Regional Council Minutes

Wednesday, March 19, 2014

The following are the minutes of the Regular Council meeting held at 7:10 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, T. Galloway, J. Haalboom, B. Halloran, R. Kelterborn, G. Lorentz, C. Millar, J. Mitchell, S. Strickland, J. Wideman, and C. Zehr.

Members Absent: R. Deutschmann

Closed Session

Moved by C. Millar

Seconded by J. Wideman

That a closed meeting of Council be held on Wednesday, March 19, 2014 at 7:00 p.m. in the Waterloo County Room, in accordance with Section 239 of the Municipal Act, 2001, for the purposes of considering the following subject matters:

a) receiving of legal advice subject to solicitor-client privilege related to a legal matter

b) receiving of advice subject to solicitor-client privilege related to a purchasing matter

Carried

Moved by T. Cowan

Seconded by G. Lorentz

That Council reconvene in Open Session.

Carried

Declarations of Pecuniary Interest under the “Municipal Conflict of Interest Act”

T. Galloway disclosed a pecuniary interest with respect to the first closed item from the Planning and Works Committee due to his employment at the University of Waterloo.
Delegations

a) Nancy Goucher, Program Manager, Environmental Defence, appeared before Council regarding Bill 6, “Great Lakes Protection Act, 2013. She provided information on the purpose and status of the proposed legislation, noting it has passed second reading. She requested Regional Council endorse the resolution from the City of Kitchener as it is important for the Province to hear from the municipalities about this matter.

The correspondence listed on the Council agenda was brought forward for consideration.

Moved by C. Zehr
Seconded by J. Haalboom

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo endorse the following motion from the City of Kitchener:

“Whereas there is an urgent and pressing need for a new, strong and effective law to protect and restore the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River basin; and,

Whereas 3 of Ontario’s 4 Great Lakes are in decline and provide more than 80% of the Province’s drinking water; and,

Whereas over 95% of Ontario’s agricultural land is in the Great Lakes basin and the health of the lakes contributes $4.4 trillion to the economy in both Canada and the United States;

Therefore be it resolved that the Ontario Legislature be requested to enact Bill 6, Great Lakes Protection Act, 2013 to protect and restore the health of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River basin; and,

Be it finally resolved that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Premier of Ontario, the Ontario Minister of the Environment, Opposition Critics for the Environment, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario and local area municipalities.”

Carried

a) Stage 1 Light Rail Transit (LRT) Project (Item #7 on P&W Summary):

1) Mark Reusser, Waterloo Federation of Agriculture appeared before Council, stating farmers have a vested interest in rapid transit as the future of farming is threatened without intensification and high quality transit. A copy of his presentation is appended to the original minutes.
2) Kate Daley, Waterloo appeared before Council stating this is an enormous change and it is necessary to find new solutions. Rapid Transit is a smart investment and needs to move forward.

3) John Shortreed, Waterloo appeared before Council and provided a presentation. A copy of the presentation is appended to the original minutes. He stated there is insufficient information for Council to make a decision and he highlighted the misrepresentation in road cost savings, other costs of expanded bus service, projected tax increase and other contract unknowns. He urged Council to complete a comprehensive analysis of the proposed contract prior to making a decision.

4) Chuck Howitt, Kitchener appeared before Council in support of LRT. With respect to the opposition to LRT, he stated it is important for everyone to work together for the success of the project. He questioned some of the statistics being used by the Stoplightrail group.

5) Fatima Pereira, Cambridge appeared before Council to thank Council for their efforts put into making this difficult decision and stated her support for the LRT project. She noted there is a large construction industry in Cambridge that will benefit from the jobs created by the approval of this project. She urged Council to continue with the route they have taken and get the LRT built quickly.

6) Craig Beattie, Perimeter Development Corporation appeared before Council in support of LRT and the positive changes that are happening in the community. He encouraged Council to get on with this project and keep driving positive change in the Region.

7) Robert Milligan, New Dundee appeared before Council stating the Region needs to play a greater role in ultra sustainability with the LRT project. He highlighted the need for accelerating environmental sustainability through collaboration.

8) Anna Beard, Waterloo appeared before Council in support of LRT, noting the dramatic changes that have taken place in the last decade. A copy of her presentation is appended to the original minutes.

9) Lee Angold, Kitchener appeared before Council in support of the LRT project. A copy of her presentation is appended to the original minutes. She cited the benefits
of the project and stated the contract is written in a way that protects the Region against time and cost overruns.

10) John Reick, Waterloo appeared before Council and urged them to revisit the LRT decision. He stated putting the trains on city streets is the wrong approach as too much street space will be lost to the tracks and will be no faster than buses. He stated the LRT project will cost a lot of money with little value and the money should be used to add more buses and change routes. He also requested a referendum be held on this issue.

J. Wideman brought forward item #7 from the Planning and Works Committee Summary of Recommendations. He noted an amendment to clause 4 to add “the Regional Chair and/or”.

Councillors stated their position on the project and the need to promote transit in Cambridge. The detailed, open and transparent process that has been followed was highlighted. Comments were made that this has been a divisive issue in the community but respect needs to be shown to everyone and the community needs to work in collaboration to make it a success. Some members raised the issue of fairness for Cambridge. It was noted the first Regional Official Plan in 1976 established the transit corridor and the tools to manage growth were identified in 2000.

A recorded vote was requested by J. Haalboom.

Moved by J. Wideman

Seconded by S. Strickland

That the Summary of Recommendations of the Planning and Works Committee, dated March 4, 2014, Item 7, be adopted as follows:

7. That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo (hereinafter called “the Region”):

   1. Receive the results of Request for Proposal No. 2012-01 - Stage 1 Light Rail Transit (LRT) Project: Selection of a “Design-Build-Finance-Operate-Maintain Consortium”, as described in this report with the results obtained using Infrastructure Ontario procurement best practices including an independent Fairness Monitor;

   2. Approve the selection of GrandLinq as the Preferred Proponent to design, build, finance, operate and maintain the Stage 1 LRT Project;

   3. Approve a Project Agreement between the Region and the single purpose legal entity to be established by GrandLinq to undertake the Stage 1 LRT Project, in accordance with the following:

      a. Construction of the Stage 1 LRT Project at a cost of $583,296,727.01, plus HST, to be paid through construction period payments of $452,054,963.43 plus HST and payment of GrandLinq’s long term debt
and equity at a cost of $11,013,651 annually, plus HST, for 30 years following Substantial Completion, subject to final interest rate adjustments at the time of Financial Close;

b. Operation of the LRT system for a period of 10 years following Substantial Completion, with renewals for successive 5 year terms, to a maximum of 30 years, at a cost of $4,036,013 per year, plus HST, subject to annual inflation adjustment;

c. Maintenance of the LRT system for a period of 30 years following Substantial Completion at a cost of $4,530,064 per year, plus HST, subject to annual inflation adjustment;

d. Life Cycle rehabilitation of the LRT system for a period of 30 years following Substantial Completion at a total cost of $263,120,208, plus HST, to be paid in varying annual amounts averaging $8.77 million per year, subject to annual inflation adjustment;

e. Insurance for the LRT system for a period of 30 years following Substantial Completion at a cost of $1,700,000 per year, plus applicable taxes, subject to annual inflation and rating adjustment;

4. Delegate to the Regional Chair and/or the Regional Chief Administrative Officer the authority to finalize and execute the Project Agreement and associated ancillary agreements, and to execute documents and certificates in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Project Agreement on behalf of The Regional Municipality of Waterloo for the Stage 1 LRT Project and to do all things as may be necessary or required to give effect to the above-described resolutions, with the foregoing authority to be subject to the terms and conditions described in Report E-14-032/F-14-019;

5. Authorize and direct the Regional Clerk and the Chief Financial Officer to sign certificates and any other documents and to do all things as may be necessary or required to give effect to the above-described resolutions, subject to the terms and conditions described in Report E-14-032/F-14-019.

Carried


Nays: D. Craig, J. Haalboom, B. Halloran, C. Millar

b) Doug Craig’s Notice of Motion:

1) Michael Druker, Kitchener appeared before Council on behalf of TriTAG and stated his Region includes Cambridge and believes a good transit network is required between all three cities. A copy of his presentation is appended to the original
minutes. He supports LRT to Cambridge and with increased ridership it will be successful. He urged that steps be taken to accelerate Phase 2 of the LRT project.

2) Sandra Hill, Cambridge appeared before Council stating she doesn’t understand the dispute and the transportation needs to go where the manufacturing is located. She said equity, wealth and happiness need to be considered and Cambridge should not pay for the LRT.

3) Greg Durocher, Cambridge appeared before Council on behalf of the Cambridge Chamber of Commerce with respect to the area rating and stated the defined benefits to the Townships also needs to be considered. Area rating for specific projects needs to be consistent. In response to a question, G. Durocher stated the Cambridge Chamber is willing to work with the Region to provide incentives to increase ridership on transit in Cambridge.

4) Lin Stevens, Cambridge appeared before Council and expressed concern with the proposed financing for the LRT. She supported D. Craig and stated it is an issue of fairness and the money should be spent on improving buses or getting GO trains to Cambridge.

5) Andrew Dodds, Waterloo appeared before Council to discuss what is a good investment for the future of the community and the need to work together. He provided background on his involvement in the LRT project.

6) John Shortreed, Waterloo appeared before Council and stated he is willing to pay for what is fair and area rating is the right thing for Cambridge.

D. Craig brought forward his notice of motion from the consolidated agenda. He provided a handout of services by municipality to explain what area rating is about. He stated it has been done for a number of years and is the best thing for Cambridge. D. Craig urged the resources be concentrated on getting the GO service to Milton/Union Station. This should be treated like the Townships so if you do not get the service you do not pay the costs.

T. Galloway called a point of order as the notice of motion figures were different on the consolidated agenda than what was sent out on Friday. Clarification was sought if the $1 million to be paid to Cambridge for improved transit is also included in the motion. D. Craig responded it is not included and that amount will continue to be paid by all three cities. Craig Dyer, Chief Financial Officer clarified the notice of motion has been
reviewed and amended to reflect the intention of D. Craig and the numbers were revised as a result.

Chair Seiling requested that T. Cowan assume the Chair for this portion of the meeting so he could make comments.

K. Seiling stated he is opposed to this motion and provided background information on the original feasibility study and two stage project for the LRT. He discussed the financing of services across the Region and provided an overview of the costs for some of the major services the Region provides that reflect the reality of how Regional dollars are spent. A copy of his statement is appended to the original minutes.

A question of clarification on the aBRT was raised and C. Dyer advised the calculation is based on Fairview Mall in Kitchener to the Ainslie station in Cambridge.

Councillors commented on the proposed motion. It was stated that together the Region is stronger and it is important to work together and collaborate. Decisions are made for the best of the whole Region and the LRT will benefit the whole Region.

D. Craig responded that housing, child care and emergency medical services have nothing to do with area rating for transit and this is an issue of the politics of division. He stated he has only been in the LRT debate for the last seven months and he has every right to bring forward this motion. He showed a chart identifying the rates and levies per capita and the various services across the Region by municipality. The chart is appended to the original minutes.

A recorded vote was requested by D. Craig.

Moved by D. Craig
Seconded by C. Millar

That the By-law to Establish and Levy Rates of Taxation for Regional Purposes for the Year 2014 listed on the Council agenda, dated March 19, 2014, be amended to eliminate the City of Cambridge from funding the LRT System from Conestoga Mall to Fairview Park Mall and to eliminate the City of Kitchener and the City of Waterloo from funding the aBRT system from Fairview Park Mall to the Ainslie Street Terminal and that the following specific changes be made:

a) That Schedule “C” of the By-law entitled, 2014 Transit Tax Rates and Levies, be amended to reduce the total amount of transit levy owed by the City of Cambridge from $18,873,171 to $17,529,792 and increase the total amount of transit levy owed by the City of Kitchener from $30,266,764 to $31,095,135 and the City of Waterloo from $18,817,160 to $19,332,168 and,
b) That Schedule “C” entitled, 2014 Transit Tax Rates and Levies and “E” entitled 2014 Tax Rate and Levies – Payment Schedule be further amended taking into consideration the changed transit levy amounts.

Motion Lost

Yeas: D. Craig, C. Millar


K. Seiling assumed the Chair.

Minutes of Previous Meetings

J. Haalboom requested an amendment to correct spelling of names on Pages 5 and 10 of the March 4, 2014 Planning and Works Committee minutes.

Moved by J. Wideman

Seconded by R. Kelterborn

That the following Minutes be approved:

a) Closed Council – February 26, 2014
b) Council – February 26, 2014
c) Economic Development and Promotion – March 4, 2014
d) Closed Committee – March 4, 2014
e) Community Services – March 4, 2014
f) Administration and Finance – March 4, 2014
g) Planning and Works – March 4, 2014

Carried

Communications

a) City of Kitchener, regarding Bill 6, “Great Lakes Protection Act, 2013” was dealt with under Delegations.

b) Township of Wellesley, regarding Wellesley Transfer Station

It was suggested this item be referred to Planning and Works Committee. Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services advised the
approximate cost to keep all four transfer stations opened for three months would be $100,000 or $15,000 - $20,000 for just Wellesley. R. Kelterborn requested that the Wellesley transfer station be kept open for one month and the matter be dealt with at the next Planning and Works Committee meeting.

Moved by R. Kelterborn

Seconded by T. Cowan

That the Wellesley Transfer Station remain open until May 1, 2014 and a report be brought to the April 1, 2014 Planning and Works Committee meeting.

Carried

Moved by J. Haalboom

Seconded by J. Mitchell

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

Carried

Finance Reports

a) F-14-030, Legislative Reform to Address Joint & Several Liability

Moved by C. Zehr

Seconded by J. Wideman

That the Regional Chair send a letter in the form attached as Appendix “C” to Report F-14-030 to the Premier of Ontario, the Provincial Attorney General and the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing supporting the Association of Municipalities of Ontario’s recommendation to adopt a “Combined model” of Legislative Reform to address the issue of the inequitable effects of Joint and Several Liability on municipal insurance claims.

Carried

b) F-14-031, T2014-101 Waterloo Landfill South Expansion Area Cell SE-4A Construction, Waterloo, Ontario

Moved by C. Zehr

Seconded by J. Wideman

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo accept the tender of Kieswetter Excavating Inc. for the Waterloo Landfill South Expansion Area Cell SE-4A Construction in the City of Waterloo in the amount of $3,488,377.80 including all applicable taxes. [F-14-031]

Carried
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c) F-14-032, T2014-102 Bridge Street East Reconstruction from Tyson Drive to the Kitchener Woolwich Boundary, City of Kitchener

Moved by C. Zehr
Seconded by J. Wideman

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo accept the tender of Site Works Construction Ltd. for the Bridge Street East Reconstruction from Tyson Drive to the Kitchener Woolwich Boundary, City of Kitchener in the amount of $3,626,385.27 including all applicable taxes.

And further that the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve an increase in project costs of $745,756.72 including all applicable taxes gross and $0 net to facilitate the replacement of the City of Kitchener’s water main and improvements to the storm sewer system on Bridge Street on behalf of the City of Kitchener. [F-14-032]

Carried

d) F-14-033, T2014-108 University Avenue Improvements – Weber Street to Lincoln Road, City of Waterloo

Moved by C. Zehr
Seconded by J. Wideman

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo accept the tender of E&E Seegmiller Limited for the University Avenue Improvements – Weber Street to Lincoln Road in the City of Waterloo in the amount of $5,015,061.02 including all applicable taxes.

And that the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve an increase in project costs of $1,166,486.08 to facilitate replacement of the City of Waterloo’s sanitary sewer and the City’s share of the storm water replacement on University Avenue on behalf of the City of Waterloo. [F-14-033]

Carried

e) F-14-034, T2014-105, Ira Needles Boulevard Widening – Highview Drive to 350M North of University Avenue, Cities of Kitchener and Waterloo

Moved by C. Zehr
Seconded by J. Wideman

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo accept the tender of Site Works Construction Ltd. for the Ira Needles Boulevard Widening between Highview Drive and 350M North of University Avenue in the Cities of Kitchener and Waterloo in the amount of $3,862,572.78 including all applicable taxes;

And that the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve an increase in project costs of $9,375.00 to facilitate the additional work to construct a 1.5M wide paved multi-use trail adjacent to sections of existing concrete sidewalk on the east side of Ira Needles Boulevard;
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And further that the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve an increase in project costs of $101,439.77 gross and $0.00 net to facilitate the portion of work undertaken on behalf of Union Gas Ltd. [F-13-034]

Carried

f) F-14-035, Q2014-1108 Test Drilling and Logging Services – Shades Mill and Branchton Meadows Well Fields

Moved by C. Zehr
Seconded by J. Wideman

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo accept the quote of Aardvark Drilling Inc. for Test Drilling and Logging Services - Shades Mill and Branchton Meadows Well Fields in the amount of $124,572.89 including all applicable taxes. [F-14-035]

Carried

g) F-14-036, T2014-114 Tire Lease – Grand River Transit

Moved by C. Zehr
Seconded by J. Wideman

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo accept the tender of Bridgestone Firestone Canada Inc. for the lease of bus tires for Grand River Transit for a term of five (5) years from April 1, 2014 until March 31, 2019, with two (2) one year renewal options. [F-14-036]

Carried

h) F-14-037, T2014-104 Waterloo Regional Police Headquarters Emergency Response Unit Garage Expansion

Moved by C. Zehr
Seconded by J. Wideman

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo accept the tender of Sierra Construction Ltd. for the Waterloo Regional Police Headquarters Emergency Response Unit Garage Expansion, 200 Maple Grove Road, Cambridge Ontario, in the amount of $1,024,314.49 including all applicable taxes. [F-14-037]

Carried

i) F-14-038, Electronic Fare Management System Purchase Order Increase

Moved by C. Zehr
Seconded by J. Wideman

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo accept the quotation of the Gooderham Group, for professional services relating to the Electronic Fare Management System 1597428
procurement process in the amount of $100,259.25 including all applicable taxes. [F-14-038]

Carried

j) F-14-029, Regional Council and Council Appointee Remuneration and Expenses for the Year Ended December 31, 2013

Received for information.

Committee Reports

Economic and Development and Promotion Committee

The Summary of Recommendation of the Economic and Development and Promotion Committee was presented by Tom Galloway, Chair of the Committee.

Moved by T. Galloway

Seconded by T. Cowan

That the Summary of Recommendations of the Economic and Development and Promotion Committee dated March 4, 2014, Item 1, be adopted as follows:

1. That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take no action on the request from Sports Properties International for in-kind services or sponsorship in the amount of $60,000 for the 2014 Manulife Financial LPGA Classic tournament;

And that the Waterloo Regional Police Service and Region of Waterloo Emergency Medical Services be requested to work with the tournament organizers to reduce costs where possible for this event.

Carried

Community Services

The Summary of Recommendations of the Community Services Committee was presented by Sean Strickland, Chair of the Committee.

Moved by S. Strickland

Seconded by J. Mitchell

That the Summary of Recommendations of the Community Services Committee dated March 4, 2014, 1 to 3, be adopted as follows:

1. That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the revised fees for Tuberculin skin tests administered in the Infectious Disease, Dental and Sexual Health and Harm Reduction clinics effective April 1st, 2014 as detailed in Report PH-14-011;
And, that By-law 14-002 being a By-law to Establish Fees and Charges for the Regional Municipality of Waterloo be amended to include a Tuberculin Skin Test with a fee of $25 per step.


3. That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve in principle the Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative Supportive Housing Redesign process;

And that the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve in principle the draft Region of Waterloo Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative Supportive Housing Program Framework as a 2"guiding policy document“ for the redesigned supportive housing program for further consultation over spring 2014;

And that the Regional Municipality of Waterloo receive for information the Questions and Answers document as outlined in report SS-14-009, dated March 4, 2014.

Carried

Administration and Finance

The Summary of Recommendation of the Administration and Finance Committee was presented by Tom Galloway, Chair of the Committee. Item #3 was taken separately due to the pecuniary interest.

Moved by T. Galloway

Seconded by R. Kelterborn

That the Summary of Recommendations of the Administration and Finance Committee dated March 4, 2014, Items 1, 2 and 3, be adopted as follows:

1. That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo establish the following tax ratios for the 2014 property tax year:

   Residential 1.0000
   New Multi-residential 1.0000
   Multi-residential 1.9500
   Commercial 1.9500
   Industrial 1.9500
   Pipeline 1.1613
   Farmland 0.2500
   Managed Forest 0.2500

   And That the two necessary by-laws to implement the approved 2014 tax ratios and 2014 regional tax rates be prepared for Regional Council approval on March 19, 2014;

   And Further That the Area Municipalities be notified accordingly. [F-14-024]
2. That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the policy statements for the following Human Resources policies:
   
   - Heat Stress Prevention (HR IV-30)
   - Fall Protection (HR IV-31)
   - Licence Suspension/Driving Prohibition (HR I-15)

   as outlined in report CA-HR-14-002, dated March 4, 2014.

3. That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into a contribution agreement with Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada to provide for funding through the Building Canada Fund for the Waterloo Region rapid transit project as a next step to the federal approval in principle letter of April 17, 2012 from the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities and subject to the form and content of the agreement being satisfactory to the Chief Financial Officer and the Regional Solicitor, all as described in Report F-14-026/CR-RS-14-019 dated March 4, 2014.

Carried

Planning and Works

The Summary of Recommendations of the Planning and Works Committee was presented by Jim Wideman, Chair of the Committee. Item #7 was dealt with under delegations. Item #8 was taken separately due to the pecuniary interest.

J. Haalboom inquired if under Item #6 consideration has been given to the bridge. It was noted this approval is for the filing of the environmental assessment not the design and that will come at a later date.

Moved by J. Wideman

Seconded by J. Brewer

That the Summary of Recommendations of the Planning and Works Committee, dated March 4, 2014, Items 1 to 6, and one report from closed session, Item 9, be adopted as follows:


2. That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve an amendment to Controlled Access By-law #58-87 for two accesses on the north side of Regional Road #50 (Northfield Drive), one at Parkside Drive, and the other approximately 145 metres west of Parkside Drive in the City of Waterloo, as described in Report No. P-14-029, dated March 4, 2014.

3. THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to the North Waterloo Scoped Sub-watershed Study as described in Report P-14-026, dated March 4, 2014:
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a) Approve the North Waterloo Scoped Sub-watershed Study (prepared by Ecoplans Ltd., MHBC Planning, and Stantec Consulting, dated November, 2013) pursuant to Regional Official Policies Plan Policy 3.1.5 and Regional Official Plan policy 7.F.6 to the extent that it addresses matters of Regional interest, and more specifically that Regional staff collaborate with City of Waterloo and Grand River Conservation Authority staff to incorporate policies in the City's planning documents for the affected area to implement an environmental management framework pursuant to the applicable Source Water Protection policies in the Regional Official Policies Plan, Regional Official Plan, and the proposed Grand River Source Protection Plan that would, among other matters:

i) require Hydrogeologic Assessments for future development applications to ensure the quantity, quality, and distribution of groundwater recharge is maintained through the design of stormwater management facilities and buried infrastructure;

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

iii) require Salt Management Plans that mitigate the risks of winter de-icing for all new employment and multi-unit residential land uses with large parking lots; and,

v) Implement a Monitoring Program to assess changes to the quantity and quality of surface water and groundwater as a result of development and to verify that the pre-development water balance is being maintained as the area is developed.

b) Address the following in a future amendment to Map 4 (Greenlands Network) of the Regional Official Plan:

i) include the additional Core Environmental Feature areas identified in Attachment 1; and

ii) whether all or part of the natural features on the rear portion of 640 Conservation Drive warrant retention as part of the Greenlands Network shown on Map 4;

c) Continue to work with City of Waterloo staff to include linkages and Supporting Environmental Features identified in the sub-watershed study in the City's planning documents.

d) Continue to collaborate with staff of the City of Waterloo and Grand River Conservation Authority to implement recommendations for the protection, stewardship, enhancement, and monitoring of the Greenlands Network within the study area.
4. That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the construction of combined pedestrian and creek culverts as the replacement for the existing Fischer-Hallman Road culvert at Strasburg Creek in the City of Kitchener, as per Alternative 3 noted in the City of Kitchener Strasburg Creek Flood Environmental Study Report dated December 2013, subject to the City of Kitchener’s Class EA Environmental Study Report clearing the statutory minimum 30-day public review period. [E-14-031]

5. That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo receive the 2013 Summary Report, as required by Ontario Regulation 170/03, the minutes from the annual Management Review of the Drinking Water Quality Management System and maintenance plan update. [E-14-030]

6. That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to the Class Environmental Assessment for the River Road Extension, King Street to Manitou Drive, in the City of Kitchener:

a) Approve the preliminary design for construction of the River Road Extension as described in Report E-14-029, dated March 4, 2014;

b) Direct staff to file the Notice of Completion for this Class Environmental Assessment Study by means of advertisements in the local newspapers and mailings to adjacent property owners, tenants, and agencies, and place the Environmental Study Report on the public record for a period of 30 days.

9. That The Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve, enter into an Agreement for, and execute all documentation related to the acquisition of land for the Rapid Transit Project – Stage 1 described as Part Lot 288 Plan 385, City of Waterloo Parts 6 & 7 58R-13231 save and except Parts 3 & 4 on WR726563, PIN 22328-0195 (LT), City of Waterloo being the property municipally known as 242 King Street South, Waterloo from Jennifer Lynn Cooper for the sum of $315,000.00 as compensation for the value of the acquisition of land plus compensation for disturbance damages and any and all other damages suffered by the said property owner in the sum of $12,000.00 not including costs, fees and bonuses charged by the existing first mortgagee in relation to the early discharge of the existing charge on title, plus associated costs, with all documentation to the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor.

Carried

Moved by J. Wideman

Seconded by J. Brewer

That the Summary of Recommendations of the Planning and Works Committee, dated March 4, 2014, one report from closed session, Item 8, be adopted as follows:

8. That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into an agreement with the University of Waterloo for the transfer of title to the lands and storm water management pond west of Bearinger Road (Regional Road No. 58), described...
as Part Lot 30, GCT, Geographic Township of Waterloo, designated as Parts 1, 2 & 3 on Reference Plan 58R-10886, City of Waterloo, Region of Waterloo, to the University of Waterloo for $2.00 in exchange for the University of Waterloo assuming responsibility for the future maintenance of the storm water management pond, for cost-sharing the expansion of the storm water management pond onto abutting lands owned by the University of Waterloo at an estimated cost to the Region of $172,000 for construction, and obtaining an easement for storm water drainage and management over the expanded storm water management pond on University of Waterloo lands for $59,250, subject to satisfactory completion of the Region’s real property disposition procedures, on terms and conditions satisfactory to the Regional Solicitor.

Carried

**Regional Clerk**

a) CR-CLK-LIC-14-001, Appointment of Area Weed Inspectors

Moved by J. Haalboom

Seconded by G. Lorentz

That the Region of Waterloo appoints the following staff as Area Weed Inspectors:

Angelo Apfelbaum, Todd Abernethy, Ryan Milanovic and Phil Neville.

Carried

**Other Matters Under Committee Of The Whole**

a) Memo, Ontario Works Caseload: February 2014 was received for information.

b) Memo, Notice of Motion – 2014 Tax Rate By-law was received for information.

Moved by G. Lorentz

Seconded by L. Armstrong

That Committee of the Whole rise and Council resume.

Carried

Moved by J. Brewer

Seconded by R. Kelterborn

That Council adopt the proceeding of the Committee of the Whole.
Carried

Notice of Motion

This item was dealt with under Delegations.

Other Business

J. Haalboom requested consideration for heritage sites as a business be included in the Waterloo Region Economic Development Strategy. Mike Murray, Chief Administrative Officer responded that there have been a series of stakeholders workshops and two of them focused on manufacturing and arts, culture and heritage.

Enactment of By-Laws – (First, Second & Third Readings)

Moved by C. Millar

Seconded by J. Wideman

a) That a By-law to Establish Tax Ratios For Regional Purposes and Area Municipal Purposes for the Year 2014 be read a first, second and third time, finally passed and numbered 14-010 signed by the Regional Chair and Regional Clerk and sealed with the Regional Seal.

b) That a By-law to Establish and Levy Rates of Taxation for Regional Purposes for the Year 2014 be read a first, second and third time, finally passed and numbered 14-011 signed by the Regional Chair and Regional Clerk and sealed with the Regional Seal.

c) That a By-law to Amend By-law Number 1-90, Being a By-law to Prohibit, Regulate and Control the Discharge of Waters and Wastes into Bodies of Water within the Regional Area or into the Regional Sanitary Trunk Sewers, Trunk Sewer System, or Sewage Treatment Works and all Tributary Sewer Systems and to Regulate and Control Extensions, Alterations or Enlargement to the Sewer System of any Area Municipality be read a first, second and third time, finally passed and numbered 14-012 signed by the Regional Chair and Regional Clerk and sealed with the Regional Seal.

d) That a By-law to Regulate the Supply and Distribution of Water Within the Townships of North Dumfries and Wellesley be read a first, second and third time, finally passed and numbered 14-013 signed by the Regional Chair and Regional Clerk and sealed with the Regional Seal.

e) That a By-law to Amend By-law 14-002, A By-law to Establish Fees and Charges for the Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Water Distribution, Townships of North Dumfries and Wellesley; Tuberculosis Skin Tests) be read a first, second and third time, finally passed and numbered 14-014 signed by the Regional Chair and Regional Clerk and sealed with the Regional Seal.
f) That a By-law to Amend By-law 58-87, As Amended, Being a By-law to Designate and Regulate Controlled Access Roads (Regional Road 50, Northfield Drive, City of Waterloo) be read a first, second and third time, finally passed and numbered 14-015 signed by the Regional Chair and Regional Clerk and sealed with the Regional Seal.

g) That a By-law to Confirm the Actions of Council of March 19, 2014 be read a first, second and third time, finally passed and numbered 14-016 signed by the Regional Chair and Regional Clerk and sealed with the Regional Seal.

Carried

Adjourn

Moved by J. Brewer

Seconded by B. Halloran

That the meeting adjourn at 10:40 p.m.

Carried

Regional Chair, K. Seiling

Regional Clerk, K. Fletcher
WATERLOO FEDERATION OF AGRICULTURE

Presentation to Regional Council

March 19, 2004

Farmers and the agricultural community in Waterloo Region will not be required to pay for and will, in all likelihood, rarely use light rapid transit yet we have a vested interest in ensuring that it is not only built but used extensively by our urban neighbours. Quite simply, without intensification and its key requirement, high quality transit, the future of farming in Waterloo Region is threatened.

Waterloo Region is growing at a rate that is higher than nearly any other city in Canada and the province of Ontario has clearly stated in the Places to Grow Act that we are to continue that growth. Yet the official boundaries of our three cities, our countryside lines, have not changed since 1973. The agricultural views, vistas and farmsteads on the screens in front of you are all located within one concession or about two kilometers of these countryside lines. Everything that you see is in peril if those countryside lines are breached.

When one travels outside of this region into other parts of Ontario, Canada, the United States, Europe and the World, the name Waterloo elicits about four common responses. People are familiar with our universities, our high tech sector, Oktoberfest and the unique agricultural heritage of which we are so proud.; the traditional old order farms and their traditional lifestyle, our farmers markets, the rolling countryside, Noah Martin summer sausage, cooked cheese, apple butter, maple syrup etc. We live in a unique and special place.

In 2002 Waterloo Region Public Health, in cooperation with the Waterloo Federation of Agriculture, commissioned Harry Cummings and Associates of Guelph to publish an agricultural economic impact study of Agriculture in the Region. If the findings of that report could be summarized in a single sentence, it would be this. Waterloo Region has the most productive and prosperous combination of farmers and farmland in all of Ontario and quite possibly in Canada.
Since 1973, when Waterloo County became a Regional Municipality, we have been blessed with politicians and planners who have demonstrated both skill and vision. We have built three great cities that are the envy of the world and at the same time protected nearly two thirds of our agricultural land. This took both courage and foresight. Our planners continue to lead and innovate and our new Official Plan and the LRT proposal are proof of that.

To the councilors of Cambridge who have expressed concern about LRT, I look forward to the day when LRT ends at Ainslie Street Terminal instead of a mall. If ever there was a potential to grow modern and scenic cities, it exists within the three original communities of Cambridge; three historic downtowns each with a river in its core. Kitchener and Waterloo have creeks and Waterloo buried theirs underground. If I were ever to choose to live in a city in Waterloo Region it would be downtown Galt overlooking the Grand River. What an incredible beautiful location. Of any place in Waterloo Region, it may have the most to gain from LRT.

Could not the southern terminus of LRT be one day both the primary origin of LRT passengers and the primary destination of LRT passengers?

Perhaps we need to view high quality public transit as an opportunity not a burden.

What would Waterloo have looked like had we not planned for the future? Our current population density is about 1500 people per square kilometer. Cities in the southern U.S. that lack effective planning policy, such as Denver, Atlanta, Dallas, Phoenix etc. have densities of less than 500. If we had not had the visionaries that we have had for almost 40 years and our population density was only 500 people per square kilometer, the cities of Kitchener, Waterloo and Cambridge would encompass not only their present footprint but also all of North Dumfries, all of Wilmot, all of Woolwich, all of Wellesley and more. Agriculture in Waterloo would not exist.

Good planning and intensification protect farmland.
Rapid Transit and specifically LRT permit and drive intensification.
It’s that simple!
Building more roads and allowing sprawl is enormously expensive in the long term. Sprawl is irreversible Should we procrastinate in choosing a transit plan or simply choose the most politically expedient option, we risk losing agricultural land that we can never regain.
No matter what decision that we make regarding public transit, we will be leaving a legacy for the next generation. Would it not be better to leave our children the opportunity to experience Ayr, New Dundee, Wellesley, St Jacobs and all of the productive countryside in between in a similar state to what it is today rather than having it resemble the sprawl of Mississauga, Brampton, Markham or Oakville?

The pressure to increase our population is not going away.
The pressure to sprawl is not going away.
This is not the time to be complacent and rest on our laurels.
It is the time to redouble our efforts to limit the urban footprint.
It is the time to be even more visionary and protect the countryside that we cherish.
It is the time to be even better planners and continue to build 3 cities that are the envy of the world.

Thank you Council for taking the time to carefully and thoughtfully envision how we can sustain both our rural and urban communities.
Thank you for using a planning timeline that looks forward nearly a generation into the future as opposed to just the next election.
Thank you for intentionally hiring the very best staff and keeping them because the quality of the people that we as a region employ are a measure of how much we value our future.

You have been elected by the people of this great Region to be leaders and to be visionary. Confirm the LRT option. We will remember that you took a risk to provide a better future and we, our children and our grandchildren, will thank you for that vision.

Mark Reusser

Vice-President
Waterloo Federation of Agriculture
The vote today commits 9 future councils to a 20% to 25% tax increase.

John Shortreed, 519 885-4027, March 19, 2014

Confusion, contradictions and information gaps means Council has insufficient information to make a decision.

The contract is incompatible with the Transit Plan. It will not provide the expected Benefits.
Savings in Road Costs is misrepresented

• ‘Without the Ion, we would need to build some 500 new lane kilometres of roads in the next 20 years,” Kitchener Mayor Carl Zehr said. “The cost of that is $1.4 billion.” ‘ Record Mar 5, 2014

• “Without rapid transit, the road expansion costs including property would be in the range of $1.4 to $1.5 billion.” – staff report for March 4
The ‘road’ savings are only about $200 million

- The Mar. 4 staff report goes on a few lines later to contradict the $1.4 billion –

“Building a rapid transit system and increasing transit ridership will reduce the amount of road construction required by approximately 40% and reduce road expansion costs by $400 to $500 million.”

- Moving forward report (details of all road projects) says 26% , not 40%

- Capacity needed for 2031 is 3000 persons per hour but contract with 14 streetcars will only provide 1500-1800 persons per hour (14 streetcars short)

- Also costs for extra roads are not mentioned, such as $54 million for Weber street - Region says one third of King St traffic will divert to Weber street

- So reduced capacity and unaccounted road extras reduces road savings to about $100-200 million, or $1.2 billion less than council expects
What about the other costs of the Moving Forward Transit Plan – the expanded bus service?

• When the costs of cross town bus routes, and expanded frequency of other bus routes, required by the LRT are added - the transit initiative is no longer “on budget”

• The March 4th staff report estimates for 2018 an annual cost of $44.78 million to operate and maintain the 14 LRT vehicles, or about 13% tax increase, which looks like it is on budget

• However the Moving Forward plan (Tables 5-11 and 5-12) estimates non LRT costs as $1.776 billion over 20 years or $88.8 million per year. These additional costs must be offset by revenues, existing recovery rates are 1/3, therefore $58 million more per year in costs or about 15% to be added to the 13% or total tax increases of about 28%
Is 28% tax increase by 2031 realistic or not?

• Would be more than 28% if 14 more streetcars would be added to the contact to achieve capacity of 3000 per hour required in Transit Plan

• Would be less by the amount of additional revenue from streetcar users not now using iXpress – limited by capacity of LRT

• Would be less if ridership does not increase from 5% of trips to 13-15% of trips in the Transit Plan as bus service could be reduced and 14 more streetcars would not be needed – But then road savings and other transit benefits would also be much less (catch 22 situation)

• Most likely scenario is increased taxes of about 20% and benefits of road savings and ridership about one half of Transit Plan
Other “contract unknowns” in March 4 report

• Frequency of service to be provided?
• Penalty for time delays? Is it sufficient?
• Costs of “honour” fare collection and provider of fare collection?
• Impacts of delays on King Street (one lane only, each direction) to local buses, police, taxies, ambulances? *No sirens needed as cars can’t move*
• How to resolve additional costs due to change in signal timing, strikes, replacement bus services due to accidents, utility repairs, etc.?
• Where are all the costs of transferring $267 million in risks estimated by the “Value for Money Report” or where those savings a fiction?
• Many other significant and unknown contract details
Given the misunderstandings exhibited by council members’ public statements and the uncertainties and missing information in the March 4 report, totaling at least 2 billion

Conclusion - it is not possible to make an informed decision without benefit of a comprehensive analysis of the proposed contract, that will commit 9 future councils
Good evening Mr. Chair, Members of council,

My name is Anna Beard and I've been a resident of Waterloo for eight years now. When I left home in 2005 to attend the University of Waterloo, I didn’t expect to stay. Now, almost a decade later I can’t imagine leaving.

In those short years I’ve grown personally and professionally, increasing my awareness of identity quite similarly to the way the region has. We’ve seen dramatic changes in the last decade – reinvigorated cores, community building strategies, and increased connectivity to other urban centres, and with the implementation of light rail transit, we’ll continue to see many more.

That ability to grow and remain on the leading edge is what made me fall in love with this region. When I jumped out of my step dad’s truck as a seventeen year old, touching regional soil for the first time, I had no idea that I would be introduced to a community that excels at encouraging its residents to take every opportunity as a chance to improve.

I learned to be responsible, to avoid stagnation, to set an example, to give back, and when to ask for help. When I was offered my job at UWaterloo in 2011, I was elated. I didn’t have to move; I could stay where I had established roots - where I had created a new home.

After settling into one position, I transitioned to another having out grown the role. I could have very well moved to another city but the continued promise of growth and community kept me here. In the past few years I’ve had the opportunity to give to the place I’m proud to call home through various volunteer commitments. Having just completed the Engage KW program through the Kitchener Waterloo Community Foundation, and working with the Region on a marketing and communications plan for ION, I’ve seen first hand how by approving the contract with Grandlino and moving forward with the stage one LRT project this region will not only continue to be the envy of many others but also continue to support those who live here.

It’s been four years since I finished my degree and while I've almost cut it by half, I am still crippled by what feels like a never-ending student debt. Trying to find an extra $10,000 per year in my budget to put towards a vehicle is impossible - using and supporting transit is the only option for myself and many others who live in the region. More importantly, I shouldn’t need to rely on a vehicle to get from my job at UWaterloo to my favourite shops in Kitchener, or my favourite art gallery in Cambridge.

The addition and implementation of light rail in the region will help keep me connected, invested, and involved while giving me more time to spend doing the things that matter most to me - including supporting our ever growing and vibrant economy.
Mr. Chair, members of council;

My name is Lee Angold. I am here to thank you for the proactive and forward-thinking LRT proposal. I am here to urge you to commit to making the Ion LRT a reality by awarding the P3 contract to GrandLinQ.

Let me tell you a little bit about myself. I am a young professional and I recently moved to the region. My husband and I are looking to buy our first home here within a couple of years. I love living here now, but it hasn’t always been that way. When I first came to visit in 2007, I was coming from urban Toronto to a largely car-dependent suburbia. I felt trapped.

I credit the Ion LRT project as the primary factor for my change in opinion. While Toronto’s transit and urban planning stagnated and backtracked, Waterloo Region brought forward a smart proposal and worked through the process of making it a reality.

The Ion LRT will be far more than a way to get from Point A to Point B. The LRT will dramatically shape our urban landscape. What would life be like without it?

An example of the future of business-as-usual lies directly to our east. Twenty years ago, Mississauga had the same population and density as we have now. Mississauga’s current population matches projections for Waterloo Region in 20 years. After two decades without transit investment, Mississauga is a sprawling, gridlocked mess of roads and highways, ill-served by an aging, slow bus system.

Here in Waterloo region, we can learn from Mississauga’s mistakes.

A different transit policy might bring far better results. Portland has a population halfway between Waterloo Region and Mississauga. Portland’s 590 000 residents enjoy 5 LRT lines, a downtown streetcar line, a dense bus network, a regional commuter train, and an aerial tram. Portland is ranked among the top cities for walkability, bikeability, and quality of life.

A robust and well-serviced transit line is good for more than just riders. When the ION LRT plan was released, the areas along the transit corridor began to transform. The Tannery and Bauer Lofts, which were unoccupied on my first visits, now house employment, cafes, restaurants, shops, and housing.

New residential and work opportunities along the transit corridor will allow young professionals like me to choose a car-free lifestyle. This will improve foot traffic for businesses, and reduce gridlock. The mere HOPE of an LRT system has already started transforming and rejuvenating our urban area.

This is the right contract at the right time. You have done an excellent job of developing an LRT plan that encourages urban renewal while remaining fiscally prudent. The GrandLinQ contract is written in a way that protects the region against cost and time overruns, while still coming in under budget. Now is the time to act.

Thank you.
March 19, 2014

Re: Doug Craig’s Notice of Motion:

Regional Council, Region of Waterloo

Members of Council,

I am here on behalf of TriTAG, the Tri-Cities Transport Action Group, to speak to Councillor Craig's notice of motion on area-rating. We believe that people in Waterloo Region should be able to get around on foot, by bike, and by transit easily and with dignity.

Our Region includes Cambridge, and we believe that a good transit network for the Region as a whole requires good transit in and between all three cities. Unity is good for the Region, but it is especially good for transit networks. The utility of a transit system grows non-linearly with better service and better design – every new iXpress line facilitates many new connections and helps many more people get where they would like to go.

We have and will continue to be firm in supporting LRT to Cambridge, because that is the proper length of the Region's central transit corridor. However, we also support practical approaches, and that means incremental changes that are doable. The whole 40km LRT line all in one go would have made the project too big to handle. And given that more than two-thirds of the ridership on the iXpress 200 line is north of Fairview, building the higher ridership portion first makes the most sense to us.

That said, we believe the ridership projections are very conservative. With the redesign of the transit network to a more grid-like system and the increased speed, reliability, and better stop spacing of both the LRT and the adapted BRT, as well as with urban growth along the corridor, there are many reasons to think ridership will be far higher.

Recently built modern light rail systems in North America are all working on extensions, and many of them already have several. Some people do dismiss comparisons to other cities, but thanks to Waterloo Region's density and linear urban form, the real current ridership along the Region's central transit corridor has shown that it is easily comparable to corridors in North American cities that have built LRT.

LRT will be successful here. And its success will result in a strong demand, and a strong case for more. There is no question that the extension to Cambridge is the first addition needed to the system, though it is
certainly not the last.

And that is a big reason that we do not support this motion. When we and many others are going to be demanding Phase 2, a requirement that Cambridge, and only Cambridge, bear the local tax impact for the doubling of the line would make the task virtually impossible.

We ask that Council continue with a united Region and a united transit network. Moreover, we urge both the Region and the City of Cambridge to take more concrete steps to accelerate Phase 2. Specifically, we would like to see station area planning beginning now and we would like to see enforced bus lanes on Hespeler Road – so that it is clear where LRT will be extended, that the Region is serious enough to dedicate street space to transit, and so that residents and astute developers can plan accordingly.

Regards,

Michael Druker,

on behalf of TriTAG
Wednesday March 19, 2014

Remarks to Regional Council of Waterloo

Regarding LRT financing and in support of Cambridge Mayor Doug Craig’s proposed motion to exempt the City of Cambridge taxpayers from paying for the LRT

Good Evening: Regional Chair, Mayors, Councilors, staff and fellow citizens of the Region of Waterloo:

Like many who live in Waterloo Region, I’ve been trying to keep up with the LRT plans and developments, mostly by reading The Record and listening to the morning broadcasts of CBC radio 89.1 for Waterloo Region.

So, having listened to several recent interviews Craig Norris has had with Cambridge Mayor Doug Craig I decided to attend tonight’s council meeting, out of personal interest.

Then, I read a brief synopsis in our local Cambridge Times of Thursday March 13th and decided to ‘speak up’ in support of my Mayor, my Councilor Claudette Millar and other taxpayers in Cambridge.

What motivated me were quotes from Councilor Tom Galloway, article attached:

“Yes, you are getting less – it’s phase one of two phases. We have every intention of doing it someday when the timing is right...”

I agree with Mayor Craig. He is accountable to the people of Cambridge. He is quoted as saying ‘The real issue and the issue over all is one of fairness” to the citizens of Cambridge.

Thank you for your consideration on this very important issue.

Lin Stevens

550 Grand Ridge Drive

Cambridge ON N1S 4Y9
City willing to pay for aBRT

Continued from page 1

Craig previously tried to bring up his motion during budget discussions, but was blocked by procedure. Instead, he worked with the clerk, so the motion could be heard next week.

"They have been telling people you pay for what you get, but they've made a mistake. They say we are getting light rail transit - we're not. We are more than willing to pay for aBRT, which is not a rapid transit system," he said.

Craig said he is sure his counterparts around the horseshoe aren't thrilled with his suggestion, "but I'm not accountable to them. I'm accountable to the people of Cambridge. The issue is about fairness. The constituents of Cambridge are extremely angry over the fact that the system is coming in and they are going to have to pay for the next 30 years and they got no advantage out of it - either in terms of development or development along the line."

The cost of virtually every service within Waterloo Region is shared by the entire region except for public transit, mobility services and libraries, according to the region's chief financial officer Craig Dyer.

Kitchener, Cambridge and Waterloo share the cost for GRT, with Woolwich Township paying for one bus route into Elmira.

Only township taxpayers pay for Region of Waterloo Library services because the cities fund their own individual libraries.

Dyer said his department is working on the calculations for the bylaw should Craig's motion pass.

According to Dyer, Cambridge and Waterloo each represent 24 per cent of the total assessment, while Kitchener represents about 40 per cent. The townships make up the remaining 10 to 12 per cent.

But whether the motion will get on the floor remains to be seen.

Regional councillors have entertained other motions intent on delaying or cancelling the LRT, but they haven't received enough votes to pass.

This time may not be any different, according to Coun. Tom Galloway.

"He'll have his day, I don't think he'll be successful; it wasn't successful back in 2011. I think the unfortunate part of this is we are going to get dragged through a really divisive discussion about how well Cambridge does in the union."

And if Cambridge doesn't want to pay for LRT now, Kitchener and Waterloo won't be paying for the extension into Cambridge, which will mean they'll never see the LRT, Galloway said.

"Cambridge would never be able to pay for LRT on its own. It will need the whole urban region to pay for it the same as it is being paid for now. So to say it is really to say it's never going to happen," he said.

"Their taxes would go up through the roof if Kitchener and Waterloo weren't part of the funding plan."

Galloway said Cambridge certainly benefits from being part of the region and he has compiled a list of numbers where Cambridge has received more service than they have paid for.

But while he said he doesn't want to use it, he will if Craig continues to push for Cambridge being exempted from LRT.

"But I would soon find out Cambridge is getting a heck of a good deal. You can't just cherry pick one service where you think you are getting less. Yes, you are getting less - it's phase one of two phases. We have every intention to do it someday when the timing is right and ratepayers in Kitchener and Waterloo will help pay for it, but it's not like they are getting nothing," he said.

The townships are not paying for LRT, but they do receive some benefits, including lower taxes because of increased development in the cities and the preservation of farmland.

Galloway said there could be an argument for having the townships pay because they do see some benefit, but they aren't directly connected to the system.

"There's a big difference because they are not physically connected by a GRT system to the line," Galloway said.

"(Craig) is forcing us into a corner on this motion. He started this politics of division, pitting one community against the other, trying to make it sound like they are getting a raw deal and we're probably going to have to respond with some actual facts."
# Services by Municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Cambridge</th>
<th>Kitchener</th>
<th>Waterloo</th>
<th>N. Dumfries</th>
<th>Wellesley</th>
<th>Wilmot</th>
<th>Woolwich</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conventional GRT route to Elmira</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional GRT Service</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban GRT Mobility Service</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural GRT Mobility Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aBRT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other Regional Services</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Services</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tax impact</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tax impact is uniform across the three Cities.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tax impact is uniform across these three Townships.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current 2014 Tax Impact</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.12%</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Net cost of service levied to municipalities with an X
## Rates & Levies Per Capita

### Population Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>133,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>232,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>129,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2012 Transit Rates & Levies Per Capita

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>$117.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>$104.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>$115.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### General Purpose Rates & Levies Per Capita

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>$652.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>$600.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>$670.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments to Regional Council
March 19, 2014

Area Rating of LRT

Councillor Craig has tabled a motion to area rate the rapid transit project. This issue was decided in 2011 and would normally require a motion to reconsider. There has been some question as to whether a motion to reconsider is appropriate but I have decided to allow Councillor Craig’s motion on the rating bylaw rather than get into a protracted procedural wrangle. This in effect is a way of putting a form of reconsideration on the table. Neither Councillor Craig nor I voted on the original motion. We are now able to speak to the matter as the motion seeks to amend the budget and levy bylaw.

*******

I am opposed to this motion and would urge Regional Council to defeat it. There are two reasons I am opposed to the motion.

By way of background, when the original feasibility study was done which set the stage for a two stage project, Councillor Craig voted for the next step which was the Environmental Assessment for phase one which was amended at his request to include adding the route study for the second phase so that, as he described the request, the preliminary groundwork for a second phase would be done and the route identified. Subsequently he took the position that if a total LRT could not be built in one phase, he would not support LRT in a phased approach.

Although not in the original phasing plans, Regional Council decided to add an adapted BRT for the second phase as an interim step to provide a form of rapid transit which would provide improved service and build ridership so that conditions for the second phase might develop more quickly. It would also provide for an easier conversion for a subsequent LRT phase. It was also decided to add the project costs to the entire urban transit levy. In addition to moving quickly on the aBRT, Council has agreed to begin planning for phase two so that we are prepared to move ahead with it.

It is being suggested that phase two of the LRT is too far off and that the project should be area rated. If there is one thing that will guarantee that the project would likely not proceed is to area rate. This would mean that all of the local capital and operating costs of phase two would have to be levied on Cambridge – something that I suggest would not be acceptable in terms of the local tax increases needed to build and operate the project. It also raises the question of whether an area rated system would provide a seamless fare system or whether a two fare system would be required. It also raises the question about whether or not the entire system should be area rated – assigning costs and revenues. Currently, as you will see, the Cambridge GRT service is already being supported financially by Kitchener and Waterloo.

It would be my hope that we will see progress on the second phase more quickly than some anticipate. However, an area-rated capital program would make efforts very difficult if an estimated $800 plus million project for phase 2 would need to be assessed against Cambridge only.
My second reason for speaking against area rating is that it flies in the face of sharing costs for services based on assessment which is foundational to all two tier governments - whether county or regional. It is also a debate I have always tried to avoid in this Region as it can be divisive and damaging to our working together. During my time both as a Mayor on Regional Council and as the Regional Chair, I have always avoided the discussion of how services are financed other than by assessment. In fact, I would not be speaking to it tonight if a motion to area rate had not been introduced and comments made by various persons about unfairness and a less than balanced view of how services are financed across the Region. I did warn against it a few weeks ago when it was first raised.

It is unfortunate that this issue is being used by some to drive a wedge between Cambridge and the rest of the Region. Whipping up anti-Region sentiment may serve the interests of some but does not reflect the reality of how Regional dollars are spent and how Cambridge has been treated, and how it continues to be treated. Cambridge has done very well in the Region over the years and continues to do so.

With few exceptions, county or regionally provided services are shared on an assessment basis. In some cases the taxes shared might closely mirror the actual provision of services. In some cases they might not. This is no different than different parts of a city or of a Province or the Country. Assessment reflects an ability to pay so that a sharing of resources takes place over the greater whole.

With some considerable reservation, I would like to provide a brief overview of some of our major services which I have gathered. I am sure more work could be done but they reflect generally how a number of service costs are shared relative to usage and levy share. They do serve to show that despite claims by some that Cambridge has been disadvantaged within the Region, the reality is that it has received considerable support from the other municipalities with no objections, no recriminations, and no suggestions of area rating. Currently Cambridge pays 24% of the general levy with 24% of the Region’s population.

**Social Assistance:** Currently 29% of the social assistance caseload is in Cambridge. It pays 24% of the local costs. The net benefit to Cambridge is approximately $896,000.

**Social Housing:** The Region currently provides 8,134 units of subsidized housing or rent supplements of which 2,594 (32%) are in Cambridge. In actual fact 34% of subsidy dollars flow to Cambridge units but Cambridge is levied only 24% of the costs. The net levy benefit to Cambridge is $2,998,000.

**Child Care:** Currently 33% of subsidized childcare is in Cambridge although it pays 24% of the costs. Of a total of 2,919 subsidy spaces, 952 are in Cambridge. The net benefit is approximately $751,000. The Region operates 3 directly operated day care centres in Cambridge with 157 spaces. These centres provide more specialized day care services. There are only two other such centres – one in Kitchener with 36 spaces and one in Elmira with 36 spaces.

**Transit:** The Region has invested heavily in transit since it took over transit in 2000. Much investment was made in Cambridge, this year seeing even more new investment. A unified levy was implemented a few years ago and preliminary work shows that when expenses, fare box revenue, Upass revenue, and gas tax revenue based on ridership are allocated,
the Cambridge levy is subsidized by the levy from Kitchener and Waterloo. The net benefit to Cambridge currently is about $582,000.

EMS: Based on 2013 numbers, the usage in Cambridge - based on calls for service - is close to the levy share with a small benefit to Cambridge of approximately $116,000.

Police: Currently Cambridge contributes 24% of the police levy however, based on occurrences or calls for service, Cambridge consumes 31% of the police services. If the service was area rated based on usage, the levy to Cambridge would be increased by $9,812,000.

Roads: The Region maintains a rural and an urban road system. The three urban municipalities assist with the rural system in line with the old suburban roads system which was in place when the Region was created. However, Cambridge has 278 km or 32% of the Region’s urban roads out of an urban road system of 879 kms. Cambridge has a benefit of $166,000 within the urban maintenance contracts. Over the last 10 years, the Region has spent $309,071,000 or 39% of its urban road budget in Cambridge. This work has been financed by a combination of development charges, gas tax money, and the property tax. The current 10 year forecast includes road construction which will see about 25% of the program spent on Cambridge roads.

Waste: When the Region assumed waste collection and was able to issue a joint tender for the three cities, the joint contract with blended rates increased services for Cambridge residents while reducing the costs for Cambridge residents. This rate also includes the cost of trucking waste and recycling to north Waterloo.

Water and Wastewater: I did not take the time to break out these costs but it is interesting to note that the Region maintains three wastewater treatment plants for the same population as Waterloo which has one.

Although I have avoided these discussions in the past, today’s motion and the public discussion of the past few weeks has brought them to the fore. I am constantly being challenged by those who say Cambridge is somehow being shortchanged. I think the numbers prove otherwise.

When we start to break down the levy with area rates, it opens the door to doing the same for other services. It undermines the principles that are at the core of county and regional governments which see a sharing of costs, even though there may be an unbalanced provision of services. Some get more than their financial share would provide, some get less, depending on the service. However we are a Regional family where sharing strengthens all of us.

The day I was elected, the new Toyota Plant was announced. Within weeks of that announcement, the Province changed the cost sharing of the site servicing and both the Region and Cambridge had to step up with unplanned financing. It was fully supported by the Region. Today we are examining ways to permit the Region to assist in servicing costs for the eastside lands in Cambridge which has been supported unanimously. A few years ago, the Region received Millennium funding from the Province for its infrastructure needs. Regional Council made a decision to share this funding with the area municipalities so that, in the case of Cambridge, we were able to provide $4.1 million which they were able to leverage to make it possible to develop the School of Architecture. More recently when Conestoga College was
seeking to expand and build the Cambridge campus, it was the Region that came to the table with more than $8 million to help the project proceed. Just last year, we relaxed our rules on hospital funding to give Cambridge advanced funding for their hospital project, something which had not been done for the other hospitals. During the Once Voice, One Vision public fundraising campaign, approximately 10% of the public donations came from Cambridge but the Region wide campaign allocated 25% of its funds to Cambridge Memorial Hospital.

It is my view that Cambridge has been treated very well over the years as a member of the Regional family, both within the Region itself and by other bodies dealing on a Regional basis. To begin to cherry pick services and break down services by area rating would undermine our common ability to do good things together and I would urge you not to begin a move in that direction
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Total Net Levy Region $</th>
<th>What Cambridge Pays for the Service</th>
<th>What Value or Benefit Cambridge gets in Service</th>
<th>Net Benefit $/Year</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Works</td>
<td>$18.044 m</td>
<td>24.04%</td>
<td>29% of OW recipients reside in Cambridge</td>
<td>$5.233 m</td>
<td>$0.896 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>$30.095 m (excludes contribution to capital)</td>
<td>24.04%</td>
<td>34% of the costs relates to subsidized units in Cambridge; Cambridge has 32% of total units (2,594 of 8,152)</td>
<td>$10.232 m</td>
<td>$2.998 m Affordable Housing units funded – 34% of new units in Cambridge receiving $24.873 m (42%) out of $59.180 m senior gov’t funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td>$8.380 m</td>
<td>24.04%</td>
<td>33% of subsidized children are in Cambridge (952 of 2,919)</td>
<td>$2.765 m</td>
<td>$0.751 m Region directly operates 5 childcare centres – 3 in Cambridge (157), 1 in Kitchener (36), 1 in Elmira (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRT Conventional Service</td>
<td>$52.507</td>
<td>27.77%</td>
<td>24% of GRT service hours in Cambridge; 16.6% revenue from Cambridge</td>
<td>$15.165 m</td>
<td>$0.582 m $22.191 m (gross cost of Cambridge service hours) less $7.026 m (16.6% of total revenues) = $15.165 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS</td>
<td>$11.979 m</td>
<td>24.04%</td>
<td>25% calls for service(2013)</td>
<td>$2.995 m</td>
<td>$0.116 m Improving response times in Cambridge is under review and may require additional resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Total Net Levy Region $</td>
<td>What Cambridge Pays for the Service</td>
<td>What Value or Benefit Cambridge gets in Service</td>
<td>Net Benefit $/Year</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>$140.905 m</td>
<td>24.04% $33.869 m</td>
<td>31% of occurrences or calls for service are in Cambridge $43.681 m</td>
<td>$9.812 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Roads Maintenance Contracts</td>
<td>$5.194 m</td>
<td>24.04% $1.248 m</td>
<td>27% of the cost was for Cambridge roads $1.414 m</td>
<td>$0.166 m</td>
<td>Urban Road System 278/879 lane kms (31.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Road Capital</td>
<td>Spending on urban roads capital <strong>2004-2013</strong> was $309.071 m in Cambridge which is <strong>39%</strong> of the total amount of $791.716 m. For <strong>2014-2023</strong>, $231.145 m (<strong>25%</strong>) of the planned urban roads capital spending totalling $925.680 m will be in Cambridge</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded is a combination of RDC’s, gas tax funds, and property taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>When a unified contract for the 3 cities was let, Cambridge received increased service at a lower cost when blended with the K-W service area. The cost of trucking waste and recyclables to north Waterloo is also blended into the common rate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDC’S</td>
<td>Regional Development Charge collections 2009-2013</td>
<td>Cambridge 17%</td>
<td>Kitchener 36%</td>
<td>Waterloo 30%</td>
<td>Townships 17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>