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

2. DELEGATIONS

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

   a) E-13-025, Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line Recommended Improvements, Village of Crosshill, Township of Wellesley (Approval)

   b) Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road Reconstruction, Petersburg, Township of Wilmot - Information Package in Advance of Public Consultation Centre (Information)


   d) P-13-016, Public Meeting for the Implementation Guideline for Cultural Heritage Landscape Conservation (Approval)

   e) P-13-017, Grand River Transit (GRT) 2013 Service Improvement Plan - Public Consultation Centres (Information)

   f) Memo: Waste Management Master Plan – Summary of Consultation Series 1 Activities (Information)

   g) Memo: Region of Waterloo International Airport Gateway Sign Award (Information)

REGULAR AGENDA RESUMES
5. REPORTS - TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION

a) E-13-024, Consultant Selection – East Boundary Road Corridor Study, Class Environmental Assessment and Preliminary Design, City of Cambridge and Township of North Dumfries

RAPID TRANSIT

b) E-13-020/F-13-011, Stage 1 Light Rail Project – Recommendation for the Selection of Three Pre-qualified Bidders, and Overview of the Request for Proposal (RFP) Process

WATER SERVICES

c) E-13-021, Consultant Selection for the East Side Lands Pumping Station and Forcemain Class Environmental Assessment and Preliminary Design

d) E-13-028, St. Jacobs - Elmira Wastewater Treatment Master Plan: Notice of Completion


INTERDEPARTMENTAL REPORTS

f) E-13-026/P-13-013, 2013 Planning and Works Project Team Membership

g) P-13-018/E-13-035, 2013 Budget – Grand River Transit (GRT) Service Reductions

REPORTS – PLANNING, HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

COMMUNITY PLANNING

h) P-13-019, Proposed Interim Planning Assistance to the Township of North Dumfries

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

i) P-13-020, Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines Update

j) P-13-021, Proposed Transportation Demand Management Modifications to the Regional Transportation Impact Study Guidelines

6. INFORMATION/CORRESPONDENCE

a) Council Enquiries and Requests for Information Tracking List

7. OTHER BUSINESS

8. NEXT MEETING – March 19, 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, February 26, 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 acquisition of land in the City of Kitchener
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) receiving of legal advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege related to property use
d) receiving of legal advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege related to interpretation of legislation
e) labour relations matter
f) receiving of legal advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege related to an agreement
g) personal matters about identifiable individuals – committee appointments
h) personal matters about identifiable individuals – committee appointments

10. ADJOURN
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>NEXT MEETINGS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning and Works Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 19, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 9, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning, Housing and Community Services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon., February 25, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon., March 18, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue., March 19, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu., March 21, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri., March 22, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation and Environmental Services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu., February 28, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: February 26, 2013

FILE CODE: CO4-30, 5378

SUBJECT: HUTCHISON ROAD AND WILLIAM HASTINGS LINE RECOMMENDED IMPROVEMENTS VILLAGE OF CROSSHILL, TOWNSHIP OF WELLESLEY

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to proposed improvements on Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line in the Village of Crosshill, Township of Wellesley:

a) approve the Recommended Design Concept for Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line as outlined in Report E-13-025; and

b) amend Traffic and Parking By-law # 06-072, following the completion of the proposed improvements along Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line in the Village of Crosshill as follows:

- Add to Schedule 24, Reserved Lanes, for Bicycle and Horse Drawn Vehicles on Both Sides of Hutchison Road (Regional Road 5) from 65 metres South of Lobsinger Line (Regional Road 15) to William Hastings Line (Regional Road 5);

- Add to Schedule 24, Reserved Lanes, for Bicycle and Horse Drawn Vehicles on Both Sides of William Hastings Line (Regional Road 5) from Hutchison Road (Regional Road 5) to 500 metres West of Hutchison Road (Regional Road 5);

- Add to Schedule 1, No Parking Anytime, on Both Sides of Hutchison Road (Regional Road 5) from 65 metres South of Lobsinger Line (Regional Road 15) to William Hastings Line (Regional Road 5), and

- Add to Schedule 1, No Parking Anytime, on Both Sides of William Hastings Line (Regional Road 5) from Hutchison Road (Regional Road 5) to 500 metres West of Hutchison Road (Regional Road 5).

SUMMARY:

The Region of Waterloo is currently considering improvements to Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line in the Village of Crosshill. The pavement structure in the sections of Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line within the village are in generally poor condition and in need of rehabilitation. The planning of the roadway improvements is being undertaken in accordance with the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process for Schedule A+ type projects.
A Project Team consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo and the Township of Wellesley, Regional Councillor and Mayor of Wellesley Township Ross Kelterborn and Township of Wellesley Ward 2 Councillor Herb Neher is directing this project.

Plans for the Project Team’s Preferred Design Concept were presented to the public at a Public Consultation Centre held on September 13, 2012 at the Crosshill Mennonite Church in Crosshill.

The Project Team is now recommending that Regional Council approve the Recommended Design Concept for Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line described as follows:

- Complete replacement of the existing two lane pavement structure on Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line;
- Construction of semi-mountable concrete curb and gutter on each side of Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line;
- Improvements to the roadway curve at the intersection of Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line to provide for better passage of large trucks around the corner;
- Construction of new 1.50 metre wide sidewalk on the west side of Hutchison Road from Lobsinger Line to William Hastings Road and on each side of William Hastings Line from Hutchison Road to approximately 350 metres westerly;
- Construction of 1.50 metre wide reserved on-road cycling / buggy lanes on each side of Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line within the project limits;
- Removal of on-street parking on each side of Hutchinson Road and William Hastings Line and construction of a 35m long parallel parking area on the north side of Hutchinson Road;
- Wider boulevards, removal of the roadside ditches and enhanced boulevard landscaping where feasible;
- Installation of a new storm sewer system on Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line outletting to existing roadside ditches; and
- Street lighting upgrades (as required) on Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line within the project limits.

The construction of reserved on-road cycling / buggy lanes on each side of Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line will require that Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended, be amended to provide Reserved Lanes for bicycles and buggies on both sides of Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line in the Village of Crosshill. Parking is currently not restricted on either side of Hutchison Road or William Hastings Line.

The cost estimate for the Recommended Design Concept is $3,300,000. There is sufficient funding available in the Region’s 2013 Ten Year Transportation Capital Program.

REPORT:

1.0 Background

The Region of Waterloo is currently considering improvements to Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line in the Village of Crosshill, Township of Wellesley. (Please refer to Appendix ‘A’ for a Key Plan.)

A Project Team consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo and the Township of Wellesley, Regional Councillor and Mayor of Wellesley Township Ross Kelterborn and Township of Wellesley Ward 2 Councillor Herb Neher is directing the planning of the proposed improvements. The planning process has been undertaken in accordance with the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process for Schedule A+ type projects. Accordingly, the
proposed improvements are approved under the Environmental Assessment Act subject to notification of the Public respecting the proposed work. The planning of the roadway is also taking into account the Regional Context Sensitive Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines, the Regional Cycling Master Plan, the Draft Active Transportation Master Plan, the 2011 Cycling Facility Map and other relevant Regional policies and practices.

William Hastings Line runs generally east-west, with Hutchison Road running generally north-south and both roads currently have a two-lane rural cross section with a posted speed of 50 km/h. The existing pavement is in generally poor condition and in need of rehabilitation. In 2011, as part of the Miscellaneous Roadway Improvements Contract, William Hastings Line was paved with 50mm of surface asphalt (no milling) and several spot repairs were completed on Hutchison Road as interim measures to address failing pavement sections.

Roadway drainage in the village is primarily via roadside ditches and driveway culverts. Adjacent properties are serviced by private water wells and septic systems with no existing municipal watermains or sanitary sewers within the project limits.

Pedestrian facilities are currently discontinuous through the study area and there are no dedicated cycling facilities. Abutting properties are primarily residential with some commercial uses. Parking is not currently prohibited on either Hutchison Road or William Hastings Line.

2.0 Development of the Recommended Design Concept

As part of the planning for this Project, a traffic study was completed to identify the need for any traffic operational improvements. Both existing and future traffic conditions were evaluated and no capacity issues were identified. The only operational improvement identified within the project corridor was modification of the sharp curve where Hutchison Road meets William Hastings Line to improve sightlines and to better accommodate large truck turning movements.

According to the Region’s Context Sensitive Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines, Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line function as a Rural Village – Main Street in the Village of Crosshill. Rural Village – Main Streets are designed to support active transportation (including walking and cycling). The proposed improvements to Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line are being planned to include facilities for cyclists, buggies and pedestrians. Additionally, enhanced boulevard landscaping is being considered as part of this project to encourage and promote walking.

Based on technical studies completed for this project, relevant Regional planning documents, including the Cycling Master Plan, the Draft Active Transportation Master Plan and Context Sensitive Corridor Design Guidelines, the Project Team has identified a Recommended Design Concept for the improvements to Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line within the Project limits described as follows:

- Complete replacement of the pavement structure on Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line;
- Construction of semi-mountable concrete curb and gutter on each side of Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line;
- Improvements to the roadway curve at the intersection of Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line to provide for better passage of large trucks around the corner;
- Construction of new 1.50 metre wide sidewalk on the west side of Hutchison Road from Lobsinger Line to William Hastings Road and on each side of William Hastings Line from Hutchison Road to approximately 350 metres westerly;
- Construction of 1.50 metre wide reserved on-road cycling / buggy lanes on each side of Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line within the project limits;
- Removal of on-street parking on each side of Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line and construction of a 35m long parallel parking area on the north side of Hutchison Road;
- Wider boulevards, removal of the roadside ditches and enhanced boulevard landscaping where feasible;
- Installation of a new storm sewer system on Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line outletting to existing roadside ditches; and
- Street lighting upgrades (as required) on Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line within the project limits.

Please refer to Appendix ‘B’ for cross-section drawings of the Project Team’s Preferred Design Concept including the above noted elements.

In addition to the existing gas station located at 4840 William Hastings Line, the Project Team is aware of a former gas station location within the project limits at 4873 William Hastings Line. An additional geotechnical study will be undertaken as part of the detailed design process to identify potentially contaminated soils or groundwater that may be present in the area and establish a protocol for handling and disposing of contaminated materials if they are encountered during construction in accordance with legislated requirements.

3.0 Public Consultation

A Public Consultation Centre (PCC) was held at the Crosshill Mennonite Church, 2537 Hutchison Road, in the Township of Wellesley on Thursday September 13, 2012 from 4:30 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. Plans showing the Project Team’s Preferred Design Concept were on display and Project Team representatives were present to answer questions and to receive feedback from members of the public. Approximately thirty (30) members of the public attended the PCC and eighteen (18) members of the public formally signed in. Twelve (12) comment sheets were received. Please refer to Appendix ‘C’ for a summary of the written comments received.

The Project Team received many positive comments regarding the proposed improvements at the PCC and many residents supported the project moving ahead as quickly as possible. The main issues raised by the public are summarized as follows:

Sidewalks

Six comment sheets questioned the need for sidewalks or stated that sidewalks are not necessary, primarily on the basis that they would be under-utilized as very few residents currently choose to walk within the village. Others noted concerns about elderly residents having to shovel snow from the sidewalk. Of note, four of these six comment sheets were prepared by residents that do not own property that fronts on to the roadway within the project limits. One resident indicated a preference for sidewalk but noted that she would like the Township to plow the sidewalk.

Project Team Response:

Region policies and design guidelines support active modes of transportation which include walking, particularly in urban cores and rural settlement areas. Currently, pedestrians in Crosshill are generally using the paved shoulders as a walking facility.
Once the road improvements are constructed, the paved shoulders will be eliminated and a suitable pedestrian facility will be required to accommodate pedestrians so they are not forced to walk along the edge of the roadway (in the cycling/buggy lane) or in grassed areas. The Project Team believes that continuous sidewalks within the village may give residents a more comfortable walking experience and encourage increased pedestrian activity. Residents that are currently driving to church or the variety store for example, may choose to walk instead.

In accordance with Township of Wellesley policy, property owners would be required to clear snow and ice from the sidewalk across the frontage of their property.

**Streetlights**

Five comment sheets requested no additional streetlights within the project limits in order to maintain a ‘small country village’ feel for Crosshill. Of note, four of these five comment sheets were prepared by residents that do not own property that fronts on to the roadway within the project limits. Several residents verbally requested that streetlights be added at intersection locations.

**Project Team Response:**

During detailed design Region staff will prioritize locations requiring new streetlights based on the Region’s Illumination Policy (at intersections and crosswalks, for example). The Region will only install full-cutoff luminaries which serve to direct the light distribution forwards (towards the roadway) and eliminate back-lighting effects.

**Speeds**

Three comment sheets made note of existing speed concerns within the study area and suggested that speeds will increase once new pavement is constructed as part of the project. Some suggested reduced posted speed limits (currently 50km/h) or speed humps to control speeds.

**Project Team Response:**

In test cases studied by the Region, operating speeds have generally not been reduced in locations where posted speeds were reduced. Drivers tend to drive at speeds that feel comfortable to them based on their surroundings, rather than according to the posted speed. Speed bumps, and the like, are not typically utilized on Regional roads as they can be hazardous for drivers that don’t see them in advance and they present challenges for snow plowing. The Project Team believes that removing the existing wide paved shoulders and the installation of curb and gutter, sidewalks and boulevard landscaping will give the roadway a more constrained feel as well as a visual indicator to drivers that they are entering a village. This is likely to encourage reduced speeds through the project limits.

Please refer to Appendix ‘C’ for all Project Team responses to individual comments submitted by the public.
3.0 **Recommended Design Concept**

The Recommended Design Concept described in Section 2.0 will achieve the project objectives of rehabilitating the road structure and improving pedestrian, cyclist and buggy facilities within the corridor. Therefore, the Project Team recommends that Regional Council approve the Recommended Design Concept for Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line in the Village of Crosshill, Township of Wellesley, as presented at the September 13, 2012 Public Consultation Centre.

The construction of reserved on-road cycling / buggy lanes on each side of Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line in the Village of Crosshill will require that Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended, be amended to provide Reserved Lanes for bicycles and buggies on both sides of Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line within the Crosshill limits. Parking is currently not restricted on either side of Hutchison Road or William Hastings Line.

Letters advising of the recommendations contained in this report were mailed to all those who attended the September 13th PCC and hand-delivered to all owners/residents abutting the Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line project limits (and on side streets within one block of Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line).

4.0 **Project Timing and Cost**

As part of the 2013 Budget process, Council recently deferred the construction of improvements for Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line from 2015 to 2016. Subject to Council approval of the Recommended Design Concept, construction is now scheduled to commence in Spring 2016 and will be completed by Fall 2016, with the exception of surface course asphalt which would be placed in 2017. The total project cost estimate for the Recommended Design Concept is $3,300,000.

5.0 **Construction Staging**

It is tentatively proposed that construction on Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line be completed concurrently in order to expedite the completion of the work. Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line would be fully closed to through traffic during construction. Local, emergency and buggy traffic would be maintained at all times. Detour routes would be developed for through traffic and signs would be erected to detour through traffic around the construction. School buses and all Emergency Services would be advised of the traffic restrictions and detour routes during the construction period.

Pedestrian and buggy access would be maintained for the duration of construction. Signage would be erected in order to direct pedestrians through the project area.

As is customary through Regional Road construction zones, the public would be advised of the construction timing and traffic restrictions through advance signage, the Region’s web site, and radio and newspaper notices.

**CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

The implementation of the Recommended Design Concept supports Corporate Strategic Objective 2.2 to “develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs” and objective 3.2 to “develop, promote and integrate active forms of transportation”.
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The most recent total project cost estimate for the Recommended Design Concept is $3,300,000. The Region’s 2013 Transportation Capital Program and 10-Year Capital Forecast included funds of $3,475,000 in years 2013 to 2016 inclusive for this project funded from the Roads Rehabilitation Reserve Fund.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Coincident with construction completion of the proposed improvements, the Council and Administrative Services Division of the Corporate Resources Department will be required to prepare the amending By-law to reflect reserved lanes for cyclists and buggies on both sides of Regional Road No. 5 (Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line) in the Village of Crosshill, Township of Wellesley.

ATTACHMENTS

Appendix A    Key Plan
Appendix B    Typical Cross-sections
Appendix C    Written Comments received from September 13, 2012 Public Consultation Centre and the Project Team’s Response

PREPARED BY:  Frank Kosa, Senior Project Manager

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

Key Plan

Hutchison Road and William Hastings Line Reconstruction
Village of Crosshill, Township of Wellesley
Appendix B.1
Typical Cross Section

HUTCHISON ROAD
RECOMMENDED DESIGN CONCEPT
2 LANES, 2 BUGGY / CYCLING LANES

PROPERTY LINE EAST SIDE
EAST

PROPERTY LINE WEST SIDE
WEST

VARES 20.11m - 28.33m R.O.W.

1.0m
GRASS

1.5m
SIDEWALK BLVD

3.35m
TRAVEL LANE

3.35m
BUGGY / CYCLING LANE

1.5m
BUGGY / CYCLING LANE

0.5m WIDE SEMI-MOUNTABLE CURB

0.5m WIDE SEMI-MOUNTABLE CURB

MATCH TO EXISTING
Appendix B.2

Typical Cross Section

WILLIAM HASTINGS LINE
(FROM HUTCHISON RD. TO 160m WEST OF HUTCHISON RD.)
RECOMMENDED DESIGN CONCEPT
2 LANES, 2 BUGGY/CYCLING LANES

VARYS 20.1m - 26.2m ROW
9.7m PAVED ROADWAY
1.5m BUSHING CYCLING LANE
3.3m TRAVEL LANE
1.5m SIDEWALK

RT. HYDRO POLE

PROPERTY LINE NORTH SIDE

PROPERTY LINE SOUTH SIDE

MATCH TO EXISTING

0.3m WIDE IMPRESSED CONCRETE
0.5m WIDE SEMI-MOUNTABLE CURB
0.5m WIDE SEMI-MOUNTABLE CURB

MATCH TO EXISTING
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Appendix B.3
Typical Cross Section
## Appendix C
### Public Comments & Project Team Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Project Team Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sara Clark</td>
<td>I would like a new sidewalk.</td>
<td>The Project Team agrees that incorporating sidewalks support active transportation. The Project Team’s preferred design concept provides for continuous sidewalks on both sides of William Hastings Line and on the west side of Hutchison Road. The proposed sidewalks are 1.50 metres in width and shall be installed in accordance with Regional practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would also like the Township to clear the new sidewalk.</td>
<td>In the Township of Wellesley, where a property has sidewalk along its frontage, the abutting property owner is responsible for snow removal in accordance with the Township’s By-law 10/2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Sugg</td>
<td>No extra lighting required on Hutchison Road.</td>
<td>In order to provide adequate lighting for the improved roadway corridor, street lighting upgrades will be considered for installation on existing poles within the project limits as per Region illumination policy. The Region will only install full-cutoff luminaries to limit light distribution towards the road and eliminate backlighting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No sidewalks required on Hutchison Road.</td>
<td>Region policies and design guidelines support active modes of transportation which includes walking, particularly in urban cores and rural settlement areas. Currently, pedestrians in Crosshill are generally using the paved shoulders as a walking facility. Once the road improvements are constructed, the paved shoulders will be eliminated and a suitable pedestrian facility will be required to accommodate pedestrians so they are not forced to walk along the edge of the roadway or in grassed areas. The Project Team believes that continuous sidewalks within the village may give residents a more comfortable walking experience and encourage increased pedestrian activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widening Hutchison Road with buggy lanes will increase traffic volume and speed.</td>
<td>No traffic volume increases are anticipated specifically as a result of the proposed improvements. Background growth will continue regardless. The Project Team believes that removing the existing wide paved shoulders and the installation of curb and gutter, sidewalks and boulevard landscaping will give the roadway a more constrained feel as well as a visual indicator to drivers that they are entering a village. This is likely to encourage reduced speeds through the project limits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherryl Roth &amp; Roger Roth</td>
<td>Please no sidewalk. Give sidewalk allowance to buggies and bicycles. Please no street lights.</td>
<td>See previous response regarding sidewalk installation. The Project Team believes that provision of sidewalks and on-road cycling/buggy lanes on William Hastings Line and Hutchison Road adequately accommodates pedestrians, cyclists and buggy traffic. See previous response regarding streetlight installation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Fritch</td>
<td>No extra lights.</td>
<td>See previous response regarding streetlight installation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No sidewalks.</td>
<td>See previous response regarding sidewalk installation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speed bumps or 40 km/hr.</td>
<td>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). Drivers tend to drive at speeds that feel comfortable to them based on their surroundings, rather than according to the posted speed. Speed bumps, and the like, are not typically utilized on Regional roads as they can be hazardous for drivers that don’t see them in advance and they present challenges for snow plowing. See previous response regarding sidewalk installation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More police for speed control.</td>
<td>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 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Licence fee for buggies.</td>
<td>The Region does not currently collect licence fees on any form of vehicle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony White</td>
<td>No need for sidewalks or extra lights – increase in taxes.</td>
<td>See previous responses regarding sidewalk and streetlight installation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in traffic and speeders.</td>
<td>See previous response regarding traffic volumes and speeds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horse buggy and bike lanes ok.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extra snow removal for residents.</td>
<td>See previous comments regarding Township of Wellesley’s snow removal by-law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More police patrol.</td>
<td>See previous response regarding police patrol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denis Shantz</td>
<td>Why do we need sidewalks? Put road on William Hastings straight through. Make the end of Greenwood Hill a dead end or one way street.</td>
<td>See previous response regarding sidewalk installation. The Region has previously acquired property to allow for a future road right-of-way for the extension of Lobsinger Line to connect directly to William Hastings Line and thereby transform the existing sharp curve to a conventional four-way intersection. This ‘Crosshill Curve Improvements’ project is not currently included in the Region’s 2013 Ten Year Transportation Capital Program. Staff will continue to monitor traffic volume projections and collision patterns in Crosshill prior to programming capital projects in future years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please no lights (I came to the country for peace and quiet).</td>
<td>See previous response regarding streetlight installation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryan Brenner</td>
<td>I feel we should have a street light at the corner of Lobsinger Line and Greenwood Hill Road.</td>
<td>This intersection is outside of the project limits, but the concern will be noted to Corridor Management staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Why do we need sidewalks in Crosshill?</td>
<td>See previous response regarding sidewalk installation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrle Baxter</td>
<td>The entrance of the driveway to my garage is a big asphalt hump and is in disrepair. This hump keeps the water run-off from coming into my garage but it is hard on the undercarriage of my vehicle. Please plan to do something about this.</td>
<td>The planned improvements will eliminate this concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Baxter &amp; Laura Baxter</td>
<td>There is an existing water line going from our house under the roadway, and up to Earle Baxter’s barn and house. If the roadway is to be lowered, this waterline will need to be lowered as well. Also, we get ponding in our driveway and on our lawn due to water run-off from store area, there is no culvert under the neighbours driveway (west of us) to let runoff escape our property.</td>
<td>As there are no formal records, the approximate locations of existing water lines have been noted on the plans as per discussions/recollections of area residents attending the Public Consultation Centre. Region staff will look into this further during detailed design to determine an appropriate course of action during construction. Curb and gutter and storm sewer installation will help redirect roadway run-off that currently drains to the store parking area and on to your property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sasha Brown &amp; Aaron Brown</td>
<td>We have an “invisible fence” which runs along the existing sidewalk, please don’t damage it. It is a thin wire buried 4 inches underground. If possible please connect new sidewalk to my front door. We are very happy you are moving the sidewalk further from our house.</td>
<td>The Region will work with the homeowners to determine the exact location of the “invisible fence” wire and arrange for appropriate measures prior to or during construction. A walkway connection will be considered during detailed design. Noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO

NOTRE DAME DRIVE AND SNYDER’S ROAD RECONSTRUCTION
Petersburg
Township of Wilmot

INFORMATION PACKAGE

Public Consultation Centre No. 2
Thursday, February 28, 2013
5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

LOCATION:

Emmanuel Lutheran Church
1716 Snyder’s Road
Petersburg

There is a Comment Sheet at the back of this package. If you wish, please fill it out and deposit it in the designated box provided at this Information Centre
1. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS PUBLIC CONSULTATION CENTRE

The purpose of this 2nd Public Consultation Centre for the proposed reconstruction of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road in Petersburg is to present and receive feedback on the revised reconstruction design plans which have been modified based on comments received at the 1st Public Consultation Centre in May of 2012.

As you are aware, the Region of Waterloo is planning to reconstruct the main streets in Petersburg. The project limits include Notre Dame Drive (Region Road 12) from the Railway crossing to the north limit of the Highway 7 and 8 interchange, as well as Snyder’s Road (Region Road 6) from the east village limit (approximately 300 metres east of Notre Dame Drive) to the west village limit (approximately 350 metres west of Notre Dame Drive) for a total combined distance of approximately 2,000 metres. Please refer to Appendix A for a key plan of the Project Area.

In May 2012 the first Public Consultation Centre (PCC No. 1) was held at the Rebel Creek Golf Course. At PCC No. 1, a proposed design was presented to receive comments from the residents, property owners and the general public. The design presented at PCC No. 1 included:

- Full reconstruction of the existing roads with one lane in each direction (same number of lanes as currently exists);
- New on-road bicycle lanes with provision for some parking spaces behind the curb in select areas;
- Installation of new storm sewers (including curb and gutter) to replace the existing old and inconsistently sized storm sewers, and to match new curb and gutter locations;
- Sidewalk, on both sides of the road, in most areas, with an approximate 1.0m grassed or hard surface boulevard between the sidewalk and curb and gutter;
- Installation of “semi-mountable” curb and gutter to address drainage problems and provide delineation between the asphalt roadway and proposed boulevard;
- Removal of the paved asphalt shoulder in most areas;
- Some select areas of on-street parking;
- Modernization and upgrading of the traffic signals at the intersection of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road, elimination of the existing marked short right turn lanes on Snyder’s Road at Notre Dame Drive (while maintaining sufficient pavement width on Snyder’s Road for through vehicles to bypass left turning vehicles);
- Minor culvert rehabilitation at Alder Creek culvert, west leg of Snyder’s Road; and
- Upgrades to various overhead and below-ground utilities as required to accommodate the proposed improvements.

Based on the comments received at PCC No. 1 (summarized in Section 4 of this report), the Project Team has modified the original design for both Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road.
This Public Consultation Centre No. 2 is a forum for you to:

1. Review the proposed “revised” designs for both Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road;

2. Ask questions of staff of the Region of Waterloo, Township of Wilmot and our engineering consultant, MTE Consultants Inc.; and

3. Provide any comments you may have on the “revised” design under consideration.

We kindly request that you fill out the Comment Sheet attached to the back of this Information Package and place it in the box at this PCC or send it to the address indicated on the Comment Sheet prior to Thursday March 14, 2013. Your comments will be considered by the Project Team in conjunction with all other relevant information, including Regional policies, master plans, design criteria etc. in confirming the proposed “revised” design for road improvements to Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road.

2. WHO IS DIRECTING THIS PROJECT?

This project is being directed by a Project Team consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo and the Township of Wilmot, and Township of Wilmot Councillor Peter Roe.

3. WHY ARE ROAD IMPROVEMENTS REQUIRED?

There are a number of needs driving this project. The following sections describe these needs:

a) Deteriorated Road Condition

The pavement condition is fair to poor on most sections of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road. In general, the deterioration is simply due to the age of the asphalt combined with areas of poor roadway drainage.

b) Drainage Issues

Except for a few small sections of curb and gutter near the intersection of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road, most of the roadway consist of areas of paved shoulders with road drainage flowing into shallow swales, roadside ditches or directly onto private driveways and front yards. In many locations the houses and properties are lower than the existing road resulting in surface drainage from the roads flowing onto private property. This drainage condition exists on the south side of the east leg of Snyder’s Road where road surface drainage flows onto private property. Backyard flooding and the potential for basement flooding has been reported in this general area. Flooding problems have also been reported on the south leg of Notre Dame Drive between Snyder’s Road and Reinhart Place. In some locations, along both roads, there are “makeshift” catchbasins and storm sewers installed in the roadway; however, many of these are in questionable condition due to their age, have inconsistent and/or insufficient size and unknown or partially buried outlets. Accordingly, there is a need for a new storm sewer system throughout Petersburg to address these drainage deficiencies.
c) **Pedestrian Needs**

Currently, there is no sidewalk on Notre Dame Drive or on Snyder’s Road. To promote and encourage walking for local trips, and a reduction in the use of cars and for pedestrian safety reasons, the Region of Waterloo has a mandated initiative to consider continuous sidewalks on both sides of the road, as part of any road reconstruction project in built-up areas. Sidewalks are therefore being considered for construction on both sides of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road, in Petersburg, in support of both the Region’s Context Sensitive Corridor Design Guidelines and the proposed Active Transportation Master Plan. Sidewalks assist in promoting walking for local trips, and the inclusion of a landscaped boulevard between the sidewalk and the traveled portion of the roadway provides a greater separation between pedestrians and traffic and promotes pedestrian safety.

Snow removal on all sidewalks is the responsibility of the abutting landowners as per Township of Wilmot By-Law 84-72.

d) **Cycling Needs**

There are currently no designated cycling lanes on Notre Dame Drive or Snyder’s Road; however Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road (both within and beyond Petersburg) are identified as designated cycling routes in the Region’s proposed new Active Transportation Master Plan and accordingly cycling facilities are being considered as part of this project.

The Township of Wilmot has also requested that the Region consider the construction of cycling facilities as part of the proposed reconstruction of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road as a part of an initiative to provide cycling connections between the various towns and hamlets in Wilmot Township.

4. **WHAT FEEDBACK WAS RECEIVED AS A RESULT OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION CENTRE No. 1?**

As a result of PCC No. 1, forty-three (43) written comments were received, a community-organized “informal” meeting was held at “The Blue Moon”, 1677 Snyder’s Road East on May 10, 2012, and a petition signed by 979 people was received on December 19, 2012.

The petition read as follows; “Petition against the $4,580,000.00 Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road Reconstruction in Petersburg (curbs, sidewalks, boulevards, and on-road bike lanes), but for shoulder resurfacing in order to accommodate walking, biking and parking throughout the whole of Petersburg”. One hundred and twenty-three (123) of the signatures were from residents of Petersburg. The other 856 signatures were from people who do not live in Petersburg.

The following summarizes the main comments received as a result of PCC No. 1.

a) **Curb and Sidewalks not Required – Keep Paved Shoulder**

Thirty-two (32) written comments were received that were not in favor of installing curbs and sidewalks. The reasons were varied and included:

- A small community does not need sidewalks;
- Nobody walks now;
- The shoulder is adequate for pedestrians;
- The sidewalk will result in too many trees being removed;
- Increased maintenance time and effort to shovel snow;
- Cost not warranted, too expensive, taxes will increase;
- Sidewalk will be very close to front of houses in some cases;
- Growth in Petersburg not anticipated so no improvements necessary;
- Curbs will limit use of road by farm equipment;
- Curbs and sidewalks will change the character of the community;
- The curbs and revised entrances to businesses will restrict access to their property;
- Curbs and sidewalks will impact drainage, vegetation and detract from the historical nature of the designated heritage building at 1634 Snyder’s Road.

In addition to the above, some residents also felt that the existing informal gravel trail to the park (located on the west side Notre Dame Drive at the bottom of the road slope between Cecil Kennedy Court and the Community Park) provided an adequate, less expensive and safer alternative to the proposed new concrete sidewalk proposed at road level.

Other general comments that were received included;

- Work needs to be done to our road;
- Road should be repaved;
- Drainage on our road is terrible, neighbours front lawn always floods during heavy rain and the roadside in front of their home always stays quite wet.

b) **Reduce Speed Limit**

Fourteen (14) written comments expressed concerns about vehicles speeding through the community and felt that the existing posted speed limit of 60 km/h resulted in excessive vehicle speeds. It was stated that gravel and other trucks travelling through Petersburg often exceeded the posted speed limit which presents a potentially dangerous situation. Many felt the speed limit should be reduced for safety reasons from 60 km/h to 50 km/h.

One comment received indicated that it was their experience that curbs, boulevards and sidewalks will slow down traffic.

c) **Concerns with Proposed Parking Arrangements**

Currently, parking is unrestricted in Petersburg, except in the vicinity of the signalized intersection of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road.

Twelve (12) written comments were received concerning the proposed parking space areas behind the proposed curb. The comments were varied and included:
• Blue Moon will lose parking spaces;
• Currently can park anywhere in town on paved shoulder;
• Need some on-street parking near Cemetery on Notre Dame Drive for use during funerals and visits;
• Safety concerns with strangers parking near their homes where no parking exists now;
• Private driveways are large enough to accommodate parking in the community;
• Parking survey should be done during the summer, not in winter;
• On-street parking should be allowed throughout the community;
• Elimination of paved shoulder will take away overflow parking for existing homes and especially businesses;
• On-street parking should be concentrated near the businesses.

d) **Bicycle Lanes Not Required**

Nine (9) comments were received that were not in favour of bicycle lanes. The comments included:

• Paved shoulder can be used by cyclists;
• Why install bicycle lanes in Petersburg when there are no bicycle lanes to connect to outside of Petersburg;
• Very few cyclists use the roads now;
• Bicycle lanes too expensive;

Two (2) comments specifically indicated that bicycle lanes are required.

e) **Intersection of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road**

Eight (8) comments related to the traffic signals or turn lanes at Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road. The comments included:

• Install an advanced green signal for left turning vehicles;
• Upgraded intersection is for cities not for rural areas;
• Turn lanes are required especially on the south leg of Notre Dame Drive.

5. **HOW DOES THE PROPOSED REVISED DESIGN ADDRESS THE COMMENTS RECEIVED AS A RESULT OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION CENTRE No. 1?**

a) **Curb and Sidewalks not Required – Keep Paved Shoulder**

The “revised” design for both Snyder’s Road and Notre Dame Drive still includes curbs and sidewalks. Curbs and gutters are an important road component needed to intercept, and collect
storm water and to correct the drainage problems identified in Section 3 b) of this Information Package. Sidewalks separated from the travelled portion of the roadway, by landscaped boulevards, bike lanes and/or parking provide a much safer pedestrian facility (compared to the existing paved shoulders) from both a physical and visual perspective, due to the separation of the pedestrians and vehicles.

As part of the new revised design there are some revisions to proposed sidewalk and curb installations as follows:

- **South side of the east leg of Snyder’s Road - sidewalk is now not proposed**, to reduce grading impacts on private property and driveways, to maintain sight line visibility and to reduce loss of privacy due to houses being significantly closer to and lower than the road;

- **North of Cecil Kennedy Court/Deerfield Avenue on Notre Dame Drive - no curb or sidewalk is proposed at the road level**: the existing gravel path at the bottom of the embankment will be replaced with a concrete sidewalk in the same location;

- **On all 4 legs of this project, the curbs and sidewalk is to be terminated approximately where the last residences are located**, near the end of the project limits. From the end of the curb and sidewalk to the end of the project limits, the road will be constructed to the cross section illustrated in either Figure 3 or Figure 4 of Appendix B;

- **At the intersections and along the back of the 6 parking spaces on the east side of Notre Dame Drive, raised barrier curb and gutter is proposed** to help protect the traffic signals, prevent turning vehicles from tracking onto the sidewalk where the pedestrians wait to cross and prevent the parking from encroaching onto the sidewalk.

In response to some of the other concerns regarding proposed curb and gutter and sidewalk, the Project Team responds as follows:

- With curb and gutters, driveway entrances to businesses and residences are better defined to avoid wider than necessary driveways and yet are still designed to accommodate large vehicles. The use of the proposed rollover curb will allow larger vehicles to still make slightly wider turns where necessary.

- With respect to farm vehicles, the proposed rollover curbs allow any over-width farm vehicles to encroach into the space outside the travel lane under these infrequent and unique circumstances.

b) **Reduce Speed Limit**

Speed studies undertaken by the Region indicated that most vehicles were driving within the 60 km/h posted speed limit through Petersburg; however, the speed studies did find some vehicles exceeding the speed limit. It is believed that those vehicles currently exceeding the speed limit are doing so due to the existing wide-open road design (i.e. wide expanse of asphalt width, partially due to the paved shoulder) that contributes to motorists feeling more comfortable driving at those increased speeds, as opposed to the posted speed limit.
As a result of the expressed speeding concern by the public, the Project Team is recommending a revised cross section within the settlement area that will physically restrict the width of the road platform and encourage slower speeds. With reference to the cross-sections in Appendix B, the “revised” design includes two 3.35m wide asphalt vehicle lanes with a narrow (0.35m or 14 inch wide) “rollover” curb on each side, a 1.25m segregated bike lane behind the rollover curb (within the settlement area) and a 1.5m on-road bike lane beyond the settlement area. Within the settlement area, a 1.5m wide concrete sidewalk is included adjacent to either the segregated bike lane, the landscaped boulevard or the on-street parking.

A revised cross section with narrower asphalt lanes, segregated bike lane behind the rollover curb and proposed plantings behind or in front of the sidewalk would provide forms of traffic calming and would have the potential to reduce motorist speed compared to leaving the roadway wide open with asphalt shoulders. Staff believes that the implementation of these traffic calming initiatives are necessary to support a reduced posted speed limit. Should the approved design incorporate traffic calming initiatives as described above, Region staff anticipates recommending a reduced speed limit in Peters burg to Regional Council as part of the Final Design Approval Report scheduled for Council approval in spring 2013. Subject to Council approval of a reduced speed limit, the posted speed limit would be reduced in 2015 coincident with the completion of construction.

To further alert motorists that they are entering a residential community, a short length of centre median is also proposed near each of the four entrances to the community. These medians may include landscape plantings or the Township may elect to erect a small decorative community welcome sign to advise motorists they are entering the community of Petersburg and to encourage reduced speeds.

In addition the proposed median at the intersection of Notre Dame Drive with Deerfield Avenue / Cecil Kennedy Court will include a pedestrian refuge to assist pedestrians crossing Notre Dame Drive to access the proposed sidewalk to the community park. Illumination will also be upgraded where necessary at the median locations to meet the Region’s illumination policy. The approximate locations of new illumination are shown on the display plans at this evening’s PCC.

c) Concerns with Proposed Parking Arrangements

The original design presented at PCC No. 1 showed a number of parking spaces in select areas throughout the project limits (20 spaces overall) based on a parking study undertaken by the Region in February 2012. Based on comments received at PCC No. 1, an additional parking study was undertaken on Snyder’s Road and Notre Dame Drive in July 2012 to capture parking demand in a summer month also. The July parking study found very little difference when compared to the February parking study.

The on-street parking arrangements have however been revised somewhat in conjunction with the proposed revised road design changes. The proposed parking arrangements now comprise of 30 - 32 spaces overall and consists of the following, with the proposed changes shown in bold font:

i) Snyder’s Road:
- No parking is proposed on the south side of the east leg due to driveway grading, sight visibility and property limitations, with the exception that four to six parking spaces
are proposed near the intersection at the Blue Moon on the Snyder’s Road frontage to provide a limited number of spaces for disabled persons and for patron parking; these spaces would be in close proximity to the only handicap-accessible entrance to the Blue Moon;

- Eight parking spaces are proposed on the north side of the east leg of Snyder’s Road;
- No parking spaces are proposed on the north or south side of the west leg of Snyder’s Road based on very little demand and comments from the public.

ii) Notre Dame Drive:
- Six parking spaces are proposed on the east side near Snyder’s Road at the Blue Moon patio area, to accommodate truck delivery of supplies to the Blue Moon and general parking during other times;
- Two parking spaces are proposed on the west side of the south leg of Notre Dame Drive, plus an additional three parking spaces are proposed between the existing entrances at the cemetery;
- One truck parking space on each side (i.e. total of two) are proposed on the north leg of Notre Dame Drive near Snyder’s Road for customers with large vehicles who patronize the businesses at the intersection. Currently large vehicles are observed to park on the paved shoulder in this area to access the variety store, gas bar and restaurant;
- On the north leg of Notre Dame Drive between Snyder’s Road and Cecil Kennedy Court/Deerfield Avenue, two parking spaces are proposed on the west side and three parking spaces are proposed on the east side near the post office;
- North of Cecil Kennedy Court/Deerfield Avenue the shoulders will be paved and no curb and gutter is being installed. The paved shoulder provides for a 1.5 m bicycle lane adjacent to the travel lane. (Please refer to Figure 3, Appendix B). During large events at the Community Park, there is an opportunity to allow overflow parking on these paved shoulders. This parking will encroach into the bike lane; however, under these infrequent events special parking signs could be erected by the event organizers to advise cyclists about the short-term encroachment of the parking onto the bike lanes.

d) Bicycle Lanes Not Required

Snyder’s Road and Notre Dame Drive are not designated cycling routes under the Region’s current Cycling Master Plan: however under the Region’s proposed new Active Transportation Master Plan, both Snyder’s Road and Notre Dame Drive are designated as planned cycling routes, both within and beyond the settlement limits of Petersburg. In addition, the Township of Wilmot has requested the Region to consider the provision of cycling facilities as part of the proposed reconstruction of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road.

As construction of these roads proceeds in the future, cycling facilities are to be constructed to ultimately form part of an overall uninterrupted cycling route network within the Region. It is therefore important that cycling facilities be constructed in Petersburg as part of the proposed road reconstruction, to avoid future expensive modifications and the associated additional construction disruption within Petersburgh.
As part of this project it is therefore proposed to build a “segregated” coloured concrete bike lane behind the rollover curb to provide an area dedicated just for cyclists and to provide some separation, from the motorized vehicle lanes. The coloured concrete surface will clearly identify the bike lane for use by cyclists only.

e) Intersection of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder's Road

From comments received at PCC #1, Region staff completed another up-dated operational review of the intersection of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road, to determine if turn lanes and/or an advanced green signal phase are required based on projected future traffic volumes. The review concluded that neither an advanced green signal phase nor turn lanes are required on any legs of this intersection. As a result, no turn lanes will be marked at the intersection. Traffic signals will be modernized and upgraded at the intersection; however an advanced green signal will not be installed at this time. In the future if an advanced green signal is required it would be installed at that time.

In addition, the existing marked eastbound and westbound short right turn lanes on Snyder's Road will not be marked after construction is completed. The new curb will however be placed such that there will be sufficient room on Snyder's Road at the intersection to allow through vehicles to bypass vehicles waiting to make a left turn onto Notre Dame Drive.

Summary of Current Proposed Improvements

The following is a summary of the proposed improvements contained in the “revised” design;

- Full reconstruction of the existing roads with one lane in each direction (same number of lanes as currently exists);
- New 1.25m wide segregated bicycle lanes behind a “rollover” curb and gutter;
- Installation of new storm sewers (including curb and gutter) to replace the existing old and inconsistently sized storm sewers;
- Sidewalk, on both sides of the road, in most areas, with an approximate 1.0m grassed or hard surface boulevard between the sidewalk and segregated bike lane;
- Removal of the paved asphalt shoulder in most areas;
- Some select areas of on-street parking;
- Modernization and upgrading of the traffic signals at the intersection of Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road, elimination of the existing marked short right turn lanes on Snyder’s Road at Notre Dame Drive (while maintaining sufficient pavement width on Snyder’s Road for through vehicles to bypass left turning vehicles);
- Minor culvert rehabilitation at Alder Creek culvert, west leg of Snyder’s Road; and
- Upgrades to various overhead and below-ground utilities as required to accommodate the proposed improvements.
6. WHAT CHANGES ARE PROPOSED TO ENHANCE THE BOULEVARD AREAS OF PETERSBURG?

The proposed new boulevard areas between the segregated bike lane and the sidewalk will be planted with grass, and where possible new trees are proposed to be planted in the boulevard areas. In the vicinity of the Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road Intersection, the boulevard area between the curb and sidewalk will be coloured patterned concrete, to provide a reduced maintenance surface and provide road aesthetics.

7. WILL A NEW WATERMAIN OR SANITARY SEWER BE INCLUDED IN THIS WORK?

As the community of Petersburg does not have a municipal watermain or sanitary sewer network or treatment facility, construction of watermain and sanitary sewers on Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road is not being considered as part of this project.

NOTE: If residents are aware of private water systems, drilled or dug wells or private septic systems that are in front yards adjacent to the road allowance, you are encouraged to make this information known to the Region’s Project Manager so this information can be shown on the construction plans and provisions made to protect these systems during construction.

8. HOW DOES THIS PROJECT ADDRESS THE REGION OF WATERLOO’S TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN?

The Regional Official plan gives direction to balance new and retrofitted roads for all modes of transportation including walking, cycling, autos and transit. In addition Regional Council also approved the Regional Transportation Master Plan and the Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines in 2010 that support the integration of active and sustainable transportation on Regional Roads. This project supports the Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) goals of optimizing our transportation system promoting transportation choice, supporting sustainable development and fostering a strong economy. This project includes facilities for all modes of transportation by providing new sidewalks and segregated bike lanes.

9. IS ANY PRIVATE PROPERTY REQUIRED TO COMPLETE THE WORK?

Some property acquisition will be required for this project and these property acquisitions are highlighted on the plans presented at this evening’s Consultation Centre. When property is required for a Regional project, the owner is reimbursed at fair market value. An independent appraisal would be completed based upon recent local sales to determine fair market value. For further information please see the Property Acquisition Process Information Sheet in Appendix C.
10. WHEN WILL CONSTRUCTION OCCUR?

Following this PCC, the Project Team will be compiling the public comments before making a final recommendation to Regional Council for project approval in Spring 2013. Following project approval, detailed design will be completed and utility relocations undertaken. To allow additional time for review and consideration of the resident’s concerns (PCC #1) and to explore all the technical aspects associated with the alternatives under consideration, along with further consultation (PCC# 2), the project construction has been rescheduled to 2015. The tenders are now scheduled for late 2014/early 2015 and the earliest construction start would be Spring 2015. Both Snyder’s Road and Notre Dame Drive will be completed under the same construction contract. Both roads could be worked on at the same time, but the construction contract will be structured to avoid significant disruptions on both roads at the same time in order to minimize inconvenience to the local residents and travelling public.

Prior to construction, another Public Information Centre will be held to provide more information on specific construction details and timing.

11. WILL THE ROADS BE CLOSED AND WILL THERE BE DETOURS?

The work will involve deep excavations for the storm sewer replacement and for road base reconstruction. It may be necessary to close the roads to all but local traffic when construction is occurring. Detours will be put in place for through traffic. Signs would be erected to detour this through traffic around the construction area via adjacent Regional and Township Roads. The Fire Department, Waterloo Regional Police and Ambulance Service, as well as school boards for bus routing, will be advised of the traffic restrictions and detour routes during the construction period.

In order to confine the work area and to minimize the amount of time work is happening at any one location, work requiring a full road closure will only occur on one leg of the four legs of Snyder’s Road and Notre Dame Drive at a time.

During the construction, local access to individual properties will be maintained at all times over temporary gravel surfaces.

As is customary when Regional Road detours are required, motorists will be advised of the construction timing and traffic restrictions through advance signage and the Region’s web site.

12. HOW WILL ACCESS BE MAINTAINED TO PROPERTIES DURING CONSTRUCTION?

Access to private driveways will be maintained at all times to the greatest extent possible. The Contractor will, however, be required to temporarily block access into and out of all driveways on Snyder’s Road and Notre Dame Drive and side streets when completing any deep excavations across each driveway/side street. Where a disruption to your driveway is expected, the Contractor will be required to hand-deliver a notice at least 48 hours in advance advising you of the time and duration of the driveway disruption.

For commercial properties, access for customers will be maintained at all times. If an alternate, secondary access is not available, the Contractor will complete the work across your driveway one ½ at a time, while maintaining the other ½ for customer access to your property.
commercial properties within the construction zone, “Name of Business” signage will be provided during construction to direct customers to the businesses. The Region does not give tax relief or compensation to businesses within the work zone. The Region makes all reasonable efforts to mitigate the impact to properties and businesses during construction.

For residential properties, it may be necessary to block driveways for up to one day at various times. If necessary, alternate parking arrangements will be made on side streets or outside the immediate construction area.

Property and business owners will be requested to contact the Region’s Project Manager if they have any concerns in relation to access, signage or other issues during construction so it can be determined if reasonable changes or modifications can be made.

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

**Pedestrian Access**

Pedestrian access will be maintained on at least one side of both Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road for the duration of the construction. Where the pedestrian area is close to deep excavations, it will be separated from the work area by plastic fencing. Pedestrians may be required to cross Notre Dame Road and Snyder’s Road at mid-block locations on some occasions to use the opposite side of the street.

13. **HOW WILL TREES, DRIVEWAYS AND LAWNS BE AFFECTED?**

It is expected that a small number of trees on private property will have to be removed during construction to accommodate the proposed improvements. The plans presented at the Public Consultation Centre show trees that likely will require removal. It is the Region’s practice to plant two replacement trees for each tree removed as a result of any road projects. There will be some work required at private driveways and front yards to tie into new curb and gutter and sidewalk. Restoration to driveways will be done using materials which match those which are existing (asphalt will be replaced with asphalt, etc.). However, all driveway aprons (portion between sidewalk and the segregated bike lane) will be reinstated in concrete. Any grassed areas disturbed during construction will be repaired to equal or better condition with topsoil and sod.

14. **HOW WILL GARBAGE / RECYCLING BE COLLECTED DURING CONSTRUCTION?**

During construction we will ask that you continue to place your garbage and blue boxes at the end of your driveway for pick-up as usual. When work is occurring in front of your home and garbage collection vehicles do not have access to your driveway, the Contractor will deliver your garbage and recyclables to an adjacent side street and return the empty containers afterwards. We will ask that all residents mark their containers with their address for easy identification.

15. **WHAT ABOUT DUST DURING CONSTRUCTION?**

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

16. WILL THERE BE ANY IMPACTS TO THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT?

Normal erosion and sediment controls will be put in place as part of the work during any construction activity. All vegetated areas disturbed as part of this project will be reinstated to equal or better condition than what existed before construction.

17. WHAT ABOUT WORKING HOURS?

In general, construction working hours will be from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. There may be occasions where the Contractor requests or is required to complete a critical work item after normal hours. In these special cases, this type of work outside normal working hours must be agreed to by the Region and the Township of Wilmot and must be proven to be critical to the requirements of the project or to lessen a public inconvenience associated with the work.

18. WHAT IS THE ESTIMATED COST OF THIS PROJECT AND HOW WILL IT BE FUNDED?

The Region of Waterloo is funding the road improvements on this project and the total budget for the proposed Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road improvements is $4,580,000.

19. WHAT IS THE NEXT STEP BEFORE FINALIZING THE DESIGN?

Prior to finalizing the final recommended design concept for Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road for Regional Council’s approval, the Project Team is asking for the public’s input on the proposed revised design. This Public Consultation Centre (PPC #2) is your opportunity to ask questions, provide suggestions, and make comments. Once your input is received, it will be used by the Project Team, in conjunction with all other relevant information and design standards to finalize the recommended design. Prior to construction, another Information Centre will be held to advise residents and property owners regarding specific timing and detour requirements.

20. WHEN WILL FINAL DECISIONS BE MADE FOR THIS PROJECT?

The Project Team will review the public comments received from this evening’s Public Consultation Centre (PCC #2) and use them as input for recommending a final Design Concept for the Notre Dame Drive and Snyder’s Road Reconstruction project. This Final Recommendation will be presented to Regional Planning and Works Committee and Council in the Spring of 2013 for approval. In advance of these meetings, letters will be sent to all adjacent property owners and tenants (as well as to all members of the public specifically registering at either of the two Public Consultation Centres) so that anyone wishing to speak to Committee or Council about this project can do so before final approval.
21. HOW CAN I VOICE MY COMMENTS AT THIS STAGE?

In order to assist us in addressing any comments or concerns you might have regarding this project, we ask that you please fill out the attached Comment Sheet and leave it in the box provided at the registration table. Alternatively, you can mail, fax or e-mail your comments to the Region of Waterloo not later than Thursday March 14, 2013.

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

Mr. Bob Wheildon, P.Eng.
Senior Project Manager
Regional Municipality of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street, 6th Floor
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3

Phone: 519-575-4757 x 3103
Fax: 519-575-4430
Email: rwheildon@regionofwaterloo.ca
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[Diagram showing typical cross sections of a road, including details such as grade to existing, landscape buffer, and asphalt width.]
Appendix C

Property Acquisition Process Information Sheet

(Projects requiring Class Environmental Assessment Approval)

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

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

Property Impact Plans

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

Initial Owner Contact by Regional Real Estate Staff

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

Initial Meetings

The initial meeting is attended by the project engineer and the assigned real estate staff person to brief the owner on the project, what part of their lands are to be acquired or will be affected, what work will be undertaken, when, with what equipment, etc and to answer any questions. The primary purpose of the meeting is to listen to the owner and identify issues, concerns, effects of the proposed acquisition on remaining lands and businesses that can be feasibly mitigated and/or compensated, and how the remaining property may be restored. These discussions may require additional meetings. The goal of staff is to work with the owner to reach mutually agreeable solutions.

Goal – Fair and Equitable Settlement for All Parties

The goal is always to reach a fair and equitable agreement for both the property owner and the Region. Such an agreement will provide compensation for the fair market value of the lands and address the project impacts (such as repairing or replacing landscaping, fencing, paving) so that the property owner will receive the value of the lands acquired and the restoration of their remaining property to the condition it was prior to the Project.
The initial meetings will form the basis on an offer of settlement or agreement of purchase and sale for the required lands or interest.

**Steps Toward Offer of Settlement or Agreement of Purchase and Sale**

The general steps towards such an offer are as follows:

1) the Region will obtain an independent appraisal of the fair market value of the lands and interests to be acquired, and an appraisal of any effect on the value of the rest of the property resulting from the acquisition of the required lands and interests;

2) compensation will be estimated and/or works to minimize other effects will be defined and agreed to by the property owner and the Region;

3) reasonable costs of the owner will be included in any compensation settlement;

4) an offer with a purchase price and any other compensation or works in lieu of compensation will be submitted to the property owner for consideration; and

5) an Agreement will be finalized with any additional discussion, valuations, etc as may be required.

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

**Expropriation**

Due to the time constraints of these projects, it is the practice of the Region to commence the expropriation process in parallel with the negotiation process to insure that lands and interests are acquired in time for commencement of the Project. Typically, over 90% of all required lands and interests are acquired through the negotiation process. Even after lands and interest have been acquired through expropriation an agreement on compensation can be reached through negotiation, this is usually referred to as a “settlement agreement”.

Put simply, an expropriation is the transfer of lands or an easement of 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 the *Act* are protected.
**COMMENT SHEET**

**REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO**

**NOTRE DAME DRIVE AND SNYDER’S ROAD RECONSTRUCTION**

Petersburg, Township of Wilmot

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION CENTRE – Thursday February 28, 2013**

Please complete and hand in this sheet so that your views can be considered for this project. If you cannot complete your comments today, please take this home and mail, fax or e-mail your comments by Thursday March 14, 2013 to:

Mr. Bob. Wheildon, P. Eng. 6th Floor, 150 Frederick Street
Senior Project Manager, Kitchener, ON N2J 4G3
Design and Construction Division Facsimile: 519-575-4430
Regional Municipality of Waterloo email: rwheildon@regionofwaterloo.ca

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you have any drainage issues or special features on your property, which the Design Team should be made aware of?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please describe:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are your sump pump discharge, area drains (i.e. catchbasins), foundation drains or roof leaders piped to the existing storm sewer or road ditch?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please describe:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you support the proposed centre median islands at the community entrances, to assist in providing traffic calming?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please describe:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What elements of the proposed road design do you like?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please describe:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What elements of the proposed road design do you not like?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please describe:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other comments or concerns regarding this project:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Name: __________________________________________________________
Address: _________________________________________________________ Postal Code: _______________________

COLLECTION NOTICE

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


SUMMARY:

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

1. Accepted the following plan of subdivision and plans of condominium;
2. Modified the following plan of condominium;
3. Released for registration the following plan of subdivision and plans of condominium; and
4. Approved the following official plan amendment.

REPORT:

City of Cambridge

1. Modification to Plan of Condominium 30CDM-12102
Applicant: Deerfield Homes Ltd.
Location: 750 Lawrence Street
Proposal: To adjust the unit boundaries of all 103 units so the unit is now only the building and the balance of the lot is identified as Exclusive Use Area.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid January 22, 2013
Commissioner’s Approval: January 23, 2013
Came Into Effect: Immediately

2. Official Plan Amendment No. 39
Applicant: Daiseyfield Development Corporation
Location: Fraserwood Court
Proposal: To amend Map 15 General Land Use Map of the City Official Plan by designating the subject lands as “Class 1 (Urban) Residential District” in order to facilitate the future residential development of 26 single detached dwelling lots.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid January 9, 2013
Commissioner’s Approval: January 15, 2013
Came Into Effect: February 5, 2013
City of Kitchener

1. **Registration of Draft Plan of Subdivision 30T-09202**
   Draft Approval Date: June 28, 2010
   Phase: Entire Plan
   Applicant: Earthpark Developments Inc.
   Location: 888 Fairway Road North and Landgren Court Extension
   Proposal: To permit the development of 21 street-fronting townhouse and 6 semi-detached units.
   Regional Processing Fee: Paid January 24, 2013
   Commissioner’s Release: January 24, 2013

2. **Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-12203**
   Draft Approval Date: August 17, 2012
   Phase: Entire Plan
   Applicant: Will-O Homes (C.S.) Inc.
   Location: 275 Old Huron Road
   Proposal: To permit the development of 14 stacked townhouse condominium units.
   Regional Processing Fee: Not applicable.
   Commissioner’s Release: January 3, 2013

3. **Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-11210**
   Draft Approval Date: September 26, 2012
   Phase: Entire Plan
   Applicant: Arrow Lofts Inc.
   Location: 112 Benton Street
   Proposal: To permit the development of 136 apartment condominium units.
   Regional Processing Fee: Not applicable.
   Commissioner’s Release: January 8, 2013

4. **Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-12204**
   Draft Approval Date: November 29, 2011
   Phase: Phase 1
   Applicant: Deerfield Homes Ltd.
   Location: Isaiah Drive, Elizah Avenue and Nyles Drive
   Proposal: To permit the development of 13 street fronting townhouse units.
   Regional Processing Fee: Not applicable.
   Commissioner’s Release: January 11, 2013

5. **Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-05207**
   Draft Approval Date: September 8, 2008
   Phase: Entire Plan
   Applicant: Boardwalk REIT Properties Holdings Inc.
   Location: 812 King Street West
   Proposal: To permit the development of 226 apartment condominium units.
   Regional Processing Fee: Not applicable.
   Commissioner’s Release: January 22, 2013
City of Waterloo

1. **Plan of Condominium Application 30CDM-13401**
   
   **Date Accepted:** January 22, 2013  
   **Applicant:** Cook Homes Limited  
   **Location:** 435 Winchester Drive  
   **Proposal:** To permit the development of 55 townhouse condominium units.  
   **Regional Processing Fee:** Paid December 12, 2012

2. **Plan of Condominium Application 30CDM-13402**
   
   **Date Accepted:** January 24, 2013  
   **Applicant:** TCP King Street Inc.  
   **Location:** 186 to 188 King Street South  
   **Proposal:** To permit the development of 63 apartment condominium units and 3 commercial units at grade.  
   **Regional Processing Fee:** Paid January 24, 2013

3. **Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-12402**
   
   **Draft Approval Date:** March 1, 2012  
   **Phase:** Phase 1  
   **Applicant:** Activa Holdings Inc. and Reflections of Laurelwood  
   **Location:** 776 to 778 Laurelwood Drive  
   **Proposal:** To permit the development of 89 apartment condominium units.  
   **Regional Processing Fee:** Paid January 10, 2013

   **Commissioner’s Release:** January 10, 2013

Township of Woolwich

1. **Plan of Subdivision Application 30T-13701**
   
   **Date Accepted:** January 30, 2013  
   **Applicant:** Empire Communities (Riverland) Ltd.  
   **Location:** West of Woolwich Street South, Breslau  
   **Proposal:** To permit the development of 405 single detached and 126 townhouse units.  
   **Regional Processing Fee:** Paid August 8, 2012

**Residential Subdivision Activity January 1, 2013 to January 31, 2013**

<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>27</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>531</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>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>531</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:

<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>Kitchener</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</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>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</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, Planning, Housing and Community Services
REGION OF WATERLOO
PLANNING, HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
Community Services

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

DATE: February 26, 2013
FILE CODE: D25-80

SUBJECT: PUBLIC MEETING FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINE FOR CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPE CONSERVATION

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following action with respect to the second draft Implementation Guideline for Cultural Heritage Landscape Conservation to the Regional Official Plan, as detailed in Report P-13-016, dated February 26, 2013:

a) Authorize a Public Meeting of the Planning and Works Committee on April 9, 2013 to receive comments from agencies, the planning and heritage consulting community and interested members of the public; and

b) Direct staff to circulate the second draft of the Implementation Guideline for Cultural Heritage Landscape Conservation for comment to the Area Municipalities, Grand River Conservation Authority, Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, planning and heritage consulting firms active in the Region, and other parties having an interest in this implementation guideline, including posting on the Regional website.

SUMMARY:

The Implementation Guideline for Cultural Heritage Landscape Conservation is intended to provide guidance to development applicants, the Regional Heritage Planning Advisory Committee (HPAC), Municipal Heritage Advisory Committees (MHAC), and Regional and Area Municipal staff, in the conservation of significant Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHLs) in the Region of Waterloo – through identifying, documenting, designating and incorporating the CHL into the existing heritage review process. The Regional approach to CHL conservation is a community-lead process undertaken at the Area Municipal level using the Region-wide framework detailed in the Implementation Guideline.

Through the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), the Province of Ontario requires that significant CHLs be conserved. The Regional Official Plan (ROP) adopted by Council in 2009 includes policies to ensure that CHLs will be conserved within the Region. This Implementation Guideline provides detailed guidance on the application of the CHL policies in the ROP.

The Implementation Guideline for CHL Conservation provides a common framework that all municipalities in the Region will use to conserve CHLs. CHL conservation will result in several refinements to the existing heritage review process which is undertaken during the development review and Environmental Assessment processes. The refinements will support future development by ensuring that CHLs are proactively identified, effectively documented and able to be efficiently assessed. Designating a CHL does not change the permitted uses for a property, but will require that the impacts of proposed development be assessed and, if necessary, mitigated.
Currently, the conservation of CHLs is being addressed in the heritage review process in an informal ad hoc manner. Through the Implementation Guideline: Area Municipalities are directed to proactively identify and document CHLs, and to formally recognize CHLs through designating CHLs in their Official Plan; and guidance is provided for effectively documenting each CHL to ensure that landscape based information is available during the heritage review process, and on how to undertake a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment for a CHL.

The first draft of the Implementation Guideline for CHL Conservation was prepared by Cultural Heritage staff in consultation with Regional Community Planning, Transportation Planning, Legal Services, and Transportation and Environmental Services Divisions, and with substantial input from heritage and planning staff at the Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo.

At Council’s direction, the first draft was circulated in the fall of 2012 for wider review and comment by Area Municipalities, MHACs, HPAC, Grand River Conservation Authority and Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, as well as heritage and planning consulting firms, Waterloo Region Homebuilders Association and the general public. At the close of the commenting period on November 9, 2012, many helpful comments and suggestions had been received. The great majority of these comments have been incorporated in the second draft. Area Municipalities are generally supportive of the common framework for conserving CHLs outlined in the Implementation Guideline and are including policies to conserve CHLs in their updated Official Plans.

Staff now recommend that a Public Meeting of the Planning and Works Committee be scheduled on April 9, 2013 to receive formal comments before a final draft is submitted for Council’s consideration. It is also recommended that the second draft be formally circulated to the Area Municipalities, relevant government agencies and other interested parties for comment prior to the Public Meeting, a copy of which is attached to this report.

REPORT:

Through the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), the Province of Ontario requires that significant CHLs be conserved. The Regional Official Plan (ROP) adopted by Council in 2009 includes policies to ensure that CHLs will be conserved within the Region. This Implementation Guideline provides detailed guidance on the application of the CHL policies in the ROP.

The Implementation Guideline for Cultural Heritage Landscape Conservation is referenced in Policy 3.G.5 of the Regional Official Plan (ROP). The document will provide guidance to development applicants, the Regional Heritage Planning Advisory Committee (HPAC), Municipal Heritage Advisory Committees (MHAC), and Regional and Area Municipal staff in the identification, documentation and further conservation of Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHLs) within the Region of Waterloo. Implementing the ROP CHL policies as outlined in the Implementation Guideline will refine the current heritage review process to include CHL conservation during both the Environmental Assessment and development review processes.

A CHL is defined in the Provincial Policy Statement (2005) as a geographical area of heritage significance which has been modified by human activities and is valued by a community. It involves a grouping of individual heritage features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites and natural elements, which together form a significant type of heritage form, distinctive from that of its constituent elements or parts. Examples may include, but are not limited to Heritage Conservation Districts, villages, parks, gardens, battlefields, main streets and neighbourhoods, cemeteries, trailways and industrial complexes of cultural heritage value.
Implementation Guidelines are policy tools that provide detailed guidance in the application of Regional Official Plan policies. This Implementation Guideline outlines the existing policy context and CHL conservation process for the Region of Waterloo, and provides guidance for the implementation of Regional Official Plan policies 3.G.5, 3.G.6 and 3.G.7 through the following sections which comprise the Implementation Guideline:

- Guideline for the Identification and Evaluation of CHLs
- Guideline for the Preparation of a CHL Technical Study
- Guideline for the Designating CHLs in an Official Plan
- Guideline for the Conservation of a CHL through a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment

ROP Policies 10.B.9 and 10.B.10 recognise Implementation Guidelines as:

... statements adopted by resolution of Regional Council which detail the manner in which policies established in this Plan will be implemented. The content and scope of these Implementation Guidelines will be determined by the Region, in consultation with the Area Municipalities and the Grand River Conservation Authority as appropriate, will be updated from time-to-time and will be in conformity with the policies in this Plan. (ROP 10.B.9).

Implementation Guidelines may not be used as a means of introducing “new policy provisions that could be the basis for denying development applications... or for interfering with the natural justice rights of landowners and the public” (ROP 12.2.2.3; 10.B.10). The development of these guidelines is subject to a public review process in order to receive input from interested government agencies and members of the public. Proposed Implementation Guidelines must be publicized in newspapers and circulated to public agencies and affected organizations in order to provide interested parties an opportunity to comment upon them. They must also be the subject of a formal Public Meeting where Council may receive comments directly from interested agencies or individuals.

**Development of the Second Draft Implementation Guideline for CHL Conservation**

The purpose of the Implementation Guideline for CHL Conservation, as identified in ROP Policy 3.G.5, is to guide the implementation of the CHL policies contained in the ROP at a higher level of detail than is appropriate in Official Plan policies.

The first draft of the Implementation Guideline for CHL Conservation was prepared by Cultural Heritage staff in consultation with Regional Community Planning, Transportation Planning, Legal Services, and Transportation and Environmental Services Divisions, and with substantial input from Heritage and Planning Staff at the Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo. On August 14, 2012, Regional Council directed that the first draft Implementation Guideline attached to Report P-12-079 be widely circulated for review and comment by Area Municipalities, Municipal Heritage Advisory Committees, the Regional Heritage Planning Advisory Committee, Grand River Conservation Authority, and Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, as well as heritage and planning consulting firms, Waterloo Region Homebuilders Association and the general public for a commenting period ending November 9, 2012.

During that time, Regional Cultural Heritage staff met with Heritage Kitchener (October 2), Heritage Wilmot (October 2), Waterloo Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (October 18), Cambridge Municipal Heritage Committee (October 18) Wellesley Township Heritage and Historical Committee (October 22) and the North Dumfries Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (November 6) to introduce the document and request comments. Staff suggested that Area Municipal heritage advisory committees look at the Implementation Guideline as a potential common resource that has the potential to streamline the heritage aspect of the development
review process for agency staff and applicants alike. A presentation was also made to the Regional Heritage Planning Advisory Committee (September 13) and the Regional Homebuilders Liaison Group (October 4) to introduce the document and request comments. A Public Consultation Centre was held on October 30, 2012 at the Waterloo Region Museum.

By the close of the commenting period, input had been received from all of the stakeholder committees as well as detailed comments from the Ministry of Tourism Culture and Sport, City of Cambridge, City of Kitchener, City of Waterloo, Grand River Conservation Authority, members of the heritage and planning consultant community, and the general public. The great majority of comments received were subsequently incorporated into the second draft.

In addition to suggested improvements to the Implementation Guideline, stakeholders recommended that the Region undertake a public education initiative on the value of Cultural Heritage Landscapes; and consider what assistance could be offered to Area Municipalities to help undertake the proactive work of identifying and documenting CHLs (e.g. research tools, reference documents, shared staffing resources).

At this time, staff is requesting that a Public Meeting be held to allow members of Council to receive comments on the second draft. It is recommended that Council authorize a Public Meeting of the Planning and Works Committee on April 9, 2013 for this purpose. In the meantime, it is also recommended that the second draft be formally circulated to agencies, planning and heritage consulting firms active in the Region, and to other interested parties for any further comments they may have up to a date two weeks after the Public Meeting.

Following the Public Meeting and the close of the comment period, staff will revise the second draft as necessary and bring the third and final draft to the Planning and Works Committee for consideration as the Region’s Implementation Guideline for CHL Conservation.

**Implications of CHL Conservation**

Designating a CHL does not change the permitted uses for a property, but will require that the impacts of proposed development be assessed through the existing heritage review process, and if necessary mitigated. Heritage review currently takes place within both the development review and Environmental Assessment (EA) processes. Identified cultural heritage resources in areas proposed for development or public works projects are flagged during the pre-consultation process or in the Preliminary Design Report (PDR). If the proposed development or public works project has a potential negative impact on the identified cultural heritage resources, a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) may be required to support the development application or to meet EA requirements.

CHIAs assess the impacts of the proposed development on identified cultural heritage resources and recommend measures for their conservation. The assessments are required and reviewed by Area Municipal and where appropriate Regional staff. Where a Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) exists, the MHAC may also be asked to review and provide comments on CHIAs. HPAC is circulated and comments on CHIAs for projects that may impact heritage resources of Regional interest. The CHIA, with accompanying comments, is used by municipal staff in reviewing the proposed development application or public works project.

Currently, the conservation of CHLs is being addressed in the heritage review process in an informal ad hoc manner. The Region’s CHL conservation framework outlined in this Implementation Guideline will refine the existing heritage review process to include a landscape perspective. The refinements will support, not inhibit, future development by making the process both more efficient and effective.
Through the Implementation Guideline:

- Area Municipalities are directed to proactively identify and document CHLs, and to formally recognize CHLs through designating CHLs in their Official Plan. These requirements ensure that CHLs are recognized early and included during heritage review.
- Guidance is provided for effectively documenting each CHL to ensure that landscape based information is available during the heritage review process, and on how to undertake a CHIA for a CHL, something relatively new for most heritage consultants. As a result, the required CHIAs will be more focused, comprehensive and constructive.

The majority of CHLs are expected to be identified in areas where heritage review is already required due to the presence of individual heritage resources; the number of CHIAs required is not expected to significantly increase. The Township of Woolwich is the first Area Municipality in the Region to designate a CHL in its’ Official Plan – the West Montrose CHL. Other Area Municipalities are actively considering the CHL conservation process as an option for conserving significant landscapes such as the Black Bridge Area in Cambridge and the Berlin Industrial/Warehouse District in Kitchener.

Conservation of CHLs, as with the conservation of any cultural heritage resources in Waterloo Region, provides for: a higher quality of life; a stronger and more defined regional identity; a wealth of social, environmental and economic opportunities; and a broader foundational understanding of the people and places of our past.

**Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination**

ROP Policy 10.C.9 requires that the content and scope of Implementation Guidelines be determined by the Region in consultation with Area Municipalities and other appropriate agencies. Regular consultation has taken place with Area Municipal Heritage Staff, including an informal circulation of an early draft of the Implementation Guideline and discussions around related Official Plan policies. Area Municipalities are generally supportive of the common framework for conserving CHLs outlined in the Implementation Guideline and are including policies to conserve CHLs in their updated Official Plans. Comments returned by Area Municipal staff have been considered in the development of this second draft, which will also be circulated to the Area Municipalities for further comment.

**CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

The Implementation Guideline for CHL Conservation will help achieve strategic objective 2.4 Promote and enhance arts, culture and heritage.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

The cost of developing the Implementation Guideline has been accommodated through budgeted funds already approved by Council.

The development of this Implementation Guideline has been undertaken by Regional staff in consultation with Area Municipal staff. In accordance with the Regional Official Plan, the Area Municipalities are responsible for identifying and designating CHLs within their jurisdiction. However, as the conservation of CHLs is a Regional priority, the ROP also states that the Region may assist Area Municipalities in this work. The Cultural Heritage 10-Year Capital Budget includes up to $30,000 in each of the next 5 years to assist Area Municipalities in undertaking the identification and documentation of Regionally significant CHLs and for the general identification of Candidate CHLs within each jurisdiction.
OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Legal Services, Community Planning, Transportation Planning, and Transportation and Environmental Services staff have assisted in the development of the Implementation Guideline. Council and Administrative Services staff will circulate the second draft of the Implementation Guideline and post it on the Region’s website.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment 1 - Second Draft Implementation Guideline for Cultural Heritage Landscape Conservation (February 2012)

PREPARED BY: Kate Hagerman, Cultural Heritage Specialist

APPROVED BY: Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Housing and Community Services
SECOND DRAFT
Regional Implementation Guideline for
Cultural Heritage Landscape Conservation
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A. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the Region of Waterloo Implementation Guideline for Cultural Heritage Landscape Conservation is to provide guidance to applicants, municipal heritage advisory committees (MHACs) and municipal staff on the implementation of the cultural heritage landscape policies of the 2009 Regional Official Plan (ROP), for the preparation and review of development applications, and for the undertaking of heritage review during the Environmental Assessment (EA) process.

This document outlines the existing policy context and Cultural Heritage Landscape (CHL) conservation process for the Region of Waterloo, and provides further detail for the implementation of Regional Official Plan policies 3.G.5, 3.G.6 and 3.G.7 through the following guidelines:

- Guideline for the Identification and Evaluation of CHLs
- Guideline for the Preparation of a CHL Technical Study
- Guideline for the Designating CHLs in an Official Plan
- Guideline for the Conservation of a CHL through a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment

The Regional Official Plan relies on implementation guidelines in a number of subject areas to provide additional technical guidance in the application of certain policies. Implementation guidelines elaborate upon ROP policy, but may not be used as a means of introducing “new policy provisions that could be the basis for denying development applications or for interfering with the natural justice rights of landowners and the public” (Policy 10.B.10).

The content and scope of Regional Implementation Guidelines is determined through a full, open, and transparent consultation process with Area Municipalities, other agencies, interested organizations and citizens. As relevant policies are updated, added, or deleted, the implementation guidelines must also be revised to ensure conformity to the provisions of the Plan.

Italicized terms within this document are defined in the glossary. Terms that are within the glossary but have not been italicized should be understood using their common definition. Bolded text has been used for emphasis.

As stated in the ROP, through the planned conservation of the region’s cultural heritage resources including CHLs, Waterloo Region will realize the benefits of: a higher quality of life; a stronger and more defined regional identity; a wealth of social, environmental and economic opportunities; and a broader foundational understanding of the people and places of our past.
A.1 What are Cultural Heritage Landscapes?

A Cultural Heritage Landscape (CHL) is defined in the Provincial Policy Statement (2005) as a geographical area of heritage significance which has been modified by human activities and is valued by a community. It involves a grouping(s) of individual heritage features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites and natural elements, which together form a significant type of heritage form, distinctive from that of its constituent elements or parts.

CHLs are typically characterized by:

- a concentration of cultural heritage resources, such as buildings, structures and landforms;
- a concentration of supporting structural elements such as vegetation, fences or roads;
- a sense of visual coherence; and
- a distinctiveness which enables the area to be recognized from neighbouring areas.

There are three types of CHLs:

- Designed landscapes, which have been intentionally designed;
- Organically evolved landscapes, which have evolved through human use, and are now either relics of the past or are continuing to evolve; and
- Associative landscapes, which have powerful religious, artistic or cultural associations, some of which may have primarily natural elements and limited material cultural evidence.

A.2 Rationale for CHL Conservation

Conserving a CHL means identifying, protecting, using and/or managing a CHL in such a way that the heritage value, attributes and integrity of the CHL are retained.

CHL conservation provides a means to conserve groupings of cultural heritage resources that together have greater heritage significance than their constituent elements or parts. A CHL has both property-based cultural heritage resources and attributes that may not be linked to real property (i.e. views, circulation networks, land use patterns, architectural details, natural features, vegetation). The attributes of a CHL help to contextualize, cluster and connect the individual cultural heritage resources. As a result, the conserved CHL is more valuable than the sum of its parts.

Conservation of CHLs, like other cultural heritage resources, provides the following benefits:

- Sense of Place - The region’s tangible cultural heritage resources, combined with stories of the past, provide a physical and psychological foundation for our Regional identity. CHLs provide important information about, and opportunities for, understanding the events, processes and activities that have shaped, and are continuing to shape, our region.
• Authenticity - CHLs often support ongoing traditions and reflect particular ways of life. CHLs allow people to participate in our region’s cultural heritage continuum: learning from the multilayered past; enjoying the vibrancy of the present; and creating meaningful linkages for the future.

• Quality of Life - CHLs provide economic, environmental, social and cultural benefits through aesthetic, ecological, recreational and educational opportunities. Conserving CHLs will make our region a better place to live, work, play and visit.

A.3 Impacts of Undertaking a CHL Conservation Process

Undertaking a CHL conservation process ensures that cultural heritage resources are proactively identified and that the necessary information is available to effectively consider cultural heritage conservation at a landscape scale during the land use and infrastructure planning process.

Priority-based Planning – The CHL conservation process is a tool to manage change. The process will be used to better inform land use and infrastructure planning decisions and is not meant to negatively impact permitted land uses. Conservation of cultural heritage resources is very often one of many planning priorities (i.e. increasing land-use density, economic development, encouraging tourism or recreation, environmental conservation, increasing transportation choice, providing affordable housing). Full consideration of all priorities, including CHL conservation, during the land use and infrastructure planning process will result in the best possible development or construction/rehabilitation solution that meets as many priorities as possible. Note: Normal farming practices are protected under the Farming and Food Protection Act and will not be impacted by CHL conservation.

Increased Transparency - The CHL conservation process requires Area Municipalities to proactively identify and document CHLs. Designating CHLs within an Official Plan or under the Ontario Heritage Act is a means to making municipal staff, developers, property owners and the public aware of the historically significant landscapes within the community that are to be conserved.

Informed Decision Making – Identified CHLs are supported by documentation which includes a Statement of Significance for the CHL, and inventories and maps the cultural heritage resources and attributes associated with the CHL. This research provides the foundation of information on which proposed development, site alteration and infrastructure projects will be reviewed.

Effective Heritage Protection - Identifying an area as a CHL does not provide automatic protection to the individual cultural heritage resources and attributes associated with the CHL. The CHL conservation process documents the cultural heritage resources and attributes that must be protected in order to conserve the CHL, lists appropriate conservation measures, and ensures that proposed development, site alteration and infrastructure projects undergo heritage review.

Individual cultural heritage resources and attributes located within a CHL continue to be protected through existing and new Ontario Heritage Act designations, conservation easements, municipal register listings, and through the implementation of recommendations made within Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments.
A.4 Policy Context – Provincial Legislation

The Province requires municipalities to conserve significant CHLs and provides a variety of legislative planning and financing tools, primarily under the Ontario Heritage Act, Provincial Policy Statement and Planning Act, to municipalities for use in the conservation of cultural heritage resources, including CHLs.

A.4.1 The Ontario Heritage Act

The Ontario Heritage Act (OHA) provides three key tools for CHL conservation.

1. If a CHL is contained on a single property (i.e. farmstead, park, garden, estate, cemetery), a municipality can designate the CHL as an individual property under Part IV of the OHA.
2. If the CHL includes a grouping of properties, a municipality can designate the area as a Heritage Conservation District (HCD) under Part V of the OHA.

An OHA designation provides the strongest heritage protection available for conserving a CHL. It allows the municipality to deny demolition permits, to guide change through development review on and adjacent to the protected property(ies) and to control property alterations through a heritage permit system. Within the Region, there are currently eight CHLs designated as HCDs under Part V, and several other single property CHLs designated under Part IV of the OHA.

3. A municipality may list a CHL as an individual or grouping of non-designated property(ies) of heritage value or interest on their Municipal Heritage Register.

Under the OHA municipalities are required to maintain a Municipal Heritage Register that lists all designated and non-designated cultural heritage resources of heritage value or interest. The list is meant to provide easily accessible information about cultural heritage value for municipal staff, land-use planners, property owners, developers, the tourism industry, educators and the general public. Owners of listed properties must provide 60 days notice prior to demolition or removal of a building or structure, and the property may be subject to a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment or Conservation Plan during the heritage review process.

A.4.2 The Planning Act and the Provincial Policy Statement

The Province has identified the conservation of cultural heritage resources including CHLs, as an area of Provincial Interest to be considered under the Planning Act and through the Provincial Policy Statement (2005) (PPS).

Under the guidance of the Planning Act, municipalities make local planning decisions and prepare planning documents including Official Plans. A municipal Official Plan sets out the municipality’s general planning goals and policies that will guide future land use, including the conservation of cultural heritage resources. These planning decisions and planning documents determine the future of their community and must be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and applicable provincial legislation.

The PPS, policy 2.6.1 states “Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.” Conserved is defined as “the identification,
protection, use and/or management of cultural heritage and archaeological resources in such a way that their heritage values, attributes and integrity are retained. This may be addressed through a conservation plan or heritage impact assessment (HIA)’.

The initial step in conserving cultural heritage resources - identification, can take place under the OHA, as noted in the previous section, and/or in Official Plans or other planning documents prescribed under the Planning Act, such as Council adopted inventories, plans or studies. Identified cultural heritage resources are conserved through the requirement of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments and/or Conservation Plans to support proposed development, site alteration or infrastructure projects that have the potential to directly or indirectly impact the identified cultural heritage resource.

A.4.3 Provincial Resource Documents

The Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) provides additional non-legislative resources to assist communities in the conservation of cultural heritage resources, such as toolkits and guides. The MTCS outlines in the Ontario Heritage Toolkit, that cultural heritage resources should be identified, listed, researched, evaluated and protected. It is up to municipalities to use the most effective and appropriate tools available at each step of this process in order to ensure the ongoing conservation of the CHLs within their jurisdiction.

A.4.4 Environmental Assessment Act

The Environmental Assessment Act requires an environmental assessment of any major public sector undertaking that has the potential for significant environmental effects. Environmental assessments (EAs) are a key part of the infrastructure planning process and must be completed before decisions are made to proceed on a project. EAs determine the ecological, cultural, economic and social impact of the infrastructure project and are informed through the undertaking of a variety of studies including Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments.

B. REGIONAL APPROACH

As stated in the previous section, the Province of Ontario requires that significant CHLs be conserved through the land use and infrastructure planning process using complementary policy provisions at the Provincial, Regional and Area Municipal level. The Province has provided a variety of CHL conservation tools, but a uniform province-wide approach to CHL conservation has not been established. The Region has therefore, in discussions with the Provincial and Area Municipal staff, developed the following Regional approach to CHL conservation.

The Regional CHL conservation approach incorporates the full spectrum of provincially legislated tools for CHL conservation and allows municipalities to choose the most appropriate conservation tool for each CHL. The chosen CHL conservation tool will be a reflection of the combined level of heritage conservation and change management desired by the municipality, public and property owners.
B.1 CHL Conservation under the Ontario Heritage Act

Currently, municipalities have three tools to conserve CHLs under the Ontario Heritage Act (OHA):
- Part IV designation of an individual property;
- Part V designation of an Heritage Conservation District; and
- Listing of a CHL on the Municipal Heritage Register as an individual or grouping of non-designated property(ies) of heritage value or interest accompanied by a map or description of the CHL.

In order for a Municipal Heritage Register listing to effectively conserve a CHL, the listing process must include:
- A full evaluation and documentation of the CHL;
- An opportunity for public consultation;
- Council approval; and
- Municipal authority to conserve the CHL during the land use and infrastructure planning processes.

These three CHL conservation tools under the OHA will continue to be used by Area Municipalities in the Region. The complete processes used for designating or listing a CHL under the OHA are not addressed as part of this Implementation Guideline as they are a well entrenched practice. However, portions of this Implementation Guideline may prove useful in the preliminary identification, evaluation and documentation of CHLs being conserved under the OHA.

B.2 CHL Conservation under the Planning Act

Although CHL conservation tools under the OHA have been available for many years, a large number of CHLs within the region remain unidentified with no landscape level conservation measures in place.

In order to assist with the conservation of the full range of CHLs within the region, the Region has developed policies in the Regional Official Plan which enable and require municipalities to conserve CHLs under the Planning Act by designating CHLs in their Official Plans. Note: CHLs that have already been or are planned to be conserved under the OHA as outlined above may also be, but are not required to be, designated in Area Municipal Official Plans.

Conserving CHLs under the Planning Act – the CHL conservation process outlined in this Regional Implementation Guideline, should be used when:

- There are multiple CHLs that a community needs to officially identify and conserve within a short time frame, using limited resources;
- OHA designation cannot currently be achieved and interim conservation is required;
- OHA Part IV and/or V designations are in place to protect individual property-based cultural heritage resources within a CHL, but the OHA designations do not conserve the larger context of the resources (e.g. the attributes of the CHL);
- Future impacts to the CHL can be addressed through requirements for Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment, Conservation Plans, and/or through implementing planning and financial tools that support the conservation of the CHL (i.e. design guidelines, site specific zoning, financial incentives); and/or
- There are opportunities for proposed *development, site alterations and infrastructure* projects to enhance the existing character of the area and/or *conserve* the grouping of *cultural heritage resources*.

A comparison of the above mentioned CHL conservation tools can be found in Appendix F.

### B.3 Regional Policy

The Regional Official Plan (ROP) contains the following policies specifically related to the conservation of CHLs.

**Cultural Heritage Landscapes**

3.G.5 The Region will prepare and update a Regional Implementation Guideline for Cultural Heritage Landscape Conservation. This guideline will outline the framework for identifying *Cultural Heritage Landscapes*, including *Cultural Heritage Landscapes of Regional interest*, and for documenting each individual landscape through a Cultural Heritage Landscape Conservation Plan (an amendment may be made to change this to CHL Technical Study) that includes:

(a) a statement of significance;
(b) a listing of the *cultural heritage resources and attributes* being *conserved* within the Cultural Heritage Landscape through the use of existing planning tools, such as Heritage Act designations, listings on the Municipal Register, official plan policies, secondary plans and zoning bylaws; and
(c) recommendations for additional conservation measures.

3.G.6 Area Municipalities will designate *Cultural Heritage Landscapes* in their official plans and establish associated policies to *conserve* these areas. The purpose of this designation is to *conserve* groupings of *cultural heritage resources* that together have greater heritage significance than their constituent elements or parts.

Designating a CHL in an Area Municipal Official Plan means identifying a CHL on a list and map or schedule contained in or appended to the Official Plan.

3.G.7 The Region will assist Area Municipalities with the preparation of Cultural Heritage Landscape Conservation Plan (an amendment may be made to change this to CHL Technical Study) for *Cultural Heritage Landscapes* of Regional interest.

3.G.13 Area Municipalities will establish policies in their official plans to require the submission of a *Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment* in support of a proposed *development* that includes or is adjacent to a designated property, or includes a non-designated resource of cultural heritage value or interest listed on the Municipal Heritage Register. (An amendment may be made in order to allow for the consideration of CHIAs within or adjacent to a *Cultural Heritage Landscape*)

Adjacent is defined as lands that are situated in sufficiently close proximity such that *development, site alteration* or an *infrastructure* project could reasonably be expected to produce a negative impact on an identified *cultural heritage resource*.

**B.4 Area Municipal Policy**

General policies for the *conservation* of CHLs must be included in an Area Municipal Official Plan (OP) in order for the plan to be consistent with the ROP and the PPS.

The Region recommends that the general CHL conservation policies include, but not be limited to, a commitment by the Area Municipality to:

1. Identify and document individual CHLs through a Cultural Heritage Landscape Technical Study as outlined in ROP 3.G.5;
2. Designate individual CHLs in the Area Municipal Official Plan;
3. Review *development, site alteration and infrastructure* projects within or adjacent to designated Cultural Heritage Landscapes to ensure that the *cultural heritage resources* and *attributes* of the CHL will be conserved. A *Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment* may be required to assist the municipality in making this determination.

Associated CHL conservation policies may include a commitment by the municipality to:

- list and/or designate under the Ontario Heritage Act individual *cultural heritage resources* and *attributes* inventoried within a CHL;
- consider the impact of lot creation and/or reconstruction within the CHL;
- further investigate CHLs to identify additional and/or evolving *cultural heritage resources* and *attributes*; and
- promote the awareness, appreciation and enjoyment of CHLs.

**B.5 Expectations and Outcomes of ROP Policies and Implementation Guideline**

Implementation of the ROP CHL conservation policies using this Implementation Guideline will result in:

1. Comprehensive Region-wide identification and evaluation of CHLs;
2. Documentation of individual CHLs in CHL Technical Studies, to include but not be limited to:
   - an official name;
   - a statement of significance; and
   - an inventory and map of *cultural heritage resources* and *attributes*, with references to existing and recommended conservation measures;
3. Individually designated CHLs in Area Municipal Official Plans; and
4. Municipal authority to require a *Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment* to support proposed *development, site alteration and infrastructure* projects within or adjacent to an identified CHL.
C. CONSERVATION PROCESS

The following process for conserving CHLs under the Planning Act has been developed to ensure that CHLs are recognized early in the land use and infrastructure planning process, and that comprehensive information on the cultural heritage resources and attributes of the CHL are available when making planning decisions.

The CHL conservation process includes:
- identifying and documenting individual CHLs in a Technical Study that evaluates, inventories and maps the cultural heritage resources and attributes associated with the CHL and documents current and proposed conservation measures for the CHL;
- designating of CHLs in Area Municipal Official Plans, excluding CHLs currently conserved under the Ontario Heritage Act; and
- reviewing proposed development, site alteration and infrastructure projects within or adjacent to designated CHLs to determine whether the cultural heritage resources and attributes associated with the CHL will be conserved.

Area Municipalities will incorporate general policies for the conservation of CHLs in their Official Plans to allow for the designating of any individual CHLs using the process outlined below. Information on general policies for CHL conservation at the Area Municipal level can be found in section B.4.

The CHL conservation process has seven key steps to be undertaken through the implementation of the guidelines in this document. The following chart outlines the connection of each key step to the associated guideline. A process chart is included on the following page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Steps</th>
<th>Associated Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Identify Candidate CHLs</td>
<td>Guideline for the Identification and Evaluation of CHLs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Inventory and Map individual Candidate CHLs</td>
<td>Guideline for the Preparation of a CHL Technical Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Evaluate the Candidate CHL’s Significance</td>
<td>Guideline for Designating CHLs in an Official Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Determine Regional interest in the Candidate CHL</td>
<td>Guideline for the Conservation of a CHL through a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Document the Candidate CHL in a Technical Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Designate the CHL in the Official Plan using the Official Plan Amendment process under the Planning Act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Conserve the CHL through the land use and infrastructure planning processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inventory & Mapping

Candidate CHL #1
Candidate CHL #2
Candidate CHL #3
Candidate CHL #4
Candidate CHL #5

(Each CHL will undergo the same process as CHL #1 from this point forward)

Evaluation of Significance

Identification of "Significant" CHL

Documentation of CHL in a Technical Study

Preparation of Report Recommending CHL Designation through an Area Municipal OP Amendment

Designate CHL in Area Municipal Official Plan

Conservation of the CHL in the land use and infrastructure planning processes through the requirement of CHIAs
D. GUIDELINES

I. Guideline for the Identification and Evaluation of CHLs

Regional Official Plan

3.G.5 The Region will prepare and update a Regional Implementation Guideline for Cultural Heritage Landscape Conservation. This guideline will outline the framework for identifying Cultural Heritage Landscapes, including Cultural Heritage Landscapes of Regional interest, and for documenting each individual landscape through a Cultural Heritage Landscape Conservation Plan (an amendment may be made to change this to CHL Technical Study) that includes:

a) a statement of significance;

b) a listing of the cultural heritage resources and attributes being conserved within the Cultural Heritage Landscape through the use of existing planning tools, such as Heritage Act designations, listings on the Municipal Register, official plan policies, secondary plans and zoning bylaws; and

c) recommendations for additional conservation measures.

Application

In accordance with policy 3.G.5 of the Regional Official Plan, this guideline will apply when Area Municipal staff and Municipal Heritage Committees are identifying and evaluating the significance of the Candidate CHLs. A CHL that is determined to be a cultural heritage resource of Regional interest is also subject to policies 3.G.2, 3.G.14 and 3.G.15.

Purpose

The purpose of this guideline is to ensure an efficient, consistent, comprehensive and defensible process is used to identify CHLs worthy of conservation within the Region.

Guideline for the Identification and Evaluation of CHLs

A Cultural Heritage Landscape is a defined geographical area of heritage significance which has been modified by human activities and is valued by a community. It involves a grouping(s) of individual heritage features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites and natural elements, which together form a significant type of heritage form, distinctive from that of its constituent elements or parts (Provincial Policy Statement, 2005).

Significant CHLs are to be conserved as required by the PPS section 2.6.1. All CHLs that are evaluated as significant using the process below, which is based on Ontario Heritage Act Regulation 9/06, shall be conserved.

Conservation means the identification, protection, use and/or management of cultural heritage and archaeological resources in such a way that their heritage values, attributes and integrity are retained. This may be addressed through a conservation plan or heritage impact...
Candidate CHLs that are evaluated and found to be *significant* will be referred to throughout the remainder of the conservation process as CHLs; those evaluated and found to not be *significant* will not be taken any further through the process and should no longer be referred to as CHLs.

1. **Area Municipal staff and Municipal Heritage Committees (MHC) will develop a list of Candidate CHLs** for their municipality.

   1.1 The list of Candidate CHLs will include, but not be limited to:
      a) areas that correspond to the **historic themes and associations** important to the development of the municipality;
      b) areas that contain **a grouping of cultural heritage resources** identified through a visual survey; and
      c) landscapes **valued by a community** suggested by the public through consultations or in written documents such as local histories, planning documents, listings of important landscapes, etc.

   1.2 Undertaking public consultation is strongly encouraged during the development of the list of Candidate CHLs.

   1.3 Upon request, the Region will assist with the preliminary identification of Candidate CHLs.

   1.4 Area Municipalities and the Region will work together to develop shared or complementary conservation processes for **cross jurisdictional CHLs** such as those related to rivers, valleylands or agricultural practices.

   1.5 Municipalities may use the additional information and resources for identifying Candidate CHLs included in Appendix A.

2. **The Region will review the list of Candidate CHLs and indicate if any of the Candidate CHLs are of Regional interest, and/or provide a list of CHLs of Regional interest to the Area Municipality to be considered for conservation**

   2.1 Identification of CHLs of Regional interest will take place in accordance with the *Regional Implementation Guideline for Conserving Regionally Significant Heritage Resources* based on the Criteria for Regionally Significant Heritage Resources (RSHR) adopted by Regional Council in 2002 (P-02-083) (see appendix E).

3. **An inventory of cultural heritage resources and attributes will be developed for each Candidate CHL.**

   3.1 The inventory of **cultural heritage resources and attributes** will include but not be limited to:
      - Built features (buildings, structures, monuments, installations or remains associated with architectural, social, political, economic or military history),
      - Ecological features (ecosystems within the landscape),
      - Vegetation (natural or introduced),
• Landforms (natural or human made),
• Water features (natural or designed),
• Archaeological resources,
• Evidence of traditional practices,
• Views and visual relationships,
• Spatial organization and landmarks,
• Land-use patterns,
• Circulation networks,
• Boundary/linear features,
• Public access, and
• Open space.

3.2 The inventory may include detailed information on each individual cultural heritage resource and attribute i.e. architectural or engineering details, historical associations, etc.,

3.3 The inventory of cultural heritage resources and attributes will be used during the evaluation of significance for the Candidate CHL.

3.4 For CHLs found to be significant, the inventory of cultural heritage resources and attributes will be documented in the CHL Technical Study.

4. Each Candidate CHL will be geographically defined through detailed mapping of the cultural heritage resources and attributes listed in the inventory.

4.1 The detailed mapping of the cultural heritage resources and attributes (as listed above) will be used during the evaluation of significance for the Candidate CHL.

4.2 Mapped boundaries and/or buffer zone(s) should be included if they aid in the conservation of the CHL. Demarcating a firm boundary for an evolved landscape that continues to evolve is not required.

4.2.1 Defining the boundaries of a CHL can involve a range of considerations including, but not limited to the use of: roadways; rights-of-way; river corridors; fences; edges of tree lines and hedge rows; property lines; landforms; and lakeshores (MOTCS InfoSheet #2).

4.2 For CHLs found to be significant, the detailed mapping of the cultural heritage resources and attributes identified in the inventory will be documented in the CHL Technical Study.

5. The significance of each Candidate CHL will be evaluated based on a three pronged approach, related to the PPS definition of a CHL, to include the: cultural heritage value or interest; historical integrity; and community value of the landscape.
5.1 Criteria for determining **cultural heritage value or interest** of a CHL is based on the criteria used to evaluate the cultural heritage value or interest of other forms of *cultural heritage resources* provided by the Province of Ontario in Regulation 09/06. Municipalities will evaluate the cultural heritage value or interest of each Candidate CHL, using the chart in appendix B, and will summarize their findings in a CHL **Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest**.

5.2 **Historical integrity** is a measure of: how well the existing landscape physically reflects the landscape of the past; and the functional continuity of the landscape over time. In order to measure integrity, the historic context of the landscape in terms of use, relationships, views, circulation networks, boundaries, etc. must be understood. Municipalities will evaluate the historic integrity of each Candidate CHL, using the chart in appendix C to gather information, and will summarize their findings in a CHL **Statement of Historical Integrity**.

5.3 The PPS states that a CHL must be **valued by a community**. Community value can be evaluated by determining the presence of indicators of community value. Municipalities will evaluate the community value of each Candidate CHL, using the chart in appendix D to gather information and will summarize their findings in a CHL **Statement of Community Value**.

5.4 An overall **Statement of Significance** which combines the cultural heritage value or interest, historical integrity and community value of the Candidate CHL will be developed.

6. For evolved landscapes, the inventory, mapping and measures of significance must illustrate and evaluate the evolution of the landscape over time.
7. A Candidate CHL that has been evaluated and found to have cultural heritage value or interest, historical integrity and community value is significant.

8. Each significant CHL will be documented in a CHL Technical Study and recommended for being designated in the Area Municipal Official Plan. Candidate CHLs that are evaluated and found not to be significant will not be taken any further through the process and should no longer be referred to as CHLs.

II. Guideline for the Preparation of a CHL Technical Study

Regional Official Plan

3.G.5 The Region will prepare and update a Regional Implementation Guideline for Cultural Heritage Landscape Conservation. This guideline will outline the framework for identifying Cultural Heritage Landscapes, including Cultural Heritage Landscapes of Regional interest, and for documenting each individual landscape through a Cultural Heritage Landscape Conservation Plan (an amendment will be made to change this to CHL Technical Study) that includes:
   a) a statement of significance;
   b) a listing of the cultural heritage resources and attributes being conserved within the Cultural Heritage Landscape through the use of existing planning tools, such as Heritage Act designations, listings on the Municipal Register, official plan policies, secondary plans and zoning bylaws; and
   c) recommendations for additional conservation measures.

3.G.7 The Region will assist Area Municipalities with the preparation of Cultural Heritage Landscape Conservation Plans (an amendment will be made to change this to CHL Technical Studies) for Cultural Heritage Landscapes of Regional Interest.

Application
In accordance with policies 3.G.5 and 3.G.7 of the Regional Official Plan, this guideline will apply when a Cultural Heritage Landscape Technical Study is being developed for a Candidate CHL being recommended for conservation.

Purpose
The purpose of this guideline is to ensure appropriate and consistent methods and report formats are applied in the preparation of CHL Technical Studies.

Compliance with these guidelines will:
- Enable the documentation of the CHL’s cultural heritage resources and attributes, with references to existing and recommended conservation measures;
• Provide the base research needed by consultants to undertake an effective Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA); and
• Help to minimize the time required to prepare a CHL Technical Study.

Guideline for the Preparation of a CHL Technical Study

The CHL Technical Study is an important resource document developed and maintained by the municipality, in consultation with Municipal Heritage Committees and/or community stakeholders. A CHL Technical Study is prepared for each CHL found to be significant and worthy of conservation.

The CHL Technical Study builds on the information gathered during the CHL identification and evaluation process. The document includes all of the information gathered during the identification and evaluation of the Candidate CHL as well as information on the current and future heritage conservation measures associated with the CHL.

1. The CHL Technical Study will include, but is not limited to:

   Existing Information from the Identification and Evaluation of the Candidate CHL
   • the Statement of Significance (a summary of the CHL’s Cultural Heritage Value or Interest, Historical Integrity and Community Value) (see section 2 below);
   • an inventory and map of the cultural heritage resources and attributes of the landscape (see section 3 below);

   Additional Information
   • an analytical listing of current and recommended conservation measures for the cultural heritage resources and attributes of the CHL (see section 4 below);

   Additional Recommended Information (Optional)
   • a shared vision for the CHL (see section 5 below); and
   • a management strategy for the CHL (see section 6 below).

1.1 The Region will assist Area Municipalities in the preparation of CHL Technical Studies for CHLs of Regional interest.

1.2 The Technical Study will be made available to consultants preparing CHIAs for proposed development, site alteration and infrastructure projects within and adjacent to the CHL.

1.3 CHL Technical Studies are evolving documents which will require updating as land use and policy changes are made.

2. The Statement of Significance is a brief summary of the cultural heritage value or interest, historical integrity and community value of the CHL as developed during the evaluation of significance of the Candidate CHL. The Statement of Significance is an important tool as it provides justification for conserving the CHL.

3. The comprehensive Inventory and Map of cultural heritage resources and attributes includes, but is not limited to: buildings and structures; architectural details;
landmarks; views; natural features; vegetation; archaeological resources; land-use patterns; circulation networks; boundary/linear features; public access; and/or open space as developed for the Candidate CHL.

4. The **Analytical Listing of Conservation Measures** for the *cultural heritage resources and attributes* of the CHL includes, but is not limited to:
   - a comprehensive listing of existing conservation measures;
   - a thorough evaluation of the ability of the existing conservation measures to conserve the inventoried heritage features and their context; and
   - recommendations for additional conservation measures where needed.

4.1 CHL conservation measures may include, but are not limited to the following planning and financial tools:
   - Protection of individual properties under the Ontario Heritage Act through designation or conservation easements;
   - Protection of a specific areas within the CHL as Heritage Conservation Districts (HCD) under the Ontario Heritage Act and through related HCD policies, guidelines, studies and plans;
   - Listing of individual or groupings of non-designated property(ies) on the Municipal Heritage Register;
   - Official Plan policies (i.e. settlement boundaries, land designations);
   - Secondary or Community Plans;
   - Community Improvement Plans;
   - Area design guidelines;
   - Corridor management plans or scenic corridor designations;
   - Park management plans;
   - Height, massing and setback restrictions that maintain the character of an area, implemented through zoning and/or site plan control;
   - Demolition control;
   - Subdivision development agreements;
   - Stewardship activities;
   - Financial incentives for OHA designated properties or within Community Improvement Plan areas
   - Public education and heritage resource interpretation, etc.

4.2 The analytical listing of conservation measures process will assist in highlighting vulnerable *cultural heritage resources and attributes* and will result in recommendations for improved conservation measures.

5. **A Shared Vision** for the CHL may be created by community stakeholders based on the collective understanding of the significance of the CHL; its cultural heritage value or interest, historical integrity and community value.

6. **A Management Strategy** may be developed that records what role the community will play in maintaining and enhancing the significance of the CHL. The Management Strategy could include:
   - a list of actions and a schedule for their implementation; and
   - a plan to monitor the impact of CHL conservation

7. **A CHL Technical Study** that includes all of the following may be referred to as a **CHL Conservation Plan** (based on Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Sport – Info Sheet
Regional Official Plan

3.G.6 Area Municipalities will designate Cultural Heritage Landscapes in their official plans and establish associated policies to conserve these areas. The purpose of this designation is to conserve groupings of cultural heritage resources that together have greater heritage significance than their constituent elements or parts.

Designation of a CHL in an Area Municipal Official Plan means to identify each individual CHL on a list and map or schedule contained in or appended to the Area Municipal Official Plan.

III. Guideline for the Designating CHLs in an Official Plan

- Identification of the conservation principles appropriate for the type of cultural heritage resource being conserved;
- Analysis of the cultural heritage resource, including documentation of the resource, descriptions of cultural heritage value or interest, assessment of the resource conditions and deficiencies, discussion of historical, current and proposed use;
- Recommendations for conservation measures and interventions, short or long term maintenance programs, implementation, and the qualifications for anyone responsible for the conservation work;
- Schedule for conservation work, inspection, maintenance, costing, and phases of the rehabilitation or restoration work; and
- Monitoring of the cultural heritage resource and the development of a long term reporting structure.

8. A scoped Conservation Plan may be required by the approval authority for a proposed development, site alteration or infrastructure project in order to conserve a specific cultural heritage resource or attribute that is within a larger CHL and is impacted by the proposed development, site alteration or infrastructure project (see Guideline IV).

9. When a CHL is identified during the land use or infrastructure planning process, rather than proactively identified using the process outlined in this Implementation Guideline, the information usually contained in the CHL Technical Study must be gathered and included in the inventory phase of a required Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (see Guideline IV) undertaken by the proponent of the project.

Application

In accordance with policy 3.G.6 of the Regional Official Plan, this guideline will apply when
Area Municipalities designate a CHL in their Official Plan.

**Purpose**
The purpose of this guideline is to ensure appropriate and consistent methods and approaches are applied when designating CHLs in Area Municipal Official Plans.

Designating a CHL within an Official Plan:
- enables a community to proactively identify a valued *cultural heritage resource*;
- provides an opportunity for public consultation and Council approval;
- results in an accessible public record of identified CHLs; and
- allows municipalities to require Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments (CHIAs) to ensure that proposed *development, site alteration and infrastructure* projects conserve the *cultural heritage resources and attributes* of the CHL.

**Guideline for the Designating CHLs in an Official Plan**

1. **Area Municipal Official Plans** will include general policies for the conservation of *significant* CHLs.
   1.1 These policies will include a commitment by the municipality to: identify and document individual CHLs through a *Cultural Heritage Landscape Technical Study*; designate individual CHLs in the Area Municipal Official Plan; and review *development, site alteration and infrastructure* projects within or adjacent to designated CHLs to ensure that the *cultural heritage resources and attributes* of the CHL will be conserved.

2. **Area Municipal Official Plans** will designate CHLs.
   2.1 The Official Plan will identify the designated CHL using *an official name, a statement of significance and a general location map* of the CHL using a simple location marker such as an unbounded shape or asterisk, and will reference to the detailed documentation within the CHL Technical Study.
   2.2 Additional CHL conservation policies and/or a detailed map may be included.

3. A *report that recommends designating* a CHL through an amendment to the Official Plan will be prepared to include:
   - Official CHL Name
   - Reason for Designating - Statement of Significance
   - Impacts of Designating, including but not limited to the potential requirement of a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment for proposed *development, site alteration and infrastructure* projects within and adjacent to the CHL.
   3.1 The CHL Technical Study shall be provided to support the recommendation.

4. **Standard procedures for Official Plan Amendments** under the Planning Act will be followed with respect to giving notice, providing information and public consultation.

5. Area Municipalities may have *additional processes and methods* for identifying and conserving CHLs so long as they result in:
Comprehensive identification and evaluation of CHLs;
Documentation of each CHL, that includes but is not limited to: an official name; a statement of significance; and an inventory and map of cultural heritage resources and attributes, with references to existing and recommended conservation measures; and
Municipal authority to require a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment to support proposed development, site alteration and infrastructure projects within and adjacent to identified CHLs.

IV. Guideline for the Conservation of a Cultural Heritage Landscape through a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment

Regional Official Plan

3.G.6 Area Municipalities will designate Cultural Heritage Landscapes in their official plans and establish associated policies to conserve these areas. The purpose of this designation is to conserve groupings of cultural heritage resources that together have greater heritage significance than their constituent elements or parts.

Conserve: the identification, protection, use and/or management of cultural heritage and archaeological resources in such a way that their heritage values, attributes and integrity are retained. This may be addressed through a conservation plan or heritage impact assessment.

3.G.13 Area Municipalities will establish policies in their official plans to require the submission of a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in support of a proposed development that includes or is adjacent to a designated property, or includes a non-designated resource of cultural heritage value or interest listed on the Municipal Heritage Register (an amendment will be made in order to allow for the consideration of CHIAs within or adjacent to a Cultural Heritage Landscape).

Adjacent will be defined as lands that are situated in sufficiently close proximity such that development, site alteration or an infrastructure project could reasonably be expected to produce a negative impact on an identified cultural heritage resource.

Application

In accordance with policies 3.G.6 and 3.G.13 of the Regional Official Plan, this guideline will apply when development, site alteration or an infrastructure project is proposed within or adjacent to a designated CHL.

Purpose

The purpose of this guideline is to ensure that Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments (CHIA) are required when appropriate and completed effectively, in order to facilitate the conservation of the cultural heritage resources and attributes associated with a CHL during the land use and infrastructure planning process.
The majority of CHLs are expected to be identified in areas where heritage review is already required due to the presence of individual cultural heritage resources. The number of CHIAs required is not expected to significantly increase. Where CHLs are identified, additional landscape scale assessment will be required. This guideline outlines how heritage review at a landscape scale will be incorporated into the existing heritage review process.

Guideline for the Conservation of a CHL through a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment

1. Proposed development, site alteration and infrastructure projects are reviewed by area municipal staff to determine whether cultural heritage resources will be conserved. To assist in the determination a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) may be required.

   1.1 Once a CHL has been designated in an Area Municipal Official Plan, proposed development, site alteration and infrastructure projects within and adjacent to the designated CHL will be reviewed to determine whether the cultural heritage resources and attributes of the CHL as documented in the CHL Technical Study will be conserved.

   1.2 Heritage review at a landscape scale should be required if the proposed development, site alteration or infrastructure project may result in any of the following list of potential negative impacts to the CHL (source: Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Sport - InfoSheet #5):
      - Destruction of any, or part of any, cultural heritage resource or attribute of the CHL
      - Alteration that is not sympathetic to, or is incompatible with, the historic fabric and appearance of the CHL
      - Creation of shadows that alter the appearance of cultural heritage resource or attributes, or change the viability of associated vegetation
      - Isolation of a cultural heritage resource or attribute from its surrounding environments, context or significant relationship
      - Direct or indirect obstruction of a significant view or vista within, from or of built and natural features
      - Change in land use where the change in land use negates the property’s cultural heritage value or interest
      - Land disturbance such as change in grade that alter soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect a cultural heritage resource or attribute
      - Increase in other disturbances such as noise and/or traffic in or near the CHL that impacts the property’s cultural heritage value or interest

2. In addition to the standard CHIA requirements, a CHIA undertaken for a property within or adjacent to a CHL will contain the following (based on the Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Sports - Info Sheet #5):

   - Historical research, site analysis and evaluation of the associated CHL. For designated CHLs, this work will have been completed by the Area Municipality and will be documented in the CHL Technical Study. If a CHL
has been identified during the land use or infrastructure planning process, this information must be gathered and included in the inventory phase of the required CHIA (see Guideline II);

- A description of the subject property(ies) in relation to the associated CHL, including but not limited to:
  - Property owner contact information;
  - A location map;
  - A site plan of existing conditions, to include buildings, structures, roadways, driveways, drainage features, trees and tree canopy, fencing, and topographical features;
  - A written and visual inventory (photographs) of all elements of the property(ies) that contribute to the cultural heritage value of the associated CHL, to include: overall site views, views to adjacent properties and views of the site from within the CHL; and internal photographs and floor plans for onsite cultural heritage resources;

- Identification of the significance and cultural heritage resources and attributes of the associated CHL. Include a recommendation as to whether any cultural heritage resources on the subject property are worthy of heritage designation in accordance with Regulation 9/06, Ontario Heritage Act;

- A description of the proposed development, site alteration or infrastructure project, including a site plan and elevations of the proposed development;

- An assessment of the impacts of the proposed development, site alteration or infrastructure project on the associated CHL including to but not limited to the potential negative impacts listen in 1.2 above;

- Consideration of alternatives, mitigation and conservation measures that may reduce the adverse effects of the proposed development, site alteration or infrastructure project on the associated CHL, including but not limited to:
  - Alternative development approaches;
  - Isolating development and site alteration from the significant built and natural heritage features and vistas;
  - Design guidelines that harmonize mass, setback, setting and materials;
  - Limiting height and density;
  - Allowing only compatible infill and additions; and
  - Reversible alterations

- A schedule and reporting structure for implementing the recommended conservation or mitigative or avoidance measures and for monitoring the CHL as the proposed development, site alteration or infrastructure project progresses; and

- A summary statement and conservation recommendations.

3. CHIAs may be scoped or waived based on the potential negative impacts of the proposed work.
4. An approval authority may also require a **Conservation Plan** for a proposed **development, site alteration or infrastructure** project in order to conserve a **cultural heritage resource or attribute** that contributes to the significance of the associated CHL and is impacted by the proposed **development, site alteration or infrastructure** project.

5. Proposed **development, site alteration and infrastructure** projects that have the potential to impact a **heritage resource of Regional interest** will require a CHIA that will be provided to the Region for comment as part of the heritage review process.

6. Where it is determined that a CHIA that includes heritage review at a landscape scale is required, the CHIA will be prepared by a **qualified professional** with expertise in **cultural heritage landscapes**.

7. Development proponents and municipal staff are **encouraged to consult** with Area Municipal planning staff and cultural heritage professionals early in the planning process. Early consultation will provide access to any available background information, ensure that **cultural heritage resources** are appropriately identified, and enable opportunities for project design to maximize enhancement of and minimize negative impacts to the CHL.


E. GLOSSARY OF DEFINITIONS

Adjacent – means lands that are situated in sufficiently close proximity such that development, site alteration or an infrastructure project could reasonably be expected to produce a negative impact on an identified cultural heritage resource (revised ROP – Contiguous).

Attribute - A quality or characteristic inherent in or ascribed to a cultural heritage landscape. These include, but are not limited to: architectural details; land-use patterns; circulation networks; relationships between built and natural heritage resources; public access; and/or open space.

Heritage attributes - Means the principal features, characteristics, context and appearance that contribute to the cultural heritage significance of a protected heritage property (PPS).

Built heritage resources – one or more significant buildings, structures, monuments, installations or remains associated with architectural, cultural, social, political, economic or military history and identified as being important to the community. These resources may be identified through designation or heritage conservation easement under the Ontario Heritage Act, or listed by local, regional, provincial or federal jurisdictions (PPS/ROP).

Conserve/conserved (for the purposes of ROP Chapter 3) – the identification, protection, use and/or management of cultural heritage and archaeological resources in such a way that their heritage values, attributes and integrity are retained. This may be addressed through a conservation plan or heritage impact assessment (PPS/ROP).

Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment – a study to determine if cultural heritage resources will be negatively impacted by a proposed development, site alteration or infrastructure project. It can also demonstrate how the cultural heritage resource will be conserved in the context of redevelopment, site alteration or infrastructure improvement. Mitigative or avoidance measures or alternative development approaches may also be recommended (revised ROP).

Cultural heritage landscape – a defined geographical area of heritage significance which has been modified by human activities and is valued by a community. It involves a grouping(s) of individual heritage features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites and natural elements, which together form a significant type of heritage form, distinctive from that of its constituent elements or parts (PPS/ROP).

Cultural heritage resources – the physical remains and the intangible cultural traditions of past human activities. These include, but are not limited to:

- buildings (residential, commercial, institutional, industrial and agricultural);
- cultural heritage landscapes (designed, organic/evolved);
- structures (water tower; bridge, fence and dam);
- monuments (cenotaph, statue and cairn);
- archaeological resources;
- cemeteries;
- scenic roads;
- vistas/viewsheds;
- culturally *significant* natural features (tree and landform);
- movable objects (archival records and artifacts); and
- cultural traditions (language, stories, music, dance, food, celebrations, art and crafts) (ROP).

**Development** – the creation of a new lot, a change in land use, or the construction of buildings and structures, requiring approval under the Planning Act (ROP).

**Development application** – an application for approval under the Planning Act. Development applications may include applications for approval of the following: Plans of Subdivision; Plans of Condominium; Consent; Part Lot Control Exemption By–laws; Official Plan Amendments; and Zone Change Applications. Development applications do not include *site plans* (ROP).

**Environmental Assessment** – a process for the authorization of an undertaking under legislation such as the *Environmental Assessment Act*, and the *Ontario Energy Board Act* (ROP).

**Infrastructure** - physical structures (facilities and corridors) that form the foundation for development. Infrastructure includes: *municipal drinking-water supply systems, municipal wastewater systems, septage treatment systems, storm water management systems, waste management systems, electric power generation and transmission, communications/telecommunications, transit systems and corridors, the Regional Road system, Provincial Highways, railways, oil and gas pipelines and associated facilities* (ROP).

**Normal farm practices** – a practice, as defined in the *Farming and Food Production Protection Act*, that is conducted in a manner consistent with proper and acceptable customs and standards as established and followed by similar agricultural operations under similar circumstances; or makes use of innovative technology in a manner consistent with proper advanced farm management practices. Normal farm practices shall be consistent with the *Nutrient Management Act*, and regulations made under that Act (ROP).

**Protected heritage property** - means real property designated under Parts IV, V or VI of the Ontario Heritage Act; heritage conservation easement property under Parts II or IV of the Ontario Heritage Act; and property that is the subject of a covenant or agreement between the owner of a property and a conservation body or level of government, registered on title and executed with the primary purpose of preserving, conserving and maintaining a cultural heritage feature or resource, or preventing its destruction, demolition or loss (PPS).

**Significant** – means (g) in regard to cultural heritage and archaeology, resources that are valued for the important contribution they make to our understanding of the history of a place, an event, or a people. Criteria for determining significance for the resources identified in sections (c)-(g) are recommended by the Province, but municipal approaches that achieve or exceed the same objective may also be used (PPS/ROP).

**Site alteration** – activities, such as grading, excavation and the placement of fill that would change the landform and natural vegetative characteristics of a site (PPS/ROP).

**Site plan** – a plan prepared under Section 41 of the Planning Act which details building location and design as well as other site specific considerations such as walkways, landscaping, lighting and storage areas (PPS/ROP).
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Appendix A – Resource to Assist with CHL Identification

1) Defining Community

CHLs by definition are “valued by a community”. A good first step in CHL identification is to broadly define the community(ies) that are part of your municipality e.g. those who reside in or regularly visit an area; historians or heritage advocates; tourists; artists; researchers; cultural groups; etc.

2) Develop a list of historic themes and associations important to the development of your municipality and list the corresponding landscapes within your municipality.

The historical context of your municipality provides a solid foundation for identifying significant cultural heritage resources including Candidate CHLs. Cultural Heritage Landscapes in Waterloo Region (2004) lists Regional Themes and Associations based on the ‘Topical Organization of Ontario’s History’ developed by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources in 1972. The Grand Strategy (1994) collaborative management plan for the Grand River, a nationally designated Canadian Heritage River, contains information on watershed-wide cultural heritage resources and river-based cultural landscapes.

Similar listings may already exist or could be developed for your Area Municipality. The consultant’s report above contains a short history of each municipality that could be used as a starting point. The list of historic themes and associations will aid in both the identification and evaluation of Candidate CHLs.

3) Undertake a visual survey of your municipality and list areas that contain grouping of cultural heritage resources.

In addition to visually surveying the landscape, you can consult land records, maps, photographs, works of art, tourism information and undertake site visits to aide in the identification of areas within the municipality that may have the physical qualities of a Candidate CHL. Landscapes may be agricultural areas, historic settlements, industrial sites, institutional districts, natural areas, residential neighbourhoods, etc.

3) Ask the public to make suggestions of landscapes or “outdoor places” that they value. Be sure to consult the public in a way that would seek input from the variety of communities present in the municipality. In addition, consult the listings of important landscapes that have been developed for various reasons in the past.

Sample Questions to Ask Your Community
Which landscapes or outdoor places in your community…
… help to tell the history of your community?
… are notable due to their design or physical form?
… create a sense of place?
… are continuing to shape the character and identity of your community?

Potential Source Documents
- local histories
- planning documents
- listings of important landscapes
## Appendix B – Criteria for Heritage Value or Interest

The following chart can be used as a framework to record information about the cultural heritage value or interest of a landscape. These criteria are based on the criteria provided by the Ministry of Tourism and Culture in Regulation 9/06 under the Ontario Heritage Act. The cultural heritage value and interest of the individual cultural heritage resources within the landscape will add to the overall value and interest of the landscape as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Heritage Value or Interest Criteria</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The landscape has design value or physical value because it,</strong></td>
<td>is rare, unique, representative or an early example of a landscape (style, trend, movement, school of theory, type, expression, material use or construction method, settlement pattern, time period or lifeway)</td>
<td>displays a high degree of design or aesthetic appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The landscape has historical value or associative value because it,</strong></td>
<td>has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community</td>
<td>yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The landscape has contextual value because it,</strong></td>
<td>is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area</td>
<td>is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>is a landmark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C – Indicators of Historical Integrity

The following chart can be used as a framework to record information that would indicate that a landscape has historical integrity. These examples are not exclusive and may not be appropriate for all CHLs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical Integrity Criteria</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land use</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>The landscape has had continuity in use and/or a compatible use (agricultural, commercial, residential or institutional).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ownership</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>There has been a continuity of ownership or occupation of the site, dating to a historic period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Built Elements</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>The buildings and other built elements (fences, walls, paths, bridges, corrals, pens, garden features, lighting, sidewalks, fountains, piers, etc.) have survived in their historic form and in relatively sound condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vegetative Elements</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>“Designed” plantings (hedgerows, windrows, gardens, shade trees, etc.) are still evident and their traditional relationship to buildings, lanes, roadways, walks and fields are still discernible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Relationships</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>The relationships between historic buildings and other built and designed elements (yards, fields, paths, parks, gardens, etc.) are intact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Features</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Prominent natural features (cliff, stream, etc.) remain intact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Relationships</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>The historical relationships to prominent natural features still exist both for the site as a whole and within the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Views</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>The existing views of and within the site can be closely compared to the same view captured in a historic photo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ruins</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Ruins and overgrown elements still convey a clear ‘message’ about the site’s history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Designed Landscapes</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Changes to a designed landscape can be corrected so that the property retains integrity versus being irrevocable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D – Indicators of Community Value

The following chart can be used as a starting point to record information that may indicate that a landscape is valued by a community. A community can be broadly defined to include any grouping of people, such as: those who regularly visit or reside in an area; historians or heritage advocates; tourists; artists; researchers; cultural groups; etc. The listed indicators of Community Value below are examples and may not be appropriate for all CHLs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators that a CHL is valued by a community</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The landscape contributes to the community’s identity and is used to tell the story of the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landmark</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The area is widely recognized as a landmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pride and Stewardship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The community demonstrates a high degree of pride and stewardship in the area (heritage designations, plaques, voluntary upkeep)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commemoration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The area or elements within the area are named to celebrate or commemorate someone or something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Space</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The area is a site of frequent or longstanding public gatherings or events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Traditions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>People use the area to express their cultural traditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of Life</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aspects of the landscape are valued for their impact on day to day living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local History</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The place is written about in local histories or spoken about through local stories or lore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Depiction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The location is widely photographed or depicted in works of art (visual, literary, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genius Loci</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>People refer to the area as having a distinctive atmosphere or pervading ‘sense of place’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Image</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The area is identified with the community image (e.g. appearing in promotions or marketing material)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tourism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The area is promoted as a tourist destination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The area has been identified through another planning process as being unique</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix E – Criteria for Regional Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Recognized/Protected</strong></th>
<th><strong>1.</strong> It is, or it contains element(s) that are, recognized on a municipal, regional, provincial or national heritage list;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old/Rare</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.</strong> It dates from a prehistoric or early historical period in the development of the region, province or nation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outstanding Design</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.</strong> It is, or contains element(s) that are, a representative example of the work of an outstanding regional, national or international architect, engineer, builder, designer, landscape architect, interior designer or sculptor;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associated with a Key Person</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.</strong> It is associated with a person(s) who is recognized as having made a significant contribution to the social, cultural, political, economic, technological or physical development or as having materially influenced the course of regional, provincial, national or international events;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associated with a Key Event</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.</strong> It is directly associated with an historic event which is recognized as having regional, provincial, national or international importance;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illustrates Community’s Development</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.</strong> It is a significant example and illustration of the region’s prehistoric or historic social, cultural, political, economic or technological development;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provides Context</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.</strong> It contributes to the effectiveness of the urban and rural composition, streetscape, viewshed, or landscape of which it may form a part;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Resource</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.</strong> It has the potential for contributing to commercial tourist or other development that is based on heritage and/or culture;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Character</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.</strong> It is, or contains elements that are, a good example of vernacular architecture or part of a group of similar bridges/structures/landscapes which contribute to the particular &quot;look&quot; of the area or region;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part of a Collection</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.</strong> It is part of a group of historically associated structures which may be totally within the region or which may be part of a larger area within the context of the Grand River (a nationally designated Heritage River).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CRITERIA FOR IDENTIFYING A REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT HERITAGE RESOURCE**

The Region will identify cultural heritage resources of Regional interest.

To be identified as being of Regional interest a cultural heritage resource must meet four (4) or more of the following criteria:
# Appendix F – CHL Conservation Tools Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Designating in an Official Plan</th>
<th>OHA Municipal Register Listing</th>
<th>OHA Part IV Designation</th>
<th>OHA Part V Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifies the area as a <em>cultural heritage resource</em></td>
<td>Yes, in Official Plan</td>
<td>Yes, on the MHR</td>
<td>Yes, on title and on the MHR</td>
<td>Yes, on title (post-2005) and on the MHR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires the documentation of the landscape</td>
<td>Yes, through a CHL Technical Study, to include: (a) a statement of significance; (b) a listing (and map) of the <em>cultural heritage resources</em> and <em>attributes</em> being <em>conserved</em> within the <em>Cultural Heritage Landscape</em> through the use of existing planning tools; and (c) recommendations for additional conservation measures.</td>
<td>Yes, evaluation form and Statement of Significance including location</td>
<td>Yes, evaluation form, Statement of Significance and Designating By-law, including location</td>
<td>Yes, through an HCD Study and then an HCD Conservation Plan, to include: (a) objectives to be achieved through the designation; (b) a statement of significance for the district; (c) an inventory of heritage <em>attributes</em>; (d) policies for enhancing the district; (e) guidelines which describe the type of work or development that council would find acceptable; and (f) a description of external alterations that would not require a heritage permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan takes precedence in the event of a conflict with existing municipal zoning and other bylaws that were in place prior to the designation.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enables the municipality to require a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) on proposed <em>development</em> and <em>site alteration</em> within or <em>adjacent</em> to the CHL</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Within – Yes Adjacent – No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designating in an Official Plan</td>
<td>OHA Municipal Register Listing</td>
<td>OHA Part IV Designation</td>
<td>OHA Part V Designation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows the municipality to make financial grants or incentives available to heritage property owners.</td>
<td>Only for OHA protected properties or if the CHL is part of an approved Community Improvement Plan.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides the municipality with the power to decide whether alterations, new construction or demolition can take place within the CHL.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alterations and new construction – yes if associated with a development application Demolition – yes through delay of demolition and opportunity to designate under the OHA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows the municipality to develop and enforce heritage property standards.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designation process is appealable to the Ontario Municipal Board</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No – But can be objected to, and referred to the Conservation Review Board for a non-binding recommendation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: February 26, 2013

FILE CODE: D28-50

SUBJECT: GRAND RIVER TRANSIT (GRT) 2013 SERVICE IMPROVEMENT PLAN - PUBLIC CONSULTATION CENTRES

RECOMMENDATION:

For information.

SUMMARY:

The proposed 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan which Council approved as part of its 2013 budget on January 16, 2013, has been refined taking into consideration public feedback received during the consultation process in November 2012. This report details the revised Plan and the next round of public consultation scheduled for March 2013. Pending Regional Council approval in May 2013, the 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan would be implemented September 2013.

The Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) establishes long-term transit modal share and ridership targets to be achieved through the implementation of rapid transit and an integrated bus network based on a series of iXpress corridors. In order to implement the RTMP, the Grand River Transit 2011-2014 Business Plan details annual service improvement priorities based on implementation of an iXpress corridor and associated local route restructuring every second year. Accordingly, the proposed 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan includes a new cross-town iXpress service along the University Avenue corridor along with local route improvements as shown in Figure 1 and summarized below.

Proposed 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan:

- New University iXpress route between The Boardwalk at Ira Needles Boulevard and the University Avenue and Northfield Drive East employment area via Erb Street West and University Avenue. This would be the largest expansion of 2013.
- Extend the existing 201 Fischer-Hallman iXpress to Conestoga Mall and the University Avenue and Northfield Drive East employment area.
- Provide two-way service on Route 13 Laurelwood and extend to The Boardwalk at Ira Needles Boulevard.
- Provide two-way service on Route 5 Erb West and extend route to The Boardwalk at Ira Needles Boulevard.
- Relocate Route 12 Conestoga Mall from Carter Avenue to the Lincoln Road area via Weber Street and Lincoln Road or Marshall Street.
- Modify Route 31 Lexington to provide service along Chesapeake Road, New Bedford Drive, and Eastbridge Boulevard; and extend service along Columbia Street West. Provide Saturday service on Route 31.
- Modify Route 35 Eastbridge to provide direct service between Downtown Kitchener and the Eastbridge neighbourhood via Bridge Street, Lancaster Street, and Wellington Street. Provide Sunday service on Route 35.
- Modify Route 6 Bridgeport to travel between Uptown Waterloo and the Bridgeport neighbourhood via Bridgeport Road and Erb Street East.

Initial Public Consultation Centres (PCCs) were held in November 2012 to gather preliminary feedback on proposed service improvement options. During the consultations, three alternative service options were displayed for both East and West Waterloo. The comments received from the PCCs were used to refine the 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan as described in this report.

The next PCCs are scheduled for March 18, 19, 21, and 22. Commentary received during these consultation centres will be used to finalize the 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan which will be recommended to Regional Council in May 2013. Pending Regional Council approval, the 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan would be implemented in September 2013.

Area Municipalities are being consulted through representation on Steering Committees and have been circulated material related to service improvement proposals.

REPORT:

The Council approved Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) establishes long-term transit modal share and ridership targets to be achieved through the implementation of rapid transit and an integrated bus network based on a series of iXpress corridors. The Grand River Transit 2011-2014 Business Plan is based on a comprehensive redesign of the bus network where a series of iXpress corridors are integrated with and support rapid transit. It also details annual service improvement priorities where an iXpress corridor and associated local improvements are implemented every second year.

Based on public feedback on various service options, a preferred Transit Service Improvement Plan has been refined for 2013, anchored on the introduction of a new University Avenue iXpress route and modifications to local routes (Attachment C). The proposed local route changes would create a grid-like network and more direct transit service options, resulting in an expected increase of 815,000 rides during the first year of operation. This would represent a 4% increase compared to 2012 annual system ridership.

Initial and Secondary Public Consultation

Public feedback used to develop the refined 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan was collected through several means including:

- Public Consultation Centres held on November 15, 20, 21, and 22 in 2012 at four locations which displayed various transit service improvement options.
- An online survey posted on the www.grt.ca website.
- Emails and telephone calls received from the public.

A total of 219 people signed in at the four initial PCCs held in November. Including comments from the online survey, 292 responses were received regarding the service improvement options. A summary of the comments can be found in Attachment A.

Dates and locations for the second round of public consultations are noted below. Information packages with detailed descriptions of the proposed service improvements and comment forms will be distributed at the PCCs.
The proposed 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan that will be presented at the March PCC’s is illustrated in Attachment C and described below.

**University iXpress Route**
A new iXpress route is proposed along the Erb Street West and University Avenue corridors that would provide service between The Boardwalk at Ira Needles Boulevard and the University Avenue East and Northfield Drive East employment area (Attachment D). Ridership during the first year of operation of the route is an estimated 480,000 which is expected to grow to 600,000 by the third year of operation. Annual ridership of 600,000 would represent approximately 3,000 daily average boardings.

During public consultation, respondents were asked to comment on two alternative routings for the University iXpress. In one option the bus remains on University Avenue East while the other option would travel on Bridge Street between University Avenue and Northfield Drive (Attachment E).

The majority of respondents who indicated a preferred option, 114 people (66%), were in favour of the routing option that remained on University Avenue East. Reasons for supporting this routing included the provision of service to RIM Park, and the perception that service would be more direct compared to the Bridge Street option.

Some 60 people, or 34%, were in favour of the Bridge Street routing. Several responses indicated that Bridge Street was more central to the neighbourhood compared to University Avenue.

Analysis of the two routing options found marginal differences in service coverage. The Bridge Street routing included approximately 2,000 housing units, or an estimated 6,200 people, within a 600 m walkshed. In comparison, the University Avenue routing included some 1,900 units, or an estimated 5,700 people, within a 600m walkshed. Additionally, the University Avenue routing provides continual service along the University Avenue corridor and serves RIM Park.

**201 Fischer-Hallman iXpress**
The 201 iXpress was the first of seven planned limited-stop express routes to be introduced in 2011. The route currently travels between Forest Glen Plaza and the intersection of Columbia Street West and Philip Street. An extension of the route to Conestoga Mall and the University Avenue East and Northfield Drive East employment area is proposed (Attachment D).

The public were largely in favour of the 201 iXpress extension to University Avenue East and Northfield Drive East. Of those that provided an answer, 202 people (89%) were in favour of the extension while 24 people (11%) did not support the extension.

Opposition to the proposed extension included eight comments related to the removal of the 201 iXpress stop at Wilfrid Laurier University. Seven respondents indicated that the extension was either not warranted, or that service should only be extended to Conestoga Mall. Three requests were also received to extend service further south to Fairview Park Mall.

While the proposed extension would result in the removal of 201 iXpress service to Wilfrid Laurier University, new service would be provided by the proposed University iXpress. The proposed extension would also provide access to the Conestoga Mall transit terminal and proposed Rapid Transit Station.
Transit station, major commercial centres and high density residential areas along King Street, and to employment at Northfield Drive East and University Avenue East.

Route 5: Erb West
Route 5 currently provides service between the Clair Hills and Westvale neighbourhoods and Uptown Waterloo. A large one way loop operates along Keats Way, Erbsville Road and in the Westvale neighbourhood. Proposed changes to Route 5 include the provision of two-way service between Uptown Waterloo and The Boardwalk at Ira Needles Boulevard, resulting in more direct service through the Westvale neighbourhood and additional connections to a major commercial centre.

Two service options were originally proposed for service improvements to Route 5 (Attachment F). Of the 25 comments received related to Route 5, 12 stated a preference for service to The Boardwalk, with 10 respondents preferring service via Westvale Drive, and two responses favouring service via Thorndale Drive. Additional comments included two requests not to have service on Westvale Drive, and six requests not to remove Route 5 service from Keats Way or Thorndale Drive.

The revised service improvement plan includes two options on how Route 5 would travel between the Westvale neighbourhood and The Boardwalk (Attachment C). The first option was included during the initial public consultation phase, and includes travel via Erb Street West, Westvale Drive and University Avenue. This option provides greater service coverage in the Westvale neighbourhood.

In response to requests for service along the length of Thorndale Drive, the second option would travel between Uptown Waterloo and The Boardwalk via Erb Street West, Fischer-Hallman Road, Thorndale Drive and Ira Needles Boulevard which would provide additional connections to the 201 iXpress and to the proposed University iXpress route. This routing option would be dependent on the installation of a roundabout or a traffic signal to facilitate left turns from Thorndale to Ira Needles Boulevard.

Transit service along Keats Way would continue to be provided by Route 29 Keats Way.

Route 13: Laurelwood
This route provides service to the University of Waterloo from the Laurelwood neighbourhood and travels via a one-way loop along Columbia Street West, Erbsville Road, Laurelwood Drive and Bearinger Road. The proposed changes to Route 13 include the provision of two-way service along the length of the route and an extension to The Boardwalk, creating additional connections for residents in the Laurelwood community.

During public consultations, some 27 people specifically stated that Route 13 should be extended to The Boardwalk with two way service. Another four respondents requested service further into the Laurelcreek neighbourhood, and a petition from the Laurelcreek Neighbourhood Associated was received with 24 signatures requesting service within the Laurelcreek Village Neighbourhood (Attachment B).

In response to customer requests and to extend service into a growing community, a short extension further into the Laurelcreek Village area northwest of the Laurelwood Drive and Erbsville Road intersection is now proposed in addition to The Boardwalk extension.

Route 12: Conestoga Mall
Route 12 operates between Conestoga Mall and Fairview Mall with buses running Monday to Sunday.
Initial proposals presented to the public during the November 2012 consultations are shown in Attachment G. Some 16 comments were received stating a preference to have Route 12 continue to provide service to Conestoga Mall, and three comments were received stating that the route should travel to Lincoln Road via Weber Road.

The revised service improvement plan includes a slight modification to Route 12 that would relocate service from Carter Avenue to avoid the unsignalized left turn from Carter Avenue onto University Avenue. Service to the Lincoln Road area would be provided by one of two options. The first option would travel via Weber Street to Lincoln Road. This routing provides connections to the commercial centres at Weber Street and Bridgeport Road and the high rise residential node in this area. Residents along Carter Avenue and Marshall Street would continue to be within the GRT walk distance standard. Alternatively, the route would travel via Weber Street, Marshall Street, and Lincoln Road.

**Route 35: Eastbridge:**
Route 35 runs Monday to Saturday and connects residents in East Waterloo to both Conestoga Mall and Uptown Waterloo. Proposed changes for Route 35 include realigning the route onto Bridge Street, Lancaster Street, and Wellington Street and the addition of Sunday service. The proposed route would provide a direct north-south connection on the east side of Waterloo and Kitchener with access to Conestoga Mall, the Northfield Drive industrial area, the Eastbridge neighbourhood, and Downtown Kitchener.

With the proposed Route 35 change, Route 6 Eastbridge which currently provides service to Downtown Kitchener along the Lexington Road corridor would be realigned to travel to Uptown Waterloo along Bridgeport Road and Erb Street West. Route 31 Lexington would be altered to provide local service within the Eastbridge neighbourhood. These changes are discussed further in the sections below.

The three alternative service options for Route 35 shown during initial public consultation are shown in Attachment H. Public comments related to the proposed Route 35/Route 6 change were largely in favour of realigning Route 35 to Downtown Kitchener and Route 6 to Uptown Waterloo with 90 people (71% of respondents) supporting the route realignment and 36 people (29%) opposing the change. There were six respondents who specified that the proposed change to provide more direct service along Route 35 would improve their current trip or encourage them to use the service, four people stated that they liked the move towards a grid system, and three people suggested having a route running straight up and down Bridge Street.

Of those opposed, seven respondents indicated that the Route 35 change would result in a longer walk distance or an added transfer to their trip or since they currently use the service to travel to Uptown Waterloo. Further comments related to Route 35 included four requests for extended hours of service.

**Route 31: Lexington**
This route currently operates Monday to Friday, and provides service between Conestoga Mall and the University of Waterloo via University Avenue East, Lexington Road and Columbia Street West.

Limited public feedback was received on the proposed service changes for Route 31 (Attachment I); however, two comments requested that service continue to be provided within the University of Waterloo Campus. An additional four comments were received for extended hours of service.
With the proposed implementation of the University iXpress along University Avenue East, and the proposed change to Route 35 to remove local service from within the Eastbridge neighbourhood, Route 31 would be redesigned to travel through the Eastbridge area via Chesapeake Road, New Bedford Drive, and Eastbridge Boulevard providing connections between Conestoga Mall and the University of Waterloo. In West Waterloo, the route would be extended past the Columbia Street West and Erbsville Road intersection. The extension into the University of Waterloo campus would be removed to provide a continuous route alignment along the Columbia Street West and Lexington Road corridor. Saturday service would also be implemented.

Route 6: Bridgeport
Service on Route 6 operates between the Bridgeport Neighbourhood and Downtown Kitchener via Lancaster Street and Wellington Road. Buses run Monday to Saturday.

As noted above, with the proposed change to realign Route 35 to Downtown Kitchener, Route 6 would be altered to travel to Uptown Waterloo. The modified service would travel from the Bridgeport neighbourhood to Uptown Waterloo via Bridgeport Road and Erb Street East, and would then connect to Route 5 Erb West in Uptown Waterloo. The proposed changes would result in direct east / west service across the Erb Street and Bridgeport Road corridors into the Bridgeport neighbourhood.

Comments received related to the proposed Route 6 / Route 35 change were largely in favour of realigning Route 6 to travel to Uptown Waterloo and Route 35 to Downtown Kitchener with 90 people (71% of respondents) supporting the route realignment and 36 people (29%) opposing the change.

A total of seven respondents stated that they were not in favour of the proposed Route 6 change because that it would either create a longer walking distance to transit or would result in an added transfer to their trip. Another four comments indicated that it would be important to make connections between Route 6 and Route 35. The scheduling of these routes are being examined to determine if timed connections are possible.

Further comments regarding Route 6 service included two requests for Sunday service.

Public Notification / Advertising

In advance of the Public Consultation Centres, notification will be sent out via various means including:

- Emails or letters will be sent to respondents from the initial round of public consultation who indicated that they would like to be informed of the 2013 service improvement process;
- Roadside signs will be erected at major intersections in the study areas;
- Direct mail will be sent to all households on streets where transit service would be introduced. All households will receive a letter describing how service changes may benefit their neighbourhood;
- An unaddressed mailer will be sent to households in the significant study areas inviting them to the PCC’s;
- Signs will be posted at selected bus stops that show proposed service changes and provide dates and times of Public Consultation Centres;
- Notices will be posted in the local newspapers
- Posters informing transit riders of proposed changes and Public Consultation Centre dates will be posted at terminals and on buses;
- Notices of proposed service improvements and changes will be posted on the GRT website: www.grt.ca;
- Comment forms will be available online and at the PCC’s;
- Mass emailing will be sent to those who subscribe to our rider e-alerts; and,
Information will be sent out via social media including Twitter

At all times when internet based comments are invited, provision will also be made for comments to be submitted by telephone, fax or conventional mail.

Next Steps

Public feedback at the PCCs will be taken into consideration when finalizing the 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan. The final 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan will be presented to Regional Planning and Works Committee in April 2013.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

Area Municipalities are being consulted through representation on Steering Committees and have been circulated material related to service improvement proposals.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The Preferred 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan supports the implementation of Council's Strategic Focus, identified under Focus Area 3: Sustainable Transportation: Develop greater, more sustainable and safe transportation choices. The plan will contribute to Strategic Objective 3.1.2. Expand the bus network and begin to integrate it with the future Light Rail Transit System.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Costs of planning and operating public consultation for transit service planning are included in the 2013 GRT operating budget, approval by Regional Council.

Annual operating costs associated with the proposed 2013 service improvements are approximately $4,204,000, and would be funded through the RTMP Reserve Fund.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Staff from Planning, Housing and Community Services and Transportation and Environmental Services worked together to develop these transit service improvement plans.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment A – Summary of Feedback from November 2012 Public Consultation Centres
Attachment B – Petition for Transit Service into the Laurelcreek Village neighbourhood
Attachment C – Proposed 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan Map
Attachment D – Proposed iXpress Station Locations
Attachment E – Initial routing options for the Proposed University iXpress Route
Attachment F – Initial Route 5 Service Improvement Options
Attachment G – Initial Route 12 Service Improvement Options
Attachment H – Initial Route 35 Service Improvement Options
Attachment I – Initial Route 31 Service Improvement Options

PREPARED BY: Erica Springate, Principal Planner

APPROVED BY: Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Housing and Community Services
## Summary of Feedback from November 2012 Public Consultation Centres

### 1) Do you support the 201 Fischer-Hallman iXpress extension to Conestoga Mall and the University Avenue East and Northfield Drive East employment area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Customer Comment</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>292</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2) Do you have additional comments regarding the 201 iXpress extension?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Customer Comment</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concerned with Wilfrid Laurier University stop removal</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>The University iXpress will provide direct service to Wilfrid Laurier for residents living in the Keats Way and Erb Street corridors. For some customers a transfer would be introduced, or alternatively the planned 201 station at Columbia and Hazel represents an ~600m walk to the current Laurier stop location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current route is not fast enough</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Current scheduled speed will be improved when the extension is added in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to ensure connections (Highland Hills Mall, Conestoga Mall, other)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Connections are planned for key terminals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend to Conestoga Mall only/ no extension needed</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>The potential extension to Northfield Drive and University Avenue is to service the growing employment node in this area in order to attract a greater portion of commuting trips to transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Frequency needed</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Greater frequency is not planned at this time. Current 15 minute service is offered during extended peak times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend Further South (such as Fairview Mall)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>An extension to Fairview Mall or the Courtland LRT station is planned for the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General support for the extension</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total comments given, not all applicable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3) Which routing do you prefer for the proposed University iXpress?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Customer Comment</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Via Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via University</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>292</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4) Do you have additional comments regarding the proposed University iXpress?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Customer Comment</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Street is more central</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Access to residences is similar between Bridge Street and University Avenue routing, as Bridge is largely back lotted and higher pockets of density exist along University Avenue compared to Bridge Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Ave is more direct service</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route should follow the length of University Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service should be frequent</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15 minute frequency is planned during extended peak periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Customer Comment</td>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route should be extended to Conestoga Mall</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The 201 and the University iXpress are currently intended to be interlined to provide continuous travel to Conestoga Mall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route should provide service to employment at Northfield / Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Service would be provided to this employment area by either the planned University iXpress or the 201 iXpress extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like extended service RIM Park if via University</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>An iXpress stop is planned at RIM Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General support</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total comments given, not all applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Do you support the proposed change to routes 35 Eastbridge and 6 Bridgeport?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Do you have additional comments regarding the proposed changes to routes 35 Eastbridge and 6 Bridgeport?</td>
<td>Would improve my current trip / encourage me to use the service</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Like that the change would result in more of a grid system</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have a route run straight up and down Bridge Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Suggestion was used to further develop the Route 35 preferred plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make the 5 and 6 one route</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>These two routes would be interlined at Uptown Waterloo, functioning as one route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes would cause extra transfers or a longer walk</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Coordinating transfers between Route 6 and Route 35 is being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 35 currently provides me with a direct connection to Uptown</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>examined. Alternatively, customers from Route 6 travelling to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 6 currently provides me with a direct connection to Downtown</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>downtown Kitchener also have the option of transferring to Route B, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Important to make connections between the 35 and 6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>transferring in Uptown Waterloo. Route 35 customer wishing to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request for Sunday service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>travel to Uptown Waterloo would be able to transfer at Conestoga Mall or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or travelling along the Proposed Route 31 at King Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total comments given, not all applicable</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Sunday service for 2013 is planned for the route (either the 6 or the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33) that operates along Lancaster Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Do you have a preference for the East Waterloo service options?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Rank in order which Service Options you prefer for East Waterloo (where 1 is most preferable and 3 is least preferable):</td>
<td>East Waterloo Option 1</td>
<td>50 (41%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50 (41%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23 (19%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Waterloo Option 2</td>
<td>40 (33%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43 (36%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38 (31%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Waterloo Option 3</td>
<td>32 (26%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28 (23%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>62 (50%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Customer Comment</td>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Do you have any additional comments regarding the proposed service options for East Waterloo?</td>
<td>Route 12 service should continue to Conestoga Mall</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>This is the proposed plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 12 should travel via Lincoln</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>This option is included in the service proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Like Lincoln Rd route providing a connection from Lincoln area to Uptown</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>This route option will be re-examined during future transit service planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request for extended hours on Route 31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Saturday service on Route 31 is planned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request for extended hours on Route 35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sunday service on Route 35 is planned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request for Sunday service on Route 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The proposed change to Route 35 would include Sunday service on Lancaster St and Wellington St, currently serviced by Route 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes should result in a grid system</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The proposed plan would result in more of a grid system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leave things alone</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Proposed service improvements result in more direct and efficient service and expanded service hours. The service proposals also incorporate customer requests and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals comments given, not all applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Do you have a preference for the West Waterloo service options?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Rank in order which Service Options you prefer for West Waterloo (where 1 is most preferable and 3 is least preferable):</td>
<td>West Waterloo Option 1</td>
<td>58 (43%)</td>
<td>10 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99 (74%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Waterloo Option 2</td>
<td>24 (18%)</td>
<td>73 (54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 (10%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Waterloo Option 3</td>
<td>52 (39%)</td>
<td>44 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38 (28%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Do you have any additional comments regarding the proposed service options for West Waterloo?</td>
<td>Extend Route 13 to The Boardwalk with 2-way service</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>This option is the preferred plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extend Rt 13 to Creekside Drive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>This extension would result in loss of on-street parking and an increase to runtimes and operational costs. Staff will continue to review this extension in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't remove Rt 5 from Keats Way or Thorndale</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Additional service along Keats Way is provided by Route 29. Residents along Thorndale will continue to remain within the walk distance service standard with access to transit at the Fischer-Hallman and Ira Needles intersections, or along Westvale Drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't have Route 5 service on Westvale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The amount of service within the Westvale neighbourhood would not change. The proposed realignment of service in Westvale would result in improved service coverage within the neighbourhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extend Rt 5 to The Boardwalk via Westvale</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>This option is the preferred plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have Route 5 travel to The Boardwalk via Thorndale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>This option is being examined in service plans, however, the left turn from Thorndale onto Ira Needles would require an advanced signal or roundabout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Customer Comment</td>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) How often do you currently use GRT?</td>
<td>More than 3 times per week</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-3 times per week</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>About once a month</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than once a month</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rarely (a few times a year)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) How do you typically pay for your trips?</td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adult Ticket</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adult Pass</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced Ticket</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced Pass</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corporate Pass</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High school term pass</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upass</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Term Pass</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) Gender:</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age:</td>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-54</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Petition for Transit Service into the Laurelcreek Village neighbourhood

The GRT (Grand River Transit) is considering service improvements to Route 13 for implementation in September 2013 if approved.

One West Waterloo proposal, “Option 3”, would see Route 13 redesigned as a 2 way route connecting the University of Waterloo campus to the Ira Needles Boardwalk through the Laurelwood neighborhood.

Unfortunately, there has been no consideration given to extending bus service into the Laurelcreek community to increase ridership through better service and convenience. Subdivision planning documents recommend a bus route around the “inside” of Laurelwood Drive/Creekside Drive in order to meet transit supportive planning criteria that states: “Structure new communities such that at least 90% of all people/jobs are within a 400m (5 minute) walking distance of a transit stop.”

Please sign to request “that GRT provide bus service within the Laurelcreek Village community”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karen Robertson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lars Jonsson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan Map
Initial routing options for the Proposed University iXpress Route
Initial Route 5 Service Improvement Options
Initial Route 12 Service Improvement Options
Attachment H

Initial Route 35 Service Improvement Options
Attachment I

Initial Route 31 Service Improvement Options
Implementation of the recommendations contained in the original 1986 Waste Management Master Plan (WMMP) have resulted in more than a threefold increase in the amount of material diverted from landfill disposal between 1995 and 2011 amidst a population increase of nearly 35% over the same period. Building upon the successes and experience gained over the last 25 years, the Region is embarking on the development of a renewed strategy to guide waste management services over the next 20 years.

The objectives of the updated WMMP include:

- Achieving meaningful involvement and public consultation early and throughout the process;
- Ensuring decision-making processes are accessible, traceable & transparent;
- Identifying continued improvements to existing waste reduction and diversion programs;
- Identifying a recommended residual waste management strategy, including an implementation plan and financial implications;
- Considering partnerships with other municipalities, the private sector and the province;
- Being strongly aligned with the Region’s corporate and strategic vision;
- Balancing regional dynamics (e.g., rural/urban differences);
- Remaining flexible to respond to changes in policies, technologies, growth and the composition of the waste stream; and
- Meeting the needs of the community into the future.

Two consultation series are planned over the course of the WMMP. The first consultation series was conducted in the Fall of 2012 and included provision of information through print and online media, public information centres (PIC’s) and collecting feedback through a survey. These activities were initiated in early October and concluded in mid-November.

The goals of Consultation Series 1 were to:

- Provide the public with an opportunity to learn more about the WMMP study;
- Collect feedback on current waste management services; and
- Collect feedback on ways to reduce the amount of garbage going to landfill.
Four PIC’s were hosted in Waterloo, Kitchener, Cambridge, and Woolwich Township. The PIC’s were strategically located for convenience and accessibility for residents throughout Waterloo Region. Attendance at the PIC’s is detailed in the table below (as recorded on the sign-in sheets). However, it is noted that actual attendance was likely 20% to 30% higher as not all residents signed in.

Table 1: Registration at Public Information Centres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Event Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Registration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knox Presbyterian Church, Waterloo</td>
<td>October 22</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmira Lions Hall, Woolwich</td>
<td>October 23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener Memorial Auditorium, Kitchener</td>
<td>October 24</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvary Assembly Church, Cambridge</td>
<td>October 25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the PIC’s, Consultation Series 1 also included interaction with the public at various community locations and the implementation of a survey to solicit feedback on the following topics:

- *Options to Improve Program Participation*: participants rated the importance of possible changes to existing programs aiming to increase program participation and diversion;
- *Possible New Diversion Initiatives*: participants rated the importance of possible new ways to reduce the amount of garbage going to landfill;
- *Other Ideas*: participants provided their own ideas for reducing the amount of garbage going to landfill; and
- *Rate Us*: feedback on current services including curbside collection, promotion and education, customer service, and depots or drop-off locations.

Table 2: Survey Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Access Point</th>
<th>Surveys Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard copy</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIC Interactive Boards</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 2, a total of 466 residents completed the survey online and 75 residents completed the survey in hardcopy format. An additional 75 residents answered the survey questions through the interactive display boards at the PIC’s, for a total of 616 responses.

Residents were asked to prioritize options to improve diversion program participation by ranking them based on importance and the results are shown in Figure 1. Encouraging the provincial and federal governments to develop policies mandating extended producer responsibility was ranked as the most important option. Helping apartment buildings and townhouse complexes to improve their recycling and organics programs was also identified as very important by the majority of respondents. Increasing the availability of drop-off locations and increasing the amount of materials available for curbside pick-up were the options most frequently ranked as not important by respondents.

Next, residents were asked to rank possible new diversion initiatives that could improve diversion based on importance. Results are shown in Figure 2. Encouraging the Province to provide incentives for business recycling and diversion was ranked as the most important initiative. Encouraging full participation in the blue box recycling and green bin organics programs by collecting those materials weekly, and garbage every two weeks was also ranked as very important by the majority of respondents. Restricting the number of garbage bags
allowed for collection and investigating enforcement to increase participation were the initiatives identified most frequently as not important.

Figure 1: Feedback on options to improve program participation and increase diversion

Figure 2: Feedback on possible new diversion initiatives
The survey included an open-ended question for residents to provide any other ideas they had to increase diversion and reduce waste. A summary of some of the suggestions is included below:

- Implement a green bin organics program for multi-residential buildings, schools and businesses;
- Enforce diversion programs for apartments and businesses through the use of fines or bylaws limiting disposal of recyclables, and requiring recycling and organics chutes in new buildings;
- Educate students on waste management issues and diversion programs;
- Improve promotion of both curbside and drop-off diversion programs;
- Pick-up additional diversion materials (e.g. e-waste and household hazardous waste) curbside on a seasonal basis for residents who do not have vehicles, and provide community drop-off bins;
- Consider energy from waste as a method for future waste disposal;
- Implement a user-pay system for garbage collection (e.g. bag tags), and require the use of clear bags to encourage recycling;
- Subsidize cost of paper green bin organics liners or allow plastic compostable liners;
- Partner with community organizations to encourage reuse (e.g. Goodwill or Habitat for Humanity); and
- Encourage residents through the use of incentives (e.g. tax breaks for program participation).

Finally, respondents were asked a series of questions to evaluate their satisfaction with current waste management services, including curbside collection programs, drop-off services, promotion and education programs and materials, and responses to customer service inquiries. Results are shown in Figure 3. Overall, feedback received was very positive, with the majority of residents indicating that curbside collection services were excellent or very good.

Figure 3: Feedback on areas of service currently offered by the Region of Waterloo
A full summary report of the Consultation Series 1 activities has been prepared and will form part of the WMMP final study report to be presented in the fall of 2013. The final WMMP study will provide Council with recommendations for future waste management services including collection, diversion programs, and disposal. Public comments will be carefully considered in the evaluation of recommendations put forward by the Project Team in the WMMP study.

The next phase of the consultation program for the WMMP study, referred to as Consultation Series 2, will be undertaken in Spring 2013. During Consultation Series 2, residents will be informed of the results of Consultation Series 1, and will be presented with information about future diversion programs and disposal technologies and options that are being considered by the Region. The goal of Consultation Series 2 will be to collect feedback from residents on future diversion programs and disposal options.
In July 2010 it was determined that the gateway sign at the Region of Waterloo International Airport, originally installed in 1987, was in need of replacement and was no longer representative of the Airport. A project team was formed at that time to develop a recommended sign design.

The design approved by Regional Council was designed by Sun Signs based on the input of the project team which consisted of Regional Councillor Jean Haalboom and six Regional staff members including John Hammer and Bob Henderson from Transportation, Bryan Stortz from Corporate Communications, Doug Gilmore from Facility Asset Planning, Chris Wood and Sandra McAuley from the Airport, and Laurel Davies Snyder from the Township of Woolwich.

The sign was fabricated and installed by Brooks Signs of Brantford. It was installed in early 2011 and successfully addressed the challenges of the site (see Figure 1 below).

Brooks Signs recently entered the Airport gateway sign into an International competition and it has been awarded first place in the Electric Monument Signs category by the International Sign Association.

Signs were judged on craftsmanship, complexity, and artistic merit. Brooks Signs said “This is a real thrill because it was a sign project that was near and dear to us. Company president, Tony Henrique was in the process of obtaining his Private Pilot’s License at the same time we were bidding this project. He became fascinated with all things aviation! Preoccupied with how this sign would be built, Tony made a small scale model of the sign out of cereal boxes.”

Figure 1 – Region of Waterloo International Airport Gateway Sign

Image provided by Brooks Signs
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
DATE: February 26, 2013
FILE CODE: 7299

SUBJECT: CONSULTANT SELECTION – EAST BOUNDARY ROAD CORRIDOR STUDY, CLASS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND PRELIMINARY DESIGN, CITY OF CAMBRIDGE AND TOWNSHIP OF NORTH DUMFRIES

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into a Consulting Services Agreement with MTE Consultants Inc. to provide consulting engineering services for the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment and Preliminary Design for the East Boundary Road Corridor Study in the City of Cambridge and Township of North Dumfries, at an upset limit of $692,952.85 plus applicable taxes.

SUMMARY:

The East Boundary Road is a planned arterial corridor on the east side of Cambridge that will connect to the South Boundary Road at Dundas Street (Highway 8) on the south end and with Townline Road to the north. The need for the East Boundary Road is identified in the Regional Transportation Master Plan Moving Forward 2031 (January 2011) and the Regional Official Policies Plan (ROPP- September 2006 Consolidation). Appendix A illustrates the Study Area, which extends approximately 5 km, from Dundas Street (Highway 8) in the south to Townline Road in the north. The study encompasses areas on both sides of the boundary between the City of Cambridge and the Township of North Dumfries and includes a small area within the County of Wellington. The study will follow Phases 1 through 4 of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process (Schedule “C”) for Municipal Road Projects in establishing the corridor alignment.

The Region of Waterloo wishes to proceed with the Class EA and preliminary design to identify and secure the East Boundary Road corridor which in turn will provide guidance for development plans within the south-east area of Cambridge and the Township of North Dumfries. In order to establish this corridor and complete the required Class EA planning work, an engineering consultant must be hired now to undertake the project.

An invitation for Letters-of-Interest to provide engineering services was advertised in the Kitchener Waterloo Record. Eight (8) firms submitted proposals and three (3) firms were short-listed and invited to submit detailed work plans and fee estimates. Subsequent to the short-listing, one firm withdrew their submission from the final price component of the evaluation.

Based on the evaluation criteria, review of the detailed work plans, schedules and upset fees provided, it is recommended that MTE Consultants Inc. be retained to undertake this assignment at an upset fee limit of $692,952.85 (plus HST) for the Class EA and preliminary design. The upset fee for the Class EA and preliminary design is within the budgeted costs to complete the Class EA and preliminary design assignment.
REPORT:

1. Background

The East Boundary Road is a planned arterial corridor on the east side of Cambridge that will connect to the South Boundary Road at Dundas Street (Highway 8) on the south end and with Townline Road to the north. The East Boundary Road is identified in the Region’s Transportation Master Plan under the Mature State Improvements for the transportation network in the south Cambridge area and is also identified in the Regional Official Plan (ROP). This proposed new corridor will address concerns with north-south travel within and around the City of Cambridge. Please refer to Appendix A for a key plan of the Study Area. The Study Area extends approximately 5 km from Dundas Street (Highway 8) in the south to Townline Road in the north. The study encompasses areas on both sides of the boundary between the City of Cambridge and the Township of North Dumfries and includes a small area within the County of Wellington. The study will follow Phases 1 through 4 of the Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process (Schedule “C”) for Municipal Road Projects in establishing the corridor alignment.

The City of Cambridge and Township of North Dumfries were also asked to comment on the terms of reference. Their comments were incorporated into the detailed terms of reference and the establishment of the study area. The County of Wellington and the Township of Puslinch have also been contacted about the project and the inclusion of a portion of their lands as part of the study area.

Due to the complexity of issues involved and the need for specialists in natural environment, planning, stormwater management and structural fields and because Regional staff are fully committed to other capital projects, it is recommended that an external consultant be hired to undertake this project. Staff has determined that it is necessary to commence the planning and engineering for this project now in order to identify and secure the East Boundary Road corridor which in turn will provide guidance for development plans in the south-east area of Cambridge and the Township of North Dumfries. Although the need to implement this new road is beyond 2031, the early identification of this corridor will allow development proposals within the study area to move forward.

2. Consultant Selection

An invitation for Letters-of-Interest to provide engineering services for this project was advertised in the Kitchener Waterloo Record. Eight (8) consultants submitted Letters-of-Interest. From a review of the submissions, three (3) firms were shortlisted based on their understanding of the project and qualifications, and these consultants were asked to submit a detailed work plan and an upset fee for the Class EA and preliminary design. The Letters-of-Interest submitted by all three short-listed consultants demonstrated a good understanding of the project with capable project teams and experience on numerous similar projects. Subsequent to the short-listing, one of the consultants withdrew their submission from the final evaluation.

The remaining shortlisted consultants were:

- MTE Consultants Inc.; and
- Bytown Engineering–Sanchez Engineering Joint Venture
The Evaluation Team involved with the consultant selection consisted of:

- Marcos Kroger, Senior Project Manager, Design and Construction Division
- Bill Gilbert, Senior Project Manager, Design and Construction Division
- Paula Sawicki, Manager, Strategic Transportation Planning, Transportation Planning
- Patricia Heft, Engineering Technologist, Transportation Division

The evaluation criteria used for selecting the successful consultant were consistent with the Region’s Purchasing By-law and includes price as a factor in the selection process. These evaluation criteria and their respective weightings were as follows:

**Quality Factors**

- Project Approach and Understanding: 25%
- Experience of the Project Manager: 20%
- Experience on Similar Projects: 20%
- Experience of the Project Support Staff: 15%

**Equity Factors**

- Current Workload for Region: 3%
- Local Office: 2%

**Price Factor**

- Upset Price: 15%

Subsequent to the one consultant withdrawing from the competition, the Evaluation Team considered “short listing” another firm; however, no other firms from the remaining five demonstrated a sufficient understanding of the project to justify adding another firm to the “short list.” Based on the review of Detailed Work Plans, and in consideration of the combination of quality, equity and price factors described above, MTE scored the higher of the two remaining short-listed consultants. Therefore, based on the above evaluation criteria, including the review of the detailed work plans, schedules and upset fees provided, the Evaluation Team recommends that MTE Consultants Inc. be retained to undertake the Class EA and preliminary design for this project.

3. **Scope of Work**

For this engineering assignment, the consultant will complete the following tasks: review all background information; provide supplementary topographical surveys; complete natural environment, cultural, heritage and archaeological inventories and studies; evaluate road alternatives and assess impacts; provide constraint mapping; prepare stormwater management (SWM) report /drainage study and other studies; coordinate with adjacent landowners, developers and regulatory agencies; prepare property impact plans and complete the Environmental Study Report. A breakdown of the successful consultant’s upset fee is included in Appendix ‘B’ attached to this report.

4. **Schedule**

Subject to Council’s approval of this consultant assignment, the proposed project schedule is outlined below.

- Project Initiation – Phase I, Summer/Fall 2013
- Evaluation of Alternative Solutions –Phase 2, 2013-2014
- Identify Preferred Alternative and Prepare and file Environmental Study Report - Phases 3 and 4, 2014/2015
5. Consultant’s Upset Fee

The upset limit for consulting fees and disbursements proposed by MTE Consultants Inc. for the Class EA preliminary design portion of this assignment is $692,952.85 plus applicable taxes. Although MTE’s fee was the higher price submitted of the two shortlisted consultants, their submission did score higher overall because of their clear understanding of the project requirements, its superior approach to the assignment, and extensive knowledge and understanding gained from completion of similar work. In addition staff carefully reviewed MTE’s upset fee and concluded that it is within the expected fee range for a project of this scope and complexity and is comparable to the upset fee for the recently completed South Boundary Road Class EA and preliminary design, a very similar consultant assignment.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The East Boundary Road Corridor Study, when complete will support Focus Area Three – Sustainable Transportation by offering accessible and affordable choices for moving people and goods in a safe, integrated and seamless manner which will support a sustainable and thriving community for current and future generations.

The consultant selection process supports Focus Area Five – Service Excellence of the Strategic Plan by meeting the objective to ensure services are responsive, efficient, effective and accountable.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The Region’s 2013 Ten Year Transportation Capital Program includes $824,000 ($524,000 in 2013 and $300,000 in 2014) for consulting work on this project, all to be funded from the Development Charges Reserve Fund. The upset fee limit proposed by MTE of $692,952.85 is within the amount allocated for this assignment as part of the total budget for this project.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

NIL

ATTACHMENTS

Appendix “A” – Key Plan
Appendix “B” – Upset Fee Breakdown

PREPARED BY: Marcos Kroker, Senior Project Manager

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner Transportation and Environmental Services
## APPENDIX “B”

### MTE’s - Upset Fee Breakdown

*East Boundary Road Corridor Study- Class EA and Preliminary Design*

*City of Cambridge and Township of North Dumfries*

### UPSET FEE BASED ON TERMS OF REFERENCE

**Section 1 – Project Initiation, Data Collection, Base Plan Preparation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Data Collection and Review and Preparation of Base Plans</td>
<td>61,655.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Agency and Stakeholder Liaison</td>
<td>8,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Disbursements</td>
<td>1,400.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 1 Sub-Total**

71,805.00

**Section 2 – Corridor Study and Preliminary Design**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Project Management and Cost Estimates</td>
<td>89,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Constraint Mapping, Route Selection and Background Studies</td>
<td>138,330.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Preliminary Design</td>
<td>201,310.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Liaise and Coordinate Geotechnical Soils Investigations, Legal Survey and Property Impact Plans</td>
<td>15,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Utility Coordination, Agency and Project Team Meetings</td>
<td>91,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 Public Consultation and Coordination (Landowner/Developer/Municipality)</td>
<td>49,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12 Preparation of ESR</td>
<td>26,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13 Disbursements</td>
<td>9,657.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 2 Sub-Total**

621,147.85

**Total Sections 1 and 2**

692,952.85

**TOTAL UPSET FEE AND DISBURSEMENTS (excl. HST)**

$692,952.85
REPORT

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

DATE: February 26, 2013

FILE CODE: A02-30/PW

SUBJECT: STAGE 1 LIGHT RAIL PROJECT – RECOMMENDATION FOR THE SELECTION OF THREE PRE-QUALIFIED BIDDERS, AND OVERVIEW OF THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) PROCESS

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following action regarding the procurement of Stage 1 of the light rail project, as described in Report No. E-13-020/F-13-011, dated February 26, 2013:

a) Pre-qualify the following three Design-Build-Finance-Operate-Maintain (DBFOM) teams based on the evaluation of the submissions to Region of Waterloo Request for Qualifications 2012-01, as endorsed by the Rapid Transit Senior Management Team and the Rapid Transit Steering Committee:

- GrandLinq
- Kitchener Waterloo Cambridge Transit Partners
- TriCity Transit System

SUMMARY:

The Region continues to plan for population and employment growth over the next two decades. Recognizing this challenge, Council approved rapid transit as the preferred transportation mode to move people and shape urban form.

In February 2012, Council approved the procurement delivery model for Stage 1 of the rapid transit implementation plan.

In April 2012, the Region received “Approval in Principle” letters from both the Federal and Provincial Governments that authorize the Region to accrue eligible costs for cost sharing purposes. During this month, Council also approved the selection of Parsons Brinckerhoff Hallsall Inc. as the General Engineering Consultant to advance the system design and prepare output specifications for the procurement of the Stage 1 of the rapid transit implementation plan.

In September 2012, Council was informed on the RFQ process for the delivery of Stage 1 light rail project. In October 2012, Regional staff issued the RFQ document and subsequently received seven submissions.

Following a comprehensive evaluation of the RFQ submissions, the three successful pre-qualified teams, as endorsed by the Rapid Transit Senior Management Team and the Steering Committee, are listed below (in no particular order):

- GrandLinq
- Kitchener Waterloo Cambridge Transit Partners
- TriCity Transit System
Based on the comprehensive evaluation, it is recommended that Council approve the three pre-qualified DBFOM teams.

Staff will report back to Council prior to issuing the Request for Proposal (RFP) document to the pre-qualified teams in April, 2013.

REPORT:

1. Introduction

In June 2011, Council approved the technology, route, stations, staging and funding for Stage 1 of the Region’s rapid transit project. Stage 1 includes 19 km of Light Rail Transit (LRT) from Conestoga Mall to Fairview Park Mall and 17 km of adapted Bus Rapid Transit (aBRT) from Fairview Park Mall to the Ainslie Street Terminal. Council also directed staff to complete an evaluation of project procurement and delivery options with the goals of maximizing project innovation and quality, leveraging private sector expertise, and managing risks to the Region of Waterloo.

In February 2012, Council approved DBFOM as the procurement and delivery model with the intent to build on the strengths of the public and private sectors and to provide the best value to the Region. As part of their deliberations, Council also directed staff to review options that would allow the Region to take advantage of Operations by a private contractor without losing significant flexibility for future system expansion.

In September 2012, Council approved the initial term of 10 years for the operations component of the approved procurement and delivery model with two or four renewal options to be exercised at the discretion of the Region.

In September 2012, Council was also informed on the Request for Qualification (RFQ) Process for the Stage 1 light rail project.

In October 2012, Regional staff issued the RFQ document and subsequently received seven submissions.

Following a comprehensive evaluation of the RFQ submissions, three successful pre-qualified teams, as endorsed by the Rapid Transit Senior Management Team and the Steering Committee, have been selected.

Specific details on the RFQ Evaluation, the successful pre-qualified teams and the planned RFP Process are provided in the body of this report.

2. Request for Qualifications

2.1 Process

The RFQ was issued on October 5, 2012 with pre-qualification submissions received on November 23, 2012.

Submissions were received from the following seven teams:

- GrandLinq
- Kitchener Waterloo Transit Solutions
- Kitchener Waterloo Cambridge Transit Partners
2.2 Evaluation

A comprehensive Evaluation Framework was developed by the Region in coordination with its consultants to describe and outline the process to select the pre-qualified parties.

The objectives of this Evaluation Framework were to:

- Safeguard the interests of the Region by ensuring that the evaluation process was fair, applied consistently, free of conflicts of interest, confidential, and transparent.
- Define the authority, decision making process, and reporting structure, while ensuring an appropriate separation of roles and responsibilities related to approvals, conflict of interest determination, fairness oversight, due diligence, overall co-ordination, completeness of Prequalification Submissions, and scoring of Rated Criteria.
- Provide multiple levels of due diligence to confirm that all material facts have been considered in selecting the RFP Proponents.
- Ensure that the evaluation process was conducted in a secure environment.
- Ensure that the evaluation process is consistent with best practices and industry expectations.
- Provide evaluation criteria and a process to select the three most qualified teams.

The reporting structure that guided the evaluation process is presented in Appendix 1. A description of the stepped process used to evaluate and pre-qualify teams is summarized below:

Step 1: Based on the established Evaluation Framework, the submissions initially underwent a completeness review to determine their substantial compliance to the terms and conditions of the RFQ. A bidder’s failure to provide a substantially complete prequalification submission would have resulted in their submission not being evaluated. Following the completeness review, it was determined that all of the bidders provided substantially complete prequalification submissions.

Step 2: Evaluation teams established by the Region assessed the Technical Package and the Financial Information Package of those pre-qualification submissions that passed the substantial completeness review under Step 1.

- The technical component focused on the bidder’s past experience and proposed approach to project development (e.g. team organization, integration, and responsibilities), design and construction, maintenance, and operations. The teams also looked at how advanced the Prime Team Member’s named projects were (for example, level of completeness), how recent (for example, completed within the past 5 years), the role and level of involvement that a Prime Team Member or Key Individual played on the prior project (for example, was the role similar to proposed role on the Project), the level of design excellence demonstrated in the project, and the overall success of the named project.

- The financial component focused on the bidder’s financial strength, track record and proposed approach to risk allocation, ability to secure performance, and financing structure.

Step 3: The prequalification submission assessment completed by the evaluation teams was presented to the Evaluation Committee for consideration as part of their review and evaluation.
Step 4: Based on the information provided through steps 1 to 3, the Evaluation Committee evaluated and ranked each submission for each of the following Evaluation Criteria Categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant’s Approach to Project Partnering and Development and Financial and Financing Information</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant’s Approach to Project Partnering and Development</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and Financing Information</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and Construction Approach and Experience</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Approach and Experience</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Approach and Experience</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and Rehabilitation Approach and Experience</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Management Approach and Experience</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Steps 5 and 6: The Evaluation Committee prepared a final score for the prequalification submissions and presented their recommendations on the pre-qualified teams to the Rapid Transit Senior Management Team and the Steering Committee for endorsement.

Based on the completed evaluation process and as endorsed by the Rapid Transit Senior Management Team and the Steering Committee staff recommends that the following three teams be pre-qualified for the RFP phase of the procurement process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Qualified Teams</th>
<th>Prime Team Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| GrandLinq                                               | ● Plenary Group Canada Ltd.  
● Meridiam Infrastructure Waterloo LRT ULC  
● Aecon Construction and Materials Ltd.  
● Aecon Concessions  
● Peter Kiewit Infrastructure Co.  
● Kiewit Canada Development Corp.  
● Mass Electric Construction Canada Co.  
● Keolis SA  
● Keolis Canada Inc.  
● AECOM Canada Ltd.  
● STV Canada Construction Inc.  
● CIBC World Markets Inc. |
| Kitchener Waterloo Cambridge Transit Partners           | ● Gracorp Capital Advisors Ltd.  
● Fluor Canada Ltd.  
● Connor, Clark & Lunn GVEST Traditional Infrastructure Partnership  
● Parsons Canada Ltd.  
● Parsons Enterprise Inc.  
● Graham Infrastructure LP  
● IBI Group  
● exp Services Inc.  
● E & E Seegmiller Ltd.  
● Guild Electric Ltd.  
● Alternate Concepts Inc.  
● Investec North America Ltd. |
These teams had the highest overall score and demonstrated strengths that are critical to the successful delivery of the Stage 1 light rail project. These include, but are not limited to:

- Strong financial position from all equity providers.
- Relevant experience on a number of similar and relevant projects in the range of CAD $500 million.
- Continuity and leadership throughout all phases of the planned project.
- A capable, experienced and integrated project team.
- Good understanding of the project and associated risks.
- Practical approach and experience for design and construction, maintenance and operational challenges.

2.3 Role of Fairness Monitor during the RFQ Process

The procurement process employed a Fairness Monitor to ensure that:

- The stipulated process in the RFQ document was followed appropriately.
- Each response was subject to the same degree of scrutiny.
- The evaluation criteria were applied in an unbiased and consistent manner.

The Fairness Monitor has monitored whether the conduct of the Region and its advisors during the procurement process was in accordance with the relevant procurement documents (RFQ) developed by the Region. A copy of the letter confirming the transparency and fairness of the RFQ process is attached as Appendix 2.

Their role will continue through the future phases of the procurement process up to the achievement of Financial Close. This will ensure that in its execution the procurement process adheres to the established protocol.

3. Request for Proposals

The following is a general overview of the RFP process. Upcoming reports will provide additional information about the essential terms and conditions of the RFP documents.

3.1 Overview

The RFP is expected to be issued in April, 2013. The RFP will be issued directly to the three successful pre-qualified Proponents identified through the recently completed RFQ process.

3.2 Due Diligence and Preparation of Documents

In order to release the RFP, a significant number of activities and documents need to be developed to inform the Proponents of the requirements and process to be followed through the RFP period.
The RFP document itself sets out the terms and conditions of the procurement. This includes the general governing procurement policies and procedures, along with the project specific features and requirements. As part of the RFP documentation, the proponents are provided the draft Project Agreement (PA) and the Project Specific Output Specifications (PSOS).

The PA is a series of interconnected legal agreements and schedules that provide the commercial terms and form of Contract to be executed between the Region and the Project Company at Commercial Close. This Agreement articulates the responsibilities, obligations, and risk transfer between the parties. Within the PA, the PSOS provides Proponents with all design, technical quality, operations and maintenance requirements they require for their bid submission. The PSOS defines the vision and project objectives which are essential to the enabling of private sector innovation, and acts as the source document for design evaluation and contractual compliance.

Additionally, the project team is developing the technical submission requirements, compliance checklists, and the RFP evaluation framework. These documents are critical to ensure that the Region can appropriately assess the quality of each Proposal to ensure it satisfies the requirements defined in the PSOS.

### 3.3 Release of RFP and Subsequent In-Market Activities

The in-market period will likely last about six to seven months, with Proposals submitted to the Region in the fall of 2013. During the in-market period, the Region will engage the Proponents in a number of Commercially Confidential Meetings (CCMs) relating to the PA and commercial matters, along with Design and Technical Presentation Meetings (DPMs).

The CCMs will allow the Proponents the opportunity to provide comments on the PA, and raise issues that require clarity. Prior to the CCMs, Proponents will submit a list of their issues/comments on the PA in advance for internal legal review. These meetings will allow for a confidential dialogue where the Region will respond to the comments received.

The DPMs will allow the Proponents to present their design proposal in its development stage to the Region for feedback on ideas and concepts with respect to their specific design submission.

Proponents may also issue requests for information during the in-market period, which can be classified as general information to be shared with all Proponents or as Commercially-Confidential if it relates to a specific feature of their design or commercial position. A tentative timeline for the next phases of the procurement process is presented below:

![Timeline Image](image)

During the in-market period, to help encourage local business participation on each of the three pre-qualified teams, the Region of Waterloo is partnering with the Greater Kitchener-Waterloo and Cambridge Chambers of Commerce to host a unique Rapid Transit Tradeshow on April 23, 2013. The event will feature one-on-one meetings with each of the three pre-qualified teams on the Rapid
Transit project. Local businesses and organizations will be invited to exhibit at this one-of-a-kind tradeshow and highlight their business to each of the three pre-qualified teams. The goal is to encourage local partnerships and provide opportunities for local talent to be part of building Rapid Transit in the Region.

3.4 Compliance and Evaluation

Upon submission of the proposals, each submission will be reviewed for completeness, to ensure that it conforms to the submission requirements described in the RFP. Each complete submission will then be reviewed for compliance, to ensure that the submitted design and technical quality substantially satisfies the requirements described in the PSOS.

Each compliant submission will be evaluated based on the defined Technical and Financial criteria. The highest scoring team will be identified as the Preferred Proponent (PP), who the Region will enter into negotiations with to achieve Commercial and Financial Close.

3.5 Commercial/Financial Close

Upon identification of the Preferred Proponent, the Region will enter into negotiations leading up to the execution of the PA. These negotiations will:

- Correct minor non-compliance issues, identified during the compliance review.
- Ensure that appropriate project company securities are in place.
- Address outstanding commercial requirements and items required in the PA.

Once all of these requirements have been met, the PA will be executed, achieving Commercial Close. Financial Close will occur immediately following Commercial Close when:

- Final interest rates spreads are set between the Region, Project Co. and the lenders.
- All the Lending Agreements are in place and funding is available to the Project Co. from its lenders.

4. Regional Council Involvement

Region of Waterloo Council will be required to issue approvals at the following stages of the RFP process:

- Identification of the pre-qualified three (3) teams based on the outcome of the RFQ process anticipated on March 6, 2013.
- Release of the RFP documents in April 2013.
- Significant changes to project scope or commercial terms that may arise out of discussions with Proponents during the RFP in-market period, if required.
- Identification of the Preferred Proponent, and approval to enter into negotiations to achieve Commercial/Financial Close.

In addition to the above, the Regional Council is also expected to receive for information, to direct and/or issue approvals on the following items that are critical to the success of the project:

- Overview of the RFP/PA essential terms and conditions.
- Design modifications at Grand River Hospital and associated public process.
- Recommendation on the brand name.
- Value for Money analysis of the delivery and procurement model for Stage 1 light rail project
- Provincial and Federal funding agreements.
Rail vehicle procurement.
Tradeshow overview.
aBRT/LRT stop concepts public engagement.
Burial of Hydro cables in the Hydro corridor by Hydro One Networks.
Recommendation on the brand logo.
Status and legal strategy with respect to rail issues.
Approval of aBRT stop concept designs.
Approval of Conestoga Parkway (Highway 7/8) LRT overpass construction.

The above list is not exhaustive and there may be additional reports identified.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The report supports Focus Area 3.1 of Council’s Strategic Focus: Implement a light rail transit system in the central transit corridor, fully integrated with an expanded conventional transit system.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

In 2011, the capital cost of Stage 1 of the rapid transit project was estimated to be $818 million (in 2014 dollars). On June 15, 2011 Council approved the funding for the Region’s portion of the Stage 1 capital costs ($253 million), as well as for estimated long term operating and maintenance costs, subject to annual budget deliberations. Regional staff are in the process of developing an updated funding model that will reflect all capital, operating, maintenance and financing costs over the 30 year life of the project agreement.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

This report was prepared with input from Finance, from Planning, Housing and Community Services, and from Transportation and Environmental Services.

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix 1: Request for Qualifications Evaluation Process
Appendix 2: Letter from Fairness Monitor

PREPARED BY: Darshpreet S. Bhatti, Director, Rapid Transit
Samer Inchasi, Manager RT Coordination, Rapid Transit

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Craig Dyer, Chief Financial Officer
Appendix 1: Request for Qualifications Evaluation Process

Evaluation Committee Scoring

Consensus Strengths and Weaknesses Meetings

Presentation of Results to Procurement Working Group

Council Approval of Shortlist

Shortlist Recommendation to Senior Management Team

Shortlist Recommendation to Steering Committee

Shortlist Recommendation to Planning & Works Committee

Shortlist Recommendation to Regional Council

RFQ Submissions Received November 23, 2012

Completeness Review

Conflict Review

Financial Team

Technical Teams

- Project Management
- Design and Construction
- Maintenance
- Operations

Individual Evaluations

Evaluation Committee Scoring Consensus Meeting

Meeting

Shortlist Recommendation to Senior Management Team

Shortlist Recommendation to Steering Committee

Shortlist Recommendation to Planning & Works Committee

Shortlist Recommendation to Regional Council

Council Approval of Shortlist
February 15, 2013

Mr. Darshpreet S. Bhatti, P.Eng.
Director, Rapid Transit
Transportation and Environmental Services
Region of Waterloo
50 Queen Street N., Suite 830
Kitchener, ON N2H 6P4

Subject: Region of Waterloo: Stage 1 Light Rail Project, RFQ No. 2012-01

Dear Mr. Bhatti:

P1-Consulting acted as the Fairness Commissioner to review and monitor the communications, evaluations and decision-making processes that were associated with the RFQ process for the Region of Waterloo: Stage 1 Light Rail Project in terms of ensuring fairness, equity, objectivity, transparency and adequate documentation of the evaluation process.

The Region of Waterloo ("the Region") is at a critical point in the development and implementation of Rapid Transit ("RT"). The Region, over the last decade, has carefully studied and planned on how to address the Region’s challenges and opportunities associated with population and employment growth (over 200,000 new residents and 80,000 new jobs are expected over the next 20 years). The Region went through several planning phases (including alternative transportation strategies, funding options, field/engineering reviews and community input processes) to formalize the preferred RT Program, Rapid Transit Technologies of light rail transit (LRT) and adapted Bus Rapid Transit (aBRT), alignment/route, and station locations. The preferred RT System, as approved by Regional Council for implementation on June 15, 2011, is fully aligned with the 2003 Regional Growth Management Strategy (RGMS). The approved system is expected to help mitigate urban sprawl, shape efficient transportation choices, re-urbanize/intensify the Region and improve overall environmental conditions.

In our role as Fairness Monitor, P1 Consulting made certain that the following steps were taken during the RFQ process for Stage 1 light rail project to ensure a fair and open process:

- Compliance with the requisite procurement policies and procedures and the laws of tendering for the acquisition of services relating to public sector procurement;
- Adherence to confidentiality of bids, as applicable, and the evaluation process;
- Objectivity and diligence during the procurement process in order to ensure that it was conducted in an open and transparent manner;
- Proper definition and use of evaluation procedures and assessment tools in order to ensure that the process was unbiased;
• Compliance of project participants with strict requirements of conflict of interest and confidentiality during the procurement and evaluation processes;
• Security of information;
• Prevention of any conflict of interest amongst evaluators on the selection committee;
• Oversight to provide a process where all Bidders were treated fairly.

The Fairness Monitor actively participated in the following steps in the RFQ process to ensure that fairness was maintained throughout:

• Project kick-off meeting
• Review session of the Draft RFQ Documents
• Applicant’s Meeting with potential bidders
• Review of written communication with Applicants
• Review of evaluation process and guideline
• Proposal receipt, bid evaluation and selection of the Prequalified Parties

As the Fairness Monitor for the Region of Waterloo Stage 1 Light Rail Project, we certify that, at the time at which this report was prepared, the principles of fairness, openness, consistency and transparency have, in our opinion, been maintained throughout procurement process. Furthermore, no issues emerged during the process, of which we were aware, that would impair the fairness of this initiative.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Jillian Newsome
Fairness Commissioner
REGION OF WATERLOO
TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
Water Services

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

DATE: February 26, 2013

SUBJECT: CONSULTANT SELECTION FOR THE EAST SIDE LANDS PUMPING STATION AND FORCEMAIN CLASS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND PRELIMINARY DESIGN

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into a Consulting Services Agreement with Associated Engineering Ltd. of Kitchener, Ontario, to provide consulting engineering services for undertaking the East Side Lands Pumping Station and Forcemain Class Environmental Assessment (EA) and Preliminary Design, at an upset limit of $456,690 plus applicable taxes, as per Report E-13-021, dated February 26, 2013.

SUMMARY:

The Region of Waterloo (Region) approved a Growth Management Strategy in 2003. This Strategy identified where, when and how future residential and employment growth will be accommodated within the Region. As part of the Strategy, the East Side Lands were identified as a significant opportunity for employment development. The Region, in partnership with the City of Cambridge and the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) and in cooperation with the Township of Woolwich and the City of Kitchener, is in the process of finalizing a Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MESP) for the East Side Lands. The MESP identifies municipal servicing requirements for the area for short and long term development.

This study will develop upon the wastewater servicing requirements identified in the MESP. This will include the identification of a location for the construction of a Regional pumping station to service the East Side Lands, the preferred forcemain alignment to convey sanitary flows from the East Side Lands to the Kitchener Wastewater Treatment Plant and opportunities for construction staging based on the projected development schedule.

A Request for Consulting Services was advertised in the Kitchener-Waterloo Record and on the Region’s Website. Based on the Region’s consultant selection policy, which includes a review of the Letter of Interest, detailed work plans, schedules and upset fee cost, and of the Region’s Purchasing By Law, the consultant selection team recommends that Associated Engineering Ltd. of Kitchener, Ontario be retained to undertake this assignment at an upset fee limit of $456,690 plus applicable taxes.

Completion of this assignment is expected to be in early 2015, after which the preferred alternative for the East Side Lands pumping station and forcemain, as identified in this EA, will proceed to detailed design and construction.
REPORT:

Background
The “East Side Lands” refers to an area of land located in the eastern portion of Waterloo Region (Region) surrounding the Waterloo Regional Airport. These lands have been identified as a potential development area to accommodate future Greenfield growth in the Region. The East Side Lands are just over 4000 hectares and are located within portions of the City of Cambridge and the Township of Woolwich, with a small area in the City of Kitchener.

The Region, in partnership with the City of Cambridge and the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) and in cooperation with the Township of Woolwich and the City of Kitchener, is undertaking a Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MESP) to examine requirements to provide infrastructure to service the East Side Lands. Development within this area is planned to occur in stages. Infrastructure must be able to service the needs of the near term development and also be able to accommodate ultimate anticipated growth for the area.

The scope of this project is to build upon the findings of the MESP and complete a schedule B Class Environmental Assessment (EA) for the East Side Lands Sanitary Pumping Station and Forcemain. The consultant will identify and evaluate alternative solutions for the location of a Regional sanitary pumping station, alignment of a forcemain to convey the flows to the Kitchener Wastewater Treatment Plant and opportunities for construction staging. Evaluations will be based on environmental, cultural, social, natural, technical and economic criteria.

The final recommended solution along with documented accounts of the public input process will be filed in an Environmental Study Report (ESR). Upon completion of the EA study, preliminary design of the recommended solution will be developed, and all major infrastructure and equipment associated with the Regional pumping station and forcemain will be identified.

Consultant Selection

A Request for Consultant Services for the East Side Lands Pumping Station and Forcemain Class EA and Preliminary Design was advertised in the Kitchener-Waterloo Record and on the Region’s Website on October 15, 2012. The Region received twelve submissions of Letter of Interest and three firms were short listed based on the Quality and Equity Factors, and asked to submit detailed work plans and upset fees for this assignment. The three short listed consultants were:

- Associated Engineering;
- Stantec Consulting Ltd.; and
- MMM Group.

The Project Team involved in the consultant selection consisted of:

J. Cavalcante, Manager, Engineering and Planning, Water Services
K. Yajima, Senior Project Engineer, Engineering and Planning, Water Services
T. Brown, Senior Project Engineer, Wastewater Operations, Water Services
P. Law, Senior Project Engineer, Engineering and Planning, Water Services

The evaluation criteria used for selecting the successful consultant were consistent with the Region’s Purchasing By-Law and consultant selection policies. The evaluation criteria and their respective weightings were as follows:
Quality Factors (80%)
- Project Approach and Understanding (25%)
- Experience of the Project Manager (20%)
- Experience of Project Support Staff (20%)
- Experience on Similar Projects (15%)

Equity Factors (5%)
- Current Regional Workload (3%)
- Local Office (2%)

Price Factor (15%)
- Upset Price (15%)

The Letters of Interest and Detailed Work Plans submitted by the three short listed consultants demonstrated a good understanding of the project, capable project teams and experience on similar projects. After reviewing the Letters of Interest, Detailed Work Plans, schedules, and upset fees, Associated Engineering Ltd. had the highest overall score. Associated Engineering’s cost for this proposal was higher than the other two short listed consultants. However, their approach and understanding of potential issues for this project was better than the other two consultants. Based on this evaluation, the project team recommends that Associated Engineering Ltd. be retained to undertake this assignment at an upset fee limit of $456,690 plus applicable taxes.

Scope of Work

The scope of work for this assignment includes:

- Class EA Framework Preparation;
- Collecting and Reviewing Background Information;
- Confirming Future Wastewater Servicing Requirements;
- Identification of Potential Pumping Station Configurations and Locations;
- Identification of Impact and Mitigation Measures;
- Development of Evaluation Criteria;
- Alternatives Comparison Workshop;
- Summary of Preliminary Preferred Alternative;
- Public Consultation;
- Draft and Final EA Report; and
- Preliminary Design;

Schedule

Subject to Council’s approval of this assignment, the proposed schedule for the Class EA is approximately twenty four (24) months commencing in March 2013 and ending in March 2015.

Consultant Upset Limit

The upset limit for consulting fees and disbursements for the East Side Lands Pumping Station Class EA and preliminary design is $456,690 plus applicable taxes. A breakdown of the successful consultant’s upset fee is included in Appendix A attached to this report.
CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The East Side Lands Pumping Station and Forcemain Class EA and Preliminary Design support the Corporate Strategic Focus Area 2: “Growth Management and Prosperity”, Strategic Objective 2.2: “Develop, Optimize and Maintain Infrastructure to Meet Current and Projected Needs.”

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The 2013 Ten Year Wastewater Capital program includes a total combined budget of $11,000,000 for the implementation of the East Side Lands Pumping Station and Forcemain, including $1,000,000 in the year 2013 – 2015, which is sufficient for the completion of this assignment.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

NIL

ATTACHMENTS

Appendix A: Breakdown of consultant’s upset fee

PREPARED BY: Pam Law, Senior Project Engineer, Water Services

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
### Breakdown of Consultant’s Upset Fee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td>Class EA Framework Preparation</td>
<td>$5,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>Collect &amp; Review Background Information</td>
<td>$33,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3</td>
<td>Confirm Future Wastewater Servicing Requirements</td>
<td>$36,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4</td>
<td>Identify Pumping Station Configurations &amp; Locations</td>
<td>$53,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5</td>
<td>Identify Impacts &amp; Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>$30,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 6</td>
<td>Develop Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td>$7,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 7</td>
<td>Alternatives Comparison Workshop</td>
<td>$23,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 8</td>
<td>Summary of Preferred Alternative</td>
<td>$84,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 9</td>
<td>Draft Environmental Screening Report</td>
<td>$19,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 10</td>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>$13,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 11</td>
<td>Final Environmental Screening Report</td>
<td>$9,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 12</td>
<td>Preliminary Design</td>
<td>$140,555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Consultant Upset Fee:** $456,690
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: February 26, 2013

FILE CODE: E12-40/8294

SUBJECT: ST JACOBS - ELMIRA WASTEWATER TREATMENT MASTER PLAN: NOTICE OF COMPLETION

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo receive the report entitled “St. Jacobs - Elmira Wastewater Treatment Master Plan” prepared by XCG Consultants Inc. dated February 2013, according to Report E-13-028 dated February 26, 2013;

AND THAT Regional Municipality of Waterloo issue the Notice of Completion of the St. Jacobs - Elmira Wastewater Treatment Master Plan and file the Master Plan Report for public review in accordance with Municipal Engineers Association Master Planning requirements.

SUMMARY:

The goal of the St. Jacobs - Elmira Wastewater Treatment Master Plan is to develop a long term wastewater treatment strategy for the communities of St. Jacobs and Elmira, to ensure that there is sufficient treatment capacity to service the existing population and new planned growth for these communities. The strategy will define infrastructure requirements and staging necessary to support growth in this community to the year 2041. The Master Plan also addressed the possibility of decommissioning the existing Heidelberg Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) and transferring its flows to the St. Jacobs WWTP.

The study is being conducted in accordance with the Master Planning requirements of the Municipal Engineers Association Class Environmental Assessment process (June 2000, as amended in 2007 and 2011). The Master Plan will follow Phases 1 and 2 of the Municipal Class EA process.

Consultation with the public, interested parties, municipalities and government agencies was conducted including one Public Information Centre. As part of the master plan, alternatives were evaluated against environmental, social, economic and technical criteria.

The major conclusions and recommendations from the Master Plan are:

- There is sufficient capacity at the Elmira Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) to 2041 with the continuation of inflow and infiltration (I/I) reduction in the collection system and some ongoing optimization of the existing plant;

- The preferred alternative for St. Jacobs is to decommission the existing WWTP and
construct a pumping station to transfer flows to the Waterloo WWTP.

- The preferred solution for Heidelberg is to maintain the existing WWTP and periodically assess the plant for future opportunities.

The background studies, evaluation of wastewater treatment alternatives, public consultation and proposed work have been documented in a Master Plan Report. Regional staff is recommending that the Notice of Completion be issued and this report be made available for 30 day public review in order to complete the Municipal Engineers Association Master Planning requirements.

REPORT:

Background

The communities of St. Jacobs and Elmira are located in the Township of Woolwich in the northern part of the Region of Waterloo (Region). Each community has its own wastewater collection and treatment system. The Township of Woolwich owns, operates and maintains the collection systems while the Region owns, operates and maintains the WWTPs.

The St. Jacobs WWTP was originally constructed in 1971 and was upgraded and expanded in 2000, based on recommendations from a Class Environmental Assessment (EA) completed by the Region in 1997. The current facility has a rated capacity of 1,450 m$^3$/d. The Elmira WWTP was originally constructed in 1967 and was expanded in 1983 and 2000. The current facility has a rated capacity of 7,800 m$^3$/d. Both communities have elevated inflow and infiltration (I/I) contributions to the sewer system. From 1997 to 2008, the Township of Woolwich undertook I/I reduction programs in these systems. The Region shared 50% of these costs as part of an agreement that expired in 2008. Currently, the Township continues with the implementation of the I/I program, as I/I flows remain elevated in these communities.

A Region wide Wastewater Treatment Master Plan was completed in 2007. This study recommended a separate Master Plan be completed for St. Jacobs and Elmira to address the wastewater treatment requirements for these two communities. Separate from this Master Plan, it was also identified there may be opportunities for incorporating sanitary flows from the community of Heidelberg, located approximately 8 km west of St. Jacobs to the St. Jacobs WWTP, allowing the decommissioning of the Heidelberg WWTP.

In 2010, the Region initiated the St. Jacobs – Elmira Wastewater Treatment Master Plan to ensure that there is sufficient wastewater treatment capacity to service the existing population and new planned growth to the year 2041. The study involves development of future population and flow projections, assessment of constraints and opportunities associated with the current treatment processes, development and evaluation of treatment alternatives and the selection of a preferred long term treatment strategy.

Population and Flow Projections

The current and future population projections for the communities of St. Jacobs and Elmira were provided by the Region of Waterloo Department of Planning, Housing and Community Services (Planning) and the Planning Department of the Township of Woolwich. These projections are summarized below along with associated wastewater flow projections.
The Heidelberg WWTP was designed to service 90 homes in this settlement area, and no change in the serviced population is expected.

**Development and Evaluation of Alternatives**

A number of alternatives to address the wastewater treatment needs for Elmira, St. Jacobs and Heidelberg were developed.

With the continuation of the Township’s I/I reduction program, the Region completing ongoing plant upgrades by 2013 and sewer use by law enforcement for reducing impacts of industrial loadings in the plant, it is expected that the Elmira WWTP existing rated capacity of the plant will be sufficient to service the community past the year 2041.

Based on the flow projections, the capacity of the St. Jacobs WWTP would likely be realized by the year 2021. A long list of alternatives for servicing St. Jacobs was developed. These alternatives were short listed based on their ability to meet project objectives. The short listed alternatives for St. Jacobs are listed below:

- Upgrade and expand the existing St. Jacobs WWTP
- Decommission the St. Jacobs WWTP and transfer flows to the Waterloo WWTP
- Upgrade the existing plant and transfer flows beyond the existing capacity of the St. Jacobs WWTP to the Waterloo WWTP.

Alternatives evaluated for the Heidelberg WWTP included maintaining the existing plant or transferring all flows to either the St. Jacobs WWTP or Waterloo WWTP.

The alternatives were evaluated against environmental, social, economic and technical criteria. Based on the results of the evaluation the preferred alternatives were to decommission the St. Jacobs WWTP and transfer all flows to the Waterloo WWTP, and to maintain the Heidelberg WWTP. The Heidelberg WWTP is relatively new and abandonment of it was not preferred. However, as the plant reaches its life span in the future, pumping the flows to the Waterloo WWTP should be reevaluated.

The preferred solution would include the decommissioning of the existing St. Jacobs WWTP, the construction of a new pumping station and a new forcemain to convey the flows to the Waterloo WWTP catchment area. Flows will be conveyed through existing collection sewers within the City of Waterloo. The City of Waterloo was involved in the Master Planning process and the Region will be involved in the City’s Sanitary Master Plan, planned to commence in 2013, which will include looking at the impact of receiving flows from St. Jacobs into their local collection system. It is being recommended that the new pumping station be in operation by 2024 to align with the proposed expansion of the Waterloo WWTP. Diversion of flows will not happen until the Waterloo WWTP has been expanded and therefore will not impact projected flows.
growth in the City of Waterloo. The Township's continuation of their I/I reduction program in combination with lower flows associated with new development should allow for the existing WWTP to have sufficient capacity to this date.

This alternative represents the lowest capital and life cycle cost of all of the alternatives, based on a 30 year life cycle cost analysis and an estimated capital cost of $7.2 million. The preferred option is 11% lower than the next lowest life cycle cost. The replacement of the existing WWTP with a pumping station reduces the operational complexity of the system and transferring the flows to the Waterloo WWTP has an environmental benefit of discharging to the Grand River which has a greater ability to assimilate treated effluent as compared to the Conestogo River which is the current receiving water body for the St. Jacobs WWTP.

Public Consultation

A Public Information Centre (PIC) was held on December 4, 2012, at the St. Jacobs Community Centre. Notices of the PIC were posted in the Kitchener Record, the Woolwich Observer, the Elmira Independent, the Region's website and also mailed to interested parties, municipalities and government agencies. Nine persons attended the PIC and no comment sheets were submitted to the Region. Two emails were received following the PIC requesting some additional information on how populations were forecasted.

Next Steps

Subject to Regional Council approval of the recommendations of this report, a Notice of Completion of the St. Jacobs - Elmira Wastewater Treatment Master Plan will be issued according to Municipal Engineers Association Master Planning requirements. The Notice of Completion will be posted in local newspapers and mailed to interested parties, municipalities and government agencies. Upon Region Council approval, the Master Plan Report will be made available for a minimum 30 day public review period from March 11 to April 12 at the Region of Waterloo Headquarters, the Township of Woolwich Municipal Offices and on the Regional website.

Following approval of the St. Jacobs - Elmira Wastewater Treatment Master Plan, the Region will initiate a Class Environmental Assessment for the facilities identified in the preferred alternative of this Master Plan.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

Implementation of the updated preferred alternative for the St. Jacobs - Elmira Wastewater Treatment Master Plan will support the Region's Strategic Plan Focus Area 2: Growth Management and Prosperity, Strategic Objective 2.2, Develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs.
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The Region’s 2013, Ten Year Wastewater Capital Program provides $10.1 million between 2015 and 2022 for the design, construction administration and construction of the new Wastewater Pumping Station and Forcemain recommended in the St. Jacobs – Elmira Wastewater Treatment Master Plan. More detailed cost estimates will be developed during the preliminary and detailed design phases of the project.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

NIL

ATTACHMENTS:

NIL

PREPARED BY: Pam Law, Senior Project Engineer, Water Services

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

DATE: February 26, 2013   FILE CODE: E04-80/MOE.QTY; C06-60/PW/WS.12

SUBJECT: 2012 ANNUAL WATER QUALITY REPORT FOR THE REGION OF WATERLOO RURAL AND INTEGRATED WATER SYSTEMS

RECOMMENDATION:

For information only.

SUMMARY: NIL

REPORT:

Background

To meet the reporting requirements under Ontario Regulation 170/03, the Region of Waterloo issues an Annual Water Quality Report by February 28, and an Annual Summary Report by March 31, of each year.

A total of 49 Water Quality Reports are prepared covering the period January 1, to December 31, 2012, to summarize water quality for each water supply system in the Region and each distribution system operated by the Region in the Townships of Wellesley and North Dumfries. These individual reports are presented in the Region’s 2012 Annual Water Quality Report. The key finding of this report is that municipal drinking water delivered by the Region during 2012 met the necessary requirements under the Safe Drinking Water Act. The report will be placed in the Councilors’ Library by February 28, 2013, and will also be forwarded to the cities and townships within the Region and made available to the public.

Annual Water Quality Report

The purpose of the 2012 Annual Water Quality Report is to provide a comprehensive document on all the water quality data. The Ministry of the Environment (MOE) has established six criteria to be included in the report:

1. A brief description of the drinking water systems including a list of water treatment chemicals used;
2. A summary of any reports made to the MOE under the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) (18(1)) Duty to report adverse test results or the O. Reg. 170/03 Section 16 (16-4) Duty to report other observations;
3. A summary of the result of tests required under this O. Reg. 170/03 or a Certificate of Approval or a MOE Order; or the most recent results taken;
4. A description of any corrective action under the O. Reg. 170/03 Schedule 16 Reporting adverse test results and other problems, Schedule 17 Corrective Action (Large Municipal Residential) and Schedule 18 Corrective Action (Small Municipal Residential);
5. A description of any significant expenses incurred to install, repair or replace required
equipment;
6. A statement on where the Annual Summary Report can be viewed (required by March 31).

In accordance with the Regulation, the Region ensures that a copy of the Annual Water Quality Report is provided to the owners of the receiving systems, is available free of charge from Water Services, and is posted on the Region's website. The Region has been publishing annual water quality reports since 1994.

**Ontario Drinking Water Quality Standards**

The MOE established the water quality sampling and analytical requirements through their Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA), O. Reg. 170/03, O. Reg. 169/03, various regulation amendments, municipal drinking water licenses and MOE orders. There are three types of drinking water quality standards, objectives and guidelines:

1) health-related standards, to protect public health;
2) aesthetic objectives, and
3) operational guidelines to ensure efficient treatment and distribution of the water.

**Water Quality Monitoring Programs**

Water samples are collected from all Regional water sources throughout the year, using the sampling protocols established by the MOE. Most of these samples are analyzed at the Regional Laboratory. The bacteriological quality of each water source is tested once a week. Testing for chemical and physical analyses are done in accordance with the regulation, acts, certificates of approval and MOE orders. The quality of the water is continuously monitored at many strategic locations throughout the Region using the computerized telecommunication system known as Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition System (SCADA) located at the Mannheim Water Treatment Plant. The MOE also checks the quality of the Region's water every year during their Annual Inspections Program. The reports for the Wellesley and North Dumfries Water Distribution Systems included the water quality from their respective supply sources. The results of these analyses are presented in the 49 water quality reports.

In 2008, changes to the regulations were made to include health-related lead sampling requirements for distribution systems. For each individual distribution system, sampling was required of residential, non-residential and distribution sites, with the number of samples needed based on population. Within the changes to the regulation, the opportunity exists to reduce the number of samples required and the frequency of sampling based on consecutive rounds of results being below the maximum acceptable concentration for lead. After the final round of sampling in 2011 and in accordance with the O. Reg 170/03, all 8 of the Region's distribution systems qualified for plumbing exempt status. This exemption confirms that sampling the internal plumbing of peoples' homes and businesses is no longer a requirement. The Region is required to test the distribution system hydrants and blow-offs for pH and alkalinity twice per year and lead every third year (2014) in all 8 of our distribution systems: Wellesley, St. Clements, Linwood, Heidelberg (Wellesley side), Roseville, Branchton Meadows, Lloyd Brown and Ayr. Water quality will be monitored and barring any changes as determined by the MOE or a change to O.Reg170/03, the plumbing exempt status will remain indefinitely.

Under the regulation for lead monitoring, municipal distribution systems are required to prepare a corrosion control plan or to apply for relief from a corrosion control plan when greater than 10 % of the samples exceed the maximum acceptable concentration (MAC) for lead in at least two sampling rounds out of the last three. As a two tier municipality, the Region, as the water supplier for the system, is required to provide a letter of support to the local municipalities if this type of
exceedance occurs. The Elmira/St. Jacob’s distribution samples had greater than 10% exceedance of the MAC for lead. Township of Woolwich chose to apply and received relief from a corrosion control plan and the Region provided a letter of support for this request of relief. No further action is required at this time and the plan complies with the requirement in the Safe Drinking Water Act.

The Local Municipalities will be issuing separate Annual Water Quality Reports for their Water Quality Monitoring on the distribution system.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The Annual Water Quality Report supports Focus Area 1: Environmental sustainability.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Nil

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

The Public Health Department has reviewed this report.

ATTACHMENTS:

Nil

PREPARED BY: Olga Vrentzos, Manager, Operations and Maintenance, Water Services

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

DATE: February 26, 2013 FILE CODE: C04-30/PWC/CORR

SUBJECT: 2013 PLANNING AND WORKS PROJECT TEAM MEMBERSHIP

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo appoint Regional Councillors to the project and study teams as noted in Appendix A to Report No. E-13-026/P-13-013, dated February 26, 2013;

AND THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo forward the requests for area Councillor representatives on project and study teams to the Area Municipalities.

SUMMARY:

NIL

REPORT:

Major Planning and Transportation and Environmental Services projects or studies have been directed, for many years, by multi-disciplinary project teams which have usually included one or more Regional or Area Municipal Councillors. The involvement of elected officials has always made a significant, positive impact on the successful completion of these projects. These committees and project teams are distinct from formal sub-committees of Council (e.g. Water Efficiency Advisory Committee), whose Council members have already been appointed.

A list of ongoing Steering Committees and major projects and studies to be undertaken in 2013, including the current political or stakeholder representatives on each group, is provided in Appendix A.

Those projects and studies which do not already have and would most benefit from political representative(s) are noted in the table below. These are typically projects which may have high public interest and/or significant implications for the Region. In addition to the projects listed below, participation by Councillors on any of the project teams noted in Appendix A is welcomed. After appointing appropriate Regional Councillors to these teams, it is recommended that this list be forwarded to the appropriate Area Municipalities to provide them an opportunity to appoint their Councillors to some of the project teams.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Suggested Council Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Access Policy</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>1 Regional Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Area Municipality</td>
<td>Suggested Council Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Pedestrian and Transit Access to Hanson Avenue</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>1 Regional Councillor 1 Local Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Swan Street Improvements, Hilltop Drive to Stanley Street and Northumberland Street, Swan Street to Rail Tracks - Design in 2013-2015 - Construction in 2016</td>
<td>North Dumfries</td>
<td>1 Regional Councillor Sue Foxton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Dundas Street Improvements, Elgin Street to Hespeler Road, Cambridge - Design 2013-2016 - Construction 2017</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>1 Local Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Sawmill Road Improvements, King Street to Waterloo / St Jacobs Tracks - Design 2013-2016 - Construction 2017</td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>1 Local Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Sawmill Road Improvements, River St. to Snyders Flats Road - Design 2014-2015 - Construction 2016</td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>1 Local Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Fountain Street Improvements, King St. to Cherry Blossom Road - Design 2013-2015 - Construction 2016</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>1 Regional Councillor 1 Local Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>King Street Reconstruction, Bishop Street to Eagle Street - Design 2013-2016 - Construction 2017</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>1 Local Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Ottawa Street Reconstruction, Fischer-Hallman Road to Westmount Road - Design 2013-2016 - Construction 2017</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>1 Local Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Area Municipality</td>
<td>Suggested Council Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Arthur Street Reconstruction, Whippoorwill to First Street - Design 2013-2016 - Construction 2017</td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>1 Local Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Fountain Street Widening, Maple Grove Rd to Kossuth Road - Design 2013-2017 - Construction 2018</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>1 Regional Councillor 1 Local Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>Conestoga Plains Water Supply System Upgrade</td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>1 Regional Councillor 1 Local Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>William Street and Strange Street Water Supply Upgrades</td>
<td>Kitchener Waterloo</td>
<td>1 Regional Councillor 1 Councillor Kitchener 1 Councillor Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>Baden and New Hamburg Waste Water Treatment Plant Expansion Class Environmental Assessment</td>
<td>Baden/New Hamburg</td>
<td>1 Regional Councillor 1 Local Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>Hespeler Waste Water Treatment Plant Expansion Class Environmental Assessment</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>1 Regional Councillor 1 Local Councillor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

The involvement of Regional Councillors on Transportation and Environmental Services and Planning, Housing and Community Services Project Teams is consistent with the Strategic Focus Area Six: Service Excellence which ensures that the Region’s programs and services foster a culture of citizen/customer service that is responsive to community needs.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

The costs for the various projects outlined in Appendix A to Report E-13-026/P-13-013 are included in each Division budget.

**OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:**

NIL

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Appendix A – Planning and Works – Project Teams – 2013

**PREPARED AND APPROVED BY:**

Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services  
Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Housing and Community Services
# APPENDIX A

## PLANNING AND WORKS – PROJECT TEAMS – 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Political/Stakeholder Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>GENERAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Advisory Committees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Ecological and Environmental Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wayne Caston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ted Creeese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lauren Cymbaly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ron Donaldson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patrick Duxbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jared Ehgoetz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Laura Ehnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alison Featherstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alge Merry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greg Michalenko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Claudette Millar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Younus Muhammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Priddle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amy Woroch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>King-Victoria Transit Hub</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Wideman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jean Haalboom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sean Strickland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dan Glenn-Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Heritage Planning Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jean Haalboom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wendy Wright Cascaden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ron Hacket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marg Rowell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Natalie Hardacre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patricia Wagner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Al Junker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carolyn Coakley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Waters-Heinrichs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Les Kadar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Terrence Gallamore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PLANNING AND WORKS – PROJECT TEAMS – 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Political/Stakeholder Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRANSIT Advisory Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Specialized Transit Services Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joyce Barlow, Greg Bechard, Alfred Bott, Felix Codat, Karen Ferguson, Sharon Giles, Jean Haalboom, Tom Livingstone, Laurie Modderman, Myrna Nicholas, Jay Oswald, Mark Urquhart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Goods Movement Study</td>
<td></td>
<td>Geoff Lorentz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Electronic Fare Payment System</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Jim Wideman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>aBRT Implementation</td>
<td>Kitchener/Cambridge</td>
<td>Claudette Millar, John Gazzola, Pam Wolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Access Policy</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>1 Regional Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Pedestrian and Transit Access to Hanson Avenue</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>1 Regional Councillor, 1 Local Councillor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PLANNING AND WORKS – PROJECT TEAMS – 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Political/Stakeholder Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RAPID TRANSIT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Steering Committees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rapid Transit Steering Committee</td>
<td>Cambridge/Kitchener/Waterloo</td>
<td>Jim Wideman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tom Galloway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sean Strickland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Claudette Millar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TRANSPORTATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Aeronautical Noise Management Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Berry Vrbanovic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scott Davey (alternate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Donna Reid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bonnie Bryant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Geoff Lorentz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art Sinclair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Stoddart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Matthew Bather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gary Tomic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Wagner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christine Rier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joan Gross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Connors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barry Aylward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Steve Darling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Active Transportation Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Geoff Lorentz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jane Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Airport Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sean Strickland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Wideman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Geoff Lorentz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>King Street, Eagle Street to Fountain Street, King Street to Shantz Hill</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>Jane Brewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road - EA and Design 2012-2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>Karl Kiefer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction in 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Area Municipality</td>
<td>Political/Stakeholder Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>South Boundary Road, Water Street to Franklin Boulevard</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>Rob Deutschmann, Gary Price, Ted Higgins, Doug Craig, Neil Ritchie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design in 2013-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction in 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Ottawa Street Improvements Transportation Study, Alpine Road to Homer Watson</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>Tom Galloway, Jim Wideman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boulevard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design in 2013-2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction in 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Eagle Street Resurfacing, Hespeler Road to Concession Road</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>Jane Brewer, Karl Kiefer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction in 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Franklin Boulevard Widening – Pinebush Road to Myers Road</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>Doug Craig, Ben Tucci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design in 2013-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction in 2013-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Homer Watson Improvements, Doon South Drive to Conestoga College Boulevard</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>Tom Galloway, Jean Haalboom, Yvonne Fernandes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Environmental Assessment in 2013-2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design in 2014-2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction in 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Hespeler Road Grade Separation at CP Rail</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>Jane Brewer, Pam Wolf, Ben Tucci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction Completion in 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Fairway Road Extension – Zeller Drive to Regional Road 17</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>Pam Wolf, Tom Galloway, Berry Vrbanovic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction Completion in 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Political/Stakeholder Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 23. | Westmount Road Reconstruction - Highland Road to Victoria Street - Design in 2013 - Construction in 2013 | Kitchener | Carl Zehr
|     |                                                                              |          | Zyg Janecki                                           |
| 24. | Victoria Street, Edna Street to Bruce Street - Design in 2013 - Construction in 2014 | Kitchener | Daniel Glenn-Graham Scott Davey                        |
|     |                                                                              |          | Jim Wideman                                           |
|     |                                                                              |          | Kelly Galloway-Sealock                                 |
|     |                                                                              |          | Herb Neher                                            |
| 28. | Highland Road Improvements, Patricia Avenue to Westmount Road - Design in 2013 - Construction in 2014 | Kitchener | Frank Etherington                                     |
|     |                                                                              |          | Zyg Janecki                                           |
| 29. | Bishop Street Improvements, Conestoga Blvd to Concession Road, - Design in 2013-2014 - Construction in 2015 | Cambridge | Karl Kiefer                                           |
| 30. | Westmount Road Improvements, Greenbrook Drive to Highland Road - Design in 2013 - Construction in 2013 | Kitchener | Zyg Janecki                                           |
| 31. | University Avenue Improvements, Lincoln Road to Weber Street - Construction in 2013 - 2014 | Waterloo | Mark Whaley                                           |
## PLANNING AND WORKS – PROJECT TEAMS – 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Political/Stakeholder Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 32. | Swan Street Improvements, Hilltop Drive to Stanley Street and Northumberland Street /Stanley Street, Swan Street to Rail Tracks  
- Design in 2013-2015  
- Construction in 2016 | North Dumfries    | 1 Regional Councillor  
Sue Foxton |
| 33. | Spragues Road Improvements, Brant/Waterloo Boundary to Wrigley Road  
- Design in 2013  
- Construction in 2014 | North Dumfries    | Gord Taylor |
| 34. | River Road Extension, King Street to Manitou Drive  
- Environmental Assessment – Ongoing  
- Construction in 2016 | Kitchener         | Jim Wideman  
Jean Haalboom  
John Gazzola  
Berry Vrbanovic  
Claudette Millar |
| 35. | Weber Street Improvements, Benjamin Road to King Street  
- Design in 2013-2014  
- Construction in 2015 | Waterloo          | Mark Bauman  
Jeff Henry |
| 36. | Weber Street Improvement, King Street to Millford Avenue  
- Design in 2013-2014  
- Construction in 2015 | Waterloo          | Diane Freeman  
Jeff Henry |
| 37. | Sawmill Road, Conestoga Bridge to Musselman and Northfield Drive, Country Spring Walk to South Village Line  
- Design in 2013-2015  
- Construction in 2016 | Woolwich          | Bonnie Bryant |
| 38. | Northfield Drive Widening, Davenport Road to University Avenue  
- Design in 2013-2014  
- Construction in 2015 | Waterloo          | Sean Strickland  
Diane Freeman |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Political/Stakeholder Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Church Street Improvements, Barnswallow Drive to Herbert Street, Elmira</td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>Allan Poffenroth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design in 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Julie-Anne Herteis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction in 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Bloomingdale Drive, Kraft Street to Bridge Street</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>Scott Davey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design in 2013-2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction in 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Frederick Street Improvements, Duke Street to Lancaster Street</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>Dan Glenn-Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design in 2013-2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jean Haalboom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction in 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Ottawa Street Improvements, Mill Street to Pattondon Drive</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>Frank Etherington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design in 2013-2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction in 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Snyders Road and Notre Dame Drive Improvements, Petersburg</td>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td>Peter Roe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design in 2013-2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction in 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>King Street Improvements, Printery Road to Sawmill Road, St. Jacobs</td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>Mark Bauman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design in 2013-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction in 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Bridge Street Improvements, Woolwich Street to University Avenue</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>Scott Davey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design in 2013-2016</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>Mark Whaley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction in 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Church Street Improvements, Arthur Street to Spruce Lane, Elmira</td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>Julie-Ann Herteis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design in 2013-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction in 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PLANNING AND WORKS – PROJECT TEAMS – 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Political/Stakeholder Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Manitou Drive Reconstruction, Homer Watson Blvd. to Bleams Road</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>John Gazzola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design in 2013-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction in 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Ainslie Street Reconstruction, Walnut Street to Dickson Street</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>Ben Tucci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design in 2013-2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction in 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Manitou Drive Improvements, Bleams Road to Fairway Road</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>Jean Haalboom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design 2013-2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Gazzola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Highway 401 Access Improvements Study, Trussler Road to Homer Watson Boulevard</td>
<td>Kitchener and North Dumfries</td>
<td>Jim Wideman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Environmental Assessment in 2013-2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sean Strickland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ben Benninger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>East Boundary Road Corridor Planning Study</td>
<td>Cambridge and North Dumfries</td>
<td>Jane Brewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Environmental Assessment in 2013-2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>Neil Ritchie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gary Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Cedar Street Reconstruction, Osborne Street to Cambridge Boundary and St. Andrews Street Improvements, Cambridge Boundary to Grand Avenue</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>Pam Wolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design 2013-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gary Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Kressler Road, Lobsinger Line to Apollo Drive</td>
<td>Wellesley Woolwich</td>
<td>Mark Bauman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design 2013-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PLANNING AND WORKS – PROJECT TEAMS – 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Political/Stakeholder Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Dundas Street Improvements, Elgin Street to Hespeler Road, Cambridge</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td><strong>1 Local Councillor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design 2013-2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Ottawa Street Improvements, Highway 7 to Lackner Blvd.</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td><strong>1 Local Councillor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design 2013-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction 2016-2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Sawmill Road Improvements, King Street to Waterloo / St Jacobs Tracks</td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td><strong>1 Local Councillor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design 2013-2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Sawmill Road Improvements, River St. to Snyder's Flats Road</td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td><strong>1 Local Councillor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design 2014-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Fountain Street Improvements, King St. to Cherry Blossom Rd</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td><strong>1 Regional Councillor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design 2013-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1 Local Councillor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Highland Road Improvements, Highland Hills Mall Entrance to Trussler Road</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td><strong>1 Regional Councillor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- EA 2014-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1 Local Councillor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design 2016-2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>University Avenue Improvements Keats Way to Erb Street</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td><strong>1 Regional Councillor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- EA 2014-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1 Local Councillor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design 2016-2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>King Street Reconstruction, Bishop St to Eagle St</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td><strong>1 Local Councillor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design 2013-2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PLANNING AND WORKS – PROJECT TEAMS – 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Political/Stakeholder Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Ottawa Street Reconstruction, Fischer-Hallman Road to Westmount Road</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>1 Local Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design 2013-2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Arthur Street Reconstruction, Whippoorwill to First Street</td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>1 Local Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design 2013-2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Fountain Street Widening, Maple Grove Rd to Kossuth Rd</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>1 Regional Councillor 1 Local Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design 2013-2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## WATER SERVICES

### Advisory Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Water Efficiency Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Les Armstrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tom Galloway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lou Lima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Claudette Millar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>James Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ken Seiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Katherine Waybrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pete Leonard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Wideman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Toal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>Source Water Protection Liaison Committee</td>
<td>Jean Haalboom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Well Interference Appeals Committee</td>
<td>Ken Seiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Les Armstrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ross Kelterborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Todd Cowan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rob Deutschmann</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PLANNING AND WORKS – PROJECT TEAMS – 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Political/Stakeholder Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>Integrated Urban System Groundwater Study, Cambridge East Environmental Assessment</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>Donna Reid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>Wilmot Centre Monitoring Program and Public Liaison Committee</td>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td>Les Armstrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>Maple Grove Area Water Supply Environmental Assessment</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>Rick Cowsill Claudette Millar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>Water Distribution/Operations Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>None required at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>Water Supply Master Plan – Update</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Jane Brewer Jean Haalboom Jane Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>Conestoga Plains Water Supply System Upgrade</td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>1 Regional Councillor 1 Local Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>William Street and Strange Street Water Supply Upgrades</td>
<td>Kitchener Waterloo</td>
<td>1 Regional Councillor 1 Councillor Kitchener 1 Councillor Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>Hespeler Water Supply Class Environmental Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>None required at this time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Water Supply – Design and Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Political/Stakeholder Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>Zone 6 – New Reservoir - Construction in 2012-2013</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>None required at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>Mannheim Chemical Storage Building - Construction in 2013</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>None required at this time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PLANNING AND WORKS – PROJECT TEAMS – 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Political/Stakeholder Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 78. | ASR Stage 2, Mannheim Water Treatment Plant  
- Design in 2013-1014  
- Construction in 2015-2016 | Kitchener | None Required at this time |
| 79. | Mannheim WTP Residue Management Plant Upgrades  
- Design in 2013  
- Construction in 2014-2015 | Kitchener | None Required at this time |
| 80. | Baden – New Hamburg Trunk Watermains (Nafziger Road)  
- Construction in 2013  
- Construction in 2016-2017 (Future Stages) | Wilmot | None Required at this time |
| 81. | New Dundee Road Trunk Watermain  
- Construction in 2013 | Kitchener | None Required at this time |
| 82. | Reservoir Relocation Elmira (Floradale) and St. Andrews  
- Construction in 2013 | Woolwich Cambridge | None Required at this time |
| 83. | Weber Street Trunk Watermain College to Sydney to Charles  
- Design 2013  
- Construction 2014 | Kitchener | None Required at this time |

**Wastewater – Studies and Pre-Design**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Political/Stakeholder Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>Rural Water Quality Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jean Haalboom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 85. | Speed River (Hespeler WWTP) and Grand River (Waterloo WWTP) Assimilative Capacity Study | Cambridge and Waterloo | Donna Reid – re-confirmed  
Claudette Millar  
Jane Mitchell  
Diane Freeman |
| 86. | Biosolids Strategy Class Environmental Assessment | Region | Les Armstrong  
Jane Brewer  
Jane Mitchell |
## PLANNING AND WORKS – PROJECT TEAMS – 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Political/Stakeholder Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 87. | East Side Pump Station and Forcemain – Class EA and Pre-design               | Cambridge Woolwich          | Todd Cowan  
Donna Reid  
Allan Poffenroth                                      |
| 88. | Baden and New Hamburg Waste Water Treatment Plant Expansion Class Environmental Assessment | Baden/New Hamburg           | 1 Regional Councillor  
1 Local Councillor                                     |
| 89. | Hespeler Waste Water Treatment Plant Expansion Class Environmental Assessment | Cambridge                   | 1 Regional Councillor  
1 Local Councillor                                     |

**Wastewater – Design and Construction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Political/Stakeholder Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 90. | Kitchener Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrades  
- Design and Construction ongoing in 2013-2020 | Kitchener                   | Jim Wideman  
Jean Haalboom  
John Gazzola  
Yvonne Fernandes                                      |
| 91. | Waterloo Wastewater Treatment Plant Update  
- Construction Ongoing in 2013 – 2014                                      | Waterloo                    | Mark Whaley                                               |
| 92. | Preston Wastewater Treatment Plant  
- Digester Upgrades  
- Construction in 2013-2014                                               | Cambridge                   | None required at this time                                |
| 93. | Elmira Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrades (Staged)  
Process Upgrades:  
-Construction ongoing in 2013                                              | Woolwich                    | None Required at this time                                |

### WASTE MANAGEMENT

#### Advisory Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Political/Stakeholder Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>Waterloo Region Landfill Liaison Committee</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Mark Whaley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Waste Management – Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Political/Stakeholder Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 95. | Residual Waste Master Plan Working Group                                      | Region-wide                 | Claudette Millar  
Jane Mitchell  
Jim Wideman  
Todd Cowan                                      |
### PLANNING AND WORKS – PROJECT TEAMS – 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Political/Stakeholder Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waste Management - Design and Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>Waterloo Landfill Leachate Pumping Station No. 2 Replacement</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>None Required at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction in 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.</td>
<td>Waterloo Landfill South Expansion Area New Cell</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>None Required at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Design in 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction in 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REPORT:

Regional Council’s approval of the 2013 Budget included the reduction of transit service to achieve a cost savings of $525,000. The following service reductions are proposed to achieve this cost reduction (Attachment A).
Transit Service Reductions

1. Reduce iXpress 200 summer frequency from 10 to 15 minutes (effective June 24)

Based on a detailed review of summer ridership on the iXpress, staff has developed an operating schedule that reflects a 15 minute service frequency but also includes several supplementary trips in the morning and afternoon to better accommodate peak passenger loads. This reduction would be implemented during the start of the summer period on June 24, 2013.

2. Elimination of Biehn extension on Route 16 Conestoga College (effective April 29)

During the midday (9:30 am to 2:00 pm) Route 16 has a mid-route deviation to serve the Biehn Drive area in Brigadoon. By eliminating the deviation, riders on the rest of the route have a more direct trip and operating costs are reduced during the spring and summer schedule period. Most residences on the Biehn extension would be within a 10 minute walk of the closest bus stop on Black Walnut Drive. (Attachment B) The Biehn Drive extension would continue to operate during fall and winter periods when ridership on this section is higher. There are 5 passengers per day on average during the spring and summer who would be affected.

As new residential growth occurs and the road network is completed in this area, the opportunity to redesign routes to provide greater coverage in the future would be considered.

3. Reduced Evening/Sunday service to Route 66 Winston during summer and Saturdays (effective June 24)

As shown in Attachment C, Route 66 Winston and Route 71 both serve the Hespeler area. Currently, during Evening and Weekends when ridership is lower, Route 66 does not operate and Route 71 is extended as a larger one-way loop to serve Winston Boulevard between Cooper Street and Franklin Boulevard providing service to most of the Route 66 service area. It is proposed to implement this service design to summer weekdays and on Saturdays.

4. Eliminate Saturday service on Route 53 (effective June 24)

The Route 53 Franklin provides a route from the Ainslie Street terminal along Main Street and along Franklin Boulevard to Hespeler, travelling past St. Benedict Catholic Secondary School on Saginaw Parkway and Jacob Hespeler Secondary School on Holiday Inn Drive. With most industries and the high schools closed on Saturdays, ridership is very low on Route 53 averaging 19 daily rides.

5. Targeted Trip Reductions (effective June 24)

A review of all of the GRT routes identified several places where some trips on some routes could be removed with minimal negative ridership impact and where alternative services could accommodate most affected customers. Trip reductions typically would occur in the early to mid evening on weekdays or Saturdays.

The routes where trip reductions are proposed include:
- Route 2 Forest Hill
- Route 3 Ottawa South
- Route 5 Erb West
- Route 11 Victoria Hills
- Route 15 Frederick
- Route 24 Highland
- Route 35 Eastbridge
While the daily ridership impact will vary by season, the annual ridership impact of the service reduction is estimated at a loss of 712 daily rides or 41,000 annual rides, approximately 0.2% of GRT’s total ridership.

6. Summer Frequency Reductions on Routes 4, 32, 61 and 201 (effective June 24)

The noted service reductions in items 1-5 would achieve the $525,000 cost reduction target on an annual basis. For 2013, the cost savings would be $407,000 because the service reductions would not be implemented until April or June 2013. Additional service reductions would be required in 2013 to make up the $118,000 shortfall. These additional service reductions are described below and would be implemented during the 2013 summer period only and would be reinstated in the summer of 2014.

- Reduce summer midday service on Route 4 Glasgow from 30 to 60 minutes
- Reduce summer peak frequency on Route 32 Kumpf from 30 to 60 minutes
- Reduce summer midday service on Route 61 Conestoga College from 30 to 60 minutes
- Reduce summer peak frequency on Route 201 Fischer-Hallman iXpress from 15 to 30 minutes.

The summer 2013 only reductions would result in an estimated loss of 226 rides per day, or 10,900 rides through the summer period.

Passenger Notification

Pending Regional Council approval of these service reductions, passengers will be notified via multiple mediums including GRT web-site, rider alert e-mail notification, social media, and the Easy GO traveller information system. Notification will also be given, wherever applicable, through notices posted at affected bus stops. Assistance will be available for customers to help them find alternative transit routes for their journey, wherever possible.

Timing of Service Changes

Because of the time required to produce changes to the operator schedule and comply with contractual obligations, most changes are not feasible until the beginning of the summer operator signup. Pending approval of the service changes, scheduling staff will adjust both the vehicle and operator schedules to put these changes into effect.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

The Area Municipalities have been circulated this report.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

Strategic Objective 5.3 - Ensure Regional programs and services are efficient and effective and demonstrate accountability to the public.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The proposed service reductions amount to annual savings of $525,000 which would meet the $525,000 target reduction approved by Regional Council. In 2013 though, the savings amount to $407,000 because the service reductions would not be implemented until April or June 2013. As a result, additional service reductions amounting to savings of $118,000 would be implemented for the summer of 2013 only and which would be reinstated in 2014.
OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

This is a joint report between Transit Services and Transportation Planning and has been reviewed by Finance staff.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment A – Map of Proposed 2013 GRT Service Reductions
Attachment B - Walk Distance to Biehn Drive Area
Attachment C - Hespeler Off-Peak Routing

PREPARED BY:  Blair Allen, Supervisor, Transit Development
Peter Zinck, Assistant Director, Transit Services

APPROVED BY:  Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Walk Distance to Biehn Drive Area
Hespeler Routing
Current Weekday and Saturday Routing

Proposed Summer and Saturday Routing (same as existing Evening and Sunday routing)
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: February 26, 2013

FILE CODE: D17-30

SUBJECT: PROPOSED INTERIM PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO THE TOWNSHIP OF NORTH DUMFRIES

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the following with regard to the request of the Township of North Dumfries, as described in Report No. P-13-019, dated February 26, 2013:

a) Agree to provide professional planning services to the Township of North Dumfries for the purpose of updating its Official Plan to bring it into conformity with the Regional Official Plan and the Provincial Growth Plan;

b) Provide the related services on the basis of a mutually satisfactory fee-for-services arrangement to be negotiated between the Township and the Region; and

c) Authorize the Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services to execute any documentation required to implement these recommendations to the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor.

SUMMARY:

The Township of North Dumfries has approached the Region of Waterloo for assistance with drafting their Official Plan Amendment regarding conformity to the Regional Official Plan. This report is being prepared to recommend assistance on a fee basis and to provide background for Regional Council, including how workload will be managed over this short-term period.

On previous occasions, Regional staff has provided assistance of this type to Area Municipalities. This has included the preparation of the current North Dumfries, Wellesley, and Wilmot official plans and growth strategies under similar contracts. Regional staff is currently completing the conformity Official Plan Amendment and related planning process for the Township of Wellesley.

REPORT:

The Township is in the process of transitioning out of an arrangement with a planning consultant and now employs one full-time permanent planning staff member (the Director). This request arose as a result of the need for an interim arrangement to aid in managing larger, strategic-based planning projects.

The Region and the Township have arrived at an agreed upon planning arrangement with an associated fee to be determined. Under this arrangement, the Region would include the following tasks:
Prepare a proposed draft Official Plan Amendment that Township’s staff can take through the stakeholder consultation process and Township adoption process, as mandated by the Planning Act.

Prepare an accompanying document that provides the rationale for the revisions to the Township of North Dumfries Official Plan.

The services to be provided by Regional staff would be in the form of assistance to Township staff only. The Township’s Director of Planning would continue to write reports and make recommendations to Township Council, be responsible for the stakeholder consultation process and any associated revisions to the Official Plan Amendment, and processing of the final Official Plan Amendment through Township Council for adoption. Costs for any associated Ontario Municipal Board hearings would not be included under this contract.

On previous occasions, Regional staff has provided assistance of this type to Area Municipalities. This has included the preparation of the current North Dumfries, Wellesley, and Wilmot official plans and growth strategies under similar contracts. Regional staff are currently completing the conformity Official Plan Amendment and relating planning process for the Township of Wellesley.

The fee to be paid to the Township by the Region (Planning, Housing, and Community Services) is intended to be used to retain additional planning assistance at the Region, as required, as the workload for Region-wide planning objectives remains high.

Regional staff is pleased to be able to recommend this short-term assistance to the Township of North Dumfries.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination:

Regional and Township of North Dumfries staff have collaboratively developed this proposal.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This report supports Strategic Plan 5.6.3 (opportunities for partnerships with area municipalities in order to improve services.)

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The fees associated with this proposal, between $8,000-$10,000 and paid by the Township of North Dumfries to the Region, would be used to fund additional planning support at the Region to ensure that the proposed short-term assistance to the Township can also be managed.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Geographic Information Services (GIS) will be required to assist this proposed task and therefore, Information Technology, Corporate Resources has been consulted.

ATTACHMENTS:

NIL

PREPARED BY: Cushla Matthews, Principal Planner

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

DATE: February 26, 2013

FILE CODE: D09-00/TCDG

SUBJECT: REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR DESIGN GUIDELINES UPDATE

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following action with respect to the proposed modifications to the Regional Implementation Guidelines for Transportation Corridor Design pursuant to the provisions of the Regional Official Policies Plan and the Regional Official Plan as detailed in report P-13-020, dated February 26, 2013:

a) Authorize a Public Meeting of the Planning and Works Committee on April 9, 2013 to receive comments from agencies and interested members of the public; and
b) Direct staff to circulate a draft of the proposed modifications for comment to the Area Municipalities and other parties having interest in this implementation guideline, including posting on the Regional website.

SUMMARY:

Regional Council approved the Implementation Guidelines for Regional Transportation Corridor Design on June 16, 2010. The Guidelines provide “context-sensitive” design standards for Regional transportation corridors and clarify the relative priority and treatment for the various travel modes and community uses. The objective was to create greater transportation choice by providing space, improving aesthetics and creating an environment within the transportation corridor for all modes. The Guidelines are also supportive of the Regional Transportation Master Plan and the Community Building Strategy.

Staff was directed to review the effectiveness of these guidelines after a year and identify the need for any modifications. An internal review was undertaken with planning and engineering staff that applies the guidelines to construction projects. The following components were identified as requiring adjustments:

- Sight triangles
- Curb lane widths
- Cycling lane widths
- Curb radii at intersections
- Fencing
- Roadway classifications

The Active Transportation Master Plan was used as input to this review specifically for the cycling lane widths.

The modifications to the Guidelines as recommended would be circulated to stakeholders including the Area Municipalities, members of the public that had previously expressed an interest and the development industry. The revisions will also be posted on the Region’s website. A formal Public Input Meeting is required in accordance with the Regional Official Policies Plan and the Regional
Official Plan and it is proposed that this meeting be held prior to the Planning and Works Committee on April 9, 2013.

REPORT:

The influence transportation facilities and their design have on the built form and the health and vibrancy of the community is considerable. All modes of transportation need to be reflected in design guidelines so that community planners and design engineers can incorporate and prioritize design elements early in the design process. Road designers and planners should consider the role of the entire road corridor as a public space and the role of roads in shaping the character, function, and livability of adjacent land uses and communities.

The Implementation Guidelines for Regional Transportation Corridor Design have been in operation for over 2 years. Staff has gained considerable experience using these Guidelines during this period. Two of the most notable projects that have been constructed using these Guidelines include Queen Street between Courtland Avenue and Highland Road, and Frederick Street between Bruce Street and Lancaster Avenue.

An internal review of these Guidelines has been undertaken over the past year. In general, the Guidelines have been effective however, there are a few areas where modifications would be helpful including:

- Sight triangles
- Curb lane widths
- Cycling lane widths
- Curb radii at intersections
- Fencing
- Roadway classifications

Sight Triangles

Sight triangles ensure sufficient sight distance is provided for the driver of the vehicle approaching an intersection to perceive potential conflicts and carry out the necessary action to avoid a conflict and negotiate the intersection safely. Sight triangles can also be used to accommodate traffic signal control and other utility equipment.

The previous Regional practice was to require, as a condition of development, the dedication of road widening’s for sight triangles with the maximum length of the side of a sight triangle bordering on either road of 15 m. The current Guidelines suggest the use of the Transportation Association of Canada methodology for Visibility Triangles. The TAC methodology resulted in a considerable amount of property dedication from new development and objections from developers were raised.

It is proposed that the Guidelines be modified to reflect the previous Regional practice for dedication with the maximum length of the side of a sight triangle bordering on either road of 15 m. In addition, during the development approval process, applicants may be required to ensure that there are no sight obstructions higher than 24 inches within the calculated sight triangle as defined by the TAC methodology. This will reduce the amount of property to be dedicated, provide sufficient room for utilities and maintain appropriate sightlines.

The current Guidelines also suggest that sight triangles are not required in built-up areas. The intent of this wording was to minimize property dedications on streets with buildings adjacent to the property line particularly on Main Streets. It is proposed that this statement be modified to read “In built-up areas, specifically Urban Growth Areas, consideration to reducing the sight triangle may be given if there is no demonstrated collision history and the land is not required for utility/traffic signal equipment.”
Curb Lane Widths

The Guidelines indicate a preferred lane width of between 3.25 and 3.35 m depending on the road classification. An additional .65 m in urban areas and an additional 1.0 m in rural areas could be provided on curb lanes where there are no cycling lanes available. It has been observed that wider lanes encourage faster traffic and the intent is to design for the appropriate speed of travel and balance road safety. Additional width on the curb lane can provide room for right turning vehicles and snow storage.

It is proposed that the preferred lane width be modified to between 3.65 and 3.75 depending on the road classification and that the additional .65 m be discontinued. An additional 1.0 m lane width would still be considered optional for Rural Connectors and Rural Village-Main Street. This modification would provide some additional curb lane width while not encouraging speeding.

Cycling Lane Widths

The current Guidelines indicate a preferred cycling lane width of 1.25 m on all road classifications with the exception of the Community Connector where it is 1.5 m. A 1.0 m minimum cycling lane width was also identified for some road classifications. The Guidelines indicate the needs for cycling facilities are optional on a Community Connector but important on all other road classifications and that the need should be considered in conjunction with the Cycling Master Plan.

The proposed Active Transportation Master Plan is recommending additional separation be considered for cyclists. As a result, it is proposed that the Guidelines be modified to indicate that the preferred cycling lane width be increased to 1.50 m for road classifications with higher speeds (Community Connector, Neighbourhood Connector-Avenue and Rural Connector) and 1.25 m for road classifications with lower speeds (Neighbourhood Connector-Main Street, Residential Connector and Rural Village: Main Street). The minimum cycling lane width would be increased to 1.25 m for all road classifications. It is also proposed, to add clarity, that the optional or important designation be replaced with a reference to the need being consistent with the Active Transportation Master Plan. Additional comments would be included that states the width of the cycling lane should be considered in conjunction with the width of the adjacent travel lane and if there is no gutter present, a wider bike lane should be considered.

Curb Radii at Intersections

The curb radii should be designed to accommodate the largest vehicle type that will frequently turn at the intersection. It is also preferred to minimize the curb radii to shorten the distance a pedestrian has to cross the road. The current Guidelines indicate a maximum curb radius of 9 m. In some locations based on geometrics and volume of trucks turning, a larger radius may be required and it is proposed that this be reflected in the modifications to the Guidelines.

Fencing

Fencing is a physical and sometimes visual barrier that prevents access to properties adjacent to a Regional road. Regional staff has required that fences be installed for back and side-lotted residential properties. Although preventing access to a Regional road is one element of this policy, it is also important to restrict encroachments such as sheds, plantings etc. on to the Regional right-of-way. Generally, the entire right-of-way is required for Regional purposes such as sidewalks and utilities which can be obstructed with these types of encroachments. Often times a property owner may erect a private fence inside the chain-link fence required as part of the development agreement. This can result in an area that cannot be maintained well and garbage collects or grass cannot be cut.
It is proposed that Regional staff continue to ask for the installation of fences for back and side-lotted residential properties adjacent to Regional roads. However, if the developer proposes installing their own fence on private property and the appropriate security is provided to the Region to ensure the fence is installed, the Region would delete this condition. If an individual property owner does not wish for a fence to be installed they could apply to the Region to have this condition waived with agreement that the Region would have the right to remove any encroachments immediately upon being discovered on the Regional right-of-way.

**Roadway Classifications**

Roads that are classified as Community Connectors are intended to help move goods and people effectively and not provide access to adjacent properties. Regional staff is currently reviewing the Access Policy and have identified additional roads that should be access controlled and classified as Community Connectors. It is proposed that the Guidelines be modified to change the classification of the following roads from Neighbourhood Connector–Avenue to Community Connector:

1. Regional Road 17 (Fountain Street) from Woolwich Street South to Victoria Street North;
2. Regional Road 85 (Arthur Street South) from the interchange with Regional Road 15 to Regional Road 21 (Arthur Street); and
3. Regional Road 33 (Townline Road) from Avenue Road to Can-Amera Parkway.

**Implementation and Next Steps**

The ROP states that Regional Roads will be planned and constructed in accordance with the provisions of the Transportation Corridor Design Implementation Guidelines.

Sections 10.B.11 to 10.B.14 of the Council Adopted Regional Official Plan (ROP) dated June 16, 2009, requires the Regional Municipality of Waterloo to provide public and agency notification for proposed modifications to Implementation Guidelines. The previous Regional Official Policies Plan had similar requirements. Accordingly, staff recommends that notification of 20 days be provided to the public and agencies and that the draft of the proposed modifications to the current Implementation Guideline for Regional Transportation Corridor Design be circulated to the Area Municipalities and other interested parties, including posting on the Regional website. In addition to the public and agency notification, staff recommends that a public meeting of the Planning and Works Committee be held on April 9, 2013 to receive comments from agencies and interested members of the public.

Following the Public Meeting and the close of the comment period, staff will revise the Guidelines as necessary and bring to the Planning and Works Committee for consideration as a revised Regional Implementation Guideline.

**Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination**

Area Municipal representatives participated on an External Agency Team and provided input into the original Guidelines. Some of the Area Municipalities have developed Urban Design Guidelines and this information was considered as input into the process. The Area Municipalities will be circulated these proposed modifications and asked for input.

**CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

The Guidelines supports Strategic Objective 2.2 “Develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs” and Strategic Objective 3.2 “Develop, promote and integrate active forms of transportation (cycling and walking).”
FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The Guidelines in their entirety are expected to result in less asphalt than previous practice, resulting in nominal savings of road construction costs. These cost savings, in addition to existing allocations for landscaping, could be applied to boulevard improvements such as public art, landscaping, street furniture, accent paving etc. One of the objectives of the Guidelines is to improve the street environment to encourage more active transportation.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Transportation and Environmental Services provided input to the review of the Guidelines.

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: February 26, 2013  
FILE CODE: D10-70  
SUBJECT: PROPOSED TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT MODIFICATIONS TO THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPACT STUDY GUIDELINES  

RECOMMENDATION:
THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following action with respect to the proposed modifications to the Regional Transportation Impact Study Guidelines pursuant to the provisions of the Regional Official Policies Plan and the Regional Official Plan as detailed in Report P-13-021, dated February 26, 2013:

a) Authorize a Public Meeting of the Planning and Works Committee on April 9, 2013 to receive comments on the proposed Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Checklist and Parking Management Worksheet from agencies and interested members of the public; and

b) Direct staff to circulate a draft of the proposed modifications for comment to stakeholders having an interest in the Transportation Impact Study Guidelines, including posting on the Regional website.

SUMMARY:
As one of the tools to create a vibrant and sustainable community, Transportation Demand Management (TDM) uses policies and programs to make active and sustainable transportation more convenient for residents. A TDM approach to transportation can deliver long-term environmental sustainability, improve public health, create stronger communities, and build more prosperous and livable cities. In Waterloo Region, TDM has typically focused on travel incentives and new infrastructure to encourage people to travel by foot, bike, carpool, or bus. An emerging strategy to enhance the effectiveness of these programs is to incorporate TDM into the development review process and to encourage developments that are located near transit, that incorporate mixed uses at higher densities, and include cycling and walking amenities and lower overall parking rates. An effective TDM-related development review strategy will also support suburban developments that encourage transit, walking, cycling and carpooling.

Research indicates that a strong but complex relationship exists between parking management policies and decisions on urban development and travel mode choice. As communities focus on reurbanization and making the most efficient use of existing land and infrastructure, ensuring that an appropriate supply of parking is provided at the right price and in the right form is becoming an increasing priority. In urban areas, land used for extensive surface parking represents lost opportunities for other uses, such as housing, employment or recreation. It may also translate into lost tax revenue for the community and an increase in development costs due to the high cost of providing parking facilities.
Where rapid transit systems exist, parking management can play a critical role in the success of the system. For example, if too much parking is provided at low (or no) cost to the end user, the relative attractiveness of public transit or other active forms of transportation may be diminished.

Reflecting the growing understanding of using parking management to achieve a more sustainable and transit-oriented community the Region partnered with the Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo in 2010 to consider innovative strategies that incorporate TDM-supportive elements into the development review process. Over the following two years, a project team consisting of planners and transportation engineers from the Region and all three Cities worked with BA Group to develop a customized strategy for Waterloo Region. The three Cities which are key partners responsible for the implementation of parking requirements are supportive of the new parking strategy.

The strategy recommended by the project team, consists of two checklists:

a) Form 1, TDM Checklist; and
b) Form 2, TDM Parking Management Worksheet.

The TDM Checklist (Checklist) rates developments on how TDM-supportive they are. Points are assigned based on the level of transit service available within walking distance of the site, whether cycling and pedestrian amenities are provided (e.g. showers, change and locker facilities, bike parking), and whether parking rates and parking facilities support walking and transit use. Conversely, the TDM Parking Management Worksheet (Worksheet) uses TDM and transit-related factors to calculate potential parking reductions, subject to approval by the Area Municipality. The parking reductions generated by the worksheet are context-dependent. For instance, a development in an Urban Growth Centre would generate a larger potential parking reduction than the same development in an Intensification Corridor or a suburban location because there are more transportation services and amenities available.

To support transit oriented development, the Project Team recommends incorporating the TDM Checklist into the Region’s Transportation Impact Study (TIS) guidelines for non-residential developments in the Urban Growth Centres, station areas, and intensification corridors of Cambridge, Kitchener, and Waterloo. In general, a TIS is requested whenever a proposed development will generate 100 or more new peak direction auto trips to or from the site during the morning or afternoon peak hour. In some cases, a study may be requested due to localized safety or roadway/intersection capacity deficiencies.

As part of the revised TIS process, the Region will consider lower trip generation rates for developments that negotiate a reduced parking rate with the appropriate Area Municipal planning authority. Lower parking rates are often negotiated for mixed-use developments because different land uses can often share parking in a complementary way, which reduces the need for additional parking. An Area Municipality may also choose to use TDM Parking Management Worksheet to calculate a proposed parking reduction but it is necessary to first contact the appropriate Area Municipal planning authority to determine whether the Worksheet applies in a specific area. Any proposed parking rate below the established Zoning By-Law minimum will also require the approval of the Area Municipality before it can be considered as part of the TIS.

This project was funded in part by Transport Canada’s ecoMOBILITY grant program.

REPORT:

The Region’s Official Plan and Transportation Master Plan support TDM as a growth management strategy that supports higher transit ridership and more sustainable travel patterns. Parking management can be an effective TDM tool to increase transit ridership as well as to encourage higher densities. The most successful approaches manage the oversupply of parking in suburban areas and create incentives for developments in the core to increase densities.
BA Group was selected by the Region and the Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo to develop a transit-supportive flexible parking strategy to support transit-oriented development in rapid transit station areas. A working group of Area Municipal and Regional staff was established and a preferred strategy was developed over the spring and summer of 2010. A consultation session was held with the Reurbanization Working Group on November 3, 2010 and BA Group completed a draft report in January 2011. The recommendations were presented to City and Regional staff on January 14, 2011 and February 14, 2011. The Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo committed to testing the strategy between January and June 2011 and in one instance it was used to justify lower parking rates for an adaptive reuse development in Downtown Kitchener. Final comments were submitted by the Cities to BA Group in August 2011. BA Group adjusted the wording of the strategy to reflect the City’s comments and added parking reductions for intensification corridors. The final report and recommendations were submitted to the Region in November 2011.

The study conducted by BA Group is intended to guide the effective integration of TDM into the existing development review process. Their final report summarizes North American best practices, provides 18 case studies in different urban contexts in Waterloo Region, and outlines a recommended implementation approach. Using the existing parking minimums in each City’s Zoning By-Law, the recommended strategy consists of a TDM Checklist and a TDM Parking Management Worksheet that rationalizes a preferred parking supply based on the mode share targets of the Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP), the transit context of the site, and the planned transit oriented development features of the site. The proposed Checklist and Worksheet also recommend effective TDM programs and services.

The three Cities have indicated that the recommendations could be used to complement their urban design guidelines. In the near term, the Project Team recommends that the Region integrate the TDM Checklist with the Region’s TIS Guidelines to encourage higher densities in Rapid Transit station areas and intensification corridors. BA Group’s recommendation to incorporate the TDM Checklist and Parking Management Worksheet in Area Municipal Zoning By-Laws, design guidelines, and the Region and Area Municipalities’ Official Plans will continue to be explored by the Parking Coordinating Committee. City of Waterloo staff has indicated it is their intent to focus on considering transportation demand management as part of parking strategies in Station Area Planning.

Best Practices Review

BA Group provided a comprehensive review of transit supportive land-use policies. The most common approach used in North America includes parking and trip generation reduction strategies. Some municipalities opt for generic policies that allow voluntary reductions in the parking supply, while others require developers to complete complex trip generation reduction calculations. The three general types of policies include:

1. **Trip generation reductions** are applied to the number of trips a project is anticipated to generate upon completion. These reductions assume that TDM initiatives and parking management will successfully lower the number of private automobile trips generated compared to what the development would generate without any strategies.

2. **Parking reductions** below the Zoning By-Law minimum make it less expensive to increase the density of a site. They are typically applied to standard minimum parking requirements and are given in exchange for the provision of TDM initiatives in a new development (e.g. carpool spaces, transit passes, proximity to transit). Municipalities often incorporate these provisions within their Zoning By-Law.

3. **Traffic impact fee reductions** are applied to developments in exchange for the provision of certain TDM initiatives. This approach has yet to be implemented in Canada.

In Canada, parking and trip management policies typically focus on voluntary parking reductions, parking maximums and the removal of parking minimums. Such measures permit, but do not force, developers to reduce their minimum parking requirement in exchange for TDM. In comparison,
American municipalities have a greater ability to require TDM because of “clean air” legislation at the federal and state levels. In the United States, TDM requirements are clearly linked with these greenhouse gas regulations. Trip generation reductions, or more precisely, traffic impact fee reductions, are a common type of TDM-based reduction policy as well as parking reductions. In many cases, municipalities mandate that developments reduce the traffic generation of the site through zoning ordinances and TDM strategies must be employed to reduce the traffic generation of the project. The required trip reductions depend on the type of TDM strategy proposed, the size of the development, and the number of employees a development has. In Canada, the regulatory environment is different which leaves provincial planning acts as the primary vehicle for implementing TDM.

**Recommendations for Waterloo Region**

It is recommended that the TDM Checklist be incorporated as part of the Region’s TIS Guidelines in the Urban Growth Centres, Rapid Transit station areas and intensification corridors of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo. Developments in these areas that are asked to submit a TIS would be required to submit a completed TDM Checklist satisfactory to the Region and the appropriate Area Municipality.

Incorporating TDM into the development review process supports transit oriented development and the provision of transportation choice in Waterloo Region. The project team considered different options for implementing the TDM Checklist in the development approval process, including mandatory and voluntary compliance. It was determined that a mandatory approach that requires completion of the TDM Checklist as part of a TIS for commercial, office, retail, and institutional developments in Urban Growth Centres, Rapid Transit Station Areas, and Intensification Corridors would be the most appropriate considering that the Region is still transitioning towards greater transit, cycling and walking use.

The TDM Checklist and Worksheet weigh the various transportation elements and amenities, TDM programs, and parking management strategies differently. The different weightings are based on North American best practices research conducted by BA Group. High weights are given specifically to parking management strategies because research shows that it is the most effective tool at shifting travel behaviour. TDM-related parking management options are also consistent with the best practices of other municipalities and serve to reduce the costs of higher density developments. From a policy perspective, the Region can permit trip generation reductions as an incentive to provide better transportation choice. However, BA Group recommends that the Region only consider traffic impact reductions when specific parking supply reductions are approved by the Area Municipal planning authority because higher parking rates are known to induce higher traffic volumes. A maximum number of points are available for each category of the Checklist and Worksheet. Features and incentives can be customized based on the needs of each application.

**TDM Checklist**

The Checklist rates developments on how TDM and transit supportive they are. Points are assigned based on the level of transit service available, whether cycling and pedestrian amenities are provided, and whether parking rates and parking facilities support walking and transit use. The TDM Checklist is intended to be part of the standard development application review process as part of a TIS. It could also be used for a zoning by-law amendment, plan of subdivision, or through the site plan approval process. The TDM Checklist is weighted to encourage sites with access to transit to provide parking rates consistent with the mode split targets of the Regional Transportation Master Plan; these transit-supportive parking rates may be lower than the approved zoning by-law minimums. In some locations, a developer may wish to provide more parking than the zoning by-law minimum which makes it harder to submit a Checklist satisfactory to the Region. However, the Checklist includes several elements to help these developments achieve a TDM-supportive designation for their TIS, such as locating the building façade adjacent to the road right-of-way, or by providing:
- Preferential carpool spaces
- Bike parking
- Car sharing spaces
- Mixed uses with retail, commercial and food services
- Structured, higher-density parking
- Shower and change room facilities for active commuters

The Checklist also encourages developers to provide trip reduction incentives such as subsidized transit passes, emergency ride home services, and online carpool matching. A TIS satisfactory to the Region would use customized combinations of these options to complete the TDM Checklist and to demonstrate that the proposed development is transit-supportive.

_TDM Parking Management Worksheet (Worksheet)_

Similar to the TDM Checklist, the Worksheet is intended to form part of the development application review process. The Worksheet is designed to work in conjunction with the TDM Checklist and, if acceptable to the Area Municipality, could be used to support a parking supply rate below the approved zoning by-law minimum. In these cases, the proponent would complete the Worksheet in addition to the TDM Checklist to justify a proposed parking reduction with the Area Municipality. If approved, both forms would be submitted to the Region as part of a complete TIS. The Worksheet is designed to automatically calculate site-specific parking reductions for commercial, retail, and institutional uses based on different TDM- and transit-related factors. The Worksheet is not applicable to residential uses, but could be used for the non-residential portions of mixed-use developments if a shared parking rate reduction is not available. The Ontario Planning Act requires that any changes to the zoning by-law parking minimums will require Area Municipal approval. In addition to completion of the Checklist and Parking Management Worksheet, the area municipalities have indicated they may require supplemental information from applicants to justify proposed reductions.

**Benefits of the TDM Checklist and TDM Parking Management Worksheet**

- **Provides transportation choice** – the proposed TDM strategy will support the Region’s strategic objective to provide transportation choice and to support sustainable and vibrant urban spaces. The proposed strategy will encourage new developments to consider all modes of travel and to consider reducing the traffic impact of their site and related parking provisions.
- **Promotes compact development** – reductions in parking supply will ensure that new developments use space more efficiently. More compact development will result in an improved urban form that is more walkable.
- **Improves healthy active living** – the proposed TDM strategy will promote the use of urban design elements in new developments that encourage active transportation (i.e. walking and cycling) by permitting reductions in vehicle parking location and supply.
- **Supports transit use and transit development** – future developments surrounding the Region’s planned Rapid Transit (RT) should be constructed with transit-supportive parking rates to maximize the return on investment. The TDM Checklist and Worksheet support the goal of transit-supportive parking rates in appropriate areas, such as the RT stations, and in doing so, support area transit use.
- **Supports Official Plan objectives** – the proposed TDM strategy will support the Region’s Official Plan policies for sustainable development.
- **Educational Component** – regardless of whether or not a developer and/ or municipality uses/ implements the Parking Reduction Worksheet, its introduction to the development review process has an important educational component.
Challenges of the TDM Checklist and TDM Parking Management Worksheet

- **Minimal use of voluntary parking reductions** – for economic reasons, some developers provide more parking than zoning by-laws require, and thus may not be interested in reducing their parking supply. However, developers in Downtown Kitchener have shown interest in using the TDM Checklist and Worksheet to support their reurbanization efforts.

- **Perceived economic development impacts** – transit-supportive parking rates effectively reduce peak period traffic and encourage compact land development. However, business owners often perceive abundant parking supply as an important factor in attracting business. As such, there is resistance to limiting the amount of parking provided by the development industry even if much of the surplus parking goes unused. To address this, the TDM Checklist leaves the option open for developers to provide more parking than the Zoning By-Law requirement. However, these developments will be asked to commit to TDM features or initiatives to improve transportation choice in their area. The Checklist also encourages structured parking, which is more valuable to a site if it goes unused than surface parking.

- **Different Zoning By-Law parking requirements** – each municipality within Waterloo Region has a different set of parking requirements in its Zoning By-Law. The variation in parking rates presents an implementation challenge. The proposed strategy will need to be monitored and adjusted accordingly. Also, some properties may already have parking reductions through site-specific Zoning By-law amendments or Minor Variances and consideration of the Parking Reduction Worksheet may not be appropriate in these circumstances.

- **Different Zoning By-Law Definitions** – each municipality currently uses a different definition of floor area to calculate parking requirements. The different definitions result in parking requirement variations between municipalities of up to 40 per cent. The proposed TDM Checklist and Worksheet is a first step in addressing these differences and the oversupply of parking that is resulting in some areas. Project team members are interested in exploring revised minimum and/or maximum parking ranges through the Waterloo Region Parking Coordinating Committee.

- **Increased demand for staff resources** – the implementation of any TDM parking or trip reduction policies will create additional demand for municipal staff time and resources. However, the impact of new policies is reduced when they are implemented through existing and complimentary processes. The Region’s TIS process is limited to developments with a substantial impact on the transportation system, which effectively reduces the number of proposals immediately affected by the new Checklist. It will also provide the Region and the Area Municipalities an opportunity to refine the process as it is expanded over time.

- **Difficulty enforcing and implementing trip reduction incentives** – the constantly changing needs of new tenants makes transferring and implementing TDM strategies at specific locations challenging. While some jurisdictions enforce TDM strategies through the planning process, the preferred strategy for Waterloo Region is keep to these features voluntary but to include them on the Checklist and Worksheet for educational and incentive purposes. The TravelWise program makes it easier to implement TDM programming and to transfer benefits to new tenants.

**Next Steps**

The project team recommends that Regional staff hold an information and consultation session with local developers and interested BIAs to discuss the proposed changes to the TIS. Information will be provided on the proposed changes and how the Checklist and Worksheet can be applied in an Urban Growth Centre, RT station area, and intensification corridor context. Feedback will be elicited from participants to inform the final recommendation to Council. In addition to the information session, a Public Input Meeting of the Planning and Works Committee is requested to receive additional comments from interested agencies and members of the public.
The following promotional steps are also recommended to inform the development community of the proposed changes:

- Invite developers to discuss the TDM Checklist and Worksheet in pre-application reviews;
- Brand the program in a way that adds to the profile of the strategy; and
- Develop and provide promotional material to the development community.

The three Cities have indicated that the recommendations could be used to complement their urban design guidelines and may influence changes to their Zoning By-Laws. BA Group’s recommendations as well as incentives to complete the Checklist will continue to be explored by the Region and its Area Municipal partners through the Waterloo Region Parking Coordinating Committee.

**Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination**

Parking and parking requirements are an Area Municipal responsibility. The Region of Waterloo served as the project lead for developing the TDM Parking and Trip Generation Management Strategy, which was a coordinated effort to establish recommendations for a stepwise approach toward transit-supportive parking policies. Funding for this initiative was provided by the Region of Waterloo, the Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener, Waterloo, and Transport Canada’s ecoMOBILITY program. The Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo were consulted throughout the process and staff has attended one of two training sessions held in 2012. On Nov. 3, 2010, the preferred strategy was developed and reviewed by the Reurbanization Working Group, which includes representatives from the development community. Several changes were made to the TDM Checklist, Worksheet, implementation strategy and Council report in response to the feedback from this group and the Area Municipalities. The project team which included Area Municipal representation is in concurrence with this report, recognizing that implementation strategies will vary depending on the context of each Area Municipality. A copy of this report and BA Group’s recommendations was provided to the project team and the Waterloo Region Parking Coordinating Committee.

**CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

The TDM Checklist and TDM Parking Management Worksheet will more effectively encourage compact, livable urban communities (Objective 2.1) that support greater use of active transportation and transit infrastructure (Objectives 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3). An additional outcome of implementation will be lower greenhouse gas emissions (Objective 1.2) resulting from changes in travel behaviour.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

NIL

**OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:**

NIL

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Attachment 1 - TDM Checklist
Attachment 2 - TDM Parking Management Checklist

**PREPARED BY:** John Hill, Principal Planner, Transit Development

**APPROVED BY:** Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Housing and Community Services
ATTACHMENT 1 - TDM Checklist

Site Address: Site Context:
Date: ZBL Parking Requirement:
Applicable Parking Reduction: __________

The Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Checklist and Parking Management Worksheet are not designed for residential properties, but can be used to inform mixed-use developments.

### TABLE A - Site Access

In creating an environment that supports pedestrian and cycling activity, the public realm must be accessible, safe, and comfortable to encourage movement on the street and in the surrounding area(s). These facilities and features should encourage walking and cycling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Development incorporates functional building entrances that are oriented to public space or to locations where pedestrians and transit users arrive from such as a street, square, park or plaza.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>External to site: Continuous sidewalks are provided along both sides of all adjacent public streets (over and above requirement). Internal to site: Pedestrian walkways (1.5m min width) are provided through large parking areas to link the building with the public street sidewalk system (over and above requirement).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Non-residential: development provides secure bike storage for 4% of the building occupants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Shower and change facilities for employees provided on-site consistent with LEED requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Provision of active uses at-grade along street frontages.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Max</th>
<th>Total Points Applicable</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE B - Public Transportation Access

The availability and proximity of convenient public transit service with direct pedestrian linkages to the building will provide viable travel options for employees, visitors and residents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Bus shelters with seating are provided at the transit stop immediately adjacent to the development in consultation with Transportation Planning at the Region of Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Information regarding public transit routes, schedules and fares are provided in an accessible and visible location on site and in adjacent bus stops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3a</td>
<td>Located within 800m of a Rapid Transit Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3b</td>
<td>Located within 600m of a bus service with headways of 15 min or less or is located in a designated mixed use corridor or node. <strong>Note:</strong> Points are awarded for either B3a, B3b or B3c only. Please choose whichever represents the highest order of transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3c</td>
<td>Located within 400m of a bus service with headways of 16 min to 30 min. <strong>Note:</strong> Points are awarded for either B3a, B3b or B3c only. Please choose whichever represents the highest order of transit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Max</th>
<th>Total Points Applicable</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE C - Parking

Vehicle parking facilities can affect the character, travel mode and cost of a development. Reducing parking supply to match expected demand can have a positive influence on the selection of alternative travel modes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Utilizes reduced parking supply consistent with the TDM Parking Management Worksheet. Contact your Area Municipal planning authority to determine whether the Worksheet is applicable to your development. <strong>Note:</strong> Points are awarded for either C1, C2, or C3 only. Please choose whichever applies with the highest value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Includes allowances for shared parking in mixed-use zones. <strong>Note:</strong> Points are awarded for C1, C2, or C3 only. Please choose whichever applies after consulting with the Area Municipal planning authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Provides no more than the minimum number of parking spaces, as required by applicable Zoning By-Law. <strong>Note:</strong> Points are awarded for either C1, C2, or C3 only. Please choose whichever applies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Implements paid parking on part or all of the site (e.g. parking permits, paid parking zones near main entrances)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Provides priority parking for carpooling/vanpooling participants equivalent to 5% of employee spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>Commercial Uses: Provide car-share spaces equivalent to 2% of building occupants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Max</th>
<th>Total Points Applicable</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parking is not located on major street frontage or between a road right of way and the building facade.

25% to 50% of parking is located underground or in a structure

50% to 75% of parking is located underground or in a structure

75% of parking or more is located underground or in a structure

Parking spaces provided off-site on a lot within 300 metres of the lot containing such use.

C7 3

Category Max = 25
Total Points Applicable = 25
Score =

TABLE D
Trip Reduction Incentives

A formal TDM plan will identify specific initiatives that will be initiated in order to encourage reduced single occupant vehicle travel.

Points
Features
Yes N/A

D1 2 The building owner/occupant will provide a ride matching service for car/vanpooling

D2 2 The building owner/occupant will provide emergency ride home options

D3 5 The building owner/occupant will provide subsidized transit passes for all occupants for a period of two years

D4 5 The building owner/occupant agrees to charge for parking as an unbundled cost to occupants

D5 2 The building owner/occupant agrees to provide reduced cost for users of car/van pool, bicycle, moped/motorcycle spaces

D6 10 The building owner/occupant has prepared a TDM plan to the satisfaction of the Region of Waterloo and the Area Municipality that targets a 10% reduction in peak hour trips using forecast trip generation with status quo travel characteristics

D7 5 The employer has provided flexible working hours, telework or shift work arrangements.

D8 14 The development agrees to join Travelwise (TMA) that provides the same services outlined under items D1, D2, D6

D9 2 The development includes mixed uses (i.e. retail, commercial or food services, daycares, or other complementary uses) on-site or located within 400 metres.

Category Max = 25
Total Points Applicable = 25
Score =

TABLE E
Checklist Summary

For each item, a “Yes” answer is equivalent to the points as indicated in the section. N/A sections should be explained in an attachment to this table. The score for each section is reflected as a percentage and calculated by dividing the points by the “Total Applicable”.

Category Minimum Requirement Total Applicable Points Scored Comments
Pedestrian & Cyclist Orientation 24 10
Public Transit Access 5
Parking 25
SUB-TOTAL 40
Trip Reduction Incentives 25
OVERALL TOTAL 65 65

TABLE F
Scoring Summary

FINAL SCORE RATING
50 - 65 **** TDM-SUPPORTIVE DEVELOPMENT
40 - 49 ***
30 - 39 **
24 - 29 *
0 - 23 X Non-TDM-Supportive Development
**ATTACHMENT 2 - Parking Management Worksheet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Address:</th>
<th>Site Context:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Worksheet No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Urban Growth Centres - (UGC) area classification includes the downtown and RT Station Areas of Kitchener, Waterloo and Cambridge.

"Intensification Corridor" (IC) classification is applied to sites within 800 metres of the future CTC line

"Other" classification applies to all other sites

Please highlight the cell percentages applicable to your development under the appropriate classification. Please note that the Parking Management Worksheet and the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Checklist are not designed for residential properties, but can be used for mixed-use developments. Local municipalities are the decision-making bodies with respect to consideration of parking reductions below Zoning By-law requirements.

### TABLE A  Pedestrian and Cyclist Orientation

In creating an environment that supports pedestrian and cycling activity, the public realm must be accessible, safe, and comfortable to encourage movement on the street and in the surrounding area(s). These facilities and features should encourage walking and cycling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>UGC</th>
<th>IC</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Maximum</th>
<th>UGC</th>
<th>IC</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Available Parking Reduction**

### TABLE B  Public Transportation Access

The availability and proximity of convenient public transit service with direct pedestrian linkages to the building will provide viable travel options for employees, visitors and residents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>UGC</th>
<th>IC</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3a</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3c</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vehicle parking facilities can affect the character, travel mode and cost of a development. Reducing parking supply to match expected demand can have a positive influence on the selection of alternative travel modes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>UGC</th>
<th>IC</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1 Provides priority parking for carpooling/vanpooling participants</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equivalent to 5% of employee spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Commercial Uses: Provide car-share spaces equivalent to 2% of building</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occupants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 Implements paid parking system on all or part of the site (e.g. parking</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>permits, paid parking zones near main entrances)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 Parking is not located on major street frontage.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5 25% to 50% of parking is located underground or in a structure</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6 50% to 75% of parking is located underground or in a structure</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7 75% of parking or more is located underground or in a structure</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Category Maximum** | 6%  | 4% | 6%  |

**Available Parking Reduction**

A formal TDM plan will identify specific initiatives that will be initiated in order to encourage reduced single occupant vehicle travel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>UGC</th>
<th>IC</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1 The building owner/occupant will provide a ride matching service for</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>car/vanpooling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 The building owner/occupant will provide emergency ride home options</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 The building owner/occupant will provide subsidized transit passes for</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all occupants for a period of two years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 The building owner/occupant agrees to charge for parking as a separate</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cost to occupants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 The building owner/occupant agrees to provide reduced cost for users</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of car/vanpool, bicycle, moped/motorcycle spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6 The development agrees to join Travelwise (TMA) that provides the same</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services outlined under items D1 and D2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Maximum</strong></td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Available Parking Reduction**

Please indicate the total reduction available based upon Tables A through D above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Reduction Achieved</th>
<th>Maximum Achievable Reduction</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian &amp; Cyclist Orientation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>24% 4% 4% 4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit Access</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>24% 12% 5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%   4% 6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trip Reduction Incentives</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23% 11% 7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td><strong>57% 31% 22%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE F**

**TOTAL REDUCTION ACHIEVED**

0%
<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>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>26-Feb-2013</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 Highway Traffic Act 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>