterloo has accomplished in community building, including many of our progressive transportation initiatives. Regional and City staff hosted over 150 delegates on tours that included exploring roundabouts, bicycle facilities, LRT planning routes, downtown revitalization areas, airport facilities and our historical and new bridges.

Guest speakers included Regional Chair Ken Seiling, Ian Klugman (Communitech), Jeff Casello (University of Waterloo) and Rod Reiger (City of Kitchener). Each speaker depicted the transportation building blocks our community is putting into place to continue creating a vibrant successful community.

The social program introduced the delegates to the world of Oktoberfest, our German heritage and our community spirit. The Crowne Hotel showed exemplary service in hosting the conference.

Hosting the CITE/OTC conference not only allowed the Region to be seen by hundreds of professionals, it provided an opportunity for many Regional and area municipal staff to attend. Participation at conferences allows interaction with other transportation professionals, builds upon our knowledge base and creates stronger networks to draw experience from to apply to challenges within the Regional transportation system.
Region of Waterloo
Planning Housing and Community Services
Transportation Planning

To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: June 17, 2014
File Code: D28-20
Subject: Pedestrian Access Improvements Environmental Assessment Between the Hanson/Hayward Industrial and Alpine Village Areas - Public Consultation Centre

Recommendation:
For information

Summary:
In January 2013, Regional Council endorsed initiating a Pedestrian Access Improvements Environmental Assessment between the Hanson/Hayward Industrial and Alpine Village Areas (please see report No.P13-009). The Environmental Assessment considers options to improve pedestrian and transit access to the Family Centre, Family and Children’s Services and other destinations in the Hanson/Hayward area.

Many requests and petitions continue to be received for improved transit access to the Family Centre and Family and Children’s Services located within the Hanson/Hayward industrial area off Homer Watson Boulevard. The isolated location of the Hanson Industrial area created a challenge for Grand River Transit (GRT) to service in a cost-effective and efficient manner. The closest stops to the area are over 800 metres away and some roads do not have sidewalks. In 2007, an Engineering Feasibility study was conducted to investigate and design a pedestrian connection between Homer Watson Boulevard and Alpine Court. The proposed connection would have provided pedestrian access between the Hanson/Hayward industrial areas and GRT Route 11 on Kingswood Drive. This connection would improve the access to transit and shorten the walking distance between the Family and Children’s Services and the GRT stop on Kingswood Drive to 525 metres and between
the Family Centre and the GRT stop to 645 metres. As the negotiations to purchase the
required property were not successful and with more requests for access improvements to
transit to the Family Centre, the Region of Waterloo initiated an Environmental Assessment
study to investigate more options to improve pedestrian access to transit between the
Hanson/Hayward industrial and Alpine residential areas.

In order to gain public feedback regarding this project, the Region of Waterloo in
consultation with the City of Kitchener, has planned a Public Consultation Centre for
Tuesday, June 17, 2014 from 4:30-7 p.m. at the Family Centre, 65 Hanson Ave., Kitchener.
Invitations to attend the public consultation centre were distributed to the residents and
businesses within the study area as well as to the stakeholders including, the Family Centre,
Family and Children’s Services, Grand River Accessibility Advisory Committee and
Pedestrian Charter Steering Committee. The invitation was also published in the Record
and Kitchener Post newspapers. The attached information package will be used to share
and seek information from participants during the public consultation centre.

The project team will review the comments received from the public and recommend a final
planning solution for Regional Council’s consideration this summer. The City of Kitchener is
participating in the study.

Report:

In 2007, in order to improve pedestrian and transit access to the Hanson/Hayward industrial
area and in particular to the Family Centre and Family and Children’s Services, the Region
of Waterloo and the City of Kitchener planned and designed a pedestrian connection
between Homer Watson Boulevard and Alpine Court. This connection is located between
the industrial buildings on Alpine Court and the condominium development at 190 and 192
Alpine Rd. The proposed connection would have allowed access for families, children and
youth, employees and volunteers who use the Family Centre and Family and Children’s
Services and are dependant on public transit, to use the existing Grand River Transit (GRT)
Route 11 stop on Kingswood Drive. The proposed connection would also improve
pedestrian and cyclist access between Alpine residential neighbourhood and employment
areas (such as Graybar industry) and recreational facilities (such as Activa Sportsplex) in
the Hanson /Hayward area. The Regional Transportation Master Plan recognizes this gap in
pedestrian access across this area and includes an “Alpine to Hanson Connection” as one
of the areas for further study as part of the Region’s planning for specific pedestrian and
cycling route improvements.

This connection (Attachment A) required the purchase of land from abutting industrial
properties on Alpine Court. The property acquisition negotiations to build this pedestrian
connection were not successful. One of the three landowners said that selling part of his
land would limit the business parking space, snow storage, ability to access the rear loading
dock and potentially affect the business resale value.

Since then, many requests and a petition have been received by the Region to improve transit access to the Family Centre. As a result the Region of Waterloo initiated the Pedestrian Access Improvements Environmental Assessment (EA) between the Hanson/Hayward Industrial and Alpine Village Areas to confirm and evaluate all reasonable options for providing improved transit services in the Hanson/Hayward industrial area.

The project team for this study consists of staff from the Region of Waterloo and the City of Kitchener. IBI Group is the consulting firm that has been retained to assist the Region in conducting the EA.

As part of the study, a Public Consultation Centre (PCC) will be held on June 17, 2014 from 4:30 - 7 p.m. at the Family Centre, 65 Hanson Ave. to present the evaluated options and seek feedback on key opportunities and challenges.

The purpose of this PCC is to provide the opportunity to the public and interested groups to:

- Review the reasons why pedestrian/transit access is desired for the Hanson/Hayward Industrial and Alpine Village
- Consider the evaluated alternatives
- Ask questions of Regional staff, City staff, and consultants from IBI
- Provide comments

The Information Package (attachment B) includes a Comment Sheet that will be used during the public consultation centre to collect the participants’ feedback.

Next Steps:

- Continue to consult with individual property owners and stakeholders.
- Incorporate the comments received from the PCC into developing the preferred option.
- The recommended option would be presented to Regional Council for consideration this summer.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination:

The City of Kitchener is actively participating in the study.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

The Pedestrian Access Improvements Environmental Assessment between the Hanson/Hayward Industrial and Alpine Village Areas supports the Region’s Strategic Focus Area 2 (Growth Management and Prosperity), that relates to developing, optimizing and maintaining infrastructure to meet current and projected needs. Strategic Focus Area 3
(Sustainable Transportation) is also supported by this project. This focus area relates to developing, promoting and integrating active forms of transportation (walking).

**Financial Implications:**

The 2014 Transportation Capital program includes funding allocation of $100,000 for growth related studies, to be funded from Regional Development Charge Reserve fund, including the Pedestrian Access Improvements Environmental Assessment between Hanson/Hayward industrial and Alpine Village Areas. The costs for holding the public consultation centre have been budgeted within this allocation.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Transportation and Environmental Services represented on the project team.

**Attachments:**

Attachment A - Previously Proposed Pedestrian Connection

Attachment B - Pedestrian Access Improvements Environmental Assessment between the Hanson/Hayward Industrial and Alpine Village Areas Information Package

**Prepared By:** Hanan Wahib, Transportation Planning Engineer

**Approved By:** Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Housing and Community Services
Attachment A – Previously Proposed Pedestrian Connection
Region of Waterloo

Public Consultation Centre For

Proposed Pedestrian Access Improvements Class Environmental Assessment between the Hanson/Hayward Industrial and Alpine Village Areas

Information Package

Tuesday, June 17, 2014

Drop-In Anytime: 4:30 p.m. – 7 p.m.

The Family Centre
65 Hanson Ave.
Kitchener, ON

Please fill out the Comment Sheet at the end of this Information Package and place it in the box at this Consultation Centre or send it to the address on the Comment Sheet.
1. Background

In 2007, in an effort to bring pedestrian and transit access to the Hanson/Hayward Industrial area and specifically The Family Centre at 65 Hanson Ave., the Region of Waterloo and the City of Kitchener planned and designed a pedestrian connection from Homer Watson Boulevard to Kingswood Drive. This connection ran between the industrial buildings on Alpine Court and the condominium development at 190 and 192 Alpine Rd. This would allow those wanting to access The Family Centre and dependent on transit to use the existing Grand River Transit (GRT) Route 11 stop on Kingswood Drive at Alpine Road. This stop has seven day a week service and high frequency peak hour service with connections to Forest Glen Plaza and Downtown Kitchener. This connection necessitated the purchase of land from the abutting industrial properties on Alpine Court, but property acquisition negotiations to build this pedestrian connection were not successful.

Since then, many requests and a petition have been received by the Region of Waterloo to improve transit access to the Family Centre. As a result, the purpose of this Environmental Assessment (EA) project is to determine the best way of providing pedestrian and transit access to the Hanson/Hayward Industrial Area, and more specifically the Family Centre. See Appendix A for a map of the resulting study area.

2. Why is Improved Pedestrian Access to Transit Needed for the Study Area?

There are four main reasons why improved pedestrian access to transit is needed for the Hanson/Hayward Industrial and Alpine Village Area:

1. Homer Watson Boulevard between Ottawa Street and Block Line Road is a major arterial road separating two interrelated land use areas. To the west is the well-established Alpine Village Area, with its residential neighbourhood including elementary schools, parks and trails, plus an employment area along Alpine Road. To the east is the Hanson/Hayward Industrial Area with a variety of industrial and business operations plus social services (The Family Centre, Family and Children’s Services), a high school, the Activa Sportsplex and public sports fields. All of these destinations would benefit from improved access to transit.

2. There is no pedestrian access connecting the two areas for the entire 1,300 metre length of Homer Watson Boulevard between Ottawa Street and Block Line Road.

3. The Region of Waterloo’s Active Transportation Master Plan recognizes this gap in pedestrian access across Homer Watson Boulevard. in the study area. It includes an “Alpine to Hanson connection” as one of the areas for further
study as part of the Region’s planning for specific pedestrian and cycling route improvements.

4. As noted above, the Family Centre has requested improved transit access to its operations at 65 Hanson Ave. Improved access to transit is needed in the study area to provide this requested connection for its staff, volunteers, clients and visitors.

3. **What is the Purpose of this Public Consultation Centre?**

The purpose of this Public Consultation Centre is to have interested groups and individuals:

1. Review and comment on the reasons why improved pedestrian access to transit is needed for the Hanson/Hayward Industrial and Alpine Village Area;

2. Consider the access alternatives being evaluated by the Project Team;

3. Ask questions of staff from the Region of Waterloo, City of Kitchener and our consultants from IBI Group; and

4. Provide any comments you may have about the project.

We kindly request that you fill out the Comment Sheet attached to the back of this Information Package and either put it in the Comment Box or send it to the address noted on the Comment Sheet no later than **June 27, 2014**. Your comments will be considered by the Project Team along with all other relevant information to confirm the preferred alternative for this project.

4. **Who is directing the Project?**

A Project Team consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo is directing this project along with staff from the City of Kitchener and consultants from the Waterloo office of IBI Group.

5. **What is an Environmental Assessment (EA)?**

In Ontario, a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) is a planning and decision-making process that must be conducted for public infrastructure projects so that potential environmental effects are considered before a project begins. It also requires consultation with the public and involved stakeholders and agencies. This is the reason why this Public Consultation Centre is being held so that public comments or concerns are heard and considered in the EA.

Pedestrian access improvements being considered in this EA require the preparation of a Schedule ‘B’ EA. This type of EA applies to minor improvements where there is the potential for some adverse environmental impacts (environment meaning the natural, social, cultural and economic environments).
6. The Do Nothing Option

As required by the Municipal Class EA process, the Do Nothing option must be considered and evaluated against other options being considered for a project. In the case of this study, a Do Nothing approach would continue to limit access for residents and employees between the Hanson/Hayward Industrial Area and Alpine Village Area primarily to private cars or to a long walk from existing transit stops. Pedestrian and transit access between the two areas would not be improved, and so a Do Nothing approach is not selected as a preferred approach to this EA study.

7. Pedestrian Connection Options

The following pedestrian access route options are being considered for this EA as shown in Appendix B:

1. Through the Alpine Court industrial park, GRT Route 11
2. Grassed berm between 190/192 Alpine Road and the Alpine Court industrial area, GRT Route 11;
3. Driveway on 190/192 Alpine Road, GRT Route 11;
4. Woodlot behind 190/192 Alpine Road, GRT Route 11;
5. Hydro Line Corridor along Kingswood Drive, GRT Route 11; and
6. Hayward Avenue, GRT Route 8 (off Courtland Avenue on Walton Avenue).

These pedestrian connection options were screened using the following criteria to determine what options could be retained for further consideration in the Environmental Assessment:

- Availability of publically-owned property (i.e. road right-of-way);
- Walking distance to the Family Centre; and
- Proximity to the signalized Homer Watson Boulevard/Hanson Avenue intersection.

The conclusion to date is that the following two pedestrian connection options best respond to these criteria:

**Option #2** – involves a new walkway connection along the grassed berm between 190/192 Alpine Rd and the Alpine Court industrial area. A preliminary design of a walkway connection was prepared for the Region in 2007. It would result in a 645 metre walking distance between the existing GRT Route 11 transit stop at the Kingswood Drive/Alpine Road intersection and The Family Centre. The associated capital cost estimate has been updated to $162,300 in 2014 dollars excluding property acquisition.
This option was identified as an area for further study in the Region of Waterloo Active Transportation Master Plan (February 2014), as it requires the more in-depth study being provided in this EA to plan for specific improvements.

**Option #6** – involves pedestrian improvements along Hayward Avenue between Lennox Lewis Way and Courtland Avenue. This would provide an improved pedestrian connection between The Family Centre along Hayward Avenue and GRT Route 8 off Courtland Ave. The resulting walking distance is approximately 725 metres. As part of the Region’s ION rapid transit, pedestrian improvements planned between the CN rail corridor and Courtland Avenue include construction of a three metre wide multi-use trail on the north side, and a 1.5 metre wide sidewalk on the south side of this Hayward Avenue section.

Pedestrian improvements along Hayward Avenue to the west between the CN rail corridor and Lennox Lewis Way are not included in the ION plan, so they would be an added project. Pedestrian improvements associated with ION rapid transit are not expected to be available for use until 2017 when the ION opens.

8. **Transit Route Modification Options**

Two different types of transit route changes have been considered for this study, being:

1. Changes to existing bus transit routes; and
2. Changes relating to the ION transit stops to be constructed on Courtland Avenue at Block Line Road.

**Existing Conventional Transit Route Modifications** – Routing modifications were considered for each of the following four existing Grand River Transit (GRT) routes operating in the study area as potential ways of providing transit access to serve The Family Centre:

- Route 8 (Walton Avenue and Courtland Avenue);
- Route 11 (Kingswood Drive and Alpine Road);
- Route 12 (Strasburg Road and Block Line Road); and
- Route 22 (Ottawa Street South and Homer Watson Boulevard).

The closest current transit route with pedestrian access to The Family Centre is Route 22 located on Ottawa Street South, a walking distance of approximately 1065 metres. GRT has already determined that Route 22, and the other alternative routes, do not have spare time in their schedule to divert to The Family Centre area. Also consideration was given to creating a new transit route through the industrial park.
However the additional operating costs would be a challenge as this is mostly an industrial area, which typically means fewer transit riders. This is why Regional staff recommended that this EA be conducted to evaluate other ways of improving pedestrian access to transit to the Hanson/Hayward Industrial and Alpine Village areas in Kitchener.

For this EA, GRT has again evaluated modifications to existing transit routes to provide a closer walking distance to transit for the Family Centre and Family and Children’s Services. Factors used in this evaluation included:

- Change to route distance;
- Walking distance to The Family Centre;
- Impact on existing riders;
- Revenue loss; and
- Capital and operating costs.

From this evaluation, it has been determined that changing an existing route would not be recommended by GRT, since this would involve significant impacts to existing riders, potential revenue loss and increased operating costs. On average, for each of the four potential transit route changes listed above, between 110,000 and 120,000 passenger trips yearly would be negatively affected. Each of these major route changes would also require at least one additional bus costing approximately $500,000. Operating expenses of the additional bus would be between $430,000 and $585,000 annually. Therefore, for the purposes of this EA, these four transit route changes have been screened out from further consideration.

**ION Rapid Transit Stops-Related Route Changes** – The other type of possible route change would involve possible route changes associated with the new Courtland Avenue ION rapid transit stop at Block Line Road. GRT believes that this could be a feasible option involving the redesign of routes in the area to integrate with the future station scheduled to be open in 2017. This approach may provide an opportunity to reduce the walking distance to transit for the Family Centre and Family and Children’s Services, but this will not be confirmed until transit route modifications associated with the Courtland/Block Line ION rapid transit stop have been finalized.

7. **When will final decisions be made for these projects?**

The Project Team will review the public comments received from this evening’s Public Consultation Centre and use them as input for recommending a final planning solution. This final recommendation is expected to be presented to the Regional Council for consideration this summer. In advance of that meeting, letters will be sent to all nearby businesses, property owners and tenants (as well as members of
the public who registered at this Public Consultation Centre or project website) so that anyone wishing to speak to Regional Committee or Council about this project can do so before final approval.

8. How can I voice my comments at this time?

In order to assist us in addressing any comments or concerns you might have about this project, please fill out the attached Comment Sheet and leave it in the box provided at the registration table. You can also mail, fax or email your comments to the Region of Waterloo/IBI Group no later than Friday, June 27, 2014. We thank you for your involvement and if you have any questions, please contact:

**Hanan Wahib, P.Eng.**  
Project Manager  
Region of Waterloo  
150 Frederick Street, 8th Floor  
Kitchener, Ontario, N2G 4J3  
Tel: 519-575-4811  
Fax: 519-757-4449  
E-mail: hwahib@regionofwaterloo.ca

**Don Drackley MCP**  
Consultant Manager  
IBI Group  
101-410 Albert Street  
Waterloo, Ontario N2L 3V3  
Tel: 519-585-2255  
Fax: 519-585-2269  
E-mail: ddrackley@ibigroup.com
Appendix A: Study Area
Appendix B: Potential Pedestrian Access Routes
Comment Sheet

Regional Municipality of Waterloo

PUBLIC CONSULTATION CENTRE – June 19, 2014

Proposed Pedestrian Access Improvements Class Environmental Assessment for the Hanson/Hayward Industrial and Alpine Village Area

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

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 sheet home and mail, fax or email your comments by June 27, 2014 to:

Hanan Wahib, P.Eng.
Project Manager
Region of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street, 8th Floor
Kitchener, Ontario, N2G 4J3
Tel: 519-575-4811
Fax: 519-757-4449
E-mail: hwahib@regionofwaterloo.ca

Don Drackley MCP
Consultant Manager
IBI Group
101-410 Albert Street
Waterloo, Ontario N2L 3V3
Tel: 519-585-2255
Fax: 519-585-2269
E-mail: ddrackley@ibigroup.com
QUESTION 1: Would you use public transit if available to access The Family Centre, and more generally to the surrounding Hanson/Hayward Industrial and Alpine Village Area?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

Other comments or concerns regarding access to the Hanson/Hayward Industrial and Alpine Village Area?

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

Demographic Information (Optional)
For purposes of data analysis, please provide your age, gender and interest. This is entirely optional:

☐ Male       ☐ Female
☐ under 19   ☐ 19-34       ☐ 35-44       ☐ 45-54       ☐ 55-64       ☐ 65-74       ☐ 75+

Name: ____________________________________________

Address: ____________________________________________ Postal Code: ______________

Email: ____________________________________________

Thank you for your time and input into this project
Region of Waterloo
Planning, Housing and Community Services
Transportation Planning

To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: June 17, 2014
File Code: D10-40/CMP RAIL
Subject: Cambridge to Milton Passenger Rail Business Case and Implementation Strategy Interim Report

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo endorse the proposed action plan for future rail service to Cambridge, as described in Report P-14-073, dated June 17, 2014.

Summary:
Nil.

Report:

On June 26, 2013, Regional Council approved the 2013 Implementation Plan of the Transit Supportive Strategy to enhance transit ridership in the City of Cambridge. The approved implementation plan included an allocation for a study related to establishing GO Train service to Cambridge. This report provides an update, including discussions with Metrolinx, the Provincial authority that operates GO.

Regional Council previously endorsed the “Cambridge to Greater Toronto Area GO Transit Rail Passenger Feasibility Study” in October 2009. That study estimated a capital cost of $110M to provide the necessary infrastructure improvements supporting an initial service along the Canadian Pacific (CP) mainline (Galt subdivision) via Milton of four morning GO trains to Union Station and four afternoon returning trains. Metrolinx has described this link as a “possible regional rail extension beyond the GTHA”, with no committed funding or schedule at this time.

The current work being jointly undertaken by the City of Cambridge and the Region of Waterloo is focused on evaluating lower cost alternatives for an initial passenger rail
service to Cambridge. The draft business case and implementation strategy report, summarized in Attachment 1, notes that a viable service between Cambridge and Union Station could be provided by conventional 12-car GO trains and/or alternatives involving Diesel Multiple Units (DMUs) from Cambridge that would require passengers to transfer to conventional GO trains at Milton Station. Daily ridership by 2021 for either service is estimated at between 600 and 1,200 people per day, and travel times would be about 90 minutes between Cambridge and Union Station.

The report evaluates the following scenarios:

1. Conventional 12-car GO trains: Two trains would travel from Cambridge to Union Station in the morning, and two trains would travel from Union Station to Cambridge in the afternoon.

2. DMUs: Four DMU trains from Cambridge to Milton in the morning, where passengers could transfer to conventional GO trains to continue to Union Station. In the afternoon, four DMU trains from Milton to Cambridge could pick up passengers transferring from conventional GO trains.

3. Hybrid service: A combination of the above scenarios. In the morning, four trains would leave Cambridge (two conventional GO trains and two DMU trains). Passengers would transfer from the DMU trains to conventional trains in Milton. In the afternoon, two DMU trains would pick up passengers transferring in Milton, while two conventional trains would travel from Union Station to Cambridge.

DMUs, which are self-propelled and can operate as a single unit or coupled together in multiple-unit trains, are an interesting alternative because they offer a number of potential advantages over conventional 12-car GO trains:

- Lower operating costs (reduced energy consumption and onboard staff)
- Faster trip times (improved acceleration/deceleration performance)
- Lower infrastructure costs (shorter platform requirements)
- Reduced impacts in an urban environment (shorter delays at level crossings)
- Greater ability to be integrated with local transit buses in multimodal stations
- Greater reliability in the Cambridge – Union corridor

Metrolinx is acquiring 18 DMUs to provide service between Pearson International Airport and Union Station as part of the UP Express. Since Metrolinx proposes to electrify that line, the DMUs may become available for other applications, such as a pilot service between Cambridge and Milton. The ongoing environmental assessment for electrification of the UP Express is expected to be complete by June 2014.

Based on the foregoing, the study is recommending that the DMU alternative is the most promising way of providing flexible passenger rail service that would meet short-term ridership demand while minimizing capital costs. If future discussions with
Metrolinx or CP revealed resistance to the concept of using DMUs on the line, conventional GO train service would be a feasible alternative.

The report provides cost estimates for the three scenarios ranging from $20M to $89M. These estimates include a variety of work, including potential track and station improvements and costs to purchase vehicles. These numbers are lower than the $110M estimate from the previous 2009 study because the number of proposed stations has been reduced and improvements to the remaining stations have been minimized.

The wide ranges in cost estimates reflect current uncertainty in project elements, such as the need for track improvements and whether DMUs would need to be purchased. Cost estimates would be refined through negotiations with Metrolinx and Canadian Pacific and an environmental assessment conducted by Metrolinx to examine the extension of passenger rail service to Cambridge, similar to the study that was done for the current service to Kitchener.

**Proposed Action Plan**

The current interim study report, the Executive Summary of which is appended as Attachment 1, is to be finalized through further discussions with Metrolinx, CP and other municipalities along the proposed transit corridor. The following action plan is being proposed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Provide approved interim GO Transit Study report to Metrolinx, GO Transit, CP Rail, other municipalities along proposed transit corridor (i.e. Town of Milton, Halton Region, Puslinch, etc.), MPs and MPPs.</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Schedule staff-level meeting with Metrolinx to discuss interim report and receive formal response</td>
<td>August 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Meeting with Mayors/Regional Chairs, MPs and MPPs of Halton Region, the Town of Milton, the City of Cambridge and the Region of Waterloo</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. GO Transit Study report is finalized</td>
<td>November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Request and compile Council resolutions and/or letter of support from stakeholder communities and businesses</td>
<td>November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Request meeting with Minister of Transportation and senior staff</td>
<td>March/April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Final report to be presented to Regional and Cambridge Councils for consideration</td>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination**

Regional staff has worked with City of Cambridge staff throughout this project.
Cambridge staff is planning to bring a report before City Council on Monday, June 23, 2014. Outside the Region, staff from the Town of Milton, Halton Region, the Township of Puslinch and the County of Wellington were consulted.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

The current project will advance Strategic Objective 3.4 (Encourage improvements to intercity transportation services to and from Waterloo Region) through Action 3.4.3 (Advocate for improved rail service to Kitchener and Cambridge).

**Financial Implications:**

The 2013 Implementation Plan of the Transit Supportive Strategy to enhance transit ridership in the City of Cambridge included an allocation of $50,000 for this study.

The Province of Ontario covers the operating subsidy for GO rail service, but generally expects municipalities to contribute one third of GO expansion capital costs. For example, Report P-12-116 (November 6, 2012) describes the Region’s contribution of $1.39 million towards the capital cost of the recently implemented GO train service to Kitchener. These capital costs are not currently budgeted. Pending progress on the Action Plan and future discussions with the Province, the Region will be required to include a contribution in a future Capital Budget and Forecast.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Nil.

**Attachments:**


**Prepared By:** Geoffrey Keyworth, Senior Transportation Planning Engineer

**Approved By:** Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Housing and Community Services
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The City of Cambridge and Region of Waterloo are requesting the Province to initiate GO Train service on the CP line between Milton and Cambridge as quickly as possible.

A Feasibility Study for the extension of commuter rail service to Cambridge was completed in 2009 and determined that the preferred routing option was to extend the current GO Train service from Milton rather than connecting Cambridge to the GO Train service on the north mainline at Guelph. The 2009 Passenger Rail Feasibility Study (2009 Study) includes estimates for capital and operating costs and provides ridership and revenue forecasts for 2021 and 2031 horizon years. The study assumed that the service extension would follow GO Transit’s traditional approach of starting with four peak period trains and increasing peak service in response to demand.

The team of Dillon Consulting Limited and Hatch Mott MacDonald was retained by the City of Cambridge to augment the 2009 Study by developing three additional scenarios that build on the previous work; explore the opportunity to start the train service quickly and with lower investment; test other important transit travel markets and promote a less auto-centric approach to station access and service design.

Scenario 1 starts service with two 12-car GO Trains, no storage yard in Cambridge and three (rather than four) new stations designed for minimal initial costs. While the start-up of service will require negotiation between CP and Metrolinx, this new scenario could be implemented very quickly and is expected to significantly reduce the initial infrastructure expansion requirement.

Metrolinx is acquiring Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU) trains to provide a passenger rail connection from Union Station to Pearson International Airport and these vehicles are designed to be suitable for operation on a freight rail line. This technology which can operate as a self-propelled single vehicle (or as two or three car trains) may provide new and significant commuter transit opportunities when applied more broadly on the GO Rail network. Scenario’s 2 and 3 were designed to use the Cambridge rail service extension to test DMU flexibility, performance, operating cost, customer acceptance, infrastructure requirements and its applicability for specific commuter rail markets. Scenario 2 uses only DMU technology for the Cambridge to Milton rail service and tests a variety of transit travel markets. Scenario 3 uses a blend of DMU vehicles and 12-car trains for the service.

DMUs in the appropriate applications will have some significant advantages over the traditional 12-car trains, including: lower operating costs (reduced energy consumption and crewing); improved acceleration/deceleration performance giving faster trip times; lower infrastructure costs through shorter platform/boarding requirements; reduced physical impacts in an urban environment (e.g. shorter delays at level crossings); greater ability to be integrated with local transit buses and LRT’s in multimodal stations; and improved corridor reliability (e.g. iced switch may only impact DMU section of corridor).

Customer reaction to the DMU’s (including AODA compliance), potential ridership impacts of a ‘train-to-
train’ transfer and a host of scheduling, operational and equipment compatibility issues are potential concerns and will also need to be tested and assessed.

Either through the traditional approach of implementing 12-car trains or by testing promising DMU technology for commuter transit service, residents and employers in Cambridge are seeking the earliest possible implementation of GO Train service. Other municipalities along the full service corridor will also benefit, through new stations, provision of an improved commuter transit service for their residents and employees, and the development of a transit option for regional travel markets.

The close proximity of the CP rail line to the heavily congested Highway 401, combined with the fast and reliable travel times that will be possible for rail commuters on this corridor, suggest a great opportunity for the Province to achieve positive economic and environmental results from the early implementation of GO Train service to Cambridge.

The Table below summarizes the results of the previous business case and the three new scenarios. The significant advantages of applying DMU technology on the GO Rail commuter network, including the opportunity to address more regional travel markets with a high quality transit service, suggest that Scenario 2 would be an excellent application for the Milton to Cambridge service extension.

### Summary of Ridership, Revenue and Costs for GO Train Expansion to Cambridge (2021 Horizon)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Annual Ridership</th>
<th>Annual Revenue</th>
<th>Annual Operating Cost</th>
<th>Capital Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Feasibility Study 4 peak trains*</td>
<td>225,600</td>
<td>415,100</td>
<td>$1.9M</td>
<td>$3.6M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 1 2 peak trains*</td>
<td>142,835</td>
<td>285,559</td>
<td>$1.6M</td>
<td>$3.3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 2 4 DMU trains</td>
<td>134,843</td>
<td>293,144</td>
<td>$1.6M</td>
<td>$3.4M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 3 2 DMU, 7 GO Trains</td>
<td>150,068</td>
<td>301,605</td>
<td>$1.7M</td>
<td>$3.5M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. All Costs in $2009
2. Revenue for new scenarios based on current GO Transit fare schedule
3. Ridership forecast for 2021
Region of Waterloo
Planning Housing and Community Services
Community Planning
Finance
Treasury Services

To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: June 17, 2014
File Code: F25-20
Subject: Brownfields Financial Incentives Program – Tax Increment Grant Application – 83 Elmsdale Drive, City of Kitchener

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions conditional on Novacore Communities Corporation or a related corporation, to the satisfaction of the Region’s Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services, assuming ownership of the property municipally known as 83 Elmsdale Drive from the Corporation of the City of Kitchener and also conditional upon approval of a Tax Increment Grant for 83 Elmsdale Drive by the City of Kitchener, as described in Report P-14-071/F-14-072, dated June 17, 2014:

a) Approve a regional Tax Increment Grant under the joint Regional and Area Municipal program for an amount not to exceed $4,779,103 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 Kitchener; and

c) Authorize the Region’s Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services and the Chief Financial Officer to execute any associated agreements with the registered owner of 83 Elmsdale Drive and the City of Kitchener, with the form and content of such agreement(s) to be satisfactory to the Regional Solicitor.

Summary:

In October 2013, the Region of Waterloo received a joint Tax Increment Grant (TIG) application from the City of Kitchener and Novacore Communities Corporation (the applicants) in regard to the remediation and redevelopment of the property municipally known as 83 Elmsdale Drive in Kitchener. The 4.89 hectare property, which includes frontage on Ottawa Street South and Elmsdale Drive, is currently owned by the City of Kitchener with a conditional Agreement of Purchase and Sale with Novacore Communities Corporation. The property is in a Wellhead Protection Area (WPSA-4) and the Phase Two Environmental Site Assessment has confirmed the presence of landfill material, likely of an industrial origin, and contaminated soils with levels of zinc, mercury, dichlorobenzene and poly(hydridocarbyne) exceeding Ministry of Environment standards.

Conditional approval of the joint TIG by the Region of Waterloo would facilitate the final sale of 83 Elmsdale Drive, the remediation of the property, as well as the development of 225 residential apartment units, 135 retirement specific units and 9,197 square metres (99,000 square feet) of mixed use commercial and office space. The proposed development would support the Region’s intensification and transit oriented development objectives and is located on the future Ottawa iXpress route, which connects to the Region’s ION Light Rail Transit system.

If approved, this TIG would represent the fourth successful joint TIG application in the City of Kitchener with approved grants to date contributing to the anticipated development of at least 391 residential units in the City and an estimated total assessment increase of approximately $88 million.

The applicant has submitted estimated environmental remediation costs for the site of $10,430,760. This amount, plus a 10% allowance for indirect costs afforded under the
joint TIG program ($1,043,076), less assistance pending under the Regional Development Charge Exemption ($3,709,530) results in a net maximum eligible joint TIG of $7,764,306. The Regional Development Charge exemption calculated for this report uses the approved rates at the time of the TIG application. The final agreement would use revised calculations based on the Development Charge rates at the time of the building permit application. The TIG would be cost-shared between the Region and the City of Kitchener 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 61.6% (maximum of $4,779,103) being provided by the Region and the remaining 38.4% (maximum of $2,985,203) provided by the City of Kitchener. The annual payments, which would last an estimated seven 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 Kitchener staff is preparing a report recommending the joint TIG application, which will go to Finance Committee on June 23, 2014 and Council on June 30, 2014. Normally the City TIG report precedes the Region’s report; however, due to meeting schedules, the TIG report is going first to Regional Council for consideration. A copy of the Region’s report was provided to City staff on June 4, 2014 and City staff concurs with the recommendations.

The Region’s portion of the joint TIG (maximum of $4,779,103) 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 Novacore Communities Corporation, the Region and the City of Kitchener would be required.

The proposed TIG is conditional on the applicant assuming ownership of the property from the City of Kitchener and the City of Kitchener approving its share of the Tax Increment Grant.
Report:

Application Details – 83 Elmsdale Drive, Kitchener

In October 2013, the Region of Waterloo received a joint Tax Increment Grant (TIG) application from the City of Kitchener and Novacore Communities Corporation (the applicants) in regard to the remediation and redevelopment of the property municipally known as 83 Elmsdale Drive in Kitchener (please see Attachment 1 for a site map). The 4.89 hectare property, which includes frontage on Ottawa Street South and Elmsdale Drive, is currently owned by the City of Kitchener with a conditional Agreement of Purchase and Sale with Novacore Communities Corporation (Novacore). The property is in a Wellhead Protection Area (WPSA-4) and the Phase Two Environmental Site Assessment has confirmed the presence of landfill material, likely of an industrial origin, contaminated soils with levels of zinc, mercury, dichlorobenzene and poly(hydridocarbyne) exceeding Ministry of Environment standards. Groundwater contamination has also been detected.

The property is immediately north of the former Ottawa Street Landfill and is a former City of Kitchener maintenance yard that is currently vacant. Conditional approval of the joint TIG by the Region of Waterloo would facilitate the final sale of 83 Elmsdale Drive, the remediation of the property, as well as the development of 225 residential apartment units, 135 retirement specific units and 9,197 square metres (99,000 square feet) of mixed use commercial and office space. The proposed development would support the Region’s intensification and transit oriented development objectives and is located on the future Ottawa iXpress route, which connects to the Region’s ION Light Rail Transit system.

Ownership of the Land

One of the standard eligibility criteria for the joint TIG program is that the applicant must be the registered owner of the site or an assignee of the owner. As noted above, the lands are currently owned by the City of Kitchener and subject to a conditional Agreement of Purchase and Sale with Novacore. Consequently, the City of Kitchener and Novacore have jointly submitted the TIG application form in contemplation of the purchase. Assuming the approval of the Region’s and City’s portions of the TIG, it is expected that the purchase and sale transaction would be completed by August 2014.
The property at 83 Elmsdale Drive, which currently includes payment-in-lieu and exempt portions, will be reassessed as a taxable property once the sale is completed. While this could have some impact on the pre-remediation taxes and calculation of the tax increment (and hence the payment schedule), it will not impact the net maximum eligible TIG.

**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 Kitchener 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 $10,430,760. This amount, plus a 10% allowance for indirect costs afforded under the joint TIG program ($1,043,076), less assistance pending under the Regional Development Charge Exemption ($3,709,530) results in a net maximum eligible joint TIG of $7,764,306. The Regional Development Charge exemption calculated for this report uses the approved rates at the time of the TIG application. The final agreement would use revised calculations based on the Development Charge rates at the time of the building permit application.

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 Kitchener 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 Kitchener 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 61.6% (maximum of $4,779,103) being provided by the Region and the remaining 38.4% (maximum of $2,985,203) provided by the City of Kitchener. The annual payments, which would last an estimated seven 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 Kitchener 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 would be capped at $4,779,103.

For more detailed information on the tax increment calculations and methodology please see Attachment 3.

**Table 1: Estimated Tax Increment Grants for 83 Elmsdale Drive, Kitchener**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated Annual Tax Increment*</th>
<th>10 Years of Tax Increments*</th>
<th>Estimated Net Remediation Costs *</th>
<th>Lesser of Tax Increments / Net Remediation*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>$429,509</td>
<td>$4,295,090</td>
<td>$2,985,203</td>
<td>$2,985,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>$687,614</td>
<td>$6,876,140</td>
<td>$4,779,103</td>
<td>$4,779,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total*</td>
<td>$1,117,123</td>
<td>$11,171,230</td>
<td>$7,764,306</td>
<td>$7,764,306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* rounded to the nearest dollar
Table 2: Estimated TIG Payment Schedule for 83 Elmsdale Drive, Kitchener

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total TIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$429,509</td>
<td>$687,614</td>
<td>$1,117,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$429,509</td>
<td>$687,614</td>
<td>$1,117,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$429,509</td>
<td>$687,614</td>
<td>$1,117,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$429,509</td>
<td>$687,614</td>
<td>$1,117,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$429,509</td>
<td>$687,614</td>
<td>$1,117,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$429,509</td>
<td>$687,614</td>
<td>$1,117,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$408,149</td>
<td>$653,419</td>
<td>$1,061,568</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>$2,985,203</td>
<td>$4,779,103</td>
<td>$7,764,306</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 Kitchener and Regional staff have reviewed the application for 83 Elmsdale Drive under the above eligibility criteria and are satisfied that the site and proposed redevelopment will meet the requirements of the joint TIG program conditional on Novacore Communities Corporation assuming ownership of the property.

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 Kitchener would be required. Upon confirmation of the estimated eligible costs under the joint TIG program and completed sale of the property to Novacore, 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. Development Charge rates at the time of building permit application will be a factor in the determination of the net remediation costs. However, the maximum amount of eligible remediation costs cannot exceed $7,764,306 of which $4,779,103 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 Kitchener staff is preparing a report recommending the joint TIG application, which will go to Finance Committee on June 23, 2014 and Council on June 30, 2014. Normally the City TIG report precedes the Region’s report; however, due to meeting schedules, the TIG report is going first to Regional Council for consideration. A copy of the Region’s report was provided to City staff on June 4, 2014 and City staff concurs with the recommendations.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

A tax increment grant which may be approved for 83 Elmsdale Drive 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) by facilitating the remediation of the property in Wellhead Protection Area.
Financial Implications:

The Region's share of the maximum potential TIG is $4,779,103 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 seven 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 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. Subject to Council's 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 - Detailed TIG Calculation Methodology
Attachment 1 – Site Map (2013 Aerial Image)
Attachment 2 – 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>$2,204,000 (2013)</td>
<td>$59,642,000 (est.)</td>
<td>$57,438,000 (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>$16,855</td>
<td>$446,364</td>
<td>$429,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>$26,983</td>
<td>$714,597</td>
<td>$687,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$43,838</td>
<td>$1,160,961</td>
<td>$1,117,123</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 it is expected that the applicant will apply for Regional Development Charge exemption.

<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>$10,430,760</td>
<td>$1,043,076</td>
<td>$3,709,530</td>
<td>$7,764,306</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 (61.6%)*</th>
<th>Maximum City Portion (38.4%)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$7,764,306</td>
<td>$4,779,103</td>
<td>$2,985,203</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.
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Rapid Transit

To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: June 17, 2014
File Code: A02-30/PW
Subject: Stage 1 Light Rail Project – Kitchener Utilities Gas Infrastructure Relocation Cost Sharing

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve cost sharing with the Corporation of the City of Kitchener for an estimated total cost of $2,027,578, exclusive of HST for relocation of the Corporation of the City of Kitchener’s natural gas infrastructure (Kitchener Utilities) in the City of Kitchener to accommodate the Light Rail Project as outlined in Report E-14-038 dated June 17, 2014.

Summary: Nil

Report:

On June 15, 2011 Regional Council approved light rail transit (“LRT”) as the preferred technology from Conestoga Mall in the City of Waterloo to the Ainslie Street Terminal in the City of Cambridge. The approved Stage 1 of the project will include LRT from Conestoga Mall in Waterloo to Fairview Park Mall in Kitchener and is slated for construction in 2014 with completion in 2017.

Construction of Stage 1 will require relocation of existing Kitchener Utilities gas infrastructure which is currently located within the proposed rapid transit corridors in the City of Kitchener. Some of the relocations will be done during the project construction stage, however to minimize delays a significant amount of relocation works are being completed in advance.

In accordance with Region of Waterloo Policies and Procedures (May 16, 1985), the
guidelines found within the provincial legislation known as the “Public Service Works on Highways Act” are followed with respect to cost sharing for relocation of existing Kitchener Utilities gas infrastructure which is required as a result of Region of Waterloo projects. This legislation provides that, in the absence of an agreement, the municipality and the utility will equally share the cost of the labour and labour saving devices (such as vehicles, equipment) associated with the relocation work. In addition to paying its share of the labour and labour saving devices, the cost of materials such as gas pipe and gas fittings is also the responsibility of Kitchener Utilities. This results in the Region of Waterloo paying approximately 35% to 45% of the total cost of the gas relocations within the City of Kitchener while Kitchener Utilities pays the remainder.

Based on the preliminary functional design efforts done for the Stage 1 LRT project, unavoidable conflicts between existing Kitchener Utilities gas infrastructure and those works necessary for the LRT construction have been identified. Kitchener Utilities has already started some early works (self-performed or contracted) that will be completed prior to the DBFOM contractor mobilizing for Stage 1 construction. Additional gas infrastructure relocations on Ottawa Street, Charles Street, Benton Street and Duke Street, as well as some individual gasmains crossing the LRT corridor are required. These locations are shown below, along with their total estimated cost to the Region:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Region cost (Total Estimated)</th>
<th>Kitchener Utilities cost (Total Estimated)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King St. – Moore Ave. to K/W Boundary</td>
<td>$281,225</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>$706,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King St. – Francis St. to Victoria St.</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
<td>$47,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward Ave. and Courtland Ave.</td>
<td>$93,838</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$233,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydro One Corridor</td>
<td>$114,720</td>
<td>$219,280</td>
<td>$334,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa, Charles, Benton, Duke and crossings</td>
<td>$1,494,795</td>
<td>$2,170,000</td>
<td>$3,664,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (excluding HST)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,027,578</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,001,280</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,028,858</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

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

In June 2011, Council approved the implementation of the RT project, including LRT and aBRT, with estimated capital costs of $818 million, in 2014 dollars, with capital funding to be provided by the Province (up to $300 million), the federal government (one third of eligible project costs to a maximum of $265 million) and the Region ($253 million). The capital cost estimate was confirmed by Council on March 19, 2014. The RT project and improvements to conventional transit are financed through annual tax rate increases.

These costs have been incorporated into the LRT project as part of the early works estimate previously presented to council. The overall costs will be funded from the approved Rapid Transit project budget.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

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

Prepared By: Greg Proctor, Project Manager, Rapid Transit

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner Transportation and Environmental Services
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Transit Services (GRT)

To: Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: June 17, 2014
File Code: V07-01
Subject: MobilityPLUS – Fleet Repairs

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions regarding Grand River Transit’s MobilityPLUS fleet located at the Strasburg Road garage:

a) approve that the work of maintaining and repairing the MobilityPLUS buses be moved in-house to be undertaken by Transit Services staff.

b) authorize the addition of up to three full time equivalents (3.0 FTE’s) with no net increase to the operating budget to undertake this work.

Summary:

The repair work on MobilityPLUS vehicles is currently performed by the City of Kitchener on a contract basis and this contract will expire on December 31, 2014. Historically the repair work on these thirty specialized transit vehicles was completed in leased space at the GRT maintenance facility on Strasburg Rd until the City moved these activities to their Goodrich Dr. facility in 2011. This change resulted in additional costs associated with the shuttling of vehicles between facilities. During 2013 the Region opened the Chandler Drive maintenance garage next to the Strasburg Rd facility with the capacity to accommodate the MobilityPLUS repair work.

This report recommends the Region of Waterloo take advantage of the cost savings available by assuming responsibility for the MobilityPLUS repair work effective January 1, 2015.
Report:

In the early 1980’s Project Lift, the predecessor to MobilityPLUS, entered into a contract arrangement with the City of Kitchener for fleet repairs on their specialized transit vehicles. This contract continued with the Region of Waterloo when they assumed responsibility for specialized transit services in 2001 and the work was performed by the City of Kitchener, from leased space at the GRT facility on Strasburg Rd.

In 2011 the City relocated this work to their facility on Goodrich Dr., which resulted in cost increases, based on the need to shuttle vehicles for repairs. Last fall the Region opened a maintenance garage, adjacent to the GRT facility which can accommodate the MobilityPLUS repairs of this fleet of thirty specialized transit buses.

In December 2011 the City of Kitchener, as the low bidder, was awarded a two year contract with the option for a one year extension to December 2014. A comprehensive review of the 2013 City of Kitchener work orders was recently completed to determine the impacts to the Region of taking on the responsibility for MobilityPLUS repairs in January 2015. It is estimated that the maintenance and repair work could require up to three mechanics while the vehicle cleaning and servicing are already completed by GRT fleet employees. There would be no additional capital costs incurred.

The following is the estimated financial savings of taking over the MobilityPLUS fleet repairs based on the City of Kitchener’s 2013 labour and shuttling costs.

Estimated Annual Savings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013 Labour and Shuttling Cost</td>
<td>$ 506,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRT Estimated Costs (3 mechanics)</td>
<td>$(275,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Annual Savings</td>
<td>$ 231,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cost of parts has been excluded from this analysis, since they are expected to be fairly consistent in either scenario. The Region will discuss the possibility of purchasing any remaining inventory of parts from the City of Kitchener and will also request the vehicle repair history.

The City of Kitchener is aware of this plan to assume the MobilityPLUS repairs at the end of this year. If approved, GRT will hire up to three new mechanics in October 2014, as required, to begin training this fall in preparation for assuming this new responsibility in January.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

This approach supports Strategic Objective 5.4 by ensuring Regional programs and services are efficient and effective and demonstrate accountability to the public.
Financial Implications:

The adoption of an in-house process for Mobility PLUS fleet repairs at the Chandler Drive maintenance garage is expected to generate annual operating savings of approximately $231,200. The addition of up to 3 new mechanics, as required, may be needed in October 2014 for training, at an estimated cost of approximately $68,750. GRT staff will monitor fleet spending for the remainder of the year in an attempt to accommodate these costs within the approved 2014 operating budget.

The additional staffing positions, if required, along with the cost of parts needed to perform the Mobility PLUS repairs in house will be accommodated in the development of the 2015 GRT operating budget from the existing 2014 MobilityPlus budget for contract repairs.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Finance was consulted in the development of this report.

Prepared By: Eric Gillespie, Director, Transit Services

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

To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: June 17, 2014
File Code: T02-04
Subject: Revised 2014 Transportation Base and System Expansion Capital Budgets

Recommendation:
That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the revised 2014 Transportation Base and System Expansion Capital Budgets as per Report E-14-076 dated June 17, 2014.

Summary:
A mid-year review of the Transportation Base and System Expansion Capital Budgets is carried out each year so that variations caused by actual tender results, revised project estimates based on detailed design and changes in project scheduling can be reported.

The revised 2014 Base Capital Budget has a funding decrease of $7,200,000 (total revised budget $41.150 million) which is primarily attributable to construction deferrals and revised project estimates and phasing. These revisions will reduce the amount required from the Roads Rehabilitation and Development Charge Reserve Funds in 2014.

The revised 2014 System Expansion Capital Budget has a funding decrease of $725,000 (total revised budget $87.160 million) which is primarily attributable to construction deferrals. These revisions will reduce the amount required from the Development Charge and Roads Capital Levy Reserve Funds in 2014.

Overall, the revised 2014 Transportation Base and System Expansion Capital Budgets have a funding decrease of $7,925,000 (total revised budget $128.310 million).
Report:

Background

Each year a mid-year review of the Transportation Base and System Expansion Capital Budgets is carried out so that variations caused by actual tender results, revised project estimates based on detail design and changes in project scheduling can be reported.

Appendix A summarizes the revisions to the previously approved 2014 Transportation Base and System Expansion Capital Budgets.

Project Variations

The following are projects that have been added, deferred or have had their budget revised to a value greater than $100,000 and a summary of the reasons are provided below. Project budget adjustments less then $100,000 have been included primarily for detailed design and minor road rehabilitations. These smaller adjustments are shown in the project details (Appendix A) and total an increase of $515,000. Projects in which tenders or Council reports have been approved by Regional Council are included in the project details (Appendix A) but are not addressed in this report.

1. **Revised 2014 Transportation Base Capital Budget**

   The 2014 Transportation Base Capital Budget includes project improvements relating to ensuring the safe, efficient operation and maintenance of the existing road transportation infrastructure and is primarily funded from the Roads Rehabilitation Reserve Fund and Federal Gas Tax funding. These projects include resurfacing, reconstruction, bridge and drainage works, traffic signal modernizations, non-growth related intersection improvements, infill sidewalk installations and system management.

   a) **Regional Road 36 (Franklin Boulevard), 200 m South of Saginaw Parkway to 20 m North of Can-Amera Parkway (RR80), Cambridge (+$310,000);**

   This spot resurfacing maintenance project has been added in order to extend serviceability of this road until 2020 when the road widening project is scheduled.

   b) **Regional Road 46 (Roseville Road), Industrial Road to Roseville’s East Limits, North Dumfries (+$340,000);**

   This spot resurfacing maintenance project has been added in order to extend serviceability of this road until 2023 when the major road rehabilitation project is scheduled.
c) Regional Road 4 (Ottawa Street), Mill Street to Imperial Drive, Kitchener (-$420,000);

This project estimate has been reduced since property acquisitions and utility relocates will now be completed in 2015 instead of 2014 to allow for additional public consultation and consideration of alternative cross sections.

d) Regional Road 6 (Highland Road), West of Patricia Avenue to Westmount Road (RR50), Kitchener (-$2,505,000);

The reconstruction of this road has been deferred by at least one year since this road is still in serviceable condition due to the resurfacing completed in 2009.

e) Regional Road 8 (Dundas Street), Branchton Road (RR43) to Franklin Boulevard (RR36), Cambridge (-$310,000);

The surface asphalt placement for this project has been deferred to 2015 to accommodate contractor warranty work in 2014 to correct a number of construction deficiencies.

f) Regional Road 8 (Weber Street), Forwell Creek Road to Blythwood Road, Waterloo (-$1,775,000);

This project has been deferred until the completion of the Rapid Transit construction in the area to better coordinate traffic management on Northfield Drive and King Street reconstruction from Weber Street to Northfield Drive.

g) Regional Road 15 (King Street), Railway Tracks to Central Street, Waterloo (-$815,000);

This reconstruction project has been deferred to 2015 to allow for additional public consultation and consideration of additional alternative cross sections. This project is being undertaken in conjunction with City of Waterloo’s Uptown streetscaping project.

h) Regional Road 20 (Bloomingdale Road) Kraft Drive to Bridge Street (RR52), Kitchener (-$315,000);

This reconstruction project estimate has been reduced as utility relocations are no longer necessary and property acquisition and archeological assessment costs are less than initially estimated.
i)  **Regional Road 50 (Westmount Road), Highland Road (RR6) to Victoria Street (RR55), Kitchener (-$300,000);**

Construction of the intersection works at Victoria Street has been deferred to 2016 due to a delay in acquiring the required property. Work will be completed with the next phase of Westmount Road reconstruction from Victoria Street to Glasgow Street currently scheduled in 2016.

j)  **Regional Road 53 (Courtland Avenue), Highway 7/8 to Queen Street, Kitchener (+$205,000);**

The placement of the final surface asphalt was deferred from 2013 to 2014 so funding is required in the 2014 budget for Courtland Avenue.

k)  **Regional Road 69 (Manitou Drive), Homer Watson Boulevard (RR28) to Bleams Road (RR56), Kitchener (-$175,000);**

This project estimate has been reduced since hydro relocations will now be completed in 2015. The rescheduling of the hydro works is due to high demand for hydro relocations.

l)  **Regional Road 50 (Westmount Road), at University Avenue (RR57), Waterloo (-$805,000);**

This bridge and drainage improvement project has been deferred and will be re-tendered in early 2015. The bids received were significantly over the project budget estimate. The re-tendered contract will include more flexibility in construction schedule and methodology to encourage more competitive bidding.

2. **Revised 2014 Transportation System Expansion Capital Budget**

The Transportation System Expansion Capital Budget includes project improvements related to the population and employment growth within the Region of Waterloo and is funded from the Roads Capital Levy and Regional Development Charge Reserve Funds. These projects include intersection improvements, traffic signal installations, road widening and road system expansions (new roads and bridges).

a)  **Regional Road 6 (Highland Road), at Lawrence Street and Belmont Avenue, Kitchener (-$170,000);**

This intersection improvement has been deferred by at least one year since this road is still in serviceable condition due to the resurfacing completed in 2009.
b) **Regional Road 9 (Erb Street), 100 m East of Caroline Street (RR9) to Menno Street, Waterloo (+$315,000);**

This intersection improvement project estimate has been increased to allow for underground works to proceed this year that were originally planned for 2015.

c) **Regional Road 56 (Bleams Road), at Fischer Hallman Road (RR58), Kitchener (+$255,000);**

This project estimate has been increased to account for increased property acquisition costs for the roundabout.

d) **Regional Road 22 (Northfield Drive), Davenport Road to University Avenue (RR57), Waterloo (+$300,000);**

This road widening project estimate has been revised to account for an increase in utility costs.

e) **Regional Road 55 (Victoria Street), Highway 7 bridge to Edna Street (RR62), Kitchener (-$1,300,000);**

This road widening project has been deferred to 2015 due to the MTO deferring the bridge rehabilitation works until 2015 which are required before the Region works proceeds.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

This report addresses the Region’s Strategic Focus Area 2: Manage growth to foster thriving and productive urban and rural communities and Focus Area 3: Develop greater, more Sustainable Transportation and the following Corporate Strategic Objectives.

- 2.2 – Develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs; and
- 3.3 – Optimize existing road capacity to safely manage traffic throughout Waterloo Region.

**Financial Implications**

A mid-year review of the Transportation Base and System Expansion Capital Budgets is carried out each year so that variations caused by actual tender results, revised project estimates based on detailed design and changes in project scheduling can be reported.

The revised 2014 Base Capital Budget has a funding decrease of $7,200,000 (total revised budget $41.150 million) which is primarily attributable to construction deferrals
and revised project phasing. These revisions will reduce the amount required from the Roads Rehabilitation and Development Charge Reserve Funds in 2014.

The revised 2014 System Expansion Capital Budget has a funding decrease of $725,000 (total revised budget $87.160 million) which is primarily attributable to competitive contract pricing and project deferrals. These revisions will reduce the amount required from the Development Charge and Roads Capital Levy Reserve Funds in 2014.

Overall, the revised 2014 Transportation Base and Capital System Expansion Capital Budgets have a funding decrease of $7,925,000 (total revised budget $128.310 million).

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Staff from Design and Construction, Finance and Transportation Planning have been directly involved in the preparation of this report.

Attachments

Appendix A – Revisions to the 2014 Transportation Base and System Capital Budgets

Prepared By: Sharon Daniel, Supervisor, Transportation Capital Program

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
## REVISIONS TO THE 2014 TRANSPORTATION BASE AND SYSTEM EXPANSION CAPITAL BUDGETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>($) (000's)</th>
<th>CFWD</th>
<th>2014 BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 TOTAL BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPENDITURES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION BASE CAPITAL BUDGET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN RESURFACING</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL RESURFACING</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECONSTRUCTION AND MAJOR REHABILITATION</td>
<td>5,560</td>
<td>30,670</td>
<td>36,450</td>
<td>29,795</td>
<td>-6,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS (NON-GROWTH)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIDGE AND DRAINAGE WORKS</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>3,050</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>-510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYSTEM MANAGEMENT / OTHER</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>2,475</td>
<td>2,515</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC SIGNAL MODERNIZATIONS</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>1,715</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC ENGINEERING GENERAL</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>2,045</td>
<td>1,945</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFILL SIDEWALK AND CYCLING FACILITIES</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL SYSTEM EXPANSION BUDGET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS (GROWTH-RELATED)</td>
<td>7,290</td>
<td>20,300</td>
<td>27,590</td>
<td>28,065</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT RELATED LEFT AND RIGHT TURN LANES</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC SIGNAL INSTALLATIONS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROAD WIDENINGS</td>
<td>22,210</td>
<td>24,620</td>
<td>46,330</td>
<td>45,630</td>
<td>-1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROAD SYSTEM EXPANSION</td>
<td>4,485</td>
<td>6,875</td>
<td>11,360</td>
<td>11,360</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44,430</td>
<td>91,805</td>
<td>136,235</td>
<td>128,310</td>
<td>-7,925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REVENUES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CFWD</th>
<th>2014 BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 TOTAL BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBSIDY (FEDERAL GAS TAX)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14,666</td>
<td>14,666</td>
<td>14,666</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT CHARGE RESERVE FUND (TRANSPORTATION)</td>
<td>28,379</td>
<td>43,740</td>
<td>72,119</td>
<td>71,335</td>
<td>-764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROADS REHABILITATION CAPITAL RESERVE FUND</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>22,394</td>
<td>31,494</td>
<td>24,286</td>
<td>-7,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYCLING FACILITY CAPITAL RESERVE FUND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROAD CAPITAL LEVY RESERVE FUND</td>
<td>3,221</td>
<td>3,982</td>
<td>7,203</td>
<td>7,203</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIRD PARTY - CF RAIL</td>
<td>2,126</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>2,295</td>
<td>2,295</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIRD PARTY - OTHER</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>2,670</td>
<td>2,670</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBENTURES</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>5,165</td>
<td>5,165</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44,430</td>
<td>91,805</td>
<td>136,235</td>
<td>128,310</td>
<td>-7,925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LEGEND:

*AG = ABOVE GROUND; BG = BELOW GROUND; CF = CYCLING FACILITY; CG = CURB & GUTTER; CP = Cold-In-Place Resurfacing; D = Drainage Improvements; DE = Design; DK = Bridge Deck Repair; DSA = Deep Strength Asphalt; EA = Environmental Assessment; EXP = Expanded Asphalt; IPS = Pedestrian Signal Installation; L = Land Purchase; LA = Land Scaping; MOD = Traffic Signal Modernization; NC = Construction; PAD = Padding; PL = Planning; RAC = Reconstruction; RH = Rehabilitation; RSS = Reconstruction With Storm Sewers; RW = Road Widening; R1 = Resurface-Single Lift; R2 = Resurface-Double Lift; RM = Resurface-Major; SA = Surface Asphalt; SI = Intersection Improvement; SIG = Traffic Signal Installation; SL = Street Lighting; ST = Storm Sewer Installation; SW = Sidewalk Installation; U = Utility Relocation*
# REVISIONS TO THE 2014 TRANSPORTATION BASE CAPITAL BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>($000's)</th>
<th>CFWD</th>
<th>2014 BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 TOTAL BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## EXPENDITURES:

### TRANSPORTATION BASE CAPITAL BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>CFWD</th>
<th>2014 BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 TOTAL BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Resurfacing</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Resurfacing</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruction and Major Rehabilitation</td>
<td>5,580</td>
<td>30,870</td>
<td>36,450</td>
<td>28,795</td>
<td>-7,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Improvements (Non-Growth)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge and Drainage Works</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>3,060</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>-510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Management / Other</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>2,475</td>
<td>2,515</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signal Modernizations</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>1,715</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Engineering General</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>2,045</td>
<td>1,945</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infill Sidewalk and Cycling Facilities</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 16,365 38,045 48,350 41,150 -7,200

## REVENUES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>CFWD</th>
<th>2014 BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 TOTAL BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subsidy (Federal Gas Tax)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14,666</td>
<td>14,666</td>
<td>14,666</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charge Reserve Fund (Transportation)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads Rehabilitation Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>22,394</td>
<td>31,494</td>
<td>24,286</td>
<td>-7,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling Facility Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debentures</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 16,365 38,045 48,350 41,150 -7,200

---

**Legend:**
- AG = Above Ground
- BG = Below Ground
- CF = Cycling Facility
- CG = Curb & Gutter
- CP = Cold-In-Place Resurfacing
- D = Drainage Improvements
- DR = Design
- DK = Bridge Deck Repair
- DSA = Deep Strength Asphalt
- EA = Environmental Assessment
- EXP = Expanded Asphalt
- IPS = Pedestrian Signal Installation
- L = Land Purchase
- LA = Landscaping
- MOD = Traffic Signal Modernization
- NC = Construction
- PAD = Paving
- PL = Planning
- REC = Reconstruction
- RH = Rehabilitation
- RSS = Reconstruction with Storm Severs
- RW = Road Widening
- R1 = Resurface-Single Lift
- R2 = Resurface-Double Lift
- RM = Resurface-Major
- SA = Surface Asphalt
- SI = Intersection Improvement
- SIG = Traffic Signal Installation
- SL = Street Lighting
- ST = Storm Sewer Installation
- SW = Sidewalk Installation
- U = Utility Relocation
### REVISIONS TO THE 2014 TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL BASE BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proj No.</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Munic</th>
<th>Proj Len (km)</th>
<th>CFWD</th>
<th>2014 Budget</th>
<th>2014 Total Budget</th>
<th>2014 Revised Budget</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5970</td>
<td>REG. RD. 24 (WATER STREET), AINSJU ST. S. (RR 24) TO CONCESSION ST.CEDAR ST (RR97)</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5572</td>
<td>REG. RD. 24 (HESPELAR ROAD), BISHOP ST. (RR41) TO EAGLE ST. N./PINEBUSH RD (RR39)</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5554</td>
<td>REG. RD. 25 (MARYHILL ROAD), BRIDGE 2501 TO ST CHARLES ST. W. (RR26)</td>
<td>WOOL</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6416</td>
<td>REG. RD. 36 (FRANKLIN BOULEVARD), 200M S. OF SAGINAW PKWY TO 20M NORTH OF CANAMERIA PKWY (RR80)</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>BUDGET ADDITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6411</td>
<td>REG. RD. 24 (HESPELAR ROAD), RAMP AT GROH AVE.</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>BUDGET ADDITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5562</td>
<td>VARIOUS URBAN SPOT RESURFACING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>265</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Urban Resurfacing**

|               | 3.22 | 355 | 715 | 1,070 | 1,420 | 350 |

### Rural Resurfacing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proj No.</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Munic</th>
<th>Proj Len (km)</th>
<th>CFWD</th>
<th>2014 Budget</th>
<th>2014 Total Budget</th>
<th>2014 Revised Budget</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6084</td>
<td>REG. RD. 4 (BLEAMS ROAD), 2.7 KM E OF QUEEN ST. (RR12) TO QUEEN ST.</td>
<td>WIL</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5423</td>
<td>REG. RD. 4 (BLEAMS ROAD), QUEEN ST. (RR12) TO WILMOT CENTRE RD. (RR51)</td>
<td>WIL</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5425</td>
<td>REG. RD. 5 (NAFZIGER ROAD), HWY 7/8 TO WATERLOO ST. (RR1)</td>
<td>WIL</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5584</td>
<td>REG. RD. 6 (SNYDERS ROAD), TRUSSLER RD. (RR70) TO 0.52KM E. OF NOTRE DAME DRIVE (RR12)</td>
<td>WIL</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5432</td>
<td>REG. RD. 9 (ERBS ROAD), W. OF IRA NEEDLES BLVD. (RR70) TO E. LIMITS OF ST. AGATHA</td>
<td>WAT</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5440</td>
<td>REG. RD. 15 (LOBSINGER LINE), 0.6KM W. OF KRESSLER RD. (RR16) TO ANITA ST.</td>
<td>WELL</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### REVISIONS TO THE 2014 TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL BASE BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJ. NO.</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AREA MUN</th>
<th>PROJ. LEN (KM)</th>
<th>CFWD</th>
<th>2014 BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 TOTAL BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5867</td>
<td>REG. RD. 15 (LOBSINGER LINE), 0.6 KM WEST OF HERRGOTT RD. (RR10) TO MOSER-YOUNG RD.</td>
<td>WELL</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6393</td>
<td>REG. RD. 17 (EBYCREST ROAD), VICTORIA ST. (RR55), TO 149 M N. OF VICTORIA ST.</td>
<td>WOOL</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45 PL R1</td>
<td>45 BUDGET ADDITION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5461</td>
<td>REG. RD. 31 (KROSSUTH ROAD), COBER RD. TO E. OF FOUNTAIN ST. (RR17)</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6087</td>
<td>REG. RD. 38 (MAPLE GROVE ROAD), HESPELER RD (RR24) TO BRIARDEAN RD.</td>
<td>WOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5586</td>
<td>REG. RD. 46 (ROSEVILLE ROAD), EDMOUTH SD. RD. (RR71) TO DICKIE SETTLEMENT RD. (RR71)</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6418</td>
<td>REG. RD. 46 (ROSEVILLE ROAD), INDUSTRIAL RD. TO ROSEVILLE E. LIMITS</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>340 PL R1</td>
<td>340 BUDGET ADDITION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5674</td>
<td>REG. RD. 49 (WRIGLEY ROAD), DUMFRIES RD. (RR7) TO 150 M EAST OF HILTOP ROAD</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5677</td>
<td>REG. RD. 70 (TRUSSLER ROAD), CEDAR CREEK RD. (RR57) TO NEW DUNDEE RD. (RR12)</td>
<td>WIL</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5678</td>
<td>REG. RD. 86 (LINE 86), HERRGOTT RD. (RR10) TO 100 M. W. OF SLOMAN LN.</td>
<td>WELL</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10 DE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>REVISED ESTIMATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5174</td>
<td>VARIOUS RURAL SPOT RESURFACINGS</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL RURAL RESURFACING</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.50</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RECONSTRUCTION AND MAJOR REHABILITATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJ. NO.</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AREA MUN</th>
<th>PROJ. LEN (KM)</th>
<th>CFWD</th>
<th>2014 BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 TOTAL BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5766</td>
<td>REG. RD. 1 (SNYDER'S ROAD) E. FOUNDRY ST. (RR61) TO GINGERICH RD. (RR6)</td>
<td>WIL</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75 DE</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>REVISED ESTIMATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5980</td>
<td>REG. RD. 4 (OTTAWA STREET N), LACKNER BLVD. (RR54) TO HIGHWAY 7 EB RAMP</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>365 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5163</td>
<td>REG. RD. 4 (OTTAWA STREET N) HIGHWAY 7 WB RAMP TO WEBER ST. E. (RR9)</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55 DE</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>REVISED ESTIMATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJ. NO.</td>
<td>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>AREA MUN</td>
<td>PROJ. LEN (KM)</td>
<td>CFWD</td>
<td>2014 BUDGET</td>
<td>2014 TOTAL BUDGET</td>
<td>2014 REVISED BUDGET</td>
<td>VARIANCE</td>
<td>REMARKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5565</td>
<td>REG. RD. 4 (OTTAWA STREET), WEBER ST. (RR8) TO KING ST. (RR15)</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55 DE</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>REVISED ESTIMATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5377</td>
<td>REG. RD. 4 (OTTAWA STREET), MILL ST. TO IMPERIAL DR.</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>100 DE</td>
<td>-420</td>
<td>REVISED PHASING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5378</td>
<td>REG. RD. 5 (HUTCHISON ROAD), CROSSHILL S. LIMITS TO CROSSHILL W. LIMITS</td>
<td>WELL</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5522</td>
<td>REG. RD. 6 (FREDERICK ST., BENTON ST.), DUKE ST., TO CHARLES ST. (RR64)</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>820 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5382</td>
<td>REG. RD. 6 (HIGHLAND ROAD), W. OF PATRICIA AVE. TO WESTMOUNT RD. (RR50)</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2875</td>
<td>2705</td>
<td>200 DE</td>
<td>-2505</td>
<td>CONST. DEFERRED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5566</td>
<td>REG. RD. 6 (HIGHLAND ROAD), FISCHER-HALLMAN RD. (RR58) TO HIGHLAND HILLS MALL ENTRANCE</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5428</td>
<td>REG. RD. 6 (SNYDERS ROAD), 0.32KM E. OF NOTRE DAME DR. (RR12) TO 0.23KM W. OF NOTRE DAME DR. (RR12)</td>
<td>WIL</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>75 DE</td>
<td>-55</td>
<td>REVISED ESTIMATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5251</td>
<td>REG. RD. 8 (DUNDAS STREET), BRANCHTON RD. (RR43) TO FRANKLIN BLVD. (RR36)</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>25 DE</td>
<td>-310</td>
<td>CONST. DEFERRED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5387</td>
<td>REG. RD. 8 (DUNDAS STREET), ELGIN ST. TO HESPELER RD. (RR24)</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100 DE</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>REVISED ESTIMATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5384</td>
<td>REG. RD. 8 (KING STREET), BISHOP ST. (RR41) TO EAGLE ST. (RR39)</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5962</td>
<td>REG. RD. 8 (KING STREET), AT CPR CROSSING E. FAIRWAY ROAD (RR 53)</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5648</td>
<td>REG. RD. 8 (KING STREET E), FAIRWAY RD. N. (RR53) TO WEBER ST. E. (RR8) / HWY 8 ON RAMP</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6134</td>
<td>REG. RD. 8 (WEBER STREET), BORDEN AVE. TO QUEEN ST.</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>135 DE</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>REVISED ESTIMATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5488</td>
<td>REG. RD. 8 (WEBER STREET), GUELPH ST. TO UNION ST</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2560</td>
<td>2560</td>
<td>2560 DE REC MOD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5489</td>
<td>REG. RD. 8 (WEBER STREET), FORWELL CREEK RD. TO BLYTHWOOD RD.</td>
<td>WAT</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2140</td>
<td>2250</td>
<td>475 DE U</td>
<td>-1775</td>
<td>CONST. DEFERRED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## REVISIONS TO THE 2014 TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL BASE BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJ. NO.</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>MUN</th>
<th>PROJ. LEN (KM)</th>
<th>CFWD</th>
<th>2014 BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 TOTAL BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5431</td>
<td>REG. RD. 8 (KING STREET), PRINTERY RD. TO SAWMILL RD. (RR17)</td>
<td>WOOL</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6510</td>
<td>REG. RD. 9 (BRIDGEPORT RD./CAROLINE ST.), KING ST. (RR15) TO ERB ST. (RR9)</td>
<td>WAT</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5390</td>
<td>REG. RD. 9 (ERB STREET), FISCHER-HALLMAN RD. (RR50) TO GATEVIEW DR.</td>
<td>WAT</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5493</td>
<td>REG. RD. 12 (NOTRE DAME DRIVE), HWY. 718 TO CP RAIL - PETERSBURG</td>
<td>WIL</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>110 DE</td>
<td>-55 REVISED ESTIMATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5650</td>
<td>REG. RD. 15 (KING STREET E), DIXON ST./MONTGOMERY RD. TO OTTAWA ST. (RR4)</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5041</td>
<td>REG. RD. 15 (KING STREET), VICTORIA ST. (RR55) TO CENTRAL MARKET</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2190</td>
<td>2210</td>
<td>2210 DE</td>
<td>REC MOD CF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6206</td>
<td>REG. RD. 15 (KING STREET), CENTRAL MARKET TO UNION ST.</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1735</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>1895 DE</td>
<td>REC MOD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6265</td>
<td>REG. RD. 15 (KING ST), RAILWAY TRACKS TO CENTRAL ST.</td>
<td>WAT</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>100 DE</td>
<td>SL MOD ST</td>
<td>-15 CONST. DEFERRED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5633</td>
<td>REG. RD. 15 (KING STREET), WEBER ST. (RR8) TO HWY 85 SB. RAMP</td>
<td>WAT</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td>1590 DE</td>
<td>RM MOD CF SW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5391</td>
<td>REG. RD. 15 (KING STREET), HWY 85 NB. RAMP (WATERLOO) TO NORTHFIELD DR. (RR50)</td>
<td>WAT</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80 DE</td>
<td>L U</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5568</td>
<td>REG. RD. 16 (KRESSLER ROAD), LOBSINGER LINE (RR15) TO APOLLO DR.</td>
<td>WELL</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5393</td>
<td>REG. RD. 17 (FOUNTAIN STREET), KING ST. (RR8) TO CHERRY BLOSSOM RD.</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>275 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5927</td>
<td>REG. RD. 17 (FOUNTAIN STREET N), CHERRY BLOSSOM RD. TO MAPLE GROVE RD. (RR38)</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5495</td>
<td>REG. RD. 17 (SAWMILL ROAD), RIVER ST. TO SNYDERS FLATS RD.</td>
<td>WOOL</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### REVISIONS TO THE 2014 TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL BASE BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJ. NO.</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AREA MUN</th>
<th>PROJ. LEN (KM)</th>
<th>CFWD</th>
<th>2014 BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 TOTAL BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5392</td>
<td>REG. RD. 17 (SAWMILL ROAD), CONESTOGO BRIDGE TO MUSSelman CR. AND REG. RD. 22 (NORTHFIELD DRIVE) - S.LIMITS OF CONESTOGO TO COUNTRY SPRING WALK</td>
<td>WOOL</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250 DE L</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5693</td>
<td>REG. RD. 17 (SAWMILL ROAD), KING ST. (RR8) TO WATERLOO/ST. JACOBS TRACKS</td>
<td>WOOL</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>125 DE L</td>
<td>-95</td>
<td>REVISED ESTIMATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5190</td>
<td>REG. RD. 20 (BLOOMINGDALE ROAD), KRAFT DR. TO BRIDGE ST. (RR52)</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>200 DE L</td>
<td>-315</td>
<td>REVISED ESTIMATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5798</td>
<td>REG. RD. 22 (NORTHFIELD DRIVE), KRAUS DR. TO Davenport RD.</td>
<td>WAT</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>275 DE U</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5692</td>
<td>REG. RD. 24 (AINSIE STREET S), WALNUT ST. TO PARKHILL RD. (RR77)</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5396</td>
<td>REG. RD. 24 (WATER STREET), AINSIE ST. TO CORONATION BLVD. (RR68)</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>265 SA</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>CONTRACT 2014-113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5459</td>
<td>REG. RD. 28 (FOUNTAIN STREET), PRESTON PKWY. TO DICKIE SETTLEMENT RD. (RR71)</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5671</td>
<td>REG. RD. 30 (SHANTZ STATION ROAD), KOSSUTH RD. (RR31) TO MENNO ST.</td>
<td>WOOL</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5786</td>
<td>REG. RD. 33 (TOWNLINE ROAD), AVENUE RD/GORE RD. TO SAGINAW PKWY.</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5617</td>
<td>REG. RD. 39 (EAGLE STREET), HESPELER RD. (RR24) TO CONCESSION RD./SPEEDSVILLE RD.</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5404</td>
<td>REG. RD. 41 (BISHOP STREET), CONESTOGA BLVD. TO CONCESSION RD.</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>550 DE U</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5405</td>
<td>REG. RD. 42 (GEORGE STREET), ST. ANDREWS ST. (RR75) TO PARK HILL RD. (RR77)</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>210 SA</td>
<td>-185</td>
<td>CONTRACT 2014-113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5498</td>
<td>REG. RD. 43 (MYERS ROAD), BRANCHTON RD. (RR43) TO WATER ST. (RR24)</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# REVISIONS TO THE 2014 TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL BASE BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJ. NO.</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AREA MUN</th>
<th>PROJ. LEN (KM)</th>
<th>CFWD</th>
<th>2014 BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 TOTAL BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5574</td>
<td>REG. RD. 50 (WESTMOUNT ROAD), GREENBROOK DR. TO HIGHLAND RD. (RR6)</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>300 SA</td>
<td>-90</td>
<td>REVISED ESTIMATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5627</td>
<td>REG. RD. 50 (WESTMOUNT ROAD), HIGHLAND RD. (RR6) TO VICTORIA ST. (RR55)</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>350 SA</td>
<td>-300</td>
<td>CONST. DEFERRED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5657</td>
<td>REG. RD. 50 (WESTMOUNT ROAD S), JOHN ST. TO ERB ST. W. (RR6)</td>
<td>WAT</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5696</td>
<td>REG. RD. 50 (NORTHFIELD DRIVE W), WEBER ST. N. (RR6) TO WATERLOO/ST. JACOBS TRACKS</td>
<td>WAT</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>1040 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5407</td>
<td>REG. RD. 50 (NORTHFIELD DRIVE), WATERLOO/ST. JACOBS TRACKS TO KING ST. (RR15)</td>
<td>WAT</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>2045</td>
<td>2045 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5183</td>
<td>REG. RD. 52 (BRIDGE STREET), KITWOOL BDY. TO BRIDGEPORT BRIDGE</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3420</td>
<td>3030 DE</td>
<td>-390</td>
<td>CONTRACT 2014-102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5576</td>
<td>REG. RD. 52 (BRIDGE STREET W), WOOLWICH ST. TO UNIVERSITY AVE. E. (RR57)</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>135 DE</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>REVISED ESTIMATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WAT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5194</td>
<td>REG. RD. 53 (COURTLAND AVENUE), HWY 7/8 TO QUEEN ST.</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>400 SA</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>REVISED ESTIMATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5501</td>
<td>REG. RD. 57, (UNIVERSITY AVENUE), HWY 85 WB RAMP TO WEBER ST. (RR6)</td>
<td>WAT</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>4220</td>
<td>4395</td>
<td>3515 DE</td>
<td>-880</td>
<td>CONTRACT 2014-108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5636</td>
<td>REG. RD. 58 (SWAN STREET), HILTOP DR. TO STANLEY ST. AND REG. RD. 58 (NORTHUMBERLAND STREET/STANLEY STREET), ST. ANDREWS ST. TO CP RAILWAY CROSSING</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>710 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5579</td>
<td>REG. RD. 69 (MANITOU DRIVE), HOMER WATSON BLVD. (RR28) TO BLEANS RD. (RR56)</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>125 DE</td>
<td>-175</td>
<td>REVISED PHASING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6353</td>
<td>REG. RD. 69 (MANITOU DRIVE), WEBSTER RD. TO FAIRWAY RD. (RR53)</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5275</td>
<td>REG. RD. 70 (TRUSSLER ROAD), NEW DUNDEE RD. (RR12) TO BLEAMS RD. (RR56)</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5471</td>
<td>REG. RD. 75 (SPRAGUES ROAD), BRANT/WATERLOO BDY. TO WIGLEY RD.</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>1720 DE RM CF</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>REVISUAL ESTIMATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5416</td>
<td>REG. RD. 75 (ST. ANDREWS STREET), CAMBRIDGE BDY. TO GRAND AVE. (RR76)</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5582</td>
<td>REG. RD. 77 (PARKHILL ROAD), AINSLE ST. (RR24) TO WATER ST. (RR24)</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>50 -85 REVISUAL ESTIMATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5417</td>
<td>REG. RD. 86 (CHURCH STREET), SPRUCE LANE TO ARTHUR ST. (RR21)</td>
<td>WOOL</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5583</td>
<td>REG. RD. 97 (CONCESSION STREET), CHISHOLM ST. TO WATER ST. (RR24)</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5420</td>
<td>REG. RD. 97 (CEDAR STREET), OSBORNE ST. TO CAMBRIDGE BDY.</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL RECONSTRUCTION AND MAJOR REHABILITATION**

|                        | 76.73 | 5,580 | 30,870 | 36,450 | 28,795 | -7,655 |

**INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS (NON-GROWTH)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJ. NO.</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AREA MUN</th>
<th>CFWD (2014)</th>
<th>2014 BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 TOTAL BUDGET</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6267</td>
<td>REG. RD. 8 (CORONATION BOULEVARD) AT CAMBRIDGE MEMORIAL HOSPITAL</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6269</td>
<td>REG. RD. 9 (BRIDGEPORT ROAD) AT LANCASTER ST. (RR28)</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40 DE</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6283</td>
<td>REG. RD. 15 (KING STREET) AT UNIVERSITY AVE. (RR57)</td>
<td>WAT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>105 REC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5630</td>
<td>REG. RD. 17 (FOUNTAIN STREET) AT CP RAIL</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125 REC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5505</td>
<td>REG. RDS. 17 AND 23 SAWMILL RD. AT KATHERINE ST.</td>
<td>WOOL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80 DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6413</td>
<td>REG. RD. 28 (HOMER WATSON BOULEVARD), AT BLEAMS RD (RR56)</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50 PL R1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6291</td>
<td>REG. RD. 28 (HOMER WATSON BOULEVARD) AT BLOCK LINE RD.</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350 REC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5710</td>
<td>REG. RD. 41 (BISHOP STREET) AT CP RAIL</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### REVISIONS TO THE 2014 TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL BASE BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJ. NO.</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AREA MUN</th>
<th>PROJ. LEN (KM)</th>
<th>CFWD</th>
<th>2014 TOTAL BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 TOTAL BUDGET</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6088</td>
<td>REG. RD 57 (UNIVERSITY AVENUE), AT ALBERT ST.</td>
<td>WAT 80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>CONTRACT 2014-108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6486</td>
<td>REG. RD 70 (ERBSVILLE ROAD) AT CREEKSIDE DR.</td>
<td>ND 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20 RE</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>BUDGET ADDITION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6481</td>
<td>REG. RD. 8 (WEBER STREET) AT GOLDEN EAGLE RD.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15 RE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>BUDGET ADDITION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TOTAL INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS (NON-GROWTH)

|            | 0.00 | 95 | 665 | 760 | 930 | 170 |

#### BRIDGE AND DRAINAGE WORKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJ. NO.</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AREA MUN</th>
<th>PROJ. LEN (KM)</th>
<th>CFWD</th>
<th>2014 TOTAL BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 TOTAL BUDGET</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6089</td>
<td>REG. RD. 1 (SNYDER'S ROAD), COACHMAN'S LN TO BRUBACHER ST.</td>
<td>WIL 0.04</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5619</td>
<td>REG. RD. 5 (NAFIKER ROAD), AT NITH RIVER (N) (#0502)</td>
<td>WIL 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25 DE</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>BUDGET ADDITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6420</td>
<td>REG. RD. 8 (KING STREET), AT ADDRESS 1228 KING STREET</td>
<td>CAM 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25 D</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>BUDGET ADDITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5774</td>
<td>REG. RD. 8 (KING STREET), GRAND RIVER BRIDGE (#0807)</td>
<td>KIT 60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6455</td>
<td>REG. RD. 8 (KING STREET), AT ADDRESS 3570 KING STREET</td>
<td>KIT 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15 D</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>BUDGET ADDITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6100</td>
<td>REG. RD. 14 (WEIMAR LINE), W. OF MAPLEWOOD</td>
<td>WELL 0.14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5621</td>
<td>REG. RD. 17 (HAWKESVILLE ROAD), AT CONESTOGO RIVER (E) (#1703)</td>
<td>WOOL 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25 DE</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>BUDGET ADDITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5622</td>
<td>REG. RD. 17 (HAWKESVILLE ROAD), AT CONESTOGO RIVER (W) (#1704)</td>
<td>WOOL 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25 DE</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>BUDGET ADDITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6330</td>
<td>REG. RD. 24 (WATER STREET), AT GAL T FURNITURE PROPERTY</td>
<td>CAM 0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5551</td>
<td>REG. RD. 27 (MAIN STREET), MAIN ST. BRIDGE AT GRAND RIVER (#2703)</td>
<td>CAM 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5992</td>
<td>REG. RD. 27 (MAIN STREET), GRAND RIVER BRIDGE</td>
<td>CAM 70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5590</td>
<td>REG. RD. 28 (FOUNTAIN STREET), BLAIR BRIDGE AT GRAND RIVER (#2801)</td>
<td>CAM 250</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>650 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### REVISIONS TO THE 2014 TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL BASE BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJ. NO.</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AREA MUN</th>
<th>PROJ. LEN (KM)</th>
<th>CFWD</th>
<th>2014 BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 TOTAL BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5993</td>
<td>REG. RD. 33 (TOWNLINE ROAD), AT PINEBUSH ROAD (RR39)</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6417</td>
<td>REG. RD. 42 (BLAIR ROAD), AT ADDRESS 1635 BLAIR ROAD</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15 D</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>BUDGET ADDITION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5994</td>
<td>REG. RD. 50 (WESTMOUNT ROAD), AT UNIVERSITY AVENUE (RR 57)</td>
<td>WAT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>55 RH</td>
<td>-805</td>
<td>PROJECT DEFERRED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5995</td>
<td>REG. RD. 52 (BRIDGE STREET), GRAND RIVER BRIDGE (#52011)</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6355</td>
<td>REG. RD. 58 (FISCHER-HALLMAN ROAD) AT LAURELWOOD DRIVE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT POND</td>
<td>WAT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200 RH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5926</td>
<td>REG. RD. 70 (TRUSSLER ROAD), NITH RIVER BRIDGE (SOUTH) (#7003)</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25 DE</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>BUDGET ADDITION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5925</td>
<td>REG. RD. 70 (TRUSSLER ROAD), NITH RIVER BRIDGE (NORTH) (#7004)</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25 DE</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>BUDGET ADDITION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5554</td>
<td>REG. RD. 86 (LINE 86), CONESTOGO RIVER BRIDGE (#8605)</td>
<td>WELL</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7123</td>
<td>REG. RD. 97 (CONCESSION STREET), GRAND RIVER BRIDGE (#9791)</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5914</td>
<td>BRIDGE 0091 WEST MONTROSE COVERED BRIDGE AT GRAND RIVER (#0091)</td>
<td>WOOL</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>170 RH</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>REPORT E-14-044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5176</td>
<td>CULVERT REPLACEMENTS IN ADVANCE OF ROAD REHABILITATION PROJECTS</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5375</td>
<td>MINOR BRIDGE REPAIRS</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7223</td>
<td>MONITORING PROGRAM - BRIDGEPORT BRIDGE</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL BRIDGE AND DRAINAGE WORKS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>3,060</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>-510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SYSTEM MANAGEMENT / OTHER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJ. NO.</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AREA MUN</th>
<th>PROJ. LEN (KM)</th>
<th>CFWD</th>
<th>2014 BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 TOTAL BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6478</td>
<td>REG. RD. 24 (HESPELER ROAD), RETAINING WALL AT ADDRESS 200 HESPELER ROAD</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40 REC</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>BUDGET ADDITION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Revisions to the 2014 Transportation Capital Base Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJ. NO.</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Length (km)</th>
<th>CFWD 2014 Budget</th>
<th>2014 Total Budget</th>
<th>2014 Revised Budget</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7053</td>
<td>Asset Management Program</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5865</td>
<td>Bridge Testing and Evaluation Program</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5529</td>
<td>Developer Related Projects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5847</td>
<td>Digital Photo Log</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6485</td>
<td>Land Dedication Surveys and Purchases</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9035</td>
<td>Municipal Drainage Works and Storm Sewer Assessments</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5265</td>
<td>Noise Attenuation Wall Retrofits/Repairs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5555</td>
<td>Preliminary Design and Post Construction Expenditures</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>Revised Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5264</td>
<td>Railway Crossing Assessments / Improvements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5778</td>
<td>Research and Development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5528</td>
<td>Retaining Wall Repairs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>Revised Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5611</td>
<td>Storm Water Management Pond Rehabilitation</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9359</td>
<td>Street Lighting Modernizations / Installations</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5521</td>
<td>Traffic Count Program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total System Management / Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>945</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,530</strong></td>
<td><strong>2475</strong></td>
<td><strong>2515</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Traffic Signal Modernizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJ. NO.</th>
<th>Location / Description</th>
<th>WAT</th>
<th>2014 Budget</th>
<th>2014 Total Budget</th>
<th>2014 Revised Budget</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9638</td>
<td>Reg. Rd. 9, Erb Street at Erbsville Crt.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9631</td>
<td>LED Replacements</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9561</td>
<td>Minor Traffic Signal Modernizations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9635</td>
<td>Pedestrian Countdown Signal Upgrades</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### REVISIONS TO THE 2014 TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL BASE BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJ. NO.</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AREA MUN</th>
<th>PROJ. LEN (KM)</th>
<th>CFWD</th>
<th>2014 BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 TOTAL BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9648</td>
<td>QUEENS BLVD AT BELMONT STREET</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65 MOD</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65 MOD</td>
<td></td>
<td>BUDGET ADDITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9551</td>
<td>UPS INSTALLATIONS</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL TRAFFIC SIGNAL MODERNIZATIONS**

| 0.00       | 640 | 1,010 | 1,650 | 1,715 | 65 |

**TRAFFIC ENGINEERING GENERAL**

| 6337       | ACCESSIBILITY                        | 0        | 100              | 100   | 0            | -100               | PROJECT REMOVED |
| 6338       | ACCESSIBILITY                        | 0        | 100              | 100   | 0            | -100               | PROJECT REMOVED |
| 9415       | BARRIER FREE SIGNAL REQUESTS         | 0        | 25               | 25    | 25           | 0                  |                |
| 9582       | CENTRAL TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEM       | 1185     | 0                | 1185  | 1185         | 0                  |                |
| 9647       | LED REPLACEMENT REVIEW               | 0        | 0                | 0     | 50           | 50                 | BUDGET ADDITION |
| 9649       | OVERSIZE LOAD REVIEW                 | 0        | 0                | 0     | 50           | 50                 | BUDGET ADDITION |
| 9646       | PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLING COUNTERMEASURES | 0        | 100              | 100   | 100          | 0                  |                |
| 9474       | TRAFFIC CONTROLLER REPLACEMENTS      | 0        | 200              | 200   | 200          | 0                  |                |
| 9423       | TRAFFIC COUNTERMEASURES              | 0        | 60               | 60    | 60           | 0                  |                |
| 9256       | TRAFFIC SIGNAL SUPPORT PROGRAM       | 0        | 275              | 275   | 275          | 0                  |                |

**TOTAL TRAFFIC ENGINEERING GENERAL**

| 0.00       | 1,185 | 860 | 2,045 | 1,545 | -100 |

**INFILL SIDEWALK AND CYCLING FACILITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJ. NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>METHOD</th>
<th>KIT</th>
<th>2014 BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 TOTAL BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5712</td>
<td>REG. RD. 4 (OTTAWA STREET), WILDERNESS DR. TO WALKWAY AT WATERCRESS CT.</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5715</td>
<td>REG. RD. 8 (WEBER STREET), WILFRED AVE. TO MONTGOMERY RD.</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5726</td>
<td>REG. RD. 28 (FOUNTAIN STREET), SHANTZ MILL RD (RR8) TO PRESTON PKWY</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### REVISIONS TO THE 2014 TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL BASE BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJ. NO.</th>
<th>RDC%</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AREA MUN</th>
<th>PROJ. LEN (KM)</th>
<th>CFWD 2014 BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 TOTAL BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5730</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 50 (WESTMOUNT ROAD), UNION BLVD. TO FORSYTH DR.</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5906</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 86 (CHURCH STREET), HERBERT ST. TO 70M E. OF RAISING MILL GATE</td>
<td>WOOL</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5779</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>WATERLOO SPUR MULTI-USE TRAIL</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>BUDGET ADDITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL INFILL SIDEWALK AND CYCLING FACILITIES</strong></td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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# REVISIONS TO THE 2014 TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL SYSTEM EXPANSION BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>($000's)</th>
<th>CFWD</th>
<th>2014 BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 TOTAL BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPENDITURES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL SYSTEM EXPANSION BUDGET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS (GROWTH-RELATED)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT RELATED LEFT AND RIGHT TURN LANES</td>
<td>7,290</td>
<td>20,300</td>
<td>27,590</td>
<td>28,065</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC SIGNAL INSTALLATIONS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROAD WIDENINGS</td>
<td>22,210</td>
<td>24,620</td>
<td>46,830</td>
<td>45,630</td>
<td>-1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROAD SYSTEM EXPANSION</td>
<td>4,465</td>
<td>6,875</td>
<td>11,360</td>
<td>11,360</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34,125</td>
<td>53,760</td>
<td>87,885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| REVENUES: | | | | | |
| DEVELOPMENT CHARGE RESERVE FUND | 28,359 | 43,358 | 71,717 | 70,945 | -772 |
| ROAD CAPITAL LEVY RESERVE FUND | 3,221 | 3,982 | 7,203 | 7,250 | 47 |
| THIRD PARTY - CP RAIL | 2,125 | 170 | 2,295 | 2,295 | 0 |
| THIRD PARTY - OTHER | 420 | 2,250 | 2,670 | 2,670 | 0 |
| DEBENTURES | 0 | 0 | 4,000 | 4,000 | 0 |
| | | | 34,125 | 53,760 | 87,885 | 87,160 | -725 |

**Legend:**
- AG = ABOVE GROUND; BG = BELOW GROUND; CF = CYCLING FACILITY; CG = CURB & GUTTER; CP = COLD-IN-PLACE RESURFACING; D = DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS; DE = DESIGN; DK = BRIDGE DECK REPAIR; DSA = DEEP STRENGTH ASPHALT; EA = ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT; EXP = EXPANDED ASPHALT; IPS = PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL INSTALLATION; L = LAND PURCHASE; LA = LANDSCAPING; MOD = TRAFFIC SIGNAL MODERNIZATION; NC = CONSTRUCTION; PAD = PAVING; PL = PLANNING; REC = RECONSTRUCTION; RH = REHABILITATION; RSS = RECONSTRUCTION WITH STORM SEWERS; RW = ROAD WIDENING; R1 = RESURFACE SINGLE LIFT; R2 = RESURFACE DOUBLE LIFT; RM = RESURFACE MAJOR; SA = SURFACE ASPHALT; SI = INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT; SIG = TRAFFIC SIGNAL INSTALLATION; SL = STREET LIGHTING; ST = STORM SEWER INSTALLATION; SW = SIDEWALK INSTALLATION; U = UTILITY RELOCATION
## Revisions to the 2014 Transportation Capital System Expansion Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proj. No.</th>
<th>RDC%</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Proj. Len (km)</th>
<th>CFWD</th>
<th>2014 Budget</th>
<th>2014 Total Budget</th>
<th>2014 Revised Budget</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7332</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 4 (OTTAWA STREET), KING ST. (RR15) TO CHARLES ST. (RR64)</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7294</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 4 (OTTAWA STREET), HOMER WATSON BLVD (RR26) TO ALPINE RD.</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>635 DE</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7272</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RDS. 4 &amp; 70, OTTAWA ST. AT TRUSSLER RD.</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5602</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 8 (HIGHLAND ROAD), AT LAWRENCE ST. AND BELMONT AVE.</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>20 DE</td>
<td>-170 CONST. DEFERRED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5389</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 9 (ERB STREET), 100m EAST OF CAROLINE ST. (RR9) TO MENNO ST.</td>
<td>WAT</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>1210</td>
<td>1525 RSS</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>CF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5284</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RDS. 12 &amp; 58, NEW DUNDEE RD. AT FISCHER-HALLMAN RD.</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5441</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 15 (KING STREET) AT GEXR CROSSING - SUBWAY INSTALLATION</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>17800</td>
<td>17800 DE</td>
<td>REC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7042</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 15 (KING STREET) AT WATERLOO INN SERVICE ROAD TO BLUESPRINGS DR.</td>
<td>WAT</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>530 DE</td>
<td>REC</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7216</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 15 (KING ST) AT CONESTOGO RD.</td>
<td>WAT</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7248</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 17 AND REG. RD. 26, SAWMILL RD. AT ST. CHARLES ST.</td>
<td>WAT</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7316</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 22 (NORTHFIELD DRIVE), KING ST (RR15) TO KRAUS DR.</td>
<td>WAT</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>650 DE</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5334</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 24 (HESPELER ROAD) AT RAILWAY N. OF DUNDAS ST. (RR8) - GRADE SEPARATION</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>2700 LA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7185</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 24 (HESPELER ROAD) AT BEAVERDALE / QUEEN ST.</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75 LA</td>
<td>75 REVISIESTIMATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7197</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 39 (PINEBUSH ROAD), AT TOWNLINE RD. (RR32)</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7317</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 50 (WESTMOUNT RD.) AT LAURELWOOD DR. EXTENSION</td>
<td>WAT</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>1175 DE</td>
<td>REC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## REVISIONS TO THE 2014 TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL SYSTEM EXPANSION BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJ. NO.</th>
<th>RDC%</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AREA MUN</th>
<th>PROJ. LEN (KM)</th>
<th>CFWD</th>
<th>2014 BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 TOTAL BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7145</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 56 (BLEANS ROAD) AT FISCHER HALLMAN RD.</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>255 DE L</td>
<td></td>
<td>REVISED ESTIMATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7322</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 58 (FISCHER-HALLMAN ROAD) AT SIENNA ST.</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7319</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 58 (FISCHER-HALLMAN ROAD) AT COLUMBIA ST.</td>
<td>WAT</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>270 DE REC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7321</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 70 (ERBSVILLE ROAD) AT COLUMBIA ST.</td>
<td>WAT</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>690 DE REC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7252</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 75 (ST. ANDREWS STREET) AT GRAND RIDGE DR., FOURTH AVE., AND SOUTHWOOD DR.</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20 DE REC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7186</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 86 (CHURCH STREET), HEBERT ST, TO BARNSWALLOW DR.</td>
<td>WOOL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175 SA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7178</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>ROUNDABOUT EDUCATION PROGRAM</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS (GROWTH-RELATED)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,290</td>
<td>20,300</td>
<td>27,290</td>
<td>28,065</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DEVELOPMENT RELATED LEFT AND RIGHT TURN LANES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJ. NO.</th>
<th>RDC%</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AREA MUN</th>
<th>PROJ. LEN (KM)</th>
<th>CFWD</th>
<th>2014 BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 TOTAL BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7296</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 12 (NEW DUNDEE ROAD), AT ROBERT FERRIE DR. / REICHERT DR.</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7309</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 28 (FOUNTAIN STREET) AT LIMERICK DR.</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7171</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 53 (COURTLAND AVENUE) AT BLOCKLINE RD.</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1600 REC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7198</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 58 (SWAN STREET) AT HILTOP DR.</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7173</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>DEVELOPMENT RELATED BOULEVARD AND SHOULDER GRADINGS</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7097</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>DEVELOPMENT RELATED LEFT AND RIGHT TURN LANES TO BE IDENTIFIED</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7180</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>PRELIMINARY DESIGN AND POST CONSTRUCTION EXPENSES</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL DEVELOPMENT RELATED LEFT AND RIGHT TURN LANES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### REVISIONS TO THE 2014 TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL SYSTEM EXPANSION BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJ. NO.</th>
<th>RDC%</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AREA LEN (KM)</th>
<th>CFWD</th>
<th>2014 BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 TOTAL BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9644</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 6 (HIGHLAND ROAD) AT WEST AVE.</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80 SIG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9640</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 53 (COURTLAND AVENUE), AT BLOCK LINE RD.</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9645</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 86 (LINE 86) AT MANSER RD. (RR5)</td>
<td>WELL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50 SIG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9025</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>GROWTH RELATED TRAFFIC SIGNAL MODERNIZATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9024</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>TRAFFIC SIGNAL INSTALLATION LOCATIONS TO BE DETERMINED</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL TRAFFIC SIGNAL INSTALLATIONS

|               | 0.00 | 10 | 145 | 155 | 155 | 0 |

### ROAD WIDENINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJ. NO.</th>
<th>RDC%</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AREA LEN (KM)</th>
<th>CFWD</th>
<th>2014 BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 TOTAL BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5752</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 6 (HIGHLAND ROAD W) HIGHLAND HILLS MALL ENTRANCE, TO IRA NEEDLES BLVD. (RR 70)</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>250 EA DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5337</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 8 (KING STREET), EAGLE ST. (RR39) TO FOUNTAIN ST. (RR8) AND FOUNTAIN ST.-KING ST. (RR8) TO SHANTZ HILL (RR8)</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>605 DE L U</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7101</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 8 (WEBER STREET), COLLEGE AVE. TO GUELPH ST.</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>11605</td>
<td>11475</td>
<td>23080 DE RW U</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7327</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 9 (ERB STREET), IRA NEEDLES BLVD. TO WILMOT LN.</td>
<td>WAT</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7303</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 17 (FOUNTAIN STREET), MAPLE GROVE RD. TO KOSUTH RD. (RR31)</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>335 EA DE L U</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7257</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 22 (NORTHFIELD DRIVE), DAVENPORT RD. TO UNIVERSITY AVE.</td>
<td>WAT</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300 DE</td>
<td>300 REVISED ESTIMATE</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7111</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 28 (HOMER WATSON BOULEVARD), DOON SOUTH DR. TO CONESTOGA COLLEGE BLVD.</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>255 EA DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5204</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 33 (TOWNLINE ROAD), SAGINAW PKWY. TO CANAMERA PKWY.</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## REVISIONS TO THE 2014 TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL SYSTEM EXPANSION BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJ. NO.</th>
<th>RDC%</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AREA MUN</th>
<th>PROJ. LEN (KM)</th>
<th>CFWD</th>
<th>2014 BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 TOTAL BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5549</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 36 (FRANKLIN BOULEVARD), MYERS RD. (RR43) TO HWY. 401</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>4595</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>3095</td>
<td>8095</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5110</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 55 (VICTORIA STREET), HWY 7 BRIDGE TO EDNA ST. (RR62)</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>160 DE U RW SW</td>
<td>-1300</td>
<td>CONST. DEFERRED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7258</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 56 (BLEAMS ROAD), STRASBURG RD. TO FISCHER-HALLMAN RD. (RR58)</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7259</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 57 (UNIVERSITY AVENUE), KEATSWAY TO ERB ST. (RR9)</td>
<td>WAT</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>195 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7122</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 58 (FISCHER-HALLMAN ROAD), PLAINS RD. TO BLEAMS RD. (RR56)</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>870 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7313</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 58 (FISCHER-HALLMAN ROAD), CULVERT REPLACEMENT AS A RESULT OF STRASBURG CREEK FLOOD CONTROL STUDY</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7121</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 58 (FISCHER-HALLMAN ROAD), BLEAMS RD. (RR56) TO OTTAWA ST.</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>330 DE L</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5340</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 69 (MANITOU DRIVE), BLEAMS RD. (RR56) TO WEBSTER RD.</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>1670</td>
<td>1670 DE L U</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7282</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 70 (IRA NEEDLES BOULEVARD), HIGHVIEW DR. TO ERB ST. (RR9)</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>4075</td>
<td>4075 DE L RW SW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7226</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>HWY. 8 TRANSIT BYPASS LANE</td>
<td>WAT</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>3400</td>
<td>3400</td>
<td>-200</td>
<td>REPORT P-14-009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL ROAD WIDENINGS

|                  | 32.72 | 22.210 | 24.620 | 46,830 | 45,830 | -1,200 |

### ROAD SYSTEM EXPANSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJ. NO.</th>
<th>RDC%</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AREA MUN</th>
<th>PROJ. LEN (KM)</th>
<th>CFWD</th>
<th>2014 BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 TOTAL BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7131</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 17 (FOUNTAIN STREET EXTENSION), VICTORIA ST. (RR55) TO 1.0 KM N. OF VICTORIA ST. (RR55)</td>
<td>WOOL</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6433</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>REG. RD. 24 (AINSLIE STREET) EXTENSION</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj. No.</td>
<td>RDC%</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Area MUN</td>
<td>Proj. Len (KM)</td>
<td>CFWD 2014 Budget</td>
<td>2014 Total Budget</td>
<td>2014 Revised Budget</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7132</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Reg. Rd. 36 (Franklin Boulevard), Myers Rd. (RR43) to Cambridge S.E. Boundary Rd.</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800 DE l</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5274</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Reg. Rd. 53 (Fairway Road Extension), W. of Zeller Dr. to Fountain St. (RR17)</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1300 SA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5349</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Reg. Rd. 70 (IRA Needles Boulevard), Victoria St., (RR55) to S. of Erb St. (RR9)</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7087</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Reg. Rd. 56 (River Road Extension), King St. (RR8) to Manitou Dr. (RR69)</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>4100</td>
<td>4450</td>
<td>4450 DE l</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7129</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>S. Boundary Road, Franklin Blvd. (RR36) to Dundas St. (RR8)</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>840 DE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7192</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>S. Boundary Road, Water St. (RR24) to Franklin Blvd. (RR30)</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>1415</td>
<td>2045</td>
<td>2045 DE l</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7127</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Active Transportation Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7298</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Commuter Parking Lot Feasibility Study</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7299</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>East Boundary Road Corridor Protection Study</td>
<td></td>
<td>390</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7304</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Goods Movement Study</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7253</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Growth Related Land Dedication Surveys and Purchases</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7074</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Growth Related Studies and Design</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7288</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Homer Watson Blvd. - New Dundee Rd. to Manitou Dr., Transportation Review</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7305</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>New Highway 401 Interchange Near Reg. Rd. 58 (Roseville Rd.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7066</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7301</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Road Improvement Transit Priority Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### REVISIONS TO THE 2014 TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL SYSTEM EXPANSION BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJ. NO.</th>
<th>RDC%</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AREA MUN</th>
<th>PROJ. LEN (KM)</th>
<th>CFWD</th>
<th>2014 BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 TOTAL BUDGET</th>
<th>2014 REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7302</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>TRANSPORTATION AND TRANSIT FORECASTING MODEL DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ROAD SYSTEM EXPANSION</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>4,485</td>
<td>6,875</td>
<td>11,360</td>
<td>11,360</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Transportation

To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: June 17, 2014  File Code: T18-01
Subject: Region of Waterloo International Airport - Master Plan Update

Recommendations:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to the preparation of a draft Master Plan for the Region of Waterloo International Airport (“the Airport”):

(a) Endorse the recommendation of the Airport Master Plan Project Team to complete a draft Master Plan for the Airport on the basis of maximizing the existing capacity of the Airport as described in Report E-14-087 dated June 17th, 2014;

(b) Include a strategy within the draft Master Plan for continuing the pursuit of additional passenger air service opportunities which will maximize the existing capacity of the Airport terminal building and associated Airport infrastructure as described in Report E-14-087 dated June 17th, 2014;

(c) Incorporate a strategy for the attraction of additional businesses that may establish aeronautics or aviation-related undertakings within the thirty-five (35) acre leased land development area located in the northwest corner of the Airport;

(d) Co-ordinate, where possible, the resources and strategies required for new air service development and new business attraction at the Airport with the Region’s broader economic development initiatives, including the development of the East Side Lands to the south of the Airport;

(e) Direct Airport staff and the Master Plan Project Team to take the following
additional matters into consideration in the preparation of a draft Master Plan for the Airport:

(i) In consultation with the Aeronautical Noise Management Committee, consider additional opportunities for both increasing awareness concerning aeronautical noise and its mitigation;

(ii) Prepare a 2015-2024 Capital Plan for the Airport to reflect the plan for maximization of the existing Airport infrastructure as set out in Report E-14-087 dated June 17th, 2014;

(iv) Include a review of the Airport Master Plan, once approved, at regular intervals or upon the operations of the Airport achieving the passenger and financial objectives set out in Report E-14-087 dated June 17th, and

(v) Undertake an evaluation of any further actions, such as federal zoning protections or designation of airport reserve lands, that may be recommended to ensure opportunities for future growth are preserved.

Summary:

This report is intended to provide a further update on the process of preparing a Master Plan for the Airport which will guide future airport development. The Airport Master Plan process began in 2013 and two Public Information Sessions were held on February 6th and April 15th, 2014. The purpose of these sessions was to obtain the views of the community and other stakeholders concerning the evaluation of various possible airport development scenarios over the twenty (20) year planning horizon of the master planning undertaking.

This report summarizes the information received from the community during the public information sessions and includes a series of recommendations that are intended to guide the preparation of a draft Master Plan document for the Airport. It is anticipated that a draft Master Plan document will be available by the end of 2014 and that a further public information session will be held in early 2015. Thereafter, a recommendation to adopt the Master Plan for the Airport will be presented to Regional Council.
Background

The Region of Waterloo International Airport (“the Airport”) is a key feature of the Region’s transportation infrastructure. More than 300 direct full-time jobs are associated with commercial and aviation activity at the Airport and, in 2013, the Airport hosted 138,733 passengers. Commencing in the spring of 2013, a project team consisting of staff and Councillors Sean Strickland, Jim Wideman and Geoff Lorentz from the Region of Waterloo, Julie-Anne Herteis from the Township of Woolwich, Donna Reid from the City of Cambridge, Angela Vieth from the City of Waterloo, Berry Vrbanovic from the City of Kitchener in addition to staff from the Airport, the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, the cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo, the Township of Woolwich and the Grand River Conservation Authority began the process of developing a master plan for the future development of the Region of Waterloo International Airport. The complete membership list of the Airport Master Plan Project Team is attached to this report as Appendix A.

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

What is the purpose of a Master Plan?

The master planning process is a tool used by most airports across the country to anticipate, and plan for, future airport development. The most recent master plan for the Region of Waterloo International Airport was completed in 2001. Considerable development has taken place since 2001 and during this time (between 2001 and 2014), the assessed value of commercial and private (personally owned hangars) construction at the Airport has increased from approximately $4.4 million to $14.7 million. In 2009, Regional Council also adopted a five (5) year business plan for the Airport. A diagram depicting the process employed for developing the Master Plan for the Airport is attached to this Report and marked as Appendix B.

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

Two public information meetings were held at the Waterloo Region Museum in Kitchener on February 6th and April 15th, 2014. A brief presentation was provided to attendees together with short presentation on noise mitigation measures associated with future airport developments. Attendees were also able to view a series of large sized boards depicting four phases of possible airport development ranging from a “status quo” option to a larger facility capable of fulfilling the role of reliever airport contemplated in a needs assessment study released by Transport Canada in 2011. Members of the Project Team were on hand at both meetings to answer questions raised by members of the public. Invitations to the public information meetings were distributed by mail to neighbors adjacent to Airport lands and attendance was also solicited by means of a comprehensive list of public notice advertisements in local media, roadside signage, Regional publications, Cambridge Chamber of Commerce publication, Communitech and the Greater Kitchener-Waterloo Chamber of Commerce e-Newsletters. The timing of the sessions was also widely made known through local media reports in advance of both meetings.

Copies of the presentation boards and other relevant reports and documents were made available together with information describing four conceptual airport development scenarios on the Airport website http://www.waterlooairport.ca/masterplan.

The two public information sessions were preceded by four (4) consultation sessions with airport stakeholders. A complete list of stakeholders assembled by the Project Team and who were consulted during the initial planning process is attached to this Report and marked as Appendix C.

In addition, members of the Project Team met with specific community groups requesting further information concerning the master plan process including the Kitchener-Waterloo Association of Realtors, the Airport Business Advisory Council, the Economic Development Advisory Committee in Cambridge, the Aeronautical Noise Management Committee, the Airport Tenant’s Committee and representatives of Concerned Residents Against Waterloo Airport Noise.

A Master Plan information poster with handouts directing passengers frequenting the Airport to the Master Plan page of the website was on display in the departure lounge from March 20th to May 31st, 2014. Hard copies of the survey were made available to attendees at both public meetings and were available on the Airport website from early February to May 31st, 2014.

Public and Stakeholder Consultation – Results

Approximately 350 people attended the two public information sessions in February and April of 2014 and 186 written comments were received between February 6th, 2014 and
May 31\textsuperscript{st}, 2014 which includes both hard copy and online submitted comment forms and e-mails submitted to Project Team members or to the general delivery mailbox for the project.

A compilation of the written comments received is attached to this Report and marked as Appendix D.

The following statistics were generated from the comments received:

- 45% of the comments (83 respondents) received favoured the “Option 1 - Status Quo” development scenario which would entail no further significant capital expansion of the Airport;

- 28% of the comments (52 respondents) indicated a preference for a phased plan to develop the Airport – identified as Option 3 - Moderate Growth - in the presentation materials – which included a plan for development which may ultimately accommodate up to one million passengers from the Airport facility within the twenty year planning horizon of the Project;

- The remainder of the comments were roughly equally split in favour of either Option 2 a lower projected growth plan which could accommodate up to 388,000 passengers annually (5% or 8 respondents) or Option 4, a reliever scenario which could possibly accommodate more than one million annual passengers (8% or 14 respondents), or did not express any preference at all (16% or 29 respondents);

- Of the 186 written comments received, 112 expressed concerns with airport noise, many expressly referencing concerns with noise resulting from the commencement of early morning flights by Nolinor in October, 2013; and

- 60% of the respondents that included address information with their comments reside in the Kitchener area with 10% from the City of Cambridge and the remainder distributed throughout Waterloo Region and Guelph.

The results of the public information sessions were provided to the Project Team and the following key messages were drawn from the comments as they applied to each of the development scenarios that were evaluated:

(a) **Option 1 - Status Quo: Optimize Use of Existing Airport Infrastructure** – **243,100 annual passenger capacity** – Of the comments received favouring this plan, 93% voiced concerns with community impacts of further airport development and specific concerns with aeronautical noise. Others indicated a preference for this option as a result of concerns with the capital costs associated with other options while some cited the impact of a possible rail linkage between the community and Pearson International Airport which may facilitate easier and
more convenient access to that airport in the future.

(b) **Option 2 - Low Growth: Limited Expansion of Air Terminal – 388,000 annual passenger capacity** – This option, intended as a second phase of development once the existing terminal can no longer accommodate demand, also entails the extension of the secondary runway oriented north-south. As a result some attendees at the public meetings cited concerns with possible aeronautical noise resulting from larger aircraft being able to utilize this runway should it be lengthened from 4,100 feet to 6,000 feet. The Project Team received correspondence from both American Airlines and WestJet confirming their support of a plan to extend the secondary runway which would provide an added measure of reliability for their existing operations should weather conditions favour use of a crosswind runway. Currently, the commercial operations of both airlines are minimally impacted by the inability to utilize a crosswind runway in adverse weather conditions. This impact, however, would likely be more of a concern if the Airport were to be successful in securing additional service, or added frequency of existing service, with either carrier.

(c) **Option 3 - Moderate Growth: Secondary Expansion of Air Terminal – 388,000 to 1 million annual passenger capacity** – This option, intended as a third phase of development, would include a more substantial expansion of the air terminal building and relocation and lengthening of the primary east-west runway to the east thereby displacing take-offs from Runway 26 farther from the residential areas in Kitchener west of the Airport. Comments in favour of this option cited the noise mitigation opportunities resulting from runway relocation while others had concerns with the magnitude of the capital costs associated with this option which were roughly estimated to be approximately $100 million. Prior to the second public information session, Bearskin Airlines announced its intent to withdraw all air services from Ottawa including the Waterloo-Ottawa route which had been operating since 2007. Accordingly some respondents expressed skepticism about the need for Airport capacity to accommodate up to 1 million passengers as a result and given the proximity to existing air services offered from Pearson International Airport.

(d) **Option 4 - High Growth: Reliever-Style Airport – more than 1 million annual passenger capacity** – Those respondents in favour of this option cited the economic benefits that may accrue to the Waterloo Region from a reliever style airport which would complement the capacity of Pearson International Airport. An evaluation undertaken by the Project Team and the Project Consultant revealed that it is unclear whether demand for a reliever-style airport will emerge in southwestern Ontario within the next twenty years. There is also some uncertainty as to whether this demand may materialize resulting from the federal government announcement in early 2013 that it intends to proceed with the
construction of an airport in Pickering. As well, current passenger usage of Pearson is 36 million passengers annually with a theoretical capability of accommodating up to 50 million passengers once the area of the facility is fully built out. Many respondents cited concerns with the community impacts that would result from a plan for such considerable expansion and, accordingly, any serious further consideration of this option would entail additional study beyond the scope of the current master plan undertaking.

Project Team Recommendation

On May 8th, 2014 members of the Airport Master Plan Project Team met for the purpose of considering the feedback received from stakeholders and the public and to define the parameters of a preferred development option which would form the basis of a draft Master Plan.

The Project Team agreed to recommend that the draft Master Plan for the Airport be built around the theme of maximizing the existing capacity of the Airport, identified as “Option 1 - Status Quo” in the presentation materials. The key reasons supporting this recommendation can be summarized as follows:

- The Project Team recognized the need for the Master Plan to achieve a balance between future Airport development and concerns of local residents, especially in the residential areas of Kitchener to the west of Runway 26 noting that additional residential development has been approved by the City of Kitchener, or is otherwise pending, in this area;

- The adoption of plan to maximize the existing infrastructure will not entail any new significant capital expenditures while existing debt associated with prior capital investment will become fully paid within the next eight (8) year period. This will result in a reduction in the per household taxpayer contribution for the Airport as this debt is retired with the first substantial reduction commencing in 2016; and

- Demand for Airport capacity exceeding 388,000 passengers annually would require changes outside of the control of the Region. Examples of such changes could include the introduction of one or more new low cost air service providers into the Canadian market that may wish to operate from the Airport or limitations associated with the capacity of Pearson International Airport. Given the uncertainties and possible risks associated with the business case supporting a plan for such capacity in the future, the Project Team recommended a plan to optimize the existing Airport infrastructure and re-evaluating that plan in the future once the objectives of the Master Plan have been realized.

In recommending the preparation of a draft Master Plan incorporating “Option 1 - Status
Quo”, the Project Team also recommended that any necessary measures to protect for further expansion be evaluated and identified in the draft Master Plan document. Specifically, the Project Team recommended the completion of an ongoing environmental study concerning the potential for expansion of the secondary north-south runway and evaluating any measures that might be required for reserving future lands for development or obtaining federal zoning protection for additional runway capacity.

What Could a Draft Master Plan Include?

The primary objectives of a draft Master Plan to maximize the existing capacity of the Airport infrastructure can be measured financially and in terms of the number of passengers using the Airport annually. The draft Master Plan could also target the creation of employment opportunities through the development of leased lands for aviation and aerospace related industrial and commercial undertakings.

In 2013, the Airport hosted more than 138,733 passengers. It is anticipated that this number will be reduced in 2014 given the decision by Bearskin Airlines to discontinue its Ottawa service, which accounted for approximately 20,000 annual passengers. Given the current configuration of the air terminal building 250,000 annual passengers can be accommodated and this number could be greater depending on the frequency and type of aircraft that may be used to provide air service. For example, if the passenger usage is spread out over the course the day and not concentrated during peak times, more capacity is possible. It is recommended that a reasonable target for annual passenger usage remains at 250,000. This target would be achieved, by way of example, with the addition of a replacement daily service to Ottawa, some modest additional seasonal charter activity and one additional daily flight to either Calgary or Vancouver utilizing a Boeing 737 or similar sized jet aircraft.

It is also recommended that the draft Master Plan include an updated capital plan. Taking into consideration additional revenues which will accrue as the Airport nears its target of 250,000 passengers and the maturing of debt that was originally incurred to fund prior Airport capital expenditures, it is anticipated that the per household taxpayer contribution needed to operate the Airport will be reduced. Currently the cost of operations and debt associated with the Airport are offset with a per household taxpayer contribution of approximately $25.\footnote{Based upon an average per household valuation of approximately $281,000.} The implementation of a plan for optimizing the current capacity of the Airport would not likely eliminate a taxpayer contribution needed to fund the Airport; however, a reduction by up to 50% is likely once the objectives of the plan have been fulfilled.

How Can the Objectives of a draft Master Plan be Achieved?
In its recommendations, the Project Team has suggested that the draft Master Plan include a revised strategy for commercializing the thirty-five (35) acre leased land development area located in the northwest corner of the Airport. This area is fully serviced and affords both airside and groundside access (via Fountain Street) for as many as eight commercial facilities of a size of more than 10,000 square feet.

Commercial development of these Airport lands could complement the development of lands within the Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve Lands several kilometres to the south of the Airport; also known as the East Side employment lands. The strategy for commercializing these lands may include collaboration with the Township of Woolwich and could entail the designation of these lands as a community improvement plan area. The Planning Act of Ontario permits municipalities to designate certain areas as a community improvement plan areas and to structure certain incentive programs to encourage community development and economic goals associated with the plan. The City of North Bay, for example, has implemented a community improvement plan for the North Bay Jack Garland Airport which is intended to stimulate development of employment related opportunities at that airport. Further work will be done by Regional staff in consultation with the Township of Woolwich on the parameters of what an Airport community improvement plan may entail.

The draft Master Plan will also include recommendations for attracting additional air services which will result in the fulfillment of the target of 250,000 annual passengers. These recommendations may include enhancements to the current measures employed by the Airport to both promote use of existing air service providers such as WestJet, American Airlines and Sunwing and to attract new air service providers. A provider of non-stop service to Ottawa with opportunities to connect to other eastern Canada destinations in Quebec and the Maritime provinces would, for example, afford many convenient travel options for residents of Waterloo Region.

**How will the Region Address Current Noise Concerns?**

Many of the noise-related comments received by the Region were specifically related to noise resulting from the commencement of Nolinor operations to northern Canada in October, 2013. These operations are conducted with an early variant of the Boeing 737, the 737-200 which is louder than most aircraft used for regularly scheduled air service by companies such as WestJet and others. A number of comments received specifically supported the imposition of a late evening/early morning curfew on flights as a result of the Nolinor departures at 6:00 am, three times weekly with additional flights during daytime hours.

Since the initial public information sessions, Nolinor has agreed to delay its early morning departures by one hour, to 7:00 am effective June 1, 2014.

The Region will continue to work with the Aeronautical Noise Management Committee
(“ANMC”) to explore options for noise mitigation. The ANMC is an advisory committee that meets quarterly and provides recommendations to Regional Council concerning aeronautical noise related issues.

The Project Team will also evaluate the suggestion for late night flight restrictions bearing in mind that the ultimate approval of flight curfews is a matter within federal jurisdiction and accordingly regulated by Transport Canada. In 2013, flights between the hours of 23:00 and 07:00 accounted for less than one per cent of the total of all movements from the Airport. This issue will be considered in finalizing the Master Plan.

Will there be Opportunities for Additional Public Consultation and Feedback?

The Project Team will work on the completion of a draft Master Plan taking into consideration the recommendations in this Report. This draft Master Plan will be made available to members of the public by the end of 2014 via the Airport website (www.waterloointernationalairport.ca/masterplan). An additional public information session will be held in early 2015 and those members of the public that have asked to be informed of any further public consultation opportunities will be notified in advance of the meeting. Following this public information session in early 2015 the draft Master Plan will be submitted to Regional Council for its consideration.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

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

Financial Implications:

The approved 2014 Airport budget includes $165,000 for the Master Plan which is sufficient to complete the project as described in this Report.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence: N/A

Attachments

Appendix A – Project Team Membership List
Appendix B – Airport Master Plan Timeline
Appendix C – Airport Master Plan – Stakeholder List
Appendix D – Compilation of Written Comments from the Public
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The Region of Waterloo International Airport Master Plan

Project Team Membership

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

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

Beth Brown, Grand River Conservation Authority

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

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

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

Scott Nevin, Director Growth Management and Councillor Angela Vieth, City of Waterloo
Appendix B

The Region of Waterloo International Airport Master Plan Process

Airport Master Plan Process

- Understand where we are
  - Completed 2000 Master Plan
  - Evaluating future needs of Airport

- Explore where we could go
  - Working to provide a set of recommendations for the next 20 years
  - Four potential options under consideration

- Evaluate how we can get there
  - Seek feedback on preferred option development
  - Ensure the continued operation of a safe, efficient and environmentally compatible Airport

- Discuss where we want to go
- Discuss how we want to get there

Establish Airport Project Team
- Spring 2013

Public Information Session #1
- Feb. 6, 2014 (Complete)
- Apr. 15, 2014

Public Information Session #2
- 2014 TBD

Recommend to Council
where we will go, and how we will get there
Prepare a written plan for Airport development with a series of recommendations for implementation 2015
Appendix C

The Region of Waterloo International Airport Master Plan Stakeholder List

Transport Canada
Canadian Owners and Pilots Association – Local Flight 26 as well as National HQ
Canadian Business Aviation Association – Ontario Region
Air Transport Association of Canada
NACC – Airline Association for Air Canada, WestJet, Transat, Jazz
Chambers of Commerce – KW, Cambridge, Stratford & Guelph
Waterloo Airshows Inc.
YKF Airport Operating Committee
Westjet
Bearskin Airlines
Sunwing
American Airlines
Local Ground Handling companies – Airways & GSI
YKF Aeronautical Noise Management Committee
Nav Canada
Greater Toronto Airports Authority
Ontario Aerospace Council
Airport Business Advisory Committee
Airport Facebook & Twitter followers
Appendix D

The Region of Waterloo International Airport Master Plan Public and Stakeholder Consultation – Comment Compilation

Region of Waterloo International Airport – Master Plan Survey Responses (February 6 to May 31, 2014)

NOTE: Online Survey Closed May 31, 2014

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

COMMENTS:

- Mostly, Very helpful having plenty of staff to answer questions.
- The SID's show the average flight paths and not actual flight path
- Not clear how option 3 & 4 are paid for.
- The four options are very well detailed and explained.
- We thought board #7 was very misleading. It seemed to indicate only a relatively small increase in the number of flights expected regardless of the option. This concealed the fact that the number of large aircraft flights would increase by a factor of 4x (one opinion) to 10x (another opinion) to 40x (what the chart really seemed to show in our opinion). It did not distinguish between training, military, cargo and large passenger flights, which is crucially important. In short it appeared to be a piece of deceptive marketing.
- It would be helpful if the maps and scale used to outline the new runways were the same for each of the four proposals. It was hard to see the changes between the proposals when trying to compare them.
- Just as your online information very clear and well read!!  Good job.
- I wasn't able to attend the session but do have the materials
- They did only partially.  There was no information on the number of airplane traffic that would be flying over Kitchener-Waterloo in each possible development option. There was an approximate passenger number, but no possible aircraft number. Also, did not address the possible number of cargo flights.
- Easily understood
- Yes, but as was said at the meeting, it's pretty tough to understand what should be done some 20 years out and we'd need to see some pretty dramatic changes in the region to visualize A $100 million project.
- It was very clear
- All of the options are mislabelled.  E.g. 'status quo' should be labeled 'low growth', since it involves a passenger increase of ~60% compared to today.
- yes
As I stated in #1, I was not able to attend and was therefore unable to view the display boards. It might have been better to have this information meeting in the spring, when it would be better for more concerned citizens to attend.

No. They were understandable, though highly skewed towards results favourable to the airport. At times the information provided was outright wrong, including limiting noise corridors to only one type of plane (unlikely any expansion would centre around one aircraft). They also failed to consider the cost of a) loss in resale value of area homes and b) health costs associated with increased noise and air pollution. Both of these costs need to be assessed in order to get a true picture of total costs.

To be honest, I didn't look at them. My main concern is the LOUD Nolinor flight. My understanding is that the possible developments would introduce newer, quieter flights, so I don't think the expansion is a horrible thing. Bring in newer, quieter planes NOT older, loud ones.

Yes, though for option 1, it said that as debt is retired, the taxpayer contribution will decrease. However, it later says that with growth limited to 243, 100 passengers, it would not be self-sustaining. Why not just keep the $25/household for that purpose, since it is no longer used for debt retirement?

It was very clearly visible that most flights will greatly impact K-W. The noise will be more and louder than ever before!

Yes, the presentation of the four options was well thought out and somewhat informative.

Yes-after the first speaker Chris Wood explained the outline - it was much clearer.

Yes - but there is nothing that explains how passenger demand is being calculated or predicted. I am very concerned that future demand is being predicted on past data. Nothing explains why the runway are being changed - is it for noise? Is it to accommodate new airlines and routes?

If it was data from an unbiased source I would believe it. How can you possibly expand and make more noise, with the problem with noise that exists today?!

The boards show the noise level to 70dB (level of car alarm). Please show dB levels to 50dB on the maps.

Yes - Excellent with appropriate details.

Yes, it was understandable, but meaningful not so much.

Yes. Would have like to know the number of additional flights off and on each runway.

Yes-brief but informative.-could have included more business development implications as I feel those are major drivers.

Yes. Very good!

Good help from staff. Posters not completely dummy-proof.

STOP THE EXPANSION
• Yes in general. I thought there could have been more consideration of environmental impacts in each of the four options.
• Yes, with the added help of persons to answer and explain additional information.
• The display boards did adequately outline the four possible development options in a meaningful and understandable way.
• Well done. Very informative.
• PARTIALLY. There was no mentioning of some aspects of the plans that will have enormous impacts on the residents of Kitchener. The information was presented only from the point of view of 'These will be the advantages for the economic development of the Region'. To improve the presentation there must be information included to illustrate the potential impact on the citizens -- more details about the type of information that impact on quality of life and the reduction in home values will be presented in section #3.
• The PDF did not show the options on line. Most pages were blank.
• Yes, possibly too much information to try to understand.
• I only saw the ones on this website and I think you have been clear.
• Was not at the public meeting.
• mostly
• They were a little too complicated, I was told that planes already using the airport are 80% to 90% full however we are paying up to 1.4 million to American Airlines over the current contract.
• The displays weren't bad visually - maps could have been better - but I was concerned about the general statements included e.g. asserting job growth for certain options, and felt they did not address questions about the neighbourhood impacts. I appreciated the simplicity of the chart of options, but felt it risked somewhat misrepresenting possibilities as facts e.g. reduction of noise, job creation numbers.
• Only partially. The boards did not mention some aspects of the plans that will have enormous impacts on the residents. The information was presented from the point of view of these will be the advantages for the economic development of the Region. To improve the presentation there must be information included to illustrate the potential impact on the citizens -- more details about the type of information that impact on quality of life and the reduction in home values will be presented in section #3.
• to a degree
• No, they did not. They failed to show the subdivisions (houses) affected. The displays showed roads, but they failed to outline if these were houses or commercial areas. They failed to show how many thousands of people's daily lives will be disrupted and disturbed. These boards shown a very one sided growth for the region.
• Yes. They were well done.
- Yes- the boards explained the options but left out a lot of the financial costs involved and the FULL impact that would have on the taxpayers.
- Yes - the display boards were quite effective.
- Only partly. I do not think that the number of additional flights that would be expected in Option 2, 3 and 4 were clearly described. This was given as number of passengers, and when we asked about number of flights, a very unclear answer was received.
- Very much.
- The drawings are not accurate with regard to the actual noise heard by the residents.
- See above comment - unable to attend.
- Yes I found the display boards to outline all 4 options very well with nice visuals and simple and understandable bullet points.
- I have reviewed the options and they are not 100% understandable in how noise will be impacted. It was indicated that noise would not increase, however, with a significant increase in flights the # times per day that residents near the airport will hear noise is drastically increased. That is gravely concerning. There is already enough noise.
- Yes & no, some were very complicated and hard to read. Colors for graphs too similar and felt like a lot of money was spent on boards which were repetitive and could easily have been less complicated.
- I did not attend the Public Information Session. The information on the website adequately outlined the 4 development options.
- No
- Where on the internet or in any newsletter are these display boards? Were these only on display @ the information session? Where can they be viewed now?
- Yes to me it was. However, some residents felt that it was a plan to justify spending money.
- N/A. I learned about the possible expansion from a local newspaper.
- I read about the changes in a newspaper
- It explained the objectives from the airport management perspective rather than the community's perspective. Should the airport objectives and activities not be totally tied to the needs of the community?
- IT THREW NUMBERS AT US WITHOUT EXPLANATION AS TO WHERE THEY CAME FROM.
- The display boards did an adequate job of outlining the 4 options. They put forth a set of options that magically improve our fiscal situation as we increase the amount spent. They were almost laughable with their lack of detail. I'm quite certain a qualified 'paid' specialist provided loads of analysis on why a larger airport would be self-sufficient. Did the analysis include a serious independent review of the failures of the likes of Hamilton or why the current airport struggles
to meet current objectives? The noise seminar was also lacking in substance. The noise expert's presentation lacked any depth. He stood up and told us how the impact of noise is dependent on how loud and how frequent it is. His display likening decibel levels to certain objects did little to demonstrate how the db curve is exponential. It did little to show how 70 db is several times louder than 45. Perhaps that was the idea. In addition the presenter was not even aware the province had its own noise level requirements for residential developments, 50db at the property line during the day and 45 at night), vs. the 70db on the ground that we were presented with. We live near the airport and there will be more noise but one would think the people in charge of the airport would have some knowledge of other legislated noise levels.

- I was not able to attend, but have reviewed documents and minutes from the meetings.
- The boards didn't mention any downsides of airport expansion, so I felt they were of limited value. I was particularly disappointed that air pollution from planes wasn't even considered as an environmental impact, according to the rep from the GRCA, considering that air quality in the region is already as poor as any region in Ontario. The costs of air pollution are considerable, to the health system, families, and employers.
- They were designed to push viewers to the conclusion you preferred.
- I never saw any display boards
- Adequate outline

**QUESTION:** Is there more information that you feel is required to assess the merits of one or more options?

**COMMENTS:**

- more details on costs to implement a phased in approach, how the existing subsidy will remain in effect, or increase, or decrease
- What is going to be done to address the concerns of residents in Woolwich who are going to be experiencing greater noise levels than even their city counterparts? Will we be ignored because our numbers are fewer?
- Cost profit analysis over next 10, 20 years for option 1, 2, 3, 4
- Would like to know why you want to expand the airport when you have not met current objectives
- Feedback is needed for the true forecast of usage from passengers and airlines.
- More information regarding noise expectations for each option.
- Environmental impact not shown. The airport is surrounded by wetlands that will be impacted - these should be shown in some sort of mapping.
- Although you show noise patterns, you do not show time frames. Hearing noise at 2pm is a lot different then noise at 2am, especially with the windows open.
• Option 4, as indicated, requires further analysis. Is it safe to assume that is option may be pursued by Transport Canada, if it all?
• Impact on real estate value
• I would like to know how much the airport is making money wise.
• Show how growth required for #3 to be self-sustaining will be achieved.
• There seems to be little thought given to getting an extra million people in and out of the airport, only vague assurances it can be done. Mr. Wood did not even know where the planned Hwy 7 extension was to be routed or where the intersections are to be located in relation to his airport. Planning about traffic patterns based on flight times seems to have been completely ignored.
• More information regarding noise and pollution are required.
• Not for me - but for the population that still requires more explanation and thought provoking information. I am thinking to expand to them how the noise levels will decrease and the revenues will increase with options 3 and 4.
• nicely presented
• I believe the information presented was sufficient for this stage of planning to solicit public input.
• UNSURE AT THIS TIME
• A quick web video explaining the options in overview would be useful.
• It was not made entirely clear what the impact of Pickering was about. I.e. What's happening in Pickering? What impact will the LRT have on the airport financially?
• It seems self explanatory the option 4 in my opinion should be a work in progress for the future of the airport. It would be excellent to have a facility such as this in the area. I feel we should proceed with caution to be sure we would get the airlines support as well as the passenger numbers.
• An actual business plan that proposes how the airport plans to increase the number of planes and passengers to support each option. The existing course of action (paying airlines to provide service) is fiscally irresponsible.
• We have lived in the Stanley Park and now Idlewood areas of Kitchener since the mid 1970's and have always felt we required more information when it comes to decisions about the airport. It would have been more important if the concerns of the people living in our area had be listened to, and enacted upon, during the 70's, 80's and 90's, but I am not so sure they were. I am not certain the concerns of the residents will be heard now either. In my mind there are really only two issues. The potential for growth for business and development, which would be assisted by airport expansion, or acknowledging that this form of development has a major impact on the citizens of the region living under the flight paths of large aircraft, and thus shifting the need for growth and development in this area to other ways and means.
• The airport scenarios are presented as standalone projects with only positive impacts. Infrastructure costs to accommodate airport growth are not mentioned.
What is the budget in the master plan for both the airport and the Region is made for upgrades to roadway access, water and sewers, power etc.? At what point does the governance of the airport go to its own board rather than being a body of the Regional government. Option 3 suggests it would be self sustaining, except that situation only occurs at the upper end of the projected growth. To get the growth to 780,000 passengers is a 600% increase which would involve an economic boom of sustained length beyond 20 years but we would be paying a subsidy throughout that period.

- Full cost of real estate loss and health costs related to neighbouring communities. Full costs of the environmental impact given how close the airport is to a) communities and b) the watershed.
- No more studies, it cost a lot of money that could be spend on the expansion of the airport
- Which airlines companies have express interest on operations out of our airport? What cost (subside)? Deny that Cargo companies would be the most likely to be interested on our expanded airport is misleading, then what is the plan to make them a positive addition to our community?
- If you're expanding, set curfews (no earlier than 7am departures)
- From what I can see it all looks good.
- Yes. Identifying where passengers will come from. With Pearson on the west side of Toronto, I worry there will not be enough demand from the surrounding area to warrant the more ambitious options. I do not have any estimates to look at however, so, as I am no expert, I cannot be sure.
- Stratford & Woodstock are farther than 35kms from the airport if want to get there by anything other than a plane! So, you display is misleading in terms of catchment area. What other misrepresentation are there in the information provided????I have to question the integrity of the people developing this plan. Are they trying to conceal something??Also, the noise footprint is for planes taking off N & W. What about E & S? We in Cambridge (Hespeler) get lots in those instances.
- Yes, tell the truth what is planned. How many more flights we liaise to put over our head and how often. In 2011, Ken Seiling stated no expansion is planned for the airport. Not even a year later they commissioned the Master Plan. ALL LIES!!
- Yes. More information regarding noise is required. Aircraft flight overhead can affect property sales and valuation. The Airport planners must illustrate the expansion must not affect home owners (nearby).
- It seems like 70dB is not loud enough to describe the noise level we hear in our neighborhood. The 6:10-6:20 a.m. flights to Iqaluit is much louder then my alarm clock in the morning. Couldn't they leave later (7am)
- See answer #2 above.-Noise is a major concern.-What new routes and airline option will be available?-More detail needed re: prediction of passenger/airline demand.
- Yes!!! The noise model must be calibrated and ‘ground-truthed’.
- Noise Exposure Forecast is used to show number of complaints. The boards do not show the NEF project only dB. Please provide the NEF project per option.
- Number planes flying over my house - corridor numbers.
- It would have been helpful to know how many planes instead of how many passengers will be added with each option. (The high/low variations are very extreme).
- Business development implications. Typical growth surrounding airport expansions - explanation of potential economic impact assumptions.
- Noise info not complete
- Yes. Will there be more cargo contracts. Will there be larger planes. Will there be louder planes. Cost impacts: noise complaints rising.
- More clearly spell out how passenger count will increase. (ie: one more westjet flight or A/R Canada Scheduling similar service etc.)
- STOP THE EXPANSION
- Nothing merits any of these options
- 1) Compare investment/infrastructure cost projection with other recent Regional projects (e.g: bridges and roads) so people understand what 50 million or 100 million actually is. 2) Actual examples of noise e.g.: Harley Davidson, vacuum cleaner3) Explain what comparable airports are (e.g.: ones of comparable population)4) Explain the realities of the Region population growth; new business, investments, the costs
- I need to go online but my answer to #4 was still pretty obvious to me
- In addition to environmental impacts, I thought additional information regarding land acquisition in #4 could have been provided further. I thought the potential economic impacts could have been explored move.
- Yes - specifically noise impact
- Only the ability to see into the future.
- Just Option 4 - would the Federal government become involved? (since we would be the overflow of Pearson Int’l)
- I feel that all the information has be covered.
- Not at this time.
- More information on potential jobs and economic impact including tourism. I would also be interested to learn what potential commercial flights and/or destinations may be considering the airport in an option 3 or 4 scenario.
- All figures and it’s focussed on taking off to the West of the airport. None seems to focus on cargo places (the noisiest, earliest departures) and other planes to east so that we in Northern Cambridge (Hespeler) get woken up at 5-6am almost
everyday. Since most of your complaints were on cargo planes, you need to make assessments of these old, noisy, planes taking off to east and deal with abatement of noise levels in that direction.

- I am concerned about increasing air traffic with its consequent increase in noise, changes to air traffic routing patterns, and those two items' effect on the property values of nearby homeowners.

- "YES!!! The following important points need to be addressed and identified in a public way so that the public can make reasoned decisions on the merits of each plan. I. The economic impact on the value of homes that will be underneath the takeoff and landing routes needs to be presented. The estimate presented by a local real estate agent at the meeting was at least 7% loss in equity for each home. What is this amount for all the homes currently impacted by the SID takeoff route for runway #26? II. The economic impact assessment needs to include an estimate for the loss in the tax base when MPAC re-assesses the homes in the areas affected. The boards should also explain to the citizens how this loss in tax revenue will be replaced. In other words, what other parts of the Region will get a tax increase to cover the loss in taxes from the impacted areas? III. The economic impact explanations did not make it clear how much tax payer money is being spent to subsidize airlines? Nor did it explain how long these subsidies will remain in effect and whether the subsidies diminish each year over the length of the contract. Currently, the flights to Chicago are being subsidized to the amount of approx. $600,00 to $ 400,000 annually, to compensate American Airlines for the loss of seat sales. Are the tax payers supposed to be paying more into the pockets of the airlines and put up with noisy and half empty flights over our heads??!!? IV. Waterloo Region has one of the poorest air quality ratings in Ontario. What will be the impact of adding many more airplane flights to the air quality of the Region, especially on the hot humid summer days? V. No mention was made in any of the 4 plans for a no fly (or blackout) period each day. As the airport grows the number of times residents will have their sleep disturbed is going to increase if we continue to allow a 24 hour operation. Why is there no mention on the boards of introducing a no fly time period such as from 23:00 to 07:00. The only exceptions would be for the emergency landing of either an aircraft in mechanical trouble or a medi-vac emergency.VI. The boards were very thorough in explaining the increase in passenger traffic but there was little mention of cargo type flights. In fact one of the major concerns at present is the terrible noise coming from cargo airplanes taking off at about 06:10 most days. The displays need to explain what the plans are for this type of traffic in each scenario."

- I feel information presented was adequate

- With increased expansion, the need for safety in the future becomes a greater concern, especially with increased traffic. The potential for business traffic has the potential to increase as this the airport is ideally situated. The need for fire
services and de-icing facilities would make the airport more viable in the future and will attract business to this region.

- I would like to know more about the Transport Canada study that identified this airport as a potential option for relieving Pearson transport congestion in the future. If Waterloo is a serious candidate, I think this represents a valuable opportunity for growth and prosperity for the Region - our businesses will continue to benefit from additional travel and transportation options.

- How do I now find out about any options? - including the next meeting?

- Re option 3 or 4 (if we can look that far ahead) meaning option 4. How do we address the large increase in car traffic to the airport. i.e.: the current bottle neck at Shantz Hill in Preston now?

- Was not at the public meeting

- Yes, the airport is already subsidizing American airlines to the tune of $400,000 last year and a possible $600,000 this year. Why was that not mentioned at the information session. Also there is currently no transit accessibility to the airport.

- Yes, I do feel that the effects on the surrounding neighbourhoods need to be taken further into account.

- Eastward connections not mentioned

- An airports worth is largely based on real estate, is the land and holdings worthy of plan #3 which is the one that was really being pushed as the best by all involved with the meeting

- Yes, definitely, significantly more information is required. The research was extremely narrow in focus and therefore potentially misleading. For example, noise research did not take into account neighbourhood noise from increased road traffic owing to higher passenger numbers at airport, only plane noise, especially in the context of pending industrial development of surrounding lands. Will more homes require noise deeds or can some be removed under certain scenarios? What about community environmental impacts of larger airport and more traffic, and in the context of development? And so on. Will the economic development of the surrounding lands lead to greater use of the airport and need for less subsidy? Any research needs to take into account any and all impacts on the surrounding community and the changing context of that community. The research presented also did not take into account the broader context of the airline industry - we need to look at what other Ontario airports are planning, particularly Hamilton, to see if our plan coordinates and makes sense in the broader context. With the current airport still reliant on taxpayer subsidies, it is vital that projections and business plan be thorough and comprehensive; general statements such as what appeared with Option 3 re: 'typically self-finance their operational and capital requirements' do not lend sufficient credibility to the discussion. I'm concerned that the Master Plan is tied in with an Official Plan that is already being challenged before the OMB. What if any impacts will it have if
the OMB rules against the Plan? Will this change some of the assumptions upon which the airport master plan is based?

- Most definitely YES. The following important points need to be addressed and identified in a public way so that the public can make reasoned decisions on the merits of each plan:-The economic impact on the values of homes that will be underneath the takeoff and landing routes needs to be presented. The estimate presented by a local real estate agent at the meeting at least 7% loss in equity for each home. What is this amount for all the homes currently impacted by the SID takeoff route for runway #26.-The economic impact assessment needs to include an estimate for the loss in the tax base when MPAC reassesses the homes in the areas affected. The boards should also explain to the citizens how this loss in tax revenue will be replaced. In other words, what other parts of the Region will get a tax increase to cover the loss in taxes from the impacted areas?-The economic impact explanations did not make it clear how much tax payer money is being spent to subsidize airlines? Nor did it explain how long these subsidies will remain in effect and whether the subsidies diminish each year over the length of the contract.-Waterloo Region has one of the poorest quality ratings in Ontario. What will be the impact of adding many more airplanes flights to the air quality of the Region, especially on the hot humid summer days? A study of air quality impact needs to be coordinated with the Waterloo Region Health Unit.-No mention was made in any of the 4 plans for a no fly (or blackout) period each day. As the airport grows the number of times residents will have their sleep disturbed is going to increase if we continue to allow a 24 hour operation. What will the increase in costs be to our medical system if sleep deprivation becomes a major problem for residents in the areas impacted? Other airports, such as Pearson, have a no fly period! Why is there no mention on the boards of introducing a no fly time period such as from 23:00 to 07:00. The only exceptions would be for the emergency landing of either an aircraft in mechanical trouble or a medevac emergency.-The boards were very thorough in explaining the increase in passenger traffic but there was little mention of cargo type flights. In fact one of the major concerns at present is the terrible noise coming from cargo airplanes taking off at about 06:10 most days. The displays need to explain what the plans are for this type of traffic in each scenario.

- Yes. Option 1 the status quo indicated that financial sustainability is a ‘no-go’. I may have missed something, but why?

- Yes, property values will drop in affected areas, houses closer to the airport and directly below flight paths will be virtually unsellable, and citizens’ lives will be disrupted by constant flights.

- Not at this time. If option 4 is selected more people will need to be updated.

- In considering future development in the short, medium and longer term, I think it’s important to examine:- the past growth patterns in both usage and demand- the services provided by nearby airports (not just Pearson)
- I feel there needs to be full disclosure of the financial costs involved. Option 2 - I still have many questions about!! I don’t believe that the noise impact was fully addressed (ie. the flight path of the planes presently on the option boards gives the impression that there is not much noise which is not the case! During the information meeting when people asked questions regarding the noise they clearly did not want to have that discussion. I would want a lot more detailed information about the noise impact. Not just an estimated decimal level for an area.

- I would like to see an information session held in Cambridge since we are also affected by the airport’s location and its plans for the future. I could not attend on the day it was held in Kitchener and it wasn’t a very convenient location for those of us who live in Cambridge.

- I would like the potential noise implications to be mapped out under different scenarios. For instance there should be multiple SIDS to distribute the noise loads more equitably amongst the neighboring communities. For instance the current Sid for runway 26 takes the departure directly over Grand Hill. We want to see multiple SIDS so that noise is distributed.

- "YES. The following aspects need to be included in the assessment and discussed. I. The fact that there is no current curfew was mentioned, and when questioned about this, no answer was given about why a curfew could not be put in place. The answer we were given was ‘some airports have curfews and some airports don’t’. We were not given a satisfactory answer of why Waterloo does not. A curfew should be considered as a part of any of these plans. II. The economic impact on the value of homes that will be underneath the takeoff and landing routes needs to be addressed. This was not considered at all in the presentation. And this economic assessment needs to include the lost tax revenue due to decreased value of the homes affected. III. What will be the impact on air quality of the increased air traffic? This was not mentioned. IV. When I asked about what the increase of cargo traffic there might be, it appears that there is no control over this. This is not acceptable.”

- Would like to know what airlines would be interested or who are already interested in flying out of YKF if there is further development.

- Possibility of a severe accident as infrastructure is built out over subdivisions and allowed to fly over our neighbourhoods. - Economic impact of quality of life lost as a result of inability to spend peaceful family time in backyards. - Failure to address

- Has the presentation been posted on a website for people to view for those people unable to attend the last presentation or to refresh their memories on the issues.

- No, all the information presented was more than enough.
• I understand that there is no curfew on flights. It makes no sense that takeoffs begin before 7 a.m., when there is normally a noise bylaw that should prevent significant noise within the City at this time. Why is the City of Kitchener allowing this to take place? Why is it even necessary for the airport to create this hugely negative impact outside of 'normal working hours' for households under the 'take off' route? Is the airport paying an 'excessive noise fine' for such flights? If so, this seemingly creates a conflict of interest for the City of Kitchener, as they are receiving a 'win fall' of money each time a plane takes off at this inappropriate time. We resided here before the international flights began over our home; thus, residential use precedes this airport function. Therefore, how are you addressing the effect on home value and the effects of air/noise pollution on our homes? The Region and City of Kitchener clearly need to look at this effects; they have ramifications on property taxes as well.

• No I personally like #3

• Absolutely, why can't the airport send flights out to the east toward Guelph where there will be less noise impact on residents. Adding more flights means more times per day with noise for residents in the Fairway/Lackner corridor.

• Yes, felt like everything in this hand out was just read to us. It could have been mailed and saved a lot of expense of hosting a meeting, salaries and graph's etc.

• a) What type/size of planes will make up the additional flights? b) What hours of the day will flights land/depart the airport? c) What periods in the day will have the most flights land/depart? d) How can 3 or more times the number of flights result in less noise? e) What are the noise impacts from option #4?

• Look at history of Malton to present and look for location further out on flat/substandard land.

• Are noise projections based on actual measurement or merely on modelling?

• Assessments by experts on the actual noise experienced over residential neighborhoods

• They need to be up at 6:00 am in the Chicopee area when the jet goes over at a very low altitude. It feels like the plane could crash!

• Yes, details about each plan with the pro’s and con’s (for any stakeholders that wish to contribute) of each.

• There is always more information that could be provided. The promise of a follow-up was appreciated.

• The MOST important purpose of any Business Plan is to determine where the company has been and them to where it is going. It should reflect on what the objectives were at the last Business Plan (BP) and determine why these were not achieved. In this case, the gap was significant. We should learn why and if conditions were sufficiently changed to change to roadway ahead. The major questions: Why did we only achieve 60% of our objectives during a period of explosive regional growth? On what community based information are the future
projections based? Many options (Option 2 in particular) are recommended on the basis of improved safety. For example, the extension of Rnwy. 14-32 is to offer improved landing conditions. How many aircraft have had to divert due to cross wind conditions or even declared a near miss based on inadequate runway layout? Even if this runway was extended would the more suitable Rnwy 26 not be preferred (prevailing winds) and ILS during suitable low ceiling and visibility conditions. In other words what improvement to our current operations would Option 2 provide?

- WE have no idea where these projected numbers come from. What makes you think you get even the modest projections (Option 1) when you have not reached your numbers set in 2000?
- YES, WHY DID WE NOT EVEN COME CLOSE TO REACHING OUR OBJECTIVE? WHERE DID THESE PROJECTIONS COME FROM? WHAT IS THE SOCIAL COST OF EXPANSION?
- I would like to see the entire report. I would like to see a review of the current airport plan with detailed cause and effect analysis of how we find ourselves with a $6.5M deficit. What went wrong? With only $3M in revenue, 50% capacity and $6.5M deficit it appears the best-case scenario would still be a $3M shortfall. Was that the plan? There was no mention of the infrastructure costs for Fairway or Fountain. I would like to know if the proposed options are in addition to the current Regional Airport budget that includes $50M in capital expenditures over the next ten years. I would like to see a study on the impact on the home values in the area of continued increase in the noise levels.
- From my perspective I have enough information, and enough experience as a long-time resident in one of the effected neighbourhoods.
- Transit context. GO at Breslau? iXpress on Fountain and/or Fairway?
- Speaking to the residents of the area should be a priority. Or, your entire team should move to the area to assess the damage your airport is doing to the quality of life of the residents in the neighborhood.
- We need to discuss these options in more detail, on more than one occasion. We need more than one more Public Session.

QUESTION: Which development option do you believe would be best suited for the community? Why?

COMMENTS:

- I think that it has been shown that more public awareness is needed to attract more passengers. While the status quo is useful for those who already use the airport, success will only come with growth.
- I picked 1 as my first choice and would be happy with 2 depending how we get there. I realize that 3 or 4 additional flights per day by a carrier flying 737-900's
would be barely noticed and put the airport close to achieving the goals of option 2. Whereas 3 or 4 more Nolinor 737-200's would cause no end of grief. 6-8 more A/A flights would be barely noticed.

- We do not want further noise. We have enough noise from ground traffic. Now we are to contend with air traffic noise as well!
- KW needs to move towards the future
- I fully support of smart, well planned urban growth, if a city (or Region) is not growing, providing economic opportunities, young professional people will leave for greener pastures. However, if the Region needs a more active airport, relocation further from the developed urban areas should be considered. Less impact on residential areas.
- A larger airport would make the noise much worse for the communities that live under the current SID.
- Because the flight plan is moved away from our house. Not sure where the extra $50 million is to come from for capital construction. I don’t think we’re ready for High. Moderate allows some growth.
- Would suit the needs for the immediate future.
- Reduced noise over Kitchener. Financially self-supporting. Safety.
- Easy choice, this option best balances the needs of the Region, the public, and the general aviation community.
- None.
- We want flights over our neighbourhood greatly reduced.
- It was hard to choose between 2 and 3. The forecasts for the region’s growth were recently found to be lower than thought, which is fine by me. But, I choose 3 in the end because - lower noise, self sustaining (however, this worries me because we may not reach the levels required, then we will be stuck with white elephant).
- The general approach to the public information sessions has devolved into an undemocratic managed public relations event in which questions are being ignored and glossed over, and only rarely answered in specific and concrete terms. Consequently I do not trust the people in charge of this process.
- Option 1 - Status Quo would allow commuter traffic to double before reaching the 246,000 capacity. It seems that it is not necessary to expand the airport at this time. Economically speaking, flight prices out of the region cannot compete with Toronto's prices, or even Buffalo, and both of these airports are close enough. Option 1 also does not greatly increase the noise in other areas of the region, which is obviously a concern. I am currently living in Hopewell Heights in Breslau with minimal air traffic over my house. Before building our house, we researched the airport and the runways so we new what to expect. Options 2-4 significantly increases the air traffic over our subdivision as the flight path would be directly over our subdivision.
• I am in agreement with options 3 and 4. I am leaning towards 3 first as the noise levels will decrease and the airport will not be a burden on the taxpayers...a ‘win-win’ situation. We also need to expand the airport if we are to build the region of waterloo and grow as everyone wants!! You cannot have both without some kind of give and take. The moaners should be told to shut up and deal with it as they all knew what they were getting themselves in for...do not whine and moan now!!!

• If the demand is there from carriers, then according to your materials, this option eventually gets us a self-funded airport, as opposed to one that requires a subsidy.

• the demand is not there-- as a taxpayer facing light rail costs and costs of water/infrastructure renewal it will be too much to over-expanded a more focused target for airport users rather than all things to all people--why try to compete with Pearson --prove the clients that we want are there

• Selected Option 3 and 4 Option 3 for the short-term Option 4 for the long-term

• This will cause the least amount of pollution and noise disturbance. If you truly believe that a large airport is needed, a new airport must be built much further away from the cities.

• Option #4 High Growth. If we want to attract big business we have to give the appearance and perception that we mean it. Anything less than high growth sends the wrong message to those contemplating a move. It would be great not to have to deal with Pearson Airport, moving forward! It is the logical choice for a reliever facility handling flights originating to and from the west. You would not have to deal with Pearson airspace, as well as mitigating the need for a new airport in Pickering, until much further down the road. It's the only logical choice, and we are only doing this once. Let's do it!

• As regional ratepayers we should not be considering any options that will continue to require a subsidy from property tax base for this airport. What we need is an airport that can be funded by the business and people that benefit directly through use of such a facility. Consider that a round trip ride by limo to YYY is about $250 and compared to a taxi ride to YKF at $50. Then multiply these savings by the number of passengers from our region that could use YKF instead of YYZ to get an indication of the magnitude of user benefit.

• Option 1 - Status Quo. I live in Breslau ON, pretty close to the airport (Wakefield St.) and the noise-level is high. The size of the airport should not be increased at all. Also, the resale value of our properties will be negatively impacted by any change of the size of the airport.

• Option 4, attract new business to the region. YZZ is too busy and their landing fee's are too high. Great opportunity to lure business from Toronto.

• The status quo option serves the interests of this community best. Expansion of airport services may assist a limited vocal group with business interests.
Developing a rapid transit plan to Toronto for air passengers and freight would offset traffic issues along the 401.

- #4 I support and feel we need. Toronto is too busy and we have a chance to make it into a niche market for us.
- Revert the airport back to a recreational facility. An international airport is not needed in the region.
- I believe that a modest but regionally approach would be best. We need to attract a lot more use of the airport and see a genuine interest in the region by airlines. We can have the most fabulous air and ground side setup, fully passenger oriented, but if no one wants to fly out of the region, or if airlines don’t see the worth here, then its all for nought.
- Number 3
- Keep the 'status quo'. The little growth the airport has experienced since its expansion is a mirage; it is a result of taxpayer subsidies to the airlines. The major airlines already have operations in 4 larger airports (YYZ, YTZ, YHM, YXU), all within 100 km of Waterloo Region. There is no evidence they are interested in adding a 5th.
- I believe Option 3 is sustainable over time. The airport must grow and add scheduled flights. I would prefer to fly out of Waterloo than Toronto.
- I believe the first scenario is the best for the citizens living near or under the flight paths. The Region of Waterloo has taken on far too many expensive projects and it would not be appropriate to go further with this one as well during these difficult economic times. But this does not resolve the underlying noise problems which will be referred to below in #6.
- Status Quo. Possibly, low growth. The people who run this region have a build it and they will come attitude. We seem to be subsidizing everything in an effort to look world class and progressive. The LRT will be a prime example. We will be throwing close to a billion dollars at the project, only to subsidize it for years and I believe the same will happen with the airport.
- Status Quo. No expansion! We live in the Doon South area of Kitchener and there is enough air traffic overhead already. Noise is an issue. Passenger airplanes are loud enough to interfere with the enjoyment of our property when we are spending time outside and can be heard from inside with the windows closed. At the moment, it is tolerable but a greater frequency of air traffic would be a serious impediment to our enjoyment of our property, our quality of life, and property values. Please do not make the mistake of assuming it is only the louder commercial flights that cause disruptions and discomfort for Kitchener residents. Passenger planes are also problematic.
- Option 1, status quo, with the following conditions: No fly curfew between 11pm and 7am. Third party committee to advise on noise complaints/make
recommendations to the region. Those currently involved are too close to the situation and are unwilling to listen to the concerns of neighbours.

- Expand the airport and have longer runways in order to land bigger aircraft and have more takeoff and landings which bring in more revenue.
- I echo the comments of Ken Selig, we want an airport the meets the needs of our community not an oversized noise machine.
- No investment at all, but use of internally generated revenues or as any business borrow money, use it wisely, reign on the expenses and generate revenues to pay the debt.
- Change the Nolinor take-off time. Yes, I realize this is not one of the scenarios, but this is my main concern.
- I believe that development scenario #3 Moderate Growth is best suited for the community because this is a growing region, and it'll need an appropriately sized airport in the future. Because the Region will be home to approximately 731,000 people in 2031, it needs to have an airport that is capable of serving the population. Today, most people use Pearson. In 2031, things will be very different, and getting to Pearson will likely be a much larger hassle than it is today. Option 3 is best suited for the community because it reduced noise over Kitchener, it will be self-financing, it will provide a significant economic boost to the Region, and it ensures that the airport will be capable of handling local travel demands in the future. My second preferred option is scenario #2 Low Growth.

- I would go for option 3 for the following: It brings the airport to the stage where its profitable, Brings it to the stage to being a good backup for Toronto as Pickering is bad because of the cost, eating up good farmland and the fact that there is more population to the west of Toronto than the east, Option 3 leaves the option open to grow to option 4.
- If there is enough potential passengers for option #3, I like that one the best. It reduces noise, increases the capacity of the airport, and is more likely to attract new carriers or increased service. However, it is reliant on more passengers, and as I have stated, that worries me. So if we were to be cautious, option #2 would be my second choice.
- I believe that option 3 is best suited because it moves the runway away from the residential areas of Kitchener and reduces the noise. Option 1 and 2 don't do much to address the future needs of the community. Option 3 provides a lot of economic growth potential and it'll benefit the local economy.
- None. Or Status quo. Until the airport can actually meet or exceed its forecast passenger target then NO additional money should be spent on it. Millions have already been spent. Yes passenger numbers are up BUT never meeting forecasts! So airport will never be self-supporting. So, no more taxpayer subsidizes. Don't even suggest Provincial or Federal funding, it’s still my tax dollars.
• My vote is for Option #1 but will settle for Option #2, if necessary. Both Options #3 and #4 are non-starters. Over the years, we have seen one airline merger after another (if not outright bankruptcy), indicating a contraction of the airline industry. Post-9/11 security, coupled with airlines piling on fee after fee, have driven passengers to other modes or to cancel trips outright. For example, we recently took the train to Ottawa. We have stopped our annual trips to Tucson and Grand Cayman. We have seen several cases where airlines begin flying to YKF and then, one-by-one, they cease operations, ostensibly because the subsidies ran out. Mesaba is the most-recent example. YKF is about an hour's drive from YXU, YHM and YYZ, where more selection, and in some cases, lower IFR minimums are provided. Most Torontonians live within a cab ride away from YYZ. However, many drive to Buffalo, since fare prices are far less expensive. YKF cannot compete with Buffalo. During the Feb 6 public meeting, one of the staff said, ‘If you build it, they will come.’ Really? They built Mirabel and they're not coming to Mirabel. What happens if the planned income to the airport does not materialize after the expenditures have been made? Does it go bankrupt? Does it disappear? My wife and I own an aircraft at YKF. Over the years, we have seen more and more encroachment by the airlines. Sixty-eight percent of the aircraft movements at YKF are general aviation, yet nothing is mentioned of the effect that airport expansion will have on GA. As it is, we have often been shoved out of the way while doing a practice instrument approach because some airliner was inbound. Increasing airline traffic exacerbates the problem. Increased traffic makes it time-consuming to wait for a take-off clearance, all the while burning fuel at over $2 per litre. Imagine the cost to a student trying to earn her multi-IFR while paying the hourly rate for a Piper Seminole, complete with instructor ($348/hr + HST).In our situation, we had been tied down on Apron II for a number of years when we received a letter that Taxiway A was being moved and we would lose our tie-down. No other tie-downs were planned, so we were forced to seek out a hangar â€“ a more-expensive option. The airport's snow removal policy puts a high priority on Apron III, yet Apron I is often neglected. Clearly, the airlines have priority. Prior to the arrival of the airlines, we could park for free. Now, we have to pay.GA also includes flight training. We have both fixed-wing and rotary-wing schools at YKF. Conestoga College now has a flight programme in co-operation with WWFC. It is essential that they not be affected by the increased traffic as well as the presence of heavy aircraft. We already have enough delays and vectoring due to wake turbulence. The Master Plan doesn't seem to provide for GA. With YKZ closing down, we can expect a number of owners previously based there to move to YKF. Indeed, that was our former base. What provision is being made for them? We didn't see any. By opening up tie-down spaces, we could generate income to the airport while at the same time, respecting its GA roots. Something that should be pursued is to
provide LPV minimums to runway 32. We have that capability for runway 08/26, and an RNAV (LNAV-only) approach already exists for 32.

- NO EXPANSION. Noise levels are at the maximum!!! Sorry, having a 737 buzz by your bedroom on a nice summer night is not a lot of fun. Even in winter the Nolinor flights are very loud during the daylight hours, (I understand they have Special Engines ???).... House values will drop if expansion is going ahead. It was a little regional airport, if you want a mega airport move it further away (Elmira) up where there are fewer homes. As there WILL be noise!!!

- We would prefer status quo. We choose this option because we moved to the Breslau Thomasfield subdivision off Victoria St N. off Fountain St. We currently hear significant loud noise from aircraft especially when we have the windows open. With option 2, 3 and 4, the runway path moves significantly more over to our side of the neighborhood. Shifting this from Breslau town to our side of Breslau is simply shifting the noise to our neighborhood which will result in complaints. When we purchase the home we monitored the noise and understood the current noise but the expansion and shift of runway to our side of Breslau was not communicated.

- If you want to develop the airport, you need to move it away from the City of Kitchener/Waterloo. Runway 26 flies smack right in the middle of the city of Kitchener; flights turning either directions impact residents!

- -3 or 1-3: possibly a balance between economic growth and minimize adverse affect on others. -1: no new increase in number of flights.

- -#1-with adjustments to Iqaluit flight times. -We actually enjoy planes taking off and watching them go up – it’s the really loud/long take off time flights that seem to be annoying to people. -Option #4: less noise/more flights/people/discounts to people

- Undecided. Need more information regarding whether there actually will be increased passenger/airline demand. I understand that the airport is currently operating at only 50% capacity and I question whether expansion is even necessary.

- Not determined due to above information.

- The airport needs to continue forward and grow more flights and destinations are required to ensure that people fly locally instead of driving to Pearson, Buffalo or Detroit. Economic Development will accelerate with growth. OPTION #4- HIGH GROWTH MUST BE CHOSEN

- The one with the least impact on noise levels for those ALREADY affected - Deer Ridge.

- Option 1 or 2. Question: Why did city allow development of subdivisions around the airport if there was plan to expand?
- Option 1 or 2, because people in the surrounding homes probably do not want the additional air or land traffic. (As it is, there are planes during the night, and this is annoying).
- I am in favor of option #3 and #4, but suggest that option 3 is most appropriate currently, reserving OPTION 4 for future development.
- Difficult to answer without assurances that noise will improve
- #1 Status Quo
- All depend on restrictions that can be applied: e.g.: time blocks. -Plane restrictions more strict than Canadian Minimum Standards-Different routes
- At this point, not enough information to adequately form an opinion.
- Option #1-More airport traffic results in more disruption and noise to the area.
- STOP THE EXPANSION
- #1 - Stop the expansion
- Option #1 - we do not want anymore noise pollution - not to mention tax dollars. Ridiculous.
- 3 - THREE - TROIS Status quo - does not address it's potential Option 2 - isn't much different then status quo (benefits are minimal) to capture economic, tourism and community benefits, need to make significant changes.
- Status Quo - low growth, moves more flights directly over Breslau, also passenger inc is about 55% but costs are 10x higher, would however be preferable to the other 2 even more expansion and noisier options
- Option 3-Meets more future needs-Economically more viable-Noise issues somewhat abated-Improves regional prospects
- Option 1: I would like to see how the LRT works out before burdening the tax payer with another large project.
- Realistically, I would support option #3 however, I think option #4 as a long term option is worth considering further. All of this is contingent on environmental issues being adequately addressed.
- Either 2 or 3 - likely 2. The issue that scares me is the increase in number of weekly flights. A little less noise per flight won't mean a thing if there are 10 - 20 more flights daily.
- I think development of #3 should be approved. I also think it’s important to prepare for option #4. The old adage If you build it, they will come but that is the future.
- Option #3: Do it right the first time! it is cheaper in the long run
- I believe option #3 would best suited for the community because it seems to be a steady paste where is not to high and not to low for expectations.
- Option #3 - make the airport self-restraining and would address basic demand for flights from this region.
- Option #3! If we want to grow business in Waterloo Region, we need to have direct access to markets. We can benefit from more commercial flights - and
businesses will find the region more attractive if it is easier to access. Tourism will be a major beneficiary of more flights into Waterloo Region.

- I don't know but based on current noise levels as noted above every day, early morning, late evenings, I am not in favour of airport expansion so that more planes will fly over Hespeler. Every modern passenger jets are noisy, when all is quiet at night it's easy to get woken up. So I would have to say I vote for Option#1 unless the airport/Region/airlines do more to consider all residents of the Region regardless of the number of complaints.
- I am in favour of option #1. I do not want more airplanes flying in and out of my area.
- Please count our votes for option #3 and possibly #4. Option #3 would not only control the noise that some residents seem to be having a concern over but also offer more possibilities for the much needed expansion and opportunities to use our beautiful airport to its potential.
- Unfortunately the Waterloo airport is located very close to the eastern residential areas of Kitchener. This means that any expansion to a large scale full service airport will have significant negative noise impacts on these neighbourhoods. In essence citizens, elected representatives and airport officials have to weigh the value of economic development on the one hand against the other hand which represents negative impacts on the citizens' quality of life. I have tried to look at both sides of this balance and have concluded that the long term growth must be kept to a minimum. Long term, large scale growth of this airport must be kept to a minimum due to the location of the airport and its close proximity to Kitchener. In fact, the airport is very poorly designed, as any flights leaving from runway 26, which is the main runway being used, will directly fly into the very populated area of Kitchener. Any responsible airport planning must correct this design and either reverse all flights, so that they take off in the opposite direction (away from Kitchener) or completely relocate the runway (very expensive solution). Although both passenger and cargo flights will be needed, I would prefer that preference be given to passenger flights and that both passenger and cargo flights be restricted to operating from 07:00 to 23:00. Since Option 1 will only require a modest capital investment I think the Region must be prudent and go with this option. Recall that the taxpayers will be called upon for large amounts to fund the new LRT system and it makes no sense to make commitments for an expensive expansion of the airport when the LRT will require in excess of $250,000,000.
- I feel Option 3 is the scenario that fits best, extending runway 14-32 takes us out of the Fair weather airport. Extending Runway 08-26, to the east, will decrease noise concerns, from locals Both these must be done to make the Airport marketable to Airlines for more destinations
- I have read about the various proposals in the paper. I would support the moderate plan as I would much prefer to use this airport as Pearson is too busy.
A moderate plan would provide the growth potential to realize growth for the future. It may attract future contracts as Toronto grows.

- I believe that the full development as a reliever airport should be strongly considered because of the potential financial (i.e., business) benefits as well as potential personal travel benefits. I expect that the business benefits are far greater than the personal benefits. The only personal benefits would be if the airport fees are such that the airlines can offer less expensive flights from KW than Pearson.

- Believe scenario #3 would be the best option for the airport at the present time. Perhaps in 2- years from now #4 could work. Afraid of all the increased traffic etc. that might occur with this kind of expansion.

- Clearly the only choice for the present is option #1, and only when the present $6,000,000 annual is greatly reduced will this change, and the need for option 2 & 3 will only arise after 2029 according to the Pickering needs assessment study. So future councils/staff in the 2020’s will have plenty of time to plan, or have the present staff, to plan for its own time.

- I believe maintaining the status quo would be best suited for the community. I am concerned about the noise and air traffic and the money it would cost to build this. With the LRT on its way, I think this generation of taxpayers in the region has enough on its plate. The costs for large projects never end up being what is originally forecast and I don’t believe the risk is worth the money.

- Option 3 from looking at a quick overview of the options. However exploring the options in more detail may change my opinion.

- Option 3 because it allows for reasonable growth, at the same time as allowing the airport to become financially self sustaining while at the same time, reducing noise over Kitchener with the relocation of the runway.

- Number 1, with some changes. First of all the airport should be moved to a more rural region, like between Stratford and Kitchener. If it is not moved then the main runway should be pushed back as outlined in option 3, i believe.

- I feel that scenario 1 with modifications to the flight plan need to be considered. I have not heard enough evidence to support the fact that the airport is currently at capacity and has contracts in place to justify the further extension.

- Full growth. Continued use of TO for all connections to west, east and south just plain unnecessary and costly to park or taxi to TO and difficult at prime business times due to traffic.

- 3 or 4. We need to get bigger to attract industry which will create jobs. Our tax base can no longer support the area. Too many large employers have gone and are disappearing.

- Plan 1 or close airport maybe keep for training. Was not informed of any possible future contracts or sustainability for amount tax dollars. Not being used by enough residence to cost so much, not even worthy of public transit.
• "I didn't feel I had enough good research to adequately assess the options. If I had to choose based on what I heard that evening, I would maintain the status quo, work to address current noise complaints, and continue on with developing the plan, broadening the research as per areas identified above. I heard from residents: 1. when they bought their home it wasn't in the flight path; the path was subsequently moved without their consultation and has since adversely effected the quality of living in their home, and also the value of their property (one participant quoted 7% decrease in value, another shared how airplane noise was a major concern for prospective home owners and he had not received any interest in his home despite decreasing the sale price). 2. Another shared his frustration at being assured by Regional administration of low noise impact and a non-24 hour airport when the airport originally opened; both have proven to be false, causing him and other homeowners to question the reliability of data currently being shared 3. I also heard that some homeowners believe the Region has failed to adequately address existing noise concerns, and therefore has little credibility for pledging to address future ones.

• Unfortunately, the Waterloo Airport is located very close to the eastern residential areas of Kitchener. This means that any expansions to a large scale full service airport will have significant negative noise impacts on these neighbourhoods. In essence citizens, elected representatives and airport officials have weigh the value of economic development on the one hand against the other hand which represents negative impacts on the citizen's quality of life. In my opinion, the airport should be developed to serve the needs of our community and also to respect the living environment of the citizens in the community. I have tried to look at both sides of this balance and have concluded that the long term growth must be kept to a minimum. Although both passenger and cargo flights will be needed, I would prefer that preference be given to passenger flights and that both passenger and cargo flights be restricted to operating from 07:00 to 23:00. Since option 1 will only require a modest capital investment, I think the Region must be prudent and go with this option. Recall that the taxpayers will be called upon for large amounts to fund the new LRT system and it makes no sense to make commitments for an expensive expansion of the airport when the LRT will require in excess of $250,000,000. In the long term, after the cost of the LRT has been totally paid, it would be prudent to look at Option #2 and at that time determine if a $50 million dollar investment in Runway 14-32 would provide sufficient revenue increase to warrant the investment and whether new engine technology combined with multiple SID routes would reduce noise pollution below the current levels.

• #4 at this time the Region needs to make the airport profitable. Needs to increase passengers and attract more airlines / cargo (Puralotor Fed Ex)

• There should be no development of this airport at all. There are at least 3 airport all within 1 hour drive (London, Hamilton, Toronto) and there is no need to
develop this airport. Its main runway, #26 is poorly designed; all flights taking off are flying directly towards the City of Kitchener, directly over residential areas.

- **Moderate Growth.** I believe moderate growth is affordable, and will meet the needs of the local community. It will provide additional destinations for residents and business, while keeping our community feel. We do want to a Toronto alternative as this would increase road traffic around the airport.

- **I would pick #3.** Not as much tax payer money required up front. There would be lots of time to judge later how option 4 would go over. Hang onto the land for option #4 and don't build homes there.

- **Status Quo.** The airport is currently under utilized and is subsidized by the region. Also, the noise of the airport, health concerns over dumping of fuel over subdivisions, make South Kitchener an undesirable place to leave; already the area is getting a negative reputation due to the airport issues.

- **Option 2 Based on the numbers and information provided it would serve this community adequately for years to come.** I think it is prudent to move in stages and prepare for expansion as growth occurs in the region. Adopting a build it and they will come attitude is an expensive proposition.

- **I would pick OPTION # 1** I don't think that anyone who lives in and around the airport ever expected or planned on this small regional airport to be expanded into a large international airport especially when we have Pearson International Airport 45 minutes away.

- **Without having seen the details of each option, I believe that keeping the airport at its current size is the better option.** The airport is currently operating significantly under capacity so expanding it to handle more flights and passengers is not fiscally responsible when the numbers are not there to support it. Are there any airlines that have expressed an interest in flying out of Waterloo that would justify any expansion? The citizens of K-W and Cambridge are the ones who would be footing the bill for any of the four options and we can't afford any more subsidies than what we are already providing. Also, any expansion would adversely affect those who are living under the flight paths and we are already subjected to increased noise levels. When we moved into Hespeler, the airport was small with mainly private airplanes that took off and landed infrequently. Now, the noise and frequency of flights is disturbing. The population of the tri-cities and surrounding areas do not justify an expansion and I don't believe that people from Mississauga/Toronto will see it as a viable alternative to Pearson Airport. Hamilton's airport was hailed as a new opportunity for passengers but has not lived up to expectations so why would a $50 million or $100 million expansion be successful?

- **I thin the third proposal permitting an enlargement of the airport. And shifting (lengthening) of the runway would be best suited, permitting economic development.** However I would only support this if multiple SIDS were implemented as noted above.
I think that the only acceptable increase is Option 2. Option 3 includes a CONSIDERABLE increase in air traffic and the impact on local resident's quality of life has not been fully considered.

Option 4, more flights locally would benefit everyone, beneficial to the economy. Connects the region to the rest of the world.

Option #3. We feel the need and demand is there.

I believe the moderate growth strategy would be the best suited for the community. The high growth strategy seems a little high for our community and I can never picture the demand for such a large airport. Moderate growth offers a competitive airport for local travellers by offering more terminal space and increasing flight capacity. It can compete against Toronto and Hamilton as it becomes larger however still remains at a manageable size. An extension of the runway also offers the potential for larger aircraft increasing the airports global reach. The potential for a third runway is a strategy that I believe should be reviewed at a later date once development has already finished. I believe this because waiting to build a third runway allows the airport to assess the viability of it based on new flights attracted by the moderate growth option. This will save the community money on the runway development until the demand for it is obvious.

Option 1 is my preference. Reason for this preference: A) In ability to attract people to the Region as websites that rate cities begin to make people aware of the direction that the Region has taken to build out the airport infrastructure this will have negative consequences to attracting people to the region. B) Look to Pickering as a model to the cost to the city as it tries to build out an infrastructure like an airport. C) Economic impact to the region in regards to property taxes drop in housing prices results in reassessment of a large part of South Kitchener by MPAC. This will have significant impact on tax revenue on Region and increases burden on the remaining part of the Region.

I believe that 'Option #3 - Moderate Growth' is the best scenario. I don't know if all that is proposed in this option needs to be done immediately but I feel that this is good goal to work towards for the future. I enjoy the option of having a 'local' airport and the ability of driving a short distance and having less congestion. I feel and hope that this option will allow greater choice and variety in the destinations airlines could offer while retaining the aforementioned benefits of a local airport. In addition, the result of having no taxpayer contribution is also a nice benefit of this option.

There should be no increase in flights without proper assessment and input from affected parties. There are well over 500 residents with the same concerns as mine.

I have flown out of the airport several times, most recently with my family to the Dominican Republic last February. I believe scenario three makes the most
sense. When we flew out, there was also an American Eagle flight and a Bearskin flight waiting to departed, making the departure lounge seem quite crowded. Also once you’re in the lounge there isn't anything to do or see making the time in there not enjoyable at all. So a larger holding-area makes sense to me, also maybe a display showing off what the community has to offer or up coming events might be an idea as well.

- Option 1 - less impact to taxes, less noise impact to residents. We live 45-60mins from Toronto, which services the entire world for flights. Why does Waterloo need increased service?
- #3. This will help the development of the airport within the community. By expanding the runway we are spending money once to get the benefits of increased public access over the coming years.
- I believe that option 1 is the best for the community because it offers an acceptable level and occurrence of noise, with the exception of some uncomfortably loud cargo flights. Any further expansion of the airport, will increase the frequency of noise from flights and possibly (likely) result in more early morning and late night flights disturbing residents to the West. Expansion would be a slap in the face to residents in existing residential areas.
- No heavy transport and /or planes over the present size strictly adhering to noise levels and flight times.
- Option 1. Option 2 does not deliver a significant pro rata benefit for the increase in cost and carries negative aspects for the nearby communities. Likewise option 3, only more so. I think option 4 has merit, but the airport is located too close to existing urban areas and has traffic access problems. I would support option 3 or 4 if the airport could be relocated more centrally to the Guelph - KW - Cambridge triangle and the future traffic problems with option 4 could be sensibly solved.
- Status quo or Low growth. I would love to see the airport expand enough so it was a viable option for me to use. I travel a lot and fly from Toronto for business and Buffalo or Detroit for pleasure. I would prefer Waterloo if they had more direct flights and more economical costs. However, I do not support expansion if it means more planes taking off and landing over Chicopee. I bought my house before the original expansion and now the planes are waking us in the morning and disturbing us at night. Further expansion would create more noise and affect the resale value of my home. I would consider a class action suit against the airport if that were to happen as I bought before this was a concern.
- I do not know, as though I am a resident of Deer Ridge in Kitchener I am not aware of the proposed development scenarios and flight landing/take off plans.
- Seeing that the current capacity of the airport is not being utilized, it is difficult to see anything other than the status quo (present day scenario). Passenger traffic seems stable or falling, so it is hard to understand the 'build it and they will come' approach. That said, if you can justify the middle-size scenario (1 million
passengers does seem like a big jump), I would be interested and more likely to use the airport than hike to Pearson. I was also interested to see that the noise pattern changes (improves) with the set back runways.

- Close the airport. With Pearson only 45 minutes down the road it is not necessary. It creates a great deal of noise and air pollution. It has a very negative impact on quality of life in our region. It costs us the tax payers to operate it. It is NOT the sound of prosperity as the Airport Manager suggested to me. It is a drag on Kitchener's budget.

- Place a prohibition on all night time take-offs and landings between 22:00hrs and 07:00hrs. Humans need 8 hrs. of undisturbed sleep per night. Community’s leaders should not interfere with that through ill-conceived policies.

- No growth, the region has allowed too much residential development around the airport. The impact of large commercial jets is too great of cost to the public with benefits of an expanded airport going to too few.

- Option one -we can't possible stretch our imagination far enough to expect that kind of passenger load.

- Status Quo. Don't spend any more money on a losing situation. Our high taxes are being drained away rapidly enough already.

- LEAVE IT AT THE CURRENT LEVEL. IF THE VOTERS ARE PLEASED BY THE SERVICES OFFERED BY THE AIRPORT CURRENTLY LET'S NOT ADD ANY MORE INVESTMENT WHICH (GIVEN THE SHORT TERM PROJECTIONS) WILL REQUIRE MORE SUBSIDIES.

- Option #1: It is the only option that may be feasible, all others are only someone's hopes and nothing is there to prove this could happen.

- I would require much more information to provide a more informed opinion. However based on the information provided the first option proposes to spend of $5M that could result in additional revenues of $2M per year, which results in a 2 1/2 year payback. The third option proposes we spend $100M but at the low end may only bring the revenue to $6.5M still leaving a deficit of $3M or likely much more given the extra spend probably resulting in a deficit similar to our current $6.5M shortfall. To actually benefit financially the best-case scenario of 1M passengers is required and only then would we possibly breakeven or better. If we assume the latter its still a 15 year payback and with much greater risk. Based on that I would have to choose the no growth strategy.

- Option 1, Status Quo is most appropriate. It already permits an annual passenger increase of 100,000, has moderate costs, and reduces the noise impact. The noise issue is significant. I bought my home in 1993, long before anything other than the odd corporate jet used the airport. Expansion of the nature being contemplated was not on the agenda. Now it is. It already is noisier with WestJet, Eagle, SunWing, and especially Nolinor. This is already reducing the value of my home. The volumes imposed will reduce the value further still. Who will
compensate me for my loss? If I decide to sell, my home will be harder to sell. You are creating a very unfair situation.

- No expansion of the airport beyond what is currently mandated. When the airport was built, it was at a distance from the cities and towns near by AND the sizes of planes using it were smaller. The current location is too close to urban areas to be expanded. Safety, including the air and noise pollution from large planes is my primary concern.

- Option 1. Region's priorities for next 10 yrs. should be building LRT and getting it to Cambridge, getting GO service to both Cambridge and Kitchener, and multi-modal hubs built in both cities. Revisit airport issue once all this is nearing completion.

- We have an opportunity to become a reliever airport for Toronto Pearson, anything less than high growth option is squandering a golden opportunity! Besides providing jobs, the economic benefits will be staggering. Giving governance to Transport Canada means our community reaps all the benefits, without the capital demands. I hope common sense prevails here!

- 'Keep the status quo', for many reasons. 1. Most importantly, we do not feel that an expanded airport is what Waterloo Region needs at this time. In order to improve transportation for Waterloo Region and therefore foster meaningful growth and development, we believe that Regional Council should be working on better transit routes between the region and Toronto with regular stops at Pearson, VIA CAMBRIDGE. 2: Waterloo is relatively close to Pearson, and from there we can get to anywhere in the world. Although my husband, who travels regularly, has successfully used Waterloo Airport on a few occasions, a recent trip to Chicago was priced about 40% higher out of Waterloo than Pearson so was unsustainable. 3: We personally cannot afford the increased tax bill that Options 1, 2 and 3 may involve - residents are struggling to pay current high property taxes, and the expected increases in taxation related to the LRT will add to the tax burden. 4: The Region cannot afford a second huge ticket expenditure item concurrent with the LRT, which will take many years' commitment ahead. 5: There is no indication of the taxpayer support needed for Options 1, 2 and 3 (if less than 1,000,000 passengers are realised). This information should be made available to the public in a credible accountable way, where public funds are to be used. 6: Time frame is not addressed, so this is not a credible plan.7: There is the possibility that only a few residents would benefit from an airport expansion â€“ it is likely that those who fly frequently might use the facility more, but the majority would be paying taxes into something that they are not benefitting from. 8: We do not want any more aircraft than we already have overhead, for both noise and safety reasons.

- Option #1. I don't think Waterloo region needs a bigger airport. The potential passenger volume is not there. Rather then spend money on this we need better roads, like a bypass for Cambridge for instance.
• Change any flight paths that affects the Edgewater Estates subdivision area
• With respect to the actual proposed Master Plan, I do not believe that any of the options proposed are satisfactory and think that this whole plan needs to be re-evaluated. To that effect, I have the following specific comments:
  Option 1: Status quo is still unacceptable as noise levels are already unbearable and increasing annually.
  Option 2: Although the description of this option has possibilities, why does it require any growth at all? This could be a viable option if there was still the limit of 243,100 Annual Passengers and if there would be airport imposed noise abatement regulations including time of day restrictions and standard instrument departure procedures for the existing runways to limit the noise in Kitchener, west of the airport. It is unacceptable that noisy flights occur between 11 PM and 7 AM daily.
  Option 3: Once again, as for option 2, although the descriptions indicate that this option has possibilities, why does it require any growth at all? I fear that by extending the main runway, this option will just allow larger aircraft to take off and land, which will only increase the noise levels which are already unbearable.
  Option 4: Once again, as for options 2 and 3, although the description indicates that this option has possibilities, why does it require any growth at all? Rather than adding a third runway, consideration should be given to simply moving the existing main runway further east to reduce the noise levels for a substantial number of Kitchener and Region residents west of the airport.

• Option 1 – Status Quo: The Kitchener airport was originally intended to be a hobby airport. Most residential neighbourhoods that were built in and around the airport were built with this in mind. More air traffic/noise will only cause more problems with the public.
• Option 1 – Status Quo: Under no circumstance would we accept any more planes flying over our house. We will boycott your airport and inform as many people as possible of the poor living conditions in the area so that they don’t make a foolish mistake like we did.
• I do not yet believe in one specific scenario
• I am very strongly in favour of the status quo option where there is no increase in traffic. I do not want to see the additional runway or the new flight path take place. Where I live would be affected and I do not feel it is acceptable for this change to affect my resale when I researched the airport prior to purchase and made a decision based on the current structure of the airport. I moved from Kitchener where the planes were louder and find the noise more manageable where I am in Breslau and I would be very upset to see that changed.

QUESTION: What more can the Airport do to address the noise concerns of neighbouring residents
COMMENTS:

- Only changes to the runways will address the noise problem in the long term.
- I don't have an issue with the noise, but checked off the box as yes, because I do not have a single family member or neighbour that doesn't complain about the Nolinor flights. I have noticed the flights taking off to the east more often and I believe if measured the noise is louder for those folks to the west of the runway. I live 2 k from the western end of the runway just south of Fairway road. When the houses are built right up to the river in the area bounded by Fairway and Zeller, your noise complaints will go through the roof.
- Limit expansion—limit number of flights. Why on earth have you allowed Nolinor to increase their flights from 4 to 7 while changing the time from 6 am to 7 am?
- No freight flights. Quieter jets taking off away from residential
- Have a no fly time for aircraft. Have quiet aircraft to and from airport. No cargo flights please.
- A little.
- Particular airlines create more noise than others.
- It is an issue now and with the development of the airport, it will continue to present a problem. The airport needs to listen to all the people living in close proximity to the airport.
- Don't live in the community BUT most people should be aware of the neighbourhood (...including the airport). All efforts should be made to reduce the noise impact of the airport on neighbouring communities like Breslau.
- See #3. Time restrictions!
- Work with carriers to be as accommodating as possible. The 737-200 is a loud (but beautiful :) ) aircraft, and the reality is that the airport needs this business from Nolinor.
- Move
- Change flight paths. Expand runway 14-32 and use it. As per option three, shift other runway further from residential , but use other majority if time
- Provide noise baffles by the neighbourhoods.
- The noise study presented at this session did not include information for the Boeing 737-200, the older noisier type of aircraft used by Nolinor and that might well be used more in expanded cargo operations by Nolinor or other similar operators. Mr. Sandon, the noise expert, said he had not been asked to include information of this sort in his report. Though Mr. Wood indicated he did not expect any increase in cargo flights, I personally regard that expectation as unlikely, and I feel that the planning process is being deliberately skewed to ignore important information about noise and misrepresents the probable outcome of expansion. Though Nolinor have agreed to reschedule their flights from 6am to 7am, I have since learned they intend to move weekend flights from 9am to 7am. In this regard the airport is not being a good neighbour. That only
the good news was reported at the meeting is yet another example of corporate deception of the public in this process.

- Before building our new home in Breslau, my husband and I did our research. We new the flight path did not go over our subdivision and that we would have minimal airplane noise issues. The proposals for the airport expansions will greatly affect the Breslau community. In addition, the affects on the environment, specifically pollution also needs to be addressed before further expanding the airport. I feel this issue needs to be addressed and reviewed before a decision is made.

- The most complaining will come from the babies who now do not like the choice locations of their houses... they knew it when they bought now just babies... deal with it like we all do!! I believe changing the runways may have a better impact and have any and all new/old house sales sign acknowledgements to the airport location and possibility of noises.

- ...but the airport has been there for a long time and jets have been flying there for years. Owners / developers of newer residential housing in Breslau and east Kitchener cannot plausibly argue that they weren't aware of the airport. It is incumbent on real estate agents and developers to make prospective buyers aware.

- I am not a neighbouring resident but have been very bothered by the flight circuits of small low noisy aircraft and large noisy cargo craft. We were never bothered by noise until the last airport renewal, then quieter with the recession but now noisy and increasing again. Old noisy aircraft should be banned. small planes should fly out over rural areas not densely populated areas--the noise in general in Waterloo has spoiled living here and it is all cumulative

- It is an issue for those who chose to purchase a home on a flight path. Little can be done about that.

- Move the runway 26, the main runway to a different location. Approx. 70% of the flights leaving the airport will use this runway to depart. This will put a huge burden on the neighbouring subdivisions, and in fact on the entire City of Kitchener. Many of these subdivisions were there before the airport was built, or before the airport started to become more than a simple recreational airport. Plan #3 mentioned moving runway 26 to the East, however this will only move it by 196 metres, which is not enough to solve the noise issue. The runway would have to be moved by at least 500 metres to accomplish any noise reduction.

- The changes proposed to SID for runway 32 and the movement of runway 26 eastward are sufficient concessions. Newer aircraft also have reduced noise so as the airlines modernize their fleet to save fuel there will also be a benefit.

- KEEP FLIGHT PATHS OVER INDUSTRIAL/FARM AREAS
- Keep its size and avoid any flights above the houses in Breslau. Use the Cambridge flight path.
- Institute a noise curfew
- I think the current steps are adequate.
- Acceptance of a noise abatement plan which impacts the fewest households the least is the only way to go. Appealing to the federal bodies responsible for noise standards on airplanes.
- Everyone near and far knew about the existing airport and knew someday it would need to grow as the city has.
- Implement a curfew.
- Noise for me is not an issue. As a registered private pilot I love seeing the planes overhead, and hearing them go over is even better. If I hear jet overhead at say 5 pm I can say to myself, oh, there goes flight such and such.... And if it was the same twice an hour 18 hours a day, it would be even better.
- The noise isn't that bad. I feel people are over reacting. Even the noisiest aircraft lasts for seconds. The expressway noise behind my home goes on forever night and day. I knew it was there when I purchased my home and I have to suck it up or move the people in the area of the airport are in the same boat. I live under the approach for runway 08.
- Significantly increase fines for cargo arrivals/departures between 11pm-6am.
- I live in the Hidden Valley area and I do have some concerns about noise. Older, noisy planes should be banned from 11:00 pm to 7 am. Flight paths once leaving the airport (runway 08-26) should be dispersed to all other areas of Kitchener/Cambridge. Most flights now veer sharply left and fly over our subdivision.
- I believe the Region attempted to address this problem at the end of last year in a positive manner. Unfortunately, it did go any farther due to the feedback it received. In the late 70's I called the airport and spoke to the person in charge about one of many extremely loud airplanes coming to land at the airport quite early in the morning. At that time the manager blasted me for complaining, stating these planes were important for economic development and that I surely must be against that. This gave a me a very negative view of those operating the airport and felt at that time, we would not be listened to. I am for economic development and growth, but not at the expense of the taxpayers who pay for it. When I say expense I mean noise and safety, not monetary. Huge aircraft should not be flying at low levels over residential areas of the region.
- Expansion is NOT going to help since there are many noise concerns already. The planes flying at night wake us up almost every night even with the windows closed. It is not just the noise, it is also the vibration issues.
- It doesn't affect me, but what I have read, it seems everything possible is being done.
- Do not increase number of flights.
• Aircraft sounds will always be somewhat controversial in that they are brief and change frequencies and volume. The Conestoga expressway and the Highway 8 segment south to 401 are each noisy roads from which traffic noise can be heard easily more than 2 km away yet it has become ‘white noise’. The suggested changes to flight paths is runways are lengthened and or repositioned seem reasonable. People who buy property near an airport and then complain, have not done their due diligence.

• Planes and people don't mix. If you wanted a bigger airport you shouldn't have sold the land around the airport/under the flight paths to developers. Any expansion plans should mandate moving the airport further outside the city limits.

• No more should be done on that the people that bought across the river knew the airport was across the river and the noise should not be a problem as they all signed waiver when they bought their new home in the former Forwell gravel pit. So do not come and cry about the noise from the airport.

• We are not just concerned about the noise for the immediate neighbours to the airport but all of KW will be affected. You only need to go to Brampton and see the effects, actual signs posted about the airplane noise. I am sure the property values are way down in those neighbourhoods.

• Change the airplane path. This is vital to decrease our negative feelings towards expansion. It should be where it was proposed last year by your own internal study, currently affects too many residential areas. Not changing the path to satisfy the interest of a builder that might or might not develop a land affected for the newly proposed path was a mistake. Please take very seriously the petition signed by over 400 residents (with many others signing and getting involved). We are becoming more informed and organized.

• Actually make a change and show us that our complaints matter and count for something. I am just asking for ONE HOUR (Nolinor taking off at 7am). It would be HUGE if the airport actually DID SOMETHING. This would show us that the citizens' voice does indeed matter.

• I think that the people living near the airport should've done their homework and realized that they've bought a house next to the airport. I don't have any sympathy for them.

• The way I see the noise complaints is that the Airport was there before the housing. They should know the fact that if you build a house at the end of a runaway you will get noise. They are also living in a city which will always have noise. I hate progress being stalled on the account of a few people crying because they don't want this in their back yard.

• Not much. I am no expert on noise reduction at airports, but perhaps planting a forest in the no build zone around the airport would help reduce noise? Maybe at least from vehicles on the ground.
• Implement curfew & don't sign contracts with carriers that use antiquated planes just to get some money. Baffin Island contract is a perfect example of this, $$'s B4 people.
• Implement a stricter noise curfew. We hear American Eagle take off at 6:30 AM. How about pushing that back to 7:00?
• Have someone, Transport Canada or the like, designate runway #25 as primary landing and #07 as primary takeoff runway. You then have the planes making all the noise over an unpopulated area. As it stands now I believe it is the other way around. This old way was great when it was only a regional airport and little prop jobs were not a problem. Simple, yet effective solution!!!
• Have the flight school fly higher and not directly over our home - 280 Townsend Drive, Breslau. Sometimes they fly over many times and late at night when my husband is trying to sleep. He works the early shift so this really interrupts his quality of living and health. We called and put in a complaint previously and were told that their path and height should not be directly over our home but they continue to fly over. Although the planes are smaller, they are lower to the ground and make a very loud noise and they circle over and over. At least with the larger jets, they rumble over top but the same plane does not fly over and over the house. It would be really nice to move the flight school path away from our home and enforce it!
• Stop using runway #26, or more flights over industrials areas or farmland.
• Reduce noise. Only use aircraft that have state of the art equipment that minimize noise in around the airport and flight lines.
• Instead of us paying to have an airport - with taxes we could offered a REBATE on our next trips out of the airport - if we live in the affected airport take-off area. If the ticket prices were more affordable - more people would take a trip, thereby increase in the number of flyers.
• -We just moved onto Winifred Street in Kitchener in December 2013 and we were shocked by the airplane noise over our house our very first morning in our new house. This needs to be remedied!!! Is this only going to get worse???
• No fly time between 11pm and 7am. That's when people are sleeping!!
• Provide information above.
• Continue to listen. Extending the main runway further east now - do what is necessary. The North/South runway also needs to be lengthened.
• Major aircraft only permitted to take-off and land between 8am and 6pm.
• Put a curfew on when planes are flying. (People in the area are annoyed by 2:00am, 2:30am, 6:00am noisy flights).
• Timing of flights where noise concerns are raised. Working in Breslau, we do not notice adverse noise conditions during the work day. Expect only real concern is before 7:00am or after 11:00pm.
• Get rid of cargo flights.
- Stop Expanding
- Reopen the flight path discussion and move it east.
- Consider hours of operations? 11-7am Consider limiting types of aircrafts. Reconsider internal study suggesting change to SID.
- Limit traffic at night. Direct more traffic to the east (land and take off).
- Also, show a chart with the noise levels for a 737-200, in addition to the 737-700 chart. I know the Nolinor flights are not the plan for airport expansion but they are a reality (and really noisy!)
- Let people actually hear the noise level (i.e.: Record sounds of take-offs etc. at the dB level expected).
- Have planes take off and arrive from East. Flight times after we have gone to work/school at least the one rattling our windows now.
- Stop expanding.
- Stop Expanding
- STOP THE EXPANSION
- Stop the expansion
- Stop expanding
- 1) Education, new residents, businesses, etc.c2) Give realtors a smack down - are they misrepresenting things? 3) Don't cater to people who would complain (e.g.: noise, flight paths) about anything.
- Listen to their closest neighbours
- Don't scare people out of bed! Timing?
- Publish flight data and correlate with over flights to better document current noise complaints.
- I'm not sure, as it’s outside of my area of expertise. Perhaps careful planning of flight times and future land use development.
- More people aware of votes, so that a few dozen people are not making/affecting decisions that affect the community - as was the case with the possible move of the runway.
- Information available before new development Restrict residential in areas immediately around possible airport expansion #4
- They do a great job.
- They can address about taking cautions or warnings about loud noise.
- Option 3 would also help address the noise concerns.
- Discuss and explain that expansion is for the greater good. Explore all options for reducing noise. Introduce curfew.
- Set your policies, restrict landings/take offs to 7am to 9pm, certainly for noisy aircraft. The reality is people used to sleep, a basic need. Consider needs of 10s to 100s of thousands of people is the Region vs. hundreds travelling in a day. Please do what is considerate, respectful, right for people basic needs.
I was reviewing the Master Plan online and it seems that options 2-4 will cause more aircraft noise issues for the Hopewell Heights subdivision is Breslau. Is this being considered in the decision making? It seems unfair to reduce noise for some residents of Waterloo Region and increase it for others.

With the new proposed extension that would mean bigger jets that make more noise, its already noisy enough with the volume of planes that are flying now.

Noise will increase: The path is been here 6 years and we have not noticed much due to our airport in the past been not busy and mainly small passenger planes at convenient times were using it. Now the airport is expanding operations to include cargo companies that operate bigger and older airplanes at earlier times.

"This is a key question and there are some answers that will not require a lot of money. The following could be implemented in a very few months if the owners of the airport, The Region of Waterloo, decide that action must be taken: I. Introduce a blackout no fly time period that will go from 23:00 to 07:00 every day. The only allowable exceptions would be for the emergency landing of either an airplane with mechanical problems or a medi-vac flight bringing a patient to a local hospital. II. Move the current runway #26 SID takeoff path eastward to the path suggested by the citizens at the 5 December, 2013 meeting of the Airport Noise Committee. See the attached map. III. Reverse the unilateral decision made in 2006, without any public input, to create a runway #26 SID route that is having an enormous impact on the residential subdivisions to the south-west of the airport. Instead of a single SID takeoff route, replace it with between 3 and 5 SID routes for runway #26 and 3 SID routes for runway #80. See attached map. The control tower would be required over the period of a month to distribute flights equally for each of the two runways. IV. Require that any aircraft using the airport on a regular basis must have engines that meet the highest standards for low decibel count. Although it may be tempting to get revenues from such operators as Nolinor Air, the impact on the citizen's quality of life is NOT ACCEPTABLE and the airport management must be told NOT to bring such traffic to our airport."

Extend 08-26 to the east.

The expansion of the runway length would decrease noise as the planes would not have to use their thrusters as much. The zoning of the immediate are should be industrial to accommodate the expansion of aircraft related industries and allow for future traffic noise better than a residential zoning. Aircraft technology continues to improve and planes are quieter. Continued monitoring is important.

We were unable to attend the Public Information Session, but I do wish to make a comment. We live on Chandos Dr., off of Grand River Blvd in Kitchener. I had read with interest the proposed change in the take off flight pattern which would have been shifted to the south. I was very much in favour of that, since there has been a very noticeable and disturbing increase in aircraft noise. Unfortunately, you bowed to public pressure from the residents to the south and abandoned that
proposal. Aircraft now wake us at 6:00 am in the morning and we are very aware whenever a jet flies overhead during the day. The noise frequency is getting worse. When we bought the property here, 15 years ago, never did we think that we would live adjacent to a Pearson International Airport! This situation will eventually lead to the devaluation of our home, if it hasn't already done so! I am honestly not looking forward to sitting outside on our deck in the summer as plane after plane roars over our home. Hot air balloons, no problem - but jets, no thank-you! However, I must say that we are not as badly off as the poor residents who are live near the Fairway Rd., Kitchener extension, just before the new Grand River Bridge. One morning, I happened to be driving along Fairway Rd., out to Kossuth Rd., as a plane, having just taken off, was following along Fairway Rd, approaching me. The noise was unbelievable - perhaps normal for you, but certainly not for us! Please add another runway to the north or south-east for take-offs and only when winds dictate absolutely, take-off to the west. This is NOT acceptable!!

- As I understand it, the noise would effectively be less if the runways were longer and so the development scenarios would help solve that problem. Further restrictions on when noisy planes are landing and taking off would also alleviate this concern. I work in Breslau and never hear air traffic, except during the air show - it is not a concern at all.
- Flights times could be restricted. i.e.: no flights between midnight and 6 am
- Obviously go ahead with plans to lengthen the runways to allow the newer quieter aircraft to use the airport.
- Don't have planes fly between 11 pm and 7 am. Do not expand the airport.
- I think they should revisit the changes to the flight path proposed earlier. Unfortunately, only the people opposed to the change turned out to the open house to voice their opposition to the change. The information meeting was poorly handled....no presentation was made to explain the proposed change and the benefits and reasons behind it. The info boards weren't clear, I and it was difficult to get close to them, and only 2 staff were available to answer questions....if you got a chance to ask them at all. Perhaps you could circulate a survey to those you distributed the notice of meeting to...and clearly explain the proposed change and its impact.
- Close it and move it.
- MOVE THE FLIGHT PATH for starters, and on top of this absolutely no flight from 11pm till 7am. How is it that the residents of Kitchener that pay some of the largest % of taxes for the city are the ones that have to deal with the noise. How is this possibly well thought out from a planning standpoint. Why not have the flight path go over the Toyota plant and the industrial areas? This noise is a concern, especially since I own a home in the Deer Ridge area and here the city is thinking of expanding the airport which in turn will continue to affect my area. Not just from a noise standpoint but the value of my home. Future residents of a
community do not want to spend $700,000+ on a home and deal with airplane noise.

- Make sure area of housing development closely controlled so no one buys a house next to a runway and then complains afterwards. Aircraft types can be monitored for comparison noise levels. Corridor of approach between Guelph and KW?

- Nothing! People whine because it is over their house, care only about one thing themselves. Then they go in their cars, drive to Toronto and fly out, couldn’t less about the people there. You buy a house near an airport you should expect noise. What about when the expressway was built in Kitchener, not much traffic then but look now, noise comes with progress. People want their services and still want the community to stay small, won’t happen. Same people will complain about their taxes are too high.

- New plans don’t say what size or type of planes expected. The planes from Hamilton Airport over my house from 1am to 3am have a high altitude and are still louder than my furnace or cars driving by. There is no limitation for night flights in our region if the money was there the flights would be too.

- Clearly, more needs to be done to address existing issues. If some Kitchener residents bought homes outside of the SID only to have it moved over their homes, then they have a legitimate complaint, as do the homeowners who were assured that there would be minimal noise impact and not a 24hr airport. For the first issue, I think we had an opportunity to address it with the new SID, but it was undermined by misinformation, particularly by those who sought to exploit the Cambridge/Kitchener political optics. First, let’s make sure our data is bullet-proof. I think we have to ensure we are counting everything when it comes to noise; twice I have complained about early morning flight noise only to be told that there was no plane. Would my complaints be counted? Are all flights (landing, departing, & overflights) included? Have we visited the homes of the Kitchener families and studied the noise levels for a period of time? Then, what if we seek to incorporate existing concerns into the evolving Master Plan? - invite the parties in for smaller, non-public meetings with staff/consultants and give them a chance to see if there is a way of addressing their concerns in the new Master Plan?

- This is a key question and there are some answers that will not require a lot of money. The following could be implemented in a very few months if the owners of the airport, The Region of Waterloo, decide that action must be taken: - Introduce a blackout no fly time period that will go from 23:00 to 07:00 every day. The only allowable exceptions would be for the emergency landing of either an airplane with mechanical problems or a medevac flight bringing a patient to a local hospital. -Move the current runway #26 SID Takeoff paths eastward to the path suggested by the citizens at the 5 December, 2013 meeting of the Airport Noise Committee. -Reverse the unilateral decision made in 2006, without any
public input, to create a runway #26 SID route that is having an enormous impact on the residential subdivisions to the south-west of the airport. Instead of a single SID takeoff route, replace it with between 3 and 5 SID routes for runway #26, which is used by about 70% of all flights, and 3 SID routes for runway #08, which is used by about 30% of all flights. The control tower would be required over the period of a month to distribute flights equally for each of the SID takeoff routes. Quarterly reports should be required. -Require that any aircraft using the airport on a regular basis must have engines that meet the highest standards for low decibel count. Although it may be tempting to get revenues from such operators as Nolinor Air, the impact on the citizen's quality of life is NOT ACCEPTABLE and the airport management must be told NOT to bring such traffic to our airport.

- It has been my experience living in Central London UK next to a railway station and subsequently Toronto under runway 33 for Toronto International that people eventually become accustomed to the noise factor. What I find confusing is the fact that Municipal local planning Depts. do little to restrict development.

- Extend / Add runways creating higher liftoff heights

- Keep the flights away from residential areas!!! Airplanes arriving or leaving from the airport must be up to the highest standards; they should not allow airlines like Nolinor here.

- My house is under the flight path, but I knew that when I bought the house. Planes make noise period. That being said, perhaps limits could be placed on evening and night flights as this is when most people are home.

- I personally do not have a problem with noise and more flights over my locations would not be a concern. I think for others especially in the new subdivisions being built should be well aware than an airport is nearby and is expected to expand. Include this information for ... homes too as part of the deal. Also try to ensure newer volume use the newer quieter planes.

- The airport needs to address flight paths. We don't feel that the airport has done anything to address this main concern since 2006. In fact I don't think that any input from public consultations is being considered. A hidden agenda is evident in all meetings which I have attended.

- Having fewer flights would mean less noise. Have flight restrictions. Presently the airport operates 24 hours. Have a banned on night time flights. Put restrictions in place.

- As noted above, the noise issue is really the critical point here. In addition to shifting SIDs a curfew should be brought into effect from 23:00 to 7:00 for large transport category aircraft - to include jets and propeller aircraft. Another option would be to lengthen the crossing runway sufficiently so that in addition the direction of takeoffs and landings could be further dispersed.

- "I would like to make some general comments on the current noise. At the recent information session (Thurs 6th Feb) it was suggested that Nolinor is skewing the
concerns over noise. We notice significant noise from a plane that goes over at 6.20 am. This is more likely to be the American eagle flight which leaves at this time, than Nolinor which leaves earlier. In other words passenger planes are also contributing significantly to noise. 1. Firstly, introduce a curfew e.g. no takeoff between 7.00 am and 11.00 pm. This would help to control the cargo flights, and the increased of cargo flights is UNCONTROLLED in any of these options. 2. Introduce at least 3 SIDs which should be used equally (weather permitting) and which should fly over totally different residential areas. I spoke with a pilot and he said that this would not be a problem for pilots flying into or out of Waterloo is very simple compared to most airports. When I suggested this to Chris Wood his response was that this would make a lot of people a little bit unhappy. This is not a satisfactory answer, as the Airport should be trying to be fair in the impact of noise, not just take the easiest route, public opinion-wise. And although it may be true that fewer people would be unhappy, no one would have a valid argument as no one can say that this is unfair. As we all stand to benefit from convenient travel, we should all bear the cost also. 3. Require that any aircraft using the airport on a regular basis must have engines that meet the highest standards for low noise. Although it may be tempting to get revenues from such operators as Nolinor Air, the impact on the citizen's quality of life is NOT ACCEPTABLE and the airport management must be told NOT to bring such traffic to our airport."

- The airport has existed longer than most nearby neighborhoods. If you didn't want airport noise don't buy next to the airport.
- As stated, runways going best way out and in. As stated using new technologies and common sense.
- I do not believe this should be a major factor in deciding whether or not to go forward with future development. The residents who live near the airport bought a house there; they knew that there was an airport there. The airport was there first so for that reason I do not believe local residents noise complaints should be factored in as a barrier to future growth.
- A) The current method of data collection for noise and response solutions is inaccurate. There is a growing concern within the South end of Kitchener regarding noise that the management is failing to address because they rely on people's fatigue when initiating complaints. Hence, results presented by the management misrepresent the growing concern in the area. B) Open up the SID on runway 26 and direct flights over commercial and industrial areas instead of family neighbourhoods. There is an abundance of industrial and commercial land.
- Stop implying that a few residents of an upscale neighbourhood constantly complain and simply disregard and write off any comments and actions as coming from a few selfish windbags. Have planes fly out of commercial vs. residential properties.
• I understand that noise is the biggest obstacle when facing expansion but I feel that the proposed options of relocating Runway 08-26 to allow 26 departures to get higher faster and the modifications to the SID of Runway 32 should go a long way to mitigating airplane noise. Other than those options I'm not sure what else can be done. Personally I do live in the departure path of 26 but I'm not bothered by the noise right now and don't feel that I will in the future especially with the proposed options to reduce future noise.

• 1. By saying 'more', there is an implication that something has already been done, but in actuality, noise has become an increasing problem! 2. Flights should be disallowed between 7 a.m. and 9 p.m, at a minimum. 3. Flight routes must be reassessed. It is completely unacceptable that my neighbourhood is suffering all the ill affects of airport expansion. Why us? If Waterloo Region residents as a whole want an expanded and/or international airport, then everyone should share in the 'costs' as well as the benefits. This means that flight plans should be directed over commercial areas, or, in the event that this is not possible, the flight plan could be rotated on a yearly/monthly basis (perhaps over 3 or 4 feasible routes), so that everyone in the region shares the excessive noise and pollution. If neighbourhoods complain that they don't want to share in these 'costs', then clearly the Region's citizens do NOT support having the expanded airport use at all.

• I would suggest putting up additional signs in the affected areas, with the date the airport was certified on it and a message saying something to the effect of Airport Noise Area.

• Don't build million dollar houses when you know there is an airport there and then complains about it. It is an airport. If you don't like it sell.

• DO NOT introduce option 2, 3, or 4. Have there not been enough complaints about noise? Has there not been enough time and resources sunk in to investigating flight paths due to noise complaints? Why is more taxpayer money being sunk in to a Master Plan? The logic just is not there.

• Re-address the flight path, landing and take off not totally fair that issue was addressed once and voted down. There must be other options that are not being presented.

• Stop expansion! If it absolutely necessary for the Region to have a larger airport. It should be built further away from existing residential areas. Moving a runway 644 feet to the east will not significantly reduce noise levels and adding more flights will exacerbate the problem.

• As above and listen very carefully!

• Reasonable and realistic no-fly blackout times. Ground measurement of actual noise generated, with a structure of compensation payments to affected residents for excess noise pollution.
Listen to them, I get woken shortly after 6 am due to a flight that goes almost
directly over my house.

Go back to your plan to move the flight plans away from residential
neighborhoods - local citizens thought this was a no brainer so did not think they
had to come out to support. Ensure any expansion does not increase noise levels
over Chicopee

Limit flights to a 7:00 am take off!

Limit air traffic over residential areas from 11:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.

Continue to educate. I saw some interesting analogies but some people either
didn't understand or refused to read. Move the cargo flight to later in the morning.
Put some restrictions on the type of plans using the airport (noise consideration).
Maybe this is a long shot. Put time of day restrictions to prevent (limit) late night
flights.

Close down.

Prohibit all flights between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m.

Don't allow early morning flights over residential areas.

Already discussed earlier at the noise committee meetings. Number one - listen
too the expert on SIDs that recommended the least obtrusive departure that
would minimize environmental damage and use this SID rather contrary to angry
voices of a few citizens. The Kich Fix was the ideal recommendation and totally
OBJECTIVE.

Stop the Nolinor flights. It's an old and very noisy aircraft.

OPEN TEH SID RECOMMENDED LAST YEAR. FLYING OVER INDUSTRIAL
AND FARM LAND MAKES ALL THE SENSE IN THE WORLD.

1) Limit times that flights may take off and land (0700 to 2200) might be a good
option. 2) You could move the runway to start at Shantz Station Road, so planes
would be a bit higher before going over Grand River Hospital and houses.

Give the noise committee a real voice. Some of the comments that have come
from certain members of that committee show their bias and inconsiderate nature
to the very issues they are charged to review. Make a true effort to survey the
residents of the area. Many are new to Canada and its not their custom to
express their grievances. Some new and or established Canadians don't think
they have the right to register a complaint because of the noise clause in their
deeds. Have residents of the area on your committee. You like to use the low
level of noise complaints as your proof there is no noise issue and yet you
always seem surprised that all airport meetings end up being about the noise.
Perhaps you should try to reconcile those two positions. There is lots of talk
about how today's modern jets are so quiet and yet we bid and accept some of
the noisiest winged craft around, in particular the cargo plane to Baffin Island. I
asked several people that night if the airport was aware of the level of noise of
this plane when they bid on the contract. I didn't get an answer.
Route flights over industrial areas. I understand there are other options that are not yet agreed to. Provide multiple SIDs and rotate them evenly. If this is such a good thing for the Region, then let all people in the Region bear the burden.

- Limit the size of planes flying out and restrict the take-off and landing hours to between 7am and 11 pm.

- Consult people of Hespeler early in any future process.

- The benefits to the community outweigh a few people’s complaints.

- Not sure

In addition, the residents of the Region of Waterloo are forced to continue to subsidize the users of this airport since it is a money losing operation and continues to run money losing events (e.g. annual Airshow). If the airport is considered necessary, then the users of the airport should pay for its entire operations and expansion costs. I see that in option 3, it is stated that Airports that serve approximately one million passengers typically self-finance their operational and capital requirements and no taxpayer contribution would be required as the airport nears this capacity. However, it is not necessary to quadruple the number of passengers to make the airport self-sufficient - just make it a user-pay system (if this will decrease use of the airport, then it is indicative of the lack of requirement for this airport). On page 4 it is stated The Region of Waterloo will continue to address the noise concerns of citizens in the residential communities to the west and north of the airport. Aircraft engine technology has drastically improved resulting in much quieter operating aircraft. To date, the airport has received relatively few noise complaints resulting from scheduled passenger aircraft. I do not think that there has been any consideration for the residents west of the airport with respect to noise impacts. With the recent changes in flight paths and the increase in the number of aircraft taking off and landing, the noise has only got worse (I moved here 25 years ago, with the understanding of the flight paths and noise levels to be expected. Not only have the number, and size, of aircraft taking off and landing increased, but the flight paths have been changed, resulting in much higher noise levels. In addition, the hours of use by larger aircraft have increased, such that a person cannot have a full night sleep without interruptions from noisy aircraft taking off and landing between the hours of 11 PM and 7 AM. If aircraft technology is resulting in quieter aircraft, then why are they not being used in this region, because noise levels are not decreasing? It is stated that the number of complaints to the airport have decreased. This is called apathy. When unsatisfactory responses are provided to complaints, residents stop complaining. This does not mean that the problem has been solved just that those responsible are unresponsive. Personally, I have stopped complaining because my concerns always fall on deaf ears. e.g. Whenever I have complained about the money losing annual airshow causing noise levels that make my ears hurt when I am outside (and make the house shake, in the case of low flying fighter aircraft), the
response I get is it only happens once a year. This laissez-faire attitude towards a legitimate concern is unacceptable and dismisses any desire to further complain about the unnecessary noise. Residential expansion of Kitchener, west of the airport, over the past 30 years (and still continuing) has made the most recent, and continuing, expansion of the airport unacceptable. With the amount of tax revenues received by the city and region from these residents, there should be consideration given to them with regards to their concerns over noise levels at the airport. If the tax revenues received is not considered significant versus the other so-called benefits provided to the region from this airport, then the region of Waterloo should reduce the taxes of these residents by 50%.

- 1. Better flight management. No take off/landings before 7AM, or after 10PM. Flights that plan to arrive outside these hours should be directed not to take off from their departure city until the following day. Or have their destination changed to Hamilton/Toronto. There should almost never be a case where a plane needs to take/off land outside these hours unless of absolute emergency. If they do take off/land, its only due to poor management. 2. Build a third run/way talked about in option #4. This would keep flight noise away from Kitchener. 3. City of Kitchener should introduce by-laws similar to Breslau to enforce flight noise over Kitchener. 4. All larger jets should be forced to have noise cancelling technology engines in order to use the airport. Nolinor does not have this currently. 5. All larger aircraft should be forced to take off/land in the direction of Guelph, unless absolutely required due to wind direction.

- You can begin by keeping your promises and being honest and loyal with the residents of the area by blocking traffic between 10 pm - 7 am. You can also cap the amount of flights that land and take off during the weekends. Finally, you should not be looking at making our lives even more miserable with the awful noise over our homes on a regular basis.

- I'm not concerned about noise - part of life in urbanized society.

- That is for those living in the area to determine that.

QUESTION: What role should the Airport have in supporting the economic development of the Region?

COMMENTS:

- It is a great asset to the region, but more information needs to be shared with the public so that this is better understood.

- None. Major polluter and contributor to stress in the lives of those in its flight path.

- A large role

- Corporate jets, teaching airplane flying - small aircraft flight simulators
• It's a large role for transporting people & goods into a vibrant economy!
• Move the airport away from the city so the noise doesn't bother the residents.
• This is helpful in potential growth to the Region. Choice is helpful when comparing to Toronto & Hamilton.
• It is an important role. Improvements will create jobs, which is positive.
• Should act to attract business to the area. An International Airport should be a major draw however the area is made of small communities that could all be very negatively affected by airport growth.
• We don't need incentive for more development. Our proximity to T.O. and 401 do that for us! I, personally, do not want us to become a Mississauga.
• The airport needs to play a lead role, and compliment the development such as I on business leaders demand a fast convenient way for themselves and their employees to travel anywhere in the world. The Region has a responsibility to ensure that this happens by maintaining a thriving airport.
• Stop spending the tax-payers money!
• Allow for tourism - in and out. Allow easy access for business travelers.
• The airport could be a very useful asset to the community, both for passenger air travel and for support of local commercial (cargo) activity.
• A major role!! We are spending how much on LRT? We need to maximize air travel as well as ground travel and combine the two to create a vibrant, thriving, developing community. I love travelling from our airport and wish to do much more!!
• If we want Waterloo Region to be a home for companies with international reach, and if we want to have head offices located here, then we need an airport that provides reasonable, regular connections to major US hubs like Chicago and New York as well as direct flights to major Canadian cities.
• Set standards for aircraft noise, and safety.
• In order for the Region to grow and contribute to attract Global business, it is vital to have an airport that can accommodate international flights
• This airport was built and used as a recreational airport. Its current location is not favourable to be used as a large commercial airport; therefore, in this case, it should not have any role. The development that took place until now and the business that the airport has brought in proves that there is no need for a large or international airport in this community.
• It will be a huge generator of economic activity
• The airport is a vital transportation link for people and material to support the development high-tech Nano Valley.
• STOP THE RHETORIC OF ECONOMIC BENEFIT AND START CHARGING FEES TO MAKE THE AIRPORT SELF-SUPPORTING. I CANNOT ENDORSE MORE TAX DOLLAR SPENDING TO SUBSIDISE A LUXURY RATHER THAN A TRUE NECESSITY
• Promote the city. Just take a look and you can notice that Breslau doesn't have ANY real grocery store... Who knows...
• Can't have one without the other.
• Economic development is supported well by existing services. Convenience for business travelers is not the responsibility of airport services. Rapid transit services directly to YYZ are important as is the easy transport of materials across this country.
• Enlarging the airport to phase #4 would itself support and greatly increase our economy.
• The airport needs to be a vital part of the regional economic development, but it needs to remain in balance with other regional initiatives.
• With out the airport this area wouldn't be where it is today and should continue to be a contributor to our future developments. We never no what they might be, however the options are way better with an airport.
• The airport should be providing a service based on actual demand.
• The airport should play an important part of economic development. It provides easy access to our region for cargo and business/personal flights.
• The airport should be a part of the economic development of the Region, but maybe it is not in the right location. To change that is drastic and will probably never happen, therefore careful planning which takes into the best interests of all taxpayers, plus takes extra care, in every step of the plans not to cause any further concerns with the people directly affected by flight paths.
• None. I don't believe it would have a significant impact,
• A reduction in quality of life and property values due to noise issues should be prioritized.
• I would support more air traffic associated with cargo flights in the short and long term.
• Given that the only options to make a profit would require the airport changing into a massive hub (unwanted by local residents) perhaps the airport should recognize they are unable to maintain current status. Perhaps we should look at returning to a hobby airport. At the very least we do not want to fund any option until the LRT plan is completed and paid for. One capital project at a time.
• Should play major rule
• The airport we have right now is sufficient to support our community
• Become economically independent and even perhaps contribute with profit (decrease in operation costs should be a big part of the plan)
• A large role. The airport should attract business to the Region (Nolinor), attract jobs and limit the number of people that are driving to Pearson airport when they could be flying from Kitchener.
• It should increase the capacity to draw more people and business to town.
As we are becoming a high tech industry region and have two large universities and a college, I feel the airport could play a large roll in getting people in and out of the region for school and business. Also, if we become an alternative airport to Pearson (like Gatwick to Heathrow, or Midway to O'Hare), the increased jobs and related industry to support the traffic would help the region.

Stop sucking up funds that would at the worst be used by that other money pit the LRT! Try going to the business community to get funding partnerships & don't starting try to quantify the dollar value of all this supposed development to justify spending more money on the airport.

While it should be an element in supporting the economic development of the community, it should not be the community's raison d'etre. It should encourage businesses to locate here, so that those businesses can fly their own aircraft into YKF.

I'm all for economic development. But, Elmira or even St. Jacob is a better place to build a mega airport or another small town where you have room to grow a huge airport if need be. Cheaper land prices and less population seem a better answer. Still only minutes away from Waterloo, if you plan one north of the city!!!Maybe one between Guelph and Waterloo, then they can benefit as well from a nice sized airport and help with the costs!!!

NONE UNTIL THEY RESOLVE THE NOISE ISSUE.

Great to increase the number of jobs available.

Not as concerned about this as we are with the other issues identified in our other answers in questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 7.

None! There is already a problem with noise in the neighbourhoods on 3 sides of the airport. The residential area should have been industrial or commercial! This was poor planning on behalf of the city and the region!

It is a key driver of economic growth in the global economy and will ensure that the region has a strong place in the new age economy.

The airport should be permitted to expand as it does support eco-dev., however, the residents and businesses that chose to move/locate here did so with the small to medium sized airport we already have. If my family or my business wanted to locate close to a large international airport we would have chosen to live in Mississauga. Instead in 2013, we chose Kitchener.

Stop putting money above neighbour concerns. What about economic impact of reduction in real estate value? Health costs for noise concerns?

Be responsible in terms of what tax payers should pay to subsidize airport (maybe companies wanting these daily flights should be the ones subsidizing the half empty planes).

The airport facilitates commercial development and enables local companies to easily access other markets. It is an essential element to continued growth and development in our global economy.
- Some, as long as economic development benefits the people who are affected by noise.
- It can be positive but cannot be at the expense of the citizens.
- The role of the airport should be significant; however it should not come at the expense of existing residents.
- As much a role as possible.
- A major role.
- I don't think it will be main bring force; not required per se financing for our region.
- None.
- STOP THE EXPANSION
- Partner with tourism-partner with business community -facility for events-continue to host airshows-work with ex. dev. officers (RE: using space for new businesses (?) Airport could be a major connector for the Region.
- It should be self sustaining.
- I think it's important. It could be a significant driver of the economy.
- I don't see how it can affect it one way or the other.
- I think it should work with business and residential needs, vacation and business opportunities.
- It is a major factor! Without good transportation development it's hard to do.
- Inform/provide and encourage college and university students around the region the education for the incoming job opportunity.
- Growth should be on the passenger side to enhance the economic impact and business growth around the airport.
- It should be major. The airport is an economic driver and should be recognized as such. Airport lands and around the airport should be developed for businesses too.
- Economic development is pointless if people cannot enjoy their lives, sleep, and peace and quiet at night, on weekends. Noise pollution is just like any other type of pollution. Who cares about money when you don't have a clean, decent environment to live in.
- First and foremost when the term 'economic development' is used it must contain an analysis of both the positive and negative impacts. We are not improving the development of the region if on the one hand we create a small number of jobs and on the other hand we disturb the sleep of several hundreds of people who then go to their work in such a condition that they cannot make an appropriate contribution. The role of the airport is to find an appropriate balance between economic development and economic hindrance.
- Get in position so area travelers can avoid Pearson!
- As the population of the region continues to grow, there will be increases in the demand for air travel for business and pleasure. With quicker turn around times it is my personal choice for travel out west. So adding another flight to Calgary and...
Vancouver is a good idea. WestJet is very smart to use smaller aircraft and regional airports to reduce their costs. Landing fees are much lower here.

- The airport has a major role to play in fostering the growth and development in the Region as it represents a key transportation hub. I regularly use it for business travel to/from Calgary as well as the US through Chicago. I prefer using this airport over Pearson because of the convenience (distance, parking, terminal), even though flights sometimes cost more.
- It should have a very important role in our development in the Region. More jobs, more recognition of our area etc.
- Having an airport available for those travelling for business is definitely an asset to the community but an expansion would not be worth it if it were at the expense of the quality of life for those living in the community. The constant noise and traffic to even get to the areas around the airport would be a nightmare. I think the role the airport has now is adequate for economic development. There is an airport available in the community.
- taxes, jobs, tourism
- The airport can definitely serve as an economic driver by servicing the business community and acting as an attractor to potential new businesses.
- So far it only costs taxpayers money, therefore it is not supporting the economic development of the region at present. It should also be noted that the budget for the airport does not balance (-$6,000,000) per year currently. Putting more money into a losing business only wastes more money.
- Cargo/conference/business/ increased access to UW and WL universities from eastern students without having to use TO and limo/taxi each time. Perhaps Guelph can be enticed to use airport expansion as very near access from its west side as well.
- More airlines, more routes and destinations. Promote the airport more through the media. Don't try to please the whiners! Busy airports mean busy community, with jobs.
- I don't recall a dollar figure mentioned for current or future supporting of the economic development of the Region. It currently does not help me or support my business in anyway. It just costs me money every year.
- I don't feel the airport should be subsidized by individual taxpayers, because I don't see it as a public necessity like public transportation. It is nice to have a local airport and potentially good for business, but does local business support the airport? I'd like to know to what extent businesses use the airport and know, if and how they would support the airport under each option i.e. is there a need or case for expanding the airport for supporting local economic development beyond the immediate airport jobs and spin-off industries/jobs? What will be the impact of surrounding industrial development - will they use and support the airport? It seems we are always relying only on individual taxpayers to support
the airport and local economic development; all sectors have to do their part, including local developers and business.

- First and foremost, when the term 'economic development' is used it must contain an analysis of both the positive and negative impacts. We are not improving the development of the region if on the one hand we create a small number of jobs and on the other hand we disturb sleep of several hundreds of people who then go to their work in such a condition that they cannot make an appropriate contribution. The role of the airport is to serve the needs of our community, not the needs of Toronto, and to find an appropriate balance between economic development and economic hindrance.

- The airport should SUPPORT regional economic development but not attempt to create development, when is big enough achieved.

- Expansion may increase industries to locate in the Region

- Very minimal, or none. The airport was built and designed as a recreational small airport. Its proximity to the city and residential subdivisions must limit its development.

- I travel across Canada for work, and currently need to travel to Toronto get my flights. And I am sure many others are the same. Being able to fly from Waterloo would reduce cars on the 401, I would spend my travel money at home, parking, a meal etc.) Business save money on travel costs to Toronto, and increase productivity as employees save and hour or more in travel time to the airport.

- It would provide more good jobs. It would have more money spent locally rather than in Toronto or Hamilton or London where people have to travel now to fly most places.

- The airport has a negative role in the economic development of the region. I fly frequently, 2 to 3 times per month and I have only utilized the airport once 4 years ago and don't plan to utilize it again. The cost of flying out of the airport is not competitive and the planes are too small and noisy. Had I known of the noise factor in the area, I would not have purchased my home in Hidden Valley. If nothing is done about the flight paths (and I have no confidence at this time that anything will be done) we will probably sell our house and move out of the region to find peace and quiet and not have to deal with these problems

- I feel it should remain about the same as it is already.

- The airport should work with companies in the region to determine if they are in need of an expanded airport.

- I would support the airport becoming self sustaining. In addition, I appreciate having an airport close by from which it have and will continue to travel.

- Any economic development needs to be fairly balanced against economic deficits and hindrances e.g. lost tax revenue as mentioned above, disturbed sleep and quality of life. Currently, the disadvantages have not been taken fully into account.
- Create more flights to New York, Florida, larger cities with corporate connection to the Region.
- Has a major role in Region jobs, tourism, future developments in regain and easy access to an airport for people.
- The Airport should be a driver in economic development. With the community flourishing in the technology industry the market for business travellers is growing. The airport should be a main focus of the cities economic development strategy as it acts as an entry point for business travellers. This has potential to help the city grow in as it offers an easy connection for outside investors.
- C) Any city depends on the talent of the people in the Region and not on an infrastructure. Human capital is the one asset that can't be replicated and should be considered over any airport expansion plans.
- In all fairness, is there a wrong answer for this question? It would be very hard to say there is no role for the airport in Ec. Dev of the Region. Of course there is a viable role but don't make that the reason to tramp over neighbourhood concerns. One role the airport shouldn't be is an economic drain in it subsidization.
- I think that if the Airport can support and promote economic development in the Region like creating more jobs, more tax revenue for the Region, or even creating or enhancing businesses that could use an improved airport, should take steps like this Master Plan to do so.
- By expanding going to more places making full use of the facility and the region
- Minimal. Why does the airport need to support the economic development? When Toronto is 45-60mins away and the majority of people have no issue driving to Toronto for a flight. The region currently develops very well with world class universities, technology companies, and insurance companies.
- The airport should serve the needs of the Region without being detrimental to residents land values and health. There are larger airports at Pearson and Hamilton for those who need them. I'm sure developers of the land over the river to the west of the airport would disagree with the airport expansion as it will reduce the value of the land and homes they are building there.
- As it is now or with supporting role for a much larger airport within 25 km. radius serving a much larger area (say 50 years of development.
- An airport is an excellent idea, but it should be primarily to support the region rather than to bring in outside traffic or off-load demand on Pearson. Ideally it should be self-financing, but there is no reason why it should not continue to be financially supported by the region while it is providing valuable services to the region.
- I think it should support economic development. I work for a large company with many travellers and the existing flights are only viable if flying direct to Chicago or if your flight would have a stop anyways. However, this should not be at the
expense of residents who purchased homes in residential neighborhoods before the airport expanded.

- With airports in Hamilton, London and Toronto what added economic advantage can this regional airport provide?
- The airport should complement the needs of the region and be sized according to growth plans. An obvious comment perhaps, but would not like to see a white elephant sitting out in Breslau, yet as anyone who travels to Pearson for travel, having a local, smaller-scale option is great.
- None. It is not necessary.
- None. We do not need this airport. Pearson, and Hamilton serve our community quite well. Think before spending the tax-payers money. Check out Portland Oregon to see how community leaders have developed a people friendly city while increasing economic activity.
- None, as the airport does not benefit the community. There are already two international airports within 1 to 1.5 hours (Toronto, Hamilton), and two more in the United States within 2 to 2.5 hours (Niagara Falls, Buffalo). The two in the States are cheaper and faster then the ones in Canada.
- It should not be an economic driver. IT should be in the supportive roll. Again listen to the citizens and if prefer to use the airport use these numbers for your projections.
- None. It should offer the community a hub and spoke operation so that we can get to certain American and Canadian centers. It’s doing that today and unless demand explodes and draws more flights there is nothing more the airport can do. OH, yes clean up the car traffic around the airport.
- THEY SHOULD OFFER THE SERVICES DEMANDED BY THE COMMUNITY. THE CURRENT TRAFFIC LEVELS TELL YOU THAT THEY DON’T NEED ANY MORE.
- It should offer reasonable flight options at the lowest cost and lowest risk to the Regional budget. I understand there are a few companies that help subsidize the Chicago flight. I can only guess who they might be and doubt they established here, grew here or stays here as a result of the airport. I don’t think any companies have. It is merely a convenience not a necessity. It provides jobs but at what cost. We are only an hour away from Toronto or Hamilton. I heard it said several times at the meeting that you have to take risks to garner any rewards. I’ve searched the Regions website for its mission statement and I could not reconcile their mission statement with the risk propositions being put forth.
- The role should, if anything, be to boost the business prosperity to the region without detriment to the quality of life for it’s’ residents. This includes both the environment we live in, as well as our financial situation.
- Is the airport currently bringing in money or costing us money?
- Limited role. Promote rail where possible.
• A major role!
• The only economic role, currently and in the future, is a tax burden. This airport will never be self sufficient. Regardless how many jobs are generated it will always be the taxpayers carrying the cost.
• I have always believed that this airport provides too little benefit to the residents of the Region of Waterloo to warrant the negative effects to the residents that live in the neighbourhood and are affected by the increasing noise levels from this airport. There are already three other larger, older, more established international airports within 100 km of Waterloo Region so any residents and/or business requiring access to an international airport can do so without this airport. (e.g. residents and businesses in the east end of the GTA require longer to get to Pearson International Airport than would anybody in the Region of Waterloo to any or Pearson, Hamilton, or London International Airports. Why is this region competing for commercial and passenger business with other more established airports? This is not making good use of infrastructure already in place in southern Ontario.
• None. The airport should be financially sustained by those who use it only. The surrounding cities should not have to pay taxes to keep the airport going. As mentioned before, this airport was originally intended to be hobby airport, and should be funded by those wanting to fly.
• NONE! That is not your job; that is the government's job. If you want to support economic growth, move your airport to the country side where no residents would be affected.
• They should have a substantial role, but only in the benefit of the region and it communities.

QUESTION: Do you have any other comments?

COMMENTS:
• I am an employee of Baffinland Iron Mines, and as such, use the airport twice every month. It is a great benefit to me to have this facility here. I have used the airport for other use, vacation flights, and WestJet flights and find the convenience of not having to drive to Toronto very beneficial. It might be useful to let the general public know that the Nolinor/Baffinland flight is a long term opportunity (up to 40 years or more)Perhaps the public would understand that this could be more of an anchor carrier, and that could attract more passenger and freight use to this facility with the lower landing fees.
• I am opposed to plan 3 and 4 and want to make that very clear. Plans 3 may have made sense before development to the west was approved a decade or more ago but not now. Plan 4 for Waterloo region is over the top and not suited to the current location of the airport, plus likely never attainable.
- Move forward
- House values will decrease in 5, 10, 15, 20 years? Tax base will be reduced on property taxes. Cost profit analysis for option 1, 2, 3, 4 over 5, 10, 15, 20 years. House residential areas are too close to the airport. Is it against the law on Transport Canada?
- Keep up the good work!
- Don’t spend any more of our taxes on the airport please!!
- $50 million more for option #3, not in budget plan. Where is it expected to come from? Region Federal Gov’t? Provincial Gov’t?
- More information is required on actual demand for increase in usage.
- Although the airport has existed well before certain residential areas were built, there is a need for noise control and these will be in the future, where the airport is expanded. Curfews should be set, similar to curfews at major airports like Pearson.
- In general, I have found flights from T.O. to be cheaper. (I think I was looking at Las Vegas) and I believe flights stopped in T.O. anyways. Some hotels near T.O. airport allow you to park for free with 1 overnight stay, and had shuttle service. A bus or GO-train service to airport would be nice (maybe there already is a bus... I don’t know)
- Please find a good use for the Millard Hangar
- What impact will expansion have on home evaluation for properties within the flight path. No impact study have ever noted on this matter.
- Sell the land for residential development the region would make more in property taxes, services and building permits. The airline industry is so unpredictable to say the airport can be self sufficient and with the Pickering airport I don’t see any overflow coming our way.
- Need to balance spending with growth. Allow for some potential for growth, keeping pace with actual growth. Environment must be protected.
- I think the airport should be kept to its present level of activity and not allowed to expand unless and until the people behind this project are properly open and honest with the community they purport to serve and have earned their respect and support. I also think that go-for-broke expansion to option 3 or 4 might be the best long term idea, considering the projected budget for such expansion seems large enough to support moving the entire airport to a location several km east and north of its present site, where it could operate with less residential interference, better road access and more efficiency. I think a move of this sort would be a wise measure with the best long term economies when all aspects are considered.
- Please let this email represent our official comments on the various options. I am writing this letter on behalf of Thomasfield Homes, we are developers and homebuilders in the Breslau community. We have just completed the 500 unit
subdivision of Hopewell Heights which is located in the southeast quadrant of Fountain Road and Existing Hwy 7. Additionally, we have a development proposal for a large mixed use community located at Greenhouse Road and Existing Hwy 7 which will provide for a mix of Residential, Commercial, Office uses and a planned GO Train Station this development proposal is currently going through planning approvals. Overall we support the smart development of the airport. However, for our current and future customers we are concerned about the impacts of a North/South runway on our existing and future development. We would ask you to consider not developing the north south runway as it significantly impacts our currently community. The expansion of the airport using the east west runway makes more sense as the approach from Guelph towards the airport brings it over lands which are protected by the country side line. We look forward to engaging in the furtherer processes of the Master Plan.

- Business Model: This is my biggest concern. For the time being, I will address only this issue. Reference: Conceptual Design Option Summary Chart Option # 1Key Concern: What are the assumptions and hard data if any that supports the forecast of 362 Potential Jobs and an Economic Impact of $97.1 M? Option # 2Here again, what are the assumptions that supports this forecast of 1200 Potential Jobs and an Economic Impact of $278.7M? What we should be concerned with are the key assumptions and their credibility in this forecast. Providing Forecast without giving out the assumptions on which this forecast is based gives the impression of high credibility to these numbers. Stating the number for economic impact of 278.7M in the distant future seems to imply that this forecast is within the range of 1M! This way of presenting information I find inaccurate and misleading. Recommendation: Info package should include the list of key assumptions to substantiate the forecast of jobs and economic impact. Region should provide a forum for those interested citizens & business leaders - to debate these assumptions; I believe it would force clarity to a much higher degree and lead to better decision making for this important project. I cannot help but feel that the business case is being built on rosy assumptions and continued subsidy ($50M) by taxpayers. Option # 3 Same comments apply as in option #2. I believe this option be postponed until option # 1 is fully realized.

- We need to expand the airport and please do not be dismayed by the complainers. Push back and plan for a better community and for growth!!!

- We purchased our house 22 years ago knowing there was an airport close by. We do not regret that decision. The planes fly over our house and it is no big deal. It is about 15 seconds of my day each time. They do not make that much noise. It is more irritating when the neighbours cut their grass at 7:00 in the morning on a weekend. To say that the airport should be moved to a non residential area is ridiculous. It was in a non residential area. These people chose to buy their homes in the area and more homes are being built so they
need to deal with it and stop complaining. This is an election year and we want to see politicians stand up for the airport, for its continued growth and the jobs it provides. It is time to stop catering to the people that have nothing better to do than to whine everyday about something.

- Business Model: This is my biggest concern. For the time being, I will address only this issue. Reference: Conceptual Design Option Summary Chart Option # 1

  Key Concern: What are the assumptions and hard data if any that supports the forecast of 362 Potential Jobs and an Economic Impact of $97.1 M? Option # 2

  Here again, what are the assumptions that supports this forecast of 1200 Potential Jobs and an Economic Impact of $278.7 M? What we should be concerned with are the key assumptions and their credibility in this forecast. Providing Forecast without giving out the assumptions on which this forecast is based gives the impression of high credibility to these numbers. Stating the number for economic impact of 278.7M in the distant future seems to imply that this forecast is within the range of 1M! This way of presenting information I find inaccurate and misleading. Recommendation: Info package should include the list of key assumptions to substantiate the forecast of jobs and economic impact. Region should provide a forum for those interested citizens & business leaders - to debate these assumptions; I believe it would force clarity to a much higher degree and lead to better decision making for this important project. I cannot help but feel that the business case is being built on rosy assumptions and continued subsidy ($50M) by taxpayers. Option #3 Same comments apply as in option #2. I believe this option be postponed until option # 1 is fully realized.

- When do you see the Region adopting an option with its recommendations? What is the timeline for implementation of the chosen plan? How is sustainability for the airport to be achieved? What are the safeguards should the master plan objectives not be met? If an option is chosen and the desired amount of annual passengers is not met, who will be responsible for the capital spending already undertaken? Will the taxpayer be on the hook for the capital spending if the airport can't reach sustainability? Is now the time for an expansion? Has the private sector been asked to support the expansion? Do the rewards outweigh the risk? Considering the loss of Bearskin, how is the Region proposing to attract the required passengers? Is having a local airport worth the cost as indicated in the Options outlined? The East Side Lands availability still needs to be refined. How does the planned airport extension fit into this plan, or is a different piece of land earmarked for this extension? Hamilton airport is focused on cargo and not passenger service. At that municipality industrial land is reserved for businesses that make use of air cargo to contribute to that airport's success. Is the Waterloo Regional Airport proposing similar services/restrictions? Have studies been done to determine the type of viable services in our region? Are flight schools being looked at? How does the Region plan to complete with Buffalo and Toronto pricing and scheduling? Will the closing of some of the other smaller airports
(such as Buttonville) make this airport more attractive, or increase traffic? In order to accommodate this, what are the plans for the runway expansion? The tax base is already looking at increases for the LRT and other demands from Hydro. How will this expansion be funded? How do we increase the industrial tax base to support this type of expansion? Businesses such as RIM, ATS, Schneider’s who used air service are leaving the area, how will this impact the expansion plans? What are the reasons why an airline leaves and how do they make this decision? What is the airport’s operating budget and what subsidies do they receive from the Region? What are the impacts on the Region’s subsidy and the tax payer (whether industrial or residential) of each of the proposed options? Will the other airline that still services the Regional Airport continue its service, and for how long?

- I will hesitate to fly from Waterloo because I do not feel they have performed well in the emergency situations reported in the news to date and this gives me no confidence in case of an incident with larger aircraft and possibly more passengers. This is especially concerning with Option 3 and 4. At Pearson the support would be there.

- Appreciate the Airport. Use it. Promote it

- Yes. The Waterloo Region has signed a climate Action Plan. They have pledged to build a sustainable region. Reducing carbon footprints is the plan. Putting more airplanes over K-W will not reduce our carbon footprints. The pollutions and health hazards of airports/airplanes are well documented. Create a liveable, sustainable community where people will not suffocate on lead and other pollutants from airplanes.

- I hope good sense prevails

- In the option 4 findings, only the inadequacy of road access to Hwy 7 and 401 is mentioned. Missing from the plan is a rail link. In this day and age it is irresponsible to think only of road access. Perhaps this has not been overlooked, however I suggest it is also vital to put it front and center. The Kitchener-Guelph rail line is about 1 km north of the airport. This line is the link to the LRT and GO transit hub in downtown Kitchener. This rail line is also a direct connection to YYZ via Metrolinx. Imagine a reliever airport for YYZ with a direct rail connection from terminal to terminal that (with modern track and equipment) could provide 60 minute service! Why not show it in the plan?

- I LIVE IN THE ROSEMOUNT AREA OF KITCHENER. WE BOUGHT HERE FOR MANY REASONS BUT HIGH ON THE LIST WAS THE LOCATION IS AWAY FROM PLANE NOISE FROM THE AIRPORT. IN THE PAST THE ODD PROP PLANE OVERHEAD WAS EITHER A TRAINING OR PERSONAL USE AIRCRAFT. IT WAS NOT UNCOMMON BUT NOT ANNOYING. NOW WE HAVE REGULAR JET AND TURBO PROP AT ALL TIMES OF THE DAY. GRANTED SOME PLANES APPEAR HIGH ENOUGH TO BE HEADING ELSEWHERE BUT SOME ARE VERY LOW. THE PROSPECT OF MORE TRAFFIC
(NOISE) SADDENS US ENOUGH TO CONSIDER MOVING FROM A PLACE WE HAD WISHED TO BE OUR FINAL HOME.

- I didn't attend the information session February 6th, but am aware of some of the issues. I like the idea of expansion, but not to the point where we are in equal size to Toronto. I like our airport now since it is easy to get to, current flights out will get you where you need to go, and the noise levels are bearable. (We hear WestJet flight every evening)
- Yes: how about 2-4 daily flights to Toronto????
- I am against any expansion of the airport unless coupled with a noise curfew from 2300 to 0630
- Option 4 do it right the first time. Cancel LRT!!! Makes no sense
- London maybe a better site for airport development.
- I pray we look at what we need to do now, not a minor update and lose our potential market.
- This airport will never have the passenger traffic it desires and the taxpayer will always be on the hook to pay for it, no matter how large the airport expands. I think it is time for the airport to change back to a recreational facility and forget about being an International Airport. Air travel is also very bad for the environment and I think in the future will decrease, rather than increase.
- Thank you for the opportunity to participate and be involved in regional planning initiatives.
- People should be told the money developed in our community due the airport. If the real numbers were made as public as this meeting was I thing some people might actual donate to the airport development. I am referring to the Wilfred Laurier Study done a few years ago. If memory serves me correctly it was some where around a 10 to 1 or 13 to 1 return on investment. Give me those numbers for my RRSP.
- I like airplanes and my daughter and I like watching them fly by. However, we do not want to be awakened at 6:00 am by a loud, noisy jet flying low over our house.
- It is my understanding that the airport authority has little, if any, control over the noise levels of individual aircraft. How does any plan, which allows low flying aircraft flight routes going anywhere in the Region, take this into proper consideration.
- We would like to keep it a smaller city; we don't want another Toronto or Hamilton. If you do expand, the noise and traffic will affect or real estate values. We have lived here our whole life and like the quaint lifestyle as do our children.
- Including this, we have to cut back on overall spending and borrowing.
- Whether or not it is intentional, the information presented at the public presentation favours the option 3 Moderate growth. It has the widest range of options which makes it most difficult to predict success or to plan for. It is a case
of Build It and They (growth) Will Come. Hamilton clearly has found its niche in
developing as a cargo hub but Waterloo appears to be basing its growth
projection almost entirely as a passenger hub. It is unclear to me why the Breslau
airport would rely on only this segment of potential growth. I arrived in Kitchener
in summer of 2013 from Saskatchewan. I have not used the Region of Waterloo
airport thus far because there were no direct flights from SK, and connecting
flights using West Jet took more hours and cost $200 more. Now that I live here,
it makes economic sense to use this airport for trips to Calgary. I would like to
see more aggressive marketing in our area to use Region of Waterloo airport,
specifically with the help of West Jet and American Airlines to become partners in
marketing. It is an unfortunate situation that you are sending payments to an
airline that no longer uses your facility, but recognize that not all business plans
will succeed. I thank you for the opportunity to see the initial proposals by the
Project Team and will be interested to follow

- Are there plans to have Region of Waterloo Public Health examine the various
  plans for a) Air quality impact on surrounding communities. b) The impact on
drinking water given the airport's location near the watershed. c) The health
impacts of increased noise on surrounding communities. I feel a full study and
assessment by Public Health should be made prior to any implementation of
options 2-4.

- Full environmental assessments and assessments by Public Health MUST be
made prior to moving forward with any discussions. Area residents do NOT want
to see airport expansion. The region should consider moving the airport well
outside city limits. Consideration should also be given to new NEF lines given
expansion plans. Any homes that would be inside the NEF30 line after expansion
should be compensated by the airport. The city of Kitchener (and Breslau and
Cambridge) have allowed homes to be built inside the airport's shadow.
Residents don't mind living next to a small, commuter airport, but they have no
interest in living next to anything larger. Their concerns should be first and
foremost on your list of considerations. The impression I got from the information
session is that Chris Wood and co. do not care about local residents. Our
concerns re noise/air pollution were dismissed. A third party non-stakeholder
needs to be brought in to consider these plans. The decision should not be made
by anyone involved in the airport/profiting from the airport's expansion

- Please move the airplane path. Honestly, I would personally love to see a
successful airport, but with the current path, rather have a small or no airport at
all.

- PLEASE work with Nolinor to change the take-off time to 7am. Please. This will
mean a lot. You have admitted yourselves that the complaints have increased
greatly since Nolinor started using your airport. Don't let this company ruin your
reputation. This is exactly what it's doing. Get rid of them or at least push them to
make a change. Bring in newer, quieter planes, not older louder ones.
• Go with scenario #3. Please ignore ignorant and short-sighted residents who prefer scenario #1. The status-quo is not an option. This region is growing and so must the airport. This region has been very good at planning for the future (LRT, countryside line). The airport shouldn’t be any different. In 20 years from now when the population is ~730,000 and driving to Pearson is no longer viable, people will look back and be grateful that the Region had the foresight to invest in a proper airport.

• No matter what option we go for, ensuring related infrastructure is built along side the development is crucial for the success of the airport. If we go with Option #3, it would be beneficial to ensure there is public transportation connected to the airport from Kitchener-Waterloo and Cambridge, as well as a reliable express rail line from Toronto to the airport like that at Gatwick in England. I travel a lot around the world and these transportation links to airports are very important for passengers.

• Today, most people have to fly out of Toronto because there aren’t any other options. Waterloo’s airport could be an option when flying and should ease the congestion at Pearson.

• In the 20 yrs.? of passenger service I have used the airport once. But the departures are too limited because the carriers can get the required number of passengers to support increases. Their business cases don’t justify spending the money. You spending the money is NOT going to change that. When you can tell me that you don’t need tax subsidization then you can expand the airport...BUT the airport pays for it NOT the taxpayer.

• The North American airline model is hub-and-spoke. We are so close to a major hub (Canada’s largest), that it makes no sense to try to compete with it. As stated above, Torontonians drive to Buffalo, when they could just take a cab to YYY. Let’s preserve YKF and not turn it into an expensive white elephant where the taxpayer is on the hook because the Region built it and they did not come.

• It will be essential that the long term parking be improved. Particularly with ice, snow and rain it is impossible to arrive at the airport in your own vehicle and alone. One cannot maneuver luggage from across the entrance roadway and you are NOT to leave unattended luggage in the Airport. Until there is covered parking could a holding area be designed and manned in the Airport for luggage for both arrivals and departures?

• I like, and my family and I use the airport as it’s convenient for flights to the U.S., but at what cost?? My house being devalued and any dinner parties or special occasions are being interrupted by 40,000 lbs of thrust going over my house and backyard!!! Have used many other airports in the area, Pearson, Hamilton, London and Buffalo, and they are mainly in industrial or rural areas. Now, you have just one of these big 737 go down on approach or on takeoff over Kitchener proper and there will be an huge uproar
- The airport is extremely poorly developed. First the city gave permits to develop the subdivisions around the airport, making people believe that this is just a small regional airport. Now, they want to develop the airport quadruple the traffic. Anyone complaining gets the cold shoulder, lies. OFFICIALS ARE ELECTED; THEY ARE NOT HERE TO MAKE THE REGION GROW AT ANY AND ALL COST. If some residents of K-W prefer to embrace airport growth, I would recommend that flight routes are moved over their subdivisions.

- Keep us informed. -No flights out after 11:00pm or before 7:00am.-Landing - no restrictions

- Why don’t we ask them to pave their runway in Iqaluit? -We want to be kept informed of the next session in the planning process. -Passenger flights should be kept to daytimes - curfew for cargo overnights 12-630 a.m. especially if the flights are noisy. -M

- It would be easier for the community to give input and assist with the Region’s decision if information was presented regarding what airlines and what routes would become available with each option. Right now, everything has a down-side and a $25.00/year tax savings is NOT incentive enough. You will need to communicate the other benefits - otherwise there is only unnecessary down-side to these expansion options. The airport is currently operating at only 50% capacity - why is expansion necessary and why would we want it? You will need to show people what convenient new routes will become available that they will get excited about... otherwise noise, cost etc. is all down-side... and unnecessary/without merit. Has future demand been estimated properly? You want to be able to survey the public about future demand unless you tell them what the routes/airlines will be. Hold a referendum. Concern: RE: Cargo flights overnight - very loud. Would want a curfew on flights so we’re not dealing with more/increased noise issues.

- Why is the zoning at the end of the runways residential instead of industrial or commercial? Where are the Region of waterloo representatives? They should be at this information session!!

- Option 1 - Status Quo. Why does it not show flight path of large planes see coming over Idlewood?

- Excellent presentations and materials -Great venues-Well organized- Suggestion: you need to better market the airport in Oxford County - too many people are not aware of flight options. - Need to consider revenue guarantees for further flight development

- My family recently moved to Kitchener from the west end of Guelph (W of Elmira Road S or Speedsvale). The airport noise in our old community was so loud and disturbing to us that when we moved, we made sure our new home was well outside NEF contours and airport zoning. However, the noise is much worse! It seems the planes fly right over our home and not with in the flight path zoning.
We did our due diligence when looking for a home to buy in the Region and are so seriously disappointed. My wife and I sleep with earplugs in (due to overnight nurses in our home for our special needs son) yet we have been woken up several times this winter - with the windows closed - with our ear plugs in - because of aircraft noise! The onus is not just a nuisance - it is quite disturbing and effecting our quality of life. PLEASE do something through the master plan process to address this and help us.

1) What guarantees do we have information presented is accurate - Based on passenger planes but was given no assurance expansion wouldn't mean more cargo planes (loud)  2) Claim noise reduction but no mention of number of planes off each runway with options.  3) Will there be environmental assessments? Protected drinking water area.  4) Info is misleading - noise is NOT reduced for more planes.

If the cargo flights had never started, I would fully support the Regions Growth Plan. The noise effect from the cargo flight and the lack of response to date from the Region makes me less willing to support the Airport and its future growth.

Stop expanding.

Reopen the flight path discussion. The impact of the upset community will significant out weight the cargo plane contract.

I don't believe most residents want to be negatively impact the potential benefits of airport growth. Unfortunately, the 737-200 cargo flights are in many ways unacceptable under the current scenario. Anything that could be done to decrease their impact would clearly go a long way in generating support for possible expansion. Thanks.

Developing new neighbourhoods around the airport conflicts with growing and developing the airport as more people will be affected by the noise. If the airport can not support itself financially maybe it should discontinue operations as it is causing more of a disturbance than benefits.

Very well presented tonight. I liked having the two presentations and that we could talk to the individuals at each station.

Noise level in my neighbourhood (hidden valley) is completely unacceptable especially at the times these flights take off. These vibrate my house. Not at level of conversation as printed in local newspaper.

Stop expanding.

Stop Expanding

STOP THE EXPANSION!!!

Very simple-status quo. Listen to the residents and stop fulfilling your agenda

1) To be a more prosperous Region, the Airport needs to match the growth and profile here 2) I would use the airport if there were more choice in flights 3) Airport should be connected with public transit 4) Need to incorporate a general Q&A 5) Need to keep people focussed on the future
• The total noise factor from all air flights over houses should be considered in measuring the noise impact and frequencies of it. e.g.: flights into Hamilton Airport expanding the runway in isolation to reduce noise concerns would make better quality of living for residents not to mention maintaining property values. Curfews should be put into place. The handling of questions at the presentations was poorly handles. Time schedule was more important than addressing those attending needs.

• The video displays/presentations could have been looped a little more frequently.

• I live a few feet away from the Homer Watson Gallery, directly under the flight path. I SPECIFICALLY stayed away from looking homes near the airport when I moved to town in August of 2012. I never suspected I would be directly under the flight paths. I will support anything that moves the flight path/reduces the noise. The cargo planes that take in the morning are beyond loud. Something has to be done.

• We need a connector to the airport as per GRT! From Fairview Park Mall/Conestoga Mall to airport - Express Bus from LRT end/start! Run at times conclusive to incoming and outgoing flights. Please try to get an airline to New York, I believe it would increase traffic (especially those travelling internationally (as most international flights go through New York))

• How could it benefit to citizens around the Region compare to the Toronto Airport.

• I support the growth of the airport and would be very happy to see lift capacity increase for the Region of Waterloo Airport

• Don't get influenced solely by economics, politics, and other abstract issues. Focus on the moral and integral aspects of people's basic needs in the Region. Balance is key. Is it unreasonable to set 14-4 window during the day when planes can come and go? No, the residents here should be able to enjoy a reasonable amount of peace and quiet at night and on weekends. And just because someone does not complain, does not mean they like the noise. If it were to complain or provide an opinion on every flight it is solicited for, I would have no time for anything else. There is a certain degree of expectations that politicians and employees of corporations and governments do the moral, integral, consider respectful and right thing for the benefit of those they serve and humanity in general. Sometimes, you also need to put your foot down and project the basic needs. e.g.: sleep, clean water, clean air, etc.

• I understand you are asking for the public opinion. I live on Paisley RD last house before you reach Lerch Rd. I do pay Guelph Eramosa taxes and since those airplanes do fly over our area I think I should have a say. I was aware of the airport when I moved in here but I got told that since this area is Guelph Eramosa township planes should be keeping to Waterloo airspace. As of now we do hear the bigger planes taking off in this house early morning. I hope that if you do
expand you fly in your area Waterloo region in and out I don't want to have an airport like Toronto international airport in my back door. I am sure you can understand my position would you like to have more traffic flying over your home coming in and out for landing. I have invested a lot of money into my home and do not want to lose my real estate value cause of an airport flying in my back door. Please sent me email with the results of this project.

- I would like to receive updates about the Airport Master Plan. Can you please advise as to when the next information session will be?
- I missed the Public session last night despite it being in my back yard, because these things are poorly advertised. Please email me updates to this address. Thanks.
- We were unable to attend last evening’s open house regarding the expansion of the Region of Waterloo International Airport but we certainly would like to voice our comments. My husband and I have flown from the Regional Airport and just LOVE it!! We would love to see the airport expand and would love to have the opportunity to fly from our airport only. It is a very sad day when we are spending millions on the LRT and not look towards the sky for enhancement as well.
- As a growing dynamic community, anything less than grabbing this opportunity to make this aviation asset we have as grand as possible, is sending the wrong message to those prospective companies, business people, and those that would enrich our society by putting down roots here. Yes, it's a big project, but transport Canada has already targeted us for it.
- In the interest of airport development I am keen to receive an electronic copy of the draft Master Plan.
- Concerned about planes flying over our house.
- I would not have been able to attend your open house; however I like to express my concerns (shared by many of my neighbours in Deer Ridge). Please, act on the petition to move the airplane path away, signed so far by over 400 people from 5 different communities. From my perspective there are two different topics here. First is the airport itself, it is in our city to stay and frankly many of us hope would succeed. Second is the airplane Path, it deserves separate consideration, these would reasons we are concern: 1. It was arbitrarily imposed to our community. There are alternatives affecting mainly farm and industrial land. 2. Pollution, the gasoline burned produces far more contaminants than regular car gas, including lead, basically dumped on our properties. Chronic exposure to contaminants, noise and interference with sleep pattern, negatively affects our health. 3. Airport expansion would make our city more attractive, but especially for cargo companies (Pearson is expensive and too busy). Then as passengers we won't have a lot more options, but traffic would increase considerably as well as negative impact on the airplane path. 4. Risk of airplane accident. This is obvious since we are in the path, although unlikely. However, keep in mind that
older crafts are at higher risk of failure; maintenance is regulated but not inspected (honour system). 5. Value of our properties, research has shown that houses on airplane path decrease value on average 7%.

- At this point 436 citizens from five different sub-divisions have signed petitions that state the current noise level is unacceptable and that action must be taken to change the situation. Surely if the current situation is intolerable, then the plans you are proposing for future development will make the areas where these residents live noise ghettos from which the only salvation is to escape. There should be citizens either involved in, or observe the decision making process; representatives from the affected neighbourhoods.

- I love to travel in and out of this airport and I try to avoid Pearson if I can.

- I think that going forward the focus of the development should be on the business development role the airport plays. This expansion opportunity, along with forward-thinking initiatives like the LRT / ION, will help strengthen the business community in the Region. Through that, every resident will benefit. I have and will continue to use the Region's airport for both personal and business travel.

- When we moved to this area the airport was much less busy. Now it is much extremely busier with air and vehicle traffic and noisier. It's far past the small airport stage - so why make it bigger, which means more noise more traffic.

- Keep the public informed via the media. The more we know about your plans the easier it will be to go forward.

- A reason trip to LAX from YKF was plagued by late departures and arrivals and missed connection. Standing in -15 degree at 11:00pm on a Sunday without transit or taxis in sight and a gentleman wondered whether this was a real city. Assured him that while there was no subway, we were installing Swiss type transit in our main streets.

- I have lived in the vicinity of the airport nearly all of my life. Except on occasions when planes have woken me up at night, the noise has not really bothered me much. I would be concerned though if the traffic were to increase substantially and would seriously consider moving to another area if it did. I would be worried about the value of my house going down. I am also concerned about taxes for years to come for all ratepayers. It seems that we are spending too much on projects that many people don't want and we can't afford when our infrastructure is aging and needs to be replaced. In my household, we don't buy what we can't afford.

- May need a good public transit route to airport.

- I am a huger booster of the local airport and use it whenever possible. Would be great to have more destinations served.

- The airport is a money pit. It requires serious outside independent consultation and input prior to making any decision. With the 800m currently being wasted for the LRT to nowhere that most residents don't want, it is ridiculous to throw even
more taxpayer dollars at the airport. I am strongly opposed to any more money going there until it can balance its budget.

- I feel that the comment I made in #5 are my main point
- Living in East Canada with students at UW for last 6-8 yrs. There are no connections to east of value except through TO or Montreal. Bearskin provides an Ottawa connection but all east flights from or to Ottawa go back through TO. Can’t understand why there is no direct flight from KW to say Montreal where all eastern connections to Moncton/Fredericton/ST John/Halifax can be arranged. 250$ taxi/limo return from airport in high traffic is not convenient. Surely there must be sufficient interest in say a Montreal connector? Any polls to look at potential volume to east via a direct MTL flight?
- Why was housing development allowed close to the airport, need to tell people you buy a place near an airport, you will get noise.
- I feel the region is already in line to spend to much tax dollars for future transportation in this region. We can’t afford any new plans for the airport. We need an independent consultation on sustainability and need in our region, not just consultants that helped construct the plans put foreword. Our council and residents are not and should not be required to know enough about airports to make this decision.
- I very much like the concept of a Master Plan for the airport and appreciate the time and effort of staff to date. I think we have to make sure we have adequate research, communicate over and above expectations, and be very sincere about considering all options. Otherwise, it becomes another exercise in marketing, and judging from the comments at the sessions I attended, there is little public appetite for that. In light of what I heard that evening and living where I live, I cannot fathom how any responsible government can approve the new residential Kitchener subdivision being built literally across the river from the airport (by the new bridge). Walk out there and you soon realize no homes should be built their due to current flight activity, let alone amidst future airport growth. This kind of decision-making does not help the Airport cause; it will only lead to more noise complaints and greater community opposition to expansion. I personally use and like the airport and found it to be an excellent service - I have used it for personal and family travel on five occasions (Victoria, Vancouver, Punta Cana, Ottawa, and Chicago). 'Work as if you live in the early days of a better nation.' Alasdair Gray
- My wife and I both grew up in Kitchener and have our extended family spread across Canada. We fly to visit them approximately 2-3 times a year. Winnipeg, Calgary, Vancouver. We always check the Waterloo airport for flights first, and it is our preference by a long shot but about half the time we end up going to Hamilton, London, or (worst case) Toronto due to the flight schedules. I know the situation is the same for my parents and siblings (also Kitchenerians) as well as our relatives who fly here to visit us. More flights from Waterloo would be
great for my family and I but whether it's worth it for the region is something I'm not knowledgeable enough on to comment about. I am sharing my situation because I read the article ‘Deciding on the local airport's optimum size’ in the Kitchener Citizen.

- At this point 436 citizens from five different sub-divisions have signed petitions that state the current noise level is unacceptable and that action must be taken to change the situation. Surely if the current situation is intolerable, then the plans you are proposing for future development will make the areas where residents live noise ghettos from which the only salvation is to escape.

- I use the airport to and from Calgary 3 to 4 times annually, in turn relatives from BC. Arrive and depart the airport, the major complaint I have is the inadequacy of the space for check in, passenger arrival and luggage retrieval. This is particularly acute when WestJet arrives at 6.30-7.00pm and leaves shortly thereafter, you have arriving passengers, departing passengers, meters and greeters all crammed in the same space. Try looking at Abbotsford BC. I would expect that you will received competition from London and Hamilton at least. Keep the add-on fees and taxes to a minimum and you may be successful. Best of Luck.

- As a taxpayer an increase in property taxes will be money well spent to the future workforce of the area if we can attract more industry.

- Just because the airport was built at one point 50 or 60 years ago, it is not necessary that it needs to be further developed; especially not when it causes so much disturbance. If the airport is developed even with such opposition, then the flight patterns must be developed so that they fly over the entire city, disturbing everyone equally.

- More flights to destination across Canada would allow me to use the airport more and save about $340 per trip in airways transit costs.

- I personally hate driving to Toronto and if I fly somewhere, I always worry about 401 traffic delays, weather delays, plus high parking costs and extended time you need to be there a head of time. I would really like to see it expanded to the point where there are more flights south, like Florida, Dominican Republic, and Cuba. Not just Mexico. If we had this I would be using it this winter. Make sure there is enough baggage handling capability. Last time I came back on WestJet from Calgary, I waited about 1/2 hour for baggage which I thought was a bit excessive for just the 1 plane landing at that time. But I plan to use WestJet out West.

- Citizen concerns must be considered. People leave their jobs, families and other responsibilities to come to these meetings. The sentiment amongst the participants is that no one cares and no one is listening. It has been since 2006 when the flight paths issues have been going back and forth. In addition, the airport is losing money. Seats are half empty. If I have a company losing money, the last thing I would be looking at doing is to expand it and lose more.
We are a small community. The noise, fuel dumping affects all of us. The airport is driving people away from this area.

- I would pick option #1 because option #2 makes no sense to spend that amount of money to expand and never be self sustained. Option #3 and Option #4 are massive expansions and would clearly change the entire area.

- I believe that the interests of neighboring communities and the airport and its users can be balanced if sufficient effort is made. While no doubt there will be groups or individuals who are not entirely satisfied, effort should be made to ensure that no group or individuals are entirely the loser either.

- At this point 436 citizens from five different sub-divisions have signed petitions that state the current noise level is unacceptable and that action must be taken to change the situation. Further development can only increase this problem and should not be considered without fully resolving the current issues. Also, I would like to comment at the outset that the meeting before Christmas about the proposed SID change resulted in biased responses. Those who were concerned about the change showed up while those who were OK with it tended not to come. This is a common phenomenon with questionnaires and surveys. This resulted in a very skewed impression and this must be acknowledged by the Airport Authorities. Thus you DO NOT have an accurate impression of the local feeling about changing the SID. Yes, and if there is some modest development (as mentioned I would be in favour of option 2, and not 3 or 4), I would like flights considered to the following destinations; Montreal, Vancouver, New York, and another major hub in the centre of the US, such as Atlanta.

- Get this built, we need flights!

- Would make affordable to travel in our Country. Much safer area then Toronto. Let's move on this New Master Plan NOW! Thank you. Would like to fly from the airport but does not go where we go.

- I would love to see our airport grow. I am a fourth year student at the University of Victoria but have grown up learning to fly at the Kitchener airport. I believe there is potential for the airport to become a very competitive option for travellers in southern Ontario. When the airport considers its strategy I believe it should look to the Victoria international airport as a potential size goal. The airport offers several regular daily flights and seasonal flight to southern destinations. I believe Kitchener has a large market for travellers wishing to go South or East. Flights to Halifax should be considered as well as flights to Florida or more flights to Central America and the Caribbean. I short flight to Toronto city airport could also be a viable option for people wishing to fly porter airlines. Toronto city has many connections and flight throughout the day without the hassle of Pearson. Strong supporter of Kitchener airport growth!!!!

- This was a very poor planning by the Region in all aspects - I see holes from many points of view that have not been addressed.
I really am getting the opinion that this is being set-up as a forgone decision and an arranged deal. Decisions do not reflect feedback and concerns of neighbourhood adversely impacted by increasing noise. If the plan is to grow the airport as the model suggests the noise is going to be ongoing and far more offensive than it is now. Surely planes flying out over more commercial properties, as has been suggested, and which looks fairly viable, would not be that difficult. If it is then please explain why that is the case.

I'm almost ashamed to say that I've not used this airport yet to travel but am certainly willing to use it in the future should it fit with my travel plans. I would certainly enjoy more choice from this airport but understand that certain upgrades to the airport may be needed before current or potential airlines offer anything more. Overall I think that a bigger airport would be better in all aspects except of course the increase in noise but I feel that steps are being outlined to take care of that and so I hope that will be enough to gain enough support and numbers that are for expansion over the numbers that are opposed to it.

As a supplement to my previous comments, please note the following. At 06:06 AM on Feb 27, 2014, we heard a loud jet take off from YKF. We live in Cambridge. That's an unreasonable amount of noise at that time so far from the airport. We need a noise curfew for large jets.

We purchased our home in a quiet neighbourhood in 'Grand Hill Village' over 20 years ago, at a time when local flights out of the airport had no real effect on our properties, with respect to noise and air pollution. Indeed, the quiet aspect of the neighbourhood is the definitive reason for our purchase and we pay significant City of Kitchener taxes despite few services to live in this neighbourhood. I do not recall being asked to participate in a public information session before consideration of expanding airport flight times and plane size with take offs directly over our property. Please advise whether this information was clearly distributed to affected neighbourhoods! If so, we would obviously have voiced our concerns. Further, the information session in late 2013 resulted in an entirely one-sided perspective because few residents currently affected by flight noise attended this session; some were unaware of the meetings and others, like us, assumed that a positive change in flight plan was being made. It is unfair and completely unacceptable that this public meeting is being used as the definitive public feedback on this issue. Our neighbourhood was apparently not given the same respectful opportunity for input before you scheduled jet flights taking off over our home and wakening our household as early as 6:10 in the morning! Although my household takes flights multiple times a year, we have not used the airport and will never do so as long as my neighbourhood bears the full negative effects of the expansion. Clearly it's counterproductive to support this injustice.

Yes I would like to see more southern flights. It is a great airport let's use it and enjoy it! I flew to Jamaica and the Dominican from here best flight awesome crew and security love my airport.
• Please expand the airport and fly more places.
• I think the committee overseeing the Master Plan really needs to consider if the actual economic impact of expanding the airport is a good use of taxpayer money given that the airport is not the driving force behind economic development of the region.
• Increased public transport at the airport will only come if the prices are lower. Only certain people will and are able to pay for convenience. If a flight is cheaper in Toronto or Hamilton. It is usually so much cheaper, it is worth the drive and parking. Waterloo needs to lower prices, offer more routes to increase passengers.
• I am surprised and disappointed that the project team does not include residents of the Breslau and Lackener Woods areas, who would have a vested interest in the noise factor resulting from any airport expansion. While there may have been few complaints about noise levels of passenger aircraft, I am sure there have been many complaints about the noise level of the cargo aircraft that have recently been using the airport. Has anyone measured the noise level of these flights? I must be much higher than the 85 dB of a WestJet passenger plane. I fail to see how moving the primary runway (08-26) 644' to the east will significantly reduce noise levels- your charts indicate it will be reduced over my house from 85 dB to 80 dB. Lengthening the runway will allow larger/heavier planes to use the airport, which will result in more noise, not less. Please consider the quality of life of residents and not just $$$.
• Do not follow the LRT path of decisions by local and regional politicians. Larger only by referendum. Consider the area development for the next 50 years. (Malton airport to the present as an example) I am not against progress in the right manner and according sound financial planning.
• I do not feel that I was adequately informed of the meeting or its purpose. If notices were sent out they did not sufficiently identify to me the importance or scope of their intent, or I would have attended.
• Local residences (in the flight paths) should be informed of any meetings regarding development or changes to the airport well in advance.
• I bought my house in Chicopee in the 90's. Back then the occasional plane flying over head was enjoyable. Now there are planes flying over that wake us in the morning or disturb us in the evening. I should have a voice over things that affect my quality of living and the resale value of my home. Change the flight plans so they are not taking off and landing over residential neighborhoods.
• Get a life. Why don't you find something more important to fight like child poverty or homeless people. Yesterday I actually timed the noise intrusion just after 6 AM. IT LASTED 30 SECONDS. Maybe what you could do is suggest that anyone who signs the petition could agree to pay their share of the revenue being paid by the freight company so those of us who don't seem to be bothered won't have
to pay with our Regional taxes. By the way, I don't seem to see any names on your home page. If you must bother the rest of us OWN IT. BTW my name is Dave Reck, I live at 229 Quinte Court at the foot of Chicopee. I'm sure the noise is much more acute than at the homes of you prima donnas on Hidden Valley Drive.

- There was a graphic shown about the number of noise complaints. I don't remember the exact details, but I am curious to know how many people are complaining as opposed to the number of complaints. That is, if you get 100 noise complaints, are they coming from 100 people or 10 people - how many people are repeat complainers.
- When we moved in we were aware of the flight path....personally, I love watching the planes fly overhead. Anyone complaining should have been well aware of the noise issue and should not be complaining.
- Be more customer-focused and not airport focused. Take some lessons from useable Business plans. Use some Break Even analysis to determine the real cost to the tax payers. Use some risk/benefit analysis to include true social costs as well.
- NO more expansions. Concentrate on trying to keep what we have.
- SOMEONE HAS GOT TO CONSIDER THE JOB LOST FROM BALCKBERRY AND THE OVERALL AFFECT TO OUR REGIONAL ECONOMY AND THEREFORE THE ACTIVITIES AT THE AIRPORT. IT DOESN'T MAKE SENSE FOR THE AIRPORT TO BUILD OR EXTEND RUNWAYS WHEN THEY WILL NOT BE SUED. WE ARE NOT IN THE BUSINESS OF MAKING WORK FOR CONSTRUCION FOLKS.
- We were told in the media that flights were to be diverted over the industrial area (which makes sense) and then there was a complete about-face. Again we heard through the media. Yes, we've flown from here but probably won't again as it was not a through flight and would add to the noise level over my home which when we purchased now 35 years ago it was QUIET!!
- I've read the airports 2009 business plan and I think it' fair to say that financially the airport has been a failure. There may have been a few operational positives but recent events demonstrate yet again the difficulties of running an international airport in this area. The report lists its vision as airport, serving Canada's Technology Triangle'. It seems the focus of the current options are a much greater geographic area. I see this type of change not so much as a lack of direction or focus but a symptom of the difficulties and challenges faced by this airport. I just can't seem to get past the airports cost to the Region. I'm very concerned that with the fox in charge of the henhouse when it comes to the preparation of this report to council that the most costly and risky option will be put forth and that our Regional representatives will try to spend their way out of this financial disaster. I'm equally concerned that whichever option is chosen it will fail and the airport officials in desperation will fill the local skies with more
cargo jets. I would think you have learned much over the last several years about why the airport continues to struggle. The length of the runways, hours of operation etc. And I also assume you know that ultimately the success or failure is dependent on whether or not the area residents decide to use it. People chose a flight based on two simple things, price and convenience. It’s been my experience that the Chicago option is most often not competitive with Buffalo or Detroit and often not much less than Toronto. When you take into consideration the wait for a connecting flight much or all of the convenience is gone as well. We have had several different flights in this airport over the years and it’s easy to understand why all of them struggle and why there are only two left. Chicago makes sense because it’s a major hub, convention city and tourist destination. I think it could work. Calgary is run by a western-based airline with good connections to Vancouver and the island. I think this could work as well. But I simply cannot come up with another direct destination that could generate sufficient volume to warrant year round service. I say direct because we already have a hub destination. I don't understand government finance or operations but I believe the $6.5M support the airport receives is a tax levy on the regional taxpayers. In other words the airport gets the money and comes up with ways to spend it. If the objective is to breakeven the only alternative that will work would be to close the international portion of the airport. I don't think anyone at the airport has the courage to recommend that or anyone at the region to support it. As a result I think you build on the two flights you have and tighten operations around them. That means the airport opens and closes around these two flights. You only spend the money you need and not the money you get. Eventually the debt should be paid eliminating a significant portion of your burden. This still represents a cost to the taxpayer but I'm convinced it will be much less than the much riskier options. When we purchased our home we knew there would be airport noise. We had an idea of what that was and made our decision. We knew the airport was only at only 50% capacity and constantly struggling but we knew there was a chance for increased flights. But we could never have imagined that airport management would seriously consider some of the options now being put forward. We also could never have imagined that same management and our elected officials would be so inconsiderate as to allow that cargo plane access to this airport. I have used the airport for business and personal travel in the past. I went to Chicago on business once and to the Dominican on vacation. I would estimate those two flights represent less than 5% of flights I have taken since I lived in the area.

- I am concerned that ambitions to create a legacy in the form of another large airport are over-riding fairness to the many residents who will suffer as a result of the proposed changes. I am certainly not happy about this prospect.
- It is important that justice is both done and seen to be done when future decisions about the airport are made. More time is needed for the consideration
of public input. Economic advantages must reflect the investment and worth of the families in the area, not just the corporations.

- In light of new climate report, discourage flying
- see (4) above
- Three flights/week at 0:615 is not a big deal. People who buy near an airport should expect a bit of noise!
- I am against any plans that affect the edge water estates subdivision and will be vocal against any such actions/plans. In addition I would like to add that I have not signed any paperwork that acknowledged the effects of the airport on my property
- Indicated in other sections
- I live close the airport in Kitchener. We are consistently bothered by larger jet powered flights. My children are woken up at all hours of the night, due to poor flight management. This needs to change. Less flight traffic is the only answer!
- Yes. We are beginning a neighborhood committee to discuss how to proceed with our concerns and we will not give up until you restore our peace and quiet and allow us to get regular hours of sleep.
- Would like to see expansion of the airport across Canada. I've taken the flights to Chicago and it's highly preferable over using Pearson. More flight frequency and variety would enable more users to use the service. A replacement to Bearskin service to Ottawa is important! Would love service to Thunder Bay!
- I would like to comment that I do not mind continuing to pay the $25.00 per year subsidy for the airport to keep it as is but I am not in support of paying any additional tax dollars towards expansion at this time.
- I simply cannot believe what is wrong with a good portion of the people of this Region! It is really hard to understand how backward and small minded they appear to be. They complain about anything and everything that appears to be planning for our future, because they cannot see past the present. How can we make plans for our future with those who have no vision or excitement for all the possibilities? These negative attitudes will, no doubt discourage and prospective investments in our region. Whether it is light rail initiative of airport growth, they all come out and howl like "coyote's at the full moon"! I hope good sense will prevail here! We have a golden opportunity to become a reliever airport for a, soon to be at capacity, Toronto Pearson! Let's hope we approve these initiatives in spite of all the howling.
- We are looking at buying a house in the area but have some reservations with the planned airport expansion. Do you know if anyone tests the area regularly for toxicity and the air/quality given the lead in the fuel planes use? Has this been taken into consideration? There have been a number of studies done that talk about the health risks related to fuel by products.
Billy Bishop airport (Toronto Island) handles over 2 million passengers/year with 3 runways, all of which are shorter than the ones at Waterloo. The runways are:

06/24 2933 ft. long (E/W) / 08/26 3988 ft. long (E/W) / 15/33 2780 ft. long (N/S)

Waterloo runways are: 08/26 7002 ft. long (E/W) / 14/32 4100 ft. long (N/S) and Waterloo handled 140,000 passengers in 2013, and the Waterloo scenarios all have less than 2 million passengers per year, so I question the need for the extension of the 14/32 runway on capacity grounds? The whole argument for a longer runway appears to revolve around solving the noise problems in south Kitchener and transferring the noise issue to the villages???? The WestJet aircraft 737-700 used in the noise study is one of the quieter jets. Why wasn’t the worse case used, the 737-200 Nolinor jet? What would the noise profile look like using that plane? The noise studies only appear to use the noise generated by the plane and ignore ground source noises. What about the cumulative noise situation where we have gravel pits generating 50dBA noise, and the MOE limit is 50dBA, and you add to that the 70dBA noise of a jet? It seems to me that the runway capacity we have is adequate, but that the terminal might need to be expanded if and when passenger traffic grows. Why can’t there be an annual review of the plans to see if a terminal expansion is necessary and when it is required? This is the way most businesses operate. I sense that the master plans are somewhat premised on the “build it and they will come” scenarios. This was the same approach used at Mirabel, and it failed miserably. The passenger traffic at the airport needs to be self-funding. It is my understanding that American Airlines receives approximately $400,000 per year as a “subsidy” to fly the Waterloo-Chicago route. Why should Regional taxpayers subsidise these flights for the limited number of passengers who fly this route? The airport passenger traffic has not yet met the numbers proposed in the 2000 “Master Plan”..............why do we need to contemplate a further expansion? Here is a link showing the Top 50 in Canada airport passenger and cargo information from Statistics Canada for 2011 and 2012: [http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/51-203-x/2012000/tablesectlist-listetableauxsect-eng.htm](http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/51-203-x/2012000/tablesectlist-listetableauxsect-eng.htm). You will notice that Waterloo only makes the Top 50 list for passengers. In conclusion, I believe that the only decision that can be rationally made is to continue with the “Status Quo”

Do you have any information about which level of government would be paying for the cost of improvements in each master plan? If all 3 levels of government chip in a certain percentage, do you have this information?
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Waste Management

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

Date: June 17, 2014  File Code: E21-01

Subject: Battery Recycling Opportunities in Waterloo Region

Recommendation:
For information.

Summary: Nil

Report:

In response to a request from the Planning & Works Committee at their meeting of January 28th, Waste Management Division staff has prepared this report regarding the implications of a program for curbside collection of household single-use batteries.

Regional and provincial waste audits show that household single-use batteries make up less than 1 per cent of waste going to landfill. While they are considered relatively inert materials by the Ontario Ministry of the Environment (and are not subject to the same handling restrictions as other household hazardous wastes), they do contain certain heavy metals which are better kept out of landfills, as well as valuable metals that should be recovered.

Local and provincial waste audits show that on average, residents dispose of between one and three pounds of household single-use batteries per person every year. Residents in Waterloo Region have the option to disposing of their household single-use batteries for free at several of Stewardship Ontario’s Orange Drop program locations, including the Region’s household hazardous waste depot, participating take-back retailers (e.g. Canadian Tire, Home Hardware, Lowes, Target) and other community-based battery-recycling drop-off locations (located in schools and office buildings). Over 50 free drop-off sites are available throughout Waterloo Region, as
found when searching by postal code at www.makethedrop.ca. In spite of these options, provincial audits show that the majority of household single-use batteries are not being recovered for proper recycling.

Beginning in 2012, the Regions of Durham and Niagara piloted curbside battery collection programs. Both pilots were run in a similar manner:

- Residents received a zipper-style plastic “battery bag” (either delivered to households, or available for pick-up at locations around the municipality).

- On a designated week, residents were invited to put household single-use batteries in the bags, and place them on top of their blue boxes to be collected.

- The batteries were collected in special pails carried on the blue box collection vehicles, and brought to the regional recycling facility.

- Batteries were debagged (the bags were separated for recycling) by regional waste management staff, and packaged for mass transportation.

- Batteries were picked up by Raw Materials Company Inc., (the only approved battery processor in the province for the Province’s Stewardship Ontario program), for transport to their Port Colborne facility to be recycled.

Acceptable batteries included:

- Standard A, AA, AAA, C, D batteries (both alkaline and "heavy duty")

- 6-volt (often used in lantern batteries)

- 9-volt batteries (often used in smoke alarms)

- Button cells (typically used in watches, toys, electronics, greeting cards, calculators, and hearing aids)

- Rechargeable battery packs - NiCad, NiMH, or Lithium Ion (typically used in laptop computers, cellular phones, etc.)

In the spring of 2012, the Region of Niagara collected over 5,000 lbs of batteries in one week from approximately 30,000 households. In the fall of 2012, the Region of Durham set a Guinness World Record for collecting 11,221 lbs on a single collection day, and over 58,778 lbs of single-use batteries total for the week from their 190,000 households. Both regions determined that their pilots were a success, and now have permanent programs twice a year.

A handful of other Ontario municipalities have begun to partner with Raw Materials Company Inc. to run week-long curbside battery collection programs. These programs (and the continuing Durham and Niagara programs) run for one week of collection in the
spring, and one week in the fall. They generally coincide with the time-change, when local fire departments encourage residents to change out the batteries in their smoke detectors.

Although there are many free drop-off options available to residents, staff feel that the success of this curbside collection program in other municipalities make it worth further investigation. Recovering more household single-use batteries for recycling rather than having them go to the Region’s landfill is a worthwhile effort, although it will come at a cost. The curbside collection of household single-use batteries is outside the scope of the Region’s current Waste Collection Contracts, and would need to be negotiated with the collection contractors. Although Raw Materials Company Inc. is the only approved battery recycling processor for Stewardship Ontario’s program at the moment, there may be an opportunity to work with additional processors currently seeking approval. Details on exact program costs for a household single-use battery recycling program in the Region of Waterloo will require further discussion by staff with collection contractors, Raw Materials Company Inc. or another approved processor, and Stewardship Ontario.

Staff will initiate discussions with current collection contractors to determine the cost and any other implications of implementing a twice-a-year battery collection program. Assuming that a cost and program can be agreed upon, staff will prepare a budget issue paper for consideration by Council as part of the 2015 budget process. If this is not successful, staff will include a battery collection program as part of the future collection contract for Council’s consideration at that time.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

This report has been prepared consistent with Strategic Objective 1.3 of the Corporate Strategic Plan, to reduce the amount of waste requiring landfill.

Financial Implications:

Household single-use batteries are a designated household hazardous waste under Phase 1 of the Municipal Hazardous and Special Waste (MHSW) program operated by Stewardship Ontario. There is no charge to the Region for the transportation and processing of household single-use batteries collected at our depot, and no charge to residents to drop-off batteries at this or other participating locations. The promotion of battery-recycling options for residents through the Region’s depot or other sites is part of the waste management division’s ongoing promotion and education program.

Based on experiences in other municipalities, if the Region were to implement a twice-a-year curbside collection program for household single-use batteries, staff estimates the cost to be approximately $50,000 - $150,000 per year. The estimated cost includes the supply and distribution of plastic storage bags, curbside collection charges from the Region’s current waste collection contractors, and promotion/education of the new
program. This is only an estimate, as actual costs would need to be negotiated with the existing curbside collection contractors. Provisional pricing for twice-a-year curbside collection of household single-use batteries could be included in the scope of the 2017 Waste Collection Contracts, to accommodate this program in the future at Committee's request.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:** Nil

**Attachments:** Nil

**Prepared By:** Cari Rastas Howard, Project Manager, Waste Management Programs

**Approved By:** Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental services
Design and Construction

To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: June 17, 2014  File Code: C04-30, 05576
Subject: Bridge Street Reconstruction (University Avenue to Woolwich Street)
Cities of Kitchener and Waterloo - Recommended Design Concept

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the Recommended Design Concept for the proposed reconstruction of Bridge Street between University Avenue and Woolwich Street as described in Report E-14-078 dated June 17, 2014.

Summary:

The Region of Waterloo is undertaking a Preliminary Design Study for the reconstruction of Bridge Street between University Avenue in the City of Waterloo and Woolwich Street in the City of Kitchener. The limits of the study area are shown on the Key Plan included in Appendix A to this report. The study is being guided by a Project Team consisting of staff and Councillors from the Region of Waterloo and the Cities of Kitchener and Waterloo.

This Preliminary Design Study is being undertaken as a Schedule “A+” project in accordance with the requirements of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment. The segment of Bridge Street within the study area currently consists of two traffic lanes with left-turn lanes at the University Avenue and Bridle Trail intersections. Reconstruction of the road is required in order to address poor pavement conditions which have accumulated over time. Widening of the road beyond the existing two lanes to increase capacity is not required.

Based on a technical review of the existing conditions within the study area, the Project Team developed a Preliminary Design Concept.

The Preliminary Design Concept was presented to area residents at a Public
Consultation Centre held on March 20, 2014. Public comments received by the Project Team are generally supportive of the Preliminary Design Concept. Several aspects of the Design Concept have been modified to address specific public comments. These modifications are described in Section 5 of this report. No significant environmental impacts from the proposed works are expected. As a result, the proposed project is pre-approved under the Environmental Assessment Act.

As a result of the public feedback received and technical review, the Project Team has developed a Recommended Design Concept for Council approval consisting of the following elements:

- Reconstruction of the existing road structure
- Construction of concrete sidewalks where none currently exist
- Designation of cycling lanes within the existing road width
- Construction of a centre median at the Woolwich Street intersection
- Reconfiguration of left-turn lanes at the intersections of University Avenue and Bridle Trail

Subject to approval of the Recommended Design Concept by Council, detailed design of the proposed works and property acquisition are planned to begin in the summer of 2014. Construction is currently scheduled in 2019.

Report:

1. Project Description

The Region of Waterloo is currently considering improvements to Bridge Street between University Avenue in the City of Waterloo and Woolwich Street in the City of Kitchener. The study limits are shown on the Key Plan in Appendix A of this report.

Due to the age and condition of the pavement structure of Bridge Street within the study limits, it is necessary to completely reconstruct the existing road including the asphalt surface and granular base. Traffic projections to the year 2031 indicate that widening of the road to more than the existing two lanes to increase capacity is not required except where the reconfiguration of turning lanes at intersections is being considered to improve traffic operations. The reconstruction of the road also offers an opportunity for the addition of new cycling lanes and concrete sidewalks where none currently exist.

The proposed Bridge Street Reconstruction Project is classified as a Schedule A+ undertaking in accordance with the planning process outlined in the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment and is therefore pre-approved to proceed to construction.

The planning and design of the Bridge Street Reconstruction project is being directed by a Project Team consisting of staff from the Regional Municipality of Waterloo and the
Cities of Kitchener and Waterloo, and local Councillors Mark Whaley (Waterloo) and Scott Davey (Kitchener). The Region has hired the consulting engineering firm, Walter Fedy, to prepare the Preliminary Design Study and Detailed Design for the project and provide contract administration services during construction.

2. Transportation Requirements

Bridge Street provides an important north-south transportation link between Kitchener and Waterloo through the predominately residential areas east of the Conestoga Expressway. Existing vehicular traffic volumes on Bridge Street within the study area are approximately 10,000 vehicles per day (average annual daily traffic (AADT)) which is within the capacity of a two lane road of this type. This volume is expected to remain consistent through the planning horizon year of 2031.

The Bridge Street corridor provides a potentially important linkage for pedestrians and cyclists to Bechtel Park, RIM Park and the Water Bean Trail along the Grand River via its connection to University Avenue. Currently there are no sidewalks available for pedestrians on the east side of Bridge Street south of the University Downs Plaza and there are no designated cycling facilities within the project limits.

The 2011 Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) does not identify the need to widen Bridge Street between University Avenue and Woolwich Street beyond the existing two lanes until after 2031. However, the RTMP does support measures that will improve the cycling and pedestrian networks.

The Regional Official Plan gives direction to balance the design of reconstructed roads to meet the needs of all modes of transportation including walking, cycling, motorized vehicles and transit.

The Context Sensitive Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines (CDG) guide the design of Regional Roads. According to the CDG, Bridge Street is classified as a Neighbourhood Connector – Avenue. As a fundamental part of this classification, Bridge Street should be designed to support active transportation modes including walking and cycling.

The Regional Cycling Master Plan and the draft Regional Active Transportation Master Plan identify Bridge Street as a core on-road cycling route. In order to facilitate alternative modes of transportation as envisioned in the RTMP and Cycling Master Plan, the Project Team considered on-road cycling lanes and concrete sidewalks within the limits of the Bridge Street Reconstruction Project.

In addition to improvements to accommodate active transportation, analysis of existing vehicular traffic patterns in the area suggests that improvements can also be made in road safety and traffic operations.
The Region of Waterloo monitors traffic collisions on all of the roads under its jurisdiction to determine where improvements are required to improve public safety. At the Bridge Street and Woolwich Street intersection a total of 13 reportable vehicular collisions were documented between 2005 and 2010. For an intersection of this type, only 3 collisions would be expected to have occurred during this period. The majority of the reported collisions involved vehicles turning left at the intersection. Sightlines for drivers turning at this intersection are compromised by the curvature and steep grade of Bridge Street. In order to improve driver safety, the Project Team considered the elimination of left-turns at this intersection.

Intersection traffic counts and capacity analysis undertaken by the Region between 2004 and 2011 indicated deficiencies in the operations of the University Avenue and Bridle Trail intersections. At the University Avenue intersection there is a significant number of northbound left-turn movements during peak hours. The storage length of the existing left-turn lane is such that during peak hours, left turning vehicles occasionally block the northbound through lane. In addition, the alignment of the northbound through lane through the intersection is offset between the south and north sides of the intersection resulting in a curvilinear path for vehicles traveling through the intersection.

At the Bridle Trail intersection, the highest numbers of turning movements occur for westbound left-turns during the morning peak hour and for northbound right-turns during the afternoon peak hour as drivers travel to and from the residential subdivisions in the Kiwanis Park area. There is no existing northbound right-turn lane at this intersection and through and right-turning vehicles must share the same lane. As a result, northbound through movements are occasionally blocked by vehicles attempting to turn right. A right-turn lane is being considered at this intersection. In addition, a school crossing guard assists children crossing Bridge Street on the south leg of the intersection which occasionally blocks left-turning vehicles during the morning peak hour.

3. Preliminary Design Concept and Potential Impacts

The Project Team developed a Preliminary Design Concept which addresses the identified pavement and transportation deficiencies within the study area. The Concept includes reconstruction of the existing road structure, the construction of concrete sidewalks where none currently exist, the delineation of cycling lanes within the existing road width, the construction of a centre median at the Woolwich Street intersection and the reconfiguration of turning lanes at the intersections of University Avenue and Bridle Trail.

3.1 Reconstruction of road structure

Since the existing roadway does not require widening, the pavement structure
will be reconstructed while retaining as much of the existing concrete curb and gutter as possible. Sections of existing curb may be replaced based on condition or the need for surface drainage improvements. At the University Avenue and Bridle Trail intersections, limited widening of the existing road will be required to accommodate proposed lane re-alignment and the construction of designated cycling lanes. Between the intersections, the existing road surface is wide enough to accommodate the width of the proposed cycling lanes.

3.2 Sidewalk construction

There is an existing concrete sidewalk on the western side of Bridge Street within the project limits. This sidewalk provides access for pedestrians to Bechtel Park, Bridgeport Public School south of Bridle Trail and to Grand River Transit stops. A sidewalk is available on the eastern side of Bridge Street from University Avenue southerly across the frontage of the University Downs Plaza where it connects to a walkway which provides access to Auburn Drive east of Bridge Street. The extension of this sidewalk southerly to Woolwich Street is proposed as part of this project. This sidewalk will provide improved pedestrian access not only for the properties fronting Bridge Street, but also for all properties in the adjacent residential subdivisions.

The installation of a sidewalk on the eastern side of Bridge Street will require the re-grading and restoration of existing boulevards and driveways and may require the removal of several mature trees. In order to avoid as many trees as possible, the sidewalk will be constructed abutting the curb between Bridle Trail and Woolwich Street. Existing steep slopes within the boulevard between Bridle Trail and Woolwich Street will require the construction of a retaining wall at some locations behind the sidewalk.

As a result of the Project Teams assessment of needs within the study area, a pedestrian refuge island is proposed south of the Bechtel Park entrance to provide a convenient location for pedestrians to cross Bridge Street to access the park. This island will be aligned with the walkway abutting the University Downs Plaza.

3.3 Designated Cycling Lanes

Designated cycling lanes are proposed within the existing width of the road surface. These lanes will provide a connection to the existing and proposed cycling network on University Avenue and on Bridge Street north of University Avenue.

At the Bridle Trail intersection, the road surface will require widening to accommodate the width of the proposed cycling lanes. This widening is proposed
3.4 Left-turn prohibition at Woolwich Street intersection

The deficient sight lines on Bridge Street due to the steep grade and curvature at Woolwich Street cannot be improved without the substantial expense of property acquisition and road re-alignment. In order to eliminate the potential for collisions with left-turning vehicles at this intersection, the installation of a centre median to prevent left-turns is proposed.

Although the construction of a centre median will improve vehicular safety, it will require that some local drivers take a more circuitous route along Bridle Trail or Lancaster Street to access their properties. The median will be designed to ensure that it does not impede snow clearing or emergency vehicle access.

3.5 Intersection lane re-alignment

The northbound left-turn storage lane at the University Avenue intersection is proposed to be lengthened to eliminate conflicts with northbound through movements. In addition, the lanes south of the intersection will be aligned with the existing lanes north of the intersection. This will result in the need to construct a slight widening of the road towards the east, necessitating the acquisition of approximately 18 square metres of property from the University Downs plaza.

At the Bridle Trail intersection, the construction of a northbound right-turn lane would provide some operational benefits for right-turning vehicle movements during peak hours. However, the construction of a right-turn lane would require the acquisition of all or part of three residential properties south of the intersection in order to construct the lane and sidewalk.
A more significant improvement during peak hours could be made by relocating
the school crossing guard from the southern leg of the intersection to the
northern leg. In doing so, the northbound right-turn and westbound left-turn
vehicular movements would be able to proceed unimpeded. Staff have discussed
this change with City of Waterloo staff and have their concurrence on this
proposal subject to the proper design of a new crossing location north of the
intersection.

4. Public Consultation

The Preliminary Design Concept was presented to area residents at a Public
Consultation Centre (PCC) held on March 20, 2014. Notices for this meeting were
mailed out to property and business owners within the project limits. The University
Downs Neighbourhood Association was notified in writing and provided with a detailed
description of the design elements being considered. Notices were also placed in the
local newspaper and on road-side signs. Staff from the Region of Waterloo and City of
Kitchener were available at the Centre to discuss the Preliminary Design Concept.
Councillor Mark Whaley was also in attendance.

The PCC was attended by approximately 30 local property owners and residents. Public
comments received by the Project Team were generally supportive of the Preliminary
Design Concept. A total of 5 written comments were submitted to the Region’s Project
Manager for consideration by the Project Team. One resident provided comments
verbally after the PCC.

Three comments were submitted expressing concern about prohibiting left turns at
Woolwich Street. Two comments were submitted in support of the prohibition. The
concerns are related to the resultant increase in travel distance to access the residents’
properties by being diverted to Bridle Trail or Lancaster Street. Support was based on
the acknowledgement of existing vehicular safety concerns at the intersection. One
resident requested that if a median were to be installed, that a pedestrian refuge island
also be installed at the southern leg of the intersection to facilitate pedestrian crossing.

Two comments were submitted in support of the construction of new sidewalks on the
east side of the road and one was received in support of the designation of cycling
lanes. The need to prohibit on-street parking to accommodate cycling lanes was
discussed with most of the attendees at the PCC and no concerns about the prohibition
were expressed verbally or in writing. Waterloo staff have indicated that the original
need for on-street parking was due to the lack of available parking for users of Bechtel
Park. Over the years, the parking available within the Park has been increased. City
staff also advise that the usage of the park will decrease in the future as some of the
sports fields are closed due to plans to expand the adjacent cemetery.
One resident expressed concern about the need to widen Bridge Street towards the west at the Bridle Trail intersection to accommodate the proposed cycling lanes. The resident is concerned about the resultant reduction in boulevard width, impacts on the grade of their driveway and their ability to remove snow from the driveway and sidewalk. The Project Team recommends that the proposed width of the southbound left-turn lane and the sidewalk within the western boulevard be reduced to minimum standards. This will increase the width of the proposed boulevard between the curb and sidewalk and shift the edge of the reconstructed road away from the properties west of the road.

5. Recommended Design Concept

Following consideration of the comments provided by the public at the PCC, the Preliminary Design Concept has been refined by the Project Team to address specific public comments. This refined Concept is now recommended for consideration by Regional Council. The Recommended Design Concept includes the following elements:

- Reconstruction of the existing pavement structure;
- Construction of new concrete sidewalk within the eastern boulevard of the road from the University Downs Plaza to Woolwich Street;
- Construction of a pedestrian refuge island south of the Bechtel Park entrance.
- Construction of a pedestrian refuge island at the south leg of the Woolwich Street intersection.
- Designation of cycling lanes within the project limits.
- Prohibition of on-street parking within the project limits.
- Construction of a centre median at the Woolwich Street intersection to prevent left-turn movements.
- Construction of an extended northbound left-turn storage lane at the University Avenue intersection. In conjunction with this, the northbound through lanes will be re-aligned to suit the existing lanes north of the intersection.
- A new right-turn lane at the Bridle Trail intersection is not recommended. A request will be made to the City of Waterloo to relocate the school crossing guard stationed at this intersection to the northern leg of the intersection; and
- Reconstruction of the southbound left-turn lane at the Bridle Trail intersection to the minimum width permissible in the Corridor Design Guidelines being 3.0 metres, reconstruction of the concrete sidewalk west of Bridge Street at the Bridle Trail intersection to the minimum width permissible in the Corridor Design Guidelines being 1.8 metres, construction of a boulevard at the Bridle Trail intersection between the western curb and sidewalk with a width of 1.0 metre.
6. Estimated Project Cost:

The estimated cost to construct the Recommended Design Concept including road reconstruction, new sidewalk, turning lanes, pedestrian refuge islands, driveway and boulevard restoration, and landscaping is approximately $1,900,000.

7. Next Steps

Subject to approval of the Recommended Design Concept by Council, preparation of the detailed design for the proposed works is scheduled to start immediately. Construction is currently scheduled to be undertaken in 2019.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

The recommended improvements to Bridge Street support Focus Area #3 (Sustainable Transportation) by integrating active forms of transportation and optimizing road capacity to improve safety.

Financial Implications:

The estimated cost of the improvements proposed in the Recommended Design Concept is approximately $1,900,000. The approved 2014 Ten Year Transportation Capital Program includes sufficient funding for the construction of this project. The estimate and budget will be further refined during the detailed design phase of this project.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Staff from Transportation Planning were consulted during the preparation of this report.

Attachments:

Appendix A – Project location plan

Prepared By: Peter Linn, Senior Project Manager

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Appendix A – Project Location Plan

REGIONAL ROAD No. 52 (BRIDGE STREET)
UNIVERSITY AVENUE TO WOOLWICH STREET
CITY OF WATERLOO AND CITY OF KITCHENER
Region of Waterloo  
Transportation and Environmental Services  
Design and Construction  

To: Chair Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee  
Date: June 17, 2014  
File Code: T04-20/7087  
Subject: Consultant Selection Detailed Design and Services during Construction – River Road Extension King Street to Manitou Drive, Kitchener (C2014-13)  

Recommendation:  
That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into a Consultant Services Agreement with MMM Group Limited to provide consulting engineering services for detailed design and services during construction – River Road Extension, King Street to Manitou Drive, Kitchener at an upset fee of $2,817,397.41 plus applicable taxes for the detailed design phases, with construction contract administration and construction inspection services to be paid on a time basis as described in Report E-14-079 dated June 17, 2014.  

Summary:  
The Region of Waterloo wishes to start construction of the River Road Extension from King Street to Manitou Drive in the City of Kitchener in 2017. In order to meet this timeline, an engineering consultant must be hired now to undertake the detailed design in order to obtain all necessary approvals in advance of construction.  

An invitation to submit Letters-of-Interest to provide engineering services for this assignment was advertised in the Waterloo Region Record, in the Daily Commercial News and on the Region’s website. Five (5) letters of interest were received. Three (3) firms were short-listed and invited to submit detailed work plans and fee estimates.  

Based on the evaluation criteria, review of the detailed work plans, schedules and upset fees provided, the Evaluation Team recommends that MMM Group Limited be retained to undertake this consultant assignment at an upset fee limit of $2,817,397.41 plus
applicable taxes for the detailed design phases, with construction contract administration and construction inspector services to be paid on a time basis. MMM Group Limited’s fees of $2,817,397.41 plus applicable taxes are within the consulting fee allowance provided for in the total budget of this project.

Report:

1. Background

The Region of Waterloo is nearing completion of a Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Study for the extension of River Road from King Street to Manitou Drive in the City of Kitchener, which is identified in the Region’s 2011 Transportation Master Plan in the 5-10 year timeframe. Please see Appendix “A” for a Key Plan of the project limits. Now that the Class EA is nearing completion, staff wish to proceed with the detailed design and construction for this project. Construction is currently identified in 2017-2019 in the Region’s 2014 Ten-Year Transportation Capital Program. The project includes the following:

- 3.6 km, 4-lane road with a continuous centre median and multi-use trails on both sides between King Street and Manitou Drive;
- Environmental mitigation in advance of and during road construction, which is summarized in Appendix “H” in Report E-14-029, March 4, 2014;
- Signalized intersection improvements at the intersection of River Road at King Street;
- Full movements, signalized intersection at the intersection of Stonegate Drive/ Hwy 8 WB ramps with closure of the existing intersection of Stonegate Drive at King Street except for right-turn entry only from King Street;
- Unsignalized intersections of River Road at Hidden Valley Road and at the Hwy 8 EB ramp;
- Roundabouts at the intersections of River Road at Wabanaki Drive north of Goodrich Drive, Goodrich Drive at Wabanaki Drive and at Wilson Avenue;
- Addition of a fourth leg to the previously approved roundabout at the intersection of Manitou Drive and Bleams Road;
- Bridges across Schneider Creek and across MTO-owned Highway 8 with ramps to access on and off Highway 8 northbound, toward Waterloo and to access onto Highway 8 southbound toward Cambridge.
- Associated stormwater management works, including modifications to existing facilities;
Additions and revisions to Highway 8 lighting and signage associated with the proposed interchange;

City of Kitchener sanitary sewer forcemain from Highway 8 to Wabanaki Drive; and

Associated utility works, including relocating and/or replacing Hydro towers

This is a large and complex project and Regional staff is fully committed to other capital projects. Therefore, staff recommends that an external consultant be hired to complete this project. Staff has determined that it is necessary to commence the engineering for this project now in order to provide sufficient time to complete the detailed design, obtain any required property, undertake environmental mitigation and utility relocations and obtain required approvals in advance of construction in 2017.

2. Consultant Selection

An invitation to submit Letters-of-Interest to provide engineering services for this assignment was advertised in the Waterloo Region Record, in the Daily Commercial News and on the Region’s website. Five (5) consultant firms submitted Letters-of-Interest. From a review of the submissions, three (3) firms were shortlisted based on their qualifications and these consultants were asked to submit a detailed work plan and upset fee for the detailed design of this project. The short-listed consultants were also requested to submit an preliminary estimate of fees for construction contract administration and construction inspection services.

The three (3) short-listed consultants were:

- Stantec Consulting;
- Delcan Corporation; and,
- MMM Group Limited.

The Evaluation Team involved with the consultant selection consisted of:

- Wayne Cheater, Senior Project Manager, Design and Construction Division;
- John Stephenson, Senior Project Manager, Design and Construction Division;
- Paula Sawicki, Manager Strategic Transportation Planning, Transportation Planning Division;
- Chris Gosselin, Manager Environmental Planning; and,
- Bob Henderson, Manager, Transportation Engineering Division.

Staff of MTO, West Region, including Scott Howard, Senior Project Manager contributed to the Terms of Reference and review of consultants’ qualifications for the consultant selection.
The evaluation criteria used for selecting the successful consultant were consistent with the Region’s Purchasing Bylaw which includes price as a factor in the selection process.

The evaluation team determined the qualifications and experience necessary for the engineering assignment and the evaluation criteria for scoring consultant submissions against these qualifications and experience as follows:

**Quality Factors  Percentage**

- Project Approach and Understanding  30%
- Experience of the Project Manager  20%
- Experience of the Project Support Staff  15%
- Experience on Similar Projects  15%

**Equity Factors  Percentage**

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

**Price Factor  Percentage**

- Upset Fee Limit  15%

The Letters-of-Interest submitted by all three (3) short-listed consultants demonstrated a good understanding of the project with capable project teams and experience on numerous similar projects. When considering the combination of quality, equity and price factors described above, MMM Group Limited scored the highest of the three short-listed consultants. MMM Group Limited’s upset fee of $2,817,397.41 plus applicable taxes for the detailed design was the second lowest of the prices and was 11.8% below the mean of the three (3) submitted prices.

Based on the above evaluation criteria, including review of the detailed work plans, schedules and upset fees provided, the Evaluation Team recommends that MMM Group Limited be retained to undertake the detailed design and provide construction contract administration and construction inspection for this project.

### 3. Scope of Work

For this engineering assignment, the consultant will complete the following tasks: review all background information, complete archaeological, and natural environmental studies; complete detailed design of the road improvements; prepare contract drawings, specifications and tender documents; develop traffic staging plans and environmental mitigation plans; obtain all necessary agency approvals; assist during the tendering period; provide construction contract administration and site inspection...
services during construction; prepare as-built drawings; and provide post-construction services during the warranty period.

4. Schedule

Subject to Council’s approval of this consultant assignment, the proposed project schedule is outlined below. The construction schedule is dependent upon the extent and timing of any property acquisitions necessary to implement the proposed improvements.

- Data collection and preparation of base plans  July 2014 – September 2014
- Detailed Design and Approvals  October 2015 – May 2016
- Property Acquisition  January 2015 – March 2017
- Construction  2017 - 2019

5. Consultant’s Upset Fee

The short-listed consultants were each requested to submit an upset fee for consulting engineering services to complete the detailed design and were also requested to submit an estimate of fees for construction contract administration and construction inspection services. For road and drainage projects, the time required for contract administration and construction inspection can vary significantly depending on weather conditions, the actual contractor hired for construction and other unknown variables. Because an upset fee does not lend itself well to these types of services, it has been the Region’s practice for road and drainage projects to pay for construction contract administration and construction inspection fees on a time basis. It is recommended that this same practice be followed for this project. For budgetary purposes, staff has estimated the cost of contract administration and construction inspection services to be $1.3 million plus applicable taxes, which is based on the preliminary estimate of fees submitted by MMM Group Limited and a review of costs on similar projects.

The consultant’s upset fee limit for the detailed design services of $2.8 million plus applicable taxes represents approximately 5.4% of the estimated $52 million total construction cost for this project which at the low end of the normal fee range for a project of this type, size and complexity.

A breakdown of the successful consultant’s upset fee is included in Appendix “B” attached to this report.
Corporate Strategic Plan:

This project is consistent with the development of Strategic Focus Area 2 (Growth Management and Prosperity) in terms of:

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

It is also consistent with the development of Strategic Focus Area 3 (Sustainable Transportation) in terms of:

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

Financial Implications:

Based on the upset fee schedule received from MMM Group Limited, the total costs for the detailed design of this project are as follows:

Upset Consulting Fee $2,817,397.41
HST (13%) $366,261.66
Sub-Total $3,183,659.07
Less Municipal HST Rebate of 86.46% $316,669.83
Net Cost of Consulting Assignment $2,866,989.24

The Region's approved 2014 Ten-Year Transportation Capital Program includes $72,350,000 in 2014-2019 inclusive for this project to be funded from the Development Charges Reserve Fund.

MMM Group Limited's fees for the detailed design of this consulting assignment in the amount of $2.8 million and the preliminary estimate of fees for construction services of $1.3 million (plus applicable taxes) are within the consulting fee allowance provided for in the total budget for this project.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Nil

Attachments

Appendix “A” – Project Key Plan
Appendix “B” – Breakdown of Consultant's Upset Fee Estimate
Appendix “A”

Project Key Plan

City of Kitchener

REGIONAL ROAD 56
RIVER ROAD EXTENSION
KING STREET TO MANITOU DRIVE
City of Kitchener
Appendix “B”

MMM Group Limited – Upset Fee Breakdown
River road Extension (King Street to Manitou Drive)
City of Kitchener

1. Project Initiation/Data Collection/Base Plan Preparation $709,752.75
2. Finalization of Preliminary Design $583,098.63
3. Detailed Design and Approvals $883,898.50
4. Contract Documents, Specifications and Tendering $250,620.51
5. Project Management $287,770.00
6. Disbursements $102,257.02

Total Upset Fee Limit and Disbursements (excluding HST) $2,817,397.41
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Design and Construction

To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: June 17, 2014
File Code: C04-30, 5428 / 5493

Subject: Amendment to Consulting Assignment - Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road Improvements, Township of Wilmot

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve an amendment to the Consultant Services Agreement with MTE Consultants Inc. for the provision of consulting engineering services for the Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road Reconstruction in the Petersburg Settlement Area, Township of Wilmot to include payment for services required to conduct additional public consultation and to perform additional preliminary design above and beyond the scope of the original agreement, at an upset limit of $113,080.00 plus applicable taxes for a total upset limit of $363,025.00 plus applicable taxes.

Summary:

MTE Consultants Inc. was retained by the Regional Municipality of Waterloo in May 2011 (Planning & Works Report E-11-049 dated May 3, 2011) to provide engineering services for preliminary design, detailed design, contract administration and construction inspection for Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road Reconstruction in the Petersburg Settlement Area, Township of Wilmot at an upset limit of $249,945.00 plus applicable taxes for the preliminary design and detailed design phases with contract administration and construction inspection to be paid on a time basis. The project includes improvements along 2000 metres of roadway through the village to address poor pavement condition, to consider the addition of new cycling and pedestrian facilities, and to construct improved drainage facilities.

The original Consultant Services Agreement included budget for the consultant to assist with one Public Consultation Centre (PCC) and to make changes to the design based on feedback from the public consultations.
on public feedback after the one PCC. Due to the continuing high level of public interest subsequent to the first PCC, as well as direction from council, staff identified the need for a number of additional meetings to facilitate additional consultation with residents. In addition, numerous preliminary design iterations are required to assess a number of different project options based on the extensive public engagement on the project.

As a result of the added scope on this project for the extra public consultation and the additional preliminary design effort, additional consultant time is necessary to carry out the project. It is recommended that MTE Consulting Inc.’s consulting assignment for the Preliminary Design, Detailed Design and Construction Administration and Inspection Services, Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road Reconstruction, Petersburg Settlement Area, Township of Wilmot (Planning & Works Report E-11-049 dated May 3, 2011) be extended as per clause 21(g) of the Purchasing By-Law to include services for additional public consultation and preliminary design changes with an increase of fees of $113,080.00 plus applicable taxes for a total upset fee limit of $363,025.00.

Report:

1. Background

MTE Consultants Inc. was retained by the Regional Municipality of Waterloo in May 2011 (Planning & Works Report E-11-049 dated May 3, 2011) to provide engineering services for preliminary design, detailed design, contract administration and construction inspection for Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road Reconstruction in the Petersburg Settlement Area, Township of Wilmot at an upset limit of $249,945.00 plus applicable taxes for the preliminary design and detailed design phases with contract administration and construction inspection to be paid on a time basis. The project includes improvements along 2000 metres of roadway through the village to address poor pavement condition, to consider the addition of new cycling and pedestrian facilities, and to construct improved drainage facilities.

A Public Consultation Centre (PCC) was held in May 2012 to present the Project Team’s preferred design alternative for the reconstruction of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road in Petersburg. Due to the continuing high level of public interest subsequent to the first PCC, as well as direction from council, staff identified the need for a number of additional meetings to facilitate additional consultation with residents. In addition, numerous preliminary design iterations are required to assess a number of different project options based on the extensive public engagement on the project. Additional consultant time is required to prepare for and attend the additional meetings, to examine new study issues as they arise, and to make revisions to the design for changes under consideration for the proposed road cross-section.

2. Additional Scope of Work
To complete preliminary design, MTE will need to provide several services that go beyond the work included in the original consulting agreement, and will incur additional costs to complete that work.

Work exceeding the original scope includes attendance at two additional Project Team meetings, a second Public Consultation Centre, one Public Input Meeting, two additional meetings with property owners and one Community Meeting, as well as two full re-designs of the proposed cross-sections resulting from public comments at these meetings. Additional work related to attending resident Working Group meetings as directed by Council at the February 28, 2014 meeting is also required, including preparing drawings, attending Project Team meetings and providing support materials for a second recommendation to Council.

MTE Consultants Inc. submitted an initial estimate of fees necessary to complete the additional public consultation and preliminary design revisions. Regional staff completed a thorough review of MTE’s initial estimate of fees and negotiated an appreciable reduction in the scope of work and fees. The extra fees are attributable to a significant number of additional tasks that constitute extra requirements above and beyond the terms of the original consulting assignment (as shown in the breakdown of the consultant’s upset fee for extra work included in Appendix A attached to this report).

Under clause 21(g) of the Purchasing By-Law, the Chief Purchasing Officer may acquire goods or services through negotiation where the extension of an existing or previous contract would prove cost effective or beneficial for the Region. In this case, extension of MTE’s consulting agreement would prove cost effective by eliminating the duplication of work and extra costs that would be incurred by any other consultant to become familiar with the project and the work completed to date. This extension would also provide the Region with the benefit of MTE’s experience and the local knowledge acquired to date on the project.

The recommended fee increase was negotiated to $113,080.00 which staff are confident represents fair value for the additional work.

3. Schedule

Subject to Council’s approval of the extension of the consulting agreement, the revised schedule for the project is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completion of Public Consultation</th>
<th>Summer/Fall 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Approval of Recommended Alternative</td>
<td>Winter 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Acquisition, Utility Relocations, Final Design and Tendering</td>
<td>Winter 2015 to Spring 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
** Construction ** | Spring to Fall 2017

** As a result of the added time to conduct Working Group meetings, the proposed construction needs to be deferred from 2016 to 2017 to allow for the required 2 years to acquire the necessary property following project approval.

4. ** Consultant’s Extended Upset Fee **

It is recommended that MTE Consulting Inc.’s consulting assignment for the Preliminary Design, Detailed Design and Construction Administration and Inspection Services, Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road Reconstruction, Petersburg Settlement Area, Township of Wilmot (Planning & Works Report E-11-049 dated May 3, 2011) be extended as per clause 21(g) of the Purchasing By-Law to include services for additional public consultation and preliminary design changes at an additional upset fee limit of $113,080.00 plus applicable taxes for a total upset fee limit of $363,025.00.

The total estimated construction cost for this project is $4,445,000. The total revised upset fee of $363,025.00 represents approximately 8.2% of the estimated construction value, which is considered competitive for a project of this magnitude and complexity.

** Corporate Strategic Plan: **

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

** Financial Implications **

The Region’s 2014 Ten Year Transportation Capital Program includes $5,075,000 in years 2014 to 2018 inclusive for this project to be funded from the Road Rehabilitation Reserve Fund. Sufficient funds are available in the overall project budget to accommodate the recommended increase in consultant fees.

** Other Department Consultations/Concurrence: **

Nil

** Attachments **

Appendix A: Breakdown of Consultant’s Additional Fees

** Prepared By: Ian Young, Project Manager, Design and Construction **

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

**Breakdown of consultant’s upset fee for additional work on the preliminary design for Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road Improvements, Township of Wilmot**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Survey</td>
<td>$1,335.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Additional Project Team Meetings</td>
<td>$1,980.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation Centre No. 2</td>
<td>$8,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Input Meeting</td>
<td>$7,930.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Meetings with Property Owners</td>
<td>$1,850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Section Visual Renderings for Public Meetings</td>
<td>$2,640.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Re-design of Cross-Sections throughout Village</td>
<td>$38,440.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Re-design of Cross-Sections throughout Village</td>
<td>$27,010.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Drawings and Attend Working Group</td>
<td>$3,180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise Drawings and Address Comments after Working Group</td>
<td>$13,730.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Team Meetings</td>
<td>$4,540.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee / Council Meeting Materials</td>
<td>$1,695.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-total of additional work** $113,080.00

*(plus applicable taxes)*
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Design and Construction

To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: June 17, 2014
File Code: 5549
Subject: Consultant Selection C2014-16 – Geotechnical Consulting and Material Testing Services – Franklin Boulevard Improvements, City of Cambridge

Recommendation:
That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into a Consulting Services Agreement with LVM Inc. to provide geotechnical consulting services for planned roadway improvements and roundabout construction on Franklin Boulevard in the City of Cambridge at an Upset Fee limit of $133,910.40 plus applicable taxes for the geotechnical investigation, with construction field services to be paid on a time basis, as outlined in report E-14-082, dated June 17, 2014.

Summary:
The Region of Waterloo intends to proceed with Year 1 construction of Franklin Boulevard Improvements from south of Main Street to north of Clyde Road (South Section) and from south of Bishop Street to north of Pinebush Road (North Section) in the City of Cambridge. Construction of the Year 1 improvement works on Franklin Boulevard are currently scheduled for 2015 in the Region’s 2014 Transportation Capital Program. The location of this project is shown on the key plan included in Appendix A. In order meet the 2015 construction timeline, a geotechnical engineering consultant must be hired now to support the detailed design of the project.

A Request for Proposals (RFP) to provide geotechnical engineering services for this assignment was advertised in the Waterloo-Region Record. Eleven (11) firms submitted proposals. Based on a review of the work plans included in the proposals, four (4) firms were short-listed. The selection process for this assignment included price
as an Evaluation Factor. Based on the evaluation criteria and review of the submitted work plans and Upset Fee limits, the Consultant Selection Team recommends that LVM Inc. be retained to undertake this assignment at an Upset Fee limit of $133,910.40 plus applicable taxes for the geotechnical investigation, with construction field services to be paid on a time basis. Sufficient funds are available in the 2014 Transportation Capital Budget to initiate the geotechnical investigation in 2014.

Report:

1. **Background**

The Region of Waterloo intends to proceed with Year 1 construction of Franklin Boulevard Improvements from south of Main Street to north of Clyde Road (South Section) and from south of Bishop Street to north of Pinebush Road (North Section) in the City of Cambridge. The roadway work for both sections of the project will generally include reconstruction of Franklin Boulevard and associated side streets including the construction of multi-lane roundabouts, centre medians, multi-use pathways and the replacement or relocation of underground services and utilities. This portion of the project is identified in the Region’s 2014 Ten Year Transportation Capital Program for construction in 2015. Please see Appendix A for a Key Plan of the Study Area.

In advance of the Year 1 works on Franklin Boulevard, a geotechnical investigation is necessary to determine the existing roadway pavement structure and base conditions, subsurface soil and groundwater conditions and to generate recommendations for the proposed pavement design and construction methodology. As part of the assignment, the geotechnical consultant will also make recommendations for specific material management on site and disposal of surplus and unsuitable materials to appropriate disposal locations outside the project limits.

During construction of the Franklin Boulevard Improvements (Year 1) in 2015, geotechnical construction field services will include excavation and subgrade inspection, soil compaction testing, concrete sampling and testing, asphalt inspection and compaction testing, a review of asphalt and concrete mix designs, laboratory testing of soils, granulars and asphalt and structural foundation inspection.

Regional staff has determined that it is necessary to commence the geotechnical investigation for this project now in order to provide sufficient time to complete the detailed design and contract preparation for this project in advance of construction.

2. **Consultant Selection**

An invitation to submit proposals to provide geotechnical engineering services was advertised in the Waterloo-Region Record on Thursday, April 3, 2014. Eleven (11) proposals were submitted, two (2) of which were deemed to be non-compliant proposals.
that were disqualified upon opening of the Technical Submission envelopes. The Fee Submission envelopes of the two firms submitting non-compliant proposals were returned unopened. The remaining nine (9) proposals were evaluated by the Consultant Selection Team which consisted of the following staff:

- Frank Kosa, Senior Project Manager, Design and Construction Division
- William Gilbert, Senior Project Manager, Design and Construction Division

The criteria used to evaluate the proposals, work plans and upset fee limits were in accordance with the Region’s Purchasing Bylaw and included price as a factor in the selection process. These evaluation criteria and their respective weightings were as follows:

**Quality Factors:**

- Project Approach and Understanding: 25%
- Experience of the Project Manager: 20%
- Experience of the Project Support Staff: 20%
- Experience on Similar Projects: 15%

**Equity Factors:**

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

**Price Factor:**

- Upset Limit Fee: 15%

The Consultant Selection Team short-listed the following four (4) firms based on the Quality and Equity Factors identified above:

- DBA Engineering Ltd.
- Golder Associates Ltd.
- LVM Inc.
- Peto MacCallum Ltd.

Fee Submission envelopes were opened only for the four short-listed firms. Based on the review of proposals, and in consideration of the combination of Quality, Equity and Price factors described above, LVM Inc. scored the highest of the four short-listed consultants and submitted the lowest Upset Fee for the geotechnical investigation. The
Consultant Selection Team recommends that LVM Inc. be retained to undertake the geotechnical investigation and construction field services for this assignment.

3. **Scope of Work**

The scope of the assignment shall have the consultant undertake field investigations for utility clearances, geotechnical and soils investigations, a geotechnical laboratory testing program, environmental characterization of soils, construction field services and reporting in support of Year 1 works on Franklin Boulevard as follows:

- South Section – from south of Main Street to north of Clyde Road
- North Section – from south of Bishop Street to north of Pinebush Road

4. **Schedule**

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

- Field Investigation/Utility Clearances June 2014
- Geotechnical/Soils Investigation Summer 2014
- Laboratory Testing Summer 2014
- Reporting Fall 2014
- Construction Field Services Spring-Fall 2015

5. **Consultant’s Upset Fee**

Upset Fees for the geotechnical investigation and Estimated Fees for construction field services have been reviewed by the Consultant Selection Team for each of the short-listed consultants. As has been the Region’s practice, only the Upset Fee limit component was used in the consultant evaluation and selection process. LVM’s Upset Fee was the lowest price submitted from the four short-listed consultants. The Upset Fee limit proposed by LVM Inc. to complete the geotechnical investigation is $133,910.40 plus applicable taxes. The fee provided is within the expected range of fees for this type of assignment. A breakdown of the proposed Upset Fee limit for the Class EA and design for this assignment is shown in Appendix B of this report.

For road reconstruction projects such as Franklin Boulevard, the fees required for geotechnical construction field services can vary significantly depending on the final design, staging, weather conditions, unforeseen conditions during construction, contractor performance, and other unknown variables. Since an Upset Fee limit does not lend itself well to these types of services, it has been the Region’s practice to pay for construction field services on a time basis. For budgetary purposes, staff has estimated the cost of the construction field services to be $250,000 plus applicable taxes, which is based on a preliminary estimate of fees submitted by LVM Inc. and a review of costs on
similar projects. This is within the amount budgeted for this purpose in the approved 2014 Ten Year Transportation Capital Program.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

Year 1 Franklin Boulevard Improvements, when complete, will support Focus Area 2 – Growth Management and Prosperity and meets strategic objective number two which is to develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs.

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

**Financial Implications**

Based on the $133,910.40 upset fee limit of LVM Inc. the net cost of this geotechnical consulting assignment is $136,267.49 as per the following breakdown:

- **LVM Inc.** $133,910.40
- **H.S.T (13%)** $ 17,408.35
- **Sub-Total** $151,318.75
- **Less: Municipal Rebate of 86.46% of HST** $ 15,051.26
- **Total** $136,267.49

The Region’s current Ten Year Transportation Capital Program includes a total of $54.220 million for this project in years 2014 through 2021 funded from the Development Charge Reserve Fund. The Upset Fee limit proposed by LVM Inc. of $133,910.40 is within the amount allocated for this assignment as part of the total budget for this project.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Nil

**Attachments**

- Appendix A: Project Key Plan
- Appendix B: Breakdown of LVM Inc. Upset Fee Limit

**Prepared By: Frank Kosa**, Senior Project Manager, Design and Construction

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

Key Plan
Appendix B
Breakdown of LVM Inc. Upset Fee Limit
Franklin Boulevard Improvements, City of Cambridge

Upset Fee for Geotechnical Investigation based on Detailed Terms of Reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mobilization and Fieldwork – South Section</td>
<td>$ 36,841.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Laboratory Work, Analysis and Reporting – South Section</td>
<td>$ 12,423.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provisional Work – South Section</td>
<td>$ 14,779.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mobilization and Fieldwork – North Section</td>
<td>$ 40,536.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Laboratory Work, Analysis and Reporting – North Section</td>
<td>$ 13,208.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provisional Work – North Section</td>
<td>$ 16,123.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Upset Fee Limit and Disbursement (excluding HST)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 133,910.40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region of Waterloo

Transportation and Environmental Services

Water Services

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

Date: June 17, 2014

Subject: Consulting Assignment to Update Well Head Protection Areas

Recommendation:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo extend the Consulting Services Agreement with Matrix Solutions Inc. to provide consulting geosciences services to update well head protection areas and provide technical support through to December 31, 2015 at an upset limit of $250,000 plus applicable taxes, as per report E-14-077, dated June 17, 2014.

Summary:

In 2008, the Region initiated the provincially-funded pilot Tier 3 Water Budget and Local Area Water Quantity Risk Assessment project (Tier 3 project) to update existing groundwater flow models to meet the requirements of the Clean Water Act. The project was awarded to Matrix Solutions Inc. (Matrix) through a competitive bidding process. The budget for the project was $3,015,000 and has been entirely funded by the province.

Through the Tier 3 project, the Region’s groundwater flow models were significantly revised. Accordingly, these models should be used to update the Region’s well head protection areas. In addition, the models will be used by Region staff to optimize the operation of the municipal water supply system and evaluate impacts of new water taking permits and land-use development on the sustainability of the supply. To ensure the model can be utilized in other program areas, additional technical support to the end of 2015 is needed.

Matrix has spent the last 6 years interpreting the hydrogeology within the Region and are unequalled in their knowledge of the Region’s Tier 3 model. Matrix has provided both a
high quality product and good value for the money spent. As the Region’s Purchasing By Law allows Regional Council to negotiate agreements directly with consultants when it is in the Region’s best interest, it is recommended that the project be awarded sole-source to Matrix.

Report:

Background

The Clean Water Act (2006) established the legislative framework for undertaking watershed-based source water protection. The purpose of the initiative was to reduce the risk that specific activities would affect the quality and quantity of drinking water sources. The Clean Water Act and related regulations set up a multi-step process that was undertaken over a number of years to establish a Source Protection Plan (SPP) for the Grand River watershed which contains policies for reducing the risks to drinking water sources.

The technical components that form the basis of the SPP are developed using groundwater flow models. To meet the requirements of the Clean Water Act, Region staff used two separate modelling processes: one to address quality and one to address quantity. Separate processes were required to address the different approaches, outcomes and timing of these components as directed through the Clean Water Act and associated regulations and guidance.

To address the Region’s water quality obligations, the Region updated its existing groundwater model and delineated new well head protection areas. These well head protection areas were included in the Proposed Source Protection Plan that was submitted to the Ministry of Environment (MOE) in February 2013 and formed the basis on which policies would be applied.

The water quantity assessment was undertaken in two steps in accordance with provincial guidance. First, a water budget was developed for the entire Grand River watershed and the percent water use within subwatersheds of the Grand River calculated to determine where additional, more detailed assessments were required. Due to the concentrated water use in the cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo, Waterloo Region was required to undertake further assessment through a Tier 3 project to confirm that its existing water supplies are sufficient to meet future demands.

In 2008, the Region retained Matrix (E-08-009) to undertake the Tier 3 project that involved a comprehensive re-assessment of the Region’s groundwater flow model. The Tier 3 project consultant award followed the competitive bidding process in accordance with the Region’s Purchasing By-Law and consultant selection process.
This report summarizes the proposed approach to consultant selection for updating the well head protection area mapping using the Tier 3 model and for undertaking additional technical support in the use and application of the model to other Water Service program areas.

**Approach to Update Well Head Protection Areas and Technical Support**

The Tier 3 project is now nearing completion. One of the significant outcomes of the project is that the Region’s groundwater flow models were significantly revised and improved around the municipal wells in Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo. This is in large part because of the inclusion of information from hundreds of reports and water monitoring data covering approximately 50 years of the Region’s water supply operations. As a result, the Region’s well head protection areas that are calculated from the Tier 3 model will be different and will need to be updated. These new well head protection areas will ultimately replace the water quality well head protection areas in the Source Protection Plan.

The Tier 3 model provides insights on the sustainability of the Region’s municipal drinking water sources and can be used to optimize the operation of the water supply system. Region staff also anticipate using the model in a number of program areas including: technical support of Environmental Assessments for new supplies; renewals and applications for new Regional permits to take water; and evaluation of the impacts of non-municipal supply wells and development applications on the Region’s municipal supplies. To ensure the model can be utilized in these and other program areas, additional technical support for approximately one year is needed. Both the update to well head protection areas and development of procedures to use the Tier 3 model will require consulting services.

Matrix has spent the last 6 years integrating a substantial amount of information into the model and has used the model to simulate numerous land-use, precipitation and pumping rate changes as direct by the Ministry of Environment. They have developed an excellent understanding of the hydrogeological conditions within the Region and are unequalled in their knowledge of the Region’s Tier 3 model. Matrix has also provided a high quality product, demonstrated a high level of dedication to completion of the project, and provided good value for the money spent. As a result, Matrix is uniquely qualified to update the well head protection area mapping and provide additional technical support on the Tier 3 model.

The Region’s Purchasing By-law (By-law 04-093, as amended) provides that goods or services may be procured through negotiation where “the extension of an existing or previous contract would prove more cost effective or beneficial for the Region”.

Due to the specialized nature and knowledge needed to undertake the projects described above, and the performance of Matrix to date, it is recommended that the Region extend the Consulting Services Agreement with Matrix to undertake this project.

Scope of Work

The work program to update the Region’s well head protection areas using the revised Tier 3 models includes the following:

- Update and re-calibrate the models to include new data that has been obtained for several well fields since the development of the Tier 3 models.
- Undertake an assessment of the impact of how and where water moves to the wells resulting from variations in individual well pumping rates and hydraulic characteristics of the models. This assessment would include developing 10 scenarios to run in the model, and compiling and analyzing the results through the creation of time-of-travel well head protection areas (e.g. 2-year, 5-year and 25-year).
- Combine the scenario results to create single well head protection area ‘envelopes’ that incorporate the movement of water to the wells under the various scenarios.
- Document the process and results in a report prepared in accordance with the standards required by the Clean Water Act.

The upset limit for consulting fees and disbursements for the well head protection area component of the assignment is $184,800 plus applicable taxes. Region staff have reviewed this cost estimate and consider the scope of work, associated hours by task, and hourly costs to be reasonable and competitive. A breakdown of the upset fee budget is included in Appendix A attached to this report. This project is anticipated to be completed by the end of 2014.

Region staff have determined that the scope of work for a one-year technical support project would include a number of tasks including: training on the use of the model and databases transferred from the consultant; development of procedures within the model to undertake technical assessments using the model; and application of model parameters to areas outside the Tier 3 study area and within Waterloo Region. The processes designed in this component of the project will enable future projects using this model to go through the competitive bidding process.

Region staff would request Matrix prepare a work plan, cost estimate, and schedule to undertake specific activities defined by the Region. Region staff would review the work
plans, confirm the suitability of scope, cost and cost effectiveness, and provide approval as appropriate. The cost estimates would be developed based on unit rates that would apply for the duration of this component of the project which would extend to the end of 2015. The total cost allocated for this component of the project is $65,200.

The update to well head protection areas and technical services project represents a total project cost of $250,000. This represents approximately 8% of the value of the original Tier 3 project that has an approved budget of $3,015,000 which has been funded entirely by the province.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

The update to regional well head protection areas project supports the Corporate Strategic Plan Focus Area 1: Protect and Enhance the Environment; protect the quality and the quantity of our water sources.

**Financial Implications:**

The approved 2014 Water Services Capital Budget and Ten-Year Forecast contain a total of $250,000 for Ministry of Environment Source Water Assessment, which includes the total costs for this project. This project is funded by the Water Reserve Fund and Regional Development Charges.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Procurement Services staff were consulted regarding the financial implications of this project and proposed process.

**Attachments**

Attachment A: Breakdown of consultant fees.

**Prepared By:** Eric Hodgins, Manager Hydrogeology & Source Water

**Approved By:** Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner Transportation and Environmental Services
### Breakdown of Consultant Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Model Updates and Recalibration</td>
<td>$42,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Short Term Water Supply Distribution Assessment</td>
<td>$31,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Capture Zone Delineation</td>
<td>$84,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Project Management</td>
<td>$17,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Disbursements</td>
<td>$8,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$184,800</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region of Waterloo

Transportation and Environmental Services

Water Services

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

Date: June 17, 2014

File Code: E06-20/GRBK

Subject: Greenbrook Water Treatment Plant Update

Recommendation: For information.

Summary: Nil

Report:

The Greenbrook Water Treatment Plant (WTP) supplies water to approximately 5% of the Region’s Integrated Urban System (IUS), which include the Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo and the Towns of Elmira and St. Jacobs. This WTP treats water from five ground water wells, (wells K1A, K2A, K4, K5 and K8). The treatment process has three main stages:

- filters to reduce iron and manganese levels using chlorine,
- an advanced oxidation process to remove 1,4 dioxane, and,
- a multi-stage disinfection process consisting of primary disinfection with ultra violet disinfection and chlorine, and secondary disinfection with chlorine and ammonia.

The Greenbrook WTP consists of a pumping station, administration area and treatment facility and some features are designated as a heritage building. The treatment facility is on the south side of the building, which was constructed as part of two additions to the original building, one completed in 1990 and another in 2008. The chemical storage area is located in the building addition completed 2008 and is separate from the treatment area. The chemical delivery at this plant is contracted out. The chemical delivery fill station is located in a locked cabinet on the exterior wall of the building. The fill station houses the chemical feed connections which are secured with cam lock caps (protective cover with distinct fitting) and identified with labels.
On April 2, 2014, the Greenbrook WTP was not operating. At approximately 5:15 pm, a delivery of ammonia was made to the treatment plant by the chemical company, Canada Colours and Chemicals Limited (subcontracted to Nachurs Alpine Solutions). It appears that the delivery of ammonia was fed into the chlorine storage tanks. There were no injuries reported related to this event.

When these two chemicals mixed together in the chemical storage tank a reaction occurred which produced heat and a secondary compound susceptible to ignition. In this case, there was enough reaction and energy to create an explosion. The Kitchener Fire Department and Regional staff immediately responded to the alarms resulting from this explosion. They took immediate steps to secure the site and ensure no impacts to the drinking water. All the energy sources to the building and controls were also isolated or placed off line.

On April 3, 2014, the Ministries of Environment and Labour and the City of Kitchener building inspector visited the site to conduct a field inspection and document the event.

In response to this event, three key activities were initiated:

- Preliminary investigation of the event including a desk top review, an environmental scan and an engineering review,
- Review of all chemical handling to prevent future events including a third party review, site assessment and WHMIS review, and
- Reconstruction of the chemical facility including any potential demolition, engineering assessment and reconstruction.

Investigation

To document the incident, Regional staff consolidated all the information related to the handling of chemicals, the details on the chemical suppliers and also collected information from all those involved with the incident. An environmental consultant was retained to provide technical guidance and advise regarding the handling of the residual chemical. They also provided comments on the potential reaction and subsequent explosion. From their review, the chemistry suggests that several potential compounds could have been generated during the mixing of these two chemicals and these compounds had the potential of being extremely volatile and easily ignited. In this case, we know that the compound did ignite and caused an explosion. The environmental consultant also recommended that we investigate the chemical area for residual materials and potential by products. With remote cameras, the chemical area was inspected and it was determined that no residual chemical or by products were visible.
Also samples of liquid were taken from the chemical tanks and containment areas which confirmed that no residual materials or by products remained.

A preliminary engineering report was also conducted to comment on the structural integrity and capture the event. The explosion caused damage to the chlorine storage tanks, some of the associated chemical equipment, structural damage to interior walls and a section of metal roof. The report does provide preliminary comments on the structural integrity of the chemical area. Further structural review was recommended and the chemical area was secured and fenced. It was also recommended that staff not enter this area of the building until further structural inspection was completed.

Prevention

The status of the chemical delivery and the associated procedures for contractor chemical delivery were reviewed by staff. As a safe guard, a temporary protocol was established that all contracted chemical deliveries would be escorted by Regional staff, effective April 3rd 2014. A desk top review of the chemical feed system equipment, standard operating procedures and handling practices was also performed. This review confirmed that there were 13 water treatment plants where chemicals are delivered by a contractor. From these 13 water treatment plants, only five plants have more than one chemical stored and delivered by a contractor. At the remaining sites, the chemical is delivered or prepared by Regional staff. This temporary protocol to escort the third party chemical delivery will remain in place until a full assessment of the chemical handling is completed.

The chemical handling study will consider best management practices, site conditions, operating practices and training. It is anticipated that any outcomes from the review to update the operating procedures and equipment will be based on best management practices. This assessment will be conducted over the summer and fall period and include all the Region’s water treatment plants. To better understand the chemistry, a separate study of the chemicals and their properties will also be evaluated. All recommendations from both of these studies will be incorporated in the standard operating procedures and staff will be trained on these new procedures.

Reconstruction

As an initial phase, the impacted chemical area will be cleaned up and the damaged roof section will be repaired to allow further review of the building to be completed. Staff discussed the situation with the Region’s Director of Procurement and Supply Services and the insurance adjuster to confirm that the best approach is to hire a demolition
contractor directly. A scope of work was developed and four quotes were received. The clean-up work was awarded to AIM Environmental Group based on the emergency provision in the Purchasing By-law and the contractor started work on May 15, 2014. Following clean-up (to be complete first week of June), a full assessment of the structure and rehabilitation will be conducted. Any residual chemicals will be removed from the storage tanks. The preliminary report from this assessment indicates that the structural integrity of the building is sound. With this information, a detailed scope of work will be developed and used to tender for the repair of the Greenbrook WTP chemical area. In general, the reconstruction will be isolated to the chemical area and all aspects for the remaining building appear to be in good shape. The details and approval for the repairs to the chemical area will be provided in a separate report.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

This project support the Corporate Strategic Plan Focus 5.3: Ensure Regional programs and services are efficient and defective and demonstrate accountability to the public.

**Financial Implications:**

In light of the emergency nature of this project, no funds had been allocated for repair and reconstruction of the Greenbrook WTP chemical area. The initial clean up project has gone well and has cost $205,000 to date. The reconstruction costs are estimated to be $500,000 to $700,000. It is expected that most of the funding for this project will come from the insurance pool. There will be no impact to the Water User Rate.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

The Design and Construction and Legal Departments have been consulted.

**Prepared By:** Nancy Kodousek, Director, Water Services

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

Transportation and Environmental Services

Water Services

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

Date: June 17, 2014

Subject: Option to Extend Agreement with Ontario Clean Water Agency ("OCWA")

RECOMMENDATION:

That The Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to the wastewater operations and maintenance:

a) Endorse the preferred approach for wastewater service delivery as described in Report CR-RS-14-033/E-14-070 dated June 17, 2014;

b) Authorize staff to provide written notice to the Ontario Clean Water Agency (OCWA) of the Region’s intent to extend the existing agreement for the management, operation, and maintenance of wastewater treatment facilities within the Waterloo Region for a second 5 year period till December 31, 2020; and

c) Direct staff to bring back a report outlining the terms of the five-year renewal (January 1, 2016, to December 31, 2020) for consideration by Regional Council in early 2015

Summary:

The Region’s wastewater treatment plants and infrastructure are currently managed, operated, and maintained by a third party agency, the Ontario Clean Water Agency ("OCWA"). The existing agreement with OCWA expires on December 31, 2015. The agreement contains a renewal provision for a second 5 year period which requires the Region to provide written notice of its intent to renew the agreement not later than December 31, 2014.
In late 2013, a working group of Region staff examined the options for continued management of the Region’s wastewater treatment plants with the assistance of a third party consultant, ARCADIS. An executive summary of the report prepared by ARCADIS is attached to this Report in Attachment A.

The preferred alternative identified by the working group is the extension of the existing OCWA contract for an additional five (5) year term as:

- OCWA has complied with the terms of the agreement and provided quality service,
- OCWA has a strong history of compliance with the legislation and has detailed knowledge of our wastewater facilities,
- OCWA is well aligned with similar values and culture to the Region,
- OCWA operates under a essential service clause in their collective agreement,
- Extension of the existing contract would avoid the potential cost of an Request for Proposals (RFP), and
- Limited market and industry benchmarks confirm that there would be no real savings through a competitive process.

Staff proposes to provide a notice to OCWA that the Region intends to renew the agreement, for a second 5 year term, negotiate the financial aspects of renewal with OCWA over the remainder of the year, and bring an open report to Council in early 2015 with a recommendation concerning the renewal of the existing agreement.

Report:

Effective January 1, 2011, the Region of Waterloo entered into a five-year operating agreement with the Ontario Clean Water Agency (“OCWA”) to manage, operate, and maintain the Region’s thirteen wastewater treatment plants. (See Report E10-054 dated April 27, 2010.) This agreement with OCWA was preceded by two successive prior agreements with the result being that OCWA has continuously operated the Region’s wastewater facilities since it was created as a separate agency of the Provincial government in 1997.

The initial five year term of the existing OCWA agreement expires on December 31, 2015. This agreement provides that it may be renewed by the Region by giving notice of intent to renew not later than December 31, 2014. Upon giving notice of intent to renew, the terms of the existing agreement would remain substantially the same except for the financial terms of the agreement.

Management Options

Region staff examined options for the management of the wastewater operations and developed a process to select a preferred management approach as outlined in Report E13-102 dated September 10, 2013. Three management models were evaluated:
internal operations with Regional staff, external operations through OCWA, and external operations contractor selection through a Request for Proposal (RFP).

1. Internal Operations

In this scenario, the Region would become responsible for the operation and maintenance of the wastewater treatment system directly. As a result, the Region would have increased control, full risk and regulatory responsibility for wastewater operations and management. The impact of this approach would include transition costs, recruitment of new staff (estimated 33 FTEs), increase internal support services, and purchase of attractables (equipment, parts and tools that are currently owned by OCWA and used at the Region’s facilities). This alternative was not preferred.

2. Continuance of External Operation with OCWA

In this scenario, OCWA would continue to operate under the “current contract service agreement.” There would be no transition issues unlike the other two options. Continuing with the current OCWA agreement includes the following benefits:

- partnership with an organization with similar culture and values,
- good compliance history,
- alignment with the Province and Ministry of Environment,
- an essential services provision in existing OCWA labour agreements, and
- an agency with a strong financial position.

Region staff have evaluated and confirmed that OCWA is operating in accordance with the existing contract terms. There are no significant issues of concern. The OCWA option is recommended (best score) due to the history of compliance, technical capacity, and association with the capital upgrades.

3. External RFP

In this scenario, the Region would initiate a procurement process to retain a new operating authority which could include OCWA or a private operator. This would introduce both procurement and transition costs, a level of uncertainty and potential change to service. The contract operating industry has been fairly stable over the past 5 years. OCWA was successful in a recent competitive process as the best value and lowest bid in the City of London. As a result, OCWA now operates the three largest operating contracts in Ontario and other third party operators have a limited role in the Province. Based on the current contract and comparable benchmarks, it would be difficult to reduce cost without risk to level of service. In consideration of this and the ranking, the RFP was not preferred.

Evaluation
The evaluation considered OCWA’s performance under the current agreement and impacts of new infrastructure, legislation, and treatment technology and market conditions. The selection of a preferred management option for wastewater operations consisted of four key steps:

- Review of current market conditions for contract operations in Ontario and trends in North America,
- Assess the impact of the new wastewater infrastructure, legislation and technology under the three management options,
- Develop and define the evaluation criteria to support a decision making framework to select a preferred management option, and,
- Conduct two workshops with Region staff to review the framework and select the preferred management option.

The working group included representatives from Water Services, Human Resources, Legal, Finance, Design & Construction, and Purchasing. The two workshops took place on October 23, 2013, and November 19, 2013.

Criteria

The evaluation criteria were based on 40 per cent financial criteria and 60 per cent technical, staffing, risk, and business criteria. In recognition of the financial cost and value of this service, the working group agreed to place greater emphasis on the financial criteria in the overall score. The criteria was divided into the following areas:

- Cost
- Financial Viability
- Technical Expertise & Support
- Staffing (non-cost component)
- Risk Allocation
- Flexibility
- Contract Transition

Ranking of Options

At the workshop, the criteria were discussed by the project team and each criteria received a ranking of 1 to 5 (best to worst) based on three management options. The ranking was established through consensus by the working group. A weighting was applied to each criteria and final total score was calculated. The final scores of the three alternatives are presented in Attachment A and the lowest score being the preferred option.
A brief summary of the evaluation for each criteria is captured as follows:

Cost

An external operation (through OCWA or RFP) appeared to provide more overall value to the Region. The advantages of the external contractor option include strong technical support, experienced asset management and risk control. As a public agency, OCWA has a cost advantage over private operators in that it is eligible for low insurance premiums given its position as a Crown agency and no bonding is required as its operations are guaranteed by the Province of Ontario all of which are advantages over an external private sector operator. While the Region would not require overhead or profit as a direct operator, there would likely be a comparable administration cost.

Financial Viability

The Region was considered in the best financial condition as a direct operator. OCWA, being a third party albeit a Crown Agency, was placed second while any other external operator would be placed lower.

Technical Expertise and Support

OCWA and the other external operators have a large contingent of operators and have access to strong technical support. The Region would need to recruit a minimum of 33 FTEs and need to retain external consultants to provide technical support during the transition and the completion of capital upgrades.

Staffing Factors

OCWA was considered better than the private operator or the Region having staff, certification, and succession planning already in place. OCWA also brings the important advantage of an essential service provision in its labour agreements thus reducing the risk of disruption to service. In the case of the Region or external operator, there would be staff recruitment, staff training, and potential labour negotiations required.

Risk Allocation

OCWA is familiar with the wastewater facilities and capital upgrades. OCWA has assisted with approvals and licensing issues related to wastewater and biosolids operations. OCWA has also demonstrated their experience in working with multiple contractors under the Waterloo and Kitchener WWTP upgrades. For these reasons, OCWA has been able to mitigate risks and delays in construction without disruption to service. The Region benefits by transferring risk to OCWA or an external operator.

Flexibility

OCWA has considerable in-depth knowledge of the wastewater industry, in its
association with the Ministry of the Environment and other regulators. The Region and external contractor may not have the same advantage.

Contract Transition

OCWA provides value because there is no transition and its ability to bring in a fair contract price. The OCWA price remains competitive based on their collective agreement, audited statements, lack of bonding, and low insurance premium. Service assumption under an external operator or the Region would introduce risk and increased governance in overseeing an effective contract transition.

Recommendation

Based on the evaluation and ranking, Region staff are recommending that the preferred option is to extend the OCWA contract.

One important aspect is the public sector attributes of OCWA and its ability to provide staff under an essential service clause. The ability of a government entity to provide a performance based service is a great advantage to the Region and probably to the vast majority of Ontario municipalities that have been operating through OCWA. There are several financial advantages noted in this Report. These financial advantages result in savings compared with an operating budget that may be proposed by a private sector competitor. With this approach potential cost of an RFP process is avoided.

Region staff recommend that the preferred option is to extend the OCWA contract as:

- OCWA has complied with the terms of the agreement and provided quality service,
- OCWA has a strong history of compliance with the legislation and has detailed knowledge of our wastewater facilities,
- OCWA is well aligned with similar values and culture to the Region,
- OCWA operates under a essential service clause in their collective agreement,
- Extension of the existing contract would avoid the potential cost of an RFP, and
- Limited market and industry benchmarks confirm that there would be no real savings through a competitive process.

The Region’s Procurement By-law (By-law 04-093, as amended) provides that goods or services may be procured through negotiation where “the extension of an existing or previous contract would prove more cost effective or beneficial for the Region.”

Terms of the Contract

The Region would renew the agreement, negotiate the financial aspects of the renewal with OCWA over the remainder of 2014 and bring a report to Council in early 2015 with a recommendation concerning the renewal of the existing agreement.
Next Steps and Timelines

Pending Council approval for the preferred approach of extending OCWA’s service contract, the next steps are:

- Council approval for the preferred approach  
  June 2014
- Notice of Intent to OCWA  
  Summer 2014
- Contract Renewal Negotiations with OCWA  
  Fall of 2014
- Recommendation Report to Council  
  Spring 2015

Corporate Strategic Plan:

This initiative support Corporate Strategic Plan Focus Area 3:  Protect and Enhance the Environment and Focus Area 5:  Ensure Operational Effectiveness and Efficiency.

Financial Implications:

The existing contract with OCWA provides for a base fee that is adjusted annually taking into consideration increases for salaries and benefits resulting from inflationary or cost of living increases.  The base fee is also reconciled taking into consideration the actual cost of chemicals used at the plants.  In the final year of the contract, the base fee is $7,355,687.  The existing contract provides that should the Region intend to renew the agreement, the only aspect that will be subject to further negotiation will be the financial aspects of the contract.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Human Resources and Finance departments have been consulted.

Attaches:


Prepared By: Khalid Mehmood, Manager Engineering and Wastewater Programs  
Nancy Kodousek, Director Water Services

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services
Executive Summary

The Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Region) provides wastewater treatment system services for the Cities of Kitchener, Waterloo, and Cambridge and the Townships of Dumfries, Wellesley, Wilmot, and Woolwich as well as collection services for the Townships of North Dumfries and Wellesley. The Regional WWTPs have been operated and maintained by the Ontario Clean Water Agency (OCWA) since 1996. The Region successfully re-negotiated terms of the current contract in 2009-10. The current agreement between OCWA and the Region commenced on January 1, 2011, and is in effect for a term of five years, ending December 31, 2015. The agreement includes the option to extend the contract for one 5-year term upon mutual agreement of the Region and OCWA and approval of the Council of the Region (Council). One year prior to the contract expiry (December 31, 2014), the Region needs to notify OCWA of its decision to extend the current agreement or permit it to expire. The Region has undertaken this evaluation to make a decision regarding the agreement and seek approval from the Council.

To assist in the decision process, the Region retained ARCADIS U.S., Inc. (ARCADIS) to evaluate the options available to the Region, taking into account current market trends in external contract operations and maintenance services, the Region’s overall goals, and to facilitate discussions with the Regional staff.

Evaluation

The following three service delivery alternatives were considered and evaluated:

- Internal (Public) Operations
- External Contract Operations - Extension of OCWA Contract
- External Contract Operations - RFP for Successor Contract

As a first step of the evaluation process, the Regional working group comprised of staff from various departments, selected evaluation criteria and assigned weights to represent its values, priorities, and the relative importance of issues associated with wastewater service delivery. These criteria were used to rank each of the service delivery alternatives during a workshop facilitated by ARCADIS on November 19, 2013. After detailed discussion and consideration, each service delivery alternative received a final comparative score. As presented in Table ES-1-1, the preferred alternative (i.e., the alternative with the lowest final overall score) was to extend the current OCWA contract. Subsequent to the workshop, the sensitivity of the weighting and ranking on the final scores was further reviewed and the ranking adjusted. The preferred alternative remained the extension of the OCWA contract.
Table ES-1-1: Service Delivery Alternative Scoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Final Weighting</th>
<th>Ranking (1 = Best, 5 = Worst)</th>
<th>Score (Rank x Weight)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>External - OCWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Maintenance, Repair, and Replacement Cost Share</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Costs</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement Costs</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization Costs</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead/Administrative Costs - Cash Flow, Incentives, Deferred Maintenance &amp; Replacement Potential, Taxes, Profits</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Viability</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Expertise &amp; Support</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing (Non-Cost Factors)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Allocation</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Transition</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, based on the evaluation and scoring process, extending the operations contract with OCWA for a 5-year period was clearly the most preferred option. Several factors led to the Region’s preference to extend the current OCWA contract.

- Cost criteria: Cost received a combined weighting of 40%. This weighing ensures a cost-effective service delivery. OCWA received favorable scores for these criteria.

  - Cost criterion, OCWA with its operating history has proven efficiencies related to staffing, utilities/consumables and equipment maintenance/repair/replacement. A competitive process for a successor contract would introduce procurement costs and require greater resources. OCWA’s current performance has demonstrated sufficient value for the costs, so a procurement process is not warranted. The recent tender process conducted by the City of London and Elgin-Huron Boards
(Boards) in 2011-12 concluded with the selection of OCWA as the lowest bid and highest scored proponent.

- Staffing was considered the second most important criterion and was evaluated under the “Cost” criteria and a separate criteria “Staffing (Non-Cost Factors)” with a combined weight of 20%. OCWA received favorable scores for these criteria. The Region considered organization structure, certification, succession planning and knowledge transfer to be challenges if it were to assume operations.

- Financial viability of OCWA received favorable scores for these criteria although the Region could offer the most stability.

- Under contract transition, there seemed to be a potential for greater risk if contract operations services were transferred from OCWA to the Region or another contract operator, while considerable capital upgrades were taking place.

- OCWA scored comparatively higher for the remaining criteria - technical support, risk allocation and flexibility criteria. Both OCWA and an external contractor were perceived as being equally able to provide technical expertise.

- OCWA has public sector attributes as a Crown Agency of the Province of Ontario, and is ultimately accountable to the Ministry of the Environment. As a result, OCWA and the Region share core values in terms of providing public services. This alignment of goals and values between the Region and OCWA contributes to the thinking that the Region may not find this alignment with a private sector service provider.

- The current service agreement includes terms and conditions that were re-negotiated by the Region and OCWA in 2009-10. All indications support sustained improved performance since the contract was renegotiated.

ARCADIS believes that the Region is well positioned to pursue a 5-year contract extension with OCWA. ARCADIS recommends that the Region create a workgroup and continue to have partnering meetings with OCWA to discuss the Region’s needs and improvements prior to engaging OCWA in formal discussions related to contract extension.
May 14, 2014

Kris Fletcher
Director, Council and Administrative Services/Regional Clerk
Regional Municipality of Waterloo
2nd Floor
150 Frederick Street
PO Box 9051, Station C
Kitchener, Ontario N2G 4J3

Dear Ms. Fletcher,

At its regular meeting on May 12, 2014, the Council of The Corporation of The Township of Wilmot adopted the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED:

WHEREAS the Regional Municipality of Waterloo is responsible for establishing speed limits on roads within its jurisdiction;

AND WHEREAS the following elementary, secondary schools and Regional Library branches are located on arterial regional roads:

- New Dundee Public School, Bridge Street, New Dundee
- Sir Adam Beck Public School, Snyder's Road, Baden
- Waterloo Oxford District Secondary School, Snyder's Road, Baden
- Holy Family Catholic School, Huron Street, New Hamburg
- Grandview Public School, Huron Street, New Hamburg
- Forest Glen Public School, Waterloo Street, New Hamburg
- St. Agatha Catholic School, Notre Dame Drive, St. Agatha
- New Dundee Regional Library, Queen Street, New Dundee
- Baden Regional Library, Snyder's Rd., Baden

AND WHEREAS it has been observed that school zones and the roads within the vicinities of libraries across the Township of Wilmot are venues of escalating congestion and activity for students and the public, thereby creating safety concerns;

AND WHEREAS as a community, we all share responsibility to reduce the risk and enhance the safety of our children, youth, crossing guards and the general public;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that in light of the safety concerns, the Township of Wilmot requests that the Region of Waterloo consider the feasibility of lowering the existing speed
limit within the school zones and in the areas of the Regional Library Branches at the above locations from their existing speed limit to 40 km/hr.

CARRIED, AS AMENDED.

If you require anything further please contact my office.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dawn Mittelholtz
Deputy Clerk

CC:  Olga Smith, Clerk, City of Waterloo
     Christine Tarling, Clerk, City of Kitchener
     Michael DiLullo, Clerk, City of Cambridge
     Christine Broughton, Clerk, Township of Woolwich
     Grace Kosch, Clerk, Township of Wellesley
     Rodger Mordue, Clerk, Township of North Dumfries
<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>27-May-14</td>
<td>P&amp;W Committee</td>
<td>Staff to report back on Stop Sign installed at the intersection of Bridge St. (Regional Rd. 12) and Queen St. (Regional Rd. 12), Township of Wilmot</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>1-Jan-2015</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>