The following are the minutes of the Regular Council meeting held at 7:00 p.m. in the Regional Council Chamber, 150 Frederick Street, Kitchener, Ontario, with the following members present: Chair K. Seiling, L. Armstrong, J. Brewer, T. Cowan, D. Craig, R. Deutschmann, T. Galloway, J. Haalboom, B. Halloran, R. Kelterborn, G. Lorentz, J. Mitchell, J. Wideman, and C. Zehr.

Members Absent: C. Millar, S. Strickland

DELIBERATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST UNDER THE MUNICIPAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT

None declared.

PRESENTATIONS

a) Lee Fitzpatrick, Chair, Children’s Safety Village Governing Committee, Lisa Hummel, Coordinator, Children’s Safety Village and Tom Ruggle, Chief Fire Prevention Officer, City of Kitchener appeared before Council to provide a presentation. A copy of the presentation is appended to the original minutes. They highlighted the Children’s Safety Village is in its 19th year of operation and provided an overview of the programs they provide. The presentation included a review of the history, partnerships, donors, mission, focus, motto, police and fire education centers, special events, children’s hero awards and sponsors.

Members of Council had questions related to roundabout education and number of schools that utilize the village. L. Hummel advised they opened a roundabout in the village in 2010 and they currently reach over 70% of the students in Waterloo Region.

DELEGATIONS

a) Hespeler Road/CPR Grade Separation delegations cancelled prior to the meeting.

b) Rail Transit Funding and Option:

Chair Seiling advised there will be additional reports coming in the future with respect to Rapid Transit.

i) Taxpayers for Sensible Transit (Peter Taylor, Ruth Haworth, Sharon Martin, Norm Knutson, Ron Smith, Richard Hobson, Penny Hobson and Rahul Racharla) appeared before Council. A copy of their submission is appended to the original minutes. P. Taylor advised light rail transit was the dominant issue in the last election. He provided their position and reasons for opposing rail as it is too expensive and inflexible. He stated the solution is not to ignore public opinion but listen to the public and bring buses back to the agenda. R. Haworth provided highlights of the survey that was completed by their organization and stated they support the proposal from Doug Craig to improve the current bus service. R. Smith stated he is a taxpayer and business owner and the costs represent big numbers.
and big responsibilities. He expressed concern as this will be a huge burden to the taxpayers and business owners and questioned how much extra the project will cost with overruns. He stated they are pro-transit and buses make more sense for this Region.

ii) Tim Mollison, TriTAG.ca appeared before Council, stating light rail transit (lrt) was not chosen because it had a lower capital cost. He stated the Region has not yet released a map explaining the lrt feeder buses. He urged the Region to invest in communicating with taxpayers and referenced the Hamilton experience as an example. He agreed that Cambridge should get lrt but ridership targets needs to be publicly set and met. He referenced escalating labour costs and stated the investment should be in lrt. A copy of his submission is appended to the original minutes.

iii) Robert Milligan, New Dundee appeared before Council and advised this is innovative technology and a world class innovative system is expected of this Region. He stated the system needs to be business friendly and improve the quality of life. He highlighted the reasons for his preference for lrt and suggested modifying the plan to realize cost effective potential by using the current rail right of way from the Stockyards north of Waterloo to the Ainslie Street terminal in Cambridge. The by-product will be greater rapid transit fairness for Cambridge.

iv) Douglas Gregory, Kitchener appeared before Council and disagreed with the premise of the motion from Doug Craig. He stated we do not yet know the tax ramifications and the citizens stand to gain from the lrt proposal. He related his own experience with relocating his company to this area and the difficulty in attracting and retaining employees. The lrt proposal will drive development, urban intensification and long term capacity and he urged Council to continue moving forward with the lrt plan.

v) Andrew Dodds, Waterloo appeared before Council and stated there is recognition that solutions are required and there is a need to move forward. There has been a lack of communication. He advised intensification is required to help manage growth and arteries are needed to grow. With respect to costs, the alternatives can be considered and he has sympathy for Cambridge not being included in the first phase. A. Dodds provided an overview of capital versus operating costs and referenced the life span of trains versus buses. He stated all costs need to be considered.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

MOVED by G. Lorentz
SECONDED by L. Armstrong

THAT the following Minutes be approved:

a) Planning & Works Public Meeting – November 23, 2010
b) Closed Council – November 24, 2010
c) Council – November 24, 2010
d) Closed Council – December 8, 2010
e) Inaugural Council – December 8, 2010
f) Closed Committee – January 11, 2011
c) Planning & Works – January 11, 2011
h) Administration & Finance – January 11, 2011
i) Special Council – January 11, 2011
j) Community Services – January 11, 2011

CARRIED

COMMUNICATIONS

a) Cambridge Councillor Nicholas Ermeta regarding D. Craig’s Notice of Motion (Item 15a) was received for information.

MOVED by T. Cowan
SECONDED by B. Halloran

THAT Council go into Committee of the Whole to consider reports.

CARRIED

FINANCE REPORTS

a) F-11-002, T2010-144 Construction of Municipal Supply Wells

MOVED by J. Wideman
SECONDED by T. Galloway

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo accept the tender of Gerrits Drilling & Engineering Limited for the Construction of Municipal Supply Wells at a total price of $1,109,249.74 including all applicable taxes.

CARRIED

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Planning and Works

The Summary of Recommendations of the Planning and Works Committee was presented by Jim Wideman, Chair of the Committee.

MOVED by J. Wideman
SECONDED by C. Zehr

THAT the Summary of Recommendations of the Planning and Works Committee, dated January 11, 2011, Items 1 to 6, and 5 reports from closed session, Items 7 to 11, be adopted as follows:


2. 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>Local Municipality</th>
<th>Suggested Council Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Emergency Services Training and Research Complex - User Group Committee (WRESTRC)</td>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td>L. Armstrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>MobilityPLUS Business Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Haalboom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>2011 Transit Service Improvement Plan (Kitchener/Waterloo)</td>
<td>Kitchener/Waterloo</td>
<td>J. Haalboom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>2011 Transit Service Improvement Plan (Cambridge)</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>J. Brewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>2011-2014 GRT Business Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Wideman S. Strickland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Active Transportation Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>G. Lorentz J. Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Waterloo Spur Multi Use Trail</td>
<td>Kitchener/Waterloo</td>
<td>To be assigned 1 Regional Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Trussler Road Improvements, - New Dundee Road to Bleams Road - Design in 2011 - Construction in 2012</td>
<td>Kitchener/Wilmot</td>
<td>T. Galloway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Northfield Drive Widening, Davenport Road to University Avenue - EA and Design in 2011-2014 - Construction in 2015</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>S. Strickland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Frederick St Improvements, King St. to Lancaster St. - Design in 2011-2012 - Construction in 2013</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>J. Haalboom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Local Municipality</td>
<td>Suggested Council Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Hiway 401 Access Improvements Study, Trussler Road to Homer Watson Boulevard</td>
<td>Kitchener and North Dumfries</td>
<td>J. Wideman S. Strickland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Environmental Assessment in 2011-2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>East Boundary Road Corridor Planning Study</td>
<td>Cambridge and North Dumfries</td>
<td>J. Brewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Water Resources Protection Liaison Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>To be assigned 1 Regional Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Haalboom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Integrated Urban System Groundwater Study</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>J. Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Wilmot Centre Monitoring Program and Public Liaison Committee</td>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td>L. Armstrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Wells W6/W7/W8 Class Environmental Assessment</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>B. Halloran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Strange Street System Class EA Update</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>J. Haalboom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Woolwich Water/Wastewater Master Plan</td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>T. Cowan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>Biosolids Master Plan Update</td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Wideman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>Speed River (Hespeler WWTP) and Nith River (New Hamburg WWTP) Assimilative</td>
<td>Cambridge and Wilmot</td>
<td>C. Millar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AND THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo forward the requests for local Councillor representatives on project and study teams to the Area Municipalities found in Appendix A to Report E-11-009/P-11-002, dated January 11, 2011.

3. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo request from the Provincial government an extension to Federal and Provincial funding to October 31, 2011 for the following projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Total Eligible Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Stimulus Fund (ISF)</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>Replacement of the Hespeler Wastewater Treatment Plant Raw Sewage Pumping Station</td>
<td>$9,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISF</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>Upgrade the Galt and Preston Wastewater Treatment Plants SCADA System</td>
<td>$9,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISF</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>Upgrade of the Galt Wastewater Treatment Plant Digester</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISF</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>Waterloo Landfill Gas Pipeline Twinning</td>
<td>$1,650,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo attests that it will continue to contribute its share of the required funding for the aforementioned projects;

AND THAT actual claims for all eligible costs incurred by March 31, 2011, for the aforementioned projects must be and will be submitted no later than April 30, 2011;

AND THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo will ensure that the projects will be completed;

AND authorize the Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services to enter into any necessary amendments to the ISF Contribution Agreements with the Federal and Provincial governments. [E-11-007]

4. 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 road improvements to Trussler Road, in the City of Kitchener and the Township of Wilmot, in the Region of Waterloo as detailed in report CR-RS-11-001 dated January 11, 2011:

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 road improvements to Trussler Road and described as follows:

**Fee Simple Partial Taking:**

1. Part Lot 1, Concession 1, Block ‘A’, Township of Wilmot, being Part 1, on Reference Plan 58R-16917, PIN 22186-0234(LT) (1040 Huron Road)

2. Part Lot 1, Concession 1, Block ‘A’, Township of Wilmot, being Part 2, on Reference Plan 58R-16917, PIN 22186-0233(LT) (1465 Trussler Road)

3. Part Lot 1, Concession 1, Block ‘A’, Township of Wilmot, being Part 3, on Reference Plan 58R-16917, PIN 22186-0232(LT) (1359 Trussler Road)
4. Part Lot 136, German Company Tract, City of Kitchener, being Part 5, on Reference Plan 58R-16917, PIN 22728-0010(LT) (1434 Trussler Road)

5. Part Lot 135, German Company Tract, City of Kitchener, being Part 6, on Reference Plan 58R-16917, PIN 22728-0009(LT) (no municipal address)

6. Part Lot 1, Concession South of Bleam’s Road, Township of Wilmot, being Part 7, on Reference Plan 58R-16917, PIN 22186-0211(LT) (1259 Trussler Road)

7. Part Lot 1, Concession South of Bleam’s Road, Township of Wilmot, being Part 8, on Reference Plan 58R-16917, PIN 22186-0210(LT) (1177 Trussler Road)

8. Part Lots 129, 133 & 134, German Company Tract, City of Kitchener, being Part , on Reference Plan 58R-16917, PIN 22728-0005(LT) (no municipal address)

9. Part Lot 1, Concession South of Bleam’s Road, Township of Wilmot, being Part 10, on Reference Plan 58R-16917, PIN 22186-0205(LT) (no municipal address)

10. Part Lot 129, German Company Tract, City of Kitchener, being Part 11, on Reference Plan 58R-16917, PIN 22727-0022(LT) (808 Trussler Road)

11. Part Lot 2, Concession 3, Block ‘A’, Township of Wilmot, being Part 1, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, PIN 22207-0377(LT) (2483 Trussler Road)

12. Part Lot 13, Beasley’s New Survey, City of Kitchener, being Part 2, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, PIN 22723-0015(LT) (2878 New Dundee Road)

13. Part Lot 13, Beasley’s New Survey, City of Kitchener, being Part 3, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, PIN 22723-0014(LT) (946 Plains Road)

14. Part Lot 13, Beasley’s New Survey, City of Kitchener, being Part 4, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, PIN 22723-0013(LT) (2232 Trussler Road)

15. Part Lot 2, Concession 3, Block ‘A’, Township of Wilmot, being Parts 5, 6 and 7, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, PIN 22207-0376(LT) (2113 Trussler Road)

16. Part Lot 2, Concession 2, Block ‘A’, Township of Wilmot, being Part 8, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, PIN 22207-0028(LT) (no municipal address)

17. Part Lot 13, Beasley’s New Survey, City of Kitchener, being Part 9, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, PIN 22723-0036(LT) (no municipal address)

18. Part Lot 13, Beasley’s New Survey, City of Kitchener, being Part 10, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, PIN 22723-0008(LT) (no municipal address)

19. Part Lot 149, German Company Tract, City of Kitchener, being Part 11, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, PIN 22723-0007(LT) (1738 Trussler Road)

20. Part Lot 15, South side of Huron Road, Plan 585 and Part Lot 149, German Company Tract, City of Kitchener, being Part 12, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, PIN 22723-0006(LT) (no municipal address)
21. Part Lot 1, Concession 2, Block 'A', Township of Wilmot, being Parts 13 and 14, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, PIN 22207-0025(LT) (1743 Trussler Road)

22. Part Lot 1, South side of Huron Road, Plan 585, City of Kitchener, being Part 15, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, PIN 22723-0004(LT) (1698 Trussler Road)

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. [CR-RS-11-001]

5. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo amend Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended, to:

   a) Remove from Schedule 18, 80 km/h maximum speed, St. Charles Street (Regional Road 26) from 500 metres east of Sawmill Road to Beitz Road; and

   b) Add to Schedule 18, 80km/h maximum speed, St. Charles Street (Regional Road 26) from 600 metres east of Sawmill Road to Beitz Road;


6. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into an Engineering Services Agreement with Stantec Consulting Limited, to provide engineering services for the Replacement of Municipal Wells Project as outlined in Report E-11-002 dated January 11, 2011, at an upset limit of $436,200 plus applicable taxes.

7. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo:

   a) approve, enter into a conditional Agreement for, and authorize and direct the Regional Solicitor, to execute all documentation related to, and subject to satisfaction of all conditions therein, complete the acquisition of lands for rapid transit described as Part Lot 17 (B. Moogk), south side of King Street, Plan 364, as in 222745, being 25 Cedar Street South, in the City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo from George Edmund (Robert) Husband for the sum of $140,000.00, plus associated costs, to the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor; and

   b) authorize and direct the Regional Solicitor to waive conditions in the Agreement, when satisfied or as appropriate.

8. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve, enter into Agreements for, and execute all documentation related to, the acquisition of lands for improvements to Trussler Road described as:
1. Part Lot 1, Concession South of Bleam’s Road, being Part 8, on Reference Plan 58R-16917, in the Township of Wilmot, Regional Municipality of Waterloo from Gary Wayne Swartzentruber and Kerry Lee Swartzentruber for the sum of $12,900.00, plus associated costs to the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor;

2. Part Lot 1, Concession South of Bleam’s Road, being Part 7 on Reference Plan 58R-16917, in the Township of Wilmot, Regional Municipality of Waterloo from Stephen Clive Moxey for the sum of $21,000.00, plus associated costs to the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor;

3. Part Lot 149, German Company Tract, being Part 11, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, in the City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo from Gordon Hugh Burmaster and Janice Mabel Burmaster for the sum of $24,000.00, plus associated costs to the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor;

4. Part Lot 1, South of Huron Road, Registered Plan 585, being Part 15, on Reference Plan 58R-16920, in the City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo from Robert Burnett, Robert Michael Burnett and Steven Douglas Burnett for the sum of $5,800.00, plus associated costs to the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor; and

5. Part Lot 13, Beasley’s New Survey, being Part , on Reference Plan 58R-16920, in the City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo from Egon Spreitzer for the sum of $6,500.00, plus associated costs to the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor;

9. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve, enter into a Settlement Agreement for, and execute all documentation related to, the expropriation of lands described as Part Lot 32, Registered Plan 1451, being Part 7, Expropriation Plan WR535632, in the City of Cambridge, Regional Municipality of Waterloo from Balambikai Jegatheeswaran and Rajadurai Jegatheeswaran for the sum of $8,500.00, to the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor.

10. THAT the Region of Waterloo re-appoint Kevin Thomason, Deb Swidrovich, Wilhard Barth and Ed Ries to the Laurel Creek Headwaters Environmentally Sensitive Landscape Public Liaison Committee for three years terms expiring December 31, 2013:

11. THAT the Region of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to the Ecological and Environmental Advisory Committee (EEAC):

   a) Appoint Jared Ehgoetz for a three-year term expiring December 31, 2013, and re-appoint John Jackson to an additional three-year term expiring December 31, 2013 to the Ecological and Environmental Advisory Committee; and

   b) Amend the Ecological and Environmental Advisory Committee Terms of Reference as follows:

      i) Section 2.1.2: Change “Three (3) members” to “At least one (1) member of Regional Council, appointed for the term of each Council.”, and

      ii) Section 3.2: Change “The quorum for the meeting shall be nine (9) members” to “The quorum for the meeting shall be a majority of the appointed members as of the date of the meeting.”

CARRIED
Administration and Finance

The Summary of Recommendation of the Administration and Finance Committee was presented by Tom Galloway, Chair of the Committee.

MOVED by T. Galloway  
SECONDED by J. Brewer

THAT the Summary of Recommendations of the Administration and Finance Committee dated January 11, 2011, Items 1 to 3, and 1 report from closed session, Item 4, be adopted as follows:

1. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo endorse the proposed approach for developing the 2011-2014 Strategic Plan, as outlined in Report CA-11-001.

2. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the proposed public art concept for Waterloo Regional Police Division #3 entitled The Lion and the Lamb as outlined in report CR-FM-11-002 dated January 11, 2011.

3. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo authorize staff to provide 2011 grant advances for core funded arts and cultural organizations that receive an annual grant from the Region in amounts up to one-half of the organization’s approved 2010 grant. [F-11-001]

4. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo appoint the following citizens to the Grand River Accessibility Advisory Committee (GRAAC) for a three-year term from January, 2011 to December 31, 2013:

   Mike Begin  
   Saul Herzog  
   David Kuhn  
   Katherine Nessner  
   Ken Parker  
   Amy Ross  
   Paula Saunders  
   Carrie Speers

CARRIED

Community Services

The Summary of Recommendations of the Community Services Committee was presented by Jane Mitchell, Vice-Chair of the Committee.

MOVED by J. Mitchell  
SECONDED by T. Cowan

THAT the Summary of Recommendations of the Community Services Committee dated January 11, 2011, Item 1, be adopted as follows:
1. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve a change to the child care fee subsidy waiting list management strategy effective February 1, 2011 as outlined in Option C in report SS-11-004, dated January 11, 2011.

CARRIED

OTHER MATTERS UNDER COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MOVED by L. Armstrong
SECONDED by T. Cowan

THAT Committee of the Whole rise and Council resume.

CARRIED

MOVED by G. Lorentz
SECONDED by B. Halloran

THAT Council adopt the proceeding of the Committee of the Whole.

CARRIED

NOTICE OF MOTION

D. Craig amended his motion to be just the final two paragraphs. He stated it is important to get this matter on the agenda and move ahead with the discussion. It is necessary to get the information out on both systems and this Council is not obligated by decisions made by the previous Council. He stated Regional staff are excellent and this is no discredit to the work already done.

Chair Seiling advised he has no issue with the motion on the floor and when staff bring the reports back there will be a full analysis. Approval of this motion should not be interpreted as Council making a different decision on rapid transit.

J. Wideman stated he can support the amended motion. He is interested in having the bus (brt) plan brought back one more time for comparison and stated communication needs to be improved.

C. Zehr supported the revised motion but stated he does not want to go back to square one on this issue or re-open the environmental assessment process. The information related to brt needs to be more fully explained to the public. He noted there will always be opponents but people need to understand why Council is making the decision.

T. Galloway stated he is not afraid to have buses put back in the discussion but noted communication is definitely an issue but now everyone is paying attention.

G. Lorentz agreed with his colleagues and thanked the delegations for coming out. He stated part of the issue is how to get people to leave their cars at home. All options need to be considered and a strong communication strategy is necessary.
J. Brewer thanked D. Craig for bringing his motion forward as the people in Cambridge feel they are being ignored and this issue needs to be resolved.

J. Haalboom stated public response during the election depended what door you knocked on. She agreed a strong communication strategy is required, including one that dispels the myths.

T. Cowan advised the message he received was that the voters want more information.

J. Mitchell concurred that BRT needs to be looked at as well and people have a lot of questions.

B. Halloran commented there is a perception of mistrust of the process and the questions need to be answered.

D. Craig thanked members for their support and stated to be fair to the process, Council needs to be prepared there may be an addendum to the environmental assessment if a different direction is taken. Regional Council needs to determine what the benefit is to Cambridge.

MOVED by D. Craig
SECONDED by J. Brewer

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Regional Staff be directed to review the BRT option in the implementation of a rapid transit system;

AND THAT the public be given an opportunity to provide comment on the benefits and impacts of both the LRT and BRT systems in terms of service delivery, cost and effectiveness.

CARRIED
(J. Haalboom opposed)

ENACTMENT OF BY-LAWS – (FIRST, SECOND & THIRD READINGS)

MOVED by C. Zehr
SECONDED by B. Halloran

a) THAT a By-law to Amend By-law 06-072, As Amended, Being the Traffic and Parking By-law (Rates of Speed) be read a first, second and third time, finally passed and numbered By-law 11-004 signed by the Regional Chair and Regional Clerk and sealed with the Regional Seal.

b) THAT a By-law to Amend By-law 10-001, A By-law to Establish Fees and Charges for the Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Museum admissions, Railway crossings/encroachments) be read a first, second and third time, finally passed and numbered By-law 11-005 signed by the Regional Chair and Regional Clerk and sealed with the Regional Seal.

c) THA THAT a By-law to Confirm the Actions of Council of January 19, 2011 be read a first, second and third time, finally passed and numbered By-law 11-006 signed by the Regional Chair and Regional Clerk and sealed with the Regional Seal.

CARRIED
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ADJOURN

MOVED by J. Brewer
SECONDED by T. Cowan

THAT the meeting adjourn at 8:25 p.m.

CARRIED

REGIONAL CHAIR, K. Seiling

REGIONAL CLERK, K. Fletcher
A Partnership With Many

Community Service Clubs
Corporate Sponsors
Emergency Services
Public and Separate School Boards

And most importantly...

The CHILDREN we teach...
OUR HISTORY

- Opened in 1992
- Police and Community initiative to teach children about safety
- Estimated cost $750,000
- Funded through corporate donations / sponsors
- Businesses / organizations were invited to construct replicas of their buildings in the scaled down Village
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPONSORSHIP LEVEL</th>
<th>NUMBER OF SPONSORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Level ($50,000 +)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platinum Level ($10,000 +)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Level ($5-10,000)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Level ($2500 – 5000)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze Level ($500 – 2500)</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1997 - Fire Departments joined the Village and constructed the Fire Education Centre

Sponsored by Economical Insurance Group and the KW Civitan Club

Also funded by corporate donations / sponsorships

Concept was developed by a volunteer with the KW Civitan Club who assisted at the Village

This world-class facility is the first of its kind in Canada

Saved lives as a result of information presented
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPONSORSHIP LEVEL</th>
<th>NUMBER OF SPONSORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Level ($50,000 +)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platinum Level ($10,000 +)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Level ($5-10,000)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Level ($2500 – 5000)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze Level ($500 – 2500)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Safety Village is committed to providing quality progressive safety programs, in a positive and interactive atmosphere, through community partnership, to protect our most valuable resources.....our children.
Focus of the village is “doing”, where the children not only receive a classroom lecture, but also practice what they’ve learned in a hands on environment in a safe and realistic setting.
“What I see, I forget
What I hear, I remember
What I do, I understand”
POLICE EDUCATION CENTER

• Taught by a uniformed police officer

• Grade 1 – Traffic and Personal Safety

• Grade 3 – Bike Safety

• Grade 5 – Internet Safety
Focus is on stranger danger, 9-1-1, pedestrian and traffic safety.

Students receive classroom instruction followed by hands-on learning.

Practice traffic safety by driving battery operated jeeps through the Village streets.

Practice pedestrian safety during a walking tour to reinforce the rules of the road.
Focus is on Bike Safety
Students learn rules of the road, sign recognition, traffic lights, hand signals and the importance of safety inspections of their bike and the proper fit / use of helmets
Students receive instruction, watch a video and then apply what they have learned by riding bikes through the Village
Focus is on Internet Safety
Was first developed in 2000
Continues to evolve to stay current
Students learn about how to remain safe on the internet and cyber bullying
Apply the classroom instruction through the use of Global Interactive Game Systems
FIRE EDUCATION CENTER

Taught by a Public Fire and Life Safety Educator

Based on Risk Watch Curriculum

Grade 2 – Fire Safety 101

Grade 4 – Science of Fire

Grade 6 – Consequences and Peer Pressure
GRADE TWO

Focus is on Fire Safety 101

- Topics include: working smoke alarms, having a practiced family escape plan and kitchen safety
- Messages are reinforced through the use of interactive tools like the Hazard House and Sparky’s apartment
GRADE FOUR

- Focus is on the Science of Fire
- Review Fire Safety 101 and introduce the fire triangle
- Review smoke alarms, home escape plans, kitchen safety
- Use Sparky’s Apartment and Hazard House
GRADE SIX

- Focus is on consequences in relation to fire safety
- Final test of their fire safety knowledge is done through the use of the Global Interactive Gaming System
Waterloo Region Arson Prevention Program (WRAPPC)

- Collaborative between the Fire Departments of the Waterloo Region, the Waterloo Regional Police Service, Family and Children’s Services and the John Howard Society
- Alternative measures and referral program
- Focus is on prevention and education

for Children
SPECIAL EVENTS

POLICE WEEK OPEN HOUSE

CHRISTMAS IN THE VILLAGE
CHILDREN’S HERO AWARDS

• First held in 2009
• Held the last Saturday in May annually
• Children from the community are recognized for their heroic acts / going above and beyond what is expected of someone their age to contribute to a safer and more positive community
• Goal is to recognize 10 children each year
• Sponsors are invited to participate
• Also a fund raiser for the Village
WHO WE REACH EACH YEAR

- 22,000 students attend the Village for our grade 1-6 programs (waiting list of 70 classes / grade)
- 500-1000 students through summer programs
- 3000-5000 people participate in Police Week Open House
- 1000-3000 people attend Christmas in the Village
- To date more than 360,000 students have attended the Safety Village
CO-OP STUDENTS

• Partner with school boards for the co-op placement program
• Each term approximately 8 students are placed at the Village
• Co-op students are an integral part of our program
• Could not reach the number of students we do without the assistance from our co-op students
• Many CSV co-ops have gone on to pursue successful careers in the police and fire services
Over the past few years we have continued to grow.

- Moose Winooski’s was built in 2006.
- Union Gas was built in 2009.
- Most recently we added a Roundabout in 2010.

We have upgraded the technology in our classrooms to include surround sound and projection units.
OUR VILLAGE STREETS

- Our Village Buildings represent local businesses, service clubs and organizations the students are familiar with in our community.
- Some buildings are interactive and contain additional safety messages for the students on the Walking Tour.
OUR VILLAGE STREETS
OUR VILLAGE STREETS
OUR VILLAGE STREETS
OUR VILLAGE STREETS
OUR VILLAGE STREETS
To view our Village programs in action please visit our website www.waterlooregioncsv.com
OUR VALUED SPONSORS

BARTHEL
FUNERAL HOME

FUNERALS • CREMATIONS

KITCHENER-WATERLOO
Humane Society

Waterloo Catholic District School Board

KIWANIS INTERNATIONAL
OUR VALUED SPONSORS
OUR VALUED SPONSORS

SHOPPERS
DRUG MART

Little SHORT STOP

union gas
A Duke Energy Company

Waterloo North Hydro Inc.
OUR VALUED SPONSORS

LIONS INTERNATIONAL

OPTIMIST CLUB

MEMORIAL LEGION

CANADA
OUR VALUED SPONSORS

CIBC

Maple Leaf

zehrs Tim Hortons
OUR VALUED SPONSORS
Thank You

- We cannot operate the Village successfully without the support of our many sponsors.
- We are committed to working with our sponsors and supporters to continue to deliver effective Safety Education Programs to all the children of Waterloo Region.
Thank you for helping us keep our children safe
Taxpayers for Sensible Transit
Presentation to Waterloo Region Council, January 19, 2011

Overview

Taxpayers for Sensible Transit is a local, grass-roots, taxpayer-led group that spontaneously organized itself to provide a voice of opposition to the Region’s light rail transit proposal. We support improvements to transit, but believe buses are a better option for reasons of cost, suitability and flexibility. Buses can also be as effective in attracting urban development and intensification as rail. Further, based on a survey of regional candidates in the 2010 municipal election, newspaper reports and other anecdotal evidence, we believe the majority of regional taxpayers agree that improvements to our existing bus service are preferable to the creation of a new and expensive light rail system.

For all these reasons, we urge all regional councilors to approve Cambridge Mayor Doug Craig’s motion and shift the focus of the region’s rapid transit plan from light rail to buses.

Cost

Federal and provincial funding for rapid transit in Waterloo Region falls substantially short of what is necessary to fully fund a light rail system. The full reported cost is $819 million for light rail in Kitchener and Waterloo and an adapted rapid bus network to Cambridge. Higher levels of government will only be providing $565 million. This shortfall, as the motion makes clear, must inevitably fall on local taxpayers. The total amount will require a charge of approximately $1,300 per household in the region. This will lead to an estimated 9 percent tax hike. Of course given the predictable nature of cost overruns in megaprojects such as this, these costs should be considered only as a starting point. The final cost is likely to be substantially more.

Our group considers this to be an unacceptable burden to place on the local tax base, regardless of how it may be phased in. And it is entirely impractical to assume, as some rail advocates do, that higher transit fares will cover the local share. Bus fares are already heavily subsidized and there is no credible evidence that transit ridership will grow sufficiently to cover the full cost of building a light rail system in Waterloo Region. Even
at current levels, it is expected that the annual operating subsidies for light rail transit will be $11 million per year in the first year.

Buses make substantially more sense from a cost perspective. The Region’s Multiple Account Evaluation (MAE) estimates the costs of a rapid bus network at $16 million per kilometre. This is less than half the cost of light rail, at $36 million per km and 43 percent less than the current light rail/adapted buses proposal of $23 million per km. On a cost basis, there is no question that buses are cheaper, and thus more attractive to taxpayers. This has been borne out by various cost/benefit analyses performed for the region.

**Suitability and flexibility**

Under the current proposal, Waterloo Region would be the smallest urban centre in Canada to have a light rail system. As local transit expert John Shortreed has previously pointed out, light rail is designed to link outlying suburbs with a single downtown employment centre for the purposes of commuter traffic. This is clearly not the profile of Waterloo Region, which lacks a single dominant downtown employment core. A rail system is thus the wrong solution to transit issues in Waterloo Region.

To make light rail transit practical on paper, the planning process has projected a massive growth in ridership. In the first year of operation, according to the MAE, rail ridership on the iXpress corridor will triple from current figures. A reliance on massive growth of this sort seems wildly optimistic. It is far more reasonable to assume a more modest growth in ridership. And this argues for a bus network.

Finally, a light rail system will require permanent tracks on King Street and many other significant changes to local roads. This will almost certainly require the relocation, or possible cancellation, of the annual and much-loved Oktoberfest Parade. A comprehensive bus network will require much less of this sort of dislocation. And it provides the benefit of flexibility in adjusting the system to unforeseen changes or obstacles.

**Urban development**

The most frequently-heard argument in favour of light rail transit for Waterloo Region is that it is necessary to achieve greater densification in the region’s urban cores. Buses, allegedly, do not facilitate intensification. However, there is ample local evidence to dismiss such a claim. The King Street corridor in Waterloo and Kitchener is currently undergoing a building boom. New and recently completed projects include condo developments such as the Bauer Lofts, 144 Park Street and Kaufman Lofts along with the Balsillie School of International Affairs, the Tannery complex and the University of Waterloo’s School of Pharmacy. All of this robust development is within walking distance of existing bus transit on King Street. More to the point, it has all occurred without light rail transit. This suggests light rail is not a necessary precondition for urban renewal.
There is ample evidence from elsewhere that a dedicated bus network can promote the same level of urban intensification as light rail. Pittsburgh, Ottawa and Brisbane, Australia all provide proof of this. Further, the U.S. Federal Transit Administration has several studies reporting on the substantial development benefits of bus networks.\(^1\) It is demonstrably false to claim that light rail transit is necessary for urban development or intensification.

**Public opinion**

During the recent municipal election, Taxpayers for Sensible Transit conducted a comprehensive survey of local candidates regarding transit options and the Region’s light rail transit proposal. The results were stunning in their uniformity. A press release summarizing the results is attached.

Approximately 95 percent of candidates surveyed disapproved of the region’s existing light rail/adapted rapid bus plan. Only one candidate supported the necessary 9 percent tax hike. The vast majority of candidate respondents also opposed traffic disruptions on King Street and other roads to facilitate a permanent rail line. Asked which form of transit was most appropriate for Waterloo Region, buses were the overwhelmingly popular choice with 80 percent approval.

The candidate survey provides tangible evidence of the broad public opposition to the idea. And it was popularly accepted during the campaign that light rail was the dominant issue on most voters’ minds, and that public opinion was against it. Here is a brief sample of opinions from elected officials following the fall election:

> “While I was door-knocking, I heard a lot of negative response to the LRT, and mostly to the cost,” Waterloo councillor Melissa Durrell (Waterloo Region Record Dec. 7, 2010)

> “The sense at the door was, ‘Don’t waste my money. I’m not going to use it’.” Kitchener councillor Yvonne Fernandes (Waterloo Region Record, Dec. 7, 2010)

> “People are totally against having trains running up and down King Street,” Waterloo Mayor Brenda Halloran (Waterloo Region Record, Oct. 22, 2010)

> “The message I got loud and clear, from not just a few, but probably hundreds, even thousands of people, was: We don’t want it. We won’t use it. We can’t afford it.” Waterloo councillor Mark Whaley (Waterloo Region Record, Dec. 7, 2010)

Taxpayers for Sensible Transit has also been monitoring letters to the editor of the local papers. Our website (www.t4st.com) includes over 120 letters in opposition to the region's current light rail transit plan. This should again be seen as a sign of the broad opposition to the proposal.

Unfortunately, the October 25, 2010 election did not include a referendum on the extremely important matter of transit. In fact, it was often impossible for voters to express their concerns with respect to light rail transit through the election process. In the vote for regional chair, for example, there was no candidate who opposed the rail plan, despite evidence that it is extremely unpopular with the population at large. It appears some local politicians and planners have become entrenched advocates of light rail rather than servants of the public interest.

Summary

We believe Region Council has an obligation to acknowledge and respond to the wishes of the taxpaying electorate. A project of nearly $1 billion – the biggest capital project in the history of the region – must not be forced on an unwilling population. As buses are widely preferred to light rail by the majority of residents for a wide variety of important reasons, council should therefore abandon its plans for light rail and look again at buses.

For more information, please contact

Taxpayers for Sensible Transit
www.t4st.com
t4stgroup@gmail.com

Ruth Haworth
519-749-9265
rhaworth@sentex.ca
October 15, 2010

Most candidates in Waterloo Region disapprove of regional LRT plan

Buses favoured by a wide margin, says survey by Taxpayers for Sensible Transit

Local grassroots organization Taxpayers for Sensible Transit (T4ST) today released the results of a comprehensive candidate survey ahead of the October 25 municipal election in Waterloo Region. The results show massive disapproval for the regional government’s controversial $819 million light rail transit plan.

T4ST, which favours improved bus service over the region’s light rail transit plan, sent out 168 email transit surveys. This covered all urban and rural mayoral and regional chair candidates plus candidates for city, regional and township councils. The overall response rate was 66 percent. Excluding township council candidates, the response rate was above 80 percent.

Asked whether they supported the region’s current plan, 95 percent of the responding candidates said no. Only one candidate supported the necessary tax hike of approximately 9 percent to pay for light rail.

“These results are crystal clear,” said Ruth Haworth, spokesperson for T4ST. “Voters in Waterloo Region do not want to pay for light rail transit. And the candidates have heard this message.”

According to the survey, 89 percent of the candidates do not support permanent traffic disruptions on King Street or other roads to facilitate a permanent rail line. And asked which form of transit was most appropriate for Waterloo Region, buses were the overwhelmingly popular response: 62 said the existing tXpress system should be improved, 30 wanted a new system of rapid buses and 21 candidates said light rail is the best form of transit for our region.

Haworth said this means regional staff should immediately stop work on light rail plans and begin examining improvements to existing bus service or rapid buses. “Over 80 percent of candidates want better bus service,” says Haworth. “Buses make sense for Waterloo Region. It’s time the region recognized this and switched gears on transit.”

Haworth added, “Our reply rate was very high and we have responses from all candidates in most urban races. This means residents can use our site as a voting aid no matter where they stand on this issue.”

The survey provided a comment section and received many interesting suggestions regarding ways to improve or alter the existing transit system in Waterloo Region. The complete survey with all candidate responses is available at the group’s website: www.t4st.com.

For more information, contact:
Ruth Haworth
Taxpayers for Sensible Transit
t4stgroup@gmail.com
Chair Seiling, Members of Council,

Light Rail Transit was never chosen because it had a lower capital cost than a bus-based solution. The project was chosen because it requires fewer wages to operate than buses, and because the rails it runs on attract private-sector investment. Why would Council, which voted in favour of this project on its merits alone in 2009, vote to reconsider? Has Council not done its due diligence? Or, was the value of the project, and its sister project, the Regional Transportation Master Plan, not properly explained to citizens?

The Region still has not released a map explaining LRT’s express feeder buses as laid out in the RTMP. The Region has not visually communicated to suburban homeowners what traffic will look like in their neighbourhood if we are forced to accept a more distributed growth model. The Region has held public information centres on its plans, but most residents haven’t actually attended one, and shouldn’t be expected to do so in order to be properly informed.

Today you have the ability to correct this mistake. Instead of spending more staff time to get the same answer you got a year and a half ago, please – invest in communicating with your taxpayers. The City of Hamilton, for example, sent detailed, easy to understand information about their LRT proposal to every single household, as well as publishing it as an insert in The Globe And Mail. Here in the Region, instead of thorough, honest communication from our government, we got, through the media, some incomplete math homework and opinion masquerading as journalism. Why not, through a direct mailing or information campaign of similar scope, put the actual facts of this proposal to your stakeholders?

Light Rail is being considered not in a vacuum, but in the context of where to direct growth in our Region. The province has already approved key elements of the new Regional Official Plan, which include nearly half of all growth taking place as urban infill along the Central Transit Corridor. Demographics and technology are changing; more than ever, people want to live and work in the cores. But more than that, we can’t afford to keep adding and maintaining the new roads, new sewer lines, new hydro service, and new water mains that growing outward demands. LRT is about helping guide the growth to where it uses existing services. Instead of having the Region’s productivity and mobility gridlocked within the next two decades, we need to invest now in the technology that will most affordably scale upward with growth: Light Rail Transit.

A lot of opposition to Light Rail (sometimes in the guise of “support” for BRT) comes from people who do not use transit, and because they pay some tax on fuel, see roads as relatively “free.” If a bus highway through our Region’s core neighbourhoods were chosen instead of Light Rail, many of these same people would start crying foul and calling for removal of its dedicated lanes. So it is at this point I ask: Where would they be without massive road subsidies from local taxpayers? If
what Andrew Coyne suggests in this week’s Maclean’s magazine about traffic and the impacts of user-pay road pricing is correct, these people would likely be on transit themselves. The status quo approach to road expansion represents a massive entitlement to motorists, of which most Regional taxpayers are not properly aware.

The idea that a substantial tax rate increase will come as a result of LRT ignores the precedent-setting permission York Region received in 2006 to apply development charges to transit expansion, and it ignores the possibility of a fare increase that could easily be applied after the introduction of LRT’s superior service. The idea that the beneficiaries of this system shouldn’t help pay for its improvements is absurd, but immediately assuming the property tax base is the only group that could bear the burden is even more so. People will pay more for a better option.

It has always been TriTAG’s belief that Cambridge should get light rail. Due to the river and highway crossing, it’s not a realistic option in Phase 1, but we believe it is wrong for Cambridge to have to wait until after 2031 to see development benefits. Moreover, we are confident that the first phase of LRT will be very successful, far beyond the conservative estimates used in the models. So, instead of keeping Cambridge in the cold, or holding Kitchener and Waterloo back to wait for Cambridge to catch up, let’s give them a challenge: publically set a ridership target for building LRT in the Cambridge corridor, and then work with the citizens of this Region to exceed that target as soon as possible.

Finally, a couple of weeks ago, The Economist magazine published articles (1, 2) about how public-sector wages are going to be the biggest pressure on government budgets in the 21st century. As a Workforce Analyst in the private sector, I view choosing to build a Light Rail system now, that will forgo escalating labour costs in the long-term, as a fiscally responsible choice. I do not view Bus Rapid Transit, with its higher labour costs and eventual need for replacement, as a fiscally responsible choice. The taxpayers of the baby boom generation may have protested with their lungs, but the taxpayer of the 21st century will, silently, vote with their feet.

Thank you.

Tim Mollison

http://TriTAG.ca
tel: 226 47 61 313, x801
e-mail: tim.mollison@tritag.ca