MEDIA RELEASE: Friday, September 23, 2011, 4:30 p.m.

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO
PLANNING AND WORKS COMMITTEE
AGENDA

Tuesday, September 27, 2011
1:00 P.M.
Regional Council Chamber
150 Frederick Street, Kitchener, Ontario

1. MOTION TO RECONVENE IN OPEN SESSION

2. DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST UNDER THE MUNICIPAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT

3. DELEGATIONS

   a) E-11-063, River Road Extension, King Street to Manitou Drive, Kitchener
   Recommended Planning Alternative and Amendment to Consultant Services Agreement:
   1. Daphne Nichols
   2. Ron and Anne Huckleberry
   3. Duncan Clemens
   4. Neil Taylor
   5. Gordon Nicholls

   b) James Parkin, MHBC Planning and Melanie Horton, CBM Aggregates,
   Bromberg Application ZC-11/08, Lot 33 & 34, Concession 9, 2772 Greenfield Road,
   Ayr, ON

   c) Bob Connors, Waterloo Wellington Flight Centre
   E-11-104, Airport Fee Structure Review

4. REPORTS – TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

   DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION

   a) CR-RS-11-059, Authorization to Expropriate Lands (1st Report) for Road Improvements to University Avenue (Regional Road 57), in the City of Waterloo

   b) E-11-063, River Road Extension, King Street to Manitou Drive, Kitchener
   Recommended Planning Alternative and Amendment to Consultant Services Agreement (staff presentation) (correspondence received)

   c) E-11-096, Update on the Construction of Townline Road Improvements, Can-Amera Parkway to Gore/Avenue Road, City of Cambridge
d) Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive Improvements in the Village of Conestogo, Township of Woolwich - Information Package in Advance of Public Consultation Centre

TRANSPORTATION

e) E-11-082, GRT - Smoking Restrictions 54
f) E-11-094, Onboard Mobile Surveillance Systems Policy Update 57

TRANSPORTATION

g) E-11-098, Lane Designation on Fischer-Hallman Road (Regional Road 58) at Activa Avenue, City of Kitchener 68
h) E-11-101, 2011 Association of Ontario Road Supervisors Trade Show 70
i) E-11-104, Airport Fee Structure Review 73

WATER

j) E-11-102, Approaches to Policies in the Source Protection Plan (staff presentation) 84
k) E-11-061.1, Fees and Charges By-law for Water Works Upgrade in Lloyd Brown (Township of North Dumfries) 104

REPORTS – PLANNING, HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

COMMUNITY PLANNING


COMMUNITY SERVICES

m) P-11-075, Building Permit Activity – January to June 2011 117

6. INFORMATION/CORRESPONDENCE

a) Memo re: Existing Delegation of Authority to the Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services 123

b) Letter dated September 6, 2011 from Neil Taylor re: E-11-063, River Road Extension, King Street to Manitou Drive, Kitchener Recommended Planning Alternative and Amendment to Consultant Services Agreement 125

7. OTHER BUSINESS

a) Council Enquiries and Requests for Information Tracking List 127

8. NEXT MEETING – October 18, 2011

9. ADJOURN
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 18, 2011</td>
<td>1:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Planning and Works Committee</td>
<td>Council Chamber 2nd Floor, Regional Administration Building 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 8, 2011</td>
<td>1:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Planning and Works Committee</td>
<td>Council Chamber 2nd Floor, Regional Administration Building 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning, Housing and Community Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 27, 2011</td>
<td>4:30 P.M. – 7:30 P.M.</td>
<td>Waterloo Spur Line: Multi-Use Trail Feasibility and Design Study Public Consultation Centre</td>
<td>Regional Administration Building – Main Floor 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation and Environmental Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 5, 2011</td>
<td>5:30 P.M.</td>
<td>Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive Improvements in the Village of Conestogo, Township of Woolwich - Information Package in Advance of Public Consultation Centre</td>
<td>Conestogo Public School, 1948 Sawmill Road, Conestogo ON</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: September 27, 2011  FILE CODE: L07-90

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZATION TO EXPROPRIATE LANDS (1ST REPORT) FOR ROAD IMPROVEMENTS TO UNIVERSITY AVENUE (REGIONAL ROAD 57), IN THE CITY OF WATERLOO

RECOMMENDATION:

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 University Avenue, in the City of Waterloo, in the Region of Waterloo as detailed in report CR-RS-11-059 dated September 27, 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 University Avenue and described as follows:

   Fee Simple Partial Taking:

   1. Part of Lot 2, Registered Plan 1050, being Part 1, on Reference Plan 58R-17179, PIN 22691-0047(LT) (251 Glenridge Drive)

   2. Part of Lot 77, Registered Plan 1050, being Part 4, on Reference Plan 58R-17179, PIN 22354-0005(LT) (240 Mayfield Avenue)

   3. Part of Lot 1, Registered Plan 1076, being Part 5, on Reference Plan 58R-17179, PIN 22355-0053(LT) (239 Mayfield Avenue)

   4. Part of Lot 3, Municipal Compiled Plan of Lot 6, German Company Tract, being Parts 1 and 2, on Reference Plan 58R-17180, PIN 22691-0046(LT) (130-140 University Avenue)

   5. Part of Lots 10 and 11, Registered Plan 501, being Part 3, on Reference Plan 58R-17180, PIN 22358-0054(LT) (115 University Avenue East)

   6. Part of Lot 10, Registered Plan 501, being Parts 4 and 5, on Reference Plan 58R-17180, PIN 22358-0055(LT) (119 University Avenue East)

   7. Part of Condominium Element Waterloo North Condominium Plan Number 23, being Part 6, on Reference Plan 58R-17180, PINS 23023-0001(LT) to 23023-0108(LT) (121 University Avenue East)

   8. Part of Lot 5, Registered Plan 1132, being Part 2, on Reference Plan 58R-17172, PIN 22355-0057(LT) (147 University Avenue East)
2. Serve notices of the above application(s) required by the Expropriations Act;

3. Forward to the Chief Inquiry Office 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.

SUMMARY: NIL

REPORT:

Regional Council approved roadway improvements to University Avenue from Lincoln Road to Weber Street, in June 2011 as detailed in Report E-11-066. The project improvements consist of complete replacement of the pavement structure on University Avenue, new designated left turn lanes on University Avenue at Carter Avenue and Glenridge Drive, increased storage capacity for all existing left turn lanes on University Avenue within the project limits and construction of 1.25 metre reserved on-road cycling lanes on each side of University Avenue from Lincoln Road to Weber Street. Construction to base course asphalt is scheduled to commence in May of 2013 and will be completed by November 2013. Surface asphalt will be placed in 2014.

Land acquisitions as outlined in the Recommendation will be required from eight (8) property owners. The acquisitions are fee simple partial takings for road widening purposes.

All of the affected property owners have been contacted by Legal Services staff to discuss the required acquisitions and have been informed of the Region’s intention to commence the expropriation process. All property owners have been provided with the Region’s Expropriation Information sheet explaining the expropriation process, as well as a written offer to purchase the required interest in the lands at the appraised value. A copy of the Expropriation Information Sheet is attached as Appendix “B”. The owners have further been advised it is the Region’s intent to seek a negotiated settlement prior to completion of the Expropriation process and that the process has been commenced only to ensure possession of the required lands by the date set by Project staff in order to keep the project timeline in place. To date a negotiated settlement to obtain ownership of the required lands has not been reached with any of the property owners. Should a negotiated settlement be reached with property owners and a conveyance of the required acquisition be completed before the Expropriation process is complete, that property will be dropped from the Expropriation process by the Regional Solicitor.

The expropriation of the lands is on an „as is‘ basis and upon closing the Region assumes all responsibility for the lands.

The subject lands are shown attached as Appendix “A”.

1034120
CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

One of the goals of the Corporate Strategic Plan is to ensure that the Region maintains and improves the Regional Roads Network.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Transportation and Environmental Services staff advises that the 2011 Transportation Capital Program and 10 Year Capital Forecast includes funds of $4,171,000 for this project to be funded from the Roads Rehabilitation Reserve Fund. Sufficient funding for the acquisitions outlined within this report is available in the project budget of the 2011 Transportation Capital Program and 10 Year Capital Forecast.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Transportation and Environmental Services staff has been consulted in the preparation of this report.

ATTACHMENTS

Appendix “A”- Project Area
Appendix “B”- Copy of Expropriation Information Sheet

PREPARED BY: Fiona McCrea, Solicitor, Property

APPROVED BY: Gary Sosnoski, Commissioner, Corporate Resources
Appendix ‘A’

UNIVERSITY AVENUE
REGIONAL ROAD No. 57
LINCOLN ROAD TO WEBER STREET
CITY OF WATERLOO
Appendix “B”

The following information is provided as a general overview of the expropriation process and is not legal advice. For complete information, reference should be made to the Ontario Expropriations Act as well as the more detailed information in the Notices provided under that Act.

Expropriation Information Sheet

What is Expropriation?

Governmental authorities such as municipalities, school boards, and the provincial and federal governments undertake many projects which require them to obtain land from private property owners. In the case of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, projects such as the construction or improvement of Regional Roads sometimes require the purchase of land from private property owners. In many cases, the Region of Waterloo only needs a small portion of the private property owner’s lands or an easement for related purposes such as utilities, although in certain instances, entire properties are required.

Usually the governmental authority is able to buy the land required for a project through a negotiated process with the affected property owners. Sometimes, however, the expropriation process must be used in order to ensure that the land is obtained within a specific timeline. Put simply, an expropriation is the transfer of lands or an easement to a governmental authority for reasonable compensation, including payment of fair market value for the transferred lands, without the consent of the property owner being required. In the case of expropriations by municipalities such as the Region of Waterloo, the process set out in the Ontario Expropriations Act must be followed to ensure that the rights of the property owners provided under that Act are protected.

IMPORTANT NOTE: The Region of Waterloo tries in all instances to obtain lands needed for its projects through a negotiated agreement on mutually acceptable terms. Sometimes, the Region of Waterloo will start the expropriation process while negotiations are underway. This dual approach is necessary to ensure that the Region of Waterloo will have possession of all of the lands needed to start a construction project on schedule. However, it is important to note that Regional staff continues to make every effort to reach a negotiated purchase of the required lands on mutually agreeable terms while the expropriation process is ongoing. If agreement is reached, expropriation proceedings can be discontinued and the land transferred to the Region of Waterloo in exchange for payment of the agreed-upon compensation.

What is the process of the Region of Waterloo under the Expropriations Act?

- Regional Council considers a request to begin an application under the Expropriations Act to obtain land and/or an easement for a specific Regional project. No decision is made at this meeting to expropriate the land. This step is simply direction for the Region of Waterloo to provide a “Notice of Application for
Approval to Expropriate” to affected property owners that the process has started to seek approval to expropriate the land.

- As stated in the Notice, affected property owners have 30 days to request a Hearing to consider whether the requested expropriation is “fair, sound and reasonably necessary in the achievement of the objectives” of the Region of Waterloo. This Hearing is conducted by a provincially-appointed Inquiry Officer. Prior to the Hearing, the Region of Waterloo must serve the property owner with a Notice setting out its reasons or grounds for the proposed expropriation. **Compensation for lands is not determined at this Hearing.** The Inquiry Officer can order the Region of Waterloo to pay the property owner up to $200.00 as compensation for the property owner’s costs in participating in this Hearing, regardless of the outcome of the Hearing.

- If a Hearing is held, a written report is provided by the Inquiry Officer to the property owner and the Region of Waterloo. Council must consider the Report within 90 days of receiving it. The Report is not binding on Council and Council may or may not accept the findings of the Report. After consideration of the Report, Council may or may not approve the expropriation of the land or grant approval with modifications. A property owner may wish to make written and/or verbal submissions to Council at the time that it is considering the Report.

- If no Hearing is requested by the property owner, then Council may approve the expropriation of the land after expiry of a 30 day period following service of the Notice of Application for Approval to Expropriate.

- If Council approves the expropriation then, within 3 months of this approval, the Region of Waterloo must register a Plan at the Land Registry Office that describes the expropriated lands. The registration of this Plan automatically transfers title of the lands to the Region of Waterloo, instead of by a Deed signed by the property owner.

- Within 30 days of registration of the Plan, the Region of Waterloo must serve a Notice of Expropriation on the affected property owner advising of the expropriation. Within 30 days of this Notice, the property owner may serve the Region of Waterloo with a Notice of Election selecting the valuation date under the Expropriations Act for calculation of the compensation.

- In order to obtain possession of the expropriated lands, the Region of Waterloo must also serve a Notice of Possession setting out the date that possession of the land is required by the Region of Waterloo. This date has to be 3 months or more from the date that this Notice of Possession is served on the affected property owner.

- Within 3 months of registration of the Plan, the Region of Waterloo must provide the affected property owner with payment for the full amount of the appraised fair market value of the expropriated land or easement and a copy of the appraisal report on which the value is based. If the property owner disagrees with this amount, and/or claims other compensation and/or costs under the Expropriations Act, the compensation and/or costs matter may be referred to a provincially-appointed Board of Negotiation in an effort to reach a mediated settlement and/or an appeal may be made to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) for a decision. In any event, the Region of Waterloo continues in its efforts to reach a negotiated settlement with the affected property owner prior to the OMB making a decision.
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
DATE: September 27, 2011
FILE CODE: T04-20, 7087
SUBJECT: RIVER ROAD EXTENSION, KING STREET TO MANITOU DRIVE, KITCHENER RECOMMENDED PLANNING ALTERNATIVE AND AMENDMENT TO CONSULTANT SERVICES AGREEMENT

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to the Class Environmental Assessment for River Road Extension from King Street to Manitou Drive in the City of Kitchener as detailed in Report E-11-063:

- a) Reaffirm approval of the Recommended Planning Alternative described as Alternative 4C;
- b) Direct staff to proceed to Phases 3 and 4 of the Class Environmental Study, including additional study of Alternative Design Concepts for the Highway 8 interchange and associated municipal road access; and
- c) Amend the Consultant Services Agreement with IBI Group of Kitchener, Ontario to authorize a $327,000 increase to the upset fee for completing this Class Environmental Assessment Study.

SUMMARY:

The Region of Waterloo is conducting the Class Environmental Assessment (EA) for the River Road Extension project to address traffic congestion problems and other deficiencies in the transportation network in the South Kitchener Area. Please refer to Appendix “A” for a map of the study area.

At the beginning of this study in 2004, the Region initiated the South Kitchener Transportation Corridor Study (SKTCS), to satisfy the requirements of Phases 1 and 2 of this Class EA. In the early SKTCS phase of this Class EA Study, the Project Team developed and evaluated eleven (11) planning alternatives (listed and briefly described in Appendix “B”) to address the transportation problem in south Kitchener. Of these eleven planning alternatives only those which include the River Road extension from King Street to Manitou Drive as a four-lane arterial road through the Hidden Valley area and over Schneider Creek were found to have the potential to solve travel demand problems in the South Kitchener Corridor.

In July 2006, upon completion of the SKTCS and based on a review of all technical data and public input, including inventories of natural environmental features and three Public Consultation Centres, Regional Council endorsed Recommended Planning Alternative 4C which consisted of a 4-lane road extension of River Road from King Street to Bleams Road at the intersection of Manitou Drive, and a partial interchange at Highway 8 with north-bound on and off ramps and a south-bound on-ramp all as shown in Appendix “C”.

In April, 2007 additional environmental investigations confirmed the presence of Jefferson Salamanders in the Hidden Valley area. In response to this new information concerning the presence of Jefferson Salamanders, the Class EA Study was then put on hold in order to complete additional field studies to determine the extent of the Jefferson Salamander population in the Hidden Valley Forest and to await new threatened species habitat regulations from the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR).
In 2010, based on new information regarding the new threatened species habitat regulations from the MNR and the MNR’s mapping of Jefferson Salamander regulated habitat, and the Region’s recently approved Transportation Master Plan (TMP), the Project Team fully reconsidered and updated its evaluation of all planning alternatives. As a result of this updated evaluation, the Project Team assessed that Planning Alternative 4C (a 4-lane road extension of River Road from King Street to Bleams Road and a partial interchange at Highway 8 with north-bound on and off ramps and a south-bound on-ramp) was still the Preferred Planning Alternative for this Class EA Study.

The results of the 2007 and 2008 field studies and the updated evaluation were presented to the public at a Public Consultation Centre (PCC) held on May 17, 2011. Comments received at the PCC raised concerns about the need for the new road, the expected impact of the new road on the natural environment and the impact of the new road on local streets and neighborhoods. During the Project Team’s review of comments received from the PCC, a concern was raised that the River Road Extension would unduly attract additional industrial and residential land development to the Hidden Valley area. After some discussion, City of Kitchener staff on the Project Team advised that the City will review the City’s Hidden Valley Community Plan with respect to this concern.

After carefully evaluating all reasonable South Kitchener strategic transportation planning alternatives, and all public input received to-date, the Project Team concluded that Planning Alternative 4C, a four lane extension of River Road between King Street and Manitou Drive, with a partial interchange at Highway 8 is the Recommended Planning Alternative to address existing and future transportation demands in south Kitchener. The Project Team is recommending that Regional Council reaffirm approval of the Recommended Planning Alternative described as Alternative 4C in Report E-11-063. Further, staff is seeking direction to proceed to Phases 3 and 4 of this Class EA project.

Prior to submitting a final recommendation to Regional Council and filing of the Environmental Study Report for this Class EA, the following tasks will need to be completed as part of Phases 3 and 4 of the Class EA:

- Develop alternative design concepts for the Recommended Planning Alternative 4C, including refinement of alternative Highway 8 interchange configurations;
- Updating traffic analysis for intersection designs and completing Hydrogeological studies and Geotechnical investigations for Design Concepts;
- Continue to work with MNR to develop mitigation measures to minimize potential impacts on the Jefferson Salamander population in Hidden Valley;
- Conduct additional public consultation;
- Continue to work with all stakeholders throughout Phases 3 and 4;
- Identify a Recommended Design Concept;
- Report to Regional Council and complete the Environmental Study Report;

As a result of additional tasks now required and the long delay in moving forward with this Class EA study, the Region’s consultant for the project, IBI Group submitted a detailed work plan for completing this Class EA Study together with a request for additional fees. After thoroughly reviewing IBI’s work plan, staff has negotiated a $327,000 increase to IBI’s upset fee as a fair and reasonable amount for consulting services required to complete this Class EA Study. Staff is therefore recommending that the existing Consultant Services Agreement with IBI Group be amended to authorize a $327,000 increase to the upset fee for completing this Class Environmental Assessment Study. The 2011 Transportation Capital Budget includes sufficient funds in 2011 to accommodate this increase in consulting fees.

REPORT:

1.0 Background

The Region of Waterloo is conducting the Class Environmental Assessment (EA) for the River Road Extension project to address traffic congestion problems and other deficiencies in the transportation network.
in the South Kitchener Area. Please refer to Appendix “A” for a map of the study area. This Class EA is being conducted in accordance with the Schedule “C” requirements of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment. This Class EA Study is being directed by a Project Team consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo, City of Kitchener, Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA), Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR), Ministry of Transportation Ontario (MTO), Regional Councillors Jim Wideman, and Jean Haaiboom, and City of Kitchener Councillors John Gazzola and Berry Vrbanovic. Consultants from IBI Group and LGL Limited are assisting the Project Team.

In 2004, the Region initiated the South Kitchener Transportation Corridor Study (SKTCS), to satisfy the requirements of Phases 1 and 2 of this Class EA. The purpose of the study was to develop transportation planning alternatives, including the establishment of possible transportation corridors, to provide additional east-west mobility in South Kitchener for people and goods movement. The study limits included an area bounded by Fairway Road to the north, Wabanaki Drive to the south, Manitou Drive to the west and King Street to the east. During Phase 1 of the SKTCS, a review of existing traffic conditions in the study area concluded that many intersections are operating at or above their capacity, resulting in long delays for motorists, particularly along Fairway Road. In the early SKTCS phase of this Class EA Study, the Project Team developed and evaluated eleven (11) planning alternatives to address the transportation problem in south Kitchener. Of these eleven planning alternatives only those which include a River Road extension from King Street to Manitou Drive as a four-lane arterial road through the Hidden Valley area and over Schneider Creek were found to have the potential to solve travel demand problems in the study area. A brief summary of the SKTCS including a description of the eleven planning alternatives is provided in Appendix “B”.

In July 2006, upon completion of the SKTCS and based on a review of all technical data and public input, including inventories of natural environmental features and three Public Consultation Centres, Regional Council approved Preferred Planning Alternative (Alternative 4C) which consisted of a 4-lane road extension of River Road from King Street to Bleams Road at the intersection of Manitou Drive, and a partial interchange at Highway 8 with north-bound on and off ramps and a south-bound on-ramp. Please refer to Appendix “C” for a plan view of Alternative 4C.

Following Regional Council’s approval of the River Road Extension Preferred Planning Alternative, the Project Team commenced Phase 3 of the Class EA. The objectives of Phase 3 were to develop Alternative Design Concepts and select a Recommended Design Concept for the River Road Extension.

In addition to the field studies completed during Phase 2 of this Class EA, investigations were conducted during Phase 3 to further explore the possible presence of a Threatened Species in the study area, namely the Jefferson Salamander. Newly developed Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) survey methods to identify Jefferson Salamanders became available in 2007. These methods were not available during the original Phase 2 field studies. These new MNR survey methods were used to conduct an advanced species survey in the late winter and early spring of 2006/2007 and the presence of Jefferson Salamanders in the Hidden Valley area was confirmed in April 2007.

In response to this new information concerning the presence of Jefferson Salamanders, the Class EA Study was then put on hold in order to:

- Consult a technical sub-committee consisting of experts from the MNR and the University of Guelph to direct additional studies and review the field surveys concerning Jefferson Salamanders.
- Complete additional field studies in 2007 and 2008 using MNR survey methods to gather data regarding the extent of the Jefferson Salamander population and their habitat in the Hidden Valley Forest;
- Await new threatened species habitat regulations from the MNR under the new Endangered Species Act (2007) including a delineation of the Jefferson Salamander Regulated Habitat in Hidden Valley; and
- Investigate the potential impacts of the proposed River Road extension on the Jefferson Salamander population and its habitat.
2. **Additional Work Completed Since 2007**

The Environmental Consultants, LGL Limited, in consultation with MNR, designed additional field studies in 2007 which were completed in the spring of 2008 using updated MNR survey methods to gather data regarding the extent of the Jefferson Salamander population in the Hidden Valley area. The results of these 2007-2008 field studies were provided to MNR for their use in preparation of a map of the Regulated Habitat of Jefferson Salamanders in the Hidden Valley area.

In 2009 MNR released draft regulations to define the protected habitat of Jefferson Salamanders under the new Endangered Species Act, 2007 (ESA). These regulations came into effect in 2010 and provided for protection of all suitable habitat within 300m distance from breeding ponds used by Jefferson Salamanders.

Later in 2010, the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) delineated, confirmed and released the Regulated limits of the Jefferson Salamander habitat within the Hidden Valley Forest. The Preferred Planning Alternative 4C of the River Road extension is outside this regulated area, as shown in Appendix “D”. However, the previously-shown alignment of the existing Hidden Valley Road connection to the River Road extension (to provide a required second access point for the Hidden Valley residential area) was shown as traversing the regulated area. As a result the Project Team has identified a revised alignment for the connection of Hidden Valley Road to the River Road Extension that does not traverse the regulated area.

Approval in 2010 of the Region’s new Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) confirmed the need and justification for increased capacity in the east-west direction in the River Road / Bleams Road corridor. In particular, the River Road extension was identified in the Master Plan as the preferred solution for this capacity need after considering other road network, transit, walking, cycling and transportation demand management options for the area.

3. **Re-evaluation of Planning Alternatives**

Based on the new information regarding the Jefferson Salamander regulated habitat and the Region’s recently approved Transportation Master Plan (RTMP), the Project Team fully reconsidered and updated its evaluation of the Planning Alternatives. This updated evaluation of the Planning Alternatives is presented in Appendix “E”. A brief summary of the updated evaluation under each of the main evaluation criteria is as follows:

1) **Transportation Criteria – No change in result.** Updated transportation data, goals and expectations flowing from the 2010 RTMP yield the same conclusion as before, namely: Of the eleven planning alternatives only those which include the River Road extension from King Street to Manitou Drive as a four-lane arterial road through the Hidden Valley area and over Schneider Creek were found to have the potential to solve travel demand problems in the study area.

2) **Social-Cultural Environment Criteria - No change in result.** The proposed concept for connection of Hidden Valley Road to the River Road Extension has been revised to locate that connection outside of the lands currently designated for residential development. This does not change the previous ranking of planning alternatives regarding support for potential development of designated lands in the Hidden Valley area.

3) **Natural Environment Criteria - No change in result.** The designation of Jefferson Salamander Regulated Habitat and additional requirements to protect Jefferson Salamanders and their non-regulated habitat is an important consideration for this Class EA Study. Although the construction footprint of the proposed new road as per Alternative 4C would require removal of some forest and wetland areas, this footprint would be entirely outside the designated Regulated Habitat area for Jefferson Salamanders. The impact to the non-regulated habitat was originally assessed as part of
the 2005 evaluation, and therefore the new information concerning the Jefferson Salamanders and their regulated habitat did not affect the ranking of the planning alternatives for this Class EA Study.

4) Economic Environment Criteria – No change in result. The relative costs of the Planning Alternatives have not changed and as a result the ranking of the planning alternatives for this Class EA Study is unchanged.

After carefully evaluating all reasonable South Kitchener strategic transportation Planning Alternatives, the Project Team assessed that Alternative 4C, a four lane extension of River Road between King Street and Manitou Drive, with a partial interchange at Highway 8 is the Preferred Planning Alternative to address existing and future transportation demands in south Kitchener.

4. Public Consultation Centre, May 17, 2011

Extensive Public Consultation took place during the initial SKTCS stages of the Study. In addition, on May 17, 2011, a Public Consultation Centre was held at Conestoga Place, formerly Columbus Hall, 110 Manitou Drive, in order for the Project Team to ask for public comments on the Preferred Planning Alternative and to update the public on:

- The 2007 field survey results that confirmed the presence of a threatened species, the Jefferson Salamander, in the study area;
- The requirements of the Endangered Species Act (2007);
- The delineation of the Jefferson Salamander Regulated Habitat on Hidden Valley;
- The results and conclusions obtained from other field surveys and additional technical project work conducted since February 2007; and
- The results of a recent revised evaluation of the previous Planning Alternatives.

At the May 17, 2011 Public Consultation Centre, 141 people signed in as attendees, and 36 comment sheets and/or emailed responses were received by the Project Team. A summary of the 36 comment sheets and some additional communications received by the Project Team together with the Project Team’s responses is tabulated in Appendix “F”.

5. Main Concerns Raised by the Public

The main concerns raised by the public and the Project Team’s responses are as follows:

The Need for the River Road Extension:
Some still questioned the need and justification for the River Road Extension and/or believed that insufficient emphasis was given to transit, pedestrian and cycling modes of transportation.

Project Team Response: The SKTCS established a transportation capacity problem in the study area and the need to develop transportation planning alternatives, including the establishment of possible transportation corridors to provide additional east-west mobility in South Kitchener for people and goods movement. That need has been confirmed by the RTMP approved in 2010 as part of a multi-mode plan that incorporates enhanced transit, a Rapid Transit plan and enhanced active transportation. The Project Team’s evaluation shows that only Planning Alternatives which include a River Road Extension with a new Highway 8 interchange provide for the needed transportation improvements called for in the 2010 RTMP.

The Methods Used to Identify the Extent of the Jefferson Salamander Habitat:
Concerns were expressed with the field investigation methods and with the interpretation of the findings that determined the extent of the Jefferson Salamander population and their habitat. Some also questioned the limits of protected habitat under the Endangered Species Act.
Project Team Response: The environmental consultants, LGL Limited, in consultation with the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR), designed additional field studies in 2007 and in 2008 using updated MNR survey methods to confirm the presence and extent of the Jefferson Salamander population in the Hidden Valley area. Not only was the methodology of the field studies endorsed by the MNR, MNR staff also participated in the field studies that were carried out in 2007 and 2008. The results of the 2007-2008 field studies were provided to MNR for their use in preparation of a map of the location and extent of the Regulated Habitat of Jefferson Salamanders in the Hidden Valley area. Aside from providing field data, the Region played no role in determining the location and extent of the Regulated Habitat.

The Expected Impacts on the Natural Environment and the Methods Used to Evaluate Them:
Some respondents said that some impacts to the natural environment had not been quantified adequately, and that the environmental impacts are excessive.

Project Team Response: The natural environment has been extensively inventoried within the study limits. Preliminary impact analysis of evaluated planning alternatives on the natural environment has been conducted to date and will be concluded in Phase 3 of the Class EA process. The amount of forest and wetland, which would be potentially impacted directly or indirectly by the 11 Planning Alternatives was fully identified and fully evaluated. Refinements to these evaluations will be completed in Phase 3 of the Class EA. Further investigation and assessment of the impacts of the new road on surface water and groundwater and how these surface and groundwater impacts might affect the natural environment are planned for Phase 3 of the Class EA to further assess the potential impacts on the natural environment before a final recommendation will be made for this Class EA.

The Project Team recognizes that there are still some members of the public that believe the impacts of Alternative 4C of the River Road Extension are excessive. The Project Team recognizes these concerns and is also sensitive to the potential impacts of this project on the natural environment. The Project Team is confident that the necessary investigations and studies have been completed to sufficiently recommend the advancement of Alternative 4C as the planning solution for this Class EA study. In addition, the Project Team is taking the following steps to minimize and mitigate potential impacts to the natural environment: continue consultation with the MNR and EEAC through completion of the Class EA Study and throughout the detailed design phase; identify and undertake any additional field studies necessary to redefine the limits of road construction; and establish design standards and construction practices for mitigation of environmental impacts.

Impact on Local Neighbourhood Residents:
Concerns were expressed that the preferred River Road Extension alternative would cause infiltration of relatively high volume and high speed traffic into local neighbourhoods and would create negative impacts on noise and air quality into the Hidden Valley and Stonegate Drive neighbourhoods.

Project Team Response: This concern will be assessed further in Phase 3 of the Class EA process. The expectation is that River Road Extension will operate well and will not attract traffic to divert through the local roads. Traffic alternatives were presented to Stonegate area residents in 2006, with a City/Region commitment to further address and resolve traffic issues in further phases of the Class EA process. The River Road Extension is proposed to be a restricted access road, meaning restriction on exits and access points. The Region will apply access restrictions to any development abutting the road. The Preferred Planning Alternative 4C for the River Road extension includes only a right in/right out at the proposed east end of the existing Hidden Valley Road to the proposed River Road Extension just west of Highway 8. This would reduce the potential of Hidden Valley Road acting as a diversion for commuters wishing to avoid using the new River Road Extension. Assessment of noise impacts will be addressed in Phase 3 of the Class EA, in accordance with the Region’s policy for noise impact assessment.
Air quality impacts depend on a number of factors, including prevailing winds, area topography and traffic flow characteristics such as speed, acceleration and congestion. The River Road Extension would generally improve air quality in the greater Study Area to the extent that it would reduce congestion on Fairway Road and other area arterial roads, resulting in less vehicle emissions.

During the Project Team's review of comments received from the PCC, a concern was raised that the River Road Extension would unduly attract additional industrial and residential land development to the Hidden Valley area. After some discussion, City of Kitchener staff on the Project Team advised that the City will review the City's Hidden Valley Community Plan with respect to this concern.

6. Recommended Planning Alternative

Based on all of the technical data collected, evaluation completed, and public input received to date, the Project Team has identified a River Road Extension with a general road alignment as per Alternative 4C (Appendix “C”) as the Recommended Planning Alternative for this Class EA study. Alternative 4C generally consists of a new 4-lane road corridor which starts at the intersection of Bleams Road and Manitou Drive, runs eastward over Schneider Creek and then follows the existing Goodrich Drive corridor until it intersects with Wabanaki Drive. The new corridor generally follows existing Wabanaki Drive and Hidden Valley Road alignments north to cross Highway 8 and connect to existing River Road and follow River Road to intersect with King Street. The Recommended Planning Alternative also includes a partial interchange with Highway 8 with north-bound on and off-ramps and a south-bound on-ramp.

Although the proposed River Road extension alternative does not encroach on the Jefferson Salamander Regulated Habitat, there is some risk that any Jefferson Salamanders that have travelled beyond the limits of the Regulated Habitat could be impacted by the construction and operation of the new road. As part of the design of the new road in the vicinity of the regulated Jefferson Salamander habitat, the Region will implement design and construction measures to avoid and reduce impacts on natural areas adjacent to the Regulated Habitat. These measures will include consideration of retaining walls and other grading that could reduce the footprint of the new road as well as measures in advance of construction to reduce the potential risk of impacts on individual salamanders and other wild-life during construction. In keeping with the goal to minimize impacts on the Jefferson Salamander population, the Region will apply for a Permit under Section 17 c) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA). All measures for the Region to reduce and avoid impact on Jefferson Salamanders will be developed in full consultation with the MNR as part of the permit process.

7. Benefits of Recommended Planning Alternative

The benefits of a four lane extension of River Road from King Street to Manitou Drive include the following:

- Reduced congestion and delay for all modes of traffic along Fairway Road (which is already at capacity) and other east-west routes in South Kitchener;
- Creation of a cycling facility that would facilitate cycling trips in the east-west direction in south Kitchener and provide for a new cycling and pedestrian link in South Kitchener as planned in the Regional Transportation Master Plan;
- Reduced noise and air pollution, in the study area overall, which is currently resulting from vehicle idling and increased travel time due to congestion;
- Utilization of existing road alignments for most of the proposed new road will minimize the segregation of adjacent lands including environmentally sensitive lands, help conserve more of the core environmental features and minimize the direct and indirect impacts on those adjacent lands.
- A River Road extension and new Highway 8 interchange would provide additional access to the widened Highway 8 for the improved movement of people and goods in south Kitchener
- A River Road extension would provide improved access for the Hidden Valley business park and residential development lands designated in the Kitchener Official Plan; and
- Lowest cost to construct and operate of all planning alternatives which adequately address the transportation problem.

8. **Next Steps for the River Road Extension Project**

The remaining major milestones for the River Road Extension Project are as follows:

- Complete preliminary design and evaluation of Alternative Design Concepts for the Recommended Planning Alternative,
- Updating traffic analysis for intersection designs and completing Geotechnical investigations for Design Concepts;
- Continue to work with MNR to develop mitigation measures to minimize potential impacts on the Jefferson Salamander population in Hidden Valley;
- Further investigation and assessment of the impacts of the new road on surface water and groundwater and how these surface and groundwater impacts might affect the natural environment;
- Conduct additional public consultation to present the results of additional studies and Alternative Design Concepts to the public and obtain comments from the public;
- Consider Public Input and prepare a Recommended Design Concept for presentation to Regional Council for approval;
- Subject to Regional Council endorsement of a Recommended Design Concept, filing of the Environmental Study Report with the Ministry of Environment, followed by a period of review by the public and Ministry of the Environment;
- Obtain a permit from the Minister of Natural Resources under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) at the appropriate time to ensure that the River Road Extension will proceed in compliance with the ESA;
- Detailed design, property acquisition, and utility relocations would follow, with road construction planned to commence in 2016, subject to budget approval.

9. **Estimated Project Cost**

The estimate of cost to complete the design and construction of the River Road Extension is based on preliminary design concepts, which will be refined through completion of the Class EA study. Any additional costs resulting from additional studies (including water resources studies and geotechnical investigations), changing property costs and other changes (such as enhanced aesthetic features) will be assessed and refined as the project unfolds. The current estimated cost in 2011 dollars to construct the project based on Planning Alternative 4C is $58 million.

10. **Revised Fees for Consulting Engineering**

In 2006, the Region of Waterloo entered into a Consultant Services Agreement with IBI Group of Waterloo, Ontario to provide engineering services for Phases 3 and 4 of the Class Environmental Assessment at an upset limit of $279,740. As a result of additional tasks now required and the long delay in moving forward with this Class EA study, IBI Group submitted a detailed work plan for completing this Class EA Study together with a request for additional fees. Additional consulting services required for completion of this Class EA Study include:

- Further consultation and coordination with MNR to establish measures to minimize potential impacts on the Jefferson Salamander population in Hidden Valley;
- Additional work with EEAC to establish measures to minimize impacts on the Environmentally Sensitive Policy Area (ESPA);
- Coordinate the study of potential impacts of the new road on surface water and groundwater and develop mitigation measures to minimize the potential impacts.
Update the traffic analysis for intersection design based on the current traffic volumes and projected volumes per the Region’s 2010 RTMP;
- Refine Alternative Design Concepts for the Recommended Planning Alternative 4C, including consideration of new alternative Highway 8 interchange configurations;
- Updating intersection control studies based on updated traffic analysis for intersections;
- Updating Capital cost estimates for Design Concepts to incorporate additional information compiled in the Class EA;
- Additional public meetings and additional consultation with the Project Team and all stakeholders throughout Phases 3 and 4 to provide for an increased level of public participation; and
- Consultation and coordination with MNR for preparation of application for an ESA Section 17c) permit.

After thoroughly reviewing IBI’s work plan, staff has negotiated a $327,000 increase to IBI’s upset fee as a fair and reasonable amount for additional consulting services required to complete this Class EA Study. Therefore, staff recommend that the existing Consultant Services Agreement with IBI be amended to authorize a $327,000 (plus applicable taxes) increase to the upset fee for additional consultant fees and disbursements to complete this Class Environmental Assessment Study.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This project is consistent with the development of Strategic Focus Area 2 (Growth Management and Prosperity) in terms of:

- Develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs.

It is also consistent with the development of Strategic Focus Area 3 (Sustainable Transportation) in terms of:

- Develop, promote and integrate active forms of transportation (cycling and walking).

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The 2011 Ten Year Transportation Capital Program includes $58 million in the years 2011 – 2018 for this project. The capital cost of the Recommended Planning Alternative is estimated to be $58 million. There are sufficient funds in the 2011 project budget for the additional consulting work needed to complete this Class EA Study.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

The Transportation Planning Division and the Environmental Planning Division of the Planning, Housing and Community Services Department were consulted in the preparation of this Report.
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APPENDIX B-1
Summary of Class EA Phases 1 and 2, The South Kitchener Transportation Corridor Study

In 2004, the Region initiated the South Kitchener Transportation Corridor Study (SKTCS), to satisfy the requirements of Phases 1 and 2 of this Class EA. The purpose of the study was to develop transportation planning alternatives, including the establishment of possible transportation corridors, to provide additional east-west mobility in South Kitchener for people and goods movement. The study limits include an area bounded by Fairway Road to the north, Wabanaki Drive to the south, Manitou Drive to the west and King Street to the east. During Phase 1 of the SKTCS, a review of existing traffic conditions in the study area concluded that many intersections are operating at or above their capacity, resulting in long delays for motorists, particularly along Fairway Road.

2004 Summary of Existing Transportation Conditions:

Roadway traffic conditions in the South Kitchener study area are generally constrained by intersection configurations and the access to Highway 8. Various through traffic movements and especially turning movements along Fairway Road are already operating at capacity as shown on the Exhibit below, and at the Bleams Road/Manitou Drive intersection.

Peak Hour Level of Service (2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delay (secs)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairway Road &amp; Manitou Drive</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairway Road &amp; Fairview Park Mall Main Entrance</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairway Road &amp; Wilson Avenue</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Avenue &amp; Kingsway Drive</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleams Road &amp; Manitou Drive</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer Watson Blvd &amp; Manitou Drive</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabanaki Drive &amp; Manitou Drive</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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South Kitchener Transportation Corridor Alternative Planning Solutions:

In the early SKTCS phase of this Class EA Study, the Project Team developed and evaluated ten (10) planning alternatives (listed and briefly described below) to address the existing and forecast demand for private vehicle transportation in south Kitchener. These ten planning alternatives included City and Region-wide strategies using public transit and other alternative modes of transportation, plus development restrictions and other measures to reduce future travel demands. A brief description is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Planning Solution</th>
<th>Summary Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1: Baseline</td>
<td>No road capacity improvements within the South Kitchener area except for those already approved, including MTO’s Highway 8 widening, the Fairway Road extension and Manitou Drive widening by the Region, and Block Line Road extension and Wabanaki Drive extension by the City. These roadway projects are common to all South Kitchener Planning Alternatives. It also includes a planned increase in the overall transit mode share from 5% in 1996 to 7% in the AM Peak Hour by 2016 as per the 1999 Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP). No other structural or travel pattern changes in the South Kitchener Corridor are included, so this is a baseline condition against which other Planning Alternatives will be compared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1A: Baseline with Development Cap</td>
<td>Includes an added hypothetical development cap with no new Hidden Valley area and Fairway Road development require rezoning being built to 2021. This did not include other planned Hidden Valley residential development projects with draft plan of subdivision have since been built. The intent of a cap is to remove the associated trip-generation from the Study Area, including trips generated by up to 3,000 employment positions within the planned Hidden Valley Business Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2: Original River Rd. Extension Plan</td>
<td>Includes the widening of Fairway Road to six lanes from Highway 8 to King Street with a further widening to Wilson Avenue. It also includes the River Road extension from King Street to Manitou Drive as a four-lane arterial road through the Hidden Valley area and over Schneider Creek, as recommended in the 1999 and 2010 Regional Transportation Master Plans. It also includes a full interchange at Highway 8,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Planning Solution</th>
<th>Summary Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 3:</strong> Transit Emphasis</td>
<td>Improvements to traffic conditions within the South Kitchener corridor will take place through approved road projects and as much intersection capacity optimization as possible. This alternative includes no full River Road Extension from King Street to Wabanaki Drive as originally planned in the RTMP. Instead, this alternative includes the extension of a two-lane Goodrich Drive west from Wilson Avenue to Bleams Road at Manitou Drive. Also assumes a significant transit mode share increase beyond the planning target of 7% by 2016 to an average of 15% by 2021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 3A:</strong> Transit Emphasis with Partial Highway 8 Interchange</td>
<td>Alternative #3 Transit Emphasis with a partial Highway 8 interchange on the east side of Highway 8 to provide movement on and off the Highway northbound only, connecting to an extended two lane River Road to King Street. No River Road extension west of the highway is included in this test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 4:</strong> Hybrid River Rd. Extension with Partial Interchange</td>
<td>A hybrid of the original River Road extension plan (Alternative 2) with Bus Only/High Occupancy Vehicle lanes and the Transit Emphasis (Alternative 3); with a partial Highway 8 interchange and an eastbound ramp on Fairway Road to Highway 8 southbound; also included widening Homer Watson Blvd to 6 lanes from Bleams Rd. to Highway 401, and widening Fairway Road to 6 lanes from King Street to Wilson Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 4A:</strong> Alternative 4 with Mixed Traffic Lanes</td>
<td>Same as Alternative 4 except that all 4 lanes of a River Road extension would be available for mixed traffic (2 lanes would not be dedicated to buses and other high occupancy vehicles as in Alternative 4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 4B:</strong></td>
<td>Same as 4A but with no widening of Homer Watson Blvd. to 6 lanes. <strong>Performed best at addressing all criteria of the 10 alternatives evaluated.</strong> (Following the evaluation, for Alternative 4C: the eastbound ramp on Fairway Road to Highway 8 was removed and a southbound Highway 8 access provided directly from the River Road Interchange.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 5:</strong> Hybrid River Rd. Extension with Full Interchange</td>
<td>Same as Alternative 4 but with full interchange at River Road Extension and Highway 8, and Fairway Road widened to 6 through lanes from King Street to Wilson Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative 5A:</strong> Alternative 5 with Mixed Traffic and Full Interchange</td>
<td>Same as Alternative 5 but with all 4 lanes of a River Road extension available for mixed traffic. <strong>Also performed best at addressing all criteria of the 10 alternatives evaluated.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternatives 4, 4A, 4B, 5 and 5A all included a new River Road extension, through the Hidden Valley natural area; however, the alignment of the new road was quite different from the alignment used in Alternative 2, in that it chiefly followed the existing Wabanaki and Hidden Valley Road alignments while avoiding much of the existing natural areas.
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Alternative Planning Solutions Evaluation Criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Transportation Criteria:</th>
<th>2. Social-Cultural Environment Criteria:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Roadway Network Performance</td>
<td>2.1 Direct Property Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Transportation System Performance</td>
<td>2.2 Regional Growth Management Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Transit System Performance</td>
<td>2.3 External Traffic Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Transit Ridership</td>
<td>2.4 Cultural Landscape Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Cycling/Walking Network Performance</td>
<td>2.5 Noise Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Roadway Network Continuity</td>
<td>2.6 Visual Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 Good Movement Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 Transportation System Accessibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Natural Environment Criteria:</th>
<th>4. Economic Environment Criteria:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Natural Area Impact</td>
<td>4.1 Capital Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Groundwater Impact</td>
<td>4.2 Operation &amp; Maintenance Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Surface Water Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Air Quality Impact</td>
<td>4.3 Property Impact Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Resource Consumption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of Evaluation of Alternative Planning Solutions:

The results of the Evaluation of these ten planning alternatives are tabulated in Appendix “E”. Of these ten planning alternatives only those which include the River Road extension from King Street to Manitou Drive as a four-lane arterial road through the Hidden Valley area and over Schneider Creek were found to have the potential to solve travel demand problems in the South Kitchener Corridor. The 2005 evaluation results showed that Alternatives 4B and 5A, each with a River Road Extension from King St. to Bleams Rd., ranked the best overall at addressing the criteria while addressing the traffic problems. Discussions with the Ministry of Transportation confirmed that a full Highway 8 interchange at River Road would not be permitted owing to the need to maintain a minimum safe traffic weaving distance from the existing Fairway Road interchange. Alternative 5A, which included a full Highway 8 interchange, was therefore dropped from further consideration and Alternative 4B was left as the Preferred Alternative for this Class EA study. In 2005, Planning Alternative 4C (Appendix “C”) was developed with all the same design elements as Alternative 4B, except the eastbound ramp on Fairway Road to Highway 8 southbound was removed and a southbound Highway access provided directly from the River Road interchange. This alternative provided highway access in all directions except the southbound exit from Highway 8 to River Road without the higher costs and limitations of constructing a highway ramp from Fairway Road.

SKTCS Recommendation to Regional Council:

In July 2006, upon completion of the SKTCS and based on a review of all technical data and public input, including inventories of natural environmental features and three Public Consultation Centres, the Regional Council endorsed a Preferred Planning Alternative (Alternative 4C) which consisted of a 4-lane road extension of River Road (RR 56) from King Street (RR 8) to Bleams Road (RR 56) at the intersection of Manitou Drive (RR 69), a partial interchange at Highway 8, with north-bound on and off ramps and a south-bound on-ramp.
APPENDIX C – PREFERRED PLANNING ALTERNATIVE 4C

LEGEND:

- EXISTING ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE POLICY AREA (ESPA) AND ADDITIONAL LANDS UNDER CONSIDERATION
- PROVINCIALLY SIGNIFICANT WETLAND

PREFERRED ALIGNMENT

Note: The Endangered Species Act-regulated habitat which is not shown on this page is shown in Appendix D.
### Scores Low

- ○
- □
- △
- ▲
- ★

### Scores High

- ★
- ▲
- △
- □
- ○

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Alt. 1 Baseline</th>
<th>Alt. 1A Baseline w Cap</th>
<th>Alt. 2 RTMP/River Rd Extend</th>
<th>Alt. 3 Transit Emphasis</th>
<th>Alt. 3A Transit Emphasis/Part Interchange</th>
<th>Alt. 4 Hybrid River Rd Extend/Part Interchange</th>
<th>Alt. 4A 4 with mixed traffic lanes/Part Interchange</th>
<th>Alt. 4C (Improved Alt. 4B) 4A with no Homer Watson widening</th>
<th>Alt. 5 Hybrid River Rd Extend/Full Interchange</th>
<th>Alt. 5A 5 with mixed traffic/Full Interchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUMMARY RANKING: Transportation</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMARY RANKING: Socio-Cultural</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMARY RANKING: Natural</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMARY RANKING: Economic</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SUMMARY RANKING</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two highest scoring alternatives:

**Alternative #4C** with a new River Road extension from King Street to Manitou Drive utilizing existing road allowances around as much of the Hidden Valley area north edge as possible and extending west along Goodrich Drive to Manitou Drive, and with a partial interchange on the east side of Highway 8 and a new southbound Highway ramp from Fairway Road.

**Note:** Alternative #4B was improved by relocating the south Highway 8 on-ramp from Fairway Road to the River Road interchange. This improved Alternative 4B is now Alternative 4C.

**Alternative #5A** with the same River Road extension alignment but with a full interchange at Highway 8 (#5A was rejected upon review of the insufficient distance for a safe on-ramp operation.)
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SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED AT MAY 17, 2011 PUBLIC CONSULTATION CENTRE

The 36 comments submitted to the Project Team are all tabulated below with a summary of responses which were prepared by Region staff, MNR staff, IBI Group and LGL Limited.

The Comment/Response Summary does not address every comment received by the 36 submissions between May 17 and 31, 2011. All comments received will be included in the Environmental Study Report (ESR). It is also noted that some comments requesting technical information are premature and cannot be addressed until more planned detailed studies are conducted, design alternatives are evaluated and Phase 3 of the Class EA process is completed, and that some comments offer constructive recommendations that will be incorporated into the process.

However, the Comment/Response Summary does respond to most comments, and involves the following main comment topics and how they are generally addressed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN COMMENT TOPICS</th>
<th>GENERAL RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall impact on the Hidden Valley natural environment.</td>
<td>Natural environment has been inventoried. Preliminary impact analysis has been conducted to date and will be concluded in Phase 3 of the Class EA process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for big picture, long term vision of transportation in the Region including South Kitchener.</td>
<td>Long-term transportation planning for the Region is provided by the Region’s new Regional Transportation Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital value of the environment (air, water, forest, wetlands), also referred to as Natural Capital, consists of a valuation of the annual financial contribution of natural lands to society as a whole.</td>
<td>Not within the Municipal Class EA scope and difficult to estimate with any level of confidence. Such a valuation was not done for this Class EA Study; however, potential impacts of each planning alternative on the natural environment was a major part of the evaluation methodology completed as part of this Class EA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project is too road oriented.</td>
<td>Transit, High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes, cycling and walking have all been considered to date in the project, and are a focus of the new Regional Transportation Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include alternative alignments of the River Road extension crossing of Highway 8 to avoid impacts on Provincially Significant Wetlands (PSWs).</td>
<td>Some alternative alignment concepts have already been considered, and will be re-considered in Phase 3 of the Class EA process. However, alternative alignments are not expected to avoid direct impacts on the small Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW) closest to Highway 8 because of the vertical profile and resulting road cut-and-fill footprint needed to extend River Road over Highway 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water quality and quantity impacts.</td>
<td>Further Hydrological, hydraulic and geotechnical conditions will be addressed in Phase 3 of the Class EA process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality impacts.</td>
<td>Will be further addressed in Phase 3 of the Class EA process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of forest, wetland and meadows impacted.</td>
<td>The amount of Core Environmental Features (CEF) lands including forest, and wetland which are potentially impacted directly or indirectly by the 11 Planning Alternatives was identified and fully evaluated. A more precise evaluation will be completed in Phase 3 of the Class EA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Hidden Valley development opportunities provided by the River road extension.</td>
<td>The Regional Official Plan and the City of Kitchener Official Plan designate objectives for land development which are supported by the Preferred Planning Alternative 4C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Methodology and establishment of Jefferson salamander habitat. | The Environmental Consultants, LGL Limited, in consultation with the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR), designed additional field studies in 2007 which were conducted ending in the spring of 2008 using updated MNR survey methods to confirm the presence and extent of the Jefferson Salamander population in the Hidden Valley area. The results of the 2007-2008 field studies were provided to MNR for their use in preparation of a map of the limits Regulated Habitat of Jefferson Salamanders in the Hidden Valley area. Later in 2010, the MNR delineated, confirmed and released the Regulated limits of the Jefferson Salamander habitat within the Hidden Valley Forest which shows that the Preferred Alternative of the River Road extension is outside this regulated area. |
| Hidden Valley area trail planning. | To be carried forward for consideration and planning in Phase 3 of the Class EA process. |
| Traffic impacts on the Stonegate Road area and Hidden Valley Road. | Traffic alternatives were presented to Stonegate area residents in 2006, with a City/Region commitment to further address and resolve traffic issues in Phase 3 of the Class EA process. The River Road Extension will be a restricted access road, meaning restriction on exits and access points. The Region will apply access restrictions to any development abutting the road. The preferred Planning Alternative 4C concept for the River Road extension includes a right in/right out at the proposed east end of the existing Hidden valley Road to the proposed River Road Extension just west of Highway 8. This would reduce the use of Hidden Valley Road as a diversion for commuters to avoid using the new River Road extension. |
| Need for updated traffic impact information associated with a River Road extension. | Updated traffic impact analysis will be included in Phase 3 of the Class EA process for intersection design. The 2010 RTMP has already confirmed the transportation need for the River Road Extension. |
| Cost of the extension and general affordability. | Current Capital cost estimate to be reassessed based on a preferred Preliminary Design from Phase 3 of the Class EA process. |
| Capacity of a River Road extension to serve future travel demands. | Addressed in Regional Transportation Master Plan, to be confirmed in Phase 3 of the Class EA process. |
| Questions on how Provincially Significant Wetlands (PSWs) were designated in the Hidden valley area, i.e. why the “small frog pond” is called “other wetland” and not PSW. | The Provincially Sensitive Wetlands (PSW) are as designated by the MNR. |
| Questions on methods used to survey Jefferson salamander in 2008, how the findings relate to the Endangered Species Act (ESA) to establish salamander habitat and how a beaver dam breach may have lowered the pond habitat. | The Project Team obtained MNR confirmation of survey methodology and protocol and subsequently confirmed that the Region will apply for a permit issued under section 17(2)(c) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) to construct the River Road extension. Water levels during the 2007 and 2008 surveys were observed to be high when surveys were conducted. Water levels were observed lower in 2010 owing at least to dry conditions. |
| Impact of River Road extension on Hidden Valley Road traffic conditions | This concern will be further assessed in Phase 3 of Class EA. The intent and expectation is that River Road Extension will operate well and will not attract traffic to divert through the local roads. |
| Why is additional access to Highway 8 in South Kitchener required? | The provision of access to Highway 8 south of Fairway Road is essential to achieving many of the transportation improvement goals of this project in South Kitchener. Many intersections in the study area are operating at or above their capacity, resulting in long delays for motorists, particularly along Fairway Road. |
| Tree removal in Hidden Valley by the owner. | Tree removal arrangements will be made during the detailed design phase after the Class EA process. |
| Region should plan for an east-west LRT in South Kitchener as an alternative to the need for a River Road extension. | No east-west rapid transit is planned in South Kitchener in the planning timeframe to 2031, but a River Road extension in no way eliminates the potential for such a long term project beyond that timeframe. |
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: September 27, 2011

FILE CODE: T04-20, 5204

SUBJECT: UPDATE ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF TOWNLINE ROAD IMPROVEMENTS, CAN-AMERA PARKWAY TO GORE/AVENUE ROAD, CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

RECOMMENDATION:

For Information.

SUMMARY:

In the fall of 2010 the Region of Waterloo accepted the bid of Bel-Air Excavating and Grading Ltd. (Bel-Air) of Cambridge to undertake reconstruction and improvements on Townline Road from Can-Amera Parkway to Gore/Avenue Road. Bel-Air started the contract construction work in Fall 2010 with the scheduled completion of all contract work by late Fall 2011. Bel-Air has encountered additional areas for removal of poor soils under the roadway, poor weather in the early spring of this year, and higher groundwater and surface water conditions than expected along Townline Road that have made it challenging to complete all construction work by the end of 2011. Bel-Air’s current construction schedule identifies that all sections of Townline Road will be completed to base course asphalt and opened to traffic by the end of 2011 with the exception of the section from Saginaw Parkway to Cedarbrook Court. This remaining section of Townline Road includes substantial areas of peat underlying the road and if excavation of the road is started now, Bel-Air cannot guarantee rebuilding this last section of road to base course asphalt and opening it to traffic for the upcoming winter months. Bel-Air has advised that reconstruction of this last section of Townline Road from Saginaw Parkway to Cedarbrook Court must be deferred until the spring of 2012. Therefore, the existing asphalt pavement will be left on this last section of Townline Road this fall so that it can be open and ready for traffic before the upcoming winter months.

REPORT:

Background

This report has been prepared by Region Staff for information purposes to provide an update on the construction of road improvements on Townline Road from Can-Amera Parkway to Gore/Avenue Road in the City of Cambridge. Please refer to Appendix ‘A’ Figure 1 for a key plan of the project limits.

In the fall of 2010 the Region of Waterloo accepted the bid of Bel-Air Excavating and Grading Ltd. (Bel-Air) of Cambridge to undertake reconstruction and improvements on Townline Road from Can-Amera Parkway to Gore/Avenue Road. Construction was initiated in October 2010 with completion anticipated by the end of November 2011.

The scope of this construction project includes improvements to address poor pavement conditions, deficient sightlines and the need to accommodate anticipated growth in traffic volumes on Townline Road between Can-Amera Parkway and Gore/Avenue Road. The approved road improvements include complete reconstruction of Townline Road with cycling lanes along the entire...
project length and widening of Townline Road from two to four lanes between Can-Amera Parkway and Saginaw Parkway.

**Poor Soil Conditions**

Geotechnical investigations undertaken for the Townline Road Improvements identified significant areas of poor soils (peat) underlying the roadway and high groundwater levels. The nature of the peat material (being highly saturated and highly compressible) would lead to continued settlement of the reconstructed road if not entirely removed and therefore the construction contract required complete removal of these peat deposits.

In order to reduce the potential impacts to adjacent lands of dewatering and excavation of the peat, the contract requires temporary sheet piling and significant dewatering efforts in order to contain the limits of excavation and dewatering to within the road allowance. The proposed complete removal of the underlying peat and its replacement with suitable native or imported backfill will provide a stable road base for the longer term service life of the road. In addition, the stable road base will provide a solid foundation for needed Regional, City and utility services within the road allowance.

**Construction Timing**

Bel-Air started the contract construction work in Fall 2010 and was scheduled to complete all contract work by late Fall 2011. Region staff have been working with Bel-Air to make every effort to complete the construction works by Fall 2011 while minimizing inconvenience to the travelling public; however Bel-Air has encountered additional areas for removal of poor soils under the roadway, poor weather in the early spring of this year, and higher groundwater and surface water conditions than expected along Townline Road that have made it challenging to complete all construction works by the end of 2011.

Bel-Air’s current construction schedule indicates that the section of Townline Road north of Saginaw Parkway, as well as the section south of Cedarbrook Court, will be paved and open to traffic by mid to late October of this year. However at this late time of the season Bel-Air has verbally advised that it cannot complete construction to base course asphalt on the remaining section of Townline Road from Saginaw Parkway southerly to Cedarbrook Court by the end of the 2011 construction season. This remaining section of Townline Road includes substantial areas of peat underlying the road which will require significant efforts in excavation for its removal and backfilling.

Bel-Air has assessed it needs approximately 12 weeks to complete all contract work including the section of Townline Road from Saginaw Parkway to Cedarbrook Court; however there are approximately only 8 weeks of working days remaining in the 2011 construction season. Bel-Air and Region staff are concerned that should Bel-Air start excavation of the roadway and underlying peat between Saginaw Parkway and Cedarbrook Court this Fall that the road cannot be completed and open to traffic for the upcoming winter months. Therefore, should Bel-Air start excavation of the roadway this Fall, Bel-Air cannot guarantee rebuilding this last section of road to base course asphalt and opening it to traffic for the upcoming winter months. Bel-Air has verbally advised that reconstruction of this last section of Townline Road from Saginaw Parkway to Cedarbrook Court must be deferred until the spring of 2012. Therefore, the existing asphalt pavement will be left on this last section of Townline Road this fall so that it can be open and ready for traffic before the upcoming winter months. Please refer to Appendix ‘B’ Figure 2 for a plan of the construction staging.

In order to complete as much construction as possible in 2011 and to make preparations for completion of the works in Spring 2012, Bel-Air will be undertaking construction works within the section of Townline Road between Saginaw Parkway and Cedarbrook Court throughout the remainder of the 2011 construction season. As such it is expected that this section of
Townline Road from Saginaw Parkway to Cedarbrook Court will continue to be closed to through traffic until late November/early December of 2011, then reopened to traffic for the winter, and again closed for completion of the construction works in early 2012. Region staff are currently working with Bel-Air to confirm details of their schedule for completion of the planned construction works in 2011 and completion of the deferred construction works in 2012.

To date there are approximately 8 weeks of working days left in Bel-Air’s contract. In addition, Bel-Air has submitted a recent request for additional working days. The Region’s consultant is currently reviewing this request, and it is expected that some additional working days will be authorized for this contract.

The construction contract includes a Contractor’s Performance Bonus ($1500.00 per day to a maximum of $60,000.00) that would be awarded to the Contractor for the entire completion of the work prior to the expiration of working days authorized under the contract. In addition, the construction contract includes Liquidated Damages ($1500.00 per day) for the Contractor if the contractor exceeds the number of working days authorized under the contract. Staff have advised the Contractor that liquidated damages will be enforced if the authorized contract working days are exceeded.

Before Bel-Air shuts down construction operations in late Fall 2011 staff will ensure that all sections of Townline Road between Can-Amera Parkway and Gore/Avenue Road are fully open and operational for traffic for the upcoming winter months. Once details of Bel-Air’s construction schedule are confirmed, letters and notices will be delivered to local area residents and businesses advising what work will be completed in 2011 and what work will be deferred to Spring 2012.

Traffic Management in 2012

Due to the nature and extent of construction in 2012 for excavation and removal of peat, pipe installations and road construction, it will be necessary to fully close Townline Road from Saginaw Parkway to Cedarbrook Court to traffic during construction. All other sections of Townline Road north of Saginaw Parkway and south of Cedarbrook Court will be fully open and operational to traffic in 2012. Prior to the 2012 road closure, staff will develop a detailed traffic detour plan and will notify adjacent property owners and the motoring public of the detour plan and provide updates to the detour as necessary.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This project is consistent with the development of Strategic Focus Area 2 (Growth Management and Prosperity) in terms of:

- Develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs.

It is also consistent with the development of Strategic Focus Area 3 (Sustainable Transportation) in terms of:

- Develop, promote and integrate active forms of transportation (cycling and walking).

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The Region’s 2011 Ten Year Transportation Capital Program includes $11.4 million in 2011 for completion of this construction project and it is expected that the construction of this project will be completed within the contract amount authorized by Council. This project is being funded from the Development Charge Reserve Fund, Roads Capital Levy Fund, and Road Rehabilitation Capital Reserve Fund.
OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:
NIL

ATTACHMENTS
Appendix A – Figure 1: Key Plan
Appendix B – Figure 2: Construction Staging

PREPARED BY: William Gilbert, Senior Project Manager, Transportation Expansion

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services
FIGURE 1: Key Plan – Project Limits
Townline Road Improvements
Region of Waterloo
FIGURE 2: Construction Staging
Townline Road Improvements
Region of Waterloo
Regional Municipality of Waterloo

SAWMILL ROAD AND NORTHFIELD DRIVE IMPROVEMENTS IN THE VILLAGE OF CONESTOGO

TOWNSHIP OF WOOLWICH

INFORMATION PACKAGE

Public Consultation Centre
Wednesday, October 5, 2011
5:30 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.

at

Conestogo Public School
1948 Sawmill Road, Township of Woolwich

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

The Region of Waterloo is currently considering improvements to Sawmill Road from Musselman Crescent to the Conestogo Bridge and Northfield Drive from the South Limits of Conestogo to Country Spring Walk, within the Village of Conestogo. Please refer to Appendix ‘A’ for a Key Plan. Within the Study Area, Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive are arterial roadways under the jurisdiction of the Region of Waterloo. Musselman Crescent, Weberlyn Crescent, Evening Star Lane, Glasgow Street, Misty River Drive, Harriet Street, Elgin Street, Ferndale Avenue and Country Spring Walk are local roadways under the jurisdiction of the Township of Woolwich.

This project has been initiated to address the poor pavement condition on the sections of Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive within the Project limits.

Improvements currently under consideration include:

- Reconstruction of Sawmill Road from Musselman Crescent to the Conestogo Bridge;
- Reconstruction of Northfield Drive from the South Limits of Conestogo to Country Spring Walk;
- Construction of new designated left-turn lanes on all approaches to the intersection of Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive to improve traffic operations;
- Construction of reserved lanes for cyclists and horse drawn vehicles on Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive within the project limits; and
- Enhanced pedestrian facilities within the project limits.

We encourage you to provide comments on the improvements under consideration by filling out the Comment Sheet attached to the back of this Information Package and either placing it in the box at this Public Consultation Centre or sending it to the address indicated on the Comment Sheet. Your comments will be considered by the Project Team, in conjunction with all of the other relevant information, in establishing a recommended design for improvements to Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive.

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

The planning of these infrastructure improvements is being undertaken by a “Project Team” consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo, the Township of Woolwich and Township Ward 3 Councillor, Bonnie Bryant.

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

Based on technical studies and investigations completed, as well as the objectives of the Regional Official Plan, Transportation Master Plan and Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines, the Project Team has identified the following Preferred Design for the proposed improvements on Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive:

- Complete replacement of the pavement structure on:
  - Sawmill Road from Musselman Crescent to the Conestogo Bridge; and
  - Northfield Drive from the South Limits of Conestogo to Country Spring Walk.
- Construction of 1.50 metre wide reserved lanes for cyclists and horse drawn vehicles on:
  - Sawmill Road from Musselman Crescent to the Conestogo Bridge; and
  - Northfield Drive from the South Limits of Conestogo to Country Spring Walk.
- Construction of new sidewalk:
i) 1.80 metres wide on the north side of Sawmill Road from Harriet Street to the Conestogo Bridge;
ii) 1.80 metres wide on the east side of Northfield Drive from the South Limits of Conestogo to Sawmill Road; and
iii) 1.50 metres wide on the west side of Northfield Drive from Sawmill Road to Country Spring Walk.

- Construction of a pedestrian refuge island on Sawmill Road at the Conestogo Public School in order to facilitate pedestrian crossings to the school;
- Construction of standard curb and gutter on each side of Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive within the project limits;
- Construction of new designated left-turn lanes on all approaches to the intersection of Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive;
- Improved traffic signal timing at the intersection of Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive;
- Replacement of the existing storm sewer system on Sawmill Road from Musselman Crescent to the Conestogo Bridge due to its poor condition;
- Construction of a new storm sewer system on Northfield Drive from the South Limits of Conestogo to Country Spring Walk;
- Removal of the existing partial paved boulevards on Sawmill Road from Musselman Crescent to Harriet Street;
- Provision for designated on-road parking on the south side of Sawmill Road from Glasgow Street to #1835 Sawmill Road and removal of existing on-road boulevard parking at all other locations within the project limits;
- Enhanced boulevard landscaping where feasible; and
- Minor street lighting upgrades within the project limits.

Please refer to Appendix ‘B’ for drawings of the Project Team’s Preferred Design for Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive.

4. How will the Proposed Improvements Enhance the Pedestrian Environment on this Project?

Currently, 1.50 metre wide sidewalks exist on both sides of Sawmill Road from Musselman Crescent to Northfield Drive. A 1.20 metre wide sidewalk exists on the north side of Sawmill Road from Northfield Drive to Harriet Street, and a 1.20 metre wide sidewalk exists on the south side of Sawmill Road from Northfield Drive to #1843 Sawmill Road. These existing sidewalks will require removal in some locations in order to accommodate the road reconstruction; however, any sections removed will be fully reinstated with 1.50 metre wide sidewalk. Existing 1.20 metre wide sidewalk that does not require replacement as part of the reconstruction will remain in place. In addition, new 1.80 metre wide sidewalk is proposed on the north side of Sawmill Road from Harriet Street to the Conestogo Bridge and on the east side of Northfield Drive from the South Limits of Conestogo to Sawmill Road. New 1.50 metre wide sidewalk is proposed on the west side of Northfield Drive from Sawmill Road to Country Spring Walk.

Additionally, a pedestrian refuge island is proposed on Sawmill Road at Conestogo Public School in order to facilitate pedestrian crossings to the school. Enhanced boulevard landscaping will also be provided where feasible to improve the pedestrian environment within the project limits.
5. **Was a Roundabout Considered at the Intersection of Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive?**

The implementation of a modern roundabout was considered by the Project Team to replace the existing traffic control signals at the intersection of Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive. The Project Team’s completed evaluation found that taking into account the estimated capital and operating costs of traffic control signals and roundabouts, collision histories at the intersection and property constraints, a roundabout is not recommended over traffic control signals at this intersection.

6. **How Does this Project Relate to the Objectives of the Regional Official Plan, the Regional Transportation Master Plan and the Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines?**

The Project Team is planning these improvements to address both the deteriorated roadway condition as well as to include enhancements to the roadway corridor consistent with Regional Bylaws, policies, plans and practices. The Regional Official Plan gives the direction to balance new and retrofitted roads for all modes of transportation including walking, cycling, autos and transit. This project supports the Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) goals of optimizing our transportation system, promoting transportation choice and supporting sustainable development. This project includes measures to improve transportation operations, as well as new reserved lanes for cyclists and horse drawn vehicles, new sidewalk, a new pedestrian refuge island on Sawmill Road and enhanced boulevard landscaping to improve the walking environment. Improving the walking environment is a key objective of the RTMP. In addition, Regional Council also approved the Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines in 2010 that supports the integration of active and sustainable transportation on all Regional Roads.

7. **When will Construction Occur?**

Construction on Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive is tentatively scheduled to occur in 2015. The Region’s Transportation Capital Program is reviewed annually and the timing of projects may change depending on several factors. This proposed 2015 timing is also subject to property acquisition, utility relocations and technical approvals required to implement the improvements.

8. **How Will Vehicular Traffic and Pedestrian Access be Maintained During Construction?**

It is tentatively proposed that construction be completed in two (2) separate stages in order to minimize disruption to traffic. These two (2) stages of construction are described as follows:

Stage 1 – Sawmill Road from Musselman Crescent to the Conestogo Bridge; and

Stage 2 – Northfield Drive from the South Limits of Conestogo to Country Spring Walk.

During construction on Sawmill Road, traffic in the westbound direction will be maintained. Eastbound traffic will be detoured via Line 86 to Katherine Street. During construction on Northfield Drive, traffic in the northbound direction will be maintained. Southbound traffic will be detoured via Line 86 to Katherine Street. It may be necessary to detour traffic on local intersecting side streets for short periods of time during construction.
As is customary when Regional Roads are under construction, motorists will be advised of the construction timing and traffic restrictions through advance signage, the Region's web site, and radio and newspaper notices.

The Fire Department, Waterloo Regional Police and Ambulance Services will all be advised of all traffic restrictions during the construction period.

Pedestrian access will be maintained on one side of Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive (as a minimum) for the duration of the construction. Signage will be erected in order to direct pedestrians through the project area.

9. How will Access be Maintained to Properties during Construction?

Access to individual properties and businesses will be maintained at all times except for short durations when work is concentrated in the immediate vicinity of each driveway. A minimum of 48 hours advance notification will be provided for driveway/access interruptions. If necessary, alternate parking arrangements will be made, such as provision for temporary parking on adjacent side streets.

For commercial properties within the work zone, additional signage will be provided during construction to direct customers to the business. If only one driveway exists, the Contractor will complete the work across your driveway in two stages.

For the Conestogo Public School, additional flag persons will be used to assist school crossing guards to ensure students cross Sawmill Road to reach the School safely during construction. Arrangements will be made during construction for school bus access to the Conestogo Public School.

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

10. Who is Responsible for Maintaining New and Existing Sidewalks?

The Township of Woolwich is responsible for the maintenance of sidewalks on Regional Roads within the Township limits.

The Township’s Bylaw stipulates that property owners are responsible for the removal of snow and ice from the municipal sidewalks adjacent to their property within twenty-four (24) hours after the end of a snow fall that results in an accumulation of 38mm or more.

11. How will Trees, Driveways and Lawns be Affected?

It is expected that approximately twenty four (24) trees will have to be removed during construction to accommodate the proposed improvements. The plans presented at this Consultation Centre show trees that likely will require removal. It is the Region’s practice to plant two replacement trees for each tree removed as a result of any road projects. Any grassed areas disturbed during construction will be repaired to equal or better condition with topsoil and sod. In addition to replacing any removed trees on a 2-for-1 basis, new boulevard landscaping, including salt resistant trees and shrubs, will be included as part of the project where feasible. Driveways will be regraded as necessary in order to blend smoothly with the newly constructed roadway.
12. **Will Property Acquisition be Required for this Project?**

Implementation of the Project Team’s Preferred Design requires a widening of the paved roadway of approximately 2.70 metres in order to accommodate the proposed 1.50 metre wide reserved lanes for cyclists and horse drawn vehicles on each side of Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive. In addition, construction of new sidewalk requires widening of the boulevard in some areas. Due to this road widening and new sidewalk, the Region will need to acquire property from sixteen (16) property owners. These proposed property purchases consist of small strips of land immediately adjacent to the existing right-of-way. The plans presented at this Consultation Centre show the proposed property acquisition that will likely be required.

In areas where property is required, the property owner will be contacted directly by the Region of Waterloo’s Land Purchasing Officer. Compensation will be provided at fair market rates based on recent similar area sales. Please refer to Appendix ‘D’ for further information on the property acquisition process.

13. **How will Garbage / Recyclables be Collected During Construction?**

For residential properties on Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive, garbage and blue boxes will continue to be picked up at the end of your driveway as usual. When work is occurring in front of your property and garbage collection vehicles do not have access to your driveway on garbage collection day, our Contractor will deliver your garbage and recyclables to an adjacent side street and return the empty containers afterwards. We ask that all residents mark their containers with their address for easy identification.

For properties with private garbage collection, driveway access will be maintained during each stage of construction to provide access for private garbage collection.

14. **What about Dust During Construction?**

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

15. **What are the Expected Working Hours during Construction?**

In general, construction working hours are from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, although the Contractor may also work on Saturdays from time to time. There may also be occasions where the Contractor is required to complete a critical work item outside of these normal working hours. Work outside normal working hours must be approved by the Region and the Township of Woolwich.

16. **Will the Posted Speed Limit on Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive be Changed?**

Following construction, the Region will retain the posted speed limit of 50 km/hr on Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive within the project limits.
17. **Is Any Watermain or Sanitary Sewer Work Proposed?**

There are no sanitary sewers located on Sawmill Road or Northfield Drive within the project limits, and there is a watermain located on Northfield Drive from the South Limits of Conestogo to Country Spring Walk. The watermain on Northfield Drive is only 18 years old and there are no upgrades planned for this project. Additionally, there are no plans to provide sanitary sewer as part of this project.

18. **Are Traffic Calming Measures Being Considered for this Project?**

Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive are arterial roadways under the jurisdiction of the Region of Waterloo. The Region’s current practice does not allow for the installation of any traffic calming measures on Regional Roads.

Various vehicular speed studies have been completed by the Region in recent years for traffic on Sawmill Road from Northfield Drive to the Conestogo Bridge. The most recent speed study was completed in May 2009. This study showed that the average vehicle speed on Sawmill Road is 52 km/hr.

19. **How Will On-Road Parking be Affected?**

Currently, on-road parking exists on Sawmill Road behind the curb on the narrow asphalt boulevards provided. On-road parking is currently permitted on the south side of Sawmill Road from #1935 Sawmill Road to #1835 Sawmill Road with the exception of the Fire Hall (#1869 Sawmill Road). Also, on-road parking is also currently permitted on the north side of Sawmill Road from #1960 Sawmill Road to the Conestogo Bridge, with the exception of #1880 Sawmill Road and in front of the Conestogo Public School.

The Preferred Design provides for on-road parking on the south side of Sawmill Road from Glasgow Street to #1835 Sawmill Road only. On-road parking in this section will be provided by a designated 2.4 metre wide parking stall behind the curb. On-road parking is prohibited in all other areas on Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive based on the Project Team’s Preferred Design, and the existing narrow asphalt boulevards will be removed and replaced with sod to enhance the walking environment.

Please refer to Appendix ‘C’ for drawings of the Project Team’s Preferred Design for On-Road Parking on Sawmill Road and how it compares to existing on-road parking arrangements.

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

The Region of Waterloo is funding the cost of the road improvements on this project through its approved Ten Year Transportation Capital Program. The estimated total project cost for the proposed Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive improvements is $5,200,000. The Township will fund its portion of the storm sewer replacement.
21. What are the Next Steps?

Prior to finalizing the recommended design concept for Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive for Regional Council's approval, the Project Team is asking for the public's input on the Preferred Design. This Public Consultation Centre is your opportunity to ask questions, provide suggestions, and make comments. Once your input is received, it will be used by the Project Team, in conjunction with all other relevant information, to finalize the recommended design for the Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive improvements.

22. When Will Final Decisions be Made for this Project?

The Project Team will review the public comments received from this Public Consultation Centre and use them as input for recommending a final Design Concept for the Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive project. This Final Recommendation will be presented to Regional Planning and Works Committee and Council in December 2011 for approval. In advance of these meetings, letters will be sent to all adjacent property owners and tenants (as well as to all members of the public specifically registering at this Public Consultation Centre) so that anyone wishing to speak to Committee or Council about this project can do so before final approval.

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

In order to assist us in addressing any comments or concerns you might have regarding this project, we ask that you please fill out the attached Comment Sheet and leave it in the box provided at the registration table. Alternatively, you can mail, fax or e-mail your comments to the Region of Waterloo not later than October 19, 2011.

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

Mr. Jim Ellerman, A.Sc.T.
Project Manager, Capital Projects
Regional Municipality of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street, 6th Floor
Design and Construction Division
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3
Phone: 519-575-4757 ext. 3757
Email: jellerman@regionofwaterloo.ca
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**Typical Cross Section – Sawmill Road Existing Conditions**

**SAWMILL ROAD**

**MUSSELMAN CRESCENT to CONESTOGO BRIDGE**

**TYPICAL EXISTING CROSS SECTION**

* SIDEWALK EXISTS ON SAWMILL ROAD FROM MUSSELMAN CRESCENT TO HARRIET STREET. SIDEWALK IS 1.5m WIDE FROM MUSSELMAN CRESCENT TO NORTHFIELD DRIVE AND 1.2m WIDE FROM NORTHFIELD DRIVE TO HARRIET STREET*
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Typical Cross Section – Preferred Design Alternative

SAWMILL ROAD
CONESTOGO BRIDGE to HARRIET STREET
PREFERRED DESIGN ALTERNATIVE
Appendix B-4

Typical Cross Section – Preferred Design Alternative

SAWMILL ROAD
GLASGOW STREET to MUSSELMAN CRESCENT
PREFERRED DESIGN ALTERNATIVE

* SIDEWALK EXISTS ON SAWMILL ROAD FROM MUSSELMAN CRESCENT TO HARRIET STREET. SIDEWALK IS 1.5m WIDE FROM MUSSELMAN CRESCENT TO NORTHFIELD DRIVE AND 1.2m WIDE FROM NORTHFIELD DRIVE TO HARRIET STREET
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Typical Cross-Section - Northfield Drive Existing Conditions

NORTHFIELD DRIVE
SOUTH LIMITS OF CONESTOGO to COUNTRY SPRING WALK
TYPICAL EXISTING CROSS SECTION
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Typical Cross-Section – Preferred Design Alternative

NORTHFIELD DRIVE
SOUTH LIMITS OF CONESTOGO to SAWMILL ROAD
PREFERRED DESIGN ALTERNATIVE
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Typical Cross-Section – Preferred Design Alternative

NORTHFIELD DRIVE
SAWMILL ROAD to COUNTRY SPRING WALK
PREFERRED DESIGN ALTERNATIVE
Appendix C

Preferred Design for Permitted On-Road Parking
Appendix D

Property Acquisition Process Information Sheet

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

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

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

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

Initial Meetings
The initial meeting is attended by the project engineer and the assigned real estate staff person to brief the owner on the project, what part of their lands are to be acquired or will be affected, what work will be undertaken, when, with what equipment, etc and to answer any questions. The primary purpose of the meeting is to listen to the owner and identify issues, concerns, effects of the proposed acquisition on remaining lands and businesses that can be feasibly mitigated and/or compensated, and how the remaining property may be restored. These discussions may require additional meetings. The goal of staff is to work with the owner to reach mutually agreeable solutions.
Goal – Fair and Equitable Settlement for All Parties
The goal is always to reach a fair and equitable agreement for both the property owner and the Region. Such an agreement will provide compensation for the fair market value of the lands and address the project impacts (such as repairing or replacing landscaping, fencing, paving) so that the property owner will receive the value of the lands acquired and the restoration of their remaining property to the condition it was prior to the Project.

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

Steps Toward Offer of Settlement or Agreement of Purchase and Sale
The general steps towards such an offer are as follows;

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

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

Expropriation
Due to the time constraints of these projects, it is the practice of the Region to commence the expropriation process in parallel with the negotiation process to insure that lands and interests are acquired in time for commencement of the Project. Typically, over 90% of all required lands and interests are acquired through the negotiation process. Even after lands and interests have been acquired through expropriation an agreement on compensation can be reached through negotiation, this is usually referred to as a ‘settlement agreement’.
Put simply, an expropriation is the transfer of lands or an easement to a governmental authority for reasonable compensation, including payment of fair market value for the transferred lands, without the consent of the property owner being required. In the case of expropriations by municipalities such as the Region of Waterloo, the process set out in the Ontario Expropriations Act must be followed to ensure that the rights of the property owners provided under that Act are protected.
PUBLIC CONSULTATION CENTRE

Please complete and hand in this sheet so that your views can be considered for this project. If you cannot complete your comments today, please take this home and mail, fax or e-mail your comments by October 19th, 2011 to:

Mr. Jim Ellerman, A.Sc.T.
Project Manager, Capital Projects
Regional Municipality of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street, 6th Floor
Design and Construction Division
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3
Phone: 519-575-4757 ext. 3757
Email: jellerman@regionofwaterloo.ca

Comments or concerns regarding this project:

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

Name: ________________________________________________________________

Address: __________________________________________________________________

Postal Code: ____________________________________________________________

COLLECTION NOTICE

Personal information requested on this form is collected under the authority of the Municipal Act and will be used to assist Regional staff and the Regional Planning and Works Committee in making decisions on this project. All names and comments will be included in the material made available to the general public. Questions regarding this collection should be forwarded to the staff member indicated above.
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: September 27, 2011

FILE CODE: A09-01

SUBJECT: GRT - SMOKING RESTRICTIONS

RECOMMENDATION:

For information.

SUMMARY:

NIL

REPORT:

Introduction

Earlier this year a delegation outlined their concern to the Planning and Works Committee regarding the impact of people smoking near GRT buses. Specifically, they asked to “have bus entrances second-hand smoke free”. Their concern was that second-hand smoke often flows into the buses causing a potential health impact to children, students and families using GRT. They requested a policy be introduced to address this concern and Committee members asked staff to prepare a report regarding this issue.

The purpose of this Report is to address the Region’s ability to regulate smoking at bus entrances, outline current practices and highlight changes that will be implemented to respond to the delegation’s concerns about second-hand smoke.

Legislative Background

The Region has three acts under which smoking could be regulated or prohibited. The legislation is as follows:

i. Smoke-Free Ontario Act
ii. Municipal Act, 2001
iii. Trespass to Property Act

The Smoke-Free Ontario Act prohibits smoking in enclosed public places and workplaces as well as certain prescribed locations such as schools. In effect, this Act prohibits smoking within GRT buildings, enclosed bus shelters and on buses.

The Municipal Act, 2001 allows municipalities to enact by-laws to regulate or prohibit smoking in public places and workplaces whether enclosed or outdoors. However, the Act specifically excludes the regulation of smoking on a highway. The Region’s Smoking By-law was enacted pursuant to the Municipal Act in September 1996. The Region’s Smoking By-law prohibits smoking in Regional buildings and transit vehicles. It does not prohibit smoking on highways because of the restriction in the Municipal Act, 2001.
The *Trespass to Property Act* (together with the natural person powers given in the *Municipal Act, 2001*) generally allows municipalities, like private land owners, to regulate the conduct of individuals on their property. The Region’s Code of Conduct By-law for GRT was enacted in October 2005. This by-law applies to all lands used by GRT and it prohibits smoking in any indoor or outdoor service line, public area or an area where “no smoking” signs have been posted. The By-law then allows the Region to use its rights under the *Trespass to Property Act* to enforce such.

**Current Restrictions and Suggested Changes**

GRT’s current practice in regard to smoking is as follows:

- a) No smoking is permitted on any GRT vehicles / equipment;
- b) No smoking is permitted inside the Ainslie Street and Charles Street transit terminal buildings as well as designated exterior “no smoking” areas at the terminals which include all building access doors and at a semi circle area located at the front door of each bus parking spot. Smoking is permitted in the remaining outdoor spaces at both of these transit terminals;
- c) No smoking is permitted within enclosed transit shelters; and
- d) Smoking is permitted at outdoor bus stops and at the outdoor platform areas at the five (5) GRT transfer terminals located in various shopping malls.

GRT does not intend to designate outdoor bus stops on highways as non-smoking based on the limitations in the *Municipal Act, 2001* and the enforcement difficulties associated with the 2900 bus stops across Waterloo Region. Instead an awareness program will be implemented asking people not to smoke near the front doors of the bus as a courtesy to those people onboard.

GRT will designate outdoor platforms at the five (5) GRT transfer terminals located in various shopping malls as “no-smoking”. GRT will rely on public awareness for enforcement.

GRT will also increase the “no-smoking” areas at the Ainslie Street and Charles Street transit terminals to include the majority of the outdoor platforms. GRT intends to allow restricted outdoor smoking areas away from waiting areas so that GRT patrons do not enter bus routes, highways or private property in order to smoke. The introduction of this broader outdoor smoking restriction at the two regional transit terminals will be promoted through a public awareness campaign. If necessary, enforcement can be used through the GRT Code of Conduct By-law and the *Trespass to Property Act*.

**CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

Broadening the outdoor no smoking areas at the Regional Transit Terminals supports Strategic Focus Area 4; Healthy, Inclusive and Safe Communities.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

The cost of an awareness program asking people not to smoke near the front doors of GRT buses at bus stops or shopping mall bus terminals along with promoting the new outdoor smoking sections at the two Regional transit terminals is estimated at $5,000. This cost can be accommodated through the Transit Services operating budget.

**OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:**

The following departments have been consulted in the preparation of this report: Licensing and Enforcement Services, Facilities Management and Legal Services.
ATTACHMENTS

NIL

PREPARED BY: Eric Gillespie, Director Transit Services

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner Transportation and Environmental Services
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: September 27, 2011

FILE CODE: V-04-20

SUBJECT: ONBOARD MOBILE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEMS POLICY UPDATE

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the expenditure of $215,000 to upgrade the Mobile Surveillance System to allow onboard information to be overwritten after 72 hours.

SUMMARY:

In June 2010, Regional Council approved the purchase of a mobile video surveillance system to be installed on GRT vehicles (Report F10-065). An Onboard Mobile Surveillance Systems Policy was also developed with assistance through community consultation and the final draft of the policy was presented to Planning and Works Committee on June 21, 2011 for approval (V-11-052).

Committee members expressed concerns with the policy requirement that information be erased or recorded over after a period of 60 hours of vehicle operation time. Staff explained that the service hours of buses can differ depending on bus usage and information could be stored onboard for longer than 72 hours. Committee members subsequently amended the motion to state that onboard recording media be overwritten after 72 hours.

This amendment requires modification to the mobile surveillance system because it is designed to operate only when the bus has power. As a result, when the bus is turned off, previously recorded images can stay on the hard drive for greater than 72 hours. Staff recommends a system upgrade be approved so video surveillance information can be overwritten after 72 hours.

REPORT:

The use of video surveillance equipment is permitted under legislation provided safeguards are put in place to protect information that is captured. In recognition of the privacy rights of transit customers, the Onboard Mobile Surveillance Systems Policy was developed in accordance with the Information and Privacy Commissioner of Ontario’s Guidelines. The policy addresses the privacy safeguards of storage, retention and access to any images or information captured through the onboard video surveillance system.

The Information and Privacy Commissioner’s guidelines recommend information not accessed be routinely erased between 48 and 72 hours. The GRT retention time of 60 hours of vehicle operation time was selected to allow recording of information for approximately three service days for in-service GRT buses. As buses are out for varying durations during the day, 60 hours was selected to capture information for the buses out during the longest service days. Information recording occurs at all times when the vehicle is turned on and is recorded over after the hard drive space for recording is full. Information is not removed after a specific period of time but rather recorded over when space for more recent information is needed. Since buses have varying daily operational times...
and some may be withheld from service for inspection or repair, information can remain on the vehicle for more than the time suggested by the Information and Privacy Commissioners office.

Based on public input and as an additional administrative safe guard, staff revised the policy to require requests for information to be received within 72 hours of the date of the alleged incident unless the information is required for a warrant, summons, court order or other legal process that requires disclosure of surveillance images or information. Committee subsequently amended the policy to require that all onboard surveillance information be over-written after 72 hours.

The surveillance system acquired by the Region of Waterloo can be modified to limit recording space to reduce the amount of data captured and the system will overwrite itself once the recording space is full. However, unlike fixed video systems which have a constant power supply, onboard systems are only powered when the vehicle is on. Therefore information contained on the vehicle is not overwritten based on clock time but rather how much time the vehicle is operational and how much information is recorded.

Staff has investigated several options to enable information on the bus to be overwritten after 72 clock hours.

**Option 1 – Provide constant power to the recording system**

This option affects battery life of the vehicle and will lead to buses not being able to start. This will frequently occur after weekends when a significant portion of the fleet is not operated. Adopting this solution would greatly impact service reliability and it is not recommended. Auxiliary power supply units were also considered however these components would also negatively affect battery life and vehicle reliability.

**Option 2 - Modify the Current Viewing Software and Reduce Hard Drive Capacity**

The current DVR platform can be maintained and the propriety viewing software modified so that the remote (off bus) video viewing is restricted to 72 clock hours for GRT’s software. The hard drive capacity of the system would also be decreased to limit the total amount of recorded video stored on the bus. This would mean staff using the remote video readers would not have access to information older than 72 hours.

The onboard hard drive would still retain information older than 72 hours. Access to this onboard hardware and information would be key and password protected and only a small number of staff would be capable of viewing images onboard. Under this option, older images not over-written could still be viewed if requested by a warrant, summons, court order or other legal process that requires disclosure of surveillance images or information. This option provides added information security by further limiting access to the information however it does not fully comply with the amended policy. The cost to implement this option is $21,000.

**Option 3: Upgrade Onboard Hardware Platform and Modify DVR Firmware**

Option 3 consists of upgrading the DVR platform and modifying the DVR firmware to limit recording hours to 72 clock hours. With these system modifications, there would be no information available on the bus greater than the 72 hours. Additional benefits include improved image quality, built in accelerometer to better support collision investigation, a back-up drive for greater reliability and the ability to easily add additional cameras in the future. The cost to implement this system upgrade is $215,000.
CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The implementation of the Mobile Video Surveillance system on GRT buses supports Focus Area 4: Healthy and Inclusive Communities and Focus Area 5 Service Excellence by ensuring a safer environment for employees and customers while protecting their right to privacy.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The approved 2011 GRT Capital Budget includes $1,720,000, to be funded from debentures for the purchase and installation of the mobile video surveillance system. The initial capital purchase of the surveillance system to outfit 162 (of 218) GRT buses and all MobilityPLUS vehicles was outlined in Report F-10-065 based on the proposal accepted from Seon Design Inc. at a cost of $680,601, net of HST rebate.

Regional Council, at it’s meeting on September 14, 2011, recently approved the transfer of $325,000 (Report P-11-071) from this project budget to Project 66071 to facilitate the installation of INIT technology on the remaining buses in the fleet.

The remaining project budget of $763,000 will be utilized to fund the $215,000 required upgrade to modify the approved On-board Mobile Surveillance System to allow onboard information to be overwritten after 72 hours. Subsequently, the remaining budget of $548,000 will be utilized over the next four years to outfit the remainder of the fleet and to install system communications components and cover extended warranties on the equipment.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Nil

ATTACHMENTS

Appendix A – Onboard Mobile Video Surveillance Systems Policy

PREPARED BY: Peter Zinck, Assistant Director Transit Services

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Service
Appendix A – Onboard Mobile Video Surveillance Systems Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRAND RIVER TRANSIT POLICY</th>
<th>Section #</th>
<th>Policy #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approval Date:</td>
<td>Revision Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>ONBOARD MOBILE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEMS POLICY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility:</td>
<td>Transit Services Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies to:</td>
<td>All Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval Level:</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLICY STATEMENT:**

Public transit vehicles are vulnerable to a number of risks, including violent acts that can threaten the health and safety of passengers and employees, criminal activities that occur on transit vehicles, vandalism and theft of property, and injuries related to the operation of the vehicles or collisions. Onboard mobile surveillance systems are one method of deterring inappropriate actions, investigating criminal activities or resolving personal injury claims. Surveillance systems may also impact the privacy expectations of transit users if there are inadequate controls on their use. The Regional Municipality of Waterloo respects the rights of individuals to have their personal information handled in accordance with applicable laws, including the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (MIFPPA). This policy outlines the procedures used by Grand River Transit (GRT) and responsible Regional staff to ensure compliance with MIFPPA. Surveillance system recordings will be used only for the purposes of: detecting, deterring and investigating unlawful activity which includes possible contraventions of any Federal or Provincial legislation or municipal by-laws; investigating and resolving personal injury and other legal claims and proceedings; and investigating and resolving employee discipline proceedings.

**OPERATING DETAILS:**

Vehicles with Surveillance Systems

- Grand River Transit (GRT) may utilize mobile surveillance systems on all conventional transit and specialized transit (MobilityPLUS) vehicles.
- Mobile surveillance systems may include the use of video and audio recording equipment.
- The mobile surveillance systems shall not be monitored by GRT staff while equipment records activities on the vehicles.
PROCEDURES:

Installation

1. Surveillance systems installed at Regional buildings including transit facilities, which are managed by Facilities Management, are not included in this policy.

2. Mobile surveillance systems will be installed or configured to prevent or limit the ability to record beyond the immediate vicinity of the vehicle. Audio recording shall not occur in the passenger compartment and is therefore restricted to the immediate driver’s area.

3. Surveillance system recordings will be used only for the purposes of: detecting, deterring and investigating unlawful activity which includes possible contraventions of any Federal or Provincial legislation or municipal by-laws; investigating and resolving personal injury and other legal claims; and investigating and resolving employee discipline proceedings.

4. The mobile surveillance systems shall not be monitored by GRT staff while equipment records activities on the vehicles.

5. Equipment will not be used for the purpose of monitoring employee performance as outlined in the relevant Collective Agreements or Regional policy.

6. Surveillance recording equipment monitors, and information storage media will be in a controlled access area restricted from any public or unauthorized viewing.

7. On all vehicles where surveillance systems are used, the signage shown in Appendix 1 will be prominently displayed at all entrances and on the inside of the vehicle. The signage may vary to suit the circumstances of the type of vehicle being monitored.

A Notice of Collection, required under section 29 of MFIPPA, will also be available to the public (see Appendix 2). The Notice of Collection shall be made available through the GRT website (www.grt.ca), public directories, or alternate formats such as pamphlets or signage based on the nature of the public’s use of specific facilities.

8. All proposed new installations of surveillance systems onboard GRT vehicles and revisions to existing locations are to be submitted for approval by the Director, Transit Services or designate. The approval process will examine the need for the equipment recognizing MFIPPA and will consult as required with Labour Relations regarding employee/labour relations concerns. Notification will be sent to all employees at any given
location prior to the new installation of surveillance systems indicating the location of installations.

9. All recording equipment will be reasonably obvious to persons using the vehicle.

10. Surveillance systems shall only be operated when the vehicle in use by the general public. For greater certainty, surveillance systems shall not be operated when the vehicle is in use for private charter or off-site at contracted services.

11. Vehicle operators shall not have the ability to alter the location of surveillance cameras or have the ability to adjust, zoom or manipulate the surveillance system components.

**Policy Distribution**

All GRT employees will be advised of and required to read and comply with this policy. Recorded documentation in the form of a Communication Record will be circulated with this policy, and any subsequent revisions, to ensure staff awareness and compliance.

**Viewing**

Images or information obtained by way of a surveillance system on a GRT vehicle shall only be used by the Region for a purpose that is consistent with the rationale for this Policy.

Only authorized persons identified in Schedule “A” may access surveillance images or information to support a proper and necessary function. At each site where systems are in operation, an Assistant Manager/Manager has been designated to maintain the list of authorized persons. This designate is responsible for ensuring only the listed people have access to video surveillance images or information, recording or storage equipment.

All authorized Regional employees and Regional agents / contractors will be advised of and required to read and comply with this policy. Recorded documentation in the form of a Communication Record will be circulated with this policy, and any subsequent revisions, to ensure awareness and compliance. Regional employees and Regional agents / contractors who access or obtain images and information will be required to execute an undertaking of confidentiality.

All Regional contracts to install / maintain the surveillance systems as well as Regional security contracts will require adequate provisions to protect privacy and maintain Regional control over the surveillance equipment and surveillance images and information.
Disclosure and Requests for Copies of Images

Release of surveillance images or information must support the purposes of this policy and requires the approval of the Director, Transit Services or designate. The Director will consult, as required, with the Region’s Information Access and Privacy Advisor in Council and Administrative Services, Supervisor, Security Services or Manager, Labour Relations prior to releasing surveillance images or information.

All requests for release of information and all released information will be logged for tracking purposes. Copies of surveillance information will only be released with the signed authorization of the Director, Transit Services or designate.

Requests from law enforcement agencies or regulatory agencies will be in writing and must identify the legal authority under which the agency is requesting disclosure unless the agency requests immediate access for reasons including imminent danger, hot pursuit or serious threat to public and/or worker health and safety. In this case, provided the images and information are logged for tracking purposes, the information may be be disclosed by the Director, Transit Services or designate without a written request.

An individual whose personal information has been recorded has a right to request access to those images or information in accordance with MFIPPA. These requests will be directed to the Region’s Freedom of Information & Privacy office in Council and Administrative Services which will process the request in accordance with the legislation.

All other persons requesting access to images or information under MFIPPA will be directed to the Region’s Freedom of Information & Privacy office in Council and Administrative Services which will process the request in accordance with the legislation.

The Region shall comply with any warrant, summons, court order or other legal process that requires disclosure of surveillance images or information, subject to consultation with the Regional Solicitor and Information Access and Privacy Advisor in Council and Administrative Services.

Storage

These procedures relate to the storage of information from surveillance systems including use of information, filing, retention, copies, security and disposal. The overriding process is that persons with authorized access must ensure security of surveillance information; responsible supervisors/managers must tightly control access to video surveillance images and information.

Surveillance system recordings will be used only for the purposes of: detecting, deterring and investigating unlawful activity which includes possible
contraventions of any Federal or Provincial legislation or municipal by-laws; investigating and resolving personal injury and other legal claims; and investigating and resolving employee discipline proceedings.

All information storage devices will be located in a controlled access area. Storage media capable of being removed from the recording device will be kept in a locked storage container within the controlled access area. Where images are captured on computer drives these are to be password protected so only authorized persons can obtain access. Information sent via the web or wifi to remote monitoring locations will also be password protected.

Old storage devices will be securely disposed of in such a way that the personal information cannot be reconstructed or retrieved. Disposal methods include overwriting electronic records or magnetically erasing the personal information as outlined by the Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner of Ontario. Access to the recordings is the responsibility of Director, Transit Services unless this Policy states otherwise. The Director, Transit Services or designate shall maintain a record that sets out all persons, with applicable dates, who access and/or obtain images or information obtained by way of a surveillance system on a GRT vehicle.

Retention

Requests for information collected by the recording systems on GRT vehicles will not be accepted or the information retrieved and viewed unless the request is received within 72 hours from the date of the alleged incident or is required for a warrant, summons, court order or other legal process that requires disclosure of surveillance images or information. Information collected by recording systems on GRT vehicles will, unless otherwise requested, be routinely erased or recorded over after a period of 72 hours. If required for investigative purposes by the Region or a law enforcement agency specific images will be copied and retained for a minimum period of one (1) year and shall be maintained thereafter for so long as necessary based on any ongoing investigation or legal proceeding.

Breach of Policy

The Director, Transit Services, Information Access and Privacy Advisor, Human Resources and Legal Services as needed will investigate and respond to any breach or alleged breach of this Policy.

The Director, Transit Services shall ensure that an audit is conducted on an annual basis to ensure compliance with this Policy.

Reporting

The Manager, Business Services and Supervisor, Security Services (Facilities) will prepare an annual report for Regional Council summarizing all new onboard
installations, as well as all requests for surveillance information and any other related security issues of import.

The Director, Transit Services, Supervisor, Security Services (Facilities) and Assistant Manager, Passenger Facilities and Terminals will review this Policy every two years and report to Regional Council concerning any amendments that are required.

A summary in the form of a pamphlet concerning the rationale for this Policy and safeguards implemented thereto shall be made available to the public, upon request. A summary concerning the rationale for this Policy and safeguards implemented thereto shall also be posted on the Regional / GRT website.

**Responsibilities**

**Director, Transit Services or designate**

- Approves all onboard mobile surveillance systems and installations
- Responsible for the overall program of mobile surveillance on transit vehicles
- Maintains a record of all requests for copies of surveillance images or information
- Approves the release of information for law enforcement or legal proceedings, grants approval to retrieve and view information.

**Assistant Manager, Passenger Facilities and Terminals**

- Assists the Director with audits to ensure all system operations are in compliance with Regional policy and MFIPPA.
- Responsible for the review and update of this Policy every two years in conjunction with the Supervisor, Security Services (Facilities)
- Supervises the activities of the Coordinator, Transit Security
- Reviews all mobile surveillance system and camera installations
- Maintains and circulates to GRT Management, the approved list of authorized persons who, as a requirement of their position may access surveillance images and information to support a proper and necessary function.

**Supervisor, Transit Security**

- In collaboration with the Supervisor, Security Services provides technical advice on types of cameras, storage devices, etc.
- Reviews storage and retention procedures for all surveillance system records
- Ensures all operators of surveillance equipment are trained including safe storage, retention, privacy requirements, and release of images and information
• Examines the necessity of specific surveillance system expansions respecting privacy requirements.
• In collaboration with the Supervisor, Security Services, recommends locations for surveillance systems and specific camera locations
• Develops rules for circumstances where images and information may be obtained by authorized persons

Supervisor, Security Services (Facilities)
• Assists the Director, Transit Services or designate in regards to the release of video surveillance images and information to law enforcement agencies or in response to a subpoena or other court order
• Assists Information Access & Privacy Advisor if access to images is requested under MFIPPA

Manager, Transit Fleet Maintenance
• Monitors all installation and maintenance work of contractors of the onboard surveillance system components
• Supervises maintenance work on surveillance system components and ensures recording systems are maintained in a state of good repair
• Ensures confidentiality of images and information during maintenance
• Responsible for posting signage on vehicles

Manager, Transit Operations
• Ensures only authorized persons access surveillance images
• Ensures Assistant Managers and Transit Supervisors have the up to date list of authorized persons and comply with notification requirements on all requests to view surveillance images or information.

Assistant Manager, Transit Operations
• Authorizes the retrieval of recorded information.
• Maintains a log of those authorized persons accessing surveillance images and information and also emails the details of each occurrence to the Manager, Transit Operations and Director, Transit Services
• Monitors equipment operation and recording activity
• Retain, store, label and dispose of images and information as according to the Information Retention and Disposal By-law (93-076)
• Ensures confidentiality of images and information

Transit Supervisor
• Secures access to recording equipment and labeled storage at GRT facilities
• When retrieving information, ensures only authorized persons access the information.

Information Access & Privacy Advisor

• Handles Freedom of Information requests for images with assistance of Supervisor, Security Services
• Provides advice on the compliance of surveillance systems with applicable privacy statutes

Manager – Labour Relations

• In consultation with the Director, Transit Services or designate, authorizes release of surveillance information where employee information has been captured, when appropriate
• Provides guidance on use of surveillance recordings in investigations where employee information has been captured.

SEE ALSO:

Facilities Management Policy Video Surveillance Policy (3.8)
Building Security (3.4)
Information Retention and Disposal By-law 93-076, as amended
Municipal Act
Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: September 27, 2011

FILE CODE: T01-20/58

SUBJECT: LANE DESIGNATION ON FISCHER-HALLMAN ROAD (REGIONAL ROAD 58) AT ACTIVA AVENUE, CITY OF KITCHENER

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo amend Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended, to provide for a right turn lane, with a buses excepted designation, on southbound Fischer-Hallman Road (Regional Road 58) at Activa Avenue, City of Kitchener.

SUMMARY: NIL

REPORT:

As a result of a new bus stop being installed on the west side of southbound Fischer-Hallman Road, north of Activa Avenue for the iXpress Route, Grand River Transit staff approached Transportation Engineering staff to designate the existing right turn lane on southbound Fischer-Hallman Road at Activa Avenue as an exclusive right-turn lane, with the exception of buses.

Buses need to stop in the existing right turn lane to pick-up and drop-off passengers. Buses then continue southbound along Fischer-Hallman Road as part of their route, and must safely merge back after the intersection to do so. South of the intersection, an additional merge area has been paved.

As these are regulatory signs, an amendment to the Regional Municipality of Waterloo Traffic and Parking By-law is required. The right-turn lane designation sign with buses excepted tab will officially make this lane a right-turn only movement lane and buses will be exempted from having to make a right-turn lane onto Activa Avenue so that they can continue southbound on Fischer-Hallman Road with the rest of their route.

Figure 1 illustrates the location of the proposed lane designation sign with the Buses Excepted tab.
Figure 1 – Right Turn Lane Designation Sign with the Buses Excluded Tab on Southbound Fischer-Hallman Road at Activa Avenue

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This report addresses the Region’s goal to optimize the use of existing infrastructure (Strategic Objective 5.1).

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The cost to revise the existing signing is approximately $200 and is provided for in the sign maintenance budget.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

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

ATTACHMENTS: NIL

PREPARED BY: Satinderjit Bahia, Engineering Technologist (Traffic)

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: September 27, 2011

FILE CODE: A23-20/WRMPWA

SUBJECT: 2011 ASSOCIATION OF ONTARIO ROAD SUPERVISORS TRADE SHOW

RECOMMENDATION:

For Information

SUMMARY:

In March of 2009, Information Report E-09-029 was presented to Regional Council outlining that the Waterloo Region Municipal Public Works Association (WRMPWA) would be hosting the Association of Ontario Road Supervisors (AORS) 2011 Municipal Trade Show. This event was held on June 7, 8, and 9, 2011 at the Kitchener Memorial Auditorium and was attended by municipal and provincial public works staff from all over Ontario.

REPORT:

Every year AORS holds a trade show where public works staff from all over the province travel to view the latest equipment and technologies in public works. This show travels throughout Ontario where it is hosted by local associations in the area.

This event was scheduled to come back into this area in 2011. In the summer of 2008, AORS requested proposals from interested associations to host this event. WRMPWA, which is a group of Municipal and Regional staff along with various local supplier members, submitted a proposal in September of 2008 to host this event. As a result, WRMPWA was chosen as host for 2011.

The trade show itself was held at the Kitchener Memorial Auditorium on June 8 and 9, 2011 and the annual golf tournament was held at Doon Valley Golf Course on June 7, 2011. The event was a resounding success as approximately 1,800 people attended over the 2 days the trade show took place. A record number 342 booths were sold this year making it the largest show in its 25 year history.

Traditionally income generated from the trade show is shared amongst AORS and the local host association. WRMPWA decided to retain part of its share of the proceeds to assist in the operational costs of the Association. The remaining funds were to be distributed to local charities that assisted both families and children. As a result of much discussion, WRMPWA decided to assist the following local organizations:

1. Nutrition for Learning;
2. Family and Children’s Services of Waterloo Region;
3. Food Bank of Waterloo Region; and
At the WRMPWA meeting being held on October 17, 2011 proceeds will be presented to the above organizations by the WRMPWA to assist them in their organizations.

Appendix A to this report is a letter from Bryan Clarke, Executive Director of AORS thanking WRMPWA for hosting this event.

In addition, WRMPWA wishes to extend its appreciation to Senior Management and Regional Council for its support in holding this event.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This event supported Focus Area 6 Service Excellence: Foster a culture of citizen/customer service that is responsive to community needs.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

There was no requirement for direct funding by the Region for this event.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

WRMPWA members from the seven local Municipalities and the Region all provided support for this event.

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix A – Association of Ontario Road Supervisor letter

PREPARED BY: Emil Marion, Supervisor, Technical Operations

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services
July 29, 2011

TO: Waterloo Region Municipal Public Works Association

On behalf of the AORS Board of Directors, staff and membership as well as your Provincial public works colleagues, I would like to thank the Waterloo Region Municipal Public Works Association for organizing and hosting a very successful 26th edition of the our Annual Municipal Trade Show.

Without a doubt, the Trade Show is the flagship event in the AORS calendar year. Our supplier members/exhibitors expect an excellent venue and a well managed team of volunteers to help them showcase their products and services. The Kitchener Memorial Auditorium Complex was a perfect venue for them. Trade Show visitors want access to a wide range of public works related equipment, companies and key contacts. From the very positive feedback we received it is clear that you and your committee achieved these objectives.

As well, I would like to acknowledge and thank the volunteer organizers of the Ross McKenzie Memorial Golf Tournament. This event is an important opportunity for everyone to socialize and relax with friends before the business of the Trade Show. Perfect weather, a great golf course, numerous prizes and a delicious dinner all contributed to a fun and memorable day for all participants.

As you are aware, AORS Local Associations – like Waterloo Region MPWA - are the foundation of our ‘grass roots’ Municipal public works professional organization. We rely on their volunteer support at every level to meet our corporate marketing and promotional strategic goals. A successful Trade Show is the key element of this plan.

The Waterloo team certainly rose to the challenge in every way. We are very proud of your accomplishments and sincerely appreciate the contributions of everyone involved. You have set the bar very high for future shows and we will rely on you to pass on your knowledge and infectious enthusiasm to them. Please enjoy your well earned rest over the summer.

Best regards,

Bryan Clarke CRS-S
Executive Director
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: September 27, 2011

FILE CODE: T18-01

SUBJECT: AIRPORT FEE STRUCTURE REVIEW

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the revised schedule of fees and supplemental charges at the Region of Waterloo International Airport (ROWIA) as per Appendix A of Report E-11-104 dated September 27, 2011, effective January 1, 2012.

AND THAT the notice of the intent to amend the Region’s Fees and Charges (By-law 10-001 as amended) as set out in Report E-11-104 dated September 27, 2011, be published in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Act.

SUMMARY:

The last review of the fee structure at the Region of Waterloo International Airport (ROWIA) was completed in 2009. Regional Airport staff has reviewed the current airport fee structure and recommend the rates, fees and charges be revised as noted in Appendix A.

REPORT:

The last review of the fee structure at the Region of Waterloo International Airport was completed in 2009 with some minor changes to fees. Airport staff has attempted to design a fee structure that is based on the type of traffic the Airport attracts as well as ease of administration. The Region of Waterloo International Airport in 2010 had 99,129 movements, making it the twentieth busiest airport in Canada.

The following proposed fee structure is being recommended by staff.

Landing Fees

The current fees are based on two separate structures for based and non-based aircraft for both domestic and international flights. Airport Staff has found that this structure has caused confusion and increased administration costs. It is recommended that one rate be charged per 1,000 kg of aircraft, whether it is based, non-based, domestic or international. Aircraft under the 3,000 kg would remain exempt from landing fees.

Staff also recommends that the current process of waiving of landing fees for aircraft undergoing maintenance at an approved CYKF facility be removed. In discussions with Aircraft Maintenance Tenants they would not have any problem with this as the majority of their clients fall under the 3,000 kg weight category which remains at “exempt” in the fee schedule.
In addition, it is recommended that the current 50% off landing fees for training flights be eliminated, as most aircraft are well below the 3000kg weight limit as well.

The landing fees proposed at ROWIA are in line with other similar airports. For example, Hamilton Airport landing fees for airlines are $11 per 1,000 kg, so we are still well below that rate.

The following table lists the recommended fee ranges and rates:

**Aircraft Landing Fees (current rates and proposed rates.)**

**Non-based (itinerant)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manufacturers Gross Take Off Weight</th>
<th>Domestic Flights (Per 1,000 kg)</th>
<th>International Flights (Per 1,000 kg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present Proposed</td>
<td>Present Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 2999 kg</td>
<td>$0.00 $0.00</td>
<td>$0.00 $0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 – 21,000 kg</td>
<td>$6.30 $6.00</td>
<td>$7.60 $6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21,000 – 45,000 kg</td>
<td>$7.70 $6.00</td>
<td>$8.80 $6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 45,000 kg</td>
<td>$8.60 $6.00</td>
<td>$10.50 $6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helicopters</td>
<td>Same rates as above per 1,000 kg</td>
<td>Same rates as above per 1,000 kg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Airlines and Based Aircraft**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manufacturers Gross Take Off Weight</th>
<th>Domestic Flights (Per 1,000 kg)</th>
<th>International Flights (Per 1,000 kg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present Proposed</td>
<td>Present Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 2,999 kg</td>
<td>$0.00 $0.00</td>
<td>$0.00 $0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 - 21,000 kg</td>
<td>$3.80 $6.00</td>
<td>$3.80 $6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21,001 - 45,000 kg</td>
<td>$4.30 $6.00</td>
<td>$4.30 $6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 45,000 kg</td>
<td>$4.50 $6.00</td>
<td>$4.80 $6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helicopters</td>
<td>$11.00 per landing</td>
<td>$12.00 per landing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same rates as above per 1,000 kg</td>
<td>Same rates as above per 1,000 kg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aircraft Parking Fees**

The Airport’s current aircraft parking fee structure is similar to the landing fees where there are two different fee structures for based and non based aircraft. It is staff’s recommendation that one category be established for aircraft parking and to be called “Apron Parking Fees” as noted in the following tables. The based aircraft rate was kept as the new fee since most of the non-based aircraft normally park on leased apron space and are charged directly by the tenant. Airlines flying from ROWIA on scheduled flights are currently charged at the based rate. There should be no loss of revenues with this change.
The proposed aircraft parking fees at ROWIA are outlined in the tables below:

**General Aviation or Non-Based change to “Apron Parking Fees”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manufacturers Gross Take Off Weight</th>
<th>Daily Rates (charged after a 6 hour period)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 2,000 kg</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>$8.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,001 – 5,000 kg</td>
<td>$11.50</td>
<td>$9.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 – 10,000 kg</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>$11.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 – 30,000 kg</td>
<td>$38.00</td>
<td>$35.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001 – 60,000 kg</td>
<td>$51.00</td>
<td>$35.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,001 – 100,000 kg</td>
<td>$78.00</td>
<td>$37.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Based Aircraft Parking Fees change to “Apron Parking Fees”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manufacturers Gross Take Off Weight</th>
<th>Daily Rates (charged after a 6 hour period)</th>
<th>Monthly Rates</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 2,000 kg</td>
<td>$8.14</td>
<td>$8.14</td>
<td>$54.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,001 – 5,000 kg</td>
<td>$9.22</td>
<td>$9.22</td>
<td>$67.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 – 10,000 kg</td>
<td>$11.39</td>
<td>$11.39</td>
<td>$77.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 – 30,000 kg</td>
<td>$35.26</td>
<td>$35.26</td>
<td>$103.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001 – 60,000 kg</td>
<td>$35.75</td>
<td>$35.75</td>
<td>$104.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,001 – 100,000 kg</td>
<td>$37.37</td>
<td>$37.37</td>
<td>$109.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parking Fee on Apron II**

It is recommended that these rates be revised to the new Apron Parking Fee rates. This particular apron is mainly used by Medivacs (exempt) and the occasional itinerant aircraft.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manufacturers Take Off Weight</th>
<th>Daily Rates</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 2,000 kg</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
<td>8.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,001 – 5,000 kg</td>
<td>$23.00</td>
<td>9.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 – 10,000 kg</td>
<td>$32.00</td>
<td>11.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 – 30,000 kg</td>
<td>$76.00</td>
<td>35.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001 – 60,000 kg</td>
<td>$102.00</td>
<td>35.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Airport Operating Fee

It is recommended that the Airport Operating Fee be removed from the schedule. This $8 per passenger fee was originally established to recover costs associated with contracted out fire services, and makes it difficult to attract additional vacation charter services. Recent changes to the fire service allows additional fire service without additional cost, therefore causing this fee to become redundant.

Passenger Facilitation Fee

The Passenger Facilitation Fee (PFF) applies to all departing enplaned passengers at the Airport, including non-revenue passengers. It is recommended that the Transborder rate be changed as noted below to reflect what similar airports are charging.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic and International</td>
<td>$15 per passenger</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transborder (U.S. Flights)</td>
<td>$15 per passenger</td>
<td>$20 per passenger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ground Rent

In 1997 Regional Council approved a Lease Land rate which was tied to the Canada Pricing Index (CPI) and a five year cyclical review for adjustments was to be completed. Up to now CPI annual increases have been implemented, however, there have not been any five year adjustments made since 1997. In order to bring lease rates more in line with other airports, it is recommended that the private and commercial building rate be increased annually by $0.01 over the next five years and the vacant land rate be increased only in 2013 by $0.01. The appropriate rate increase will be applied at the Tenants lease renewal date (typically every 5 years.) The CPI will continue to be applied annually.

Building: Private and Commercial leases (currently $0.22 per sq. ft.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rate per sq. ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1 2012</td>
<td>$0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1 2013</td>
<td>$0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1 2014</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1 2015</td>
<td>$0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1 2016</td>
<td>$0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Land: Private and Commercial leases (currently $0.04 per sq. ft.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rate per sq. ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1 2012</td>
<td>$0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1 2013</td>
<td>$0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1 2014</td>
<td>$0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1 2015</td>
<td>$0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1 2016</td>
<td>$0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special Commercial (Building Currently $0.38 per sq. ft.)

No Change
**Special Commercial** (Land Currently $0.10 per sq. ft.)

No Change

**Office Rent**

To keep in line with Regional Facilities rental rates, the airline office and common area rents will be increased as follows:

Office rent in the Terminal Building will increase to $18.50 per sq. ft. from $16 per sq. ft.

Common Area will increase to $0.60 per sq. ft. from $0.50 per sq. ft.

**Vehicle Parking Fees**

It is staff’s recommendation that the current parking fees be adjusted in order to attract more airline passengers, visitors to the restaurant and the community public who enjoy spending the day at the airport watching aircraft. It is also recommended that a Special Events Parking Permit be added to the schedule. The majority of parking receipts consist of 1 hour or 1 week, with the minority of cars parking for a day. Staff believe that a very large marketing opportunity exists to exploit $6 a day parking, while actually increasing the hourly rate, and only reducing the weekly rate from $45 to $42. We believe more cars will use the parking lots because of the attractiveness of $6 a day parking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking Meters At Terminal</td>
<td>15 min for $1.00</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hour</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td>$30.00 per month</td>
<td>$30.00 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Rental Agencies - Reserved Spots</td>
<td>$60.00 per month</td>
<td>$60.00 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Events Parking Permit</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>$3.00 per vehicle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Parking rates include HST*

**Operation Fee for based Flight School**

Currently the monthly flat rate fee structure is set by aircraft type for the flight schools. Since the current landing fees are waived for all aircraft under 3,000 kg and since most of the flight schools use aircraft in this category, it is staff’s recommendation that the current fee for aircraft under 3,000 kg remain at the current operation fee and should any training aircraft over 3,000 kg be included at the flight schools they would then be charged the landing fee rate. There was no negative feedback from flight training tenants on this change.
### Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Engine &lt;3000 kg</td>
<td>$50 per aircraft per month</td>
<td>Keep at current rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Twin &lt; 3000 kg</td>
<td>$70 per aircraft per month</td>
<td>Keep at current rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Twin</td>
<td>$45 per aircraft per month</td>
<td>Charge landing fee as per schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turbo Prop</td>
<td>$65 per aircraft per month</td>
<td>Charge landing fee as per schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet</td>
<td>$110 per aircraft per month</td>
<td>Charge landing fee as per schedule</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New Leases and Assignment of Leases

It is recommended that the preparation of New Leases and the Assignment of existing leases be increased as per the chart below. The Administrative responsibility, time and effort necessary to prepare and assign a lease has increased over the years and it is responsible to pass on the increased cost to the client.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Lease</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment of Lease</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Supplementary Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pushback Fee (Region owned tug)</td>
<td>$45 per flight</td>
<td>$50 per flight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film Productions (commercial)</td>
<td>Time and Materials</td>
<td>$1,000 / day plus expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film Productions (students)</td>
<td>Time and Materials</td>
<td>Time and Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Events Permit</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50 per permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Deposit</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50 (refunded upon return of key)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydro Administration Fee</td>
<td>$5 per meter reading</td>
<td>$7 per meter reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Facility Alterations Permit</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50 per permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airside Escort Fees</td>
<td>$100 per hour</td>
<td>$50 per hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weigh Scale Fees (word change only)</td>
<td>$50 per flight</td>
<td>$50 per flight per scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Rescue Fire Fighting standby fee (special request)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$200 per hour per vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Extinguisher Training</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$60 per person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow Removal – Commercial or Special Commercial Property Tax Class</td>
<td>$125 per hour</td>
<td>$250 per hour on request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow Removal – Non-commercial property tax class</td>
<td>$125 per hour</td>
<td>15% of lease cost for one season of snow clearing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Fees and Charges not changed

From the review, it was determined that the other fees charged by the airport were appropriate and subsequently no changes are being recommended at this time.
Comments from Tenants

The Airport Operating Committee (AOC) which is made up of all tenants and airlines, were given a copy of the proposed fees and were asked to provide comments. The proposed fees were also discussed at the scheduled meeting of September 8, 2011. Several issues were raised by the tenants including clarification on the new ground rent schedule and the snow removal fees. Some tenants felt the adoption of a one fee landing fee system would be a substantial increase for them and offered alternative suggestions. Staff has considered these suggestions and after much deliberation feel that the one fee system would overall decrease the chance of lost revenue due to the confusion of the multiple fee system and less administrative time to process as well as errors. It is also becoming increasingly more difficult to justify why an international aircraft should be charged more than a domestic aircraft.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The Region of Waterloo encourages improvements to inter-city transportation services to and from Waterloo Region, and supports the growth of aviation-related activities at the Region of Waterloo International Airport, and investigates the potential for further expansion at the Airport.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The proposed fee structure will result in an estimated increase of approximately $170,000 over the 2011 budget. If approved, the increased fees will be incorporated into the 2012 Budget.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Corporate By-Law

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix A - Recommended 2012 Waterloo Regional Airport Rates and Fees

PREPARED BY: Jane Jenkins, Supervisor Administration and Finance

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Service
RECOMMENDED 2012 WATERLOO REGIONAL AIRPORT RATES AND FEES

**Based, non-based, domestic and international (maximum gross take off weight)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANDING FEES</th>
<th>All Aircraft</th>
<th>LANDING FEES</th>
<th>All Aircraft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Aircraft</td>
<td>No Fee below 3,000 kg</td>
<td>3,000 - 21,000 kg</td>
<td>$6/1000 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21,001 - 45,000 kg</td>
<td>$6/1000 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Over 45,000 kg</td>
<td>$6/1000 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Helicopters</td>
<td>Same rates as above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LANDING AND TAKEOFF FEE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANDING AND TAKEOFF FEE</th>
<th>RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Stage II or equivalent aircraft between 2300 and 0630 hours except the following categories of aircraft: Medivac, Police, Military Aircraft on operational missions, Emergency flights; Weather delays (YKF) and alternate diversions.</td>
<td>$5,000 per occurrence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Based, non-based, domestic and international (based on gross take off weight)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APRON PARKING FEES</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 2,000 kg</td>
<td>$8.14</td>
<td>$54.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,001 - 5,000 kg</td>
<td>$9.22</td>
<td>$67.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 - 10,000 kg</td>
<td>$11.39</td>
<td>$77.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 - 30,000 kg</td>
<td>$35.26</td>
<td>$103.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001 - 60,000 kg</td>
<td>$35.75</td>
<td>$104.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,001 - 100,000 kg</td>
<td>$37.37</td>
<td>$109.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2012 Lease Rates (per year) (*HST exempt)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING TYPE</th>
<th>BUILDING RATE</th>
<th>LAND RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>$0.23 per square foot</td>
<td>$0.04 per square foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$0.23 per square foot</td>
<td>$0.04 per square foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Commercial</td>
<td>$0.38 per square foot plus Maintenance fee of $0.08 per sq ft</td>
<td>$0.10 per square foot plus a Maintenance fee of $0.08 per sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Rent - Terminal Building Common Area</td>
<td>$18.50 per sq ft</td>
<td>$0.60 per sq ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Development Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND LEASE DEVELOPMENT FEES</th>
<th>RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Fee LLD2 (one time fee)</td>
<td>$1.43 per sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Fee LLD4 (one time fee)</td>
<td>$7.43 per sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage and Water Connection Fee LLD2 (one time fee)</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Water Maintenance and Service Charge</td>
<td>$50 per month plus the posted Township of Woolwich Usage and Reserve Water Charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Sewage Maintenance and Service Charge</td>
<td>$50 per month plus the posted Township of Woolwich Usage and Reserve Sewage Charges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aviation Fuel Surcharge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JET</th>
<th>AVGAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0.040 per litre</td>
<td>$0.050 per litre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aircraft Operating Fees for based Flight Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>RATE per month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Engine</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Twin</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: under this fee category landing fees will be charged to all training aircraft greater than 3,000 kg as per landing fee table.

Automobile Parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTOMOBILE PARKING</th>
<th>RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking Meters at Terminal Building</td>
<td>15 min for $1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hour</td>
<td>$3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>$6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td>$42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Parking</td>
<td>$30/month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Rental Agencies -- Reserved Spots</td>
<td>$60/month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Events Parking Permit</td>
<td>$3 per vehicle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: automobile parking rates include HST

Passenger Facilitation Fee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSENGER FACILITATION FEE</th>
<th>RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic and International</td>
<td>$15 per passenger enplaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transborder (U.S. flights)</td>
<td>$20 per passenger enplaning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### REAL ESTATE FEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Leases</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment of Leases</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADVERTISING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Building Lobby 39 ¼” x 240”</td>
<td>$540.09 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Building Lobby 68 1/8” x 47 1/8”</td>
<td>$243.73 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Building Lobby 39 3/8” x 50”</td>
<td>$186.40 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Building Lobby 19 5/8” x 47 1/8”</td>
<td>$172.02 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Parking Shelters 68 5/8” x 46 7/8”</td>
<td>$112.50 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Media</td>
<td>$200.00 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadside Signage</td>
<td>$50.00 per month per side</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUPPLEMENTARY FEES

**Miscellaneous**

- Fuel Spill Fees: Time and Materials
- After hour custom fees: $250
- Blue Directional Signs: $100
- Hydro Connection Fee: $250
- Hydro Meter Reading Administration Fee: $7 per reading
- Tenant Facility Alterations Permit: $50 per permit

**Snow Removal**

- After hour call out fee (snow removal): Actual Costs
- Snow removal during operating hours: Commercial Property Tax Tenant - $250 per hour  
Non-Commercial Property Tax Tenant – 15% of lease cost for one season
- Apron sweeping: $125 per hour
- Winter Sand Application: $50 per application

**Airline Associated Fees**

- Aircraft pushback fee: $50 per push back
- Lavatory Disposal Fee: $25 per flight
- Ground Handler License Fee: $1,000 per annum
- Weight Scale Fees: $50 per scale per flight
- International Waste Fee: Time and Materials
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Key Replacement Fee</td>
<td>$ 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Key Deposit</td>
<td>$ 50 (refunded upon return)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Airside Escort Fees</td>
<td>$ 50 per hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• AVOP (Airport Vehicle Operators Permit)</td>
<td>$50 (refunded on return)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TSAP (Terminal Security Access Permit)</td>
<td>$50 (refunded on return)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(if TSAP and AVOP issued on one card, only one charge of $50 will apply)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobile</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• All Airside vehicles and equipment</td>
<td>$ 0.033 per kg. per year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office Administration</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Boardroom rental during business hours</td>
<td>No Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Boardroom rental after hours</td>
<td>$50 up to 4 hours and $10 for each additional hour. Security $25 per hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Overhead and LCD display (if not renting boardroom)</td>
<td>$25 each per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Film Production (Commercial)</td>
<td>$1,000 per day plus expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Film Production (student)</td>
<td>Time and Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Special Events Permit</td>
<td>$50 per person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fire Services</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Airport Rescue Fire Fighting Standby Fee</td>
<td>$200 per hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fire Extinguisher Training</td>
<td>$60 per person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE:

- HST WILL BE APPLIED TO ALL THE ABOVE WATERLOO REGIONAL AIRPORT FEES AT THE TIME OF INVOICING UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED. AUTOMOBILE PARKING RATES INCLUDE HST, LEASE RATES ARE HST EXEMPT

- THE ONLY FEE SUBJECT TO CPI INCREASES ARE LEASE RATES
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee  
DATE: September 27, 2011  
FILE CODE: C06-60/WS.11  
SUBJECT: APPROACHES TO POLICIES IN THE SOURCE PROTECTION PLAN

RECOMMENDATION:  
For Information

SUMMARY:  
The last planning step in fulfilling the requirements of the Clean Water Act for watershed-based source water protection is the development of the Source Protection Plan (SPP). The SPP is to contain policies to reduce the risk from drinking water threats and is required to be submitted to the Ministry of Environment (MOE) for approval by August 2012. This report provides a summary of the approaches being considered by Region staff to develop risk-reduction policies for the SPP.  

Development of the risk-reduction policies follows several principles including those identified in the Water Resources Protection Master Plan that was approved by Regional Council in 2007. Differing degrees of protection are integrated into the policies depending on whether there are drinking water quality issues (deteriorating water quality trends) observed in a municipal drinking-water supply well and proximity of the threat to the well. A combination of prohibition, risk management, land-use planning, Prescribed Instruments e.g. certificates of approval issued by the Province, incentives, and education policies are proposed to reduce the risk from the 19 threats prescribed by the MOE. Development of the SPP is on-going and will include providing additional detail for each policy and consideration of other components of policy implementation including the scope of incentive programs and establishment of the Risk Management Official (RMO) and Risk Management Inspectors (RMI). Consultation on the policy approaches has commenced and will be expanded over the next several months to get property owner, public and agency feedback on the draft policies and SPP.  

REPORT:  
Background  
The Clean Water Act (2006) establishes the legislative framework for undertaking watershed-based source water protection. The purpose of this initiative is to reduce water quality and quantity risks from threats to drinking water sources. The Clean Water Act and related regulations establish a multiple step process undertaken over a number of years to establish a SPP that will contain policies for reducing risks to drinking water sources. Several recent reports to Regional Council (E-10-082, E-10-012, E-09-110) have provided information on the risk assessment that are documented in an Assessment Report for each watershed. The Assessment Report for the Grand River Watershed provides the technical basis for development of the SPP. The completion of technical work for the Assessment Report and policy development in the SPP is a collaborative effort between
municipalities and Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) staff. The multi-stakeholder Lake Erie Source Protection Committee (SPC) is responsible for completing the Assessment Report and the SPP.

The Grand River watershed Assessment Report was submitted to the Province on December 20, 2010 and is currently undergoing Provincial review. The Region provided formal comments on the Assessment Report to the GRCA (E-10-082). In addition, Region and GRCA staff have been working on an update to the Assessment Report, as allowed under the Clean Water Act, to include new and updated information (E-11-013). The GRCA is unable to submit the report to the Province until it has received comments on the original Assessment Report. Region and GRCA staff are continuing to develop policies for the SPP based on the work in the Updated Assessment Report.

Development of risk reduction policies for inclusion in the SPP will need to consider numerous evaluation criteria, will involve extensive consultation with property owners affected by the policies and government agencies identified as implementing the policies, and will need to adhere to Provincial rules, regulations, and guidance. While Region staff has been identified as having the lead for local policy development, the Source Protection Committee will ultimately approve the SPP and submit it to the Province for approval. Policy development and consultation is to be completed in a relatively short period of time, as per Clean Water Act regulation, compared to the time taken for development of the Assessment Report.

This report provides a summary of the approaches being considered by Region staff to develop risk-reduction policies for the SPP. Specifically, it will identify the general principles Region staff are using to develop the policies and the preferred implementation tools for reducing risks. The report will also provide an update on the status of the Updated Assessment Report, will present some additional implementation issues that Region staff has been considering, and will provide a synopsis of the consultation and approval process for the SPP.

Assessment Report Status

The Grand River watershed Assessment Report contains a detailed assessment of drinking water sources in the watershed, including a risk assessment on each county, region or single-tier municipal system for the 19 water quality threats prescribed by the MOE. Risk was determined by identifying and ranking Threats (existing and future land uses and activities, intake water quality Issues and historic water contamination Conditions) in vulnerable drinking water areas including municipal well head and surface water intake protection areas. In addition, risk is calculated for significant groundwater recharge areas and areas of high vulnerability within the watershed. A risk “score” is calculated for each threat in each vulnerable area and any threat where the risk is calculated to be Significant must have a policy in the SPP to mitigate the risk.

As noted in report E11-057, a total of 2750 properties in Waterloo Region have been identified as having Significant threats that will need to be addressed in the SPP. Appendix A presents a summary table of the number of threats by well field and whether the threats are associated with a water quality Issue. The identification and ranking of threats was done using a combination of property-owner surveys and existing data sources. Accordingly the ranking is based on the best available information that will need to be confirmed as part of SPP policy development and implementation.

It is important to note that the Updated Assessment Report does not include the results of the Local Water Budget (Tier 3) and Risk Assessment project that was initiated in 2008 and was required under the Clean Water Act. This project looks at the overall water use in Waterloo Region and will assess water quantity threats to the Region’s municipal water intakes. The Tier 3 project is
anticipated to be completed in 2012, the results of which will be incorporated into a further update of the Assessment Report.

Overall Approach and Considerations

A total of 7 municipalities plus the GRCA have been identified as leads for developing risk-reduction policies for the municipal intakes within the Grand River Watershed. To assist each of these agencies, a series of discussion papers were developed for each prescribed threat. Each discussion paper summarizes the circumstances that make the threat significant, reviewed existing legislative tools and voluntary programs that could be used to reduce the risk, and developed examples of policies. The examples were created for the different implementation tools identified by the Province that could be used as risk-reduction policies. Each tool has different advantages, disadvantages and legal effect depending on who is responsible for implementation. A brief description of each tool is presented in Appendix B. It is important to note that the first 4 approaches (prohibition, restricted land use, risk management plans and prescribed instruments) are new tools introduced in the Clean Water Act and related regulations that are available to Upper Tier municipalities for reducing risk. These tools provide authority to implement programs but require increased administration resources to implement. The remaining tools provide varying degrees of enforcement for source protection and have been available for many years. In addition to this information, the Province has issued numerous technical bulletins and support documents that describe the applicability and limitations of the tools.

The discussion papers and Provincial guidance provides the information needed to begin consideration of risk-reduction policies. Region staff have additional knowledge to offer as a result of over 15 years of experience in implementing source protection programs. Based on all of the above, several principles were identified to guide the development of risk-reduction policies as follows:

- Overall principles to reducing risk should consider previous source protection program implementation experience and align with approaches identified in the Region’s Water Resources Protection Master Plan (E-07-076) including the need to balance voluntary and regulatory initiatives, where feasible and technically justified in relation to Clean Water Act, and build on existing programs before creating new programs;
- More protective policies (regulatory driven and/or shorter implementation time period) should be applied in areas closer to well (e.g. 100 m zone) compared to those further from the well.
- More protective policies should be developed for threats associated with a drinking water Issue compared to those for threats not associated with an Issue;
- A “carrot and stick” approach should be employed to enable voluntary implementation before requiring compliance in future implementation periods. As source protection is envisioned to be a continuous improvement process, the first round of risk management policies should emphasize voluntary implementation with or without financial incentives to reduce risk. If voluntary implementation is unsuccessful in this initial implementation period, the stronger enforcement tools enabled through the Clean Water Act would be used to require compliance and any financial incentives would be removed;
- A consistent approach to policies (e.g. degree of forcefulness) should be attempted for the various threats to ensure no individual threat is regulated to a greater degree than others;
- Existing prescribed instruments (e.g. Provincial certificates of approval and permits) and local programs (e.g. Rural Water Quality Program) should be used to achieve risk reduction objectives. Where no current program exists, development of new programs (e.g. business spill prevention incentives) would be considered. Where numbers of properties do not warrant development of a new program, consideration should be given to using risk management plan and/or education/awareness programs to achieve objectives;
Compliance dates should be distributed over the five year implementation period to manage impact on Region/municipal staffing and property owners;

Policies applied to existing properties must consider that land uses and activities may have been present for many years and allow for changes to be implemented in a reasonable time frame. Accordingly, financial incentives could be considered in recognition that they will be required to meet new legislative requirements; and,

Costs to comply with the policies by property owners and to implement programs by municipalities and the GRCA are an important consideration in the development of policies.

Using these principles, guidance and discussion papers, a preliminary approach including the identification of the main tool to be used to reduce risk from the 19 prescribed threats has been developed and is presented in Tables 1 through 4. The tables list the primary tools to be used to address the threats identified by the Province and several additional threats identified by the Source Protection Committee that need to be included in the SPP. The four tables present the proposed tools for: existing threats without drinking water quality Issues; existing threats with Issues; future threats without Issues; and future threats with Issues. The tables list each threat and the tool that is proposed to be applied to specific vulnerable areas.

The tables together list a range of tools that are to be applied to a large number of properties for addressing a number of threats. It is important to note that this is a conceptual approach and is the first step in the development of policies. The approaches and tools will be refined though a detailed review of each property identified as a significant threat, may be different for different wells, and could change in response to public consultation and discussion at the Source Protection Committee. In addition, the actual policies contained in the SPP will be much more detailed (by well, threat and/or property) and will likely include compliance dates. Notwithstanding the above, the following general implications are provided.

- The policies may require existing property owners to undertake additional measures to reduce risk from their activities depending on the degree to which existing risk management measures have been undertaken.
- Policies to address future threats may require changes to the Regional Official Plan (ROP) and area municipal official plans at some point following approval of the SPP by the MOE. Where possible the proposed approaches have attempted to develop a similar level of protection as that afforded in ROP.
- The Region and area municipalities will have additional responsibilities arising from these proposed approaches including complying with policies on municipally-owned properties and implementing various programs. For policies that use the new Clean Water Act tools, the Region will need to establish risk-management office to implement these programs as discussed below. For example, area municipalities may have to implement inspection programs associated with septic systems in accordance with the Building Code.

It is important to note that the proposed approaches have not evaluated the detailed implementation costs for municipalities or staffing requirements to implement them. Staff will continue to develop this information to the extent possible as part of the policy development process, including further discussion with area municipal staff through the Source Water Protection Liaison Committee. It is anticipated that an assessment of the financial impacts to the Region and local municipalities will be developed to coincide with the formal consultation on the SPP in winter/spring 2012.
Supporting Program Considerations

While Region staff are familiar with the scope of several tools to be used for source protection (e.g. land-use planning or education programs), it is proposed that many of the identified threats are best addressed using the new tools enabled through the Clean Water Act and incentive programs. Accordingly the scope of these implementation approaches needs additional consideration to better evaluate the implications of using them. A description of these is provided below.

Scope of incentives

The Rural Water Quality Program (RWQP) has had considerable success in improving water quality related to farming activities. Accordingly, it was felt that this program could be used to meet Clean Water Act risk-reduction objectives. As noted above, incentives could be provided during this initial few years of SPP implementation. However, unlike the original RWQP, an incentive program would target contacting property owners in vulnerable areas to encourage their participation and inform them that this is a time-limited offer. Incentive programs are also a proposed approach for application of road salt and chemical storage/handling. Some further information on the scope of these programs is provided below:

- Risk reduction from agricultural activities would be addressed through the RWQP with a higher priority for properties in well fields with drinking water quality issues. As with the original program, the incentives would cover a portion of the cost of the specific measure. Where the threat is application of manure or fertilizer, the incentive covers approximately 30 percent of the cost up to $1000 for preparation of a Nutrient Management Plan (NMP). For manure or fertilizer storage, the cost share is the same with an upper limit of $15,000 in recognition of the much higher costs for constructing storage facilities some of which can exceed $100,000. The current structure of the RWQP is well suited to meeting the objectives of the Clean Water Act.
- For application of road salt, incentives would be provided to property owners to undertake the assessment and accreditation as part of the smart about salt™ program. It is envisioned that the scope of incentives would be similar to that of preparation of a NMP.
- An incentive program would be developed for addressing fuel storage and organic solvents primarily targeting properties where the chemical use is “secondary” to the land use. At this time, it is proposed that the incentive programs would not be available to property owners where the primary use of the property is for fuel or chemical storage (e.g. gas station). It is assumed that these companies likely have stringent regulations and/or follow association beneficial management practices that minimize the opportunity for spills and that incentives would only cover a very small percentage of the cost to upgrade any of these facilities. The incentive programs would use a similar structure to that of the RWQP and the Business Water Quality Program that was terminated in 2005.

Development of these proposed incentive programs including evaluation of financial and staffing implications is ongoing.

Risk Management Official and Inspectors

The Clean Water Act includes tools for prohibiting activities, restricting land use, and requiring risk management plans to reduce the risk from threats. Each of these tools requires the development of a Risk Management Official (RMO) and Risk Management Inspectors (RMI) for implementation. Together these persons would comprise a RMO “office” that would have extensive enforcement authority including provisions for: issuing, amending, renewing and revoking risk management plans; power of entry to gather information necessary for the preparation of the SPP; issuance of
enforcement orders and the authority to cause work to be done at the property owner’s expense; and charging processing fees and/or recouping work expenses where the property owner refused to take action. Appeals of decisions made by the RMO Office can be made to the Environmental Review Tribunal. Accordingly, development of additional detail on this process is necessary to understand the implications of using these tools.

Region staff has developed a conceptual approach to the RMO Office including development of administrative process associated with these tools, identification of specific tasks, the time required to undertake them, and the experience needed to perform these activities. This process has been developed following MOE guidance, participation on an informal municipal/MOE working group, participation in a pilot training session for RMO/RMI developed by the MOE, and consultation with Legal Services and Community Planning staff. A summary of this structure is as follows:

- The RMO Office would be operated within Water Services. The RMO would report to the Manager, Hydrogeology and Source Water.
- To the extent possible, existing staff resources would be utilized for undertaking these new activities. There may be some opportunity for the RMO/RMI activities to be integrated into existing job descriptions.
- Technical support for review of risk management plans would be undertaken using existing staff. Compliance dates for risk management plans would be staggered to reduce requirements for new staff. Additional database management and/or administrative support may be necessary to ensure the functionality of the RMO Office.
- The preliminary assessment of the content of risk management plans for salt, nutrient, chemical and pesticide management has been developed to better understand the scope of the plans and staffing needs. It is important to note that each risk management plan is to be negotiated individually with each property owner.

The development of the RMO Office is on-going. As with the incentive programs, further details on the financial, staffing, and administrative process will be developed for early 2012 to enable a full evaluation of the implications of these functions as part of the Region’s comments on the SPP.

**Next Steps Including Public Consultation**

Regulations require the SPP to be submitted to the MOE by August 12, 2012. By this time period, the policies must be developed, and then undergo three levels of consultation: public engagement, pre-consultation, and formal consultation. Public engagement is an optional consultation step available to agencies with the lead for policy development and involves direct discussion with stakeholders. Pre-consultation is a recommendation by the MOE to forward draft polices to municipal and Provincial agencies that would be responsible for policy implementation for their comment. Formal consultation is set in regulation and includes advising agencies and property owners of their opportunity to comment on the draft SPP. As discussed above, discussion papers, regulations and guidance will be used by the lead agencies to formulate draft policies that will then be provided to the GRCA for inclusion in SPP. The next steps in the policy and consultation process are as follows:

- Region staff will continue to implement public engagement with local municipal staff through the Source Water Protection Liaison Committee. Public engagement will be expanded to include notification to property owners with significant threats, stakeholder association presentations and the hosting of four Public Information Centres in October and November 2011.
- Staff will prepare a report to Regional Council for December 2011 providing proposed policies to be forwarded to the SPC for their inclusion in and public consultation on the SPP.
Further public engagement and pre-consultation will occur between December 2011 and March 2012 on the draft policies.

The SPC is scheduled to consider the draft SPP in March 2012 and approve it for formal public consultation including a public meeting. A 35 day commenting period is available for public and municipal comments on the SPP. Region staff will prepare a report on the draft SPP for Regional Council’s consideration.

A revised draft SPP is scheduled to be approved for further 30 day commenting period in May 2012.

The SPC is scheduled to approve the SPP in late June 2012.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The preparation of the SPP contributes to the implementation of the Strategic Objective to protect the quality and quantity of our drinking water sources of Focus Area 1: Environmental Sustainability.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The scope of policies and programs including financial implications as discussed in this report are on-going. Further assessment of anticipated staffing needs and implementation costs to implement the SPP will be undertaken and included in the 2013 budget process.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Corporate Resources (Legal Services), Planning, Housing and Community Services (Community Planning) staff have been consulted in the selection of policy approaches and related support programs. Public Health staff participate in SPC meetings and the Source Water Protection Liaison Committee.

ATTACHMENTS

Appendix A: Summary of Significant Threats by Well Field
Appendix B: Legal Affect of Policy Tools
Tables 1 through 4: Proposed Policy Tools

PREPARED BY: Eric Hodgins, Manager, Hydrogeology and Source Protection

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
**Appendix A: Enumeration of Significant Threats by Wellfield for the Updated Assessment Report**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Well Field</th>
<th>Total Number of Significant Threat Activities</th>
<th>Total Number of Properties with Significant Threats</th>
<th>Total Number of Properties with Significant Threats Related to Issues</th>
<th>Drinking Water Quality Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baden</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Nitrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blair Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branchton Meadows</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Salt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemens Mill</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conestogo</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunbar Road</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin Street</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Salt, TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmira</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erb Street</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountain Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foxboro Green</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenbrook</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>Salt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidelberg</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hespeler</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Salt (H3), Salt &amp; Nitrate (H4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linwood</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mannheim</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>Nitrate (K23, K24 &amp; K26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryhill</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>Salt, TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Dundee</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hamburg</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>Salt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinebush</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Salt (G5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pompeii / Forwell</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseville</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shades Mill</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Clements</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strange Street</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Salt (K10A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strasburg</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo North</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Montrose</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Street</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>Salt, TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmot Centre</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Nitrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolner</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand River Intake</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Some properties lie in areas of overlapping protection zones and are ranked and counted separately for each well field. Total number of significant threat properties with overlaps removed equals 2750.
## Appendix B: Legal Effect of Policy Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Party for Implementing Policy:</th>
<th>Provincial</th>
<th>Municipality, Local Board or Source Protection Authority</th>
<th>Other Bodies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIGNIFICANT THREAT POLICIES - ACTIVITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part IV Tools (1)</td>
<td>Comply (3)</td>
<td>Comply</td>
<td>Comply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescribed Instruments</td>
<td>Must Conform</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Planning Approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td>Must Conform</td>
<td>Must Conform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Outreach/ Incentive Programs</td>
<td>Strategic Action</td>
<td>Comply</td>
<td>Strategic Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **SIGNIFICANT THREAT POLICIES - CONDITIONS** |           |                                                       |              |
| Part IV Tools (1)                          | N/A        | N/A                                                    | N/A          |
| Prescribed Instruments                      | Must Conform | Must Conform                                           | Must Conform |
| Land Use Planning Approaches                |            |                                                       |              |
| Education and Outreach/ Incentive Programs  | Strategic Action | Comply                                           | Strategic Action |
| Other (2)                                  |            |                                                       |              |

| **MONITORING POLICIES**                    |           |                                                       |              |
| All Policy Tools                            | Comply     | Comply                                                 | Comply       |

| **OTHER**                                  |           |                                                       |              |
| Transport Pathways                         |           |                                                       |              |
| Climate change data collection             |           |                                                       |              |
| Spill prevention, contingency or response plans along highways, railways or shipping lanes | Strategic Action | Strategic Action | Strategic Action |

### Notes:
1. Part IV Tools include Section 57 Prohibition, Risk Management Plans and Restricted Land Uses
2. Other approaches authorized by the regulation include: specify the action to be taken to implement the source protection plan or to achieve the plan’s objectives; establish stewardship programs; specify and promote best management practices; establish pilot programs; and govern research.
3. The legal effect of the Source Protection Plan will vary according to the following: persons carrying out significant threat activities must comply with policies that use Clean Water Act Part IV authorities; municipalities, local boards and Source Protection Authorities must comply with any obligation identified in the Source Protection Plan; Planning Act decisions and issuance of Prescribed Instruments must conform to the Source Protection Plan; Strategic Action policies do not have legal implementation requirements.

N/A - not applicable
**ACRONYMS USED IN TABLES 1 - 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Tool Applied to Well Head Protection Area – A (100m)</th>
<th>Tool Applied to Well Head Protection Area – B Where Vulnerability Scores 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASM</td>
<td>Agricultural Source Material e.g. Manure</td>
<td>NMP (equivalent to NMP)</td>
<td>PI – NMP or I – RWQP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEPA</td>
<td>Canadian Environmental Protection Act</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td>Prescribed Instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNAPL</td>
<td>Dense Non-Aqueous Phase Liquid</td>
<td>RMP</td>
<td>Risk Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>ROP</td>
<td>Regional Official Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUDI</td>
<td>Well with groundwater under direct influence of surface water</td>
<td>RWQP</td>
<td>Rural Water Quality Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Specified Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K23</td>
<td>Municipal well named K23</td>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>Smart About Salt Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUP</td>
<td>Land Use Planning</td>
<td>SLP</td>
<td>Salt Loading Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>Ontario Ministry of the Environment</td>
<td>SMP</td>
<td>Salt Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>TSSA</td>
<td>Technical Standards and Safety Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM</td>
<td>Non-agriculture Source Material e.g. Biosolids</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Vulnerability Score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 1: PROPOSED POLICY TOOLS FOR EXISTING THREATS WITHOUT DRINKING WATER QUALITY ISSUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Threat (No Issues)*</th>
<th>Tool Applied to Well Head Protection Area – A (100m)</th>
<th>Tool Applied to Well Head Protection Area – B Where Vulnerability Scores 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Source Material (ASM) – Application</td>
<td>Risk Management Plan (RMP) (equivalent to NMP)</td>
<td>PI – NMP or I – RWQP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASM – Storage</td>
<td>RMP</td>
<td>PI – NMP or I – RWQP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASM Generation – Confinement</td>
<td>RMP</td>
<td>I – RWQP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASM Generation – Grazing</td>
<td>I – RWQP</td>
<td>I – RWQP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Fertilizer – Application</td>
<td>RMP (equivalent to NMP)</td>
<td>I – RWQP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Fertilizer – Storage/Handling</td>
<td>RMP</td>
<td>I – RWQP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNAPL Storage/Handling</td>
<td>Prohibit above and below ground</td>
<td>RMP (V&gt;=8); I – Spill prevention incentives (V&gt;=6); E – (V&lt;6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel – Storage/Handling</td>
<td>Prohibit – below ground storage RMP – above ground storage</td>
<td>I – encourage upgrades where secondary use E – to TSSA and owner where primary use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel – Home Heating Oil</td>
<td>E – home owner and fuel distributor</td>
<td>E – home owner and fuel distributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Agricultural Source Material (NASM) – Application</td>
<td>Not permitted under Nutrient Management Act</td>
<td>PI – NMP or I – RWQP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM – Storage</td>
<td>RMP</td>
<td>PI – NMP or I – RWQP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Solvent Storage/Handling</td>
<td>Prohibit – below ground storage RMP – above ground storage</td>
<td>I – encourage upgrades where secondary use RMP – where handling/storage is primary land use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticide – Application</td>
<td>RMP</td>
<td>RMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticide – Storage/Handling</td>
<td>RMP</td>
<td>RMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Threat (No Issues)*</td>
<td>Tool Applied to Well Head Protection Area – A (100m)</td>
<td>Tool Applied to Well Head Protection Area – B Where Vulnerability Scores 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt – Application on Roads</td>
<td>RMP (equivalent to SMP submitted for CEPA)</td>
<td>RMP (equivalent to SMP submitted for CEPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt – Application on parking lots</td>
<td>RMP – large lots I – encourage SAS Certification for small lots</td>
<td>RMP – large lots I – encourage SAS Certification for small lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt – Application on parking lots (less than 8 parking spots)</td>
<td>E – awareness of salt impact on water supply</td>
<td>E – awareness of salt impact on water supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt – Storage/Handling</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>RMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary Sewers and Related Pipes</td>
<td>PI – request MOE review maintenance and/or inspection requirements and prioritize SA – require municipalities to assess and prioritize inspections</td>
<td>PI – request MOE review maintenance and/or inspection requirements and prioritize SA – require municipalities to assess and prioritize inspections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septic System – Small (including holding tanks)</td>
<td>SA – Municipal inspection program</td>
<td>SA – Municipal inspection program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septic System – Large</td>
<td>PI – MOE review and inspect</td>
<td>PI – MOE review and inspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow Storage</td>
<td>Prohibit above ground &gt;5 ha and below ground &gt;0.5 ha</td>
<td>Prohibit above ground &gt;5 ha and below ground &gt;0.5 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Retention Pond Discharge</td>
<td>PI – request MOE review maintenance and monitoring requirements for those that infiltrate groundwater</td>
<td>PI – request MOE review maintenance and monitoring requirements for those that infiltrate groundwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal Site - Landfilling (Municipal Waste)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>PI – request MOE require spill management and containment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal Site - Landfilling (Solid Non Hazardous Industrial or Commercial)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>PI – request MOE require spill management and containment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal Site - PCB Waste Storage</td>
<td>PI – request MOE require spill management and containment</td>
<td>PI – request MOE require spill management and containment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal Site - Storage Of Hazardous Waste At Disposal Sites</td>
<td>PI – request MOE require spill management and containment</td>
<td>PI – request MOE require spill management and containment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal Site - Storage of wastes - (p),(q),(r),(s),(t) or (u) of the definition of hazardous waste</td>
<td>PI – request MOE require spill management and containment</td>
<td>PI – request MOE require spill management and containment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Water Treatment Plant – Storage Tanks</td>
<td>PI - request MOE review for spill prevention</td>
<td>PI - request MOE review for spill prevention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Threat Policies Identified by the Source Protection Committee**

<p>| Conditions Arising from Historic Contamination | SA – request MOE advise municipality of reports and Risk Assessments to; SA – request MOE review certificates of approval, advise municipalities, and prioritize for further action | SA – request MOE advise municipality of reports and Risk Assessments to; SA – request MOE review certificates of approval, advise municipalities, and prioritize for further action |
| Transportation Corridors – Need for Emergency Response Plans | SA – municipalities update plans | SA – municipalities update plans |
| Transport Pathways | To Be Determined | To Be Determined |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Threat (No Issues)*</th>
<th>Tool Applied to Well Head Protection Area – A (100m)</th>
<th>Tool Applied to Well Head Protection Area – B Where Vulnerability Scores 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preventing Medium/Low Threats From Becoming Significant – Monitoring Policies for ASM Application, Commercial Fertilizer Application, Pesticide Application, and Snow Storage</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* There are no existing aircraft deicing, Waste Water Treatment Plant direct discharge, liquid industrial waste injection, tailings pond waste disposal, application of untreated septage, petroleum waste landfarming or hazardous waste landfilling activities identified as Significant threats in Waterloo Region.
## TABLE 2: PROPOSED POLICY TOOLS FOR EXISTING THREATS WITH DRINKING WATER QUALITY ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Threats With Issues</th>
<th>Tool Applied to Well Head Protection Area – A (100m)</th>
<th>Tool Applied to WHPA B/C where Vulnerability Scores &gt;&gt;8*</th>
<th>Tool Applied to Other Well Head Protection Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate Issue (Baden, Hespeler (H4), Mannheim West, Wilmot Centre)</td>
<td>Agricultural Source Material (ASM) – Application</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>RMP (equivalent to NMP) K26 – also require soil nitrate testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASM – Storage</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>I – RWQP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASM Generation – Confinement</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>I – RWQP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASM Generation – Grazing</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>I – RWQP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial Fertilizer – Application</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>RMP when V=8 K26 – also require soil nitrate testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial Fertilizer – Storage/Handling</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>I – RWQP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non Agricultural Source Material (NASM) – Application</td>
<td>Not permitted under Nutrient Management Act</td>
<td>RMP (equivalent to NMP) K26 – also require soil nitrate testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NASM – Storage</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>I – RWQP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sanitary Sewers and Related Pipes</td>
<td>PI – request MOE review maintenance and/or inspection requirements and prioritize SA – require municipalities to assess and prioritize inspections</td>
<td>PI – request MOE review maintenance and/or inspection requirements and prioritize SA – require municipalities to assess and prioritize inspections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Septic System – Small (including holding tanks)</td>
<td>SA – Municipal inspection program</td>
<td>SA – Municipal inspection program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Septic System – Large</td>
<td>PI – MOE review and inspect</td>
<td>PI – MOE review and inspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Snow Storage</td>
<td>Prohibit above ground &gt;5 ha and below ground &gt;0.5 ha)</td>
<td>Prohibit – V=10; SA – request MOE implement assessment guidelines (V=8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stormwater Retention Pond Discharge</td>
<td>PI – request MOE review maintenance and monitoring requirements for those that infiltrate groundwater</td>
<td>PI – request MOE review maintenance and monitoring requirements for those that infiltrate groundwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waste Disposal Site - Landfilling (Municipal Waste)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>PI – request MOE require spill management and monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waste Disposal Site -</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>PI – request MOE require</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Existing Threats With Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Threats With Issues</th>
<th>Tool Applied to Well Head Protection Area – A (100m)</th>
<th>Tool Applied to WHPA B/C where Vulnerability Scores &gt;=8*</th>
<th>Tool Applied to Other Well Head Protection Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landfilling (Solid Non Hazardous Industrial or Commercial)</td>
<td>spill management and monitoring</td>
<td>require spill management and monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TCE Issue (Elgin Street, Middleton, William Street)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool Applied to WHPA B/C where Vulnerability Scores &gt;=8*</th>
<th>Tool Applied to Other Well Head Protection Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DNAPL Storage/Handling (25 L exemption)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal Site - Landfilling (Municipal Waste)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal Site - Landfilling (Solid Non Hazardous Industrial or Commercial)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal Site - Storage Of Hazardous Waste At Disposal Sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal Site - Storage of wastes - (p), (q), (r), (s), (t) or (u) of the definition of hazardous waste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chloride Issue (Branchton Meadows, Elgin Street (G9), Greenbrook, Hespeler (H3,H4), Middleton, Parkway, Pinebush (G5), Strange Street (K10A), William Street)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool Applied to WHPA B/C where Vulnerability Scores &gt;=8*</th>
<th>Tool Applied to Other Well Head Protection Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salt – Application on Roads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt – Application on parking lots</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt – Application on parking lots (less than 8 parking spots)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt – Storage/Handling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow Storage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Retention Pond Discharge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septic System – Small (including holding tanks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septic System – Large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Relevant Issues

- **Landfilling (Solid Non Hazardous Industrial or Commercial)**: Spill management and monitoring.
- **TCE Issue (Elgin Street, Middleton, William Street)**: Spill management and monitoring.
- **Waste Disposal Site - Landfilling (Municipal Waste)**: Spill management and monitoring.
- **Waste Disposal Site - Landfilling (Solid Non Hazardous Industrial or Commercial)**: Spill management and monitoring.
- **Waste Disposal Site - Storage Of Hazardous Waste At Disposal Sites**: Spill management and monitoring.
- **Waste Disposal Site - Storage of wastes**: Spill management and monitoring.
- **Chloride Issue (Branchton Meadows, Elgin Street (G9), Greenbrook, Hespeler (H3,H4), Middleton, Parkway, Pinebush (G5), Strange Street (K10A), William Street)**: Spill management and monitoring.
- **Salt – Application on Roads**: Spill management and monitoring.
- **Salt – Application on parking lots**: Spill management and monitoring.
- **Salt – Application on parking lots (less than 8 parking spots)**: Spill management and monitoring.
- **Salt – Storage/Handling**: Spill management and monitoring.
- **Snow Storage**: Spill management and monitoring.
- **Stormwater Retention Pond Discharge**: Spill management and monitoring.
- **Septic System – Small (including holding tanks)**: Spill management and monitoring.
- **Septic System – Large**: Spill management and monitoring.

*Note: V refers to vulnerability scores.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Threats With Issues</th>
<th>Tool Applied to Well Head Protection Area – A (100m)</th>
<th>Tool Applied to WHPA B/C where Vulnerability Scores ≥8*</th>
<th>Tool Applied to Other Well Head Protection Areas (V&lt;6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* The tool applied in this column does not supersede the tool applied for WHPA B where vulnerability score is greater than or equal to 10 in Table 1 if it is more protective of drinking water.
## TABLE 3: PROPOSED POLICY TOOLS FOR FUTURE THREATS WITHOUT DRINKING WATER QUALITY ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Threat (No Issue)</th>
<th>Tool Applied to Well Head Protection Area – A (100m)</th>
<th>Tool Applied to Well Head Protection Area – B Where Vulnerability Scores 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Source Material (ASM) – Application</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>PI – NMP or I – RWQP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASM – Storage</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASM Generation – Confinement</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASM Generation – Grazing</td>
<td>I – RWQP</td>
<td>I – RWQP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Deicing</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Fertilizer – Application</td>
<td>RMP (equivalent to NMP)</td>
<td>I – RWQP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Fertilizer – Storage/Handling</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNAPL Storage/Handling</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel – Storage/Handling</td>
<td>LUP or Prohibit – prohibit above and below ground storage</td>
<td>LUP or Prohibit – prohibit below ground storage; LUP study for above ground storage; LUP or Prohibit – prohibit bulk storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel – Home Heating Oil</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Agricultural Source Material (NASM) – Application</td>
<td>Not permitted under Nutrient Management Act</td>
<td>PI – NMP or I – RWQP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM – Storage</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Solvent Storage/Handling</td>
<td>LUP or Prohibit – prohibit above and below ground storage</td>
<td>LUP or Prohibit – prohibit below ground storage: LUP study for above ground storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticide – Application</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>RMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticide – Storage/Handling</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>RMP (retail only) LUP – Prohibit manufacturing or wholesale distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt – Application on Roads</td>
<td>LUP – assess new roads to see if increase to SLP</td>
<td>LUP – assess new roads to see if increase to SLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt – Application on parking lots</td>
<td>LUP – prohibit large lots RMP – including SAS certification for sm lots</td>
<td>RMP – large lots LUP – study for small lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt – Storage/Handling</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary Sewers and Related Pipes</td>
<td>PI – request MOE require enhanced construction. LUP– Prohibit certain size and require enhanced construction</td>
<td>PI – request MOE require enhanced construction. LUP– Prohibit certain size and require enhanced construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septic System – Small (including holding tanks)</td>
<td>LUP or Prohibit - Prohibit (as currently in ROP)</td>
<td>GUDI wells – LUP prohibition Other wells – LUP study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septic System – Large</td>
<td>PI - Request MOE not approve new</td>
<td>PI - Request MOE not approve new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow Storage</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Retention Pond Discharge</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>LUP or Prohibit – prohibit for wells in rock aquifers; LUP study to assess impact and mitigation measures for non-rock systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal Site – Application of Untreated Septage</td>
<td>LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
<td>LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal Site – Liquid Industrial Waste Injection</td>
<td>LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
<td>LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal Site –</td>
<td>LUP prohibit and PI – require</td>
<td>LUP prohibit and PI – require</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Threat (No Issue)</td>
<td>Tool Applied to Well Head Protection Area – A (100m)</td>
<td>Tool Applied to Well Head Protection Area – B Where Vulnerability Scores 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfarming Petroleum Waste</td>
<td>MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
<td>MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal Site - Landfilling (Municipal Waste)</td>
<td>LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
<td>LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal Site - Landfilling (Solid Non Hazardous Industrial or Commercial)</td>
<td>LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
<td>LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal Site - PCB Waste Storage</td>
<td>LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
<td>LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal Site - Storage Of Hazardous Waste At Disposal Sites</td>
<td>LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
<td>LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal Site - Storage of wastes - (p), (q), (r), (s), (t) or (u) of the definition of hazardous waste</td>
<td>LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
<td>LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Water Treatment Plant – Effluent Discharge</td>
<td>PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
<td>PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Water Treatment Plant – Storage Tanks</td>
<td>LUP – prohibit below grade storage</td>
<td>LUP – prohibit below grade storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal Site – Tailings Pond</td>
<td>LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
<td>LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Threat Policies Identified by the Source Protection Committee

| Conditions Arising from Historic Contamination | LUP – Require Record of Site conditions | LUP – Require Record of Site conditions |
| Transportation Corridors – Need for Emergency Response Plans | SA – municipalities update plans | SA – municipalities update plans |
| Transport Pathways | LUP – prohibit aggregate extraction, geothermal wells, underground parking garages and other permanent below grade structures | LUP – prohibit aggregate extraction, geothermal wells, underground parking garages and other permanent below grade structures |
| Preventing Medium/Low Threats From Becoming Significant – Monitoring Policies for ASM Application, Commercial Fertilizer Application, Pesticide Application, and Snow Storage | To Be Determined | To Be Determined |
**TABLE 4: PROPOSED POLICY TOOLS FOR FUTURE THREATS WITH DRINKING WATER QUALITY ISSUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Threats With Issues</th>
<th>Tool Applied to Well Head Protection Area – A (100m)</th>
<th>Tool Applied to WHPA B/C where Vulnerability Scores &gt;=8*</th>
<th>Tool Applied to Other Well Head Protection Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nitrate Issue (Baden, Hespeler (H4), Mannheim West, Wilmot Centre)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Source Material (ASM) – Application</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>RMP (equivalent to NMP)</td>
<td>RMP – V=6 E – V&lt;6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASM – Storage</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>RMP</td>
<td>I – V=6 E – V&lt;6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASM Generation – Confinement</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>RMP</td>
<td>I – V=6 E – V&lt;6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASM Generation – Grazing</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>I – RWQP</td>
<td>E – V&lt;=6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Fertilizer – Application</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>RMP when V&gt;=8</td>
<td>I – V=6 E – V&lt;6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Fertilizer – Storage/Handling</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>RMP</td>
<td>I – V=6 E – V&lt;6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Agricultural Source Material (NASM) – Application</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>RMP (equivalent to NMP)</td>
<td>RMP – V=6 E – V&lt;6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASM – Storage</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>RMP</td>
<td>I – V=6 E – V&lt;6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary Sewers and Related Pipes</td>
<td>PI – request MOE require enhanced construction. LUP – Prohibit certain size and require enhanced construction</td>
<td>PI – request MOE require enhanced construction. LUP – Prohibit certain size and require enhanced construction</td>
<td>LUP (V=6) – Require enhanced construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septic System – Small (including holding tanks)</td>
<td>LUP - Prohibit (as currently in ROP)</td>
<td>K22/K23 – LUP prohibition Other wells – LUP study SA – require municipalities to inspect functioning of any tertiary treatment systems</td>
<td>LUP – study (V=6) E – property owner (V&lt;6) SA – require municipalities to inspect functioning of any tertiary treatment systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septic System – Large</td>
<td>PI - Request MOE not approve new</td>
<td>PI - Request MOE not approve new</td>
<td>PI (V=6) - Request MOE not approve new PI (V&lt;6) Request MOE require enhanced nitrate treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow Storage</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>Prohibit (V=6) SA – request MOE implement assessment guidelines (V&lt;6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Retention Pond Discharge</td>
<td>LUP – prohibit PI – Request MOE not approve new</td>
<td>LUP or Prohibit – prohibit for wells in rock aquifers; LUP study to assess impact and mitigation measures for non-rock systems</td>
<td>LUP study to assess impact and mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Threats With Issues</td>
<td>Tool Applied to Well Head Protection Area – A (100m)</td>
<td>Tool Applied to WHPA B/C where Vulnerability Scores &gt;=8*</td>
<td>Tool Applied to Other Well Head Protection Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal Site - Landfiling (Municipal Waste)</td>
<td>LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
<td>LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
<td>LUP and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal Site - Landfiling (Solid Non Hazardous Industrial or Commercial)</td>
<td>LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
<td>LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
<td>LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal Site – Application of Untreated Septage</td>
<td>LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
<td>LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
<td>LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Water Treatment Plant – Effluent Discharge</td>
<td>PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
<td>PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
<td>PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs (V=6) PI – require MOE to include study that assesses impact to municipal well (V&lt;6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal Site – Tailings Pond</td>
<td>LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
<td>LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
<td>LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCE Issue (Elgin Street, Middleton, William Street)</td>
<td>LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
<td>LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
<td>LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNAPL Storage/Handling (25 L exemption)</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>RMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal Site - Landfiling (Municipal Waste)</td>
<td>LUP and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
<td>LUP and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
<td>LUP and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal Site - Landfiling (Solid Non Hazardous Industrial or Commercial)</td>
<td>LUP and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
<td>LUP and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
<td>LUP and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal Site - Storage Of Hazardous Waste At Disposal Sites</td>
<td>LUP and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
<td>LUP and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
<td>LUP and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal Site - Storage of wastes -(p),(q), (r),(s),(t)or(u) of definition of hazardous waste</td>
<td>LUP and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
<td>LUP and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
<td>LUP and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chloride Issue (Branchton Meadows, Elgin Street (G9), Greenbrook, Hespeler (H3,H4), Middleton, Parkway, Pinebush (G5), Strange Street (K10A), William Street)**

| Sanitary Sewers and Related Pipes | PI – request MOE require enhanced construction. LUP – Prohibit certain size and require enhanced construction | PI – request MOE require enhanced construction. LUP – Prohibit certain size and require enhanced construction | LUP study to assess impact and mitigation measures |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Waste Disposal Site – Landfiling (Municipal Waste)**

- LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs
- LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs
- LUP and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs

**Waste Disposal Site – Landfiling (Solid Non Hazardous Industrial or Commercial)**

- LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs
- LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs
- LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs

**Waste Disposal Site – Application of Untreated Septage**

- LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs
- LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs
- LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs

**Waste Water Treatment Plant – Effluent Discharge**

- PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs
- PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs
- PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs

**Waste Disposal Site – Tailings Pond**

- LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs
- LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs
- LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs

**TCE Issue (Elgin Street, Middleton, William Street)**

- LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs
- LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs
- LUP prohibit and PI – require MOE to not approve CofAs

**Sanitary Sewers and Related Pipes**

- PI – request MOE require enhanced construction. LUP – Prohibit certain size and require enhanced construction
- PI – request MOE require enhanced construction. LUP – Prohibit certain size and require enhanced construction
- LUP study to assess impact and mitigation measures
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Enhancement/Prohibition</th>
<th>RMP Study Requirements</th>
<th>LUP Study Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salt — Application on roads</td>
<td>Prohibit new roads</td>
<td>RMP where V≥8:</td>
<td>LUP study where V&lt;8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt — Application on parking lots</td>
<td>LUP — prohibit large</td>
<td>RMP where V≥8 and</td>
<td>SA — require SAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and small parking lots</td>
<td>large lots: SA — require</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAS contractors on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>municipal properties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E — encourage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>participation in SAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt — Storage/Handling</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>LUP study where V=6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E — V&lt;6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septic System — Small</td>
<td>LUP - Prohibit (as</td>
<td>K22/K23 – LUP</td>
<td>LUP — study (V=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(including holding tanks)</td>
<td>currently in ROP)</td>
<td>prohibition</td>
<td>E — property owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other wells — LUP study</td>
<td>(V&lt;6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA — require</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>municipalities to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>inspect functioning of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>any tertiary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>treatment systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septic System — Large</td>
<td>PI - Request MOE not</td>
<td>PI - Request MOE not</td>
<td>PI (V=6) - Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>approve new</td>
<td>approve new</td>
<td>MOE not approve new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PI (V&lt;6) Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MOE require</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>enhanced nitrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow Storage</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>Prohibit</td>
<td>SA — request MOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>assessment guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(V=6), LUP (V&lt;6) study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Retention</td>
<td>LUP — prohibit</td>
<td>LUP or Prohibit —</td>
<td>LUP study to assess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pond Discharge</td>
<td>PI - Request MOE not</td>
<td>prohibit for wells in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>approve new</td>
<td>rock aquifers; LUP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>study to assess</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>impact and mitigation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>measures for non-rock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The tool applied in this column does not supersede the tool applied for WHPA B where vulnerability score is greater than or equal to 10 in Table 3 if it is more protective of drinking water.
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: September 27, 2011

FILE CODE: E03-20/C06-60/PWC/WS.11

SUBJECT: FEES AND CHARGES BY-LAW FOR WATER WORKS UPGRADE IN LLOYD BROWN (TOWNSHIP OF NORTH DUMFRIES)

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT The Regional Municipality of Waterloo enact the Fees and Charges By-Law for the Lloyd Brown settlement area in the Township of North Dumfries, attached as Appendix A, pursuant to Report E-11-061.1, dated September 27, 2011.

SUMMARY:

In 2010, the Region extended the municipal water distribution system to 49 unserviced properties in the Lloyd Brown settlement area, in the Township of North Dumfries (from now on “Benefited Properties”). Staff recommends passing a fees and charges by-law to fully recover the costs from the 49 Benefited Properties when property owners opt to connect to the municipal system (from now on “Connection Charge”). The connection charges for this by-law will be as follows:

1) Single Family Dwelling (SFD) with water service lateral (41 units) $9,600.00
2) SFD without water service lateral (7 units) $8,400.00 + actual cost of lateral at the time of request
3) 1001 Orr’s Lake Road (7 equivalent SFD units) $65,500.00

REPORT:

Background

Based on discussions with the Township of North Dumfries, residents of the Lloyd Brown settlement, and the Ministry of the Environment (MOE), the Region initiated a project to extend the water distribution system to all unserviced properties in Lloyd Brown. On June 30, 2010, Regional Council awarded a construction contract for the above work (Report F-10-067). This project included extending water services to all unserviced properties within the Lloyd Brown settlement boundary at a total cost of $516,893.01 funded by the Region’s water distribution capital program. A summary of these costs is presented in Appendix B at the end of this report.

There were three categories of Benefited Properties from the watermain extension in the Lloyd Brown settlement area:

1) 41 SFD properties with water laterals extended to their property line.
2) Seven (7) SFD properties without water laterals installed.
3) One (1) multi-residential property (1001 Orr’s Lake Road) with ten (10) units serviced by one water lateral and one metering chamber.
The categories of Benefited Properties have been identified on a map in Schedule A of the proposed by-law in Appendix A. The multi-residential property on 1001 Orr’s Lake Road is equivalent to seven (7) SFD units. There are 10 units on the property, each treated as a townhouse, and each equivalent to .699 of a SFD as per Regional Development Charges. Therefore, 1001 Orr’s Lake Road is equivalent to seven (7) SFD Benefited Properties.

It is not compulsory for Benefited Properties to connect to the municipal water distribution system. However, each property owner will have to pay the Connection Charge in a lump sum before connecting to this system. For the Benefited Properties with laterals installed up to the property line (41 SFD units) the Connection Charge includes all water works within the municipal right-of-way up to the property line, and the cost to install the service lateral. The Connection Charge for the Benefited Properties without laterals installed (7 SFD units) includes only the water works within the municipal right-of-way. The actual cost for the installation of the laterals from the watermain to the property line will be charged at the time a water service connection for the property is requested. Properties without a water lateral are those along the existing transmission main on Roseville Road that expressed no interest to be connected to municipal water services in the short term. The Connection Charge for the multi-residential property on 1001 Orr’s Lake Road includes the water works within the municipal right-of-way for seven (7) equivalent Benefited Properties, the cost to install the service lateral, and a water metering chamber that was specially required by this property.

Appendix B shows a summary of all capital costs for the implementation of this project and details about the calculation of connection charges. The Connection Charge part of this by-law for each category of Benefited Properties is as follows:

1) SFD with water service lateral (41 units) $ 9,600.00
2) SFD without water service lateral (7 units) $ 8,400.00 + actual cost of lateral at the time of request
3) 1001 Orr’s Lake Road (7 equivalent SFD units) $65,500.00

The connection charges include all costs incurred on the public roadway. All costs for the installation of the water service within the boundary of the benefited property will be the responsibility of the property owner and are not included in the connection charge.

It is the recommendation of staff, subject to any needed readjustments pursuant to the proposed by-law, that 100% of any recouped fees from the Benefited Properties are contributed to the Water Distribution Reserve Fund of the Water Services Division.

Public Consultation

On June 22, 2010, a Public Information Centre (PIC) was held for the Benefited Properties identifying the opportunity for extending water services to the whole Lloyd Brown settlement area. The estimated construction cost per property at the time was $11,000. At the same time, a survey was conducted to quantify the intent of the Benefitted Properties in connecting to the municipal system. Of the 49 benefitting properties, the Region received 39 responses: 10 expressed interest in connecting, and 29 expressed no interest in connecting at this time. The owner of 1001 Orr’s Lake Road has already negotiated with Region staff to expedite the water service connection to his property, and has already provided the necessary securities to cover the costs of this connection in advance of this by-law.

As requested by residents of Lloyd Brown, the Region held another PIC on September 15, 2011, to answer any further questions residents may have. A survey similar to one in the 2010 PIC was conducted, including an additional question to quantify benefited property owners intent in connecting if financing would be provided. Five (5) property owners attended the meeting and no one expressed interest in connecting. The Township of North Dumfries also suggested that if
financing is provided, the property owners could pay the connection charge up front, but opt to make
the connection at a later time. This would defer the cost of the service lateral on the property, not
included in the potential financing, to a later date.

**Costs to Be Recovered and Proposed By-law**

The final cost incurred by the Region for the extension of water services to the Benefited Properties
in the Lloyd Brown settlement area was $516,893.01. These costs included all construction works,
Regional staff costs, legal and survey fees, application fees and consulting engineering fees.

In order to recover these costs, Region’s staff is proposing a fees and charges by-law where each
benefiting property owner pays a proportionate share of the water extension described above. The
Connection Charge must be paid in full once a property owner opts to connect to municipal water
system. The recoverable costs as proposed in the fees and charges by-law amount to a total of:

1) 41 Benefiting Properties With Laterals $393,600.00
2) Seven Benefiting Properties Without Laterals $58,800.00*
3) 1001 Orr’s Lake Road $65,500.00

**Costs to Be Recovered through Connection Charges** $517,900.00

*Note: All associated costs for installing the water service lateral will be borne by the property owner
at the time a water service connection is requested.

The proposed by-law is attached as Appendix A to this Report.

The original cost estimate, provided to residents at the June 2010 Public Information Centre, was
$11,000 per benefited property. The final cost per property is less than initially estimated due to very
competitive bids for this project.

The authority for the proposed by-law is Part XII of the *Municipal Act, 2001* which specifically allows
municipalities to pass fees and charges by-laws to recover costs including those for the installation
of capital works. Additional authority is also found in Part II of the *Municipal Act, 2001* which grants
“natural person” powers to municipal corporations that are general in nature.

**Additional Future Connections and Proposed By-law**

The extension of water on Roseville Road, Hillside Avenue, Oakwood Drive, and Brown Avenue in
the Lloyd Brown settlement area currently benefits 49 properties. However, there is potential for
severance of some of the existing properties, and, therefore, potential for more connections to the
municipal system. If that were to happen, and those property owners chose to connect to the
municipal system, they would be subject to the proposed by-law under a provision where they would
be subject to a fee of $8,400.00 for the installation of the watermain plus the actual cost of the
installation of each water lateral from the watermain to the property boundary on the municipal
roadway and within their property. Therefore any new properties that are created from severances
will be treated as the SFD units without water laterals installed.

**Public Notice of By-Law**

In accordance with the Region’s Notice Policy (Class 2) letters were delivered in August 25, 2011 to
all Benefited Properties advising them that the Region will be considering the proposed by-law at the
September 27, 2011, meeting of the Planning and Works Committee and the October 5, 2011,
meeting of Regional Council. The letter also included an invitation to a public meeting held
September 15, 2011 for residents to discuss the by-law and have staff answer questions. A notice
CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This project meets the objectives of the 2011-2014 Corporate Strategic Plan Focus Area 2: Growth Management and Prosperity, to “manage growth to foster thriving and productive urban and rural communities”. Strategic Objectives 2.2 to “develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs.” Action 2.2.1 to “continue to prioritize and implement capital program projects required to meet community needs and ensure sustainability.”

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The total cost for the construction of the water works to service the Benefited Properties was $516,893.01. It is proposed that this amount be recovered from the benefiting property owners in the Lloyd Brown settlement area, Township of North Dumfries, when they opt to connect to the municipal water system. The connection charge as per the by-law referenced in this report and attached in Appendix A must be paid in full to the Region before the connection is permitted.

FINANCING ARRANGEMENTS FOR WATER SERVICE CONNECTIONS:

Financing of connection charges for water works was provided by the Region and/or Local Municipalities (Municipal Providers) in situations when the connection to the municipal system was made mandatory. This occurred in systems where the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) had ordered the Municipal Providers to take over ownership and operation of existing private systems. Fees and Charges By-Laws were passed by Local Municipalities for the systems in St. Agatha (Township of Wilmot), Breslau and Heidelberg (Township of Woolwich). A similar By-Law was passed by the Region for Heidelberg (Township of Wellesley side).

The Region also passed a Fees and Charges By-Law for water works completed on Northumberland Street, Village of Ayr, in the Township of North Dumfries. Funds for these works were partially up-fronted by a benefited developer and by the Region. In this case, connection was optional and no long term financing was provided. Any connection by a Benefited Property would require immediate payment to the Region prior to connection. Two of the 13 Benefited Properties have already paid the connection charge and connected to the municipal system.

The proposed By-Law does not require that Benefited Properties connect to the municipal system. For this reason, the proposed By-Law does not give the Benefited Property owners the option of paying the fees and charges over a period of time. This is the same structure as the Northumberland Street Fees and Charges By-law. Staff believes that benefited owners in the Northumberland Street area may perceive it as unfair if the benefited owners in the Lloyd Brown Subdivision were treated differently. Staff also believes that allowing payment over a period of time for non-mandatory connections would set a precedent for future fees and charges by-laws of similar nature.

In the September 15, 2011 PIC, five (5) property owners attended the meeting and no one expressed interest in connecting to the municipal system.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Corporate Resources (Legal) and Finance staff assisted in the preparation of the proposed by-law of this Report. Finance staff will manage the fund recovery program.
ATTACHMENT(S)

Appendix A – “A By-Law to Impose a Fee and Charge Upon Owner of Land Who Derive or Will or May Derive a Benefit from Water Works Sufficient to Pay the Municipal Portion of the Capital Cost of the Works”

Appendix B – “Summary of Water Works and Connection Charges on Roseville Road, Hillside Avenue, Oakwood Drive, Brown Avenue”

PREPARED BY:  Nathan Morris, Coordinator, Engineering and Planning

APPROVED BY:  Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
BY-LAW NUMBER ""Insert By-law Number""

OF

THE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO

A By-law to Impose a Charge Upon Owners of Land Who Derive or Will or May Derive a Benefit from Water Works Constructed Along Certain Parts of Roseville Road, Hillside Avenue, Oakwood Drive and Brown Avenue, Township of North Dumfries

WHEREAS The Regional Municipality of Waterloo has undertaken the installation of water works to provide water services to certain lands along Roseville Road, Hillside Avenue, Oakwood Drive, and Brown Avenue in the Township of North Dumfries pursuant to its authority under the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c. 25, as amended;

AND WHEREAS persons who connect or have connected to the municipal services will receive an ongoing benefit.

AND WHEREAS The Regional Municipality of Waterloo has determined that it is desirable to recover a part of the municipal portion of the capital cost of the construction of the water works within the said benefiting area by imposing a charge pursuant to Section 391 of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c. 25, as amended, upon the owners of the lands who derive or will or may derive a benefit there from;

NOW THEREFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. In this By-Law:

   (1) “lateral charge” means the charge for the installation of each water lateral which shall be:

      (a) $1,200 for each water lateral that has been installed within the Lloyd Brown benefiting area as of the date this By-law comes into full force and effect; or
      (b) the actual cost of the Region, including but not limited to costs for construction works, staff time, legal and survey fees, application fees and consulting engineering fees, for the installation of each new water lateral within the Lloyd Brown benefiting area after the date this By-law comes into full force and effect;

   (2) “Lloyd Brown benefiting area” means:

      (a) the properties shown on Schedule “A” attached to this By-law that are designated as Benefiting Properties; and
      (b) any other properties that lie along the water main with the exception of those designated as Serviced Properties on Schedule “A” attached to this By-law;

   (3) “main charge” means the charge for the capital cost of the water main which shall be deemed to be $8,400 per property;
(4) “owner” means the person or persons registered on title as the owner or owners of the property;

(5) “Region” means The Regional Municipality of Waterloo;

(6) “Treasurer” means the Treasurer of the Region, his or her designate, or any successor position;

(7) “water lateral” means the pipe within the municipal road allowance that connects the water main to a property; and

(8) “water main” means the municipal water main that runs along Roseville Road between 520 meters west of the Brown Avenue road centerline and 110 meters east of the Brown Avenue road centerline, Hillside Avenue, Oakwood Drive and Brown Avenue in the Township of North Dumfries.

PART I – MAIN CHARGE AND LATERAL CHARGE

2. (1) Every owner of a property within the Lloyd Brown benefiting area who is connected to the water main as of the date this By-law comes into full force and effect shall pay the Region a main charge and lateral charge within 30 days of the date of any invoice from the Treasurer.

(2) The Region may charge interest at the rate of 12% per annum against any owner who fails to pay the main charge and lateral charge within 30 days of the Treasurer’s invoice.

(3) Without limiting any other remedy, the Treasurer shall have all necessary authority to request that the treasurer of The Corporation of the Township of North Dumfries add any outstanding main charge, lateral charge and interest under this section to the tax roll to the property that was connected to the water and collect them in the same manner as municipal taxes.

3. (1) Where an owner of a property within the Lloyd Brown benefiting area requests in writing to the Region that its property be connected to the water main then the owner shall pay the Region a main charge and lateral charge.

(2) Every main charge and lateral charge imposed pursuant to subsection (1) of this section shall be paid in full to the Region before the connection is permitted.

4. For the purposes of this By-law, 1001 Orr’s Lake Road, Township of North Dumfries, and the 9 residences thereon, shall be deemed to be 7 properties with 5.8 laterals.

PART II – GENERAL

5. Schedule “A” shall form part of this By-law.

6. This By-law may be cited as the “Lloyd Brown Fees and Charges By-law”.

7. If any section or sections of this By-law or parts of it are found by any Court to be illegal or beyond the power of Council to enact, such section or sections or parts of it shall be deemed to be severable and all other sections or parts of this By-law shall be deemed to be separate and independent and shall continue to be in full force.
8. This By-law shall come into full force and effect upon final passing.

By-law read a first, second and third time and finally passed in the Council Chamber in The Regional Municipality of Waterloo this ""Insert date"" th day of ""Insert Month"", A.D., 2011.

______________________________  ______________________________
REGIONAL CLERK                    REGIONAL CHAIR
SCHEDULE “B”

Summary of Water Works and Connection Charges on Roseville Road, Hillside Avenue, Oakwood Drive, Brown Avenue

1. Capital Costs for the Project
   Capital Costs for the Watermain $461,987.87
   Capital Costs for the Water Laterals $ 49,414.71
   Capital Costs for the Water Meter Chamber @ 1001 Orr’s Lake Road $ 5,490.43

   Total Cost for the Project $516,893.01

2. Watermain Charge Calculation
   Capital Costs for the Watermain $461,987.87
   Benefited Properties 55
   • 41 SFD with water laterals
   • 7 SFD without water laterals
   • 7 equivalent SFD (1001 Orr’s Lake Road)

   Watermain Charge per Benefiting Property $  8,400.00

3. Lateral Charge Calculation
   Capital Costs for the Water Laterals $ 49,414.71
   Benefited Properties 42
   • 41 SFD
   • 1 (1001 Orr’s Lake Road)

   Lateral Charge per Benefited Property $  1,200.00

   Note: For Benefited Properties without an installed water lateral the actual cost for the installation of each lateral from the watermain to the property line will be charged at the time the water service connection is requested.

4. Connection Charges

   SFD with Water Service Lateral (41 SFD units)
   • Watermain Charge $ 8,400.00
   • Lateral Charge $  1,200.00

   Total Charge per Benefited Property $  9,600.00

   SFD without Water Service Lateral (7 SFD units)
   • Watermain Charge $ 8,400.00
   • Lateral Charge to be determined

   Total Charge per Benefited Property $  8,400.00 +
   actual lateral cost

   1001 Orr’s Lake Road (7 equivalent SFD units)
   • Watermain Charge $ 8,400.00 x 7
   • Lateral Charge $  1,200.00
   • Water Meter Chamber $  5,550.00

   Total Charge per Benefited Property $  65,500.00
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: September 27, 2011  FILE CODE: D18-01

SUBJECT: MONTHLY REPORT OF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY FOR AUGUST 2011

RECOMMENDATION:


SUMMARY:

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

1. Approved the following part lot control exemption by-laws;
2. Accepted the following plan of subdivision and plan of condominium;
3. Draft Approved the following plan of condominium; and
4. Released for registration the following plan of subdivision and plan of condominium.

REPORT:

City of Cambridge

1. Part Lot Control Exemption By-law 77-11
Applicant: Mattamy (Hespeler) Limited
Location: Baldwin Drive
Proposal: To permit the creation of 4 single detached units.
Processing Fee: Paid July 27, 2011
Commissioner’s Approval: August 3, 2011

2. Registration of Draft Plan of Subdivision 30T-06103
Draft Approval Date: December 5, 2007
Phase: Phase 3B
Applicant: Mattamy (Hespeler) Limited
Location: Guelph Avenue and Blackbridge Road
Proposal: To permit the development of 24 single detached and a maximum of 15 multiple residential units.
Processing Fee: Paid August 22, 2011
City of Kitchener

1. Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-10213
   Draft Approval Date: June 10, 2011
   Phase: Stage 1
   Applicant: Deerfield Homes Ltd.
   Location: 931 Glasgow Street
   Proposal: To permit the development of 64 condominium apartment units.
   Processing Fee: Not applicable
   Commissioner’s Release: August 9, 2011

City of Waterloo

1. Part Lot Control Exemption By-law 2011-085
   Applicant: Chris and Sons Builders Ltd.
   Location: Maverick Street
   Proposal: To permit the creation of 4 street-fronting townhouse units.
   Processing Fee: Paid August 17, 2011
   Commissioner’s Approval: August 18, 2011

2. Plan of Condominium Application 30CDM-11405
   Date Accepted: August 2, 2011
   Applicant: Waterloo Living 3 Inc.
   Location: 50 Marshall Street
   Proposal: To permit the development of 21 condominium apartment units.
   Processing Fee: Paid July 21, 2011

3. Draft Approval of Plan of Condominium 30CDM-11401
   Applicant: 2218553 Ontario Inc.
   Location: 133 Park Street
   Proposal: To permit the development of 18 condominium apartment units.
   Processing Fee: Paid July 21, 2011
   Commissioner’s Approval: August 9, 2011
   Came Into Effect: August 30, 2011

Township of Wilmot

1. Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-04601
   Draft Approval Date: July 19, 2005
   Phase: Phase 2
   Applicant: Vesper Village Retirement Community Inc.
   Location: Foell Street, Baden
   Proposal: To permit the development of 8 condominium townhouse units.
   Processing Fee: Paid July 27, 2011
   Commissioner’s Release: August 11, 2011

Township of Woolwich

1. Plan of Subdivision Application 30T-11701
   Date Accepted: August 3, 2011
   Applicant: Ariss Glen Developments Limited/Thomasfield Homes Limited
   Location: Victoria Street North, Breslau
   Proposal: To permit a mixed-use development consisting of 885 residential units
   (single detached, townhouses and apartment units).
   Processing Fee: Paid July 29, 2011
### Residential Subdivision Activity January 1, 2011 to August 31, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Units in Residential Registered Plans</th>
<th>Residential Units Draft Approved</th>
<th>Pending Plans (Units Submitted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Kitchener</em></td>
<td>216</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dumfries</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Waterloo</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The acceptance and/or draft approval of plans of subdivision and condominium processed by the City of Kitchener under delegated approval authority are not included in this table.

For comparison, the following table has also been included:

### Residential Subdivision Activity January 1, 2010 to August 31, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Units in Residential Registered Plans</th>
<th>Residential Units Draft Approved</th>
<th>Pending Plans (Units Submitted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Kitchener</em></td>
<td>347</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dumfries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Waterloo</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The acceptance and/or draft approval of plans of subdivision and condominium processed by the City of Kitchener under delegated approval authority are not included in this table.

### Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

These planning approvals, including consultation with Area Municipalities, have been completed in accordance with the Planning Act. All approvals contained in this report were supported by the Area Municipal councils and/or staff.

### CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This report reflects actions taken by the Commissioner in accordance with the Delegation By-law adopted by Council. The activities described in this report are operational activities with the objective of Focus Area 2: Growth Management and Prosperity.

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

NIL

### OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

NIL

### PREPARED BY:

Andrea Banks, Program Assistant

### APPROVED BY:

Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: September 27, 2011

FILE CODE: D07-40

SUBJECT: BUILDING PERMIT ACTIVITY, JANUARY TO JUNE 2011

RECOMMENDATION:

For information.

SUMMARY:

This interim report on building permit activity in the Region covers the first half of 2011. It reflects building permit data related to new construction (as provided by the Area Municipalities) for the period of January to June 2011. A subsequent year-end report on building permit activity will be compiled in early 2012, providing a summary of 2011 with comparisons to previous years, and further analysis.

Building permit activity across the Region was higher in the residential sector and lower in the non-residential sector in the first half of 2011 over the same period in 2010. Residential permits were issued for 1,818 units in the first half of 2011, up 18% from the 1,544 units in the first half of 2010. The value of these permits increased 15% to $351 million from $305.6 million. The City of Kitchener had the highest number of new units created (1,026), and the largest year-over-year increase in new units, with 435 more units permitted in 2011.

New non-residential floor space decreased 72% to 620,508 square feet from 2.1 million square feet in the first half of 2010. The value of non-residential permits issued in the first half of 2011 decreased 31% to $339.9 million from $494.2 million in the same period in 2010. Notable non-residential projects in the first half of 2011 include permits for the completion of the new provincial courthouse on Duke St E in Kitchener and expansions at the Kitchener and Waterloo wastewater treatment plants.

Canada Mortgage and Housing (CMHC) reported in their July Housing Starts press release that housing starts were down 27.8% in the Kitchener-Cambridge-Waterloo Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) in the first half of 2011 over the same period in 2010. CMHC is forecasting that starts will improve near the end of the year and into 2012.

REPORT:

Building permit activity is one indicator of the strength of a local economy. This report summarizes building activity in both the residential and non-residential sectors for each Area Municipality in the Region of Waterloo, for the first two quarters of 2011 (January to March, and April to June). Building activity data for the same period in 2010 is provided for comparison. These figures are compiled by Planning, Housing and Community Services staff, based on data supplied by the Area Municipalities.
Comments on Residential Activity

- A total of 1,818 units were issued construction permits in the Region in the first half of 2011. Of these permits, 39% (700) were single detached units, 2% (42) were semi-detached, 9% (158) were townhouse units and 50% (918) were apartment units.

- The ratio of new single detached units to multi-residential units declined to 39% in the first half of 2011 from 45% in the same period in 2010. This downward trend was first reported in (P-11-025 “2010 Building Permit Activity) where it was noted that over the past five years the ratio of new single detached units to new multi-residential units has shifted from 60/40 to 35/65.

- The number of single detached units stayed relatively unchanged from 698 units in 2010 to 700 in 2011; semi-detached units decreased 58% from 99 to 42; townhouse units decreased 31% from 229 to 158; and apartment units increased 77% from 518 to 918.

- Apartment unit construction is highly variable. The City of Kitchener was the only municipality to have increases in apartment construction in the first half of 2011. Kitchener was boosted by two large projects (two 164 unit buildings on Fallowfield Dr, and the 136 unit Arrow Loft project on Benton. Meanwhile, apartment construction in Waterloo decreased 28% from 410 units to 294 in 2011; Cambridge decreased 60% from 62 units in 2010 to 5 units in 2011.

- In response to Council’s past request, Regional Staff are reporting on seniors’ oriented residences for the first time. Seniors’ oriented residences differ from a typical apartment by the fact that rooms in these residences do not have their own kitchen facilities; instead there is a dining room for meals. These types of developments have always been reported in the non-residential sector by floor space and construction value. Instead of units, beds are counted in these developments. Regional Staff will report more fully on seniors’ and student residences in the year-end building activity report.

- There were two large seniors’ residence projects in the first half of 2011. A 145 bed residence at 208 Hespeler Rd in Cambridge, and a 117 bed residence on 25 West Hill Dr in Waterloo.

- CMHC reported in their July press release that starts were down 27.8% in the Kitchener-Cambridge-Waterloo Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) in the first half of 2011 over the same period in 2010. There are two important differences in the statistics reported by CMHC and those found in this report. First, as CMHC does not include residential conversions such as the Arrow Lofts. Secondly, this report accounts for units at the building permit issuance stage, while CMHC accounts at the construction start. Therefore, permits for the five largest apartment projects in the first half of 2011 were issued in June and CMHC will likely account for these starts in the 2nd half of the calendar year when the footings are poured.

- Figures 1 through 9 illustrate building activity in each Area Municipality by quarter. The change from 2010 to 2011 was mixed across the municipalities. Kitchener led the way in the first half of 2011 with 435 more units constructed over the same period in 2010; followed by Wilmot with 20 more units, and North Dumfries (8); Woolwich (-2); Wellesley (-20); Cambridge (-60); and Waterloo (-107).
Figure 1: First Quarter 2010 and 2011: Total New Residential Units By City

Figure 2: Second Quarter 2010 and 2011: Total New Residential Units By City

Figure 3: First Quarter 2010 and 2011: Total New Residential Units By Township

Figure 4: Second Quarter 2010 and 2011: Total New Residential Units By Township

Figure 5: Total New Residential Units By Type, January - June *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single Detached</th>
<th>Semi Detached</th>
<th>Townhouse</th>
<th>Apartment</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAT</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDU</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEL</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIL</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOO</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMW</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Permits cancelled during the year are reflected in this table

Figure 6: First Quarter 2010 and 2011: Total New Residential Construction Value By City

Figure 7: Second Quarter 2010 and 2011: Total New Residential Construction Value By City
Comments on Non-Residential Activity

- In the first half of 2011, institutional building permits accounted for 51% of total floor space; commercial 31%, and industrial permits 18%.

- The value of non-residential permits decreased 31% to $339.9 million from $494.2 million in the same period in 2010.

- The highest construction values for a project in the first half of 2009 by type are:
  - Institutional - $160.8 million for two permits completing the balance of construction of the new courthouse in Kitchener;
  - Commercial - $3 million for an addition to Bennet/chevrolet/Cadillac on Hespeler Rd in Cambridge;
  - Industrial - $1.35 million for an addition at 258 McBrine Dr in Kitchener

- Of the 12 permits with a construction value over $2 million, Kitchener had 6; Cambridge (4); and Waterloo had 1.

Figures 10 through 18 illustrate non-residential building activity in each of the Area Municipalities. Non-residential building activity can be highly variable from year to year. Total floor space constructed decreased 72% from 2.2 million square feet in the first half of 2010 to 620,508 square feet in 2011.

**Figure 10: Total New Non-Residential Floor Space By Type, January - June**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
<th>Institutional</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>14,660</td>
<td>112,982</td>
<td>113,931</td>
<td>24,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>69,841</td>
<td>35,254</td>
<td>43,333</td>
<td>60,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAT</td>
<td>770,864</td>
<td>23,980</td>
<td>12,105</td>
<td>2,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDU</td>
<td>2,144</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,275</td>
<td>20,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28,040</td>
<td>2,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,595</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOO</td>
<td>108,752</td>
<td>13,578</td>
<td>2,164</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMW</td>
<td>966,261</td>
<td>191,389</td>
<td>209,848</td>
<td>110,420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Values in square feet
Figure 11: First Quarter 2010 and 2011: Total Non Residential Floor Space By City

Figure 12: Second Quarter 2010 and 2011: Total Non Residential Floor Space By City

Figure 13: First Quarter 2010 and 2011: Total Non Residential Floor Space By Township

Figure 14: Second Quarter 2010 and 2011: Total Non Residential Floor Space By Township

Figure 15: First Quarter 2010 and 2011: Total Non Residential Construction Value By City

Figure 16: Second Quarter 2010 and 2011: Total Non Residential Construction Value By City

Figure 17: First Quarter 2010 and 2011: Total Non Residential Construction Value By Township

Figure 18: Second Quarter 2010 and 2011: Total Non Residential Construction Value By Township
Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

Building permit data are collected by Area Municipal staff and submitted either electronically or in hardcopy. They are compiled by Regional staff for use in Regional development charge calculations, development tracking, forecasts, and reporting. Municipal staff are consulted for verification and insight into the data. Copies of this report will be circulated to the Area Municipalities.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

Tracking and reporting building permit activity contributes to Strategic Focus Area 2: Growth Management and Prosperity

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

NIL

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

NIL

ATTACHMENTS:

NIL

PREPARED BY:  Chris Rumig, Planning Technician

APPROVED BY:  Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
From: Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
Subject: EXISTING DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO THE COMMISSIONER OF PLANNING, HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

This memo has been prepared as a follow-up to direction from the Planning and Works Committee for additional information on delegated authority that has been given to the Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services for planning matters.

Delegation was first assigned to the Commissioner in 1976, and provides a variety of benefits to the planning process, including:

- Applying a technical review to a large volume of applications;
- Delivering timely approvals; and
- Efficient processing of applications that have been approved by Area Municipal Councils, and that conform to applicable Regional and Provincial legislation and policy.

The Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services (the Regional Planning Commissioner) performs a number of specific functions on behalf of Regional Council. Under Regional By-law No. 01-028, the Regional Planning Commissioner is permitted to perform a variety of roles, including:

- Draft and final approval of plans of subdivision and condominium and with or without conditions, as well as approving minor amendments;
- Refusing to accept applications until they are deemed to be complete;
- Issuing notices of public meetings and issuing declarations relating to prescribed Planning Act processes;
- Approving all Area Municipal Official Plan Amendments;
- Approving part lot control exemptions; and
- Executing agreements, amendments and releases.

The delegated authority is accompanied by a variety of conditions. For example, delegation is not applicable if conditions to be imposed vary substantially from the recommendations of the applicable Area Municipality, or create unplanned financial obligations to the Region. It should also be noted that approval authority was previously sub-delegated by the Region to the City of Kitchener for defined Planning Act matters in that Area Municipality only.

The delegation also permits the Regional Planning Commissioner to monitor, review, comment on, impose and release conditions on applications made under the Planning Act and the Aggregate Resources Act. At a more detailed level, the Regional Planning Commissioner is
able to scope or waive requirements for Environmental Impact Statements and to waive requirements relating to contaminated sites in defined circumstances.

Finally, authority has been delegated to the Planning Commissioner to make appeals to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) in planning matters, subject to subsequent ratification by Council and additional directions. This keeps Regional Council's options open on whether to proceed to the OMB, where the first step is typically a mediation process. The Commissioner's authority also extends to direct representation of the Region at OMB hearings where the Region is not the appellant.

I trust this information is of assistance, and I would be pleased to discuss any aspects with you.
September 6th, 2011
(Via e-mail)

Without Prejudice

Attention:
A. Wayne Cheater, P.Eng.
Senior Project Manager
Regional Municipality of Waterloo, 150 Frederick Street,
Kitchener, Ontario, N2G 4J3.

Re. South Kitchener Transportation Corridor, and
     River Road Extension Class EA

Dear Mr. Cheater,

Thank you for your letter dated, September 2nd, 2011. It has escaped me that it arrived at the end
of a week in which I had appealed to elected municipal councilors to assist me in receiving a
response to my letter of July 26th.

Your email with the attached letter stated, “…my letter in response to your letter dated July 26,
2011.” To blatantly state that my “…questions relate to issues which we have not yet
investigated or which we do not intend to investigate…” pretty much summed up your letter.
This could never be construed as a response.

So here we are in the school playground hearing, “I didn’t cause it. He did!”

Mr. Cheater, since you decline to answer the following question, I am going to assume as any
reasonable person would assume that the answers to this fundamental question:

   “Has a detailed analysis of risk to all life stages of Jefferson salamander been completed
   which would include:
   • Identification of migratory routes of Jefferson salamander in Hidden Valley,
   • Identification of the full life habitat of Jefferson salamander in Hidden Valley,
   • Identification of the risks to all stages of life for Jefferson salamander in Hidden
     Valley,
   • Identification of the potential impact of road salt and other related contaminants
     related to a 4 lane highway on Jefferson salamander in Hidden Valley

   is a resounding “NO!”

Now that this is well understood, we will require the MNR to provide the data relied upon to
delineate the regulated limits for Jefferson salamander habitat.
In closing, I am reminding you and the Region of something I stated 4 years ago in a March 17th letter to the Region.

“The alignment of the road has been under extensive consideration and revision and now that the process is at a stage of final decisions, the most serious consideration must be made for the impacts these roads will have for this threatened species at risk which migrates up to a kilometer twice a year. If another view of this situation is required, I respectfully request that this analysis could be independently critiqued by Dr. Stephen Hecnar, Department of Biology, Lakehead University.

In 2005/6 Regional Staff insisted time and again that they were right in proceeding with the River Road Extension. They were dead wrong and have not had the grace to state this publicly.

The Region has an obligation to do the right thing now. Don’t move forward as was proposed in 2006, only to take 5 years of steps backward, all at taxpayers’ expense.

Respectfully submitted,


Neil E. Taylor

Encl.

C.c.

Mrs. Jean Haalboom, Councillor, Region of Waterloo and Project Team Member
Mr. John Gazzola, Councillor, City of Kitchener and Project Team Member
Mr. Barry Vrbanovic, City of Kitchener and Project Team Member
Ms. Claudette Millar, Councillor, Region of Waterloo
Ms. Jane Mitchell, Councillor, Region of Waterloo
Hon. Dalton McGuinty, Premier of Ontario,
Hon. Linda Jeffrey, Minister of Natural Resources
Hon John Wilkinson, MPP, Minister of the Environment
Ms. Leeanna Pendergast, MPP
Hon. John Milloy, MPP
Mr. Ken Seiling, Regional Chair
Karolyne Pickett, SAR Biologist
Ms. Virginia West, Deputy Minister
Mr. Gord Miller, Environmental Commissioner of Ontario
Mr. André Marin: The Ombudsman
Dr. Ann Cavoukian, Information and Privacy Commissioner of Ontario
Mr. Howard Hampton, MPP, Critic, Natural Resources
Mr. Jerry J. Ouellette, MPP, Critic, Natural Resources
Ms. Elizabeth Witmer, MPP
Mr. Ian Hagman, MNR
Mr. Chris Gosslin, Region of Waterloo

Other interested and concerned citizens.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting date</th>
<th>Requestor</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Assigned Department</th>
<th>Anticipated Response Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24-May-11</td>
<td>P&amp;W</td>
<td>Staff report on emerging technology and current technology being used for traffic signal control</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>Fall - 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Aug-11</td>
<td>P&amp;W</td>
<td>One year review of Report E-11-085 re: Parking on Bleams Road</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>1-Aug-2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>