MEDIA RELEASE: Friday, January 25, 2013, 4:30 p.m.

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO
PLANNING AND WORKS COMMITTEE
AGENDA

Tuesday, January 29, 2013
9:00 a.m.
Regional Council Chamber
150 Frederick Street, Kitchener, Ontario

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

2. DELEGATIONS

a) Ken Hall, Enbridge Pipelines Inc. re: Enbridge Announced Plans to Reverse the Directional Flow of Line 98 Crude Oil Pipeline Between North Westover, Ontario and Montreal, Quebec

b) Lane Burman, President of Mount Hope Breithaupt Park Neighbourhood Association re: E-13-016, Weber Street (Regional Road 8) and Wilhelm Street Pedestrian Refuge Island, City of Kitchener

c) E-13-014, Accessibility Solutions at Intersections and Roundabouts on Regional Roads in the Region of Waterloo

   i) Dawn Clelland, Kitchener
   ii) Carrie Speers, GRAAC

d) Rob Loewen, Kitchener, re: E-13-017, Proposed Removal of Heavy Truck Restriction on Bleams Road (Regional Road 56) between Homer Watson Boulevard (Regional Road 28) and Fischer-Hallman Road (Regional Road 58), City of Kitchener

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS
Items on the Consent Agenda can be approved in one motion of Committee to save time. Prior to the motion being voted on, any member of Committee may request that one or more of the items be removed from the Consent Agenda and voted on separately.

3. REQUEST TO REMOVE ITEMS FROM CONSENT AGENDA

4. MOTION TO APPROVE ITEMS OR RECEIVE FOR INFORMATION

   (Approval)

b) Memo: Reminder of Upcoming East Side Lands Master Environmental
### Servicing Plan and Community Plan Public Information Centre #3 – January 31, 2013 *(Information)*

c) **CR-RS-13-009**, Authorization to Expropriate Lands (1\textsuperscript{st} report) for Bloomingdale Road Improvements (Kraft Drive to Bridge Street), in the City of Kitchener *(Approval)*

d) **CR-RS-13-010**, Authorization to Expropriate Lands (2\textsuperscript{nd} report) for Weber Street West Grade Separation and Road Improvements (Phase 2 - Wilhelm Street to Guelph Street), in the City of Kitchener *(Approval)*

e) **E-13-010**, Victoria Street Improvements from Edna Street to Bruce Street, City of Kitchener – Public Input Meeting for the Preferred Design Concept *(Information)*

f) **E-13-012**, GRT Accessibility Update *(Information)*

g) **E-13-008.1**, Rainwater Harvesting Promotion 2013 *(Approval)*

h) **E-13-015**, License Agreement with Cambridge and North Dumfries Hydro Inc. for the Sole Purpose of Installation, Maintenance and Operation of Radio Repeater Equipment on Top of Inverness Water Tower in City of Cambridge *(Approval)*

i) **Memo**: New Canada Post Fees for Developers *(Information)*

### REGULAR AGENDA RESUMES

#### 5. REPORTS - PLANNING, HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

**COMMISSIONER’S OFFICE**

a) **P-13-005**, Response to Proposed Amendment 2 to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe  

**COMMUNITY PLANNING**

b) **P-13-006**, Region of Waterloo King/Victoria Transit Hub Update

c) **P-13-007**, Central Transit Corridor Community Building Strategy (CBS) – Release of First Draft *(Presentation)*

d) **P-13-012**, Notification of Proposed Wind Turbine Project in the County of Perth

**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING**

e) **P-13-008**, Metrolinx Regional Transportation Plan - The Big Move Update

f) **P-13-009**, Proposed Pedestrian Access Improvements to Transit for the Hanson/Hayward Industrial and Alpine Village Areas
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS

g) P-13-004/F-13-007, Recommended Refinements to the Region of Waterloo Brownfield Financial Incentive Program (BFIP) 89

h) CR-RS-13-001/E-13-018, Surplus Declaration and Conveyance of Easement Interest to Region of Waterloo International Airport in Favour of Waterloo North Hydro Inc. 101

REPORTS - TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION

i) E-13-006.1, Recommended Construction Phasing – Ira Needles Boulevard Widening from Highview Drive to Erb Street in the Cities of Kitchener and Waterloo 103

j) E-13-011, Kitchener Wastewater Treatment Plant Request for Proposals for Biosolids Storage Lagoons Decommissioning 108

TRANSPORTATION

k) E-13-013, Posted Speed Limits Approaching Roundabouts on Regional Roads 111

l) E-13-014, Accessibility Solutions at Intersections and Roundabouts on Regional Roads in the Region of Waterloo 116

m) E-13-016, Weber Street and Wilhelm Street Intersection, City of Kitchener-Request for Pedestrian Traffic Control Signals 135

n) E-13-017, Proposed Removal of Heavy Truck Restriction on Bleams Road (Regional Road 56) Between Homer Watson Boulevard (Regional Road 28) and Fischer-Hallman Road (Regional Road 58), City of Kitchener 143

6. INFORMATION/CORRESPONDENCE

a) Council Enquiries and Requests for Information Tracking List 155

7. OTHER BUSINESS

8. NEXT MEETING – February 26, 2013

9. MOTION TO GO INTO CLOSED SESSION

THAT a closed meeting of the Planning and Works, Administration and Finance and Community Services Committees be held on Tuesday, January 29, 2013 immediately following the Planning and Works Committee meeting in the Waterloo County Room, in accordance with Section 239 of the Municipal Act, 2001, for the purposes of considering the following subject matters:

a) proposed or pending litigation and receiving of legal advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege related to a matter before an administrative tribunal
b) proposed or pending litigation and receiving of legal advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege related to a matter before an administrative tribunal

c) proposed or pending litigation and receiving of legal advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege related to proposed or pending acquisition of land in the City of Kitchener

d) receiving of legal advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege related to property use

e) proposed or pending litigation and receiving of legal advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege related to a matter before an administrative tribunal

f) proposed or pending disposition of land in the City of Waterloo

g) personal matters about identifiable individuals – financial matters

h) personal matters about identifiable individuals – committee appointments

i) personal matters about identifiable individuals – committee appointments

10. ADJOURN
### NEXT MEETINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning and Works Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 26, 2013</td>
<td>9:00 A.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>March 19, 2013</td>
<td>9:00 A.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>Thu, January 31, 2013</td>
<td>6:30 P.M. – 9:00 P.M.</td>
<td>East Side Lands Public Information Centre #3</td>
<td>Ecole Secondaire Pere-Rene-de-Galinee 450 Maple Grove Road Cambridge, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue., February 12, 2013</td>
<td>5:30 P.M. – 7:30 P.M.</td>
<td>West Montrose Covered Bridge Public Information Centre</td>
<td>Township of Woolwich Council Chamber 24 Church St. West Elmira, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed., February 20, 2013</td>
<td>4:00 P.M. – 7:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Community Building Strategy Open House</td>
<td>Knox Presbyterian Church 50 Erb Street West Waterloo, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu., February 21, 2013</td>
<td>4:00 P.M. – 7:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Community Building Strategy Open House</td>
<td>The Tannery 36 Francis Street Kitchener, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon., February 25, 2013</td>
<td>4:00 P.M. – 7:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Community Building Strategy Open House</td>
<td>Cambridge City Hall Atrium, 50 Dickson St. Cambridge, ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation and Environmental Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed., February 6, 2013</td>
<td>6:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Victoria Street Improvements from Edna Street to Bruce Street, City of Kitchener - Public Input Meeting for Preferred Design Concept</td>
<td>Council Chamber 2nd Floor, Regional Administration Building 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommending:


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-law;
2. Draft approved the following plan of condominium; and
3. Released for registration the following plans of condominium.

Report:

City of Cambridge

1. Draft Approval of Plan of Condominium 30CDM-12102
Applicant: Eastforest Homes Ltd.
Location: 750 Lawrence Street
Proposal: To permit the development of 103 townhouse condominium units.
Processing Fee: Paid December 10, 2012
Commissioner’s Approval: December 20, 2012
Came Into Effect: January 10, 2013

City of Kitchener

1. Plan of Condominium Application 30CDM-12208
Date Accepted: December 14, 2012
Applicant: York Queen Inc.
Location: 214 Queen Street South
Proposal: To permit the development of 41 multiple residential condominium units.
Processing Fee: Paid December 14, 2012
Township of North Dumfries

1. **Part Lot Control Exemption By-law 2536-12**
   
   **Applicant:** 8285439 Ontario Inc. and 839658 Ontario Inc.
   
   **Location:** Vincent Drive, Ayr
   
   **Proposal:** To permit the creation of 8 semi-detached units.
   
   **Processing Fee:** Paid December 6, 2012
   
   **Commissioner’s Approval:** December 6, 2012

Township of Wilmot

1. **Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-01601**
   
   **Draft Approval Date:** November 2, 2012
   
   **Phase:** Phase 6
   
   **Applicant:** Stonecroft Corporation
   
   **Location:** Haysville Road
   
   **Proposal:** To permit the development of 58 single detached (vacant land) condominium units.
   
   **Processing Fee:** Paid November 20, 2012
   
   **Commissioner’s Release:** December 21, 2012

**Residential Subdivision Activity January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2012**

<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>383</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>2,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dumfries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Waterloo</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>2,335</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, 2011 to December 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>367</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1253</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>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Waterloo</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>944</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 Consultations/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 1: 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  
From: Amanda Kutler, Acting Director of Community Planning  
Subject: REMINDER OF UPCOMING EAST SIDE LANDS MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICING PLAN AND COMMUNITY PLAN PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #3 – JANUARY 31, 2013

A third and final Public Information Centre (PIC) for the East Side Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MESP) and Community Plan will be held on Thursday January 31, 2013, 6:30 to 9:00 P.M. at Ecole Secondaire Pere-Rene-De-Galinee on Maple Grove Road in Cambridge. The MESP will help bring approximately 300 net hectares of employment land designated as Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve (PISR) to development readiness (please see Attachment 1 for location).

The PIC will be an open house format, with a presentation starting at 7:00 P.M. The purpose of the meeting is to present the preferred option, respond to questions from the public and receive input. The PIC will also explain the proposed implementation process. The PIC was advertised in the local newspapers and individual notice was sent to all landowners within the Stage 1 Study Area and to all others who requested notice.

A final recommendation and presentation on the MESP is expected to be forwarded to Regional Council (via Planning and Works Committee) in March of 2013 for consideration.
Attachment 1 – Study Area Location
REGION OF WATERLOO

CORPORATE RESOURCES
Legal Services

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

DATE: January 29, 2013

FILE CODE: L07-90

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZATION TO EXPROPRIATE LANDS (1st REPORT) FOR BLOOMINGDALE ROAD IMPROVEMENTS (KRAFT DRIVE TO BRIDGE STREET), IN THE CITY OF KITCHENER

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 reconstruction of Bloomingdale Road between Kraft Drive and Bridge Street, in the City of Kitchener, in the Region of Waterloo as detailed in report CR-RS-13-009 dated January 29, 2013:

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

Fee Simple Partial Taking:

1. Lot 25 Small Lots N of Hornings Tract, Kitchener being Part 8 on 58R-17403; PIN 22302-0103 (66 Bloomingdale Road North, Kitchener);
2. Lot 21 Small Lots N of Hornings Tract, Kitchener being Part 4 on 58R-17403; PIN 22302-0107 (52 Bloomingdale Road North, Kitchener);
3. Lot 18 Small Lots N of Hornings Tract, Kitchener being Part 1 on 58R-17403; PIN 22302-0110 (40 Bloomingdale Road North, Kitchener)
4. Lot 22 Small Lots N of Hornings Tract, Kitchener being Part 5 on 58R-17403; PIN 22302-0106 (54 Bloomingdale Road North, Kitchener)
5. Lot 19 Small Lots N of Hornings Tract, Kitchener being Part 2 on 58R-17403; PIN 22302-0109 (44 Bloomingdale Road North, Kitchener)
6. Lot 20 Small Lots N of Hornings Tract, Kitchener being Part 3 on 58R-17403; PIN 22302-0108 (48 Bloomingdale Road North, Kitchener)
7. Lot 31 Small Lots N of Hornings Tract; Part Lot 32 Small Lots N of Hornings Tract, Kitchener as in 657148 being Part 10 on 58R-17403; PIN 22302-0100 (88 Bloomingdale Road North, Kitchener)
8. Lot 23 Small Lots N of Hornings Tract, Kitchener being Part 6 on 58R-17403; PIN 22302-0105 (58 Bloomingdale Road North, Kitchener)
9. Part Lot 71, German Company Tract, Township of Waterloo; Woolwich as in 1268832 being Part 5 on 58R-17402; PIN 22710-0140 (155 Bloomingdale Road, Kitchener)
10. Part Lot 39, Small Lots N of Hornings Tract, Kitchener as in 1211424 being Part 3 on 58R-17402; PIN 22301-0004 (130 Bloomingdale Road North, Kitchener);

11. Part Lot 38 Small Lots N of Hornings Tract, Kitchener; Part Lot 39 Small Lots N of Hornings Tract, Kitchener as in 968521 being Part 2 on 58R-17402; PIN 22301-0005 (126 Bloomingdale Road North, Kitchener);

12. Part Lot 37 Small Lots N of Hornings Tract, Kitchener; Part Lot 38 Small Lots N of Hornings Tract, Kitchener as in 746418 being Part 1 on 58R-17402; PIN 22301-0006 (122 Bloomingdale Road North, Kitchener);

13. Part Lot 32 Small Lots N of Hornings Tract, Kitchener as in 1553512 being Part 11 on 17403; PIN 22302-0099 (92 Bloomingdale Road North, Kitchener);

14. Part Lot 39 Small Lots N of Hornings Tract, Kitchener as in 542388 being Part 4 on 58R-17402; PIN 22301-0003 (134 Bloomingdale Road North, Kitchener);

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

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

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

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

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

SUMMARY: NIL

REPORT:

Regional Council approved roadway improvements to Bloomingdale Road (Regional Road 20) from Kraft Drive to Bridge Street in December, 2011 as detailed in report E-11-117. The project improvements consist of complete replacement of the existing asphalt platform, construction of 1.25 metre reserved on-road cycling lanes on each side of Bloomingdale Road from Kraft Drive to Bridge Street and installation of sections of sidewalks on both sides of the Bloomingdale Road where they currently do not exist. Construction is scheduled for the summer of 2015.

Land acquisitions as outlined in the Recommendation will be required from fourteen (14) 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 been reached with three property owners. As at the writing of this report one of these transactions has been completed and the property is not included in this expropriation. There is also an acquisition required from the City of Kitchener that has not been included in the expropriation as a negotiated agreement is expected. 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 acquisition the Region assumes all responsibility for the lands.

The Project Area is shown attached as Appendix “A”.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

Two strategic objectives of the Corporate Strategic Plan are to develop, promote and integrate active forms of transportation (cycling and walking), and to optimize existing road capacity to safely manage traffic throughout Waterloo Region.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Transportation and Environmental Services staff advises that the 2013 Transportation Capital Program includes funds of $1,295,000 in the years 2013 to 2015 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.

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 “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
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.
THAT Council of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the expropriation of lands for the purpose of reconstruction of Weber Street West between College Street and Guelph Street, in the City of Kitchener, in the Region of Waterloo as detailed in Report CR-RS-13-010 dated January 29, 2013, described as follows:

Fee Simple Partial Taking:

1. Part of Lot 8, Plan 373 being Parts 4 and 5 on 58R-17416, City of Kitchener, PIN 22332-0021 (LT) (306 Guelph Street, Kitchener);
2. Part of Lot 8, Plan 373 being Part 6 on 58R-17416, City of Kitchener, PIN 22325-0009 (LT) (307 Guelph Street, Kitchener);
3. Part of Lot 8 Plan 373 being Part 11 on 58R-17416, City of Kitchener, PIN 22326-0174 (LT) (26 Blucher Street, Kitchener);
4. Part of Lot 8, Plan 373 being Part 2 on 58R-17416, City of Kitchener, PIN 22332-0019 (LT) (340 Weber Street West, Kitchener);
5. Part Lot 8, Plan 373 being Part 9 on 58R-17416, City of Kitchener, PIN 22326-0176 (LT) (315 Weber Street West, Kitchener);
6. Part of Lot 8, Plan 373 being Part 8 on 58R-17416, City of Kitchener, PIN 22326-0177 (LT) (319 Weber Street West, Kitchener);
7. Part of Lot 8, Plan 373, being Part 3 on 58R-17416, City of Kitchener, PIN 22332-0020 (LT) (336 Weber Street West, Kitchener);
8. Part of Lot 8 Plan 373, being Part 7 on 58R-17416, City of Kitchener, PIN 22326-0167 (LT) (295 Guelph Street, Kitchener); and

Fee Simple Full Taking:

1. Lot 24, Plan 131, City of Kitchener, PIN 22326-0193 (LT) (269 Weber St W, Kitchener);
2. Part Lot 8, Plan 373, City of Kitchener, PIN 22331-0095 (LT) (296 Guelph Street, Kitchener);
3. Part Lot 8, Plan 373, City of Kitchener, PIN 22331-0097 (LT) (345 Weber Street West, Kitchener);

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

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

AND THAT if no agreement as to compensation is made with an owner, the statutory Offer of Compensation and payment be served upon the registered owners of the property in the amount of the market value of the interests in the land as estimated by the Region’s appraiser in accordance with the Expropriations Act;

AND FURTHER THAT the Regional Solicitor be authorized to discontinue expropriation proceedings or any part thereof, in respect of the above described lands, or any part thereof, upon the registration on title of the required documentation to complete the transaction.

SUMMARY:

NIL

REPORT:

Regional Council approved the reconstruction of the Weber Street West (Regional Road 8) corridor from College Street to Guelph Street and a grade separation of Weber Street at the CN Railway Tracks (GEXR), in the City of Kitchener on June 29, 2011 (the “Project”). With this Project the Region seeks to achieve the following objectives:

a. to widen Weber Street from 2 lanes to 4 lanes to provide north/south capacity improvements to accommodate future growth and reduce delays for vehicles and transit;
b. to construct a grade separation at the crossing of the CN Rail corridor, which will provide improvements to accommodate increases in rail traffic movements and reduce traffic delays and conflicts at the existing level railway crossing; and
c. to enhance facilities for transit, cyclists and pedestrians and to reduce traffic collisions.

Construction will be undertaken in two phases. Phase 1 from College Street northerly to Wilhelm Street, including the grade separation, will be constructed in 2013-2014. Phase 2 from Wilhelm Street north to Guelph Street, will be constructed in 2014.

Council approved the commencement of expropriation of the required lands for Phase 2, being either full buyouts or partial takings from 20 properties, on April 25th, 2012, as detailed in Report CR-RS-12-019. The appropriate forms under the Expropriations Act were served in order to initiate formal proceedings under the Act for these properties. All of the affected property owners were previously contacted by Legal Services staff and informed of the project as well as the Region’s intention to commence the expropriation process and the Region’s Expropriation Information Sheet was provided to each of them. Legal Services staff also contacted all property owners and informed them of the Region’s intention to continue with the expropriation process in order to ensure that the construction timeline is maintained, including this report being presented to Council, as detailed in
the Region’s Expropriation Information Sheet.

To date the Region has acquired through a negotiated purchase agreement 6 full buyout properties and none of the partial takings. There is a purchase agreement for 1 of the above noted full takings that is scheduled to be completed on or before January 13, 2013. If this purchase transaction is completed by registration of a Transfer on title conveying interest in the lands to the Region as scheduled Legal Services staff will cease expropriation proceedings with those owners. The remaining land acquisitions are full and partial takings for road widening purposes. Legal Services staff intends to continue attempts to negotiate with the remaining property owners and it is hoped that satisfactory agreements as to compensation can be reached.

As reported to Council in Report CR-RS-12-071 the Region received a notice for a Hearing of Necessity from the owners of 311 Weber Street West. The hearing was held on August 15th, 2012. The Report of the Inquiry Officer was received on September 5, 2012 and in order to meet the requirements of the *Expropriations Act*, Regional Council considered the Report of the Inquiry Officer at its meeting on November 21, 2012 and approved the expropriation of part of 311 Weber Street West.

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

Once ownership by the Region is secured through the registration of the Plan, it is possible to serve the Notice of Possession. The date for possession can be no sooner than three months following the date of service of the Notice of Possession. The Notices of Expropriation and Notices of Possession may be served at the same time. In order to meet the construction time line possession of all the required lands is needed before the end of August, 2013. Accordingly, Legal Services staff will be proceeding expeditiously to register the Expropriation Plan and serve the Notices of Expropriation and Notices of Possession following approval by Regional Council.

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

The expropriation of the lands is on an “as is” basis and upon registration of the Plan of Expropriation the Region assumes all responsibility for the lands.

The subject lands are shown on the plan attached as Appendix ‘A’.

**CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

One of the focus areas of the Corporate Strategic Plan is to develop greater, more sustainable and safe transportation choices.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

1332683
Transportation and Environmental Services staff advises that the 2013 Ten Year Transportation Capital Program contains funding in the amount of $39,655,000 during the years 2013 to 2015 for the Weber Street project to be funded from the Development Charge and Roads Capital Levy reserve funds. Adequate funds are available in the approved Program for the acquisition of the properties listed in this report.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

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

ATTACHMENTS

Appendix ‘A’ – location map of lands

PREPARED BY: Fiona McCrea, Solicitor, Property

APPROVED BY: Gary Sosnoski, Commissioner, Corporate Resources
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: January 29, 2013

FILE CODE: T04-20, 5110

SUBJECT: VICTORIA STREET IMPROVEMENTS FROM EDNA STREET TO BRUCE STREET, CITY OF KITCHENER – PUBLIC INPUT MEETING FOR THE PREFERRED DESIGN CONCEPT

RECOMMENDATION:

For information in advance of the Public Input Meeting for the Victoria Street (Edna Street to Bruce Street) Class Environmental Assessment Study to be held on Wednesday, February 6 at 6:00 p.m. in the Regional Council Chamber at 150 Frederick Street, Kitchener, Ontario.

SUMMARY:

The Region of Waterloo is undertaking a Class Environmental Assessment study to develop an operational and safety improvement strategy for the Victoria Street corridor between Edna Street and Bruce Street, in the City of Kitchener. The study limits are indicated on the Key Plan in Appendix “A”. The study is being guided by a Project Team consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo and City of Kitchener Councillors Daniel Glenn-Graham and Scott Davey, along with input from the Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO).

The Victoria Street (Edna Street to Bruce Street) Class Environmental Assessment was initiated in 2010 to address the need for improvements to reduce mid-block collisions largely associated with congestion and turning movements at commercial driveway locations. Two workshops were held with business and property owners located within the study area to gather feedback, discuss the nature of the problem and develop possible solutions. Those who attended the workshops generally agreed with the need to address the collision problems and participated in developing Alternative Design Concepts for consideration. The Project Team has reviewed and made modifications to the Alternative Design Concepts and evaluated them with particular emphasis on safety benefits, traffic operations, potential impacts on the natural environment and the social/economic environment, and costs.

In August 2012, the Provincial Government announced that the MTO would begin construction on New Highway 7 in 2015. This reversed a previous decision by the MTO (in 2010) to remove the new highway project from their five year plan. The New Highway 7 project will include replacement of the Conestoga Expressway bridge on Victoria Street and changes to the existing on and off ramp configurations. The Project Team has reviewed anticipated impacts of the new highway construction on the Victoria Street corridor and generated a modified Design Concept that will serve as a solution to meet present needs with an opportunity to adapt to future needs when New Highway 7 is open.

Based on the evaluation of Alternative Design Concepts, a thorough review of all public input received, and in consideration of the MTO’s plans for proceeding with New Highway 7 construction, the Project Team has identified Alternative Design Concept 2A – Narrow Centre Concrete Median and Widening for Future Two Way Left Turn Lane - as the Preferred Design Concept. Alternative Design Concept 2A includes: a continuous narrow centre concrete median on Victoria
Street between Edna Street and Bruce Street; widening of Victoria Street from Edna Street to the Conestoga Expressway bridge to accommodate a future two way left turn lane and; infill sidewalk along the south side of Victoria Street between Edna Street and the Conestoga Expressway bridge. Cross sections for the Preferred Design Concept are included in Appendix “B”.

The Preferred Design Concept is to be presented for further public review and comment at a Public Input Meeting (PIM) of Regional Planning and Works Committee on February 6, 2013, in the Regional Council Chamber at 150 Frederick Street, Kitchener at 6:00 pm. Following the PIM, the Project Team will review comments received and report back to Regional Planning and Works Committee with responses and identification of a Recommended Design Concept for approval by Regional Council in early 2013. Subject to approval by Regional Council, the Environmental Assessment Project File will be made available for a 30-day public review and subsequent approval by the Minister of Environment.

The estimated cost for the Project Team’s Preferred Design Concept is $1.4 million with anticipated construction of the improvements scheduled for 2014.

REPORT:

1. Background

The Region of Waterloo is undertaking a Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) study for the development of an operational and safety improvement strategy primarily to address high mid-block collision rates at commercial driveways along the Victoria Street Corridor between Edna Street and Bruce Street in the City of Kitchener. The study is following Schedule “B” of the Municipal Class EA process (2011). The study limits are indicated on the Key Plan in Appendix “A”. The study is being guided by a Project Team consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo and City of Kitchener Councillors Daniel Glenn-Graham and Scott Davey, along with input from the Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO).

For more than 10 years, the study area along Victoria Street has consistently been included on the Region’s list of worst collision locations. This section of Victoria Street experiences unique collision patterns resulting from congested peak hour operations, extensive intersection queuing, high turning volumes in and out of commercial driveways and tight spacing of commercial driveway locations. A key contributor to existing congestion in this corridor is traffic attempting to access the Conestoga Expressway ramps on Edna Street and Bruce Street. During peak times, the queuing at the ramp locations often reaches Victoria Street which, in turn, results in queuing on Victoria Street at the Edna Street and Bruce Street intersections.

The Region periodically reviews and optimizes traffic signal timing within the corridor; however, this has not been successful in resolving all the operational and safety concerns, primarily due to operational constraints on the system. Additional improvements are required within the study area to address current operational issues and safety concerns.

The existing pavement structure in the study area requires rehabilitation and existing traffic signal infrastructure needs to be replaced at the Edna Street and Bruce Street intersections due to age and condition. These improvements will need to be incorporated in the final Design Concept.

1.1 New Highway 7

One of the challenges encountered with this Victoria Street Class EA study has been the uncertain timing of New Highway 7. When the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) constructs New Highway 7 between Kitchener and Guelph it will attract most of the commuters that are presently using Victoria Street as a route between the two cities. It will also significantly change the highway ramp configuration in the vicinity of Victoria Street. Primary access to both the Conestoga Expressway
and the new highway will shift from the Edna Street and Bruce Street ramps to new ramps that will be constructed at Wellington Street and Shirley Avenue. A copy of the preliminary layout plan for New Highway 7 at the Conestoga Expressway is included in Appendix “C”.

Once New Highway 7 is constructed, the change in highway access and reduced traffic volumes will significantly alter traffic operations on Victoria Street between Edna Street and Bruce Street. Therefore, decisions made within the Victoria Street study area are heavily influenced by the proposed configuration and construction timing of the new highway. MTO’s schedule for New Highway 7 construction has changed several times over the last ten years and the uncertainty has prompted the Region to delay the start of the Victoria Street Class EA on several occasions. The mid-block collision rate on Victoria Street between Edna Street and Bruce Street has continued to rise and Regional staff made a decision to formally initiate the Victoria Street Class EA study (at a time when New Highway 7 was not in the MTO’s five year plan) to address the operational and safety concerns in this corridor under the assumption that New Highway 7 would not be constructed in the near future.

In August 2012 the Provincial Government advanced the anticipated timing of New Highway 7 by announcing that it would proceed to construction within three years. Based on this announcement, with a construction duration estimated at approximately 5 years, New Highway 7 could be operational as early as 2020. Rather than placing the Victoria Street EA on hold again, the Project Team decided to focus on selecting a Preferred Design Concept that would accommodate ultimate needs in the corridor once New Highway 7 is open, while still addressing the immediate collision concerns that are present today.

1.2 Collisions

Collision data compiled by Region staff for the section of Victoria Street from Edna Street to Bruce Street identifies 75 actual collisions versus 31 expected collisions in the mid-block for the period of 2007 to 2011. This location is historically prone to collisions and the ranking has been getting worse over time. Victoria Street from Edna Street to Bruce Street ranked as the 11th worst location in the Region’s most recent annual collision report. It is important to note that the Region’s annual collision report compiles intersections and mid-block locations together. Among mid-block locations only, this section of Victoria Street ranked as the 3rd worst location in the Region.

The type of collisions occurring along this section of Victoria Street often result in injuries (1 in 5 collisions between 2007-2011 involved injury) and there was a fatality in this location in 2005. Typically, 75% of the collisions in the study area are either rear-end or sideswipe type collisions. Although other factors can be involved, many of these collisions within the study area occur when a vehicle is waiting in the through lane to turn left in to a driveway and the driver behind either does not stop in time (rear-end) or makes a last second decision to change lanes (sideswipe).

1.3 Speed Survey

A speed survey at a mid-block location within the study area was undertaken by Region staff for a 24 hour period on June 5th and 6th, 2012. The posted speed in the corridor is 60 km/hr. The survey data indicates that the average speed is 54 km/hr and the 85th percentile speed is 66 km/hr (ie. 85% of all vehicles travel at less than 66 km/hr). The 85th percentile speed is quite low and the small spread between the average speed and 85th percentile speed suggests that speeds are fairly consistent most of the time. Approximately 65% of vehicles travel under the speed limit, likely due to the congestion in this area during peak times.

Collision data indicates that 96% of collisions take place between 9:00am and 7:00pm when the average speed is 53 km/hr. More than half of collisions (54%) take place in the three hour afternoon peak from 3:00pm to 6:00pm when the average speed is 52 km/hr.
Based on the results of the speed survey study and comparative collision review, the vast majority of collisions are taking place during periods of congestion when speeds are low. This data, combined with the type of collisions reported (rear-end, sideswipe and turning) suggests that the accidents are more directly related to the turning movements taking place, rather than to high speeds.

1.4 Operational Issues

The Victoria Street intersections at Edna Street and Bruce Street are congested during peak times. The westbound left turn movement at Edna Street and the eastbound right turn movement at Bruce Street are particularly heavy as many vehicles are destined for the Conestoga Expressway on-ramps located on Edna Street and Bruce Street. During peak periods these Expressway on-ramp intersections experience traffic queuing that extends to Victoria Street.

During peak times, the traffic queuing from the Expressway on-ramps has a major impact on the traffic operations on Victoria Street between Edna Street and Bruce Street. At these peak times, left turns from Victoria Street to Edna Street are delayed during the traffic signal green time and the resulting left turn queue on Victoria Street extends as far back as the Expressway bridge. The left-turn queuing on Victoria Street at Edna Street encroaches into the Victoria Street west bound through lanes forcing through traffic to a single curb lane which in-turn experiences significant queuing. East bound drivers on Victoria Street looking to turn left into the north side commercial driveways along this section of Victoria Street have a difficult time finding a gap in the west bound traffic (left turn and through traffic queuing) and block the inside eastbound lane while waiting, thereby forcing east bound drivers to a single curb lane.

Similarly, during peak times, right turns from Victoria Street to Bruce Street are delayed by queuing at the Bruce Street Expressway ramp and the resulting right turn queue on Victoria Street extends as far back as the Expressway bridge. The right turn queuing on Victoria Street at Bruce Street forces east bound through traffic to the inside lane which in-turn experiences significant queuing.

The congestion during peak traffic times described above results in drivers weaving from lane to lane and stopping suddenly which frequently leads to collisions. At these times, operations at the commercial entrances also suffer from this congestion as it makes left turns in or out difficult and queues form in the driveways. Frustrated drivers trying to make left turns often start moving across one lane at a time in an attempt to ‘force’ gaps in traffic which can also result in collisions.

1.5 Cycling, Pedestrian and Transit Needs

The section of Victoria Street between Edna Street and the Conestoga Expressway bridge has been previously identified as a corridor requiring infill sidewalk on the south side of the road. This recommendation is also included in the current draft of the Region’s Active Transportation Master Plan (ATMP). There is currently a narrow paved maintenance strip behind the curb along this section of Victoria Street that is often mistaken for a sidewalk. Although pedestrian activity is currently fairly low along this corridor, the sidewalk connection is required on the south side to help complete the walking network in the area and provide a more comfortable pedestrian environment.

The Regional Cycling Master Plan and the current draft of the ATMP both identify alternate cycling routes in the area that route cyclists around this portion of the Victoria Street corridor. Therefore, no short or long term cycling needs have been identified within the project limits.

There are no current transit routes along this section of Victoria Street; however, the Region’s Official Plan identifies Victoria Street as a future transit priority corridor. Transportation Planning has indicated that the approximate time frame for adding a transit route through this section is 2016/2017. Provisions for future transit facilities will be considered as part of the detailed design process.
2. **Public Consultation**

2.1 **Business and Property Owners Workshops**

Two workshops were held with business and property owners adjacent to the road allowance within the project limits. For the first workshop, letters were mailed out and hand delivered to business and property owners on Victoria Street between Edna Street and the Conestoga Expressway bridge inviting them to attend the workshop with Project Team members to introduce the project and gather feedback. The objectives of the first workshop were to identify current problems, develop alternative solutions, and identify the evaluation criteria for the assessment of impacts and benefits of the alternative solutions.

Representatives from three of the eleven businesses attended the first workshop (KW Surplus, Suzuki of KW and Weston Bakeries). The workshop attendees identified many of the collision and operational issues outlined in Section 1 of this report. They also noted that some drivers already avoid making left turns directly in or out of driveways, choosing to make right turns and U-turns instead, or turning in to driveways at less congested locations and cutting through adjacent properties to reach their destination. A variety of suggested improvements were developed at the workshop and condensed into four Alternative Design Concepts for further consideration by the Project Team:

**Design Concept 1 - Centre Two Way Left Turn Lane (TWLTL):** Similar to other sections of Victoria Street, a centre turn lane would be provided as a refuge for drivers headed in either direction, waiting to turn left in to driveways, or for drivers turning left out of driveways and waiting to merge with traffic. The TWLTL would tie in to the existing westbound left turn lane at Edna Street and taper out at the west side of the Conestoga Expressway bridge.

**Design Concept 2 - Centre Concrete Median:** The centre concrete median would extend between the Edna Street intersection and Bruce Street intersection and eliminate left in and left out movements from driveways within this section of Victoria Street. U-turns would be permitted at the Edna Street and Bruce Street intersections for cars and small trucks.

**Design Concept 3 - Centre Concrete Median with Roundabouts at Victoria/Edna and Victoria/Bruce:** Similar to Design Concept 2 with the addition of roundabouts at the Edna Street and Bruce Street intersections. Roundabouts would allow all vehicles to make U-turns at the Edna Street and Bruce Street intersections.

**Design Concept 4 - Centre Concrete Median with Traffic Signals Mid-Block:** Similar to Design Concept 2 with the addition of a new signalized intersection at a mid-block location that would provide an alternate location for left turn access to the commercial properties within this section of Victoria Street. Internal driveway connections between properties would need to be implemented for this Design Concept.

A brief review of the impacts and benefits of each of the four Alternative Design Concepts was undertaken at the first workshop in conjunction with the business/property owners. Sketches of the Design Concepts have subsequently been created by the Project Team and further evaluated with particular emphasis on safety benefits, impacts on traffic operations, implementation costs, and potential impacts on the natural environment and social/economic environment.

A second workshop was held with business and property owners adjacent to the road allowance within the project limits in the spring of 2012. Again, letters were mailed out and hand delivered to business and property owners on Victoria Street between Edna Street and the Conestoga Expressway bridge inviting them to attend the second workshop with Project Team members. At the
second workshop, Alternative Design Concepts 3 and 4 were identified as having been assessed and screened out from further consideration by the Project Team. Alternative Design Concept 3 had been screened out primarily due to the considerable property impacts that the roundabouts would have along with very high costs. Alternative Design Concept 4 had been screened out as a mid-block signalized intersection would not meet conventional warrants and would result in increased operational problems within the corridor and within the driveways on private property.

The Project Team presented Alternative Design Concepts 1 and 2 as the short-listed alternatives with Alternative Design Concept 2 (Centre Concrete Median) as the Project Team's Preliminary Preferred Design Concept. The second workshop was organized with business and property owners to outline the rationale in screening out Alternative Design Concepts 3 and 4, review the assessment and comparative evaluation of Alternative Design Concepts 1 and 2, and discuss the Project Team's Preliminary Preferred Design Concept and any other concerns.

Representatives from five of the eleven businesses attended the second workshop (Ashton Pools, Factory Shoe, KW Surplus, Suncor and Suzuki of KW). The workshop attendees recognized the safety benefits associated with Alternative Design Concept 2 (Centre Concrete Median) but expressed concerns regarding property access. KW Surplus indicated a preference for Alternative Design Concept 2 as long as delivery truck access to their loading bays could be accommodated. The other participants generally indicated a preference for an alternative that would not restrict left turns in and out of driveways. The Project Team noted that since the Edna Street and Bruce Street intersections are in close proximity, U-turns would be available for vehicles wishing to “turn left” to their properties. The Project Team also noted that the Edna Street/Frederick Street/Bruce Street block provides an alternate means of access for delivery vehicles and for those drivers uncomfortable making U-turns.

Although KW Surplus expressed a preference for Alternative Design Concept 2, there was little support by the other business and property owners attending the workshop for either of the short-listed design alternatives. Instead, several attendees suggested addressing perceived speed issues in the corridor without altering the roadway configuration. In essence, their preference was for a ‘Do Nothing’ Alternative with enhanced speed control. When prompted for a preference between the two short-listed options, three of the five business/property owners in attendance expressed a preference for Alternative Design Concept 1 - Centre Two Way Left Turn Lane, to maintain full access at driveway locations. A summary of the main issues raised at the workshop and responses by the Project Team are included in Section 4 and Appendix “D” of this report.

3. Assessment and Evaluation of Alternative Design Concepts

The Alternative Design Concepts have been assessed and evaluated by the Project Team with respect to impacts on the project environment related to:

- Safety (ability to address collision history concerns in this corridor)
- Traffic Operations (ability to accommodate expected vehicular and pedestrian traffic needs)
- Economic Environment (impact on commercial activities, anticipated capital/property costs)
- Property (impact on access, parking, buildings)
- Social Environment (impacts on pedestrians, noise impacts, air quality)
- Natural Environment (effect on existing vegetation, storm drainage, wildlife and wildlife habitat)

In 2010, the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) had removed New Highway 7 from their 5 year construction plan, so during the time that the Project Team initially assessed the Alternative Design Concepts for Victoria Street, the time frame for construction of the new highway was indefinite. Based on this, the Project Team had agreed that for the purpose of the Victoria Street study, it would be assumed that the existing Highway 7 and Conestoga Expressway infrastructure would remain in its current configuration well into the future. Thus the base assumption in assessing the
alternatives initially was that Victoria Street traffic volumes would continue to rise in the foreseeable future and that congestion and queuing at the Edna and Bruce Street intersections would increase accordingly.

The announcement in August 2012 that New Highway 7 will proceed to construction by 2015 altered the Project Team’s base assumption about the project’s timing. If the MTO moves ahead with its current plan, the Victoria Street bridge would be replaced with a longer and wider structure, three of the four on ramps to the Conestoga Expressway would be closed at Edna Street and Bruce Street, and the new highway would carry most of the commuter traffic between Kitchener and Guelph (possibly by 2020). As such, the Project Team re-assessed its Preliminary Preferred Design Concept in consideration of the New Highway 7 construction timing and considered a “modified” Design Concept that would address the immediate collision concerns that are present today while still accommodating ultimate needs in the corridor once New Highway 7 is open.

**Design Concept 2A - Narrow Centre Concrete Median and Widening for Future Two Way Left Turn Lane (TWLTL)** – The narrow centre concrete median would extend between the Edna Street intersection and Bruce Street intersection and eliminate left in and left out movements from driveways within this section of Victoria Street. U-turns would be permitted at the Edna Street and Bruce Street intersections for cars and small trucks. Victoria Street would be widened to provide a long westbound left turn lane to Edna Street in the short term until New Highway 7 is operational. This short term widening will be constructed wide enough to accommodate a future TWLTL (when New Highway 7 is constructed) which would “tie in” to the existing westbound left turn lane at Edna Street and a future lengthened left turn lane at Bruce Street (over the widened Conestoga Expressway bridge). During New Highway 7 construction (at the time that the Victoria Street bridge is replaced), the narrow concrete median would be removed as a retrofit and the road converted to the TWLTL configuration.

The Project Team has now selected Alternative Design Concept 2A as the Preferred Design Concept. A full assessment of all Alternative Design Concepts and rationale for this selection is included in Appendix “E” and a comparative analysis of the short-listed Alternative Design Concepts is included in Appendix “F”.

4. **Concerns Raised by Business Owners**

In general, business owners recognize the current collision problem, traffic congestion and operational difficulties within the study area. They acknowledge the challenge that their customers face trying to turn left in or left out of the commercial entrances in this area during peak traffic periods. Some have even noted that they personally adjust their own route in to work or heading home such that they don’t need to make a left turn movement in or out of one of the driveways. Many have witnessed collisions (or heard them taking place) just in front of their businesses; however, several business owners have expressed concerns with those Design Concepts that include a centre concrete median due to perceived impacts on their business access and operations. In implementing the Preferred Design Concept (Alternative 2A), the Project Team expects that the key issue for business owners will be the changes in the way that customers and delivery truck drivers access their properties in the short term.

As the centre concrete median would prevent left turns into and out of commercial entrances, drivers wanting to access the opposite side of the street would either need to plan their route accordingly (use the Edna/Frederick/Bruce block as a means of changing their direction of travel) or make a U-turn at the Victoria/Edna or Victoria/Bruce intersection. Local widening would be provided to allow cars and small trucks to make U-turn movements easily and the Region could consider additional signage to make drivers aware that U-turns are permissible at these locations.

Larger delivery vehicles would need to alter their route (using the Edna/Frederick/Bruce block) to
change their direction of travel. Further discussion would take place with individual business owners during the detailed design stage to ensure that this transition would take place smoothly and to address any outstanding concerns. The Region has been working with KW Surplus to determine turning movement requirements and establish a practical driveway configuration at that location. Turning movement needs at other individual driveway locations may also need to be addressed during detailed design. There are many options that could be considered to improve the existing access configurations such as larger entrance radii, semi-mountable portions of the boulevard, and semi-mountable portions of the centre median.

It is acknowledged that these route changes are undesirable to property and business owners in the short term. New Highway 7 construction will permit the removal of the centre concrete median and its conversion to a TWLTL when the Victoria Street bridge is replaced and the Expressway ramps are reconfigured; however, the timing of the MTO’s bridge replacement is currently undetermined and may not take place for several years. Because of the serious collision problem currently occurring in the corridor, the Project Team unanimously agreed that it is necessary to implement a centre concrete median in the interim as it is the most effective solution available to address existing collision and congestion issues. The Project Team notes that the aforementioned mitigating factors (U-turns and short alternate routes) will minimize any potential adverse access impacts to the adjacent properties. The Preferred Design Concept also allows for a future retrofit to a Two Way Left Turn Lane (as the Victoria Street bridge is reconstructed and the Expressway ramps are reconfigured at Victoria Street) when it is expected that reduced traffic volumes will make it a viable and effective configuration for this project.

A more comprehensive list of questions and concerns raised at the workshops are summarized in Appendix “D” along with responses from the Project Team.

5. Project Team Preferred Design Concept

Based on a review of the technical information gathered for this project, and in consideration of the evaluation of the benefits/opportunities of the Alternative Design Concepts, as well as a thorough review of all public comments received, the Project Team has identified Alternative Design Concept 2A – Narrow Centre Concrete Median and Widening for Future Two Way Left Turn Lane as the Preferred Design Concept for this Class EA Study.

Until the Victoria Street bridge is replaced as part of New Highway 7 construction, it is expected that traffic volumes on Victoria Street will remain high and likely continue to rise. Although the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) has set a start date for New Highway 7 construction, the exact timing of the Victoria Street bridge replacement is uncertain.

The Project Team recognizes the need for Victoria Street improvements to address the safety and operational issues that currently exist in the corridor and may continue to exist at least in the short term until New Highway 7 is operational. The Preferred Design Concept effectively addresses the collision problems identified under current traffic conditions and can be easily adapted to a TWLTL configuration during construction of New Highway 7 when the Victoria Street bridge is replaced and the Expressway ramps are reconfigured.

Additional property along Victoria Street is not required for Alternative Design Concept 2A, except possibly for Hydro easements at some pole locations. New sidewalk will be provided along the south side of Victoria Street and existing sidewalk will be replaced where impacted in areas of roadway widening. The existing pavement structure will be rehabilitated and the traffic signal infrastructure at the Edna Street and Bruce Street intersections will be replaced.

It is recognized that the centre concrete median will require route changes for customers and delivery vehicles wanting to turn left in or out of commercial entrances along this section of Victoria
Street in the short term. These effects would be mitigated through design elements at the Edna Street and Bruce Street intersections to allow U-turns for cars and small trucks and by the availability of the relatively short alternate route of the Edna/Frederick/Bruce block for larger delivery trucks or for those uncomfortable making a U-turn.

If the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) is able to provide a construction schedule for the New Highway 7 project, prior to the Region’s Victoria Street project proceeding, that confirms the Victoria Street bridge replacement is scheduled early in the MTO’s Highway 7 project (ie. 2015/2016), staff would recommend that the Region construct Victoria Street to the ultimate TWLTL configuration in conjunction with the MTO project rather than constructing the centre concrete median first. If the Victoria Street bridge replacement is scheduled later in the staging process, or the timing remains uncertain at the time that the Region’s Victoria Street project proceeds, the centre concrete median would be constructed initially and removed in conjunction with the future MTO bridge replacement. The “throw-away costs” associated with installing and subsequently removing the centre concrete median would be approximately $120,000.

The Project Team has identified Alternative Design Concept 2A as the solution that offers the most flexibility to effectively address the current collision and operational problems while providing the ability to adapt the design at an appropriate time to meet future traffic needs.

6. Project Cost

The capital cost for the Preferred Design Concept is estimated to be $1.4 million. The final cost will be further refined as part of the detailed design phase and will depend in part on costs for relocation of utilities. New sidewalks included in the conceptual estimate are expected to cost approximately $30,000.

7. Next Steps

After the Public Input Meeting on February 6, 2013, the Project Team will consider and address any additional issues raised by the public in order to develop a Recommended Design Concept. It is anticipated that the Project Team’s Recommended Design Concept will be presented to the Planning and Works Committee of the Region of Waterloo for their consideration in March 2013, and pending Committee’s endorsement, a recommendation will be considered by Regional Council in late March/early April 2013. All members of the public who have expressed an interest in this project will be notified directly of all future opportunities to comment before a final decision is made for this project.

Subject to Regional Council approval of the Recommended Design Concept, the Project File will be completed and a “Notice of Study Completion” will be filed in the public record for a 30 day review period. This filing will be advertised by mail-outs and notices in newspapers. If someone feels that the study did not fully address all of the issues, they can request that the Minister of Environment order the project to a more detailed environmental assessment, referred to as a Part II Order request. The Minister of Environment must receive such requests in writing, with a copy sent to the Region’s Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services. The Minister will determine if a more detailed environmental assessment is required and the Minister’s decision will be final.

If there are no significant unresolved objections following the 30 day review period, the project will proceed to detailed design and construction. It is anticipated that implementation of improvements will begin with utility relocations in late 2013 or early 2014 and roadway construction in the summer/fall of 2014.

Staff will continue to liaise with the MTO with respect to the New Highway 7 construction schedule. Notwithstanding the timing noted above, the Victoria Street bridge replacement timing would dictate the Region’s course of action with respect to the centre concrete median. If New Highway 7 construction is delayed in the MTO’s construction program, the narrow concrete median would be
constructed on Victoria Street as an interim safety measure. If New Highway 7 moves ahead as planned, but the Victoria Street bridge reconstruction is scheduled in the latter stages, the Region would construct the concrete centre median initially and remove it in conjunction with the bridge replacement. If New Highway 7 goes ahead and the bridge replacement is scheduled early in the construction process, the Region could consider adjusting its timing of the Victoria Street project and construct the ultimate TWLTL configuration initially, instead of constructing the centre concrete median.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This project is consistent with the development of Strategic Focus Area 2 (Growth Management and Prosperity) in terms of developing, optimizing and maintaining infrastructure to meet current and projected needs. It is also consistent with the development of Strategic Focus Area 3 (Sustainable Transportation) in terms of developing, promoting and integrating active forms of transportation (walking) and optimizing existing road capacity to safely manage traffic.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The 2013 Transportation Capital Program includes $1.51 million over the years 2013 to 2015 for the design and construction of this project to be funded from the Region Development Charges Reserve Fund.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Nil
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APPENDIX “A”

KEY PLAN OF STUDY AREA
VICTORIA STREET FROM EDNA STREET TO BRUCE STREET
CLASS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 2A (PREFERRED DESIGN CONCEPT)
NARROW CENTRE CONCRETE MEDIAN AND WIDENING FOR FUTURE TWO WAY LEFT TURN LANE
APPENDIX “C”

PRELIMINARY LAYOUT PLAN
NEW HIGHWAY 7 AT THE CONESTOGA EXPRESSWAY

PROPOSED NEW BRIDGE(S)

X – ON/OFF RAMP TO BE CLOSED
APPENDIX “D”

QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS RAISED BY PROPERTY AND BUSINESS OWNERS

Questions and concerns raised at the public consultation workshops by the business and property owners within the study area are summarized below, along with responses from the Project Team.

Two Way Left Turn Lanes

Several business owners noted that Two Way Left Turn Lanes (TWLTLs) seem to be working well on other sections of Victoria Street and questioned why the Project Team had concerns about a similar configuration for this project.

Project Team Response:

Other sections of Victoria Street with a Two Way Left Turn Lane (TWLTL) are working reasonably well (although some still demonstrate similar collision patterns related to turns in and out of driveways). The main difference along this section of Victoria Street is the operation of the intersections at Edna Street and Bruce Street in association with the traffic queuing from the Expressway on ramps. These intersections have heavy turning movements and are very congested at peak times, primarily because they serve as main access points to the Expressway. This results in increased congestion within the Victoria Street mid-block which would limit the effectiveness of a TWLTL during those peak times under current traffic conditions.

The eastbound left turn lane at Victoria/Edna often has 200 metre to 300 metre long queues during peak times. During these times, queued vehicles would occupy the entire length of a TWLTL if implemented at the present time.

The number of driveways between Edna Street and the Expressway bridge would also limit the effectiveness of a TWLTL with the current level of congestion. When several vehicles are attempting to turn left into a business on either side of Victoria Street and occupy the TWLTL at the same time, drivers in the through lanes may not be sure which driveways these vehicles are trying to access or whether they are in the queue to turn left at Edna Street. This could result in additional traffic weaving in and out of the TWLTL and through traffic lanes, and raise the potential for sideswipe and rear-end accidents. The confusion generated during peak times would also create a potential for head on collisions within the TWLTL.

Two Way Left Turn Lanes generally function well when Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) volumes are moderate (10,000 to 28,000 vehicles/day). Victoria Street, between Edna and Bruce has an existing AADT of approximately 30,000 vehicles/day, and is expected to increase over the short term. The traffic volumes, combined with the intersection queuing and tight driveway spacing suggests that a TWLTL will not function well under current traffic conditions and may result in increased collision rates over the existing condition.

As future traffic levels on Victoria Street are projected to drop significantly when New Highway 7 is open, a TWLTL would be a viable alternative for this corridor at that time, particularly as reduced intersection queuing at Edna Street and Bruce Street is also anticipated.
**Signal Timing Adjustments**

A number of workshop attendees suggested that the advanced left turn signal time should be increased at Edna Street to reduce queuing.

**Project Team Response:**

The signal timing at Edna Street needs to be balanced with the signal timing at the Expressway ramp. All movements at each intersection need to be taken into consideration in balancing this timing as increasing green time for one movement takes green time away from other movements. Major adjustments to signal timing in favour of Victoria Street traffic could result in longer queues for vehicles exiting the Expressway which would be a more significant concern.

During detailed design, once the lane configuration is established on Victoria Street, the Region will investigate opportunities to further improve the signal timing at Victoria Street intersections at Edna Street and Bruce Street.

**Route changes**

One of the primary questions expressed by business owners is how customers and delivery vehicles would access businesses on the opposite side of the street if a centre concrete median is implemented.

**Project Team Response:**

Drivers wanting to access the opposite side of the street would either need to plan their route accordingly (use the Edna/Frederick/Bruce block as a means of changing their direction of travel), or make a U-turn at the Victoria/Edna or Victoria/Bruce intersection.

Although U-turns are legal at intersections that are not signed otherwise, many drivers are not aware of this. The Region could consider additional signage to make drivers aware that U-turns are permissible at these locations.

It is recognized that U-turns may add to the congestion at the Victoria/Edna and Victoria/Bruce intersections and may have further impacts on signal timing. The anticipated U-turn volumes would need to be considered when making adjustments to the signal timing at these intersections.

Large delivery vehicles would need to alter their route (using the Edna/Frederick/Bruce block) to change their direction of travel. Further discussion would be required with individual business owners during the detailed design stage to ensure that this transition would take place smoothly and to address any outstanding concerns.

**Truck Turning Movements Into Driveways**

Concerns were raised about truck movements in and out of driveways if a centre concrete median is implemented. It was noted that some businesses have delivery trucks that currently use the full width of Victoria Street for manoeuvres, particularly where loading bays are close to the roadway.

**Project Team Response:**

The Region has been working with KW Surplus to determine turning movement requirements and establish a practical driveway configuration at that location. Turning movement needs at other individual driveway locations may also need to be addressed during detailed design. There are many options that could be considered to improve the existing access configurations such as larger entrance radii, semi-mountable portions of the boulevard, and semi-mountable portions of the centre median. It is however noted by the
Project Team that discouraging manoeuvres across the entire roadway width is a positive effect of the centre concrete median option, as long as appropriate measures are implemented to allow for truck access where required. During detailed design, the Region will meet with each property owner to confirm truck access needs.

**Speed Concerns and Speed Reduction Measures**

A primary concern raised at the second workshop relates to concerns about speeds along this stretch of Victoria Street. In particular, there were concerns expressed regarding the posted speed (60km/h as opposed to 50km/h which is posted further west). It was also noted that motorists speed up considerably heading west from Bruce Street as they cross the Expressway bridge and several workshop attendees expressed a desire to see the speed limit reduced in this area. It was suggested by some of the business owners that speed may be the major contributor to the accident rates experienced within the corridor.

**Project Team Response:**

In test cases studied by the Region, operating speeds have not been reduced in locations where posted speeds were reduced (in many cases, the operating speed increased). Region Transportation staff attribute this to the fact that drivers tend to drive at speeds that feel comfortable to them based on their surroundings, rather than according to the posted speed. The Region has found that physically changing road corridors by reducing lane widths and adding other features such as curbing, trees etc. that give a more ‘crowded’ feel to the roadway has been more effective in reducing speeds.

Speed plays a role in most collisions, but it is not the only factor to consider. The collision pattern on Victoria Street, between Edna and Bruce is clearly indicative of problems associated with turning movements. Many of the collisions are directly with vehicles making a turn in or out of a driveway. Many of the other collisions (rear end or sideswipe) are associated with drivers hitting a vehicle waiting to turn into a driveway or making a last second decision to change lanes to try to avoid hitting a stopped vehicle.

Based on data from the period 2006-2010, 96% of collisions are taking place between 9:00am and 7:00pm. Based on a speed survey study on Victoria Street between Edna Street and Bruce Street conducted by the Region in June 2012, the average speed on this section of Victoria Street is 53 km/hr at this time of day with an 85th percentile speed of 64 km/hr.

The same data indicates that 54% of collisions are taking place during the afternoon peak (3:00pm – 6:00pm) when the average speed is 52 km/hr and the 85th percentile speed is 64 km/hr.

The collision and speed data indicate that the vast majority of collisions are taking place during periods of congestion when speeds are low. This data, combined with the type of collisions reported (rear-end, sideswipe and turning) suggests that the accidents are more directly related to the turning movements taking place, rather than to high speeds.

**Speed Reduction Measures**

A variety of measures were suggested by business and property owners to reduce operating speeds including: ongoing enforcement, speed notification signs, rumble strips, flashing yellow lights, and installation of a ‘singing median’.

**Project Team Response:**

Based on Regional pilot studies, police enforcement is rarely an effective means of reducing operating speeds. In test areas, operating speeds were found to stay about the same, or in
some cases increase, both during and after intensified speed enforcement. Long term, ongoing enforcement may be more effective, but can be quite costly. Requests for increased enforcement can be made by Region staff should speeding become a safety concern but ultimately it is up to Police Services staff to prioritize locations.

Speed notification signs (electronic signs that detect and display vehicular speeds) can be used in instances where the speed limit has been reduced to draw further attention to the change; however, the effectiveness of these signs is reduced over time, particularly if drivers come to realize that there are no associated implications (ie. if enforcement is not present on a regular and ongoing basis).

Rumble strips are intended to notify drivers that there is a stop ahead. If the Region were to start installing them for other applications (such as on Victoria Street), their meaning would become confused which could reduce their effectiveness in areas of intended use.

Flashing yellow lights are used by the Region to draw attention to signage that is particularly important for safety reasons (school zones, speed advisory signs on sharp curves, etc.). Overuse of flashing lights would limit their effectiveness (ie. if every speed limit sign had a flashing light, over time, drivers would not notice the light any more than they would notice the sign).

Singing medians (continuous rumble strips down the centre median) are intended to notify drivers to stay off of that section of roadway. This would not be an appropriate treatment for a Two Way Left Turn Lane or if the intent is to allow drivers to cross over the median.

The Region will consider appropriate measures to encourage driving at reasonable speeds as part of the detailed design.
APPENDIX “E”
ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPTS

The Project Team has selected Alternative Design Concept 2A as the Preferred Design Concept. An assessment of the alternatives considered and the rationale for this selection is included below.

Assessment of Alternative Design Concept 1 (Centre Two Way Left Turn Lane)

Upon initial consideration, the Project Team viewed Alternative Design Concept 1 as a viable alternative to help address turning collision issues in the study area. Two Way Left Turn Lanes (TWLTLs) are commonly implemented in corridors where mid-block turning movements are problematic. The TWLTL can act as a refuge area for those waiting to turn left in to a driveway, or for those turning out of a driveway waiting to merge with traffic. However, based on a review of traffic operations within the study area, the Project Team expects that collision rates could be as high or higher than the ‘Do Nothing’ alternative if Alternative Design Concept 1 is implemented under current traffic conditions on Victoria Street.

Traffic levels on Victoria Street are currently higher than the threshold at which a TWLTL is typically considered effective. Based on current queuing for the westbound left turn movement at the Victoria/Edna intersection, most of the TWLTL would be occupied during peak periods, further reducing its effectiveness. Turning left out of driveways is currently difficult during peak periods (when most accidents are occurring) with the existing four lane configuration. Adding a TWLTL that is frequently occupied (and difficult to turn in to) would add another lane to cross. It may also be more difficult to judge traffic gaps on the opposite side of the road. This could dissuade more drivers from turning left out of driveways, or it could result in more collisions.

With drivers trying to access the many driveways between Edna Street and the Expressway bridge from both directions, combined with the anticipated queuing from the Edna Street intersection, it would be difficult to judge when a driver wanting to turn left into one of the driveways should enter the TWLTL. This confusion could result in more sudden braking and rear-end collisions, more drivers moving in and out of the TWLTL causing side-swipe collisions, possible head on collisions in the TWLTL and more angle-type collisions with people trying to cross the TWLTL.

This alternative is potentially less effective than the ‘Do Nothing’ option if implemented under current traffic conditions as it would not likely reduce (and may actually increase) current collision rates. A TWLTL could be effective in reducing collisions if traffic volumes were lower and intersection queuing was reduced (particularly the left turn queuing at Edna Street). When New Highway 7 is open, these reductions are likely, which would allow for implementation of a TWLTL. It would serve as a continuous connection between the left turn lane at Edna Street and the future lengthened left turn lane at Bruce Street (over the widened Conestoga Expressway bridge).

Assessment of Alternative Design Concept 2 (Centre Concrete Median)

Alternative Design Concept 2 achieves the primary objective of this study (to reduce mid-block collisions) under the current traffic conditions as it would be expected to reduce collisions by at least 25%. The Project Team initially preferred this alternative prior to the MTO’s latest announcement regarding New Highway 7. A modified version of this alternative has been developed (Alternative Design Concept 2A) to take into account the impacts of the new highway construction on the Victoria Street corridor.

It is expected that a centre concrete median will result in a significant reduction in collisions under current traffic conditions. Left turns in and out of driveways would no longer be feasible which would eliminate collisions directly related to these turning movements entirely, and significantly reduce collisions that are indirectly related to these movements (rear-end and side-swipe). Potential impacts to businesses in eliminating the left turns in and out of driveways can be mitigated through properly designed intersections at Edna and Bruce to allow U-turns and by the availability of a
relatively short alternate route (Edna/Frederick/Bruce block) for large delivery trucks or for those uncomfortable making a U-turn.

This alternative would help ease congestion on this section of Victoria Street during peak times as vehicles would no longer block the through lane while waiting to make left turn movements at driveways. Driveways would operate more effectively as drivers would not be waiting for long periods of time to attempt a left out movement. An extension of the westbound left turn lane at Edna Street would be feasible which may further reduce congestion in the through lanes. Introducing a centre median and reducing lane widths will also help give the roadway a more constrained feel which may help to reduce travel speeds.

As it is currently anticipated that New Highway 7 construction will significantly reduce traffic on Victoria Street and reduce left turn queues at the Edna Street intersection, the net benefit of a centre concrete median may be diminished in the ultimate condition. With lesser congestion and better operations in the corridor, a Two Way Left Turn Lane may ultimately provide comparable safety benefits while still offering ease of access to adjacent commercial properties.

**Assessment of Alternative Design Concept 2A (Narrow Centre Concrete Median and Widening for Potential Future Two Way Left Turn Lane)**

Alternative Design Concept 2A combines the immediate benefits of Alternative Design Concept 2 with the ultimate benefits of Alternative Design Concept 1. The centre concrete median would achieve the primary objective of this study (to reduce mid-block collisions) under current traffic conditions, with the flexibility to adapt to a TWLTL when New Highway 7 is constructed and traffic volumes are lower. The Project Team has identified Alternative Design Concept 2A as the Preferred Design Concept.

The narrow centre concrete median would offer all of the safety benefits as outlined above for Alternative Design Concept 2 under current traffic conditions. When the Victoria Street bridge is replaced as part of New Highway 7 construction, the centre concrete median can be removed with minimal additional reconstruction. With lower traffic volumes and reduced intersection queuing, a TWLTL would act as an effective refuge area for vehicles turning left in to or out of commercial driveways. The TWLTL would form a continuous connection between the left turn lane at Edna Street and the future lengthened left turn lane at Bruce Street (over the widened Conestoga Expressway bridge).

The timing of the Victoria Street bridge replacement would dictate the Region’s course of action with respect to the centre concrete median. If New Highway 7 construction is delayed in the MTO’s construction program, the narrow concrete median would be constructed on Victoria Street as an interim safety measure. If New Highway 7 moves ahead as planned, but the Victoria Street bridge reconstruction is scheduled in the latter stages, the Region would construct the concrete centre median initially and remove it in conjunction with the bridge replacement. If New Highway 7 goes ahead and the bridge replacement is scheduled early in the construction process, the Region could consider adjusting its timing of the Victoria Street project and construct the ultimate TWLTL configuration initially, instead of constructing the centre concrete median.

**Assessment of Alternative Design Concept 3 (Centre Concrete Median with Roundabouts)**

Alternative Design Concept 3 is a modified version of Alternative Design Concept 2 developed during the first workshop as a means of providing easier access to commercial driveways. The centre concrete median prevents drivers from turning left in to and out of the commercial entrances. Roundabouts at both ends of the corridor would provide an easy means of making a U-turn both for customers and for delivery truck drivers. This would be more convenient than making a U-turn at the traffic signals or having to change routes to use the Edna Street/Frederick Street/Bruce Street block to turn around.
Although this alternative offers easier driveway access within the study area, The Project Team screened out Alternative Design Concept 3 from further consideration due to the extensive property purchase that would be required to implement roundabouts at the Edna Street and Bruce Street intersections. Full buy-outs of at least six businesses would be necessary along with major impacts to at least two others. Estimated costs for Alternative Design Concept 3 is approximately 7 to 10 times that of the other Alternative Design Concepts and conventional warrants for roundabouts are not present at these intersections (ie. there are no other significant improvements required at either intersection nor any significant safety or operational concerns that would be mitigated by a roundabout).

Assessment of Alternative Design Concept 4 (Centre Concrete Median with Mid-Block Traffic Signal)

Alternative Design Concept 4 also represents a modified version of Alternative Design Concept 2 developed at the first workshop. This alternative would allow drivers to turn left in and out of commercial areas at one specific mid-block location, at a new signalized intersection.

While this concept has worked reasonably well in other locations (Hespeler Road for example), the Project Team screened out Alternative Design Concept 4 from further consideration for several reasons. The existing building and parking lot configuration in the study area does not readily lend itself to a single access point. There is no practical location for internal driveway connections and there is insufficient space to accommodate internal queuing at a new signalized intersection.

Conventional warrants for signals would not be present at this location as there would be insufficient volumes from the ‘plaza’. Mid-block signals would also result in significant operational issues at adjacent intersections due to the close proximity (particularly at Edna where the existing left turn lane would be reduced in length). Shared access to businesses would be required with links between parking areas which may present liability concerns and internal queuing within the ‘plaza’ at the intersection location would result in operational issues within the driveways and parking areas.

Assessment of the ‘Do Nothing’ Alternative

Several attendees at the second workshop suggested a ‘Do Nothing’ alternative in conjunction with measures to try to control travel speeds. This approach would have little to no effect on addressing the existing collision problems or operational challenges and is not preferred by the Project Team.

With a ‘Do Nothing’ alternative, the current high rate of collisions is expected to continue and possibly increase in the short term as traffic volumes increase, resulting in many more injuries. As data collected suggests that current collision patterns are more directly related to congestion and turning movements, speed reduction measures or increased enforcement are likely to have very little effect in reducing accident rates. Therefore, the ‘Do Nothing’ alternative, even with speed reduction measures, does not address the core issues identified in this study.
**APPENDIX "F"**

### COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF SHORT-LISTED ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION CRITERIA</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 1</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 2</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE DESIGN CONCEPT 2A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY (ability to address collision history concerns in this corridor)</td>
<td>Does not adequately address safety concerns identified in this study for current traffic conditions. Potentially creates new safety concerns.</td>
<td>Addresses safety concerns identified in this study for current traffic conditions well.</td>
<td>Concrete median addresses safety concerns identified in this study for current traffic conditions well. Potential TW/TL would address safety needs if future traffic volumes and intersection queuing are reduced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC OPERATIONS (ability to accommodate expected vehicular and pedestrian traffic needs)</td>
<td>Does not improve existing traffic operation challenges. Potentially creates new operational issues.</td>
<td>Provides a moderate level of improvement to existing traffic operations.</td>
<td>Provides a moderate level of improvement to existing traffic operations. If future traffic volumes and intersection queuing are reduced, a TW/TL would function well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT (impact on commercial activities, impact on property access)</td>
<td>No significant impact on commercial activities or property access.</td>
<td>Restricts left in/out access to properties. Mitigating factors included to minimize potential impact on commercial activities.</td>
<td>Concrete median restricts left in/out access to properties. Mitigating factors included to minimize potential impact on commercial activities. TW/TL may enhance property access if future traffic volumes and intersection queuing are reduced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY (impact on access, parking, buildings)</td>
<td>No significant impacts on property. Potential utility easements only.</td>
<td>No significant impacts on property. Potential utility easements only.</td>
<td>No significant impacts on property. Potential utility easements only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT (impacts on pedestrians, cyclists, noise impacts, air quality)</td>
<td>No significant impact on social environment. New sidewalk on south side of Victoria Street to accommodate pedestrians.</td>
<td>No significant impact on social environment. New sidewalk on south side of Victoria Street to accommodate pedestrians.</td>
<td>No significant impact on social environment. New sidewalk on south side of Victoria Street to accommodate pedestrians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATURAL ENVIRONMENT (effect on existing vegetation, storm drainage, wildlife and wildlife habitat)</td>
<td>No significant impact on natural environment.</td>
<td>No significant impact on natural environment.</td>
<td>No impact on natural environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COST (capital cost and property cost)</td>
<td>$1.2 million.</td>
<td>$1.4 million.</td>
<td>$1.4 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL RANK</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REGION OF WATERLOO
TRANSIT SERVICE (GRT)

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

DATE: January 29, 2013

FILE CODE: A-34-41

SUBJECT: GRT ACCESSIBILITY UPDATE

RECOMMENDATION:

For Information.

SUMMARY:

This report provides an update on some recent GRT successes to enhance transit accessibility to ensure compliance with the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) requirements and also to improve access for all transit customers.

REPORT:

In December 2012 a multi-year Accessibility Plan was approved by Regional Council (Report CR-CLK-12-019) in accordance with the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities (AODA). This multi-year plan also included the GRT Accessibility Plan which outlined the many initiatives implemented and underway to ensure compliance with the requirements of the Transportation Standards section of the Integrated Accessibility Regulations (Ontario Regulation 191/11).

This plan was developed with input from the Grand River Accessible Advisory Committee (GRAAC) and the Specialized Transit Services Advisory Committee (STSAC). The report specifies each of the AODA transportation regulatory requirements and how GRT has ensured compliance to date and how they plan to meet the requirements in 2013. This plan is available at the GRT website at www.grt.ca in the Accessibility section.

The following is a summary of some of the highlights from the GRT Accessibility Plan.

1) Low Floor Bus Fleet

With the purchase of replacement buses in September 2012 the entire transit fleet is fully low floor accessible. Low floor buses have no stairs, making it easier for all customers to use conventional transit services. As a result all bus routes in the GRT network are now also fully low floor accessible.

In 2012 there were 139,300 trips provided to MobilityPLUS customers on conventional low floor transit bus routes. These trips can be taken without requiring the customer to make a trip reservation which is a requirement of the MobilityPLUS service which leads to more spontaneous travel. With the added assurance that every bus is low floor accessible the ridership is expected to continue to increase. A travel training program has been developed to assist MobilityPLUS customers who want to use the conventional GRT route network.
2) **Automated Bus Stop Announcements**

Also with the purchase of these replacement buses in September all transit buses are also fully equipped with the technology to make automated bus stop announcements. This feature ensures the next bus stop location is both visually and audibly announced to assist customers in determining when the bus will be arriving at their stop location. In cases where the stop announcement equipment malfunctions or where the bus detours off route the Bus Operator will be required to temporarily make passengers aware and offer assistance to customers. Over the next few months there are plans to update the technology so detours can be easily updated and to introduce manual stop announcements of major cross streets during temporary service disruptions.

3) **GRT website**

Another area where significant progress has been made to improve accessibility is the GRT website. The website is currently compatible with most assistive technology (AT) software which allows the user to convert text only schedule information into an audible format. Going forward there are plans to upgrade the web based trip planner to a more accessible format as well. Currently only the input screens can be fully read with the AT software. The software upgrade which is planned for 2013 will ensure the output or the actual trip plan provided to the customer is also in the accessible format.

4) **AODA Training**

Over the past year all employees in the Transit Services Division participated in AODA customer service awareness training. This training was designed to ensure that all GRT employees are able to assist passengers with disabilities by safely using the accessibility features on the buses and executing the required procedure in the event of equipment failure or emergencies.

As demonstrated by these recent successes outlined above, coupled with the compliance with AODA requirements, Grand River Transit is committed to the continuous development of accessibility of public transit services in Waterloo Region to comply with the legislation and to ensure a barrier free service for all customers.

**CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

Focus Area 5.1.3 - Implement the standards under the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) to comply with Provincial regulations.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

The financial implications for the accessibility initiatives identified above have been included in the Regional capital or operating budgets. This report was provided as an update on these initiatives.

**OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:**

NIL

**PREPARED BY:** Eric Gillespie, Director, Transit Services

**APPROVED BY:** Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Region of Waterloo implement a rainwater harvesting promotion campaign in 2013 as detailed in Report E-13-008.1.

SUMMARY: NIL

REPORT:

Water Services has successfully purchased and distributed 200-litre rain barrels in Waterloo Region for 12 consecutive years. A total of 25,000 rain barrels were distributed to residents at the subsidized cost of $20 each from 2001 to 2005, 15,000 rain barrels were distributed for $30 each from 2006 to 2010, and 6,000 rain barrels were distributed at a cost of $40 each in 2011 and 2012. Cumulative water savings from the 46,000 rain barrels distributed is estimated to be 54,000 cubic metres (m$^3$) per year. The water saved is enough to supply the needs of 212 average households.

In addition to water savings, rain barrel distributions have benefited the community by:

- increasing public awareness about the importance of water conservation;
- encouraging and supporting participation in the Water Conservation By-Law;
- reducing storm water runoff into sewers;
- promoting a conservation ethic that leads to other water saving practices.

The rain barrel distribution was one of several water conservation programs approved in the Water Efficiency Master Plan, 2007 to 2015. Other Council-endorsed outdoor water conservation measures include the Water Conservation By-Law, efficient landscaping seminars and other marketing initiatives. The overall master plan goal is to achieve a cumulative water savings of 8,146 m$^3$ per day by 2015 (1.8 million gallons per day).

The Water Efficiency Advisory Committee (WEAC), through Council, endorsed phasing out rain barrel distributions following the spring of 2012 (Reports E-10-089, E-11-103.1), and to review the options for rainwater harvesting in 2013 and beyond. The main reasons for discontinuing the subsidized 200-litre rain barrel distribution are:

- surveys indicate 1/3 of Region single family households have at least one 200-litre rain barrel and many have two or more barrels, which reflects program maturity;
- the one-day Region distributions attract many of the same participants each year and miss residents that either find the Saturday morning distribution inconvenient or simply do not wish to participate;
- 200-litre rain barrels are less effective at reducing drinking water consumption than other water conservation measures;
the subsidized Region distributions compete with retailer efforts to sell a variety of alternative rain barrels and rainwater harvesting systems;

the Region distribution of smaller rain barrels does not encourage larger scale rainwater harvesting, which would be a more effective water conservation measure.

Staff subsequently reviewed rainwater harvesting program options for 2013 and narrowed it down to the three possibilities listed below.

1. To provide an enhanced rainwater harvesting incentive program that promotes the capture of larger volumes of water for non-potable use.

   Staff concluded that the first option, to provide an enhanced rainwater harvesting incentive program, was premature and best reviewed in detail as part of the Water Efficiency Master Plan (WEMP) Update. The 1.5-year WEMP Update process began in 2013 and will include a review of best practices, including the possibility of a broader rainwater harvesting program.

2. To work with retailers to provide subsidized discount coupons for 200-litre rain barrels.

   The rain barrel coupon option was also eliminated. Staff concluded that the option of distributing a subsidy coupon for 200-litre barrels directly or through Retailers would prove difficult to administer and would be more costly than the one-day distribution method that concluded in 2012. It would also be very difficult to balance a fair sale of rain barrels through the varied retailers in Waterloo Region that currently supply them.

Preferred Program Option

3. To deliver a rainwater harvesting promotion campaign in cooperation with advertisers, the media, retailers, municipal governments and non-profit organizations in Waterloo Region.

   The recommended option is to promote rainwater harvesting in general during a three week period that culminates during “Rainwater Harvesting Week,” which will be held at the same time as Earth Week in 2013. With Council approval, Water Efficiency staff would communicate with retailers to encourage them to feature rain barrel sales during the week of April 21 to April 27, 2013, and to join in a strategic, focused advertising campaign. The intent would be for Waterloo Region to promote rainwater harvesting in general, while community participants would finance separate advertising for their own sales and activities.

Positive feedback for the proposed rainwater harvesting promotion has been received from initial contact with local municipalities and other community organizations.

Water Efficiency and Corporate Communications staff has completed a draft communications strategy for the proposed rainwater harvesting campaign that will target all settlement areas within Waterloo Region. The communications strategy will incorporate the following resources:
Corporate web site & social media
Region News/Environews
Special events and interest group networking
Media relations - unpaid
Newspaper and print advertising
Radio advertising

Following the conclusion of the 2013 rainwater harvesting campaign, staff will provide Committee and Council with results, analyses and recommendations regarding the program direction for 2014.

Water Efficiency Advisory Committee Endorsement

The Water Efficiency Advisory Committee (WEAC) reviewed, discussed and endorsed the recommended rainwater harvesting campaign, as detailed in E-13-008.1, during a meeting held January 9, 2013. WEAC members encouraged staff to deliver communications to all sectors within the Region, including residential, school, commercial, industrial and institutional markets. It was noted that several organizations engage in a variety of Earth Week activities that would facilitate cross-promotional opportunities.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The implementation of the Rainwater Harvesting Program relates to the Strategic Focus Area 1: Environmental Sustainability: Protect and enhance the environment. The strategic objective 1.4 states “Protect the quality and the quantity of our drinking water sources.”

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The upset budget allocation for the proposed 2013 rain barrel promotion campaign is a maximum of $30,000. Funds for this project will come from the approved 2013 Outdoor Water Use Capital Budget, which totals $180,000. The remaining funds in this budget are allocated to other outdoor water use reduction projects such as Water Conservation By-law enforcement, advertising and promotion.

Water Efficiency capital projects are financed through Regional Development Charges.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

The recommended 2013 rainwater harvesting promotion campaign is being developed in close consultation with Corporate Communications.

ATTACHMENTS: Nil

PREPARED BY: Steve Gombos, Manager, Water Efficiency, Water Services
APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
REPORT:

The Region has been approached by Cambridge and North Dumfries Hydro Inc. with a request for installation of radio repeater equipment on the tower effective the 1st day of February 2013. Regional staff recommend entering into a License Agreement effective the 1st day of February 2013, whereby: (i) the term of the License Agreement will be five (5) years, with two optional renewal terms of five (5) years each; (ii) Cambridge and North Dumfries Hydro Inc. will have the right to install, operate and maintain radio repeater equipment at the tower as approved by the Region; and (iii) Cambridge and North Dumfries Hydro Inc. will pay two ($2.00) dollars per year, plus all applicable taxes throughout the term of the License Agreement and any renewal(s) thereof.

Should additional equipment be required to be added, Cambridge and North Dumfries Hydro Inc. will formally submit a request. If approved by the Region, Cambridge and North Dumfries Hydro Inc. is required to have a pre- and post-inspection done by a Region approved contractor on the tower to ensure that damage does not occur during the installation of the new equipment. Should damage occur to the tower or to Region equipment, Cambridge and North Dumfries Hydro Inc. is responsible for all associated repairs.

Cambridge and North Dumfries Hydro Inc. acknowledges that the efficient, unimpaired and uninterrupted functioning of the Region’s operational systems, including, but not limited to its waterworks system and emergency services communication equipment, is of paramount importance to the health, welfare and safety of the public. Cambridge and North Dumfries Hydro Inc. therefore covenant and agree to immediately, upon request of the Region, cease any or all activities and transmissions at or from the tower where the activities and transmissions have interfered with or disrupted, or may interfere with or disrupt, the Region’s operational systems or emergency services communications equipment.

Security of the site is maintained as per the signed License Agreement. Water staff is notified any time the site is accessed.
CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

In maintaining Agreements with the local business community, the Region supports Strategic Priority #5: Service Excellence.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The Region will not be responsible for any costs related to the proposed License. The licensing fee of two ($2.00) dollars per year plus all applicable taxes will be applied to the operating budget. Cambridge and North Dumfries Hydro Inc. will be responsible for pre- and post-inspections as maintenance is required.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Legal Services and Facilities Management were consulted in the negotiation of the terms of the new Agreement and they are in concurrence with the recommended direction.

ATTACHMENTS

NIL

PREPARED BY: Olga Vrentzos, Manager, Water Operations & Maintenance

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environment Services
MEMORANDUM

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

From: Brenna MacKinnon, Manager, Greenfield Planning

Subject: NEW CANADA POST FEES FOR DEVELOPERS

Effective January 1, 2013, Canada Post began charging developers a one-time fee of $200 per address to install community mail boxes and set up addresses in new residential and commercial developments. The fee does not apply to multi-unit developments that share a common indoor entrance. Multi-unit developers are currently responsible for building mail rooms and installing mail room equipment.

Canada Post has communicated its mandate from the Government of Canada to be financially self-sustaining; that while the core mail business has declined, more than 150,000 new addresses are added each year to the delivery network and that the sharing of a portion of the costs of installing and activating community mail boxes is necessary to maintain its level of service.

The Region circulates Canada Post on subdivision and condominium applications, resulting in a standard condition imposed on developers through the Area Municipal subdivision agreement, to complete, at their own cost, the base infrastructure (e.g. concrete pad and curb) required for the installation of community mail boxes. Developers will now be responsible for entering into a Community Mailbox Developer Agreement and pay the address activation fee by way of a security deposit to Canada Post. The developer is expected to notify Canada Post of key project dates such as the site release date and first occupancy dates.

Planning staff have met with representatives from the Waterloo Region Homebuilders Association who have expressed serious concern over the imposition of the new fees by Canada Post. A letter, co-authored by the Ontario Home Builders’ Association, explains its concerns in greater detail.

Regional staff will continue to discuss this matter with the Area Municipalities, and any recommended actions will be forwarded to Regional Council in future reports.
October 29, 2012

Ms. Josephine Polak
Vice President, Communications and Public Affairs
Canada Post
2701 Riverside Drive, Suite N1200
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0B1

Dear Ms. Polak,

*Re: Changes to the Process of Installing Community Mail Boxes in New Developments*

The Building Industry and Land Development Association and the Ontario Home Builders’ Association are in receipt of the October 18th letter from Canada Post with respect to changes to the process of installing community mail boxes (CMB) in new developments. I have attached a copy of the aforementioned letter. We wish to take this opportunity to raise significant concerns we have for the one-time fee to developers of $200 per address, to install and activate CMBs and addresses in new developments.

BILD and OHBA are strongly opposed to this charge for the following reasons:

1. The letter indicates that Canada Post has historically incurred the full cost of installing CMBs and activating all addresses in new developments. This is simply not the case. Our industry already accepts initial infrastructure costs associated with building either mail rooms in high-rise developments or super mail box pads in low-rise developments. These costs far exceed the installation of mailboxes, and the costs are not transferred back to Canada Post to absorb.

2. Additionally, when our industry builds mailrooms and super mail boxes this effectively lowers Canada Post’s operations and maintenance costs on a per unit basis. New community residents have accepted ‘the walk to the mailbox’ in an effort to support service efficiency. This creates efficiencies where Canada Post is the sole and primary beneficiary.

3. The letter also indicates that over the past five years, Canada Post has experienced a rapid decline in mail, leading to the corporation’s unprecedented financial losses. This is an unfortunately circumstance, but our industry should not be the ones to accept the
displacement of burden for operational shortfalls nor should we be called upon to subsidize existing door to door delivery in older established neighbourhoods.

Our industry has been very supportive of Canada Post over the years. We strongly believe this is an opportunity, especially with respect to new development projects, to re-think an existing business model and modernize practices in an era of rapid technology growth. We welcome the opportunity to discuss this matter with you in further detail, and as an interested and significantly affected stakeholder, would appreciate the opportunity for consultation.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact the undersigned. We very much look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

Paula Tenuta, MCIP, RPP
Vice President, Policy & Government Relations
BILD

Michael Collins-Williams, MCIP, RPP
Director, Policy
OHBA

cc: Jacques Cote, Group, President, Physical Delivery, Canada Post
Wayne Beaton, Canada Post Delivery Planning Manager, Canada Post
Canadian Homes Builders’ Association
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: January 29, 2013

FILE CODE: D06-50

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO PROPOSED AMENDMENT 2 TO THE GROWTH PLAN FOR THE GREATER GOLDEN HORSESHOE

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT Report No. P-13-005, dated January 29, 2013, be adopted as Regional Council’s formal response to Proposed Amendment 2 to the Provincial Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe;

THAT the Ontario Growth Secretariat be requested to use any revised figures on an interim basis only until the initiation in 2016 of the comprehensive review of the Provincial Growth Plan;

AND THAT the Province of Ontario assess the merits of better coordinating and potentially merging other related Provincial policy with the Growth Plan.

SUMMARY:

In 2006, the Province of Ontario established the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (the Growth Plan). The Growth Plan is a key Provincial policy document that mandates compact growth, higher densities of development, and higher order transit and includes forecasts of population and employment growth for communities in the Greater Golden Horseshoe. In late November of 2012, the Province issued “Proposed Amendment 2” to the Growth Plan, which proposes to revise and extend the population and employment growth forecasts to the year 2041.

This report has been prepared as the recommended response by Regional Council. The Province is seeking feedback by February 8, 2013. Regional staff support the forecast figures to 2031, but recommend further review of the 2036 and 2041 figures, and with a lesser (notional) status being given to both of these longer timeframes. In addition, any revisions should only be in place until the Province comprehensively reviews the Growth Plan in 2016. Finally, given the number of Provincial policy documents that currently exist, reviews should be better coordinated, and if possible, Provincial policy should be merged to assist in resolving competing and conflicting priorities.

REPORT:

Overview

In November of 2012, the Provincial government (through the Ontario Growth Secretariat) issued Proposed Amendment 2 to the Provincial Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (the Growth Plan). The purpose of this amendment is to refine some of the forecast figures currently contained in the Growth Plan, and to extend the forecast to the years 2036 and 2041. Since the Growth Plan will be comprehensively reviewed in 2016, this forecast is expected to be reviewed again at that time as well. The current Growth Plan forecasts are contained in Attachment 1 of this report, while the proposed Provincial forecasts are contained in Attachment 2.

The Provincial government is seeking comments on the proposed Amendment by February 8, 2013.
This report has been prepared as the recommended formal response of Regional Council.

**Key Considerations of the Proposed Provincial Amendment**

The following aspects of the (new) proposed growth forecasts are particularly worthy of note:

- The forecasts to the year 2031 are identical to the existing forecasts in the current growth plan and the Regional Official Plan, and remain supported by Regional staff.

- The forecasts for 2036 and 2041 are new to the Growth Plan and reflect lower growth rates than to the year 2031. Provincial staff has indicated that the lower growth rate was in part based on an assumption that water and wastewater infrastructure would be operating at full capacity and would thereby limit growth.

- Undertaking a forecast to the year 2041 is a very challenging exercise, and a thirty year projection should always be considered a general estimate of growth only.

- The forecasts contained in Proposed Amendment 2 are to be reviewed again in 2016 as part of a comprehensive review of the Growth Plan. Consequently, any revised figures should only be used on an interim basis.

- Based on the Region’s size and economic position, there appear to be inconsistencies with other communities, particularly when compared to Niagara Region, Hamilton, Barrie, Brant County and Brantford. For example, the Region of Waterloo is expected to grow in population by 11.8% from 2031 to 2041, compared to 34.1% for the City of Brantford. Likewise, employment is expected to grow by 7.4% for the Region of Waterloo from 2031 to 2041 compared to 22.5% for the Region of Niagara.

- The growth forecasts contained in the Growth Plan are important, as the figures are used for such purposes as assessing land supply and absorption, and infrastructure planning. The figures are also significant from an economic development perspective, to reflect the Region as a growth centre, both provincially and nationally.

- The growth forecasts should not be viewed as a simple translation to greater land need. This is particularly significant given the increasing densities of new development and the guiding direction of the Regional Official Plan to continue to support compact growth and to contain outward sprawl. A dominant focus remains on the Rapid Transit Corridor, particularly around station areas. In fact, the Growth Plan mandates that by 2015, 40% of new residential development be located within built-up areas of communities. In 2011, this figure was over 55% in the Region of Waterloo, well above the Provincial figure.

**Comparative Scenarios**

Regional staff has compiled the following four scenarios as a means of putting into context the 2031 to 2041 forecasts contained in Proposed Amendment 2:

**Scenario 1:** Population and employment as contained in the Province’s Proposed Amendment 2.

**Scenario 2:** The application of the same rate of population and employment growth for the Region of Waterloo from 2021 to 2031 (15%), to the 2031 to 2041 period.

**Scenario 3:** Application of the total Outer Ring (excludes Toronto, Hamilton, Durham, Peel and York) average projected growth level (19%) to the Region of Waterloo.
Scenario 4: The Provincial growth forecast, but assuming no limits to water and wastewater capacity being able to support growth.

The figures associated with each scenario are provided in Attachment 3 of this report, and Attachment 4 graphs these figures.

Implications of the Comparative Scenarios

The Provincial government’s growth forecasts, as currently contained in Proposed Amendment 2, remain consistent with those of the current growth plan to the year 2031, and remain supported by Regional staff. In fact, the Regional Official Plan is based on the forecast to 2031.

However, the growth projections from 2031 to 2041 reflect a lower rate of growth than may be expected (compared to the period up to 2031) for the Region of Waterloo. In addition, it is unclear why other communities (e.g. Niagara, Brant, Brantford, Hamilton and Barrie) appear to be forecast at a higher rate, particularly given Waterloo Region’s economic position as a major provincial and national growth centre. The Region of Waterloo is already the 4th largest community in Ontario, the tenth largest in Canada, and is often cited as an increasingly globally competitive community.

Based on the four scenarios described in this report, the Province should review its 2036 and 2041 figures in the context of scenarios 2, 3 and 4 described in this report. Since the forecasting model resides with the Province, it would require rerunning these scenarios to confirm their accuracy and to ensure that the same methodology is being applied to all communities in the Greater Golden Horseshoe. A different status should also be assigned to the 2036 and 2041 figures (in that they are notional only and even less certain than the shorter-term forecast to 2031). Regardless of the 2036 and 2041 figures that are ultimately chosen by the Province, the entire forecast is expected to be reviewed again in 2016 as part of the Province’s comprehensive review of the Growth Plan.

Finally, the Provincial Growth Plan remains a key statement of Provincial policy. However, other important and related Provincial policy documents, like the Provincial Policy Statement and the Greenbelt Plan, also undergo review from time-to-time. At a minimum, reviews of related Provincial policy should occur at the same time. In addition, the Province should examine the merits of merging Provincial policy documents, particularly as a means of resolving competing and conflicting priorities.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

A draft copy of this report was circulated to all Area Municipal Planning Heads.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This proposed response to Proposed Amendment 2 to the Growth Plan is a key consideration of Focus Area 2 of the Corporate Strategic Plan (Growth Management and Prosperity) – Manage Growth to foster thriving and productive urban and rural communities.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

There are no financial implications relating to the review of the proposed growth forecasts. However, the figures ultimately approved by the Province could have significant implications on such matters as infrastructure planning, as described in this report.
OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Staff from Transportation and Environmental Services was consulted in the preparation of this report.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment 1 – Distribution of Population & Employment for the Greater Golden Horseshoe 2031-2041 (currently in Growth Plan)
Attachment 2 – Distribution of Population and Employment for the Greater golden Horseshoe to 2041 (Proposed Provincial Amendment No. 2)
Attachment 3 – Population and Employment Growth Scenarios for the Region of Waterloo, 2031-2041 (Table)
Attachment 4 – Population and Employment Growth Scenarios: 2031-2041 (Graph)

PREPARED AND APPROVED BY:  Rob Horne, Commissioner
Planning, Housing and Community Services
### Attachment 1

#### Distribution of Population and Employment for the Greater Golden Horseshoe 2001-2031 (figures in 000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region of Durham</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of York</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Toronto</td>
<td>2,590</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>2,930</td>
<td>3,080</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Peel</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Halton</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hamilton</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTAH TOTAL**</td>
<td>5,810</td>
<td>6,860</td>
<td>7,770</td>
<td>8,620</td>
<td>2,950</td>
<td>3,630</td>
<td>4,040</td>
<td>4,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Northumberland</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Peterborough*</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Peterborough*</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Kawartha Lakes</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Simcoe*</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Barrie*</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Orilla*</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Dufferin</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Wellington*</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Guelph*</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Waterloo</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Brant*</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Brantford*</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Haldimand</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Niagara</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTER RING TOTAL**</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>2,230</td>
<td>2,560</td>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>1,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GGH**</td>
<td>7,790</td>
<td>9,090</td>
<td>10,330</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>3,810</td>
<td>4,640</td>
<td>5,170</td>
<td>5,560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers rounded off to nearest 10,000 for GTAH municipalities, GTAH Total and Outer Ring Total, and to nearest 1,000 for outer ring municipalities.
* Separate forecasts for these municipalities for 2021 and 2031 will be determined.
** Totals may not add up due to rounding.
Schedules

Schedule 3 is replaced by the following Schedule 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution of Population and Employment for the Greater Golden Horseshoe to 2041 (figures in 000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region of Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Peel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Halton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTAH TOTAL**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Northumberland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Peterborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Peterborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Kawartha Lakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Simcoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Barrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Orillia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Dufferin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Wellington*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Guelph*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Brant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Brantford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Halton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Niagara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTER RING TOTAL**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GGH**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers rounded off to nearest 10,000 for GTA municipalities, GTA Total and Outer Ring Total, and to nearest 1,000 for outer ring municipalities.

*Population growth of 24,000 and employment growth of 12,000 are currently unallocated between the County of Wellington and the City of Guelph for 2031. The unallocated forecast portion is not included in the forecasts for these municipalities for 2031 but is included in the Outer Ring Total and in the GGH Total for 2031.

**Total may not add up due to rounding and unallocated amounts which are included in the totals.
### Population and Employment Forecast Scenarios for Region of Waterloo, 2031-2041

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region of Waterloo Scenarios</th>
<th>Population (thousands)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Employment (thousands)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2031 2036 2041</td>
<td>Growth 2031-2041</td>
<td>2031 2036 2041</td>
<td>Growth 2031-2041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenario 1: As described in proposed Provincial Amendment</strong></td>
<td>729  779  815</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>366  377  393</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenario 2: Applying same rate of growth between 2021 and 2031 to the 2031 to 2041 period</strong></td>
<td>729  782  835</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>366  389  411</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenario 3: Applying the Outer Ring Growth Rate</strong></td>
<td>729  805  868</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>366  404  436</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenario 4: No infrastructure limitations</strong></td>
<td>729  825  902</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>366  401  439</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outer Ring Total</strong></td>
<td>2,880  3,180  3,420</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1,240  1,370  1,480</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Greater Golden Horseshoe</strong></td>
<td>11,500  12,740  13,480</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5,560  5,920  6,250</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Population and Employment Growth Scenarios: 2031-2041

Scenario 1
Scenario 2
Scenario 3
Scenario 4

Population
Employment

Year
2031
2036
2041
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee  
DATE: January 29, 2013  
FILE CODE: D10-20  
SUBJECT: REGION OF WATERLOO KING/VICTORIA TRANSIT HUB UPDATE  

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo receive Report No. P-13-006, dated January 29, 2013 for information, and endorse the implementation of recommendations from the Heritage Impact Assessment for the King/Victoria Transit Hub, as summarized in this report.

SUMMARY:

Over the past five years, the Region of Waterloo has purchased several properties at the intersection of King and Victoria Streets for the purpose of developing a transit hub, and planning for the site is well underway. The development of the transit hub will not only link the future Rapid Transit, GRT conventional transit, GO and Via train services, GO and other inter-city bus lines into one seamless public transportation system, it will also serve as a significant catalyst for additional development on this property and within this part of the City of Kitchener known as the “Innovation District”. As the property owner, the intention of the Region of Waterloo is to achieve a landmark gateway development that is comfortable and convenient for pedestrians and seamlessly connected to transit.

The development of the Hub is directly linked to a number of other ongoing Regional projects including: the Community Building Strategy; the Weber Street grade separation; the King Street grade separation; the development of the Rapid Transit System; and the realignment of the Grand River Transit (GRT) conventional transit system. Coordination of these projects is of a high priority in order to ensure proper alignment of schedules, construction staging and interfaces, and public consultation/information processes. All of these projects are being undertaken in direct consultation with the Transit Hub Project Team, which includes Regional Councillors Jean Haalboom, Jim Wideman and Sean Strickland, City of Kitchener staff and Kitchener Councillor Dan Glenn-Graham.

A number of studies and approval processes are being undertaken or have been completed to ready the site for interim uses and for future use as a transit hub and a major new development site. These include: the submission of planning applications to the City of Kitchener to provide for future private sector development of the site (including the completion of a Heritage Impact Assessment for the former Rumpel Felt building); development of a Preliminary Site Design and Station Area Access Plan; remediation of the site; the required environmental assessments for the eventual closing of Waterloo Street to vehicular through traffic and the development of various transportation facilities associated with the facility (including the future GO Rail and VIA Rail platform); and a market scoping study to determine the viability of various future uses of the site. The site has also been prepared for use as an interim parking area to support riders of GO and VIA Rail and to provide temporary parking facilities to assist the City of Kitchener in its economic development initiatives (until such time as additional parking is constructed elsewhere).
As part of the formal application to amend the City’s Official Plan and Zoning By-law, a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) was required by, and submitted to, the City of Kitchener. The HIA found that only the 1913 portion of the Rumpel Felt Co. building located at 60 Victoria Street North is considered to meet the criteria for designation under Regulation 9/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act, and listed the following heritage attributes of the structure: the original 1913 facades, riveted shear plate column construction, door hardware, goods lift (circa 1913), original boiler, entry columns and porch, wooden pipes, and the massing of the building for its contribution to public special and historical experience. The Rumpel Felt Co. building has already been appropriately secured and is being monitored and maintained by the Region of Waterloo. The HIA recommends that the 1913 portion of the Rumpel Felt Co. building be conserved through adaptive reuse and that a Conservation Plan be submitted as part of any future site plan application for new development.

The City of Kitchener Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) has reviewed the HIA and recommended that the City proceed with listing 60 Victoria Street North on the Municipal Heritage Register.

The HIA has also been presented to the Region’s Heritage Planning Advisory Committee (HPAC) for information and to keep the Committee apprised of the Hub development process. Regional Cultural Heritage staff also support the HIA recommendations.

The conservation of 1913 portion of the Rumpel Felt Co. building through adaptive re-use does not sterilize the planned redevelopment of this portion of the site, as the heritage review process allows for the consideration of a wide range of development options, including alteration and additions. However, as the actual development of the site may be several years in the future, the treatment and context of the 1913 Rumpel Felt Co. building would need to be examined in greater detail at that time.

At this point, Regional staff is working with the City of Kitchener to formally confirm, with regard to the 1913 portion of the Rumpel Felt Co. building:

i) That the 1913 portion of the structure is being properly maintained (e.g. roof, basic heating, and is secured) by the Region of Waterloo; and

ii) That as anticipated by the HIA, future additions and/or alterations to the structure will be considered at key decision points in the site’s redevelopment.

REPORT:

Project Background

Over the past five years, the Region of Waterloo has purchased a number of properties located at or near the intersection of King and Victoria Streets in the City of Kitchener for the purpose of development of a transit hub that could be constructed on the resulting parcel of land in order to connect the future rapid transit system and Grand River Transit to inter-city bus and rail systems serving the Region. As a result of this process, the Region has assembled properties totalling approximately 1.6 hectares (four acres) of land, a significant portion of which may not be required to facilitate the actual transit facilities and as such is developable for other purposes (e.g. office, retail). This report provides an update to the process since the previous update Report No.P12-076, dated August 14, 2012

Project Description

The proposed King/Victoria Transit Hub involves the development of significant transportation infrastructure including: new train platforms to serve inter-city GO train and VIA Rail services; bus bays to support Grand River Transit (GRT) and intercity bus services such as GO bus and other
private sector carriers; underground and at-grade connections to and from the new Regional rapid transit system (light rail); as well as the facilities necessary to support and integrate other transportation modes such as taxis, car share, cycling and pedestrians.

The convergence of high-order transportation at the King/Victoria Transit Hub elevates its importance as a gateway feature to the Region of Waterloo. The proposed Transit Hub could be integrated into a combination of public and private sector developments, potentially including higher density mixed use commercial, office, and residential spaces served by transit and a multi-level underground commercial parking structure.

The Transit Hub project is both a central feature in the development of an integrated inter- and intra-city transit system for the Region of Waterloo, as well as a catalyst to support the development of the City of Kitchener’s planned Innovation District. The prominence of the site makes it imperative that any proposal demonstrate a high standard of design that sets the standard for other developments in the area.

**Progress to Date on Key Items**

1. **Planning Applications** – Formal applications and all associated studies required to support proposed City of Kitchener Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Amendments have been prepared and submitted to the City of Kitchener. The intent of these applications is to allow for the broadest range of uses and higher density appropriate for the site so as to eliminate constraints moving into the design and procurement processes. The Region is also seeking a reduced parking standard for the site in recognition of the high level of access to transit services associated with the site. GSP Group has been retained to assist with these Planning Act application processes. An informal public meeting was jointly held by the Region of Waterloo and the City of Kitchener in September 2012 at the School of Pharmacy with over 250 attendees. City staff is currently reviewing comments received from various agencies and the public and will hold the formal statutory public meeting for the applications under the provisions of the Planning Act in February 2013. City of Kitchener Council is expected to make a decision on the applications shortly thereafter (i.e. March).

2. **Heritage Impact Assessment** - As part of the formal application to amend the City of Kitchener Official Plan and Zoning By-law, a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) was required by, submitted to, and has been approved by the City of Kitchener. A summary of the HIA recommendations and further description of next steps and implementation is included in the following section of this report.

3. **Environmental Assessment** – A Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Schedule ‘B’) is underway for the transportation facilities associated with the multimodal use of the Transit Hub site. An Environmental Assessment (Schedule A+) is also underway for the eventual closure of Waterloo Street through the Transit Hub site. A public information centre was held on November 20, 2012, and the filing of both environmental assessments is expected by summer 2013. IBI Group has been retained to assist with the completion of these environmental assessments.

4. **Soil/Groundwater Investigation and Remediation** – An updated Phase One Environmental Site Assessment and supplementary Phase Two Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) have been completed; a Phase Two ESA involves sampling and testing soil and ground water at site. The results of these investigations are generally consistent with the environmental condition data previously collected in the area. The data collected will be used to support a Risk Assessment. Once the Risk Assessment is complete, a Record of Site Condition will be filed with the Ministry of Environment.
5. Preliminary Site Design and Station Area Access Plan - The Region, with the City of Kitchener, launched development of the Preliminary Site Design and Station Area Access Plan for the King/Victoria Transit Hub in March 2012. The purpose of the plan was to identify and balance the space requirements of pedestrians, cyclists, transit and transit passengers, trains, taxis, cars, and service vehicles in and around the Transit Hub site. The Station Area Access Plan prioritizes pedestrian and cyclist connections, as well as facilitate transfers between Light Rail Transit, GRT buses, GO transit, and VIA Rail service. To determine the impact of continuous bike lanes on King Street through the Victoria Street intersection, a traffic assessment of nine surrounding intersections was also completed as part of this project.

The project steering committee is comprised of Grand River Transit, Rapid Transit, Transportation Planning and TDM staff representatives from the City of Kitchener and the Region of Waterloo. Working with IBI Group, which was retained to assist in the completion of the project, the steering committee identified the public transit and multi-modal requirements of the site and made efforts to maximize the area available for private sector investment. The steering committee evaluated several design alternatives focused on reducing conflicts between modes, while emphasising pedestrian comfort and way finding. The steering committee presented these draft recommendations to the Hub Project Team in August and to the public at two open houses held at the School of Pharmacy, one in June 2012 and another in September 2012. The second open house attracted over 250 residents who actively engaged staff with detailed questions about the site, and no objections were received. The cycling community, however, raised concerns about crossing LRT tracks while riding downhill on King Street as well as riding between traffic and a retaining wall through the King Street grade separation. Design recommendations to address these concerns will be provided in the final Access Plan report.

In addition to the public open houses, consultation meetings were held with the Active Transportation Advisory Committee as well as adjacent property owners, including Kaufman Lofts, the University of Waterloo, Momentum Development, Zehr Group, and Perimeter Development. The consensus among these various stakeholders and the project steering committee is that dedicated transit waiting areas, wider sidewalks and cycling facilities are required adjacent to the Transit Hub and on the surrounding road network to accommodate transit oriented population and employment growth in the Innovation District and Downtown Kitchener generally.

The final Preliminary Site Design and Station Area Access Plan report is being compiled and will be distributed to the steering committee the Transit Hub Project Team for review. As a partner in the process, Metrolinx is currently reviewing the draft plans to see if vertical circulation between station levels can be further improved for pedestrians. In consultation with Rapid Transit, detailed designs and cost estimates are being prepared for the King Street grade separation and Waterloo Street pedestrian tunnel, as well as the stair and elevator accesses to the GO and VIA Rail platforms. The draft recommendations are expected to have an impact on the budget of the King Street grade separation.

6. Beer Store Property Purchase – The purchase of the Beer Store property is complete and the Region is now in possession of this property. This completes the land purchases required for the Transit Hub, save and except for the portion of Waterloo Street currently subject to the environmental assessment process (owned by the City of Kitchener).

7. Real Property Market Scope and Feasibility Study – A market scope and feasibility study is being undertaken to determine the potential range of future uses for the non-transportation components of the Transit Hub (see Report P-12-077). The market scope study will enable the Region to better understand and establish the most prudent set of premises, criteria, scope, and procurement strategies for development of the site. It will thus provide the Region with the
degree of due diligence and procedural rigour that could be generally expected of an entity undertaking commercial land development. The market scope study may be followed by a business case analysis for the preferred investment option(s). Cushman and Wakefield has been retained to assist the Region in the preparation of this study, which is expected to be completed in 2013.

8. Temporary Parking - The structure at 50 Victoria Street North has been demolished and a temporary parking lot created on the vacant lands. In addition to providing free parking to GO commuters arriving before 7 a.m., the Region continues to sell monthly permits to major tenants at The Tannery to utilize surplus parking spaces not required by GO commuters. Revenue from the sale of permits is offsetting the cost to construct and administer the temporary parking lots and the cost to maintain the Rumpel Felt building and 16 Victoria Street. The 16 Victoria Street property is temporarily housing the ambulance waiting station and a short-term tenancy, the sales office for the Momentum Developments redevelopment of 1 Victoria Street South. In addition, a special transit fare is available for GO Train riders who can now board a GRT bus for only 50¢ with valid proof of a GO transit train fare to travel to and from the Kitchener Train Station.

Summary of Heritage Impact Assessment Recommendations

The "Heritage Study and Heritage Impact Assessment, Proposed Region of Waterloo Multimodal Hub, 16 Victoria Street North, 50 & 60 Victoria Street North, and 520 & 510 King Street West, Kitchener" was completed in April 2012 by The Landplan Collaborative Ltd. with John MacDonald Architect Inc..

The key recommendations of the HIA are summarized as follows:

- retain the 1913 portion of the Rumpel Felt Co. building for adaptive re-use, with the aim of preserving and restoring the heritage attributes/character-defining elements identified in the HIA, which include the:
  - original 1913 facades (Victoria Street, adjacent to 50 Victoria, and rail side);
  - riveted shear plate column construction;
- door hardware, goods lift (circa 1913) and original boiler;
- entry columns and architrave to the roof of the entry porch;
- wooden pipes (presently used in the parking lot retaining wall); and
- massing of the building for its contribution to public special and historical experience

- list the Rumpel Felt Co. building on the Municipal Heritage Register;
- complete and implement a Conservation Plan for the 1913 portion of the building at Site Plan; and
- designate the property post development under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

The HIA also includes several specific recommendations related to the scale, massing and location of new built form on the transit hub properties which would be considered alongside the recommendations from the other supporting studies. Implementation of such recommendations is expected to be addressed in the future through the detailed site plan and future development agreements.

![Diagram of Rumpel Felt Factory Construction Dates](image)

The conservation of 1913 portion of the Rumpel Felt Co. building through adaptive re-use does not sterilize the planned redevelopment of this portion of the site, as the heritage review process allows for the consideration of a wide range of development options including alteration and additions. Listing the building on the Municipal Heritage Register is not formally connected to the Planning Act application process, and seeks to provide heritage protection, while maintaining flexibility in the development process. Please see Appendix A for a detailed explanation of Municipal Heritage Register Listing, Conservation Plan and Ontario Heritage Act Designation.

The Region has appropriately secured the building, retained a property management company to monitor it, and is undertaking required maintenance (e.g. bricks, roof). It is the Region’s intention to continue to maintain it and further examine its potential use in the context of the larger site development, expected in future years.
The City of Kitchener Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) has reviewed the HIA and recommended that staff proceed immediately with the process to list 60 Victoria Street North on the Municipal Heritage Register as a non-designated property of cultural or heritage interest.

Listing the property formally identifies that the property is of cultural heritage value or interest and increases the amount of time the municipality has to process a demolition application to 60 business days. The owner, in this case the Region, may comment on the recommendation for listing a property, after which Kitchener City Council makes the decision. Listing a property does not necessarily result in an eventual OHA designation.

The HIA has recommended that an Ontario Heritage Act (OHA) designation be considered by City of Kitchener Council after site development and any planned alterations have been completed. The HIA has also recommended that a Conservation Plan be submitted as part of any future site plan application. The Conservation Plan would document how the Rumpel Felt Co. building will be conserved during future site development, acknowledging that the building is expected to be part of a larger redevelopment and that alteration of the existing 1913 structure is expected. The recommendations in the Conservation Plan could include a description of the adaptations, repairs, stabilization and preservation activities as well as long term conservation, monitoring and maintenance measures proposed for the building.

Following completion of the adaptive reuse of the 1913 portion of the building, the City would consider designating the property under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. This approach, listing the property on the Municipal Heritage Register and requiring a Conservation Plan as part of a complete Site Plan application, ensures that the property has heritage protection during development. The alternative approach, designating the property prior to development, would mean that a Heritage Permit Application would be required at each stage of alteration or repair. The City has taken a similar approach, requiring a Conservation Plan for the Breithaupt Block, a neighbouring property that is also being redeveloped with an adaptive re-use component.

The HIA has been presented to the Region’s Heritage Planning Advisory Committee (HPAC) for information and to keep the Committee apprised of the Hub development process. HPAC’s mandate includes the review of Regional projects that may impact heritage resources. HPAC supports the overall approach being taken in the heritage review process, and is in general agreement with the findings and recommendations of the HIA including the recommended conservation of the 1913 portion of the Rumpel Felt Co. building. The recommended conservation of the 1913 portion of the Rumpel Felt Co. building would require the Region and future development interests to creatively consider how the identified heritage attributes and character defining elements can be preserved, restored and effectively incorporated into the Transit Hub redevelopment, and would be an opportunity to showcase how heritage conservation supports the development of a thriving and productive urban community.

At this point, Regional staff is working with the City of Kitchener to formally confirm, with regard to the 1913 portion of the Rumpel Felt Co. building:

i) That the 1913 portion of the structure is being properly maintained (e.g. roof, basic heating, and is secured) by the Region of Waterloo; and

ii) That as anticipated by the HIA, future additions and/or alterations to the structure will be considered at key decision points in the site’s redevelopment.
Coordination with Intersecting Projects

Team members from across the intersecting projects are represented in the governance and decision-making structure of this project. This approach of participatory engagement has proven to be a very effective means of establishing and maintaining a high degree of understanding and collaboration between the various projects, which include: the Central Transit Corridor Community Building Strategy; the Active Transportation Master Plan Study; the Weber Street Grade Separation; the King Street Grade Separation; Rapid Transit; and the Grand River Transit Route Network Redesign.

Next Steps

Subject to Regional Council concurrence, staff will continue to advance the project as described in this report and in consultation with the Project Team. It must also be reiterated that as the property is in the direct ownership of the Region of Waterloo, the ultimate development of the property will be guided by the public sector directly, contrasted to the limited municipal regulation applicable to a property that is privately owned.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

City of Kitchener staff has been involved extensively in the various studies underway and completed to date. City of Kitchener staff is also overseeing the review of the required Planning Act applications. The City of Kitchener is represented on the Project Team by three staff members, one each from planning, engineering and economic development, and by Councillor Dan Glenn-Graham. Regional Councillors Jean Haalboom, Jim Wideman and Sean Strickland are also Project Team members. A draft of this report was also shared with Kitchener staff.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This initiative directly supports Strategic Action 3.4.1, “Implement the multimodal transportation hub at Victoria and King Streets”.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

As reported in the August 2012 Periodic Financial Report (Report F-12-084; October 16, 2012), total spending on property relating to the Hub project to that time was $6.9 million, including land acquisition and related costs, land transfer taxes, commissions and consulting engineering fees associated with site redevelopment (including remediation, surveys and demolition). Since that time, the Region has purchased the Beer Store property for a total consideration of $2,725,000. As part of a future Hub redevelopment strategy (to be considered by Regional Council), a detailed financing plan will be recommended. Planning and consulting costs along with site operating, maintenance and repair costs associated with the ongoing development of the Hub project amount to approximately $1,067,000 to December 2012. These expenditures are being funded from the RT/RTMP property tax commitment of 1.5% (1% net) per year to 2018. Ongoing site operating costs are being partially offset with revenues from building leases and parking space rentals.

Capital Cost of Infrastructure and Land Development

An estimate of the site infrastructure and land development capital costs is expected upon completion of the Preliminary Site Design and Access Plan Study, and the Market Scope Study. The Preliminary Site Design and Access Plan report, which will identify requirements and develop conceptual designs for the transportation infrastructure and the street interface elements, is
expected to be complete by the end of 2012. The Market Scope Study, which undertakes real estate economic analysis together with a market sounding exercise, will provide a realistic projection of the type and scale of development that could be commercially sustained at the site; and is scheduled to be completed in 2013. Regional staff will report on the outcome of all of these studies and regulatory processes later in 2013.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Staff from Transportation Planning, Legal Services, Facilities Management, Finance and Rapid Transit has been consulted in the preparation of this report.

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix A - Explanation of Municipal Heritage Register Listing, Conservation Plan and Ontario Heritage Act Designation

PREPARED BY:  
Kevin Eby, Director, Multi Modal Transit Hub  
Kate Hagerman, Cultural Heritage Specialist  
John Hill, Principal Planner

APPROVED BY:  
Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
Appendix A

Municipal Heritage Register Listing

Listing a property on the Municipal Heritage Register formally identifies that the property is of cultural heritage value or interest to the municipality and increases the amount of time the municipality has to process a demolition application to 60 business days. The City of Kitchener typically lists properties with the intent that the listed properties will ultimately be designated under the Ontario Heritage Act.

The City of Kitchener uses a four step listing process:
1. Properties are evaluated for potential cultural heritage value using recognized criteria.
2. Properties are then considered by a sub-committee and a Statement of Significance (SOS0 is prepared for short-listed properties. Owners are circulated a copy of the relevant information and invited to make comment.
3. Heritage Kitchener reviews the merits of the shortlisted properties and considers the comments of the property owners, then makes a recommendation to City Council on listing the properties.
4. City Council makes a decision on whether or not to list the properties on the Municipal Heritage Register as "non-designated properties on cultural heritage value or interest". Property owners are also able to appear before Council.

The property owner may comment on the recommendation for listing a property, after which Kitchener City Council makes the decision on whether or not to list a building.

Conservation Plan

A Conservation Plan may be required by the City of Kitchener as a condition of development and is used to guide the conservation of a property during site development (such as the historically significant portion of the Rumpel Felt Co. building). A conservation plan includes recommendations for conservation measures and interventions, such as: inspections; maintenance programs; phases of demolition, rehabilitation or restoration work, including descriptions of planned adaptations, repairs, and stabilization and preservation activities; long term conservation measures; costing; and monitoring.

Ontario Heritage Act Designation

Heritage protection under the Ontario Heritage Act (OHA) is an Area Municipal responsibility. It will be the City of Kitchener Council’s decision as to when and if 60 Victoria St. N. receives heritage protection in the form of an OHA designation. City of Kitchener staff view is that all properties that meet one or more of the provincial criteria stated in Regulation 9/06 of the OHA should be considered for designation. OHA designations are typically property based. As it is only the 1913 portion of the Rumpel Felt Co. building that has heritage value, the Region could request that only that building be impacted by the OHA designation.

As the property owner, the Region may file an objection within 30 days of the City of Kitchener Council’s published Notice of Intent to Designate. If an objection is filed the City Council must refer the objection to the Conservation Review Board (CRB) for a hearing which will provide a non-binding recommendation to City Council on whether or not to designate. Following the hearing, City Council makes the final decision whether or not to proceed in passing a bylaw to designate the property.

Once designated, demolishing the structure would require the approval of the designating council, including a repeal of the OHA designation. If the City Council denies a demolition permit, the Region may appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB). In this process, the OMB’s decision is final.
REGION OF WATERLOO
PLANNING, HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
Community Planning

TO: Chair Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
DATE: January 29, 2013
FILE CODE: D-10-20
SUBJECT: CENTRAL TRANSIT CORRIDOR COMMUNITY BUILDING STRATEGY (CBS) - RELEASE OF FIRST DRAFT

RECOMMENDATION:
For Information.

SUMMARY:
The Region of Waterloo’s rapid transit initiative has the dual goals of moving people and shaping the community. The draft Community Building Strategy (being tabled with this report) is a flexible framework, and focuses on shaping the community around station areas and throughout the broader Central Transit Corridor. The Community Building Strategy (CBS) is being led by the Region of Waterloo and the Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo. Regional Council retained Urban Strategies (with sub consultants Nelson Nygaard and Colliers) in February 2012 to complete this work.

The Community Building Strategy has been underway for approximately one year, and has included a broad range of public and community consultation, including (to date) thirteen workshops, twelve open houses, five speaker events and regular opportunities (April – December 2012) to drop into the project storefront on King Street in Kitchener to speak one-on-one with staff. The Strategy and related initiatives have been developed by the Project Team, which includes representatives from the Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo, and Regional staff (including the Rapid Transit Office).

The draft Community Building Strategy is a lengthy, detailed document that addresses many aspects of shaping the community. The draft CBS also reflects substantial public input, from which this initiative benefitted greatly. The Strategy has been developed as a flexible framework respecting the jurisdictional responsibilities of the Region and the Area Municipalities. Considerable focus has been placed on the implementation of the CBS respecting adjacent stable neighbourhoods, informing investment opportunities, and visually demonstrating “what could be” in the community. The CBS explicitly acknowledges that many initiatives are yet to be considered for inclusion in municipal budgets, while other initiatives are expected to be realized through such processes as development applications. Public-private partnerships may also be appropriate in some instances.

The draft strategy is planned to be presented to the public for input at a series of public consultation sessions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, February 20, 2013</td>
<td>Knox Presbyterian Church, Uptown Waterloo</td>
<td>4:00 P.M. – 7:00 P.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, February 21, 2013</td>
<td>The Tannery Event Centre, Downtown Kitchener</td>
<td>4:00 P.M. – 7:00 P.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, February 25, 2013</td>
<td>Cambridge City Hall Atrium, Downtown Cambridge</td>
<td>4:00 P.M. – 7:00 P.M.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A number of subsequent next steps are also described in this report. This will include immediate additional work on priority-setting and development of potential incentives (e.g. regulatory, financial) with the three cities, given the large number and broad range of initiatives contained in the CBS. The Project Team will also have the benefit of receiving the public’s input on priorities from the February open houses to help inform its decision-making process. All individuals on the mailing list will continue to kept apprised of the CBS and its’ implementation.

REPORT:

Overview

The Region of Waterloo’s rapid transit initiative has the dual goals of moving people and shaping the community. The Community Building Strategy (CBS) is a flexible framework, and focuses on shaping the community around station areas and throughout the broader Central Transit Corridor. The CBS is being led by the Region of Waterloo and the Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo. Regional Council retained Urban Strategies (with sub consultants Nelson Nygaard and Colliers) in February 2012 to complete this work.

The CBS has been underway for approximately one year, and has included a broad range of public and community consultation including to date thirteen workshops, twelve open houses, five speaker events and regular opportunities (April – December 2012) to drop into the project storefront on King Street in Kitchener to speak one on one with staff. The Strategy and related initiatives have been developed by the Project Team, which includes representatives from the Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo, and Regional staff (including the Rapid Transit office). This report introduces the draft CBS to Council and the community.

Public Consultation and Engagement

The CBS has involved a year long, highly collaborative planning process in all three cities, involving hundreds of stakeholders and community members. Efforts to host a robust community dialogue built on the Region’s past consultation efforts included a project launch, stakeholder interviews, three “Exploring the Opportunity Forums”, 12 open houses, a dedicated project website and a project storefront.

The Community Building Strategy Project Team hosted a speaker’s series, where experts with experience planning rapid transit in other communities presented their perspectives to encourage a broader based community dialogue. Speakers at these sessions included Steve Cassidy, Director MRC McLean Hazel Ltd, G.B. Arrington, Principal Practice Leader for Parsons Brinckerhoff, Sue Zielinski, Managing Director of SMART at the University of Michigan, and Karina Ricks, Principal with Nelson\Nygaard. All have international experience, and gave the public the opportunity to directly ask questions about their work in other communities.

Through these events and activities, the community came together to develop a more focused vision for the Central Transit Corridor, being a lively, well connected and inviting corridor that demonstrates excellence in community building. The CBS helps articulate this vision by providing guidance for future planning, development and investment along the Corridor, as well as considering established stable neighbourhoods.

A series of open houses are planned to be held in the Cities of Waterloo, Kitchener and Cambridge on February 20, 21, and 25, 2013, respectively. These open houses will allow members of the public and key stakeholders to review the draft CBS and provide input. The public will also be requested to identify what it views as its’ top priorities. The open houses will be a drop-in format with a presentation at 5:00 p.m. and discussion at 5:30 p.m. led by staff and the consultant team.
Planned upcoming public consultation opportunities consist of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday, February 20, 2013</strong></td>
<td>Knox Presbyterian Church, Uptown Waterloo</td>
<td>4:00 P.M. – 7:00 P.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday, February 21, 2013</strong></td>
<td>The Tannery Event Centre, Downtown Kitchener</td>
<td>4:00 P.M. – 7:00 P.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday, February 25, 2013</strong></td>
<td>Cambridge City Hall Atrium, Downtown Cambridge</td>
<td>4:00 P.M. – 7:00 P.M.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The draft CBS will be available on the project website (as noted below), on CD, through limited hard copies for viewing/borrowing (including copies at the City libraries), and through a consolidated executive summary of the work.

**Project Website**

The website ([www.centraltransitcorridor.ca](http://www.centraltransitcorridor.ca)) currently contains information and resources, news and media coverage, links to other related projects and project contact information. It also includes an interactive section where the public may view materials presented at past public events, including: consultant and speaker presentations, maps and display panels. There is also an opportunity to provide online comments. The draft Strategy will be posted on the website for public review and comment as well.

**Storefront Space**

A project storefront was established in April, 2012 at 220 King St. W., Kitchener to house project materials, provide a space to host discussions with various stakeholder groups and to act as a community resource for the public to drop in and have conversations with staff. The storefront closed on Dec 20, 2012. The storefront was open regular hours every week and during special events in Downtown Kitchener (100th Anniversary, Cruising on King, Blues Festival, Christkindl Market). A staff member was available during these times to speak with interested parties about the project. In addition, project working materials were available for review. Over one thousand people dropped by the storefront to learn more about the CBS.

**Outcomes (Deliverables)**

The CBS has produced the following seven broad outcomes or deliverables:

i) **Hosting Dialogue and Building the Constituency**
   The community and stakeholder sessions along with the *Exploring the Opportunity* Forums have helped to engage a broad-based constituency, including leaders from business, technology, development, mobility and environment. These groups will be able to continue to provide input to the Region and the Area Municipalities in a variety of ways. Regional staff is also developing forums to facilitate ongoing public dialogue, including the continuation of the speakers series.

ii) **A More Focused Vision for the Corridor**
   Corridor-wide enhancements are described that can help optimize new investments. These opportunities reflect a shared understanding of the kind of place the community wants the Central Transit Corridor to become and are guided by the strong overall vision for the Corridor.

iii) **Urban Structure Mapping**
   An enhanced mobility grid creates a framework for integrating land use and transportation across the CTC. This structure can inform investments in improving streets and open spaces, directing the provision of community amenities and guiding the form and function of new development over time.
iv) Place Specific Initiatives
Along the Central Transit Corridor, there are a number of places where unique opportunities exist. To energize the process of community building in the Corridor, a number of place specific initiatives have been identified. These initiatives respond to issues and challenges in specific places related to larger reurbanization efforts in the Region.

v) Station Area Snapshots
Station “snapshots” for each of the 23 station areas have been developed. These snapshots bring together the setting, key market considerations, mobility considerations, city building opportunities and conceptual areas of influence around each station.

vi) Illustrations of Transformation: What Could Be
A series of visual models and renderings, focusing on specific areas along corridor, are included in the CBS. The visualizations, developed in consultation with the Area Municipalities, are essential to help illustrate several examples of change that may occur over time.

vii) Implementation Strategies
The CBS includes a number of very specific actions. Discussions around implementation will continue through a CBS implementation working group of the Region and City planning departments.

Key Aspects of the Draft Community Building Strategy

The following dimensions of the CBS are particularly worthy of note:

The CBS as a Flexible Framework
The CBS can be used as a resource for such purposes as evaluating the context of development applications, in undertaking comprehensive amendments to the official plans and zoning by-laws, and in considering priorities for public investment (e.g. walkways, bike lanes, streetscaping).

The CBS as a Document to Visually Show “What Could Be”
The community has been very engaged in the CBS. While the final form of development cannot be completely anticipated, the public has a desire to understand what our community might look like. To this end, the CBS has a number of images to demonstrate how station areas could physically and functionally evolve from their current form.

Sensitivity to Adjacent Neighbourhoods
The CBS recognizes that many established and stable neighbourhoods are located adjacent to station areas and their expected “areas of influence” (as a general guideline, 800m or less from rapid transit station stops). One of the goals of the CBS is to inform context-sensitive development and redevelopment, and should be an important resource in considering proposed official plans and zoning by-law amendments, site plans and applications for building permits. The CBS can also assist property owners and developers to better understand the community context of the areas around them.

The CBS as an Investment Tool
At the present time, investors have information related to the Rapid Transit Line (route and timing), as well as other traditional tools and forms of regulation (e.g. strategic plans, official plans, secondary plans, zoning by-laws, heritage studies and other special-purpose documents). The CBS provides both context and further identifies a series of “economic zones” where similar market conditions exist. In this respect, the CBS can give investors a more focused view of both development opportunities and community priorities and sensitivities.
Municipal Budget Implications
Over 60 “Place Specific Initiatives” are recommended in the draft Community Building Strategy. These initiatives are intended to further leverage investment in rapid transit and can assist the Region and Area Municipalities in guiding future development. These initiatives will require implementation by the public or private sectors (or in partnership). Financing for many public improvements identified in the CBS will not be found in existing municipal budgets. Priorities will need to be set and considered for inclusion in annual budget planning processes. Other opportunities will also arise, particularly as conditions of development applications and where public-private partnerships may be appropriate to aid in the implementation of the CBS. Examples of candidate priorities are appended as Attachment 1 of this report.

Next Steps
The draft CBS represents a major step in further shaping the community around stations and in the broader Central Transit Corridor. The following short and mid-term steps are expected to occur:

- Completion of public open houses, as described in this report;
- Careful review of public feedback by the Region and the three cities;
- Offers to Area Municipal Councils to formally present the draft CBS (joint Area Municipal and Regional staff presentations);
- Additional work on priority setting and potential incentives (e.g. regulatory, financial) with the three cities, focusing on both proactive elements and identifying important opportunities related to future development applications;
- Tabling a final draft with Regional Council for consideration. At this point, and as noted in this report, the CBS is expected to be recommended for use as a flexible framework to inform decisions around shaping our community (as described in this report);
- Establishing an ongoing Community Building Strategy Implementation Working Group with Regional and Area Municipal Planning staff, and continuing to closely coordinate with the Rapid Transit Office;
- Continuing to engage the public in a variety of forums (e.g. speakers series, additional Rapid Transit public meetings, presentations to interested parties, and the Region’s Community Advisory Panel); and
- Reviewing current development incentive tools (e.g. Brownfield Financial Incentives Program), with a view to potentially revise or recommend additional incentives to catalyze strategic development in station areas and in the broader Central Transit Corridor.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination
Staff from the Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo have overseen and led the CBS, and their collective continued commitment to this initiative is greatly appreciated. City staff has provided their comments on the CBS, which have been incorporated into the draft document.

This report has also been forwarded to Township planning staff for information. The CBS supports compact growth, which helps to preserve agricultural lands and environmentally sensitive areas within the rural areas.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:
The Central Transit Corridor Community Building Strategy directly addresses Focus Area 2: Growth Management and Prosperity (Manage growth to foster thriving and productive urban and rural communities) and the Strategic Objective 2.1. Encourage compact, livable urban and rural settlement form.
Specifically, this relates to Action 2.1.2. Work with area municipalities to develop and implement a comprehensive strategy to promote intensification and reurbanization within existing urban areas.

The Strategy also addresses Focus Area 3: Sustainable Transportation (Develop greater, more sustainable and safe transportation choices) and the Strategic Objective 3.1. Implement the Light Rail Transit system in the central transit corridor fully integrated with an expanded conventional transit system.

Specifically this relates to Action 3.1.1 Develop an implementation plan for Light Rail Transit including corridor and station area planning.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The costs of developing the CBS were financed by the Region of Waterloo through budgeted funds previously approved by Regional Council (please see Report No. P-12-012).

As described in this report, many of the identified public investment initiatives would need to be considered by the respective Municipal Council(s) as part of their budget process, and through development and redevelopment pertaining to specific properties.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Staff from the Rapid Transit Office, Transportation and Environmental Services actively participate on the study’s Project Team.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment 1 – Candidate Community Building Strategy Priorities
Attachment 2 - Draft Community Building Strategy Report (under separate cover).
Please note that limited hard copies have been made.

PREPARED BY: Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
Becky Schlenvogt, Principal Planner

APPROVED BY: Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
ATTACHMENT 1 – CANDIDATE COMMUNITY BUILDING STRATEGY PRIORITIES

RECOMMENDED FIRST IMPLEMENTATION STEPS
Realizing the vision of the Community Building Strategy will require the Region and municipalities to put in place mechanisms that effectively translate the 8 opportunities and 69 initiatives into reality. Though realizing the vision for the Central Transit Corridor will require long-term commitments, a number of early interventions are recommended over the next few years to build momentum for long term changes and to enable projects through partnerships. The following represents a list of key first steps that the Region and area municipalities may consider as priority. This list is supported by a more detailed set of implementation recommendations (Section 7.3) to help foster investment, shape communities and move people.

1. **Complete Priority Station Area Plans** to manage change and create positive transformation in and around RT stations over the immediate and longer term

2. **Establish an ongoing CTC/TOD Integrated Working Team** comprised of Region and City staff to coordinate, collaborate and provide leadership in implementation of the CBS

3. **Utilize the CBS as the Foundation to guide planning and investment decisions within the Central Transit Corridor**, in particular, the Integrated Land Use and Mobility Framework provides key direction with respect to transformation in terms of transit design, station area planning and infrastructure and capital works

4. **Resource the RRCIP to fund catalytic projects and leverage investment** in the form of a revolving or capital fund, complemented with financial tools directed to projects, initiatives and public infrastructure to implement the CBS directions.

5. **Engage the Reurbanization Community Advisory Panel as Key Ambassadors** and advisors in terms of building momentum, design and implementation of projects and promoting community dialogue and awareness with regard to the CBS initiatives.

6. **Actively Promote the CBS to the Investment Community** in partnership with the City's economic development agencies, and other existing business stakeholders

7. **Build on Existing and Explore New Partnerships that will be key to successfully transforming the Central Transit Corridor.** Fostering ongoing and new partnerships between municipalities, public agencies, businesses, institutions and investors to leverage resources, techniques and strategies will advance community building in the CTC.

8. **Create an Education and Community Awareness Program focused on community building in the Central Transit Corridor.** Building on the value of the community dialogue which informed the CBS, an Education and Community Awareness Program focused on community building in the CTC and aligned with the RT design process should be established.
REPORT:

A total of 26 wind turbines are planned to be located within the Municipality of North Perth and Township of Perth East in the County of Perth. The wind turbines are bordered by Highway 86 (Main Street East/Wellington Road 86) to the north, Highway 23 to the west, Perth Line 72 to the south and Perth Road 131 to the east (please see attached map). The collector system will be comprised of underground lines and CWPP is endeavouring to locate all lines underground. To connect the Project to the provincial power grid, it will be necessary to run low voltage, 34.5 kV, power lines approximately 25 km east of the wind turbines, within municipal road rights-of-way to a connection point with the 115 kV provincial transmission line at a proposed substation located in the Township of Wellesley on land currently used for aggregate extraction. The lines will be located on privately owned land and within the municipal road rights-of-way (RoW) in the Township of Wellesley (Buehler Line, Schummer Line, Boomer Line) and two Regional Roads – Ament Line and Kressler Road. It is proposed that the wind turbines will be situated entirely on privately owned land (outside of the Region of Waterloo) that are currently under agricultural production, used for pasture or is land that has been left fallow.
Project components to be constructed consist of the following:

- **Turbines** – 120 metre by 120 metre cleared area (during construction) which includes the turbine tower, foundation, pad mount transformer, crane pad and temporary turbine component laydown area;
- **Access roads** – 15 metre wide corridor leading to each turbine (50 metres at temporary turning radii), aggregate roads (5 metres to 7 metres wide), temporary compacted shoulders, temporary topsoil windrow, staging areas and where necessary, culverts. A final transportation study will be completed as part of the project design stage to determine the turbine delivery routes within the project area and to identify any municipal road infrastructure that may require expanding;
- **Collector system** – underground electrical cables and alternate electrical cables, junction boxes and fiber optic communication cable installed in approximate 1.2 metres deep by 0.3 metre wide trench, conveying energy output of all turbines to the project substation over private land and municipal road allowance; and
- **Project substation** – 40 metre by 70 metre fenced area with circuit breakers, disconnect switches, protection and control equipment, 34.5 kV to 115 kV step up transformer with an approximate 45 metre long overhead spur line connecting the substation to the existing 115 kV Hydro One transmission line. The transformer may utilize a SORBWEB spill containment system or a concrete containment system pit with oil/water separator to protect the environment from spills. The containment system will be sized to contain 110% of the transformer oil should there be a complete failure of the system and will be designed to handle a 25 year rain storm event. The substation will be an open air enclosure surrounded by wire fencing and equipped with security lighting and informational hazard signage.

The Noise Study Report submitted on behalf of CWWP by Dillon Consulting (November 2012) was completed as per the Ministry of the Environment’s applicable noise guidelines, including their 2008 guideline specific to wind farms. The potential noise impact for the transformer station was specifically addressed and found to comply with the guideline limit of 40dBA.

One issue that has been raised by the Township of Wellesley is the potential for “stray voltage”. This is voltage that could permeate from areas surrounding wind turbines, substations and other infrastructure. The proponent will need to ensure that stray voltage is minimized and mitigated, particularly related to agricultural uses such as dairy barns.

This proposal and its corresponding reports were circulated to the Region’s Public Health Unit, Hydrogeology and Source Water Protection staff. No comments were received.

The Region’s Transportation Planning staff was also consulted and the following comments will be forwarded to the proponent for incorporation into the final REA application:

Municipal Consent is required for any infrastructure placed on the Regional Road Allowance. In this regard, the proponent will be required to submit six copies of detailed plans illustrating the proposed: underground hydro plant, hydro poles, anchors and any required structures on the Regional Road Allowance. These drawings along with a corresponding report are to be submitted to the Region’s Transportation Engineering Services.

**Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination**

Regional staff has discussed this proposal with the Township of Wellesley and understand the Township will be providing similar comments to the proponent.
CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This report supports Focus Area 2 (Growth Management and Prosperity).

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

NIL

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Staff from Transportation and Environmental Services were consulted in the preparation of this report.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment 1 – Geographic Location of Proposed Project

PREPARED BY: Brenna MacKinnon, Manager, Greenfield Planning

APPROVED BY: Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
Attachment 1 - Geographic Location of Proposed Project
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: January 29, 2013

FILE CODE: A16-40/MTBM

SUBJECT: METROLINX REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN-THE BIG MOVE UPDATE

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo request the Province of Ontario establish a Task Force to expand on the current GO rail service mandate by examining the potential deployment of interregional rail services to link commuters with employment opportunities, colleges and universities in the major urban growth centres of Waterloo Region, Guelph and other communities in Southern Ontario, as described in Report No. P-12-008, dated January 29, 2013;

AND THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo formally request Metrolinx continue to plan and advance the additional rail passenger service to Waterloo Region identified in this report.

SUMMARY:

Metrolinx is currently updating its 2008 Regional Transportation Plan called “The Big Move”. As part of this update, they are preparing a progress report and have identified the “Next Wave” of projects. There is no clear advancement of projects related to Waterloo Region in this update. Prioritization of projects outside of the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area (GTHA) is challenging when comparing external projects with projects that are within the GTHA. These external projects often have broader provincial benefits and should be considered independently of the Metrolinx mandate.

Projects of specific interest to Waterloo Region include:

- Expansion of peak hour rail passenger service to Kitchener to 4 trains leaving in the morning and 4 trains returning in the evening;
- Provision of regular rail passenger service to Cambridge;
- Provision of 2 way all day rail passenger service to Waterloo Region; and
- Electrification of the Kitchener Line.

The Province of Ontario, Waterloo Region and other communities within southern Ontario would benefit from improved rail passenger service. Current service levels are minimal or nil and do not encourage potential passengers to use the service regularly. It is recommended that the Province of Ontario in conjunction with Metrolinx and other communities in Southern Ontario including Waterloo Region establish a task force to expand the current GO rail service mandate by examining the potential deployment of interregional rail to link commuters with employment opportunities and colleges/universities in the area. It is also recommended that Metrolinx continue to plan and advance the additional rail passenger service to Waterloo Region identified in this report.

REPORT:

In 2008, Metrolinx approved its Regional Transportation Plan-The Big Move. This plan primarily covered the Greater Toronto Hamilton Area although it did identify GO Transit links to Waterloo Region. The Big Move identified 10 strategies as follows:
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1. Build a comprehensive regional rapid transit network
2. Enhance and expand active transportation
3. Improve the efficiency of the road and highway network
4. Create an ambitious transportation demand management program
5. Create a customer-first transportation system
6. Implement an integrated transit fare system
7. Build communities that are pedestrian, cycling and transit supportive
8. Plan for universal access
9. Improve goods movement within the GTHA and with adjacent regions
10. Commit to continuous improvement

The strategies included in the Big Move are consistent with many of the strategies included in the Region of Waterloo Transportation Master Plan-Moving Forward 2031.

Metrolinx is currently updating the Big Move and is asking for public feedback. The purpose of the Big Move update is to:
1. Reconcile The Big Move with GO 2020
2. Incorporate findings of key studies since 2008
3. Incorporate approved Environmental Assessments

Metrolinx is also preparing a progress report on the 2008 Big Move plan. The draft update was presented to the Metrolinx board on December 5, 2012. It will be consulting with the public through January 2013, and staff will keep Regional Council apprised.

As part of the update, Metrolinx announced the Next Wave of projects which will continue expanding the regional transit network as well as providing resources for local transit, roads, active transportation and more. Projects include:

**Rapid Transit Projects:**
75 per cent of proposed investment is allocated to these regional transit projects:

- **Brampton Queen Street Rapid Transit**: 10 km of upgraded transit along Queen Street.
- **Downtown Relief Line**: New subway that will improve access to the regional core for residents from across the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area (GTHA) and provide relief to the overflowing arteries of the Toronto transit system.
- **Dundas Street Bus Rapid Transit**: 40 km of bus service running in dedicated lanes, connecting Toronto, Mississauga and Halton.
- **Durham-Scarborough Bus Rapid Transit**: 36 km of bus service running in dedicated lanes, connecting Scarborough Centre to downtown Oshawa via Pickering, Ajax and Whitby.
- **GO Rail Expansion: More Two-Way, All-Day and Rush Hour Service**: Introducing more two-way, all-day service, adding additional rush hour service across the entire network, and extending trains to Hamilton and Bowmanville.
- **Electrification of GO Kitchener line and Union Pearson Express**: Upgrading diesel train service to electric propulsion for these two complementary transit services that share a substantial portion of their routing.
- **GO Lakeshore Express Rail Service - Phase 1 (including Electrification)**: Transforming GO Transit's backbone from Hamilton to Oshawa into a faster, more frequent and more convenient transit option by beginning the transition to an international-style Express Rail service.
- **Hamilton Light Rail Transit**: 14 km LRT line stretching from McMaster University to Eastgate Square.
- **Hurontario-Main Light Rail Transit**: 23 km LRT line connecting Port Credit to downtown Brampton via Cooksville and Mississauga City Centre.
- **Yonge North Subway Extension**: 6 km extension that will connect the City of Toronto to the Richmond Hill / Langstaff Urban Growth Centre.
Local transit, roads and highways and other projects:
The remaining 25 per cent is allocated to local transit projects, as well as roads and highways, active transportation and transportation demand management throughout the region.

As part of the 2008 Big Move, possible regional rail extensions beyond the GTHA to Kitchener, Waterloo and Cambridge were identified. A partial rail passenger extension to Kitchener was implemented in December, 2011. The service included two passenger trains to Toronto in the morning and two trains returning in the evening.

The status of projects relating to Waterloo Region is:

1. Expansion of Rail Passenger Service to Waterloo Region
The maps are being revised to indicate that the Kitchener service now exists. There are no changes to the map for the Cambridge service and it is still designated as a possible regional rail extension.

2. Completion of the First Phase of the Kitchener Service
The first phase of rail passenger service to Kitchener was to include four trains departing from Kitchener in the morning and four trains returning in the evening. The completion of the first phase remains as a project in the GO capital program. The timing will be contingent on the investment strategy being prepared by Metrolinx.

3. Electrification of the Kitchener Line
Metrolinx has recently completed a study on the electrification of its passenger train service. The Kitchener line has been identified as a top priority for electrification and is indicated as part of the Next Wave of projects in the Big Move Update. The first phase would include electrification from Union Station to Mount Pleasant (West Brampton). Timing of this phase is also contingent on the investment strategy. The second phase would include completion of electrification to Kitchener. The intent would be to use hybrid trains on this corridor in the interim that could run on diesel between Kitchener and Mount Pleasant and then electric the rest of the way to Union Station.

4. Completion of the Second Phase of the Kitchener Service
The second phase of rail passenger service to Kitchener was to include two-way service all day long. The extension of two-way service from Mount Pleasant to Georgetown has been postponed to the 16 to 25 year period. There is no timing for expansion west of Georgetown.

Of additional note, two-way all day GO service on the Milton line between Meadowvale and Milton has also been postponed to the 16-25 year period. This is the same corridor that would be used by the future rail passenger service to Cambridge.

Implications

All of the transportation projects proposed in Metrolinx’s Next Wave of projects are important initiatives that will help strengthen the transportation network in the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area. Prioritization of projects outside of the GTHA is challenging when comparing these external projects with projects within the GTHA. These external projects often have broader provincial benefits and should be considered independently of the Metrolinx mandate. Projects of specific interest to Waterloo Region include:

- Expansion of peak hour rail passenger service to Kitchener to 4 trains leaving in the morning and 4 trains returning in the evening;
- Provision of rail passenger service to Cambridge;
- Provision of 2 way all day rail passenger service to Waterloo Region; and,
- Electrification of the Kitchener Line.
It is important that, as part of these projects, track infrastructure be improved and travel times be reduced to improve reliability and competitiveness of the service.

Benefits of these projects include:
- Reduced traffic growth and future congestion on the busy Highway 401 corridor. This will also provide benefits to the GTHA by assisting with goods movement into and out of the area;
- Potential postponement of the need to widen Highway 401;
- Strengthen the economic contribution of Waterloo Region by providing access to a broader labor market particularly in the high-tech sector; and,
- Associated health and environmental benefits from reduced greenhouse gas emissions, pollutants and collisions.

The Province of Ontario, Waterloo Region and other communities within Southern Ontario would benefit from the provision of improved rail passenger service. Current service levels are minimal or nil and do not encourage potential passengers to use the service regularly. The importance of interregional labor force mobility for the economy of Southern Ontario and the transit orientation of postsecondary students should be recognized.

Since 1970, GO Rail has been a great success in linking people to jobs in central Toronto. It is timely to reinforce that proven success and expand GO Rail’s mandate to also link people to jobs in other major growth centres.

It is recommended that the Province of Ontario in conjunction with Metrolinx and other communities in Southern Ontario including Waterloo Region establish a task force to review the current state of rail passenger service in this area and make recommendations to develop a broader interregional rail passenger service beyond the GTHA. It should also be recommended to Metrolinx that they continue to plan and advance the additional rail passenger service to Waterloo Region identified in this report.

Subject to Regional Council endorsement, this initiative should be communicated to other communities in Southern Ontario, local MPP’s and local Chambers of Commerce to obtain their support.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

A copy of this report will be circulated to the Area Municipalities for their information.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The provision of GO Transit rail service is consistent with Strategic Plan Focus Area 3: Sustainable Transportation, Encourage improvements to intercity transportation services to and from Waterloo Region. Regional Council has identified this Focus Area as one of the top three initiatives for the remainder of this Council term. Regional staff is developing an advocacy strategy to address this issue and will bring a report forward for Council’s consideration.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

NIL
OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:
NIL

ATTACHMENTS:
NIL

PREPARED BY: Graham Vincent, Director Transportation Planning

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

DATE: January 29, 2013

FILE CODE: T13-50

SUBJECT: PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS TO TRANSIT FOR THE HANSON/HAYWARD INDUSTRIAL AND ALPINE VILLAGE AREAS

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo initiate an Environmental Assessment Study to improve pedestrian access to transit to the Hanson/Hayward Avenue Industrial and Alpine Village Areas, City of Kitchener, as described in Report No. P-13-009, dated January 29, 2013.

SUMMARY:

Many requests and a petition have been received for improved transit access to The Family Centre located within the industrial area on Hanson Avenue off Homer Watson Boulevard. This area of Kitchener is a challenge to service by transit as the land use is primarily low density industrial.

In 2007, the Region of Waterloo in cooperation with the City of Kitchener, had previously planned and designed a pedestrian connection from Homer Watson Boulevard to Kingswood Drive, running between the industrial buildings on Alpine Court and the Condominium development that fronts onto Kingswood Drive (please see Report No. P-07-072). This connection required the purchase of property from three industrial developments on Alpine Court. To date, negotiations have not been successful for the acquisition of the property from the land owners needed to construct this connection. One of the three landowners felt that selling part of their land would limit their parking space, snow storage, ability for trucks to access the rear loading dock and potential future resale value. As a result, further options need to be investigated. Therefore, Regional staff is recommending conducting a Class Environmental Assessment (EA) study to investigate all opportunities to improve pedestrian access to transit to the Hanson/Hayward Avenue Industrial and the Alpine Village areas in the City of Kitchener. An approved Class EA process would provide the ability to acquire property if necessary. There would be opportunities given for public input, with an expected study completion date of the end of 2013. Regional staff is also discussing this initiative with the City of Kitchener as a potential partnership.

REPORT:

The Family Centre is located in the Hanson/Hayward Industrial Area close to Homer Watson Boulevard and Alpine Village (please see Attachment 1). The Family Centre staff and visitors have made several requests for improved access to transit service over the past 5 years and recently have submitted a petition with over 400 signatures. In 2007, Regional Council approved in principle, a pedestrian connection between Homer Watson Boulevard and Alpine Road (please see Report No. P-07-072). However, efforts made by Regional and City staff to acquire required property were not successful, and the initiative did not proceed.

The closest transit service to the area is located on Ottawa Street, over a 10-minute walk along Homer Watson Boulevard. Staff has considered options for providing transit service to the Family Centre and the Hanson/Hayward Industrial area. Existing routes do not have spare time in their
schedule to divert them to this area. Therefore, consideration was given to options for new routes. The analysis estimated that the net annual operating cost would range between $340,000 and $500,000 to provide 30-minute frequency, 12 hours a day, Monday to Friday service, no weekend service and limited evening service. This cost includes the purchase of one or two additional buses depending on the option selected. Weekend and evening service would increase the operating costs accordingly. This area of Kitchener is a challenge to service by transit as the land use is primarily low density industrial uses.

GRT Route 11 is close to the area and is located on Kingswood Drive (service 7 days a week, higher frequency peak hours with connections to Forest Glen Plaza and Downtown Kitchener). Staff previously investigated providing pedestrian connection to Route 11 from The Family Centre. The Region, in cooperation with the City of Kitchener, planned and designed a pedestrian connection from Homer Watson Boulevard to Kingswood Drive, running between the industrial buildings on Alpine Court and the condominium development that fronts onto Kingswood Drive (please see Attachment 2). This connection required the purchase of property from three industrial developments on Alpine Court. To date, negotiations have not been successful for the acquisition of the property from the land owners needed to construct this connection. One of the three landowners felt that selling part of their land would limit their parking space, snow storage, ability for trucks to access the rear loading dock and potential future resale value. As a result, further options need to be investigated. Therefore, Regional staff is recommending conducting a Class Environmental Assessment (EA) study to investigate all opportunities to improve pedestrian access to transit to the Hanson/Hayward Avenue Industrial and the Alpine Village areas in the City of Kitchener.

The schedule (and process) that the study would follow is expected to be an “A plus” or “B”, but this would be determined during the process (please see Attachment 3 for Schedule descriptions). The EA is proposed to follow the outline shown in Attachment 3. An approved Class EA process would also provide the ability to acquire property if necessary.

The study schedule would include a Public Consultation Centre to present the options and preferred alternative and a final presentation to Regional Council for approval is proposed for November 2013.

The next step for the study would be to announce the EA commencement after receiving Council approval and begin the study.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

The City of Kitchener has been requested to participate in the study as a Project Team member, and Regional staff will be discussing the City’s interest in this project as a local pedestrian connection.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The Environmental Assessment Study to improve pedestrian access to transit to the Hanson/Hayward Avenue Industrial Area Waterloo Spur Line Multi-Use Trail Feasibility and Design Study supports the Region’s Strategic Focus Area 2 (Growth Management and Prosperity), that relates to developing, optimizing and maintaining infrastructure to meet current and projected needs. Strategic Focus Area 3 (Sustainable Transportation) is also supported by this project. This focus area relates to developing, promoting and integrating active forms of transportation (walking).

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The study is being conducted by Regional staff. There will be a requirement for up to $5,000 for printing and advertising costs for public consultation that will be covered by Transportation
Planning’s internal operating budget. The funding for any new infrastructure or transit service would be brought forward as part of the 2014 budget process, and requires the discussion of potential cost-sharing with the City of Kitchener.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Transportation and Environmental Services will have representatives on the Project Team.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment 1 – Study Area
Attachment 2 – Class Environmental Assessment Process
Attachment 3 – Class Environmental Assessment Process

PREPARED BY: Paula Sawicki, Manager, Strategic Transportation Planning

APPROVED BY: Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
Attachment 2 – Previously Proposed Pedestrian Walkway
Attachment 3 - Class Environmental Assessment Process

Ontario Environmental Assessment Act

The purpose of the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act (EA Act) is to provide for “the betterment of the people of the whole or any part of Ontario by providing for the protection, conservation and wise management in Ontario of the environment”. Environment is applied broadly and includes the natural, social, cultural, built and economic components.

The key principles of successful environmental assessment planning include:

- Consultation with stakeholders and affected members of the public;
- Consideration of a reasonable range of alternatives;
- Assessment of the environmental impacts for each alternative;
- Systematic evaluation of alternatives; and
- Clear documentation of the process followed.

MUNICIPAL CLASS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA)

The Municipal Class EA is planning process approved under the Environmental Assessment Act that is used by municipalities to plan infrastructure enhancement projects while satisfying the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act. Under the Class EA process, projects are planned in one of three ways depending on their scope, complexity, and potential for adverse environmental impacts.

Schedule “A”
- Includes routine maintenance, operation and emergency activities.
- The Municipality can proceed with this work without further approval or public consultation.

Schedule “B”
- Includes projects with the potential for some adverse environmental effects.
- These projects are subject to a screening process that includes consultation with directly affected public and agencies.

Schedule “C”
- Includes larger, more complex projects with the potential for significant environmental affects.
- These projects are subject to all phases of the Class EA and require a minimum of 3 points of public contact.
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: January 29, 2013

FILE CODE: D09-01

SUBJECT: RECOMMENDED REFINEMENTS TO THE REGION OF WATERLOO BROWNFIELD FINANCIAL INCENTIVE PROGRAM (BFIP)

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following action regarding the Region’s Brownfields Financial Incentive Program, as described in Report No. P-13-004/F-13-007, dated January 29, 2013:

a) Approve a sustainable, long term funding model for the financing of the Regional portion of Tax Increment Grant approvals based on funding the grant from the incremental tax revenue following remediation and redevelopment;

b) Approve the allocation of $250,000 from the 2013 Regional Smart Growth Initiative Capital Budget to provide additional funding for the Phase Two Environmental Site Assessment Grant program;

c) Delegate authority for Phase Two Environmental Site Assessment grant approvals to the Chief Financial Officer and the Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services, or their respective designates, jointly and;

d) Direct staff to continue reviewing the Brownfield Financial Incentive Program and report back in the latter part of 2013 with recommendations for program refinements that further align the program with Regional priorities, in consultation with the Area Municipalities.

SUMMARY:

The Brownfield Financial Incentive Program (BFIP) was established by Regional Council as a pilot program in 2006 in order to:

- promote compact growth that utilizes existing infrastructure;
- reduce the outward expansion of the urban area;
- mitigate potential risk to Regional groundwater sources by promoting the remediation of environmentally impacted properties; and
- generate increased tax revenue from previously under-utilized or abandoned properties; and;
- support the adaptive reuse of buildings, including heritage properties.

The BFIP consists of three incentive programs: the Phase Two Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) Grant of up to $40,000; the joint Tax Increment Grant (TIG); and the Regional
Development Charge (RDC) exemption. The joint TIG program is offered to any Area Municipality who has approved a Community Improvement Plan (CIP) for the purposes of encouraging brownfield remediation and redevelopment. To date, the Cities of Cambridge and Kitchener have approved such a CIP. The resulting joint TIG programs offered share a common set of program characteristics with the exception of the funding model.

Since 2006, Regional Council has invested a total of $5 million into the ESA and TIG programs. The RDC exemption is funded through program budgets (Roads, Water and Wastewater, other) in a manner similar to other development charge exemptions offered by the Region rather than through the BFIP budget. In September 2012, Regional Council approved a joint TIG for the Breithaupt Block in Kitchener (Report P-12-088/F-12-073) which utilized the remaining uncommitted funds of the BFIP.

The BFIP has been successful in its ability to promote new investigations about the environmental condition of properties throughout the Region and promote the successful remediation and redevelopment of brownfields in strategic areas of the Region, including the Central Transit Corridor. In total, the funding has contributed to the creation of approximately 285 new residential units and approximately 60,000 sq m (646,000 sq ft) of non-residential floor area that together have resulted in building permits valued at approximately $57.1 million. Demand for the program continues to remain strong.

The joint TIG program has acted as a catalyst for redevelopment through its ability to provide the developer with a ‘bankable commitment’ for recouping all, or a portion of, the remediation expenses required to redevelop a brownfield property. The relatively small outlay of funding for remediation expenses by the Region and Area Municipality in comparison to the potential long-term benefit that can be realized from the site’s redevelopment has made the program a success as demonstrated through staff’s review of financial metrics from now completed redevelopments. The costs associated with providing the TIG for the now completed Tannery in Kitchener and Waterscape (Building 1) in Cambridge will be recouped by the Region and Area Municipality through increased taxes within 2 and 3 years respectively. Please see Attachment 3 for a summary of the financial metrics.

Given that the Region’s BFIP was developed as a pilot program, the Region’s practice of providing one time funds to the BFIP budget represented a conservative approach that was reasonable at the time. However, this funding model does not work well on a longer term or ongoing basis. A more permanent program with a sustainable funding model is required to provide more certainty to developers who are considering making an application. The proposed funding model for TIGs is the same model used by the Cities of Cambridge and Kitchener. TIGs would be funded from the incremental tax revenue following redevelopment and reassessment and the impact to the Regional budget would be a delayed benefit from the assessment growth to the overall tax levy. To the extent that the TIG advances development or results in development that otherwise would not have occurred, there would be no delayed benefit and even additional revenue.

The Region’s 2013 capital budget and forecast currently includes funding for the Regional Smart Growth Initiative. It is proposed that $250,000 of the capital budget allocation be utilized for the on-going demand for ESA grants offered under the BFIP.

Should a sustainable, long term funding model be adopted by Regional Council, staff would begin retroactively reviewing applications for potential Regional funding. Staff would also begin contacting those who had inquired about the programs and begin the process of accepting new applications to both the Phase Two ESA and TIG programs.
Regional staff will also continue to review the existing BFIP, in conjunction with the Area Municipalities and the outcomes of the Community Building Strategy (as per Report P-12-009/F12-016, dated February 28, 2012). The review could result in recommendations for additional refinements to various program elements including eligibility criteria, application process / submission requirements, how eligible costs are determined and administered, the 5 year timeline associated with RDC exemptions (through the RDC by-law review process) and the geography of program priorities (e.g. focusing on specific station areas and/or key wellhead protection areas). Any recommended refinements are expected to be brought back to Regional Council later in 2013.

REPORT:  
BFIP Program Background

In October 2006, Regional Council approved the framework for a Regional Brownfield Financial Incentive Pilot Program which was fully implemented in 2007. The goal of the program has been to encourage the remediation and redevelopment of existing brownfield sites in a manner that serves to:

- promote compact growth that utilizes existing infrastructure;
- reduce the outward expansion of the urban area;
- mitigate potential risk to Regional groundwater sources by promoting remediation of environmentally impacted properties;
- generate increased tax revenue from previously under-utilized or abandoned properties; and;
- support the adaptive reuse of buildings, including heritage properties.

The goals and outcomes of the BFIP align with Provincial and Regional Policies including the Province’s Places to Grow Growth Plan, the Regional Growth Management Strategy (RGMS), and the Regional Official Plan (approved by Regional Council in 2009).

The BFIP consists of the following three incentive programs for developers:

1. Phase Two Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) Grants – a cost sharing program which funds up to 50% of eligible costs associated with the completion of environmental site investigation, in the form of a Phase Two ESA report, to a maximum of $40,000;

2. Regional Development Charge (RDC) Exemptions – development charge exemptions are provided through the RDC By-law up to a maximum of the total eligible remediation costs incurred for the remediation of environmentally impacted sites in areas where RDCs would otherwise be due; and

3. Tax Increment Grants (TIG) – a joint program that further offsets remediation costs by providing grants to developers who remediate and redevelop a brownfield site. The TIG program is operated jointly with the Cities of Cambridge and Kitchener and shares a common set of eligibility requirements and identical program characteristics including the following:

- the maximum amount of the TIG is determined at the time of approval based on the estimated eligible costs for remediation less any other applicable financial incentives
- annual payments are provided each year until the eligible remediation costs incurred have been recouped, to a maximum of 10 annual payments;
- the annual grant is capped at a maximum value that is equal to the increase in the annual taxes due as a result of the redevelopment;
• the property owner continues to pay all taxes due during the TIG payment period and;
• payments only begin after the property has been remediated, redeveloped and reassessed.

Legislative authority for the provision of Tax Increment Grants is provided through Section 28 of the Planning Act which authorizes a lower or upper tier municipality to provide grants or loans to land owners for the purposes of promoting community improvement activities, including environmental remediation, for properties located within a defined project area that forms part of a Community Improvement Plan (CIP) approved by Council. The Region participates in the TIG program through the Area Municipalities CIPs. Currently, the cities of Cambridge and Kitchener have enacted CIPs with project areas that encompass the entirety of each municipality.

While the TIG program offered jointly between the Region and cities of Cambridge and Kitchener are identical, the Region and Area Municipalities currently fund their respective portions of the annual TIG payment through different financing models. The Cities of Cambridge and Kitchener use the new tax revenue collected after redevelopment as the source of funding for grant payments while the Region has utilized one-time funds contributed to the BFIP budget to cover the future annual payments to the developer and “backstop” the entire amount of the TIG commitment up front.

One time funding of the BFIP in the amount of $2.5 million was provided for in the 2006 Regional budget. In 2011, an additional $2.5 million was allocated from the elimination of the Environmental Insurance Reserve Fund for a total budget of $5.0 million since 2006.

BFIP Approvals to Date

To date, a total of 22 applications have been approved (14 Phase Two ESA grants; 4 RDC exemptions and 4 TIGs) and staff has responded to over 75 inquires from the public regarding the BFIP program. Please see Attachment 1 for budget allocations to date.

TIGs approved by the Region and Area Municipalities have been for 4 major projects known as The Tannery (Kitchener), Waterscape on the Grand River (Cambridge), 750 Lawrence St (Cambridge) and the Breithaupt Block (Kitchener) as described in Attachment 2.

These sites were formerly vacant, abandoned or under-utilized properties that were environmentally impacted by various contaminants including hydrocarbons, heavy metals, and asbestos. Grants provided have assisted with costs associated with the remediation of these properties including soil removal and the application of other risk mitigation measures that were required by the Ministry of the Environment in order to obtain a Record of Site Condition (RSC) to allow for the redevelopment of the sites.

In total, redevelopments receiving BFIP funding will result in the creation of 285 new residential units and approximately 60,000 sq m (646,000 sq ft) of non residential floor area in Cambridge and Kitchener representing a combined building permit value of approximately $57.1 million.

BFIP Evaluation

Through the course of the BFIP pilot, staff has gained considerable experience administering the incentive programs and have been evaluating the overall impact and success of the programs in the development community and their ability to further the Region’s strategic goals.

The following is an overview of staff’s evaluation of each program’s performance and role in promoting the remediation and redevelopment of brownfields in the Region:
Evaluation: Phase Two ESA Grant Program

The Phase Two ESA grant program provides property owners the opportunity to cost-share with the Region expenses associated with the investigative testing and preparation of a Phase Two ESA report in order to document the current environmental state of a property. The 14 Phase Two ESA grants approved to date have resulted in the environmental investigation of 11 properties of which 6 have proceeded with subsequent remediation, redevelopment and further application to either the RDC exemption or TIG programs.

The information obtained through these site investigations has provided benefits in two respects:

1. to promote real, up-to-date knowledge about a site’s environmental condition which has the potential to form part of due diligence investigations in the event of a sale or redevelopment of the property; and
2. the provision of early information about a site’s environmental status (in terms of soil and groundwater) to various Regional departments and divisions (including Planning and Water Services) allowing staff to more efficiently assist developers with remediation and redevelopment and implement Regional policies and programs for planning and sustainability.

The program also provides staff with an early indication about forthcoming development plans and can serve as an opportunity to make applicants aware of other incentives offered that can further facilitate their redevelopment plans.

Evaluation: RDC Exemption Program

The RDC exemption program represents the Region’s most widely available program for assisting with brownfield remediation costs. The maximum potential value of RDC exemptions for brownfield remediation costs approved to-date is $5,065,730. The program’s ability to provide assistance early in the development process (exemptions on DC’s due at time of building permit) makes it a valuable form of assistance to the development community. Feedback from developers indicates that the early timing of the assistance helps to mitigate financial risk associated with a project at a time in the development process when expenditures and financial risk incurred by the developer are at their highest.

However, the program’s current 5 year limitation on approvals (commencing 30 days after filing of a Record of Site Condition with the Province) means the RDC program has difficulty accommodating large-scale, multi-phased redevelopments that require longer periods of time to complete the redevelopment of the site including submitting all building permits associated with the development. As a result, staff note that some projects will not be able to take full advantage of all the RDC exemptions to which the project may be entitled to. All aspects of the exemption for brownfield remediation costs will be the subject of a review by staff through the RDC By-law review process in 2013.

Evaluation: Joint TIG Program

The joint TIG program provides the primary financial incentive opportunity specifically for brownfield remediation in Cambridge and Kitchener’s core areas. It also provides an additional opportunity for developers to recover remediation costs for brownfield sites outside the core areas where a developer would be unable to recover all of the remediation costs through the RDC exemption program alone.
The TIG’s ability to act as a catalyst for redevelopment is its ability to provide the developer with a ‘bankable commitment’ for recovering all, or a portion of, the remediation expenses that will be required in order to redevelop the property. In particular, the grant approval by both Regional and City Councils can act as a guarantee which could be useful in assisting a developer to secure financing for the project.

In return, the Region and Area Municipalities are able to promote redevelopment opportunities on under-utilized or vacant brownfields by reducing the overall impact of the cost of remediation on the financial performance of a potential project. The resulting redevelopment transforms a formerly under-utilized property into a new source of assessment and tax revenue in the built up area.

The Tannery in downtown Kitchener is an extremely successful example of the adaptive reuse of a formerly under-utilized and contaminated manufacturing site that has been restored into a mixed use building consisting of character office space and ancillary retail that now employs 1000 people. Waterscape on the Grand in Cambridge is a multi-phased high density residential development located on a formerly abandoned and contaminated property adjacent to the Grand River. To-date, Building 1 of the Waterscape development has been completed with the addition of 113 new condominium units in the downtown Cambridge market.

The completion of these two projects has resulted in staff’s first opportunity to review the incremental assessment and taxation resulting from the redevelopment in comparison to the grant amount provided for the remediation (see Attachment 3).

The costs associated with providing the TIG will be recovered by the Region and Area Municipality through increased taxes within 2 years for Waterscape (Building 1) and 3 years for the Tannery as shown in Appendix 3. In both cases, the incremental taxes arising over time from the remediation and redevelopment of the sites is significantly greater than the cost of the TIG.

The program’s success lies in the mutual benefit created for the Municipality and the developer from the provision of a relatively small outlay of funding for remediation expenses in comparison to the potential long-term financial benefit that can be realized from the site’s redevelopment. For the developer, the incentive provides an opportunity to offset the expenses that will be required to remediate the property and makes brownfield properties a more competitive option for development compared with uncontaminated sites in the Region.

In addition to financial metrics, staff have also noted that each of the sites approved for a TIG to date have been located in the Region’s Central Transit Corridor (CTC). The addition of high profile office space and residential units along the Region’s future Rapid Transit line on formerly under-utilized properties will have positive impacts for generating future ridership growth. As a result, staff plan to further explore potential opportunities to strategically apply the TIG program within the CTC, in concert with the Community Building Strategy (CBS), to accelerate redevelopment in anticipation of rapid transit.

Current Status of the BFIP

In September 2012, Regional Council approved a joint TIG for the Breithaupt Block in Kitchener (Report P-12-088/F-12-073) which utilized the remaining uncommitted funds approved for the TIG program. In addition, the current number and value of Phase Two ESA grant applications under review will use the majority of the remaining funds budgeted for that program as well.

As a result, staff sent correspondence on October 26, 2012 to those who had expressed an interest in applying to either of those programs within the last year and advised that no new
applications would be accepted at this time. In addition, applicants whose applications for a TIG were already under review, but not yet approved, were advised that their applications were being placed on hold with the Region’s portion of any potential funding subject to future consideration by Regional Council.

Recipients were further advised that the hold on existing and new applications did not apply to applications made under the RDC exemption program or the Area Municipal portion of TIG funding. As such, TIG applications can, and have, continued to be made to the Area Municipalities (Cambridge and Kitchener), at their discretion.

Proposed Funding for the BFIP

The Region’s BFIP was initially developed as a pilot program with a fixed budget provision. As approvals were granted for the various program components (ESA grants and TIGs), the pilot program funding was allocated and reserved for those specific approvals. This enabled the Region to ensure that pilot project funds were not over committed and that funds were available to cover the approved costs when they were eventually incurred. While this funding approach works for a pilot or time limited project, it does not work well on a longer term or on-going basis, particularly for TIGs with their more significant amounts.

Funding: Phase Two ESA Grant Program

The Phase Two ESA grant program utilizes funds allocated through the BFIP budget for application approvals and requires an additional funding source to continue. The Region’s capital budget and forecast currently includes funding for the Regional Smart Growth Initiative. It is proposed that $250,000 of the 2013 capital budget allocation be utilized to fund an estimated 6 - 8 ESA grants offered under the Brownfield Financial Incentive Program. Staff will consider a longer term funding source for ESA grants as part of the 2014 budget process.

Under the pilot BFIP, Council delegated authority to the Chief Financial Officer or his designate to disburse funds for ESA grants. It is recommended that under the proposed BFIP funding plan, this authority rest jointly with the Chief Financial Officer and the Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services (or their respective designates).

Funding: TIG Program

The approval of a TIG will pre-date by several years the benefits of the increased tax revenue that will result from a redevelopment as the program requires remediation, redevelopment and reassessment to occur prior to any TIG payments. The pilot program’s requirement for funding to be in place at the time the TIG is approved results in funds being set aside or reserved several years in advance of the anticipated payment. This could tie up funds unnecessarily, result in fewer approvals or divert funds from other critical requirements.

Another approach to funding TIGs, an approach used by a number of municipalities in Ontario including the cities of Cambridge and Kitchener, is to fund the annual TIG payment from the increased tax revenue in the same year. In other words, the tax revenue resulting from the increased assessment following the redevelopment is used to fund the grant payment to the developer. More simply, the incremental taxation from that property pays for the TIG for that same property. Funding annual TIGs from the increased tax revenue in the same year matches the timing of the revenue to the timing of the payment of the expense for the duration of the TIG. The impact to the Region’s budget is the delayed benefit of the increased assessment to the overall tax levy. To the extent that the TIG advances development or results in development that otherwise would not have occurred, there would be no delayed benefit and even additional revenue.
Under the proposed funding approach, TIGS would show in the Region’s capital budget and forecast funded from the revenue resulting from the increased taxes (i.e. the tax levy). TIGs would continue to be approved by Regional Council before the TIG payments are included in the capital budget for the relevant years. The eligible costs would continue to be subject to Regional staff review. The program would continue to require remediation, redevelopment and reassessment to occur before any payments are made. All other requirements under the current program would also continue to apply. The only difference is the funding source for the Regional portion of the TIG.

Next Steps

Should a sustainable, long term funding model be adopted by Regional Council for the TIG program, TIG applications made to the Area Municipalities following the hold on applications would be retroactively reviewed by staff for eligibility and potential Regional funding. Staff would also begin contacting those who had inquired about the programs and begin the process of accepting new applications. Likewise, should Regional Council approve the allocation of additional funds for the Phase Two ESA grant program, staff would resume accepting applications for that program as well. Applicants will continue to be advised that all approvals for TIGs are subject to formal Regional Council approval.

Regional staff will continue to review the existing BFIP, in cooperation with Area Municipalities, with the intention of proposing refinements that would further align the BFIP with Regional priorities and promoting transit ridership growth in key strategic locations in concert with the outcomes of the Community Building Strategy (as per Report P-12-009/F12-016, dated February 28, 2012). The review could result in recommended changes to various program elements including eligibility criteria, application process / submission requirements, how eligible costs are determined and reimbursed, the 5 year timeline associated with RDC exemptions (through the RDC by-law review process) and the geography of program priorities (e.g. focusing on specific station areas and/or key wellhead protection areas). Any recommended refinements are expected to be brought back to Regional Council later in 2013.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

Regional staff has consulted with planning and finance staff from the Cities of Cambridge and Kitchener regarding the recommendations proposed in this report and have confirmed they are supportive of the recommendations.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The Regional BFIP directly addresses Focus Area 2 of the Corporate Strategic Plan: Growth Management and Prosperity (Manage growth to foster thriving and productive urban and rural communities), Strategic Objective 2.1 (Encourage compact, livable urban and rural settlement form) and its specific Actions:

- Implement a sustainable Brownfield Program to promote the redevelopment of previously contaminated sites (Action 2.1.1); and
- Work with area municipalities to develop and implement a comprehensive strategy to promote intensification and reurbanization within existing urban areas (Action 2.1.2).

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The proposed funding approach for TIGs is to fund the annual TIG payment from the increased tax revenue in the same year. Tax revenue resulting from the increased assessment following the redevelopment is used to fund the grant payment to the developer. This is consistent with
the funding approach used by a number of municipalities across Ontario including the Cities of Cambridge and Kitchener. The impact to the Region’s budget is the delayed benefit of the increased assessment to the overall tax levy.

The Region’s capital budget and forecast currently includes funding for the Regional Smart Growth Initiative. It is proposed that $250,000 of the capital budget allocation, funded from the Capital Levy Reserve Fund, be utilized for ESA grants offered under the BFIP.

OTHER DEPARTMENTAL CONSULTATION/CONCURRENCE:

Staff from Legal Services have been involved in the development of the funding model proposed in this report and will continue to be involved, along with other departments such as Water Services and Corporate Resources, in the continued review of the BFIP.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment 1 – BFIP Budget Allocation (2006 – Present)
Attachment 2 – Joint TIG Regional Financial Commitment Summary
Attachment 3 – Approved TIG Applications Nearing Completion for Grant Payment

PREPARED BY: Phillip Caldwell, Principal Planner/Brownfields Coordinator
Angela Hinchberger, Director of Financial Services, Treasury & Tax Policy

APPROVED BY: Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning, Housing & Community Services
Craig Dyer, Chief Financial Officer
Attachment 1 – BFIP Budget Allocation (2006 – Present)

This table details the allocation of the BFIP’s budget since 2006. It should be noted that the 4 applications approved under the RDC exemption program are not listed as they are not funded through the BFIP’s budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Approvals</th>
<th>Expenditures To-Date</th>
<th>Amount Reserved for Existing/Anticipated Approvals</th>
<th>Total Expenditures / Reserved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase Two ESA Grant</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$347,450</td>
<td>$187,019</td>
<td>$534,469*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIGs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,328,609</td>
<td>$4,328,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Municipal CIP Implementation</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Development</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$86,922</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$86,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>$434,372</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,565,628</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Phase Two ESA program has a remaining $20,347 in funds which is less than the maximum potential for a single grant and thus has remained as contingency for existing applications that are pending approval.

**Funds are reserved for Area Municipalities wishing to participate in the TIG program to fund their CIP implementation.
Attachment 2
Joint TIG Regional Financial Commitment Summary

The following table shows the projects where Regional Council has approved a TIG with a total maximum value of $6,487,644. This includes “finalized” TIG commitments of $762,944 where the final payment schedule has been confirmed and up to $5,724,700 of “potential” Regional TIG commitments for projects where the remediation and redevelopment is not yet complete and the payment schedule is not yet confirmed.

The $5,724,700 is a “potential” maximum Regional TIG commitment. The final TIG amounts for these projects will depend on a number of factors including the actual costs of remediation, the value of other incentives, the timing of project completion and the final MPAC assessment. Staff estimate the final costs for these TIGs to be in the range of $3.46 to $3.56 million for a total commitment of $4.2 million $4.3 million.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIG Project</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Year Approved</th>
<th>“Finalized” Regional TIG Commitment</th>
<th>“Potential” Regional TIG Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36 Francis St. (The Tannery)</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$537,410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170 Water St. North (Wat 1)</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$225,534</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170 Water St. North (Wat 2)</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>$605,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 Water St. North (South)</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,441,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750 Lawrence St.</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>$723,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Breithaupt St.</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>$953,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total TIG Commitments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$762,944</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,724,700</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No TIG payments have been made to date.

Funding for the TIG program was provided from the original $2.5 million dollars set aside for the Brownfield Financial Incentive Pilot Program in 2006. An additional $2.5 million was allocated in 2011 from the elimination of the Environmental Insurance Reserve Fund for TIGs or other BFIP components as needed. Currently there is $4,328,609 available to fund TIG commitments. Given the amount of confirmed or “finalized” Regional TIG Commitments ($762,944), the variables impacting the “potential” TIGs, and estimates of the final costs for the “potential” TIGs ($4.2 to $4.3 million), it is staff’s view that the current TIG funding set aside to date will be sufficient for the current “finalized” and “potential” TIG commitments.

Staff will continue to monitor the anticipated expenditures and payment schedules as more information becomes available and provide periodic updates to Regional Council.
Attachment 3
Approved TIG Applications Nearing Completion for Grant Payment

The table below provides a summary of key financial metrics with which staff evaluated the outcomes of the Lang Tannery and Waterscape (Building 1) TIG approvals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre Remediation and Redevelopment Municipal Taxes</th>
<th>Post Remediation and Redevelopment Municipal Taxes</th>
<th>Annual Tax-Increment (Region and City)</th>
<th>TIG Amount *</th>
<th>TIG Payments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*total grant amount including both the Region and City's portion
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: January 29, 2013

FILE CODE: L07-90

SUBJECT: SURPLUS DECLARATION AND CONVEYANCE OF EASEMENT INTEREST TO REGION OF WATERLOO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT IN FAVOUR OF WATERLOO NORTH HYDRO INC.

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo:

a) declare an easement interest in the lands described as Part Lot 102, German Company Tract, being Part 1, Reference Plan 58R-17685, part of PIN 22254-0193 (LT), in the Township of Woolwich surplus to the needs of the Region, as detailed in Report No. CR-RS-13-001/E-13-018 dated January 8, 2013, and provide the standard public notification as required by the Region’s property disposition by-law; and

b) approve, enter into an Agreement for, and execute all documentation related to, the conveyance of a permanent easement to Waterloo North Hydro Inc., for the sum of $1.00, for the installation and maintenance of hydro equipment over the lands described as Part Lot 102, German Company Tract, being Part 1, Reference Plan 58R-17685, part of PIN 22254-0193 (LT), in the Township of Woolwich as detailed in Report No. CR-RS-13-001/E-13-018 dated January 8, 2013, pursuant to the Region’s property disposition by-law and the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor.

SUMMARY:

NIL

REPORT:

As one of the final steps to completing the Airport Operations Centre (AOC) located on airport lands adjacent to New Germany Lane, Waterloo North Hydro Inc. (“Waterloo Hydro”) will require a permanent easement for the installation of poles and wires to service the AOC and adjacent neighbor. The road allowance along New Germany Lane is not wide enough to accommodate Waterloo North Hydro’s equipment. The total easement area will be approximately 924 square feet.

The Region’s property disposition by-law requires advertising of any proposed conveyance of an interest in Regional land in a local newspaper. When the requirements of the Region’s property disposition by-law have been met, the subject easement will be conveyed to Waterloo Hydro. The Region will be responsible for the associated costs of the easement such as preparation of the Reference Plan, advertising and registration of all documentation.

The subject lands are shown attached as Appendix ‘A’.
CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

One of the goals of the Corporate Strategic Plan is to support the growth of aviation-related activities at the Region of Waterloo International Airport.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The estimated cost for executing all documentation related to the conveyance of the easement to Waterloo North Hydro is $4000. The 2013 Airport Capital Budget includes sufficient funding for this.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

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

ATTACHMENTS

Appendix “A” – Location map of lands.

PREPARED BY: Joan Moore, Property Agent, Legal Services  
John Hammer, Director, Transportation

APPROVED BY: Gary Sosnoski, Commissioner of Corporate Resources  
Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
REPORT:

1. Background

The Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Study for Ira Needles Boulevard was originally completed in 1988, recognizing the need for a west side arterial extending from Highway 7/8 to Erb Street to serve the westerly expansion of the Cities of Kitchener and Waterloo. The Class EA Study was updated in 2002 and a Preliminary Design Study was completed in 2004. The Preliminary Design Study identified the preferred ultimate design for Ira Needles Boulevard as a 4-lane urban arterial with cycling lanes, to be constructed initially with two through traffic lanes and cycling lanes. The initial two-lane construction of Ira Needles Boulevard was completed in 2007. The initial construction of Ira Needles Boulevard included measures to minimize the future costs of expanding to 4 lanes which included: installation of the storm sewers in their ultimate location, construction of the sub-structure for the future widening of the bridge over the GEXR railway to 4 lanes and construction of full-depth paved shoulders in some sections of the road to accommodate the future widening of the road to 4 lanes. Please refer to Appendix A for a key plan of the project limits.

2. Ira Needles Boulevard Widening and Recommended Construction Phasing

On March 7, 2012, as per Report P-12-026, Regional Council approved the widening to 4 lanes of Ira Needles Boulevard from Highview Drive to Erb Street, including advancement of the widening work from 2019 to 2015. Subsequent to Regional Council’s decision, staff hired a consultant and awarded the detailed design for the widening. The widening work also includes the widening of the existing bridge deck over the GEXR railway crossing north of Victoria Street, including facilities for cyclists and pedestrians.
Over the last several months during the design of the widening of Ira Needles Boulevard, staff have become aware of various development proposals for lands adjacent to Ira Needles Boulevard on the north (City of Waterloo) section of the project. These lands are located along the east and west sides of Ira Needles Boulevard between the existing Boardwalk development and Erb Street. An additional proposed development that is being considered is located on Erb Street west of Ira Needles Boulevard. Please refer to Appendix A for a key plan of the project showing the location of these properties.

Many of these properties are still in the very early planning stages but staff anticipates these development proposals will be approved in the next two years or so. One or more of these development proposals has the potential to require significant changes to Ira Needles Boulevard north of the Boardwalk development, including the potential for new intersections, significant re-alignment of Ira Needles Boulevard or significant modifications to the Erb Street roundabout. As these development proposals may result in significant changes to the Ira Needles Boulevard corridor, staff cannot complete the detailed design of this section of the road until the development proposals have been approved. Unlike the north section of Ira Needles Boulevard, the south section from Highview Drive to just beyond University Ave. has no adjacent undefined development parcels and as such, detailed design is proceeding and construction can be advanced from 2015 to 2014.

On January 8, 2013, staff tabled Report E-13-006 recommending the following construction phasing plan to account for the uncertain land re-development in the north section as follows:

- Phase 1 (2014) – Highview Drive to University Avenue;
- Phase 2 (2016) – University Avenue to Erb Street.

At this Committee meeting, the Report was deferred with a direction that staff consider revising the northerly limit of Phase 1 to north of University Avenue so that more of the widening to 4 lanes could be completed in 2014 rather than 2016.

Subsequent to the January 8, 2013 Committee meeting, staff has reviewed the northerly limit of Phase 1 and is now recommending the following revised construction phasing:

- Phase 1 (2014) – Highview Drive to approximately 350 metres north of University Avenue;
- Phase 2 (2016) – Approximately 350 metres north of University Avenue to Erb Street.

Staff are confident that the design can be completed and necessary approvals received in time to allow the advancement of the Phase 1 portion from 2015 to 2014. The actual timing of the Phase 2 portion will depend on the timing of the development plans along that stretch of Ira Needles Boulevard. Despite the potential one year delay to the Phase 2 section of this project, staff will look for opportunities to advance the schedule or to make operational improvements to the Erb Street roundabout to help reduce traffic delays at this intersection during peak periods.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The widening of Ira Needles Boulevard between Highview Drive and Erb Street, when complete, will support Focus Area 2 – Growth Management and Prosperity and meets strategic objective number 2.2 which is to develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs.
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The Region’s approved 2013 Ten Year Transportation Capital Program includes a total of $8.6 million for this project in the years 2013 to 2016 to be funded from the Development Charges and Road Capital Levy Reserve Funds. The revised construction phasing recommended in this report will require Council approval to advance for this project an estimated $5.8 million in funding from 2015 to 2014.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Transportation Planning Division was consulted in preparation of this report.

ATTACHMENTS

Appendix A: Project Key Plan

PREPARED BY: Marcos Kroker, Senior Project Manager, Design and Construction

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
REGION OF WATERLOO
TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
Design and Construction

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

DATE: January 29, 2013

FILE CODE: C06-60/8797-H

SUBJECT: KITCHENER WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR BIOSOLIDS STORAGE LAGOONS DECOMMISSIONING

RECOMMENDATION:

For information.

SUMMARY:

The Kitchener Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) has two biosolids storage lagoons that are no longer used and decommissioning must start by mid-2013 in order to meet the Region’s schedule commitments as part of the overall Kitchener WWTP Upgrades project. A number of processing and disposal alternatives for the biosolids remaining in the lagoons are available, so Region staff intend to utilize a Request for Proposals (RFP) process to allow the market to respond with various alternate approaches that will provide best value for the Region through competition. Because there is the potential that Ontario landfills might not accept any or all of the biosolids from the decommissioned lagoons and in order to ensure viable disposal options and competitive proposals, the proposed RFP approach will allow and consider proposals that include receivers located outside of Ontario.

REPORT:

The Kitchener Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) has two biosolids storage lagoons that are no longer used and require decommissioning as part of the overall Kitchener WWTP Upgrades project to allow for the upcoming construction of the new Kitchener WWTP Plant 3. In order to meet the Region’s schedule commitments for the overall Kitchener WWTP Upgrades project, the lagoons decommissioning work must start by mid-2013. The biosolids storage lagoons decommissioning work will include processing, removal and off-site disposal of an estimated 60,000 cubic metres of liquid biosolids remaining within the lagoons followed by the backfilling and grading of the lagoon area in preparation for the subsequent Plant 3 construction contract.

There are a number of possible receivers for the lagoons’ biosolids, including licensed solid waste landfills, agricultural lands or other possible users for a soil amendment. Certain receivers, such as licensed solid waste landfills, can only accept biosolids in solid form. Different types of equipment and processes are available to solidify the liquid biosolids, such as mechanical dewatering or addition of a solidifying amendment. These solidification processes could be conducted on-site at the Kitchener WWTP or off-site at a licensed processing facility. The characteristics of the biosolids within the lagoons vary both in terms of solid-to-liquid ratio and chemical quality. As a result, various combinations of solidification processes and receivers could be utilized in different parts of the lagoons. Each possible combination of solidification process and receiver has advantages and disadvantages in terms of cost, schedule, potential for odour generation, approvals, potential impact to WWTP operations, and process reliability. The cost and availability of different processing and receiving alternatives fluctuate constantly as existing processing and receiving facilities commit or open up capacity and new processing and receiving facilities become available.
Because of the many possible processing and receiving alternatives and fluctuating costs and availability, Region staff intends to utilize a Request for Proposals (RFP) process to select a construction contractor for the biosolids storage lagoons decommissioning rather than a construction tender process that specifies the biosolids processing and disposal methods. The advantage of the RFP approach is that it doesn't specify processing and disposal methods but rather allows the market to respond with various alternate approaches that will provide best value for the Region through competition. The RFP will specify in general terms what the Region wants but provide flexibility for respondents to propose a solution. The RFP approach will include formal, comprehensive evaluation criteria and a scoring matrix. Price will be the major criterion subject to the proposed approach demonstrating conformance to schedule, effective odour control, regulatory compliance, compatibility with WWTP operations, and proven process reliability. The proposals will be submitted in two separate envelopes; one for the technical submission and one for the price submission. The technical submissions will be evaluated first and the price envelopes will only be opened for those submissions meeting the minimum technical requirements. Award of the decommissioning work will be recommended to the proponent with best value to the Region as represented by the highest overall score.

The Region’s consultant contacted landfills in Ontario to inquire if they would accept the biosolids from the storage lagoons. Many Ontario landfills including the Waterloo Landfill Site cannot accept biosolids at all. Other Ontario landfills can only accept biosolids from specific municipalities that do not include the Region. One landfill in Ontario can accept the large volume in the lagoons, but will not accept certain solidifying amendments that may be the most appropriate and cost-effective approach for the biosolids lagoons decommissioning work. One other landfill in Ontario will accept a variety of solidifying amendments but can only accept about one-third of the estimated biosolids volume per year. If this latter landfill were utilized, the biosolids lagoons decommissioning would require at least three years to complete and the overall Kitchener WWTP Upgrades project would be delayed by at least two years. Because there is the potential that Ontario landfills might not accept any or all of the biosolids from the decommissioned lagoons and in order to ensure viable disposal options and competitive proposals, the proposed RFP approach will allow and consider proposals that include receivers located outside of Ontario.

Region staff will be issuing the RFP in the first quarter of 2013, and will be presenting a recommendation to Council once an evaluation of the proposals has been completed. It is expected that the lagoon decommissioning work will occur between mid-2013 and mid-2014.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The Kitchener WWTP Upgrades including the biosolids storage lagoons decommissioning supports the Corporate Strategic Plan Focus Area 1, Environmental Sustainability, and the following strategic objectives: protect the quality and quantity of our water sources.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The Region’s 2013 Ten Year Wastewater Capital Program provides a total budget of $67,255,000 for the Kitchener WWTP upgrades over the years 2013-2014, of which $17,700,000 has been allocated for biosolids storage lagoons decommissioning.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

The Region’s Finance Department, Procurement and Supply Services Division has been consulted in the preparation of this report.
ATTACHMENTS

NIL

PREPARED BY: Nancy Corbett, Senior Project Manager, Environmental Engineering

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
REGION OF WATERLOO
TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
Transportation

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

DATE: January 29, 2013

FILE CODE: T04-10

SUBJECT: POSTED SPEED LIMITS APPROACHING ROUNDABOUTS ON REGIONAL ROADS

RECOMMENDATION:

For Information

SUMMARY:

Staff reviewed the relationship between posted speed limits and roundabout size versus roundabout entry speeds. The study found that posted speed limits do not influence entry speeds for posted speed limits between 50km/h and 80km/h. As the size of roundabouts increases, it was generally found that entry speeds increase. The overall conclusion of the review found that entry speeds to roundabouts are determined by the design and size of a roundabout and not the posted speed limit.

REPORT:

On February 28, 2012, Planning and Works committee members requested that staff consider reducing the speed limit on Can-Amera Parkway approaching Conestoga Boulevard in the City of Cambridge from 70 km/h to 60 km/h. Staff has generally responded to similar requests indicating that arbitrary reductions to the posted speed limit on Regional roads will typically have no positive impact on driver behavior based on studies undertaken by staff and research elsewhere on the subject. However since this is the first time staff has been requested to consider lowering the speed limit on an approach to a roundabout, staff initiated a comprehensive study to determine if there is any relationship between posted speed and roundabout entry speed.

If a relationship exists between posted speed and entry speed at roundabouts, then it should exist today and be apparent at roundabouts in the Region of Waterloo as the Region has a number of roundabouts with approaches (Regional and Municipal) currently operating under various speed limits ranging between 50 km/h and 80 km/h. Staff measured entry speeds at crosswalks in all lanes of all approaches to roundabouts on Regional roads to find a relationship between posted speed limit and roundabout entry speed.

Staff aggregated the data by posted speed limits to help decipher any existing relationship (linear or exponential). A relationship may exist if entry speed is seen to increase or decrease relative to the posted speed limit. Table 1 summarizes observations of posted speed limit versus average roundabout entry speed. Based on the information presented in Table 1, staff was able to conclude that no relationship existed between posted speed and roundabout entry speed.
Table 1 – Posted Speed Limit vs. Average Roundabout Entry Speed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Posted Speed Limit (km/h)</th>
<th>Average Entry Speed (km/h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff also completed several Global Positioning System speed runs on the approaches to 3 different roundabouts operating under different speed limit conditions. These studies were completed to obtain a better appreciation for approach and entry speed at roundabouts operating under differing speed limits and to determine how far in advance drivers may be reacting to approaching roundabouts. Staff completed 10-15 runs following motorists under free-flow traffic conditions to obtain accurate speed profiles. The following Figure 2 and 3 depict the speed profile of two roundabouts having approach speed limits of 80 km/h and 50 km/h respectively. The two distinctive dips at the bottom of each speed profile illustrate average speed leading into and out of the roundabout. More importantly, when comparing the two speed profiles, it is noted that entry and exit speed of both roundabouts are nearly identical despite a difference of 30 km/h in posted speed limit.

Figure 2 - Northbound Arthur Street and Sawmill Road (80km/h Posted Speed Limit)
Other key findings upon reviewing the speed profile of all roundabout approaches studied determined that a driver may begin to decelerate their vehicle by as much as 500m in advance of a roundabout. Drivers also tend to decelerate their vehicles first without brakes and then apply brakes to decelerate more quickly as they approach roundabouts. However despite the slight deviations in braking behavior for various operating conditions, drivers enter roundabouts with consistent speed averaging approximately 28 km/h. The following Table 2 summarizes the average distance drivers began to decelerate in advance of roundabouts, deceleration rates and average entry speed based on a review of speed profiles at 3 different roundabouts.

Table 2 – Roundabout Speed Profile Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Posted Speed (km/h)</th>
<th>Average Deceleration Distance (m)</th>
<th>Average Deceleration Rate (m/s)</th>
<th>Average Entry Speed (km/h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff has determined through the analysis of the obtained speed data that there is no statistically reliable relationship between posted speed limits and average roundabout entry speed and has determined that the posted speed limit cannot be used reliably as a means to control or reduce roundabout entry speeds.

Staff believes that rather than posted speed limits, roadway characteristics and geometry have a greater influence on driver travel speeds. The following Table 3 summarizes observed average roundabout entry speeds based on inscribed circle diameters (ICD) of roundabouts on Regional roads. The ICD is best described as the distance across the roundabout measured between the outer curb (or edge) of the circulatory roadway.

Table 3 - Inscribed Circle Diameter (ICD) vs. Average Entry Speed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICD (m)</th>
<th>Average Entry Speed (km/h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of speed data suggests that entry speed tends to increase as the diameter of roundabouts increase. In general but not in all cases, as the diameter of a roundabout increases, curve geometry on the entry, within and upon exit of a roundabout increases as well. In road design larger radii is often cited as a means to lesson the centrifugal forces or lateral forces exerted on drivers and their vehicles. However it is widely recognized that doing so increases motorist comfort level which can result in increased driver speed. This effect appears to be present in the data obtained by staff at Regional roundabouts. Although a stronger correlation was found between the diameter of a roundabout and entry speed, there are many other factors that influence speed at roundabouts including but not limited to grades, sight visibility and landscaping, entry and departure radii, and the number of lanes. This analysis however demonstrates that roundabout geometry in general has a greater influence on entry speed at roundabouts versus posted speed limits.

Staff is not recommending lowering speed limits on approaches to roundabouts for the following reasons:

1. There is no direct relationship between posted speed limit and average roundabout entry speed;
2. Research in the Region and abroad indicates little to no positive speed reduction when speed limits are reduced; and
3. Roundabout design geometry and in particular ICD and related geometry are key contributing factors that can influence roundabout entry and exit speeds.
4. Speed limits on approaches to traffic control signals or stop-controlled intersections are not reduced.
CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This report addresses the Region’s goal to implement proven roadway safety strategies and education to enhance the safety of our roadways (Strategic Objective 3.3.2)

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

NIL

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

NIL

ATTACHMENTS:

NIL

PREPARED BY: Bob Henderson, Manager, Transportation Engineering

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Region of Waterloo endorse a practice of enhancing accessibility at intersections and roundabouts in the Region of Waterloo as outlined in Report E-13-014, dated January 29, 2013.

SUMMARY:

Members of a multi-agency working group consisting of Regional and local municipal staff met with members of the Grand River Accessibility Advisory Committee and Canadian National Institute for the Blind over the course of 2012 to develop recommendations to enhance accessibility at intersections and roundabouts on Regional roads for members of the community with visual impairments. Regional staff is recommending enhancement programs that include but will not be limited to audible pedestrian signals, tactile advisory surface indicators, tactile guide strips, ladder marking, yellow curbs and Roundabout Accessible Traffic Control Signals where appropriate.

REPORT:

At its meeting on January 31, 2012, Planning and Works committee members requested that Regional staff collaborate with the Grand River Accessibility Advisory Committee (GRAAC) and Canadian National Institute for the Blind (CNIB) to discuss and develop solutions to enhance accessibility for members of the community with visual and hearing impairments in the Region of Waterloo at intersections and roundabouts.

In early 2012 a working group comprised of Regional Transportation Engineering, Design and Construction and Transportation Planning staff and municipal staff from the cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo was formed. This multi-agency working group was established with the objective of developing a strategy to enhance accessibility in the Region of Waterloo at intersections and roundabouts on Regional roadways.

To obtain a better appreciation for common accessibility issues at intersections and roundabouts, and help define recommended accessibility enhancement strategies, two separate workshops were held with GRAAC and CNIB members on September 26, 2012 and November 28, 2012. The first workshop included a brief overview of accessibility initiatives currently being provided by the Region and local municipalities, as well as a group exercise concentrated on identifying primary accessibility concerns at different intersection controls, including stop-controlled intersections, pedestrian refuge islands, traffic signals, channelized right–turn lanes and roundabouts. Some of the key concerns expressed by members of GRAAC and CNIB included:
• Difficulty locating pedestrian refuge and channelized right-turn islands;
• Inconsistent right-turn island design and obstructions;
• Motorists not stopping at stop-controlled intersections;
• Locating push-buttons at traffic signals;
• Too much or too little noise at traffic signals; and
• Trusting motorists to yield at multi-lane roundabouts.

Following the identification of accessibility concerns for each intersection type, members of GRAAC and CNIB were requested to suggest possible mitigating measures to address the identified concerns and to suggest ideal criteria that could be used to prioritize the installation of measures assuming limited funding. Participants were advised that the suggestion “Do it everywhere” defeated the purpose of the exercise and would provide no practical rationale for staff to consider. This input gave participants an appreciation for the challenges of managing infrastructure based projects, but more importantly it provided local and Regional staff valuable insight as to what criteria was deemed most important to members of GRAAC and CNIB. A summary of input from this workshop is provided in Appendix A.

The summary provided in Appendix A was presented at a second workshop held with members of GRAAC and CNIB on November 28, 2012. The workshop assessed mitigating measures suggested by GRAAC and CNIB through an AIM exercise (Advantages, Impediments and Maybe’s) which is a brainstorming exercise for working groups to identify advantages, impediments and questions associated with suggestions from different perspectives with the end goal of identifying a preferred solution. The results of the AIM exercise are presented in Appendix B.

Following the workshops, staff discussed various options internally and worked collaboratively to develop a recommended action plan going forward based on the information obtained from the workshops. Based on feedback and input from GRAAC and CNIB, it is recommended that the accessibility measures that the Region and local municipalities agree can be considered for future implementation on Regional and local municipal roadways, subject to available funding, include:

• Audible pedestrian signals;
• Tactile advisory surface indicators;
• Tactile guide strips;
• Yellow curbs at pedestrian refuge islands;
• Smart channels;
• Roundabout Accessible Traffic Control Signals; and
• Ladder crosswalks;

**Audible Pedestrian Signals**

Audible pedestrian signals (APS) are devices that supplement regular traffic signals by providing audible cues and are currently being installed at traffic signalized intersections in the Region of Waterloo upon request. All requests for these audible devices are referred to the Canadian National Institute for the Blind (CNIB) for assessment. CNIB staff assesses their clients’ need, and if required CNIB staff send a request to the Region identifying intersection crossings that should have an APS. Regional staff order and install the equipment based on annual budget availability and then meet with the CNIB staff and their client(s) to explain the operation. Regional staff works with CNIB staff to ensure their clients know the location of the APS and how they operate. Figure 1 illustrates an example of an APS pushbutton/locator tone.
The Region of Waterloo has embarked on one of the first pilot studies in Ontario assessing tactile advisory surface indicators, also known as truncated domes at the intersection of Frederick Street and Edna Street and two adjacent pedestrian refuge island locations. These devices are intended to warn members of the community with visual impairments that they are about to traverse into an area that presents a potential hazard (e.g. moving traffic). These devices are most commonly situated behind curb cuts at crosswalks along the full length of the curb cut. These devices can be sensed by cane and or feeling in the feet for persons with no visibility, and by sight using color contrast for some members of the community with limited visibility. A common misconception with these devices is that they are to be specifically used for alignment purposes. Although it is desirable to align these devices with the pathway of crosswalks, it is not always feasible. Design constraints can certainly present challenges in situating crosswalks in perfect alignment with the tangential pattern of the truncated domes. Other accessibility measures identified in this report can better address alignment concerns more effectively. Figure 2 illustrates tactile advisory surface indicators that were installed at the intersection of Frederick Street and Edna Street in 2012. Currently winter maintenance implications, durability, and slip resistance when snow is present on these devices are being monitored as part of the pilot project. Staff will continue to monitor these variables accordingly and will revise specifications as necessary.
Figure 2 – Tactile Advisory Surface Indicators

Tactile Guide Strips

Tactile guide strips are relatively new devices which have not been used actively on busy arterial roadways and or subjected to snow ploughing in North America. Notwithstanding this, staff is prepared to pilot them in the Region of Waterloo to help mitigate pedestrian wandering problems as described by GRAAC and CNIB members. A tactile guide strip consists of a semi-circular groove approximately 20mm in diameter embedded in a device that can either be surface mounted along the centerline of a crosswalk or inlaid along the centerline of a crosswalk. A groove can also be formed or retrofitted into the asphalt surface which is preferred by Regional staff to effectively address winter maintenance concerns. In each case the groove is demarcated either through the device itself or pavement marking to highlight the guide strip for locating purposes. The groove is meant to be detectable by cane and is used to define the pathway across a crosswalk helping to mitigate wandering outside of designated crosswalk limits. Figure 3 illustrates an example of a tactile guide strip in use. Staff from Design and Construction and Transportation Engineering will work collaboratively to come up with a standard that minimizes winter maintenance concerns and trip hazards and to monitor effectiveness and longevity of the device. Similar to the pilot of tactile advisory surface indicators, staff may have to refine the standard based on any maintenance or operational issues arising out of their use.

Figure 3 - Tactile Guide Strip
Yellow Curbs at Pedestrian Refuge Islands

Contrasting yellow paint on curbs that form a pedestrian refuge island helps members of the community with visual impairments locate these devices when approaching the island walking along a sidewalk and when crossing at these locations. Figure 4 illustrates the use of yellow curbs at a pedestrian refuge island.

Figure 4 –Pedestrian Refuge Island and Yellow Curbs

Smart Channels

Smart channels are a new channelized right-turn design used in the Region of Waterloo since 2006 and are intended to enhance pedestrian accessibility by forcing vehicles to slow down through design geometry instead of having an unrestricted free flow movement. The Region of Waterloo has developed a standard drawing specification for the installation of new right-turn channels and to retrofit old designs. Applying a consistent design standard has been requested by the CNIB and GRAAC. Figure 5 illustrates the old and new right-turn channel designs. Smart channels have been installed recently at Ottawa Street and Westmount Road and Fairway Road and Manitou Drive.

Figure 5 –Right-turn Smart Channel Design
Roundabout Accessible Traffic Control Signals

Roundabout Accessible Traffic Control Signals are intended to provide members of the community who have visual impairments an accessible option to help reach intended destinations that may be impeded by the current or planned presence of a multi-lane roundabout. These devices if deemed required should be positioned a minimum of 60m upstream / downstream of any current or planned roundabout, be positioned no closer than 215m to another traffic control signal, supplemented with audible pedestrian signals, tactile advisory surface indicators, tactile guide strips and operate similar to any midblock pedestrian traffic control signal currently in operation. This device is not intended to replace an existing roundabout crosswalk, but rather supplement it when appropriate.

Roundabout Accessible Traffic Control Signals will be considered upon receiving a request from the CNIB similar to the process currently used for the installation of APS. Installation shall be justified based on the need to provide crossing access for members of the community with visual impairments near any current or planned multi-lane roundabout. Roundabout Accessible Traffic Control Signals shall be subject to an operational review to ensure the traffic signal and roundabout can operate in tandem together satisfactorily. All requests will be considered on an as-need-be-basis where such requests are supported by at least one known user and where the known user’s regular path of travel cannot be facilitated by any other practical route (e.g. crossing provided at a nearby traffic signal). Practical routes will be determined based on the presence of a controlled crossing within 200m of the regular route and or where that route offers an alternative to crossing an existing or planned multi-lane roundabout. Should a Roundabout Accessible Traffic Control Signal no longer be required to assist a known user, removal of the device may be considered.

It is believed following the assessment of alternative Roundabout Accessible Traffic Control Signals locations that the option to situate this device upstream / downstream of a roundabout as recommended minimizes the negative operational impacts that a signalized roundabout crosswalk will have on other pedestrian traffic control devices currently in use at roundabout crosswalks and adequately accommodates members of the community with visual impairments. To maintain the high rate of yield compliance currently seen at Regional roundabout crosswalks, consistent application of the current pedestrian control device is recommended to be maintained. This is recommended because the introduction of a signalized crosswalk at a roundabout inevitably creates inconsistent right-of-way control and messaging for both pedestrians and motorists at roundabouts and will likely cause driver confusion and degrade the rate of yield compliance at roundabout crosswalks controlled by signs. Additionally traffic signals at roundabout crosswalks would likely be disregarded by pedestrians, especially near high schools as pedestrians would likely perceive them as an unnecessary impediment and delaying their crossing. Currently pedestrians only wait on average approximately 2 seconds before a driver yields to them or they obtain a gap in traffic to cross at a roundabout crosswalk based on studies and observations. This recommendation has the benefit of accommodating members of the community with visual impairments while simultaneously avoiding unnecessarily barriers for the general public. It is anticipated that the large majority of pedestrians will continue to use crosswalks under current signed yield control at roundabouts however the general public may use a Roundabout Accessible Traffic Control Signal at their own discretion should they not feel confident crossing at a roundabout. The multi-agency working group was advised by workshop participants, including the chair of GRAAC that they would be willing to walk out of their way to reach their intended destination using such a device. Roundabout Accessible Traffic Control Signals will be equipped with APS locator tones to assist members of the community with visual impairments in locating these devices. CNIB mobility specialists will also continue to provide training and assistance to enhance accessibility for members of our community. Future advancement in technology is also anticipated to enhance accessibility for visually impaired members of the community. Figure 6 illustrates a concept of the Roundabout Accessible Traffic Control Signal.
Ladder Crosswalks

Ladder crosswalks are highly visible crosswalks that help delineate the area used by pedestrians to cross intersections and can help to mitigate pedestrian collisions. They are typically used at Regional signalized locations where intersections experience more than 700 pedestrian crossings over an 8 hour period or where an intersection has seen at least 3 pedestrian collisions over a 5 year period. CNIB and GRAAC members have identified that these types of crosswalks can help guide-dogs negotiate crossing paths. The use of ladder crosswalks must be considered carefully because it is believed that overuse can degrade the overall positive impact that these devices may have on mitigating pedestrian collisions. The use of ladder crosswalks is illustrated in Figure 7.

Figure 7 – Ladder Crosswalks
Budget Impacts

Potential overall budget implications should the accessibility enhancement devices recommended above by the multi-agency working group be implemented at all potentially applicable locations Region-wide is estimated to be approximately $43,000,000. This estimate applies to Regional road locations only and does not include local municipal roadways. The estimated cost to supplement one typical 4-legged signalized intersection with tactile advisory surface indicators and tactile guide strips is approximately $19,000 per intersection and $9,500 per typical 4-legged unsignalized intersection. These costs are likely to come down as demand grows for these accessibility devices in the future. A breakdown of cost estimates are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 – Region-wide Accessibility Enhancement Program Estimated Cost Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessibility Enhancement</th>
<th>Average Cost</th>
<th>Applicable Locations in the Region</th>
<th>Cost to Install at all Potential Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audible Pedestrian Signalized Crosswalk</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
<td>1781</td>
<td>$3,918,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactile Advisory Surface Indicators (Signalized Crosswalk)</td>
<td>$3,750</td>
<td>1781</td>
<td>$6,678,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactile Advisory Surface indicators (Stop Controlled Crosswalk)</td>
<td>$3,750</td>
<td>1815</td>
<td>$6,806,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactile Advisory Surface Indicators (Pedestrian Refuge Island Crossing)</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactile Advisory Surface Indicators (Roundabout Crosswalks)</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>$204,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactile Guide Strips per Crosswalk</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>3596</td>
<td>$3,596,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Curbs at Pedestrian Refuge Islands</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Channels</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>250 **</td>
<td>$8,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundabout Accessible Traffic Control Signal Crosswalk</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>$3,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladder Crosswalk signal or stop-controlled intersection</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>3596</td>
<td>$8,990,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Accessibility Enhancements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,391,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Denotes approximate estimate
Careful consideration has to be given to how to best initiate and deliver an annual accessibility enhancement program recognizing the timelines, overall cost implications, construction and maintenance programs and the fact that Provincial Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) regulations are still currently only in draft form. It is suggested that in order to effectively deliver an accessibility enhancement program on Regional roads that funding support recommended accessibility enhancements as follows:

1. Capital reconstruction projects through present budget as appropriate; and
2. Ongoing requests and appropriate retrofit program.

A table summarizing the Region of Waterloo’s recommended annual accessibility enhancement program is provided in Appendix C. Appendix C also includes budget estimates.

The recommended annual accessibility enhancement plan is seen as a positive step forward with respect to enhancing accessibility in the Region of Waterloo for members of the community with visual impairments. This strategy precedes anticipated AODA regulations which is currently still in draft form. Installation of APS and tactile advisory surface indicators will conform to the latest standard specifications outlined in the draft Built Environment Standard guideline dated August 2012, as amended. At this time it is not known when the draft Built Environment Standard will become regulation as part of the Provincial AODA. Once they become regulatory, it is anticipated that the Region will revise standard design and construction specifications as necessary.

Local Municipal Impacts

Local municipal staff from the cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo has been intimately involved throughout the entire process and development of these recommendations. Local municipal staff has advised that it is preferred that the Region endorse an accessibility enhancement program first prior to initiating local municipal programs to ensure that overall all respective programs can be delivered consistently with appropriate Council approvals.

Maintenance Implications

As mentioned some of these initiatives are being piloted and actual impacts on maintenance is not known at this time, however impacts on maintenance costs are estimated to be relatively low as noted in the following table.

Table 2 – Maintenance Impacts of Recommended Accessibility Enhancements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Item</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audible Pedestrian Signals</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactile Advisory Surface Indicators</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactile Guide Strips</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Curbs at Pedestrian Refuge Islands</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-turn Channels</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundabout Accessible Traffic Control Signals</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladder Crosswalks</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Accessibility Enhancement Considerations Currently Under Review

Other considerations to enhance accessibility on Regional roadways staff is pursuing include but are not limited to:

- Raised crosswalks; and
- Dedicated disabled parking.
Research regarding raised crosswalks indicates that they are associated with effectively reducing motorist speed and improving driver yielding rates at crosswalks. Raised crosswalks have been successfully implemented at roundabouts elsewhere internationally. Regional staff will be considering the implementation of a raised crosswalk as part of one or more upcoming projects including roundabout locations.

Staff is reconsidering current strategies to enhance disabled parking on Regional roads. Presently, disabled parking spots are considered on a request basis with input from local businesses and affected local municipality. Where requested, disabled parking spots are typically only considered to be placed at the beginning or end of a row of on-road parallel parking spaces for access and convenience. Dedicating a percentage of parking spaces within the downtown core areas of local municipalities is currently under review.

Members of GRAAC and CNIB have been informed of the Region’s intent to consider raised crosswalks at pedestrian crossing locations including roundabouts as well as new parking considerations.

The recommendations provided in this report have also been shared with members of GRAAC and CNIB. Members of GRAAC and CNIB have been notified of the date and time of the presentation of this report to Planning and Works Committee.

Members of the Region’s Roundabout Coordination Committee which includes local municipal representation and Grand River Transit staff also support the recommendations presented in this report.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This report addresses the Region’s goal to:

- Implement proven roadway safety strategies and education to enhance the safety of our roadways (Strategic Objective 3.3.2);

- Develop, promote and integrate active forms of transportation (cycling and walking) (Strategic Objective 3.2);

- Improve the accessibility of Regional programs and services to support our diverse community (Strategic Objective 5.1); and

- Improve satisfaction with Regional programs and services (Strategic Objective 5.2).

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The cost to fund the recommended accessibility enhancement devices in future applicable construction projects would be included in the project budget in the Transportation Capital Program. The annual funding proposed to support the retrofit program, as noted in Appendix C (e.g. pedestrian refuge islands, APS crosswalks, etc.), is approximately $500,000 or $100,000 per year over a 5-year period. The annual budget to support new requests is estimated to be $100,000 per year. The funding for these programs will be considered as part of the 2014 Transportation Capital Program.
OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

The recommendations in this report have been reviewed with assistance from Design and Construction and Transportation Planning staff.

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix A - Summary of September 26, 2012 Workshop Feedback
Appendix B - November 28, 2012 AIM Exercise
Appendix C - Region of Waterloo Recommended Annual Accessibility Enhancement Program

PREPARED BY:  Bob Henderson, Manager, Transportation Engineering

APPROVED BY:  Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
## Pedestrian Refuge Islands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Concerns</th>
<th>Mitigating Measures</th>
<th>Installation Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Difficult to locate</td>
<td>• Yellow curbs</td>
<td>• Traffic volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tactile surface indicators</td>
<td>• Pedestrian Volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tactile Guide strips</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Channelized Right-turn Lanes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Concerns</th>
<th>Mitigating Measures</th>
<th>Installation Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Difficult to locate</td>
<td>Tactile surface indicators</td>
<td>• Traffic volumes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Width of roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Way-finding</td>
<td>• Tactile Guide strips</td>
<td>• Traffic volumes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ladder markings</td>
<td>• Width of roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Obstructions</td>
<td>Consistent geometric design</td>
<td>• Traffic volumes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Width of roadway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Stop-controlled Intersections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Concerns</th>
<th>Mitigating Measures</th>
<th>Installation Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Motorists do not stop</td>
<td>• Ladder Crosswalks</td>
<td>• Traffic volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Motorists do not stop at the stop-bar</td>
<td>• Ladder Crosswalks</td>
<td>• Traffic volume</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Traffic Control Signals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Concerns</th>
<th>Mitigating Measures</th>
<th>Installation Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Advanced Green Phases</td>
<td>Not identified</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Right-turn on red</td>
<td>Not identified</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Too much traffic noise</td>
<td>Not identified</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Traffic Control Signals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Concerns</th>
<th>Mitigating Measures</th>
<th>Installation Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Pedestrian Crossing time</td>
<td>Pedestrian countdown signals</td>
<td>• Known users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Pedestrian volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of lanes to cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Locating Pushbuttons</td>
<td>• Locator tones for pushbuttons</td>
<td>• Known users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ped volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of lanes to cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tactile surface indicators</td>
<td>• Known users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ped volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of lanes to cross</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Roundabouts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Concerns</th>
<th>Mitigating Measures</th>
<th>Installation Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>•Yielding</td>
<td>•Add control to assist pedestrians</td>
<td>•Known Users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•Don't trust yield control</td>
<td>•Add a separate controlled crosswalk for visually impaired away from the roundabout</td>
<td>•Traffic Volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•Multi-Lane threat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•Gap detection</td>
<td>•Not identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•Not Identified</td>
<td>•Tactile Guide Strips</td>
<td>•Known Users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•Traffic Volume</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mitigating Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigating Measure</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Impediments</th>
<th>Maybe’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Curbs</td>
<td>Enhance visibility</td>
<td>Winter clearance and snow maintenance</td>
<td>Snow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visible to motorists</td>
<td>Sufficient contrast</td>
<td>Why no markings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dark concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yellow concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactile Attention Surface Indicators (Truncated Domes)</td>
<td>Tactile</td>
<td>Not necessarily aligned to crosswalk</td>
<td>Slip hazard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detectable</td>
<td></td>
<td>Winter maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wheelchair accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>False security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactile Guide Strips</td>
<td>Detectable</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trip hazard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Way finding</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintains level surface</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ice accumulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add ladder markings to pedestrian refuge island</td>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>False security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helps dogs</td>
<td>Slip hazard for cyclists, motorcycles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helps define alignment</td>
<td>Not tactile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indication to drivers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent Channelized Right-turn Design</td>
<td>Way finding</td>
<td>Design challenges, constraints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add ladder crosswalks to stop control</td>
<td>Visible to motorists</td>
<td>Slippery</td>
<td>Effect device has when used too much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alignment good for low vision dogs</td>
<td>Not tactile</td>
<td>False security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curb cut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add ladder crosswalks to traffic Signals</td>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>Not standard</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive guidance</td>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-turn-on-red Prohibition</td>
<td>Reduced pedestrian collisions</td>
<td>Motorist delay</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Motorist frustration</td>
<td>Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inconsistent application</td>
<td>False Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Countdown Signals</td>
<td>Driver response / respect</td>
<td>Not visible to blind</td>
<td>May cause more pedestrian running at end of interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced pedestrian collisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate signalized crosswalk away from roundabout</td>
<td>Accessible</td>
<td>Locating it</td>
<td>Driver confusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stops traffic</td>
<td>Higher motorist speed</td>
<td>Pedestrian collisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good for motorists and pedestrians</td>
<td>Inconvenient</td>
<td>Will it be used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian is visible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better audible queues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide signalized crossing at roundabout crosswalk</td>
<td>Positive right-of-way guidance</td>
<td>Increased motorist delay</td>
<td>Compliance at non-signalized crosswalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accessible</td>
<td>Added pedestrian delay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Angle of crosswalk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Accessibility Enhancements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessibility Enhancement</th>
<th>Recommended Implementation Strategy</th>
<th>Annual Budget (000's)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Tactile Advisory Surface Indicators (Signalized crosswalks) | 1. Retrofit all APS locations  
2. New requests | $65 *  
$45 |
| Tactile Advisory Surface indicators (Stop Controlled crosswalks) | 1. New requests | $15 |
| Tactile Advisory Surface Indicators (Pedestrian Refuge Island crossings) | 1. Retrofit existing pedestrian island locations | $10 * |
| Tactile Advisory Surface Indicators (Roundabout Crosswalks) | 1. New requests | $12 |
| Tactile Guide Strips | 1. Retrofit existing APS crosswalks  
2. Retrofit pedestrian refuge island crosswalks  
3. New requests at traffic signal crosswalks  
4. New requests at unsignalized crosswalks | $20 *  
$3 *  
$8  
$2 |
| Yellow Curbs at Pedestrian Refuge Islands | 1. Retrofit existing islands | $2 * |
| Ladder Crosswalks at signal or stop-controlled intersection | 1. New requests | $10 |
| Audible Pedestrian Signals (per leg) | | N/A |
| Smart Channels | | N/A |
| Roundabout Accessible Traffic Control Signals | | N/A |

* Denotes annual budget amount is based on a 5-year retrofit program.

Note: Where appropriate, accessibility enhancements indicated above will be provided and funded through all future capital reconstruction projects in addition to this estimated annual budget.
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: January 29, 2013

FILE CODE: T01-20/8

SUBJECT: WEBER STREET AND WILHELM STREET INTERSECTION, CITY OF KITCHENER – REQUEST FOR PEDESTRIAN TRAFFIC CONTROL SIGNALS

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo proceed as planned with the installation of a pedestrian refuge island at the intersection of Weber Street (Regional Road 8) and Wilhelm Street;

AND THAT underground provisions for an intersection pedestrian signal be installed at the time of reconstruction and widening of Weber Street between College Street and Guelph Street (Regional Road 8) in 2013, in the City of Kitchener, as outlined in Report E-13-016, dated January 29, 2013.

SUMMARY:

Staff have reviewed a request made at the November 21, 2012 Regional Council Meeting for enhanced protection for pedestrians crossing Weber Street in the vicinity of Wilhelm Street in the City of Kitchener. Based on current and short-term expected vehicular and pedestrian traffic volumes, pedestrian traffic control signals are not warranted at this location. A pedestrian refuge island is proposed at this location as part of the reconstruction and widening of Weber Street. Staff recommend that this is sufficient protection at this location.

REPORT:

The recommended Design Concept described in the approved 2011 Environmental Study Report for the reconstruction and widening of Weber Street between College Street and Guelph Street includes a pedestrian refuge island south of the Wilhelm Street intersection abutting George Lippert Park in the City of Kitchener (See Appendix A). This proposed island is meant to facilitate pedestrian crossing of the widened road. At the November 21, 2012 Regional Council Meeting, a delegation from the Mount Hope – Breithaupt Neighbourhood Association appeared before Council with respect to the need for enhanced protection for pedestrians crossing Weber Street in the vicinity of Wilhelm Street. Council requested that staff prepare a report for consideration by Planning and Works Committee describing school walking routes in the area as well as the positive and negative aspects of a pedestrian refuge island compared to an intersection pedestrian signal.

The intersection of Weber Street (Regional Road 8) and Wilhelm Street, situated approximately 320m south of Guelph Street and 270m north of Wellington Street, in the City of Kitchener, currently operates with an estimated 13,000 vehicles a day. Of the 13,000 vehicles, approximately 400 vehicles a day enter the intersection from Wilhelm Street. This intersection is expected to carry approximately 20,000 vehicles by 2031 which represents traffic volume growth of approximately 2% per year. Approximately 40 pedestrians cross this intersection over 8 hours on a normal weekday based on traffic data collected in 2009 and more recently in 2012 and it is estimated that approximately 70 pedestrians cross this intersection over 24 hours on any given day based on expected pedestrian distribution patterns. Weber Street has a posted speed limit of 50km/h and motorist speed observed in the area operates on average at 51km/h. This average speed is
expected to increase slightly with widening Weber Street to four lanes. The intersection is currently operated and controlled by stop signs on Wilhelm Street. The Waterloo Spur Line crosses just south of this intersection.

Over the past 5 years (2007 to 2011) this intersection has seen 5 collisions where 6 were expected and is currently ranked 1922nd in the Region for most unexpected collisions based on the Region’s collision prediction model. Over this time period the intersection experienced 1 pedestrian collision. Traffic control signals would not have prevented this collision as the motorist was turning right off of Weber Street onto Wilhelm Street while a pedestrian was crossing Wilhelm Street with the right-of-way.

An analysis of the Region’s traffic count database reveals that there are 75 stop-controlled intersections that have both higher traffic volumes and pedestrian crossing activity than the intersection of Weber Street and Wilhelm Street. The location of the intersection is illustrated in Figure 1.

Figure 1 – Weber Street and Wilhelm Street Intersection

Student Transportation Services (STS) of Waterloo Region is responsible for student transportation for both the Waterloo Region District School Board and Waterloo Catholic District School Board. STS was requested to provide information regarding walking routes to schools in the vicinity of Weber Street. Unfortunately, they were unable to provide any definitive pedestrian routing information other than to say that pedestrian traffic is significantly higher to Margaret Avenue Public School (grades 7 and 8) and KCI (grades 9 to 12) than to King Edward Public School (grades K to 6) and St Teresa School (grades K to 8). The location of Margaret Avenue P.S. on Wellington Street and KCI on King Street would suggest that a reasonable route for pedestrians would include the traffic signals at the Wellington Street intersection.

The location of the four schools in relation to the intersection of Weber Street and Wilhelm and existing traffic control signals are illustrated on Figure 2.
In 2007 Regional Council adopted the Ontario Traffic Manual, Book 12, Traffic Signals warrant methodology to justify the installation of traffic signals, including pedestrian traffic control signals on Regional and local municipal roadways. This warrant methodology is intended to assist and identify pedestrian crossing situations where main street traffic volumes are likely to cause excessive delay and or hazards to pedestrians. It considers two primary factors of volume and pedestrian delay. If sufficient volume and delay are present, consideration is given to providing added pedestrian control typically in the form of an intersection pedestrian signal or midblock pedestrian signal (IPS and MPS). When an IPS or MPS cannot be justified based on pedestrian volume and delay, consideration may be given to the use of pedestrian refuge islands to enhance known pedestrian crossing locations.

The reconstruction and widening to four lanes of Weber Street between College Street and Union Street is scheduled for completion by the end of 2014. The following Figures 3 and 4 illustrate the warrant analysis for Weber Street and Wilhelm Street in 2015 once construction is complete. The shaded area on each chart identifies scenarios when pedestrians are likely to experience excessive delay or challenges crossing roadways. Areas not shaded identify situations when pedestrians are likely to experience sufficient gaps in traffic to cross roadways conveniently. An IPS may be justified if both warrants are satisfied. The following analyses assume 2015 pedestrian crossing numbers similar to that observed in 2009 and 2012. A multi-use trail to be constructed in the boulevard on the western side of Weber Street as part of the road reconstruction is intended to connect the proposed Waterloo Spur-line Multi-use trail to the downtown core of Kitchener. However, the timing for the construction of the Spur-line trail is currently unknown. Pedestrian usage of the Spur-line trail could potentially increase the demand to cross Weber Street at Wilhelm Street.
Figure 3 – Pedestrian Volume Justification

Figure 4 – Pedestrian Delay Justification

Anticipated future operating conditions
Given the above analyses, intersection pedestrian signals are not warranted as pedestrians crossing Weber Street at Wilhelm Street are not anticipated to experience unacceptable delay in 2015. Of the pedestrians crossing on a daily basis today, very few pedestrians experience more than 10 seconds of delay before they find a safe gap to cross the roadway. This is not expected to change significantly following the widening of Weber Street to four lanes as the added capacity created by two additional lanes on Weber Street should essentially create more gaps for pedestrians versus having the street remain two lanes. Regional staff predicts 16-19 second gaps in northbound traffic and 14-16 second gaps in southbound traffic on average during peak hour operations following the widening of Weber Street based on computer modeling. Such gaps represent sufficient opportunities for pedestrians to cross Weber Street without taking on unnecessary risk. An unwarranted intersection pedestrian signal may create operational conflicts with the rail crossing just south of this intersection. Traffic stopped by an intersection pedestrian signal is anticipated to spill back at times very close to the Waterloo Spur Line crossing during peak hour operations in the future based on traffic signal analyses. It is highly recommended to avoid potential conflicts with rail lines where possible.

A pedestrian refuge island at this location is expected to provide pedestrians added assistance and convenience to cross Weber Street and more importantly added protection. Studies have found that the presence of a pedestrian refuge island and or a median island is associated with 40% fewer pedestrian collisions. Local research has found positive results as well. In 2006 a median island was installed on the 4-lane section of Weber Street between Fergus Avenue and Kinzie Avenue to mitigate pedestrian crossing collisions. This section of Weber Street carries main street volumes similar to that seen on Weber Street in the vicinity of Wilhelm Street. Over a 5-year period, that stretch of Weber Street saw 5 pedestrians struck by motorists prior to the installation of a median island. By comparison, only 1 pedestrian collision occurred in the 5-year period after the installation of the median island representing an 80% reduction in pedestrian collisions attributable to the median island. The pedestrian was noted as being impaired at the time of the incident. The Region plans to pursue the installation of more pedestrian refuge and median islands given the positive impact that they have had on pedestrian collisions. Figure 5 illustrates the location of the median islands installed in 2006 for pedestrian safety on Weber Street.

Figure 5 – Median Islands Installed for Pedestrian Safety
The following table summarizes a comparison of expected motor vehicle collisions impacts over a 5-year period for stop-controlled versus intersection pedestrian signal controlled intersections based on historical experience of other similar locations.

Table 1 – Expected 5-year Collisions at Weber Street and Wilhelm Street (2015 – 2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Collisions</th>
<th>Injury Collisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stop-controlled Intersection</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Pedestrian Signal</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As requested by Council the following table outlines the positive and negative impacts of intersection pedestrian signals and pedestrian refuge islands for the Weber Street at Wilhelm Street intersection based on Regional experience and analysis.

Table 2 – Positive and Negative Impacts of Pedestrian Crossing Controls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive Impacts</th>
<th>Negative Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Intersection Pedestrian Signal** | Assigns right-of-way between motorists and pedestrians  
|                               | Added convenience                                                              | Potential queue conflicts with Waterloo Spur Line  
|                               |                                                                                | Increased motorist collisions expected  
|                               |                                                                                | Increased pedestrian delay  
|                               |                                                                                | Pedestrian delay encourages pedestrian non-compliance  
|                               |                                                                                | Increased motorist delay  
|                               |                                                                                | False sense of security for pedestrians  
| **Pedestrian Refuge Island**  | Effective pedestrian collision countermeasure  
|                               | Minimizes pedestrian and motorist delay  
|                               | Fewer motorist collisions expected compared to signals.                        | Right-of-way is not assigned |

Staff recommends to proceed with the installation of a pedestrian refuge island at Weber Street and Wilhelm Street and to install underground provisions at the intersection for ease of installation should intersection pedestrian signals become required.

City of Kitchener staff has been contacted regarding this issue and support the Region’s recommendation to proceed with the installation of a pedestrian refuge island at Weber Street and Wilhelm Street. After construction of the proposed pedestrian refuge island on Weber Street and the potential construction of the Waterloo Spur-line multi-use trail, staff will monitor pedestrian and vehicular volumes in the area and make appropriate recommendations to Regional Council as required.

Those wishing to be advised of when this matter will be dealt with by the Regional Planning and Works Committee have been notified.
CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This report addresses the Region’s goal to implement proven roadway safety strategies and education to enhance the safety of our roadways (Strategic Objective 3.3.2)

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The cost to install a pedestrian refuge island is approximately $15,000 and is included in the Weber Street widening project.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

NIL

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix A – Proposed Pedestrian Refuge Island

PREPARED BY: Bob Henderson, Manager, Transportation Engineering
Peter Linn, Senior Project Manager

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Proposed Pedestrian Refuge Island

Wilhelm Street

Weber Street

Waterloo Spur Line
REPORT:

In response to recent concerns from businesses regarding the existing 7:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. heavy truck restriction on Bleams Road (Regional Road 56) from Homer Watson Boulevard (Regional Road 28) to Strasburg Road and Westmount Road (now Fischer-Hallman Road) to Strasburg Road, which was approved by Regional Council in January 1990 (See Appendix A), Regional staff reviewed the truck route to determine if this restriction adheres to the Region’s policy as outlined in the Kitchener-Waterloo Traffic Operations Study (KWTOS) dated April, 1991. This study states:

“All Regional roads should be truck routes unless there are valid reasons for imposing prohibitions or time restrictions on a particular section. Valid reasons include:

a) The section of roadway was not designed or constructed for heavy truck traffic or long vehicles;
b) There are critical height or weight restrictions on the section of roadway.

Valid reasons for time restrictions include:

a) The environment of the section is primarily front-lotted urban residential with numerous driveways, and a suitable alternate route is available.

A suitable alternate route is defined as a route that would be less than 50% longer than using the section for which the restriction is proposed, but not more than 4.0 km longer, and
on which there are not valid reasons for a time restriction.”

Bleams Road between Homer Watson Boulevard and Fischer-Hallman Road is mainly comprised of
back-lotted residential properties and industrial properties on the north and south sides of the road
respectively. The area bounded by Fischer-Hallman Road, Huron Road, Homer Watson Boulevard
and Bleams Road is generally commercial and industrial lands. Bleams Road carries an Average
Annual Daily Traffic Volume (AADT) of approximately 11,000 to 20,000 vehicles per day with the
higher volumes operating in the east end of this section. The percentage of heavy vehicles that
make up the AADT is estimated to be approximately 2.5% based on existing turning movement
count information.

Bleams Road between Homer Watson Boulevard and Fischer-Hallman Road has 3 noise barrier
walls with a total length of 1171 metres. Figure 1 below shows the section of Bleams Road under
consideration and the location of existing noise barrier walls along Bleams Road. The residential
properties backing onto Bleams Road between west of Thistledown Drive and Strasburg Road
currently do not have a noise barrier wall.

Figure 1: Bleams Road (Regional Road 56) and Noise Barrier Wall Locations

Region staff proceeded to undertake a Noise Study along Bleams Road between Thistledown Drive
and Strasburg Road with updated traffic counts to determine if a noise barrier wall is warranted
under Part C of the Region’s Implementation Guideline for Noise Barriers (Existing Development
Impacted by Noise from Existing Regional Roads). If a noise barrier is warranted under Part C of the
Noise Policy, the cost of installing this noise barrier could be cost shared 50/50 between the affected
residents and the Region and would be built to Regional standards. The average cost of
constructing a 1.82 metre (approximately 6 feet) noise barrier wall is approximately $1,000 per linear
metre based on 2012 prices.

Under Part C of the Guideline a noise barrier is warranted when noise levels are greater the 60 dBA. Another important determining factor for warranting a noise barrier wall in addition to the traffic volumes is the proximity of the Outdoor Living Area (OLA) (3 metres from the rear of the house) to the centreline of the road.

A Noise Study has been completed for the properties between Thistledown Drive and Strasburg Road which has confirmed that a noise barrier wall is not warranted at this time. For all properties except one, the existing daily traffic of 13644 would need to increase by approximately 5,500 vehicles per day to 19144 in order to warrant a noise barrier wall. One particular sidelotted property (12 Colony Drive) at the intersection of Colony Drive and Bleams Road where the OLA is significantly closer to the centreline of Bleams Road than the rest of the properties, the existing daily traffic of 12779 would need to increase marginally by approximately 220 vehicles per day to 12999. Figure 2 shows the affected properties between Thistledown Drive and Strasburg Road. Since the property at 12 Colony Drive may be warranted in the near future under Part C of the Implementation Guideline for Noise Barriers a noise barrier wall could be constructed to Regional standards for this property if the affected property owner wishes to pursue a noise barrier wall and agrees to cost sharing with the Region 50/50.

Figure 2 – Noise Wall Study Area

On November 21, 2012 Transportation Division staff conducted 24-hour traffic volume surveys to obtain the percentage of medium and heavy trucks currently operating along Bleams Road between Thistledown Drive and Strasburg Road. Our surveys indicate that there are 2.5% medium trucks and 1% heavy trucks or 376 medium trucks and 80 heavy trucks per day

Figure 3 shows a summary of medium and heavy trucks captured from our November 21, 2012 survey.
Figure 3: Summary of Medium and Heavy Trucks

Analysis of traffic data illustrates that this section of Bleams Road currently operates with approximately 76 medium trucks and 12 heavy trucks between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. It is not known what percentage of these heavy trucks have legitimate destinations and which are simply ignoring the by-law. Medium trucks are typically exempt from this by-law. Based on analysis of traffic patterns, staff anticipates only a minor increase in the number of heavy trucks between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.

From September 20, 2012 to October 2, 2012, Transportation Division staff placed information boards along Bleams Road requesting comments from residents through the Region’s website or via telephone; an Internet questionnaire was setup to receive comments and a phone number was provided. As a follow up to the web survey, questionnaires were also mailed to residents backing onto Bleams Road within the project limits also requesting comments on the proposed changes.

The questionnaire asked whether the residents were in support of or in opposition to removing the heavy truck restriction on Bleams Road from Homer Watson Boulevard to Fischer-Hallman Road.

A total of 71 responses were received where 66 are opposed and 5 are in favor to the proposed change. Those opposed to the change did not want to see an increase in truck traffic and noise pollution.
After a review of Bleams Road and the existing by-law staff is proposing the removal of the truck restriction for the following reasons:

- Current restrictions do not adhere to the Region’s policy as outlined by the KWTOS;
- Removing the restriction would eliminate driver confusion and inconvenience;
- The remainder of Bleams Road has an existing 24-hour truck route designation;
- Revisions will better serve the industrial properties in the area;
- Provides a continuous 24-hour truck route;
- Current heavy truck volumes between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. are not expected to increase noticeably; and
- Addresses the gap in the existing Regional truck route network;

Figure 4 shows the proposed truck route by-law change on Bleams Road.

**Figure 4: Proposed Truck Route By-Law Change on Bleams Road (Regional Road 56)**

City of Kitchener staff support the proposal to remove the existing No Heavy Truck Restriction on Bleams Road.

Those wishing to be advised of when this matter will be dealt with by the Regional Planning and Works Committee have been notified.

**CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

This report addresses the Region’s goal to optimize existing road capacity to safely manage traffic throughout Waterloo Region (Strategic Objective 3.2).
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The cost of removing the heavy truck restriction on Bleams Road between Homer Watson Boulevard and Fischer-Hallman Road is approximately $1,000 and is provided for in the Transportation Operations Budget.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

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

ATTACHMENTS:


PREPARED BY:  Mike Jones, Supervisor Transportation Engineering

APPROVED BY:  Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
APPENDIX A

THE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO

COMMISSIONER OF ENGINEERING

TO: Chairman Fred Kent and Members of the Engineering Committee

DATE: Wednesday, January 17, 1990

SUBJECT: 1. HEAVY TRUCK PROHIBITION ON REGIONAL ROAD #56 (BLEAMS ROAD) FROM REGIONAL ROAD #50 (WESTMOUNT ROAD) TO STRASBURG ROAD.

2. SPEED LIMIT REDUCTION ON REGIONAL ROAD #56 (BLEAMS ROAD) FROM REGIONAL ROAD #50 (WESTMOUNT ROAD) TO COLONY DRIVE

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo amend Traffic and Parking By-law #60-87 as follows:

1. Prohibit Heavy Truck Traffic on Regional Road #56 (Bleams Road) from Regional Road #50 (Westmount Road) to Strasburg Road between the hours of 7:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. Monday to Sunday.

2. Reduce the speed limit on Regional Road #56 (Bleams Road) from Regional Road #50 (Westmount Road) to Colony Drive from 70 km/h to 60 km/h.

SUMMARY:

With the recent roadway improvements completed in conjunction with the installation of the new watermain on Bleams Road Traffic Services Staff recommend the replacement of the 24 hour heavy truck prohibition with a 7:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. Monday to Sunday restriction from Westmount Road to Strasburg Road and a reduction in the 70 km/h speed limit to 60 km/h from Westmount Road to Colony Drive. The following report summarizes the information reviewed by staff while developing the above recommendations.

REPORT:

There is an existing 24 hour heavy truck prohibition on Bleams Road from Westmount Road to Homer Watson Boulevard. The heavy truck prohibition was initially imposed due to the deteriorated roadway conditions on this section of Bleams Road.
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These conditions contributed to the noise and safety issues brought forward by residents of adjacent neighbourhoods who requested the heavy truck prohibition.

The recent reconstruction of the section of Bleams Road from Westmount Road to Strasburg Road in conjunction with the installation of the new watermain have improved the roadway conditions to accommodate heavy truck traffic.

Regional Council at its meeting on June 25, 1987 approved the following heavy truck prohibition to be implemented in conjunction with the completion of the reconstruction of Bleams Road from Homer Watson Boulevard to Strasburg Road:

"A 7:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. truck ban on the proposed street for a one year trial basis."

Therefore in recognition of Regional Council’s decision regarding the limited heavy truck prohibition on the section of Bleams Road from Homer Watson Boulevard to Strasburg Road and that there are existing residential properties which back onto Bleams Road west of Strasburg Road, staff recommend that heavy truck traffic be permitted only during the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Bleams Road has a posted speed limit of 70 km/h from Trussler Road to Colony Drive. The remaining section of Bleams Road from Colony Drive easterly has a posted speed limit of 50 km/h. The design criteria for the reconstruction of Bleams Road from Westmount Road to Colony Drive utilized a design speed of 70 km/h with a posted speed limit of 60 km/h.

Traffic Services Staff have been requested by the City of Kitchener to reduce the existing 70 km/h speed limit on Bleams Road from Westmount Road to Colony Drive to 60 km/h. Staff has no objections to the reduction in the speed limit for the following reasons:

1. The proposed 60 km/h speed limit is consistent with the design criteria established for Bleams Road.

2. Upon the reconstruction of the section of Bleams Road from Homer Watson Boulevard to Strasburg Road (proposed 1990) staff will recommend an increase in the existing 50 km/h speed limit to 60 km/h to be consistent with the design criteria.
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3. The existing adjacent residential properties located on the north side of Bleams Road which are backlotted.  

Attachment #1 to this report illustrates the proposed 7:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. heavy truck prohibition and the proposed 60 km/h speed limit.  

Attachment #2 to this report is a copy of correspondence from Mr. Don Snow, Director of Traffic and Parking Services for the City of Kitchener concurring with the recommended heavy truck prohibition and requesting a reduction of the existing 70 km/h speed limit to 60 km/h.  

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS: ‘NIL’  
OTHER DEPARTMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS: ‘NIL’  

G.A. Vincent, P.Eng., Senior Transportation Engineer  
C.B. Bauman, P.Eng., Director of Traffic & Transportation  
G.A. Thompson, P.Eng., Commissioner of Engineering  

AM/gth
December 21, 1989

Alister McIlveen, C.E.T.
Superintendent of Traffic Engineering
The Regional Municipality of Waterloo
Engineering Department
Marsland Centre
20 Erb Street West
Waterloo, Ontario
N2J 4G7

Dear Alister:

RE: Heavy Trucks - Bleams Road

In response to your recent inquiry as to our our position on the removal of the heavy truck prohibition on Bleams Road between Westmount Road and Strasburg Road, I offer the following.

It is my recollection that the 24 hour truck prohibition was initially imposed due to the various road deficiencies including poor riding surface, narrow carriageway (deteriorated road edge) and the varying grades on the vertical curvatures. These were the contributing factors that related specifically to the noise pollution and safety issues that were brought forward by the residents of the adjacent communities who requested the truck ban. At that time their representatives acknowledged that Bleams Road, once these deficiencies were eliminated, would ultimately be developed as a major facility that would accommodate truck traffic. With the recent improvements completed in conjunction with the installation of the water main these conditions have been rectified to the extent that the road can now accommodate truck traffic. However, in recognition of the fact that residential properties back onto Bleams Road from the subdivisions to the north, the entire prohibition should not be removed but rather should remain in effect in the evening hours (7:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) thus permitting daytime use only.
We are also concerned with the existing posted speed limit of 70 km/h from Westmount Road which reduces to 50 km/h at Colony Drive. In recent discussions it was acknowledged that ultimately the section of Bleams Road between Westmount Road and Homer Watson Boulevard would have a posted speed limit of 60 km/h once all of the road improvements are completed. We also concur with your concerns with respect to the lack of compliance due to varying speed limits on any facility. However, we suggest that the existing variance of 20 km/h from 70 km/h to 50 km/h would breed a far greater lack of compliance than a variance of 10 km/h that would exist with a 60 km/h (future speed limit) to 50 km/h. I would therefore respectfully suggest that the proposed 60 km/h speed limit be introduced immediately in conjunction with the lifting of the 24 hour truck prohibition on that portion between Westmount Road and Strasburg Road.

I trust that this information adequately represents our position in this matter.

Yours truly,

Donald R. Snow, Director
Traffic & Parking Services

cc: Mayor Dominic Cardillo
Alderman M. Hiscott
John A. B. Webster
<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>10-Jan-12</td>
<td>P&amp;W</td>
<td>Update report on proposed Source Protection Policies after GRCA Source Protection Committee public consultation is completed</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>08-Jan-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Jan-12</td>
<td>P&amp;W</td>
<td>That staff meet with representatives of the Canadian National Institute for the Blind and the Grand River Accessibility Advisory Committee to develop solutions for the visually- and hearing-impaired at all roundabouts and intersections in the Region of Waterloo.</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>29-Jan-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Feb-12</td>
<td>J. Brewer</td>
<td>Report regarding reducing the speed limit from 70 kilometers per hour (70 kms) on Can-Amera Parkway approaching the Roundabout at Conestoga Boulevard.</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>29-Jan-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Mar-12</td>
<td>D. Craig</td>
<td>Report on possible enhancements similar to what is proposed for Weber Street in Kitchener at the railway overpass for the Delta construction in Cambridge.</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>Feb. 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-Mar-12</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Staff to review the operation of the Homer Watson Boulevard/Block Line Road roundabout and report back to Council in 2013.</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>Sept. 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-May-12</td>
<td>P&amp;W</td>
<td>Report detailing the rationale for the Injury Crash Cost calculation used by staff in reports for roadway improvements. (E-12-045 page 48 authored by Frank Kosa)</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>29-Jan-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-May-12</td>
<td>P&amp;W</td>
<td>Staff to review options for signalized vehicle lights and signalized pedestrian crosswalks in Roundabouts in the detailed design report prepared later in 2012 for Franklin Boulevard Improvements.</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>29-Jan-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting date</td>
<td>Requestor</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Assigned Department</td>
<td>Anticipated Response Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Sep-12</td>
<td>S. Strickland</td>
<td>Staff were requested to look into potential improvements at the King Street and University Avenue intersection due to the high pedestrian volumes during the school season and the increase of incidents there.</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>19-Mar-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Haalboom</td>
<td>Staff continue to lobby the Province for changes to the <em>Highway Traffic Act</em> providing right of way to pedestrians and on an as needed basis provide an update to Council.</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Sep-12</td>
<td>C. Millar</td>
<td>Staff were requested to look at diverting transport truck traffic off Blair Road.</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>30-Apr-2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>