
Members absent: T. Galloway, S. Strickland

DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST UNDER THE MUNICIPAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT

K. Seiling declared a pecuniary interest regarding Report P-12-012, Region of Waterloo Central Transit Corridor Development Strategy Consultant Selection, due to two of his adult children who own residential properties within the proposed corridor.

D. Craig declared a pecuniary interest regarding Report P-12-012, Region of Waterloo Central Transit Corridor Development Strategy Consultant Selection, due to his son owning property within the area of a proposed station on the rapid transit system.

R. Deutschmann declared a conflict of interest regarding Report P-12-012, Region of Waterloo Central Transit Corridor Development Strategy Consultant Selection, since he and his spouse are shareholders of corporations that have an interest in a property at 10 Duke Street West, Kitchener.

The Committee brought forward item 3(i) of the agenda.

i) E-12-006, Homer Watson Boulevard (Regional Road 28) and Block Line Road Review

Bob Henderson, Manager, Transportation Engineering, provided a presentation to the Committee regarding the report and proposed actions, including:

- History of development/construction of roundabout;
- Recommendations from consultant and concurrence/disagreement of staff; and
- Countermeasures can be completed by Spring 2012.

The presentation is attached to the original minutes.

*R. Deutschmann entered the meeting at 9:21 a.m.

DELEGATIONS

a) E-12-006, Homer Watson Boulevard (Regional Road 28) and Block Line Road Review
i. Jennifer Urosevic, Regional Manager, Canadian National Institute for the Blind (CNIB), Waterloo

J. Urosevic provided a handout to the Committee in support of her appearance, which is attached to the original minutes. She spoke to the incidence of vision loss at various ages, and described the dangers encountered by vision-impaired residents at roundabouts. She observed that a number of communications to Regional staff from the CNIB on the issue of roundabout safety had no response. She related the recommendations of CNIB with respect to roundabouts, specifically that the Region consult with an Orientational & Mobility Specialist on safe travel skills of people who are blind or partially-sighted, that the Committee review US-based research studies on how to make roundabouts safe and accessible for those who are blind or partially-sighted, and that the Committee install research-proven accessible pedestrian crosswalks at all roundabouts with pedestrian traffic.

The Committee asked for clarification from J. Urosevic with regard to the recommendations of CNIB. The Committee learned that two CNIB clients attending St. Mary’s Catholic Secondary School nearby are not able to access the crossing at the roundabout without the assistance of the crossing guard, resulting in the students being able to cross during school hours but not outside school hours when the crossing guards have left. J. Urosevic explained the work and expertise of Orientational & Mobility Specialists, and related the Specialist’s proposed solution for pedestrian crossings at the roundabout that vehicles be required to stop. She asserted that the student clients of CNIB would not be able to access the crossing at the roundabout without the assistance of the crossing guard, despite the proposed improved signage.

ii. Gord Cummer, Co-chair, Grand River Accessibility Advisory Committee (GRAAC), Waterloo

G. Cummer spoke to the purpose of GRAAC and its activities. He observed that GRAAC recognizes that roundabouts are expected to be a permanent part of the Region, and that there appears to be emphasis on the increased safety of vehicular traffic in roundabouts at the expense of attention to pedestrian safety. He noted that GRAAC had sent multiple correspondence to the Region following visits to a number of roundabouts, and those letters contained the concerns and recommendations of GRAAC with respect to the safety of those roundabouts for disabled persons. He noted expected upcoming standards arising from the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) pertaining to the built environment and specifically for roundabouts. He emphasized that the safety concerns for persons with disabilities increase significantly as the number of lanes to cross increases. He cited the speed of traffic and the need for eye contact between drivers and pedestrians as factors that strongly influence the safe crossing of pedestrians, and noted the findings of Transport Canada that more effort is required to deal with problems of roundabout accessibility. He stressed the willingness of GRAAC to work with staff in addressing issues of roundabout safety.

The Committee confirmed with G. Cummer the importance of speed reduction and the reduction of lanes of traffic to increase the safety of roundabout crossings for pedestrians with disabilities.

*G. Lorentz entered the meeting at 9:43 a.m.

iii. Dawn Clelland, Kitchener

D. Clelland provided a handout to the Committee in support of her appearance, which is attached to the original minutes. She related her involvement in VIEWS, a non-profit group advocating for children who are blind or have low vision, as well as the Consumer Advocacy Committee which is a national group concerned with promoting best practices to governments.
The latter group recently completed a guideline for Accessible Pedestrian Signals and is creating guidelines for accessible roundabouts. She highlighted the challenges of the Region’s pedestrian infrastructure, describing it as not blind-friendly despite the best of intentions, and expressed that the limitations the built environment places upon residents who are blind or have low vision limits their independence and runs contrary to their human rights and the Province’s philosophy of universal design. She asserted that all pedestrian signals must be accessible, citing inequity in having the CNIB requesting an accessible signal.

D. Clelland related a number of suggestions to the Committee to improve roundabout safety, including sound strips, pedestrian-activated flashers, raised sidewalks, and a pedestrian hybrid beacon. She cited studies concluding that there is no safe, accessible method for visually-impaired or blind residents to cross more than two lanes of traffic at a roundabout.

The Committee obtained clarification from the delegation as to the use of various countermeasures for pedestrian safety including tactile indicators at curb cuts, contrasting colours, and sound strips.

Chair J. Wideman spoke to the importance of addressing safety issues at all intersections and roundabouts, and suggested that an addition be made to the report’s recommendation to include direction to staff to meet with CNIB and GRAAC to obtain their perspectives on the matter, which received general agreement from the Committee.

MOVED by K. Seiling
SECONDED by G. Lorentz

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the implementation of the recommended collision countermeasures at the Homer Watson Boulevard/Block Line Road roundabout as outlined in Report E-12-006, dated January 31, 2012;

AND THAT staff meet with representatives of the Canadian National Institute for the Blind and the Grand River Accessibility Advisory Committee to develop solutions for the visually- and hearing-impaired at all roundabouts and intersections in the Region of Waterloo.

The Committee discussed the motion and spoke to the concerns for pedestrians at signalized intersections and roundabouts, at specific locations such as Franklin Boulevard and throughout the Region. Members of the Committee spoke in support of the motion, specifically to the direction to meet with members of the CNIB and GRAAC to hear their concerns. The Committee clarified with B. Henderson that the Province requires vehicles to yield to pedestrians at all roundabouts where the specified signage and pavement markings are in place. The Committee obtained detail from B. Henderson as to the Type 2 PXO sign to replace the existing signs which help facilitate pedestrian traffic at roundabouts.

A member of the Committee ascertained from B. Henderson that staff would not be comfortable in proceeding immediately with the reduction of the southbound approach to the roundabout from three lanes to two, as staff would seek to observe the traffic volumes from the extension of Block Line Road prior to proceeding with any lane reduction. The Committee heard from B. Henderson that the roundabout at Can-Amera Parkway and Conestoga Boulevard had 2 minor pedestrian collisions or 1 more than Homer Watson Boulevard at Block Line Road. Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services, observed that there are fewer pedestrian collisions at roundabouts than at signalized intersections, notwithstanding that improvements can be made for safety at roundabouts. The Committee member suggested that from a safety standpoint, an immediate reduction from three lanes to two would be of benefit.
MOVED by R. Deutschmann
SECONDED by C. Millar

AND FURTHER THAT the southbound approach to the Homer Watson/Block Line Road roundabout be reduced from three lanes to two immediately, notwithstanding the recommended timeline contained within the report.

Some members of the Committee indicated their desire to understand the costs and practical implications of proceeding with the potential lane reduction; the Committee debated the merits of deferring the amending motion to a later date to allow staff to compile a fulsome response to the question.

MOVED by C. Zehr
SECONDED by J. Mitchell

THAT the amending motion be deferred to no later than the Planning and Works Committee meeting on March 20, 2012 to allow staff to report back to the Committee on the practical and financial implications of a lane reduction for the southbound approach.

CARRIED

The Committee resumed discussion regarding the main motion.

A member of the Committee questioned B. Henderson with respect to the recommendation to not changing the current location of pedestrian crosswalks at the roundabout, with B. Henderson indicating that the location of the current crosswalks sees vehicles travelling at lower speeds than at points further away from the roundabout. He related his expectation that the majority of student pedestrians at the intersection would likely disregard the relocated crosswalk. He spoke to the good engineering practice of maintaining consistent design to allow drivers to anticipate situations on the road and best react to them.

Some members of the Committee related their concerns at changing the pedestrian crossing location, expressing that the change could exaggerate the problem, that consistency in roundabouts would be put in jeopardy, and relating various anecdotes with regard to areas where pedestrians cross in a dangerous manner when safer options are present.

A member of the Committee expressed concern at the roundabouts planned for Franklin Boulevard, noting that such a series of roundabouts would need a clear definition of how they will work properly.

A member of the Committee expressed apprehension at changing the wording on the signs advising drivers to yield instead of stop for pedestrians crossing at the roundabout, citing the perceived weakening of the wording. B. Henderson explained the staff rationale for the sign change, based on maintaining consistency and seeking to maximize compliance; he noted that there would be an enforcement program in place at the roundabout.

The Committee ascertained from the Region’s consultant Brian Malone, CIMA+, that neither of the options for the wording of signs is contained in legislation; B. Malone elaborated that the aim in such a situation would be to achieve a uniform response from drivers and that the yield sign is more likely to achieve such a response.
MOVED by R. Deutschmann
SECONDED by G. Lorentz

AND FURTHER THAT staff be directed to provide for the Committee's consideration alternate
design concepts that relocate the roundabout crosswalk to an area outside the roundabout.

MOTION LOST

The question of the main motion was put.

MAIN MOTION CARRIED

b) Dwayne Wolfe, Kitchener, re: CR-RS-12-007, Authorization to Expropriate Lands (1st
Report) for Weber Street West Grade Separation and Road Improvements (College
Street to Guelph Street), in the City of Kitchener

D. Wolfe spoke to the impacts upon his family of the proposed expropriation, mentioning the
significant impact upon his children who have high needs. He related a number of anecdotes as
to the adaptations his family has made at their home to accommodate their unique needs, as
well as noting the difficulty his family would encounter resulting from the expropriation. His
family has had difficulty in finding a new property that would fit their unique requirements. He
requested that the Region defer the expropriation process to allow his family more time to
conduct their property search.

c) Natalie Cockburn, Federation of Students, University of Waterloo and Sean Madden, Vice
President: University Affairs at Wilfrid Laurier University Students' Union re: P-12-013,

N. Cockburn noted that also in the audience were Michael Makahnouk from the University of
Waterloo Graduate Student Association and Matthew Colphon, President of the Federation
of Students, University of Waterloo.

N. Cockburn and S. Madden provided a presentation to the Committee with regard to the U-
Pass program, which included:

- History of UPass program;
- Core principles for students' use of U-Pass for students;
- Concerns at annual price increases with perceived lack of increase in service
  standards;
- Concerns regarding the efficacy and consistency of annual negotiations;
- U-Pass business model, and its benefits to the Region from economies of scale and
  concentration of service demands;
- Recommendations to the Region:
  - Separate long-term U-Pass agreements with the individual student groups,
    with agreements prescribing rates, rate increases, and terms of service;
  - Maintain current base fee of $60.64;
  - Fee increases should be assessed at 50% of general fare increases, with a
    max annual increase of 5%, based on current base price of $60.64;
  - Agreement should include minimum service standards and customer service
    response mechanisms.

The presentation and accompanying handout are attached to the original minutes.
Members of the Committee articulated the importance of students to Grand River Transit (GRT). The Committee noted that the cost of the U-Pass is among the lowest for similar student passes in Ontario, and that a balance is sought between value for both students and GRT.

The Committee questioned why a report on the GRT Business Plan would be brought forward during negotiations to renew the U-Pass. Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Housing and Community Services, explained that the report’s recommendation includes a broader policy for the entire transit plan. N. Cockburn asserted that the report’s recommendation would contradict those of the delegation and would limit the latitude available in negotiations.

REPORTS

c) P-12-013, Grand River Transit - Proposed 2011 – 2014 Business Plan

Graham Vincent, Director, Transportation Planning, provided a presentation to the Committee on the GRT Business Plan, including:

- Development process of business plan;
- Significant increases in ridership since 2000;
- Improvements made to GRT service, including iXpress, express routes and local route improvements;
- Proposed restructuring of service plans, including:
  - New express routes;
  - Local service improvements;
  - Township service to connect to urban areas;
- Continued advocacy for interregional bus service and rail service;
- Financial plan;
- Fare strategy, with aim to achieve 50% cost recovery from fares;
  - Planned fare increases ranging from 5-9% annually;
  - Plan to increase U-Pass fees to equalize revenue-to-cost ratio to that of average user;
- Marketing strategy; and
- Next steps.

The presentation is attached to the original minutes.

The Committee expressed concern at the need for increased service to RIM Park in Waterloo, and obtained clarification from G. Vincent and Gethyn Beniston, Principal Planner, Transit, as to prospective improvements. G. Vincent noted that prospective future service to the RIM campus would provide an opportunity for service to RIM Park, and R. Horne observed that RIM is a member of the Transportation Management Association which can provide momentum to bring transit service to that part of the Region.

The Committee requested that staff provide details of the plan’s prospective fare increases.

The Committee questioned the target of 50% cost recovery from fares, and G. Vincent responded that the 50% represents the notion of equitable contributions from users and municipal operating contributions.

A member of the Committee expressed concern at the aim of the plan to achieve cost recovery from the U-Pass equal to the system average. G. Vincent provided additional detail on the proposal, including the proposed U-Pass cost of $74.48. The Committee ascertained from staff that comparable passes are available to students at the University of Guelph and Brock
University costing $81 and $84.42, respectively. The Committee requested that information on comparable passes in Ontario be circulated to members.

G. Vincent explained at the request of the Committee how staff would work with the students with regard to the U-Pass negotiations and their recommendations.

A member of the Committee questioned staff as to the GRT’s advertising revenues, and Sandy Roberts, Manager, Marketing & Communications, responded that advertising revenues are based on a five year agreement with an outside vendor with a minimum guaranteed annual revenue amount which is negotiated into the agreement; a new agreement is presently being negotiated, and the exact figure would be supplied directly to the member. The member asked if revenues for service to Woolwich would be shared with the Township, and G. Vincent indicated that staff could examine the situation with the member. The Committee clarified that advertising revenues are contained within the cost recovery portion in the GRT Business Plan, though not listed separately.

The Committee clarified that future fare increases ranging from 5-9% would depend on how quickly Council would seek to attain the 50% cost recovery, with G. Vincent emphasizing that the range provides the basis for an annual consideration of ridership growth and other factors affecting GRT service. A member of the Committee expressed concern at establishing the range for fare increases in advance, stressing that this would prohibit staff from arriving at more creative solutions in situations such as U-Pass negotiations. The Committee generally agreed that the third bullet of the report’s recommendation be amended to remove the wording “…with annual increases thereafter equal to the average annual increase to general fares and as additionally described in this report”.

A member of the Committee suggested that prospective express transit service along Ottawa Street, anticipated to begin in 2017, be moved up in consideration of the density of development along that corridor. G. Vincent indicated that the allocations for transit funding allow for the implementation of a new express transit route every other year, and that the collection of prospective routes require prioritization. Chair J. Wideman spoke to the debates at the steering committee with respect to the priority of the prospective express routes, and asserted that the established order reflects the decisions of the steering committee. The member requested that staff reconsider the order, and G. Vincent indicated that the development of the next business plan would provide that opportunity.

The Committee noted that the fourth bullet in the report’s recommendation speaks to transit service to the Townships, and the Committee recalled the manner in which past pilot projects had been conducted to test linking the Townships to the urban areas. The Committee clarified that the pilot project for service to Woolwich was funded from the transit budget, and thus effectively funded from the urban areas. The Committee discussed the manner in which transit service is funded from urban areas vs. the Townships, emphasizing that funding differences arise from differing service levels.

A member of the Committee suggested that the report’s recommendation should be amended to more clearly denote that funding for pilot projects to the Townships is to be determined, to which the Committee generally agreed.

The Committee requested that second, third and fourth bullets of the motion be voted on separately.

MOVED by K. Seiling
SECONDED by R. Deutschmann
THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the 2011 – 2014 Grand River Transit Business Plan, as described in Report P-12-013, dated January 31, 2012, including:

- the proposed service plan, based on developing a network of express routes to streamline integration with adapted Bus Rapid Transit and Light Rail Transit services, supported by redesigned local routes;

- developing and implementing a multi-year marketing plan consistent with the marketing strategy detailed in this report;

- working with Metrolinx and the Province to develop expanded rail services to the Region of Waterloo; and

- implementation of the new Business Plan subject to annual Regional Council budget deliberations.

CARRIED

MOVED by K. Seiling
SECONDED by R. Deutschmann

- the fare strategy, based on annual fare increases of between 5% and 9%, until transit revenue and the municipal contribution to transit operating costs are equal;

CARRIED

MOVED by K. Seiling
SECONDED by R. Deutschmann

- setting universal pass (U-Pass) prices based on achieving equal cost recovery between U-Pass programs and other customers;

CARRIED

MOVED by K. Seiling
SECONDED by R. Deutschmann

- providing service to the Townships at the request of, and developed in collaboration with, each respective Township, with the full costs of permanent service to be assumed by the Township requesting the service and that allocation of pilot program costs are to be determined;

CARRIED

REPORTS – PLANNING, HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

COMMUNITY PLANNING

a) P-12-010, Monthly Report of Development Activity for December 2011
MOVED by R. Kelterborn
SECONDED by J. Brewer


CARRIED

b) P-12-012, Region of Waterloo Central Transit Corridor Development Strategy Consultant Selection

Chair J. Wideman spoke to the importance of the activities outlined in the report, noting the importance of providing an indication to the development community as to the strategies to be put into place for development of the corridor.

MOVED by L. Armstrong
SECONDED by J. Mitchell

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo accept the proposal of Urban Strategies, for the Central Transit Corridor Development Strategy at an upset limit of $643,450.25 including all applicable taxes, as described in Report No. P-12-012, dated January 31, 2012.

CARRIED

*J. Haalboom left the meeting at 12:01 p.m.

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

d) P-12-014, Highway 401 (Hespeler Road to Halton) Environmental Assessment – Region of Waterloo Comments on Preliminary Preferred Plan

MOVED by C. Zehr
SECONDED by T. Cowan

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the following with regard to Highway 401 (Hespeler Road to Halton), as described in Report No. P-12-014, dated January 31, 2012:

a) Endorse the protection of the Highway 401 corridor to accommodate eight lanes and two high-occupancy vehicle lanes, and the provision of sufficient width to accommodate these lanes when replacing all structures;

b) Encourage the Province of Ontario to consider increased passenger rail service, including extension of GO Rail service along the Milton Line to Cambridge and enhanced GO Rail service along the Georgetown Line to Kitchener, prior to the physical widening of Highway 401;

c) Continue to work with the Ontario Ministry of Transportation and the City of Cambridge to identify appropriate pedestrian and cyclist crossing provisions for the Hespeler Road and Franklin Boulevard interchanges, and develop cost sharing agreements to implement these measures as soon as possible; and
d) Encourage the Ontario Ministry of Transportation to consider modifications to the Townline Road interchange and carpool lot to accommodate inter-regional bus operators.

CARRIED

e) P-12-015, Waterloo Spur Line Multi-Use Trail Feasibility and Design Study

MOVED by J. Mitchell
SECONDED by G. Lorentz

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the preferred alignment detailed in the Waterloo Spur Line Multi-Use Trail Feasibility and Design Study, with construction subject to finalizing funding as described in Report No. P-12-015, dated January 31, 2012.

CARRIED

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS

f) E-12-016/P-12-008, 2012 Planning and Works Project Team Membership

Chair J. Wideman solicited Councillors to volunteer for the project teams noted in the report. A vacancy remained for the Integrated Urban System Groundwater Study, Cambridge East Environmental Assessment project team.

MOVED by C. Zehr
SECONDED by T. Cowan

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo appoint the following Regional Councillors to the following project and study teams:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Suggested Council Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>King-Victoria Transit Hub</td>
<td></td>
<td>S. Strickland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Transit Service Improvement Plan (Kitchener)</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>J. Haalboom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Transit Service Improvement Plan (Cambridge)</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>J. Brewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>University Avenue Express</td>
<td>Waterloo/Kitchener</td>
<td>J. Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Goods Movement Study</td>
<td></td>
<td>G. Lorentz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>GRT SmartCard Implementation</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>J. Wideman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>aBRT Implementation</td>
<td>Kitchener/Cambridge</td>
<td>C. Millar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AND THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo forward the requests for area Councillor representatives on project and study teams to the Area Municipalities as described in Appendix A to Report No. E-12-016/P-12-008, dated January 31, 2012.

CARRIED

REPORTS – TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION

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

Received for information.

h) CR-RS-12-007, Authorization to Expropriate Lands (1st Report) for Weber Street West Grade Separation and Road Improvements (College Street to Guelph Street), in the City of Kitchener

MOVED by K. Seiling
SECONDED by J. Brewer

THAT The Regional Municipality of Waterloo direct and authorize the Regional Solicitor to take the following actions with respect to the expropriation of lands for the reconstruction of Weber
Street West between College Street and Guelph Street, in the City of Kitchener, in the Region of Waterloo as detailed in report CR-RS-12-007 dated January 31, 2012:

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

**Fee Simple Partial Taking:**

a) Part of Lot 394, Plan 376, being Part 1 on Reference Plan 58R-17282, City of Kitchener, P.I.N. 22319-0047 (LT) (178 Louisa Street)
b) Part of Lot 16, Registered Plan 374, being Parts 1 and 2 on Reference Plan 58R-17285, City of Kitchener, P.I.N. 22319-0176 (R) and 22319-0175 (LT) (84 Victoria Street North)
c) Part of Lot 8 and 9, South side of Weber Street and West side of College Street, Plan 401, being Part 1 on Reference Plan 58R-17284 and Part 1, on Reference Plan 58R-17378, City of Kitchener, P.I.N. 22317-0073 (LT) (79-85 Weber Street West)
d) Part of Lot 17, Registered Plan 374, being Part 1 on Reference Plan 58R-17283, City of Kitchener, P.I.N. 22320-0071 (LT) (122 Weber Street West/ 110 Victoria Street North)
e) Part of Lot 3, Plan 131, being Part 1 on Reference Plan 58R-17363, City of Kitchener, P.I.N. 22325-0096 (LT) (40 Wilhelm Street)
f) Part of Lot 5, Plan 400, being Parts 2,3,4 and 5 on Reference Plan 58R-17363, City of Kitchener, P.I.N.S 22320-0012 (LT) and 22320-0001(LT) (43 Wilhelm Street)

**Temporary Easement for Rail Line Detour:**

g) Part of Lot 2, Subdivision of Lot 16, German Company Tract, being Part 2 on Reference Plan 58R-17281, City of Kitchener, P.I.N. 22319-0173 (LT) (282 Duke Street West)

**Temporary Easement for Construction Yard:**

i) Part of Lot 17, Registered Plan 374 , being Part 1 on 58R-17354, City of Kitchener, P.I.N. 22320-0071 (LT) (122 Weber Street West/ 110 Victoria Street North)

**Full Taking:**

a) Part Lot 16, Plan 374, Part Lot 19, Subdivision of Lot 3, German Company Tract, being Parts 1 and 2, on Reference Plan 58R-5402, City of Kitchener, P.I.N. 22319-0177 (LT) (100 Victoria Street North)
b) Part Lot 19, Subdivision of Lot 3, German Company Tract, Part Lot 221, Plan 376, being Part 1, on Reference Plan 58R-11146, City of Kitchener, P.I.N. 22319-0195 (LT) (125 Weber Street West)
c) Part Lot 155-156, Plan 376, City of Kitchener, P.I.N. 22319-0161 (LT) (133 Weber Street West)
d) Part Lot 81, Plan 376, City of Kitchener, P.I.N. 22319-0150 (LT) (135 Weber Street West)
e) Part Lot 155-156, Plan 376, Part Lot 45, Streets and Lanes, City of Kitchener, P.I.N. 22319-0159 (127 Weber Street West)
f) Part Lot 155-156, Plan 376, Part Lot 45, Streets and Lanes, City of Kitchener, P.I.N. 22319-0160 (131 Weber Street West)
g) Part Lots 1 to 5, Plan 389, being Parts 1 to 5 on Reference Plan 58R-6324, City of Kitchener, P.I.N. 22315-0011 (LT) (108/110 Weber Street West)

h) Part Lot 320, Plan 376, City of Kitchener, P.I.N. 22319-0094 (LT) (157 Weber Street West)

i) Part Lots 8 and 9, Plan 389, as in A115620 (firstly) except Part 1 on Reference Plan 58R-13446, City of Kitchener, P.I.N. 22315-0030 (LT) (100 Weber Street West)

j) Part Lot 80, Plan 376, as in 1236916, City of Kitchener, P.I.N. 22319-0148 (LT) (143 Weber Street West)

k) Part Lot 267, Plan 376, City of Kitchener, P.I.N. 22319-0103 (LT) (162 Wellington Street North)

l) Part Lots 4 and 8, Plan 389, City of Kitchener, P.I.N. 22319-0020 (LT) (104 Weber Street West)

m) Part Lot 320, Plan 376, City of Kitchener, P.I.N. 22319-0093 (LT) (161 Weber Street West)

n) Part Lot 267, Plan 376, Part Lot 69, Streets and Lanes, City of Kitchener, P.I.N. 22319-0104 (LT) (153 Weber Street West)

o) Part Lot 19, Subdivision of Lot 3, German Company Tract, being Part 4 on Reference Plan 58R-11146, City of Kitchener, P.I.N. 22319-0194 (LT) and Part Lot 221, Plan 376, City of Kitchener, P.I.N. 22319-0171 (LT) (123 Breithaupt Street)

p) Part Lot 155, Plan 376, City of Kitchener, P.I.N. 22319-0158 (LT) (126 Breithaupt Street)

q) Part Lot 155-156, Plan 376, Part Lot 45, Streets and Lanes, City of Kitchener, P.I.N. 22319-0161 (LT) (133 ½ Weber Street West)

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

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

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

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

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

CARRIED

TRANSPORTATION

j) E-12-013, Lane Designation By-law for Approach Lanes at Roundabouts, in Cities of Kitchener and Cambridge

MOVED by C. Zehr
SECONDED by R. Kelterborn

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo amend Traffic and Parking By-Law # 06-072, as amended to:

a) Add to Schedule 16 - Lane Designation, northbound through, northbound through / left-turn movement on Ira Needles Boulevard (Regional Road 70) at The Boardwalk;
b) Add to Schedule 16 - Lane Designation, southbound through / right-turn, southbound through on Ira Needles Boulevard (Regional Road 70) at The Boardwalk;

c) Add to Schedule 16 - Lane Designation, eastbound right-turn, eastbound left-turn on The Boardwalk at Ira Needles Boulevard (Regional Road 70);

d) Add to Schedule 16 - Lane Designation, northbound through / right-turn, northbound through / left-turn on Homer Watson Boulevard (Regional Road 28) at Block Line Road;

e) Add to Schedule 16 - Lane Designation, southbound through / right-turn, southbound through, southbound through / left-turn on Homer Watson Boulevard (Regional Road 28) at Block Line Road;

f) Add to Schedule 16 - Lane Designation eastbound through / right-turn, eastbound through / left-turn on Block Line Road at Homer Watson Boulevard (Regional Road 28);

g) Add to Schedule 16 - Lane Designation, westbound through / right-turn, westbound through / left-turn on Block Line Road at Homer Watson Boulevard (Regional Road 28);

h) Add to Schedule 16 - Lane Designation, eastbound through / left-turn, eastbound through / right-turn on Fairway Road (Regional Road 53) at Zeller Drive; and

i) Add to Schedule 16 - Lane Designation, westbound through / left-turn, westbound through / right-turn on Fairway Road (Regional Road 53) at Zeller Drive

in the City of Kitchener, as outlined in report E-12-013, dated January 31, 2012.

AND THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo amend Traffic and Parking By-Law # 06-072 to:

a) Add to Schedule 16 - Lane Designation, northbound through / right-turn, northbound through / left-turn on Dickie Settlement Road (Regional Road 71) at Fountain Street (Regional Road 28);

b) Add to Schedule 16 - Lane Designation, eastbound through / right-turn, eastbound through / left-turn on Fountain Street (Regional Road 28) at Dickie Settlement Road (Regional Road 71);

c) Add to Schedule 16 - Lane Designation, westbound through / right-turn, westbound through / left-turn on Fountain Street (Regional Road 28) at Dickie Settlement Road (Regional Road 71); and

d) Add to Schedule 16 - Lane Designation, southbound right-turn, southbound through / left-turn on Conestoga College access at Fountain Street;

in the City of Cambridge, as outlined in report E-12-013, dated January 31, 2012.

AND FURTHER THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo amend Traffic and Parking By-Law # 06-072 to:

a) Add to Schedule 16 - Lane Designation, northbound left-turn, northbound through / right-turn on Fountain Street (Regional Road 17) at Kossuth Road (Regional Road 31) / Fairway Road (Regional Road 53);

b) Add to Schedule 16 - Lane Designation, southbound through / left-turn, southbound through / right-turn on Fountain Street (Regional Road 17) at Kossuth Road (Regional Road 31) / Fairway Road (Regional Road 53);

c) Add to Schedule 16 - Lane Designation, eastbound through / left-turn, eastbound through, eastbound right-turn on Fairway Road (Regional Road 53) at Kossuth Road (Regional Road 31) / Fountain Street (Regional Road 17); and

d) Add to Schedule 16 - Lane Designation, westbound through / left-turn, westbound through / right-turn on Kossuth Road (Regional Road 31) at Fountain Street (Regional Road 17) / Fairway Road (Regional Road 53)
in the City of Cambridge and Township of Woolwich, as outlined in report E-12-013, dated January 31, 2012.

CARRIED

k) E-12-014, 2010 Collision Report on Roundabouts in the Region of Waterloo

Received for information.

The Committee directed staff to bring back the report for consideration at the Council meeting on February 8.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

l) E-12-021, Shingle Diversion - Pilot Program

MOVED by L. Armstrong
SECONDED by G. Lorentz

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo:

a) Implement a pilot shingle diversion and recycling program effective March 1, 2012 until December 31, 2012 and if successful, incorporate the program cost into the 2013 Waste Management operating budget; and,

b) Accept the proposal of TRY Recycling Inc. for P2011-48 Shingle Recycling for a one year term commencing March 1, 2012 at an estimated cost of $61,130.00 plus applicable taxes.

CARRIED

WATER

m) E-12-002, 2011 Annual Water Quality Report for the Region of Waterloo Rural and Integrated Water Systems

Received for information.

OTHER BUSINESS

a) Council Enquiries and Requests for Information Tracking List was received for information.

b) C. Millar noted that the GRT Business Plan contains no mention of work related to the adapted Bus Rapid Transit (aBRT) to Cambridge, and expressed concern at its absence. Mike Murray, Chief Administrative Officer, clarified that the report of June 15, 2011 pertaining to the approval of the Rapid Transit Project clearly denotes that assessment work would start on the aBRT in 2014, and Chair J. Wideman observed that aBRT is contained within the Rapid Transit plan. M. Murray and G. Vincent emphasized that all of the planned GRT service expansions are meant to integrate conventional transit service with rapid transit service. C. Millar asserted that she would like reference made to service to Cambridge in similar future reports.
c) D. Craig requested information from staff with regard to any planned improvements to Highway 24 from Guelph to Cambridge to address traffic volumes.

d) D. Craig requested information from staff with regard to the heavy flow of traffic coming out of the new subdivision in Hespeler, specifically coming from Black Bridge Road onto Highway 24, and the potential for traffic signals at that location.

NEXT MEETING – February 28, 2012

ADJOURN

MOVED by J. Mitchell
SECONDED by L. Armstrong

THAT the meeting adjourn at 12:17 p.m.

CARRIED

COMMITTEE CHAIR, J. Wideman

COMMITTEE CLERK, M. Grivicic
Homer Watson Boulevard at Block Line Road Review

January 31, 2011
Homer Watson Boulevard and Block Line Road Road Review

August 14, 2011

- Roundabout fully operational
- Higher than expected frequency of fail-to-yield on entry collisions

Region retained the services of CIMA+ to complete an independent traffic operations and safety review of the roundabout.
Homer Watson Boulevard and Block Line Road Road Review

- CIMA+ findings
  - Roundabout adheres to North American state-of-the-art design guidelines
  - Pedestrian operation appears to be very good
    - Majority of drivers stop for pedestrians
    - Pedestrians exhibit appropriate due caution
  - Higher than expected fail-to-yield collisions
Homer Watson Boulevard and Block Line Road Road Review

- CIMA+ Recommendations:
  - Implement Ontario Traffic Manual Book 15 Concepts (Type 2 PXO)
Homer Watson Boulevard and Block Line Road Road Review

- CIMA+ Recommendations:
  - Revise "Stop for Pedestrian" sign back to "Yield to Pedestrian" sign
  - Defer overhead signs until OTM design is confirmed
Homer Watson Boulevard and Block Line Road Road Review

• CIMA+ Recommendations:
  • Enhance crossing conditions for persons with disabilities through installation of Type 2 PXO
  • Do not relocate crosswalks
  • Maintain crossing guards until installation of Type 2 PXO
Homer Watson Boulevard and Block Line Road Road Review

• CIMA+ Recommendations

- Paint circulating lane lines
- Paint pavement marking arrows
Homer Watson Boulevard and Block Line Road Review

• CIMA+

Recommendations

• Paint lane designation arrows on entry
Homer Watson Boulevard and Block Line Road Road Review

- CIMA+ Recommendations

- Paint shark teeth yield lines
Homer Watson Boulevard and Block Line Road Review

- CIMA+ Recommendations:
  - Replace "To oncoming traffic" sign tab with "To all traffic in roundabout"
  - Use Portable Variable Message Signs to educate drivers on proper yielding procedures (in addition to current messages reminding motorists to yield/stop for pedestrian)
Homer Watson Boulevard and Block Line Road Review

- CIMA+ Recommendations:
  - Focus signalling education on right-turn signal for time being.
  - Enhance central island landscaping.
Homer Watson Boulevard and Block Line Road Road Review

- CIMA+ Recommendations:
  - Reduce the southbound approach to 2 lanes
Homer Watson Boulevard and Block Line Road Review

Spring 2012
Homer Watson Boulevard and Block Line Road Road Review

Thank you
Chair Wideman and members of Planning and Works Standing Committee,

My name is Jennifer Urosevic and I am the Regional Manager, Service and Operations for the local CNIB office. As a member of the Waterloo CNIB office for the past 14 years I have worked closely with the Region of Waterloo consulting on Accessible Traffic Signals and Grand River Transit.

In Canada, vision loss is usually defined as a visual acuity of less than 20/40 in the better-seeing eye, even with corrective lenses. Blindness (a subset of vision loss) is defined as 20/200 or worse in the better-seeing eye, even with corrective lenses, or a visual field of less than 20 degrees in the horizontal plane. In Canada more than one million people have self identified themselves as living with blindness or partial sight which represents over 510,000 people in Ontario. After age 40, the number of cases of blindness or partial sight doubles approximately every decade. At 75, it triples.

The report prepared by Bob Henderson indicates that the “Region of Waterloo has set a precedent which provides pedestrians the right of way over vehicles at roundabouts which benefits all members of our community” however there are many factors that have not been addressed that are specific to someone who blind or partially sighted.

- Sighted pedestrians have the advantage over pedestrians who are blind or partially sighted in being able to judge gaps and detect yielding vehicles using both visual and auditory information.
• Lack of access to visual information places the pedestrian who is blind or partially sighted at a distinct disadvantage.

• The distance at which single vehicles can be detected is shorter, perception of direction from which single vehicles are coming is less precise, perception of vehicle movement is very difficult on curving paths, perception of rate of approach is less precise, the sound of a vehicle that has just passed the crosswalk can mask the sound of an approaching vehicle, and it is often difficult to detect the presence of a yielding vehicle.

• The presence of multiple vehicles enhances all these difficulties. As a consequence of these difficulties, pedestrians who are blind or partially sighted typically delay crossing longer than pedestrians who are not.

• This may result in a yielding driver accelerating at precisely the same time as the pedestrian who is blind or partially sighted decides to begin to cross.

• Sighted pedestrians also have the advantage in that they can attempt to force yields given the ability to establish non-verbal (visual) communication with the approaching drivers. Pedestrians who are blind or partially sighted lack that advantage.

• For any crossing situation where the pedestrian only faces one conflicting lane, crossing opportunities are uniquely defined by the vehicle state in that lane. However, at a two or three lane crossing, the individual needs to consider the vehicle state in up to three lanes. The individual of two-lane crossings therefore distinguishes between driver behavior in the near lane (the closest lane relative to the position of the pedestrian) and the far lane.
Furthermore the report indicates that staff routinely solicits community feedback and that staff “will work collaboratively with member of the community with visual impairment and CNIB to identify concerns in advance of the installation of roundabouts.” The track record of working collaboratively on roundabouts is non-existent.

On December 16th, 2009, a letter was sent to the transportation department regarding CNIB’s concerns with the accessibility of roundabouts and requested a meeting.

January – March 2011 CNIB participated in several round table discussions regarding accessibility and requested to meet with regional staff.

On October 31, 2011, an email was sent to the transportation staff outlining our concerns and provides some recommendations. Staff responded and indicated that a report was being compiled and it would be shared once completed. A phone call was received on January 25th after registering as a delegate for this meeting. I received a brief summary of the report but was told that the report would be available on Friday January 27th after 4:00pm.

Moving forward CNIB recommends that:

1. The expertise of an Orientation and Mobility Specialist be consulted on safe travel skills of people who are blind or partially sighted. (An Orientation and Mobility Specialist receives training from a post graduate program on teaching safe travel skills to people who are blind or partially sighted.)

2. The Planning and Works Committee review US Research studies on how to make roundabouts safe and accessible to pedestrians who are blind and partially sighted ranging from
flashing beacons and audible sound strips, to raised crosswalks, automated yield detection systems and Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons (HAWK signal).

Institute for Transportation Research & Education - North Carolina State University

http://itre.ncsu.edu/ITRE/research/Pedestrian-Accessibility/index.html


Pedestrian Access to Modern Roundabouts: Design and Operational Issues for Pedestrians who are Blind

http://www.access-board.gov/research/roundabouts/bulletin.htm


3. The Planning and Works Committee and The Region of Waterloo to set a precedent in installing research proven accessible pedestrian crosswalk at all roundabouts with pedestrian traffic.
My name is Dawn Clelland. I am a resident of Kitchener and I come here today, wearing three hats. I am President of VIEWS, a not for profit, support and advocacy group for children, who are blind or have low vision, and their families. We work in partnership with the Ministry of Education, to create positive educational opportunities for our children. We work collaboratively with the CNIB, and other stakeholders, to ensure best possible outcomes for people who are visually impaired.

I am also a member of a national group called the Consumer Advocacy Committee. We look at international best practices, for universal design, and create standards and recommendations, which are presented to the appropriate governments. We recently completed a guideline for Accessible Pedestrian Signals, and are currently creating guidelines for safe, accessible roundabouts, using the most up to date best practices, in design.

Thirdly, and most importantly, I am the parent of a 13 year old daughter, who is blind. She is a wonderful musician, playing piano, drums and clarinet. She is funny, charismatic, optimistic and composes the most beautiful songs, inspiring everyone she knows. My daughter is fearless... she swims, wakeboards, downhill skis and bikes. Her goal is to represent her country in the Olympics, downhill skiing. A great deal of effort, expense and love has gone into the development of
Alyssa, from service agencies, such as the CNIB, the Ministry of Health, Ministry of Education and us, her family. Our goal has been to raise a child who is strong, capable and independent, able to be a contributing, tax-paying member of society.

A large part of being independent is the ability to travel safely from one location to another. People who are blind or have low vision are pedestrians, by necessity, rather than by choice. If our sidewalks and streets are not accessible for them, then they become isolated and restricted to specific routes of travel, if any are available. The more roundabouts created without state of the art, universally designed features built in, the more limitations we are choosing to place on them. This goes in complete opposition to their human rights, under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, subsection 6, Freedom of Mobility. It is also in contradiction with our provincial governments philosophy of universal design, as is evidenced by the AODA.

I love our community! I think we have done some pretty amazing things with our downtowns. I believe our region gets a lot of things right, and I truly think that you operate with the best of intentions. I know, however, that our streetscapes are not blind friendly.

I have twins – one sighted – one blind. When we walk to the market, my son will make a beeline. My
daughter, however, will need assistance. Not because she does not know her way – we go there every week. But, because we have no tactile markings on our streets to indicate the crosswalk, my daughter will often veer into traffic. Because, the slope of our curb cuts are often too shallow and do not have effective tactile indicators, often she will miss the fact that she is even crossing the road.

We cut little lines in our sidewalk, which are often not cane detectable in the ideal conditions of summer, to indicate the entrance to a street crossing. Yet, studies have already been completed identifying ideal indicators for all exceptionalities, in winter or summer conditions. These are now standards in the industry.

We have the interesting perspective that some intersections are so dangerous that sighted people need pedestrian signals, yet, we believe that the blind should be able to safely cross, by using their hearing. All pedestrian signals must be accessible. The current practice of having the CNIB request an accessible pedestrian signal is paternalistic and inequitable. Imagine your world being limited to the routes somebody teaches you, while everybody else gets to travel anywhere they want. That is the world our region has created for their blind citizens. We should be going with best practices for accessibility in a consistent, planned manner and then communicating that with the Grand River Accessibility Advisory
Committee, rather than having it on a case by case basis. For the citizen, who is blind, consistency is essential for independence. All APS buttons need to be in the same place, so they can locate them.

In my work with the Consumer Advocacy Committee, I have had the opportunity to discuss our roundabout situation with Dr. Bastian Schroeder, one of the lead researchers on the Institute for Transportation Research and Education (ITRE) at the NC State University. There has been a great deal of research completed on improving safety for sight-impaired pedestrians at roundabouts.

When I explained our Homer Watson roundabout, to him, he was quite surprised and said that roundabout would be in contradiction to the Guidelines for Accessible Public Rights-of-Way, in his country.

They have been actively researching this challenge for almost a decade and have created some terrific ideas I would like to share with you today.

There are different treatments for different lanes of roundabouts when installed in communities.

All roundabouts need clear indicators to define direction of travel for pedestrians, which could include low landscaping, such as grass or low shrubs or railings. There needs to be Tactile Walking Surface Indicators
(TWSIs) to indicate when you are going to enter and exit the street crossing. The CNIB has a standard for these TWSIs, which is readily available through them. I have included a drawing taken from “Clearing Our Path”, a CNIB publication.

![Diagram of TWSIs]

Single lane roundabouts, with lower traffic volume, need sound strips, which are just slightly raised mounds of pavement, creating sound when the tires go over it. It requires pedestrian activated flashers, and ideally, raised sidewalks, as indicated in the picture I have included.
Visualization taken from ITRE website.
Blind Pedestrians Access to Roundabouts and Other Complex Intersections

Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon

A Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon (also known as a HAWK Signal) installed at a two-lane roundabout in Golden, CO for evaluation under NCHRP Project 3-78a.

The signal is intended to stop vehicular traffic when a pedestrian activates the signal and intends to cross.

Schematic of the phasing sequence of the Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon/HAWK Signal

Figure 4F-3. Sequence for a Pedestrian Hybrid Signal

1. Dark Until Activated
2. Flashing Yellow Upon Activation
3. Steady Yellow
4. Steady Red During Pedestrian Walk Interval
5. Alternating Flashing Red During Pedestrian Clearance Interval
6. Dark Again Until Activated

Legend
- SY Steady yellow
- FY Flashing yellow
- SR Steady red
- FR Flashing red

Image from FHWA
Multi lane roundabouts require pedestrian signals. The one they found most effective was the Pedestrian Hybrid Signal (also known as the HAWK). I have included a picture, with my presentation. When there is no pedestrian, the signal is dark. When the button is activated, it flashes yellow, then goes to a steady yellow, giving traffic time to slow and then stop. When the steady red is displayed, the audible, vibrating tactile indicator alerts the pedestrians that it is safe to cross. It then flashes red during the pedestrian clearance interval. On a street with a wide median between incoming and outgoing lanes of the roundabout, there will be two such HAWK pedestrian crossings. This makes the time shorter for traffic to be halted for each lane of traffic.

After a lawsuit in Oakland County, Michigan, studies have shown that there really is no safe, accessible method for visually impaired and blind pedestrians to cross more than two lanes of traffic, at a roundabout. The only real option is to create an above or below ground pedestrian crossing. In this presentation, I have included some websites that you can use for more information.

The other really awesome thing about accessibility is that it benefits everyone. I printed this using a larger font. Wasn’t it much easier for you to follow along, rather than having to put on your reading glasses? Accessibility just makes sense for everyone.
Creating accessible streets is not something that just happens, it is something we must choose to happen. If we are not following the best practices available to us, then we, as a community, must acknowledge that we are choosing to create public places, which are only public to people without special needs. The technology is available, the research has been done, let’s live up to our reputation as a forward-thinking, progressive community and follow the standards discussed here today.
Further Reading Opportunities

- Link to the Final Report of the Oakland County, Michigan lawsuit. This document contains research results of a Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon (PHB, aka HAWK Signal) and a Rectangular Rapid-Flashing Beacon (RRFB) system at both two-lane and three-lane approaches to roundabouts.

- Link to our NCHRP 674 report. This contains findings from the Raised Crosswalk (RCW) and a PHB installation at a multilane roundabout, findings from three single lane roundabouts without treatments, and findings from a channelized turn lane with a flashing yellow beacon and sound strips.
  http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/nchrp/nchrp_rpt_674.pdf

- Link to the US Access Board proposed rulemaking (PROWAG).
  http://www.access-board.gov/prowac/nprm.htm

- Link to ITRE accessibility website, which includes a lot of publication links and downloadable .pdf files of presentations on the topic.
  http://www.itre.ncsu.edu/ITRE/research/Pedestrian-Accessibility/index.html
  http://www.itre.ncsu.edu/ITRE/research/Pedestrian-Accessibility/publications.html
OUR MEMBERS ENJOY

Annual residential camps which include Music Camp for Braille Users and Views Camp Freedom (Independent Living Skills Camp). These are week long camps which teach children specific skills set in a fun, interactive camp environment.

VIEWS Family Week at Lake Joseph is an opportunity for families to enjoy time together in a recreational environment designed to accommodate the individual who is blind or has low vision. Some of the sports they enjoy with their families are wake boarding, waterskiing, canoeing, and sailing.

The VIEWSletter which highlights great places to explore, Orientation and Mobility concepts, ideas on ways to teach daily living skills, updates on policy and programming, upcoming events and various other features.

Annual General Meeting with conference featuring guest speakers, workshops and information sessions relating to the abilities and needs of children who are blind or have low vision and their families.

VIEWS helps families receive the information, resources and support that they require. VIEWS educates policy makers, families and the public about the abilities and needs of children who are blind or have low vision.

CONTACT INFORMATION:
Mail: VIEWS c/o
PO Box 298, Oil Springs, ON, NON IPO
Phone: 519-616-4397
Web: www.viewson.ca
Email: contact@viewson.ca
Charitable 011928-5872R0001
MISSION STATEMENT

VIEWS is a non-profit provincial support and advocacy organization, working with other stakeholders, advocating for and providing opportunities to assist children who are blind or have low vision in reaching their full potential. VIEWS helps families receive the information, resources and support that they require.

VIEWS educates policy makers, families and the public about the abilities and needs of children who are blind or have low vision.

CURRENT VIEWS INITIATIVES

Advocating to ensure that every child who is blind or has low vision in our province, receives the support of a Specialist Teacher of the Blind, Orientation and Mobility Instructor, Transcriber and Educational Assistant in their school, as mandated by P.P.M. 76C.

Promoting the necessity of the implementation of the Essential Skills for Accessibility (Expanded Core Curriculum) as identified by Dr. Phil Hatlen, that it be taught to all children who are blind or have low vision in our province. These skills include literacy, numeracy, assistive technology, orientation and mobility, independent living, recreation, personal management, leisure, social, career, life management, visual efficiency and self-determination skills. These are written into the IEP as an alternative Program.

Supporting Short Term Programs, in conjunction with W. Ross Macdonald School, to work on specific skills for children who are blind or have low vision and their families. Encouraging educational opportunities for professionals, paraprofessionals and our children, especially in math and science.

In partnership with the Ministry of Education and CNIB, creating an implementation plan and learning opportunities for teachers, in Unified English Braille (UEB), which is the Braille code recently adopted by the Canadian Braille Authority (CBA).

Creating and nurturing partnerships with organizations, educators and researchers to improve opportunities and standards for children who are blind or have low vision. Hosting workshops for members and the community interested in learning more about the abilities and needs of children who are blind or have low vision. Assessing and evaluating programs currently in place, for our children, to ensure that high quality standards are met and maintained. Advocating for equality in services to our children in all areas of the Province of Ontario.

Advocating for increased access to reading materials in Braille (uncontracted and contracted), tactile and large print formats.
Grand River Transit & UPASS Programs

Federation of Students, University of Waterloo
Graduate Student Association, University of Waterloo
Wilfrid Laurier University Students’ Union

January 31, 2012
Background

• Throughout 2006/2007 the Federation of Students, Wilfrid Laurier Students’ Union, and UW and WLU Graduate Students’ Associations began providing UPASS programs through Grand River Transit to their student populations.

• All members of each association are assessed a UPASS fee on a per term basis, with no opt-out option available (with very few exceptions).

• Each of the student associations are responsible for negotiating the terms for the UPASS program on an annual basis.
Background

GRT has articulated the following core principles for its U-Pass Programs:

• Universal Participation
• Economies of Scale
• Financial Sustainability
Over the past several years there have been serious concerns around the annual changes to UPASS programs, particularly with respect to increasing prices and service standards. This puts the core principles of the UPASS program at risk.

**Annual Price & Percentage Increases (UW Feds):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>UPASS Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>6.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>15%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Presented as a one time increase to adjust cost-recovery

Subsequently over the last several years, Regional Council has approved annual general ridership increases at a significantly lower rate.
Core Objectives

Maintain the core principles of UPASS Programs:

• Universal Access
• Economies of Scale
• Financial Sustainability

Partner with the Region of Waterloo to:

• Ensure affordability and predictability for students
• Put all organizations in a place to succeed heading into LRT
Summary of Concerns

• Efficacy and consistency of annual negotiations
• Rapid increases to price over the past few years
• Establishing a pricing model that is successful for each of the respective student associations & GRT
• Customer service response mechanisms
Long Term Agreement

Recommendation 1:
Grand River Transit enters into separate long-term agreements with Feds, WLUSU, and UW GSA for the U-Pass Service, which includes rates, rate increases, and terms of service, and terms for renegotiation.

• Annual increases have been inconsistent since the inception of the U-Pass Programs. Under the current arrangement it is impossible to predict what increases for the following year will look like.

• A long-term agreement would allow predictable and consistent pricing for both students and GRT. This would allow for better strategic planning, and allow GRT better work toward its long-term cost recovery goals. It would create efficiencies for the student organizations, and allow for more clarity and communication to student users.
The GRT Business Plan proposes **raising the ‘base fee’ to $68.33**, followed by a **9% increase on the new base fee**, bringing the base fee to **$74.48**. Following this increase, GRT proposes that all further increases **be tied to General Ridership Increases** as approved by Regional Council (forecasted at 9% per year for the next five years).

**Proposed Increases to GRT UPASS Fees:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage Increase</th>
<th>UPASS Fee Per Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>$53.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$60.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>$74.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>$81.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>$88.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>$96.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>$105.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UPASS Business Model

The UPASS model is significantly different than General Ridership, and warrants special consideration for it’s pricing model:

• Guaranteed Upfront Revenue
• Economies of Scale
• Concentrated Service Demands
Students’ Price & Rate Increase Proposal

Recommendation 2:
Any fee increases be assessed at 50% of the General Fare increases, as approved by Regional Council, with a maximum annual increase of 5%. These increases should be based on the current base price of $60.64.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage Increase</th>
<th>UPASS Fee Per Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$60.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>$63.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>$66.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>$69.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>$72.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>$75.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation 3:
Any agreement between GRT and student associations will include minimum service standards and customer service response mechanisms

• Service standards, including hours of service, wait times, accessibility for students with physical disabilities or injury, and bussing capacity will be an important component of establishing reliable transit offerings going forward. In addition to setting standards for service, mechanisms for response from GRT must also be created.

• Any agreement between GRT and one of the student associations should make clear the expectations on both parties for gathering and responding to service inquires and/or concerns.
Summary of Recommendations

• Separate five year agreements between GRT and each of the student organizations

• Maintain current base fee of $60.64

• Assess 50% of General Ridership increases to UPASS programs in the long term agreement

• Establish minimum service standards and mechanisms for customer service response
Background:

In 2007, the Federation of Students (Feds) entered into an agreement with Grand River Transit (GRT) to offer a Universal bus pass program (U-Pass) for its student constituents at the University of Waterloo. All full time students at UW are assessed a U-Pass fee on a per term basis, with no opt-out option available (with very few exceptions). Feds is primarily responsible for the administration of the program, and negotiates rates on an annual basis with GRT. When the U-Pass programs were established the pricing model was based on cost-recovery of operational costs associated with running the U-Pass program. Similar arrangements are also in place with the University of Waterloo Graduate Student Association, Wilfrid Laurier University Students’ Union, and the Wilfrid Laurier Graduate Students Association. GRT has articulated the following core principles for its U-Pass Programs:

- Universal Participation
- Economies of Scale
- Financial Sustainability

In 2011 GRT approached Feds with a proposal to make significant increases to the U-Pass fee, citing issues of cost-recovery as a major driver for the increase. The Federation of Students has serious concerns over consecutive increases above what would normally be expected for a program of this nature, and what it will mean for accessibility and affordability for University of Waterloo Students. As such, Feds is seeking support from Regional Council in negotiating terms of agreement for the GRT U-Pass program on a going forward basis.

**Recommendation 1:** Grand River Transit enters into separate long-term agreements with Feds and WLUSU for the U-Pass Service, which includes rates, rate increases, and terms of service, and terms for renegotiation.

Currently negotiations for the price of U-Pass programs are taking place on an annual basis, and are often complicated by turnover of student executive and negotiating under the confines of Feds bylaws and requirements for passing fee increases.

Annual increases have been inconsistent since the inception of the U-Pass Program in 2007. Under the current arrangement it is impossible to predict what increases for the following year will look like. This creates difficulty for GRT from the perspective of planning and financing service offerings, Feds as administrators of the program, and student users who pay for the program.

A long-term agreement would allow predictable and consistent pricing for both students and GRT. This would allow for better strategic planning, and allow GRT better work toward its long-term cost recovery goals. It would create efficiencies for the student organizations, and allow for more clarity and communication to student users. The core goals of a long-term agreement are:
- **Economies of Scale** – universal access means that people who are paying for the service are not utilizing it, and allows for major efficiencies in terms of serving a set population. Feds has been very responsive to the GRT's concerns over ridership controls in order to ensure that those that are not paying into the service are not taking advantage of it. If the base price of the U-Pass continues to climb at inconsistent and often high rates, opt-out opportunities may have to be made available to students, compromising the principles of universal access and economies of scale.

- **Concentrated Service Demands** – The U-Pass program puts specific demand on the core university areas and the accompanying bus lines. While students have access to and take advantage of service to other areas, the majority of U-Pass related ridership is confined to a small area with specific service needs and costs for meeting those needs.

Given the important differences in these business models, Feds and WULUSU are requesting that, in the proposed five-year agreement, any fee increases be assessed at 50% of the General Fare increases, as approved by Regional Council, with a maximum annual increase of 5%. These increases should be based on the Federation of Students' current base price of $60.84.

| Recommendation 3: Any agreement between GRT and Feds will include minimum service standards and customer service response mechanisms |

There are unique service demands within the core areas of the two universities, which often times students feel have not been adequately met. It is vital that students have reliable transportation to campus, both from a safety perspective and from an access perspective. Service standards, including hours of service, wait times, accessibility for students with physical disabilities or injury, and bussing capacity will be an important component of establishing reliable transit offerings going forward. In addition to setting standards for service, mechanisms for response from GRT must also be created. Any agreement between GRT and one of the student associations should make clear the expectations on both parties for gathering and responding to service inquiries and/or concerns.
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Background

GRT 2000
- 9.4 million riders
- 330,000 service hours
- 140 buses

GRT 2011
- 19.7 million riders
- 550,000 service hours
- 238 buses

GRT 2014
- 23.3 million riders
- 680,000 service hours
- 252 buses
Service Strategy
2011 Service Plan

Route 32 Extended to end of Kumpf Dr.
Route 7 Evening Service Increased and UWWaterloo-bound 7E buses moved from Regina St to King St.
Route 29 extended to The Boardwalk on Ira Needles Blvd and to King and University.
Route 12 rerouted to Westmount Rd, Summer Frequency Increased.
Route 4 extended to The Boardwalk on Ira Needles Blvd during Evenings and Saturdays.
IXpress Frequency and Hours of Operation increased, New Stop added at King St and Victoria St.
Additional Route 52 service added via Fountain St.
IXpress via Fischer-Hallman Rd Introduced.
Route 61 and Route 111 Extended to Conestoga College South Campus.
Route 52 Frequency Increased.
Hespeler area routes changed to improve efficiency, expand service coverage, and reduce travel times.
Route 72 changed to improve efficiency.
2012 Service Plan

- Extend hours of operation of Route 13 Laurierwood on Saturdays to 10 p.m.
- Extend Sunday morning and evening service on various Cambridge area routes
- iXpress Saturday evening and Sunday evening Hours of Operation increased
- Introduction of Doon South BusPLUS service connecting to Conestoga College
- Restructure northeast Galt and L.G. Lovell Industrial area routes
- Extend Sunday morning and evening service on various Cambridge area routes
2014 Service Plan

Legend:
- Route 6 Bridgeport
- Route 23 Idlewood
- Route 31 Lexington
- Route 55 St. Andrews
- Route 56 Dunbar
- Route 59 Christopher
- Route 60 Northview Acres
- Route 61 Fisher Mills
- Route 71 Mclain

- Other GRT Routes
- Road Network
- Regional Municipal Boundaries

- Increase frequency of service on Sundays to every 30 minutes from the current 60, between 10am and 6pm on various Cambridge area routes.
- Provide Sunday service on Route 6 Bridgeport.
- Extend Route 23 Idlewood weekday and evening service to Fairview Mall Terminal.
- Extend Route 31 Lexington weekday evening service.
- aBRT connecting Ainslie Street Terminal with Fairview Pall.
Township Service

Demand responsive zone bus to/from Conestoga Mall one to two days a week

Semi-express weekday peak service between New Hamburg, Baden, Petersburg and new Boardwalk Terminal

Existing Elmira / St. Jacobs Service (all day, six days a week)

Park and Ride facilities

Semi-express weekday peak service between Breslau and Downtown Kitchener

Semi-express weekday peak service between Ayr and Ainslie or Sportsworld Terminal

Semi-express weekday peak service between Breslau, Baden, Petersburg and new Boardwalk Terminal

Existing Elmira / St. Jacobs Service (all day, six days a week)
Interregional Service: Bus
Interregional Service: Rail
## Financial Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Service Hours</th>
<th>Expansion Buses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011 - 2018</td>
<td>Reserve Fund*</td>
<td>138,000</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 - 2018</td>
<td>Efficiency Improvements</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2017</td>
<td>Reallocated from Central Transit Corridor (200 iXpress)</td>
<td>71,732</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Reallocated from Route 7D/E</td>
<td>13,728</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Service Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>242,460</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Service Expansion (net of reallocation of existing service)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>138,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage Increase to GRT service, 2011 - 2018</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>25%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fare Strategy

- Achieve a 50% cost recovery
- Increase fares between 5% and 9% per year
- Increase U-Pass fees to equalize R/C
  - Future increases with general fare structure
Marketing Strategy

• Target Markets for ridership growth
  – Commuters
  – Secondary & post-secondary students
  – Seniors, new Canadians and interregional travellers

• Survey target markets to measure effectiveness of marketing efforts

• Work with GO Transit to develop joint information and marketing programs

• Develop a multi-year marketing plan in support of the business plan
Strategy Alignment

• Network Redesign to integrate with LRT and aBRT
  – Providing seamless connections between bus & rail
• Improved transit system
  – Achieve mode share target of RTMP
  – Provide a sustainable transportation system
  – Help achieve a compact urban form as prescribed in Provincial Policy Statement and ROP
Next Steps

• Public Consultation for 2012 service improvements
• Begin planning 2013 service
• Fare increase July 1, 2012
• New U-Pass agreements
• Multi-year marketing plan
• Smart card fare system strategy