MEDIA RELEASE:  Friday, April 26, 2013, 4:30 p.m.

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO
PLANNING AND WORKS COMMITTEE
AGENDA

Tuesday, April 30, 2013
9:00 a.m.
Regional Council Chambers
150 Frederick Street, Kitchener

1. MOTION TO GO INTO CLOSED SESSION

THAT a closed meeting of the Planning and Works and Administration and Finance Committees be held on Tuesday, April 30, 2013 at 8:45 a.m. in the Waterloo County Room, in accordance with Section 239 of the Municipal Act, 2001, for the purposes of considering the following subject matters:

a) proposed or pending acquisition of land in the City of Kitchener
b) proposed or pending acquisition of land in the City of Kitchener
c) proposed or pending disposition of land in the City of Kitchener
d) proposed or pending litigation and receiving of legal advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege related to a legal matter
e) receiving of legal advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege related to an agreement

2. MOTION TO RECONVENE INTO OPEN SESSION

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

4. DELEGATIONS

a) Dianne Ensing, Vice-Chair, Laurel Creek Headwaters Environmentally Sensitive Landscape Public Liaison Committee

b) Mary Ann Wasilka re: P-13-048, Recommended Grand River Transit 2013 Fare Structure

5. REQUEST TO REMOVE ITEMS FROM CONSENT AGENDA

6. MOTION TO APPROVE ITEMS OR RECEIVE FOR INFORMATION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td><strong>E-13-055</strong>, Church Street Improvements, Herbert Street to Barnswallow Drive, Township of Woolwich - Agreement with Lunor Group Inc. Et Al. – Country Club Estates Subdivision <em>(Approval)</em></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Ottawa Street Improvements - Pattandon Avenue to Imperial Drive, City of Kitchener - <em>Information Package</em> in Advance of Public Consultation Centre <em>(Information)</em></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td><strong>E-13-056</strong>, Landscaping Review for Fairway Road Extension from East of Pebble Creek to West of Zeller Drive, City of Kitchener <em>(Information)</em></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td><strong>CR-RS-13-033</strong>, Surplus Declaration of “St. George Tank” Water Tower, 100 St. George Street, Kitchener <em>(Approval)</em></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td><strong>P-13-043/E-13-054</strong>, West Montrose Covered Bridge Conservation Measures <em>(Approval)</em></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td><strong>P-13-044</strong>, Monthly Report of Development Activity for March 2013 <em>(Approval)</em></td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td><strong>P-13-045</strong>, Passenger Information Display Sign Acquisition – Grand River Transit <em>(Approval)</em></td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td><strong>P-13-052</strong>, Proposed New Grand River Transit Text Messaging Service Model <em>(Approval)</em></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REGULAR AGENDA RESUMES**

7. **REPORTS – TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES**

**RAPID TRANSIT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td><strong>CR-RS-13-035</strong>, Authorization to Expropriate Lands (2nd Report) Designated as Phase 2 of Stage 1 of Rapid Transit Project Relating to Property and Interests from Eby Street South Between Charles Street East and King Street East in the City of Kitchener to Borden Avenue South and Ottawa Street South in the City of Kitchener</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td><strong>CR-RS-13-036</strong>, Authorization to Expropriate Lands (1st Report) Designated as Phase 3 of Stage 1 of Rapid Transit Project Relating to Property and Interests from Borden Avenue South and Ottawa Street South to Courtland Avenue East in Kitchener and From King Street North and Northfield Drive to King Street South and John Street in Waterloo</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td><strong>E-13-031</strong>, Rapid Transit Brand Name Recommendation <em>(staff presentation)</em></td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRANSPORTATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td><strong>E-13-034</strong>, Line 86 (Regional Road 86) and Floradale Road (Regional Road 19) Traffic Operational Review</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WATER SERVICES

e) E-13-044, Water Supply and Distribution Operations Master Plan Recommended Strategy

REPORTS – PLANNING, HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

f) P-13-047, Recommended 2013 Grand River Transit Service Improvements

8. INFORMATION/CORRESPONDENCE

a) Memo: Noise Assessment Review for Bleams Road (Regional Road 56) between Fischer-Hallman Road (Regional Road 58) and Homer Watson Boulevard Road (Regional Road 28), City of Kitchener and Information on the Construction of Noise Barriers on Ira Needles Boulevard North of University Avenue

b) Canadian Owners and Pilots Association (COPA) President’s Award

c) Council Enquiries and Requests for Information Tracking List

9. OTHER BUSINESS

10. NEXT MEETING – May 28, 2013

11. ADJOURN
## NEXT MEETINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning and Works Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 28, 2013</td>
<td>9:00 A.M.</td>
<td>Planning and Works Committee</td>
<td>Council Chamber 2nd Floor, Regional Administration Building 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 18, 2013</td>
<td>9:00 A.M.</td>
<td>Planning and Works Committee</td>
<td>Council Chamber 2nd Floor, Regional Administration Building 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning, Housing and Community Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation and Environmental Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thur., May 2, 2013</td>
<td>5:30 P.M.</td>
<td>Ottawa Street Improvements - Pattandon Avenue to Imperial Drive – Public Consultation Centre</td>
<td>Central Baptist Church 358 Ottawa Street South Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Good evening, Mayor and Councillors, staff and guests. My name is Dianne Ensing and I live at 505 Wilmot Line. I am here to represent the Laurel Creek Headwaters Environmentally Sensitive Landscape Public Liaison Committee. We would like to discuss the need to better protect the integrity of the LCH-ESL. Specifically, we are requesting support and participation in a comprehensive study that would assess current and future traffic on ESL roads, and would provide mitigation measures to improve environmental protection and safety for end users.

The LCH-ESL was created in 2006. It is recognized as a unique part of Waterloo Region. With an area of more than 5000 acres, it includes parts of 4 municipalities; the townships of Woolwich, Wellesley, and Wilmot and the City of Waterloo. It lies adjacent to a large and growing population base. This landscape provides significant habitat to a rich diversity of flora and fauna, including threatened and provincially significant species. It is an area important for groundwater recharge and discharge including a coldwater fishery. ESL policies promote opportunities for habitat enhancement on a landscape level. The Public Liaison Committee was formed at the time of LCH-ESL designation, bringing together both advocates and opponents of the ESL. Since then, we have been working together to raise public awareness and to encourage environmental stewardship of this area.

In recent years there has been significant commercial and residential development along the west side of Waterloo and outlying communities. The Boardwalk retail area is an extensive commercial strip along Ira Needles Blvd. At this time, construction is not yet complete. The Region of Waterloo has moved ahead its plan to widen Ira Needles Blvd as traffic demand has increased in response to accelerated development. Residential construction and growth will also impact future traffic through the ESL. The City of Waterloo's west side residential development is located adjacent to the ESL. Just this winter, the first houses are up in this block of land that will see roughly 1600 homes; a population approximating the size of Baden. Outlying communities such as Wellesley are also growing. We wish to understand the demand of commuter traffic using ESL roads.

Let’s talk about who is using ESL roads. This natural heritage area attracts a wide range of recreational users. People are drawn to the beauty of the hilly topography and the health benefits of physical activity in this natural setting. Local residents walk in their neighborhood. An Avon Trail hiking group is seen at the junction of Berlett's Rd and Wilmot Line. Runners use this area in every season and at different times of day. Organizations host events. High school groups train here. Horse and buggies head east to the junction of Kressler Rd and Weimar Line. A university science class is involved in stream studies at Laurel Creek and there are a variety of trucks that pass them. Farm equipment uses these roads. Cross country skiing is popular on the trails at Schneider's Bush. On a particular Sunday afternoon in February, skiers’ cars are parked on Carmel Koch Rd, along Wilmot line and along Wideman Rd.

The nature of these roads in the ESL illustrates some of the challenges. Kressler Rd is a Regional Rd finished to a high standard with wide paved shoulders. At the east border of the ESL on Kressler Rd heading west, if you do not turn L onto Erbsville Rd, nor R onto Weimar Line then you will continue directly onto the gravel portion of the Wilmot Line. A fair number of vehicles do so daily, including heavy trucks. A City of Waterloo traffic count in 2011 indicated close to 1000 vehicles per day on portions of the Wilmot Line. The environmental impact of this is that the frequent road grading required for such heavy use contributes more sediment to the ESL creeks which cross under the road.
This is Monastery Creek near the junction of Wilmot Line and Carmel Koch Rd; another location where environmental impacts of traffic are well illustrated. It is in places like these where both sediment from road grading and surface erosion and road salt run-off from the adjacent hills enter directly into the waterways.

At Berlett’s Rd near the west border of the ESL the road has particularly poor sight lines combined with narrow shoulders. Our committee has heard from concerned residents who live along Berlett’s Rd about the volume and speed of commuter traffic on the road and they feel it is becoming unsafe to walk their neighborhood.

We believe there is compelling need to begin the examination of traffic and environmental protection of the ESL now. The process to accomplish a comprehensive traffic study of roads in the ESL area may be a long one. In the meantime, traffic on these roads will increase. The mix of vehicular traffic and recreational users of this hilly and scenic area will continue to challenge those bodies responsible for road safety and environmental enhancement.

For example, what is the level of commuter service provided by Berlett's Rd, Conservation Dr and Wideman Rd? Or Weimar Line? What is the ESL traffic demand that comes from Kressler Rd such as vehicles from Heidelberg, heavy trucks from the aggregate industry in Hawkesville and Woolwich and Wellesley agriculture?

Unilateral action taken by one municipality to mitigate traffic in one portion of this network is likely to adversely impact traffic on nearby roads. We believe the collective approach is needed now in order to address the impacts of district traffic on these local roads.

In recent weeks, we have taken this presentation to the three townships and the City of Waterloo to raise awareness, and to request support and collaboration on developing solutions. The response has been quite positive from the various councils and staff, with a general consensus that our request be taken to the Region who they felt should lead this initiative. Although there was some reluctance to discuss funding at this time, we have received a few suggestions on approach such as engaging university students in a mutually beneficial partnership to develop and carry out aspects of the study; and investigating provincial funding through the Places to Grow Provincial Implementation Fund. There was also some discussion that perhaps the study could look at other communities that have faced similar challenges and how they were solved.

In summary, we are asking Regional Council to direct staff to come back with recommendations for a comprehensive study that would:
- assess traffic on ESL roads
- provide mitigation measures to improve environmental protection and safety
- address social impacts
- look at funding
- work with the municipalities, the community & the Laurel Creek ESL Committee

We have a natural heritage jewel that is located in the backyard of a large population base that needs Regional support. We trust that the environmental leadership demonstrated in 2006 will continue with this study, and we hope the outcome of this work will be applicable to other ESLs that may face similar concerns. (I wish to thank my neighbours and also Deb Lehman for their contribution of photos.) Thank you for your attention.

Dianne Ensing, Vice-Chair
Laurel Creek Headwaters Environmentally Sensitive Landscape Public Liaison Committee
January 24, 2013

Stephen Woodworth MP.
Suite 12, 300 Victoria Street North,
Kitchener ON N2H 6R9

John Milloy, MPP
1770 King St. E, Unit 6C
Kitchener, ON N2G 2P1

Dear Stephen Woodworth MP and John Milloy MPP,

I’m writing to you due to a concern about our regional public transit system, specifically the Grand River Transit (GRT). The Regional Municipality of Waterloo assumed responsibility for the public transit system in 2000, before that time Cambridge and Kitchener/Waterloo had their own publically funded systems.

The Region of Waterloo has made many valuable improvements in the local transit system in 12 years and has increased ridership in the student demographic; however fares have also increased yearly by more than both cost of living and inflation. Stats Canada has indicated in the past 2001 to 2006 and decline in ridership in the demographic of those living under the $10,000, by almost 1% per year. (I would need to verify these stats with a report to regional council in 2010, and would be happy to send them to your offices, in the next week).

I have appeared at budget time over the past couple of years about the potential risk to those in poverty who are no longer able to access public transportation. These low-income citizens usually cycle or walk in all weather conditions, and road hazards.

I’m requesting the assistance of your offices in reviewing the current Stats Canada figures for 2006-2011, which will be available this summer to ascertain if the GRT in the management of the Region of Waterloo is increasing student ridership at the cost of those in poverty, and if that is the case, could you assist me in encouraging and discussing with the region and GRT the establishment a fare structure or subside which would provide access to GRT for the lowest income demographic.

Yours Truly,

Mary Ann Wasilka

P.S.
I’m also interested in information on the Municipal Act as the Regional Clerks’ office has advised me that unless I have new information to provide I may not appear before Regional Council more than once on the same issue. I was wondering if the Municipal Act covers access to public meetings. Thank you for your help and assistance now and in the past.

Cc Tom Galloway Regional Councillor and Chair of Finance Committee
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: April 30, 2013

FILE CODE: T04-20, 7186

SUBJECT: CHURCH STREET IMPROVEMENTS, HERBERT STREET TO BARNSWALLOW DRIVE, TOWNSHIP OF WOOLWICH - AGREEMENT WITH LUNOR GROUP INC. ET AL. - COUNTRY CLUB ESTATES SUBDIVISION

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into an agreement with Lunor Group Inc., 2079993 Ontario Inc., 229249 Ontario Limited, and Elmira and District Association for Community Living for watermain, sanitary forcemain, storm sewer and concrete ductbank installations within the Church Street road allowance in the Township of Woolwich required as part of the adjacent subdivision development, all at the developers’ expense, on terms and conditions satisfactory to the Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services and the Regional Solicitor;

AND THAT the Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services be authorized to execute the agreement, as described in Report E-13-055, with Lunor Group Inc., 2079993 Ontario Inc., 229249 Ontario Limited, and Elmira and District Association for Community Living on behalf of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo.

SUMMARY:

Nil

REPORT:

On December 12, 2012, Regional Council approved the Recommended Design Alternative for improvements on Church Street in Elmira from Herbert Street to Barnswallow Drive as outlined in Report E-12-125. The approved improvements are scheduled for construction in 2013 and include pavement rehabilitation, new storm sewer, curb and gutter, cycling/buggy lanes, sidewalk, turn lanes and raised median islands as well as sanitary sewer and watermain replacements on behalf of the Township of Woolwich.

To the north of the Region’s proposed Church Street improvements is the Country Club Estates Subdivision development by Lunor Group Inc., 2079993 Ontario Inc., 229249 Ontario Limited, and Elmira and District Association for Community Living (collectively the “Developers”), which is currently in the first phase of construction. In order to service the Country Club Estates Subdivision development, there are watermain, storm sewer, sanitary forcemain and concrete ductbank works required along and across Church Street. The watermain, storm sewer and sanitary forcemain works will ultimately be inherited by the Region/Township as municipal infrastructure and accordingly it has been the Region’s practice to construct works such as these as part of a tendered Regional contract to ensure the quality and workmanship meets Regional standards and complies with Regional contract provisions and warranty obligations. It is appropriate therefore that these
works be incorporated into the upcoming Region tender for the Church Street Improvements at the Developers’ expense. It is also proposed that the concrete ductbanks (which are required for future utility purposes to service the development) also be constructed at this time as part of the Region’s contract to eliminate trench cuts in the road in the future.

It is therefore proposed that these development-related works all be incorporated into the Region’s upcoming construction for the Church Street Improvements on behalf of the Developers. This construction work is scheduled to commence in July 2013 and be fully completed by October 2013. The Developers would be required to provide financial security in advance of the award of the construction contract to pay for all costs for the subdivision servicing work including the construction costs and a pro-rated share of the Region’s engineering costs for tender preparation, tendering, contract administration, testing and site inspection.

The complete scope of these development-related requirements has now been defined and an agreement is required to outline the details of the work to be constructed, the timing for construction, payment of all costs of construction and the provision of security for the work. The purpose of this report is to obtain Council approval to authorize the Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services to execute such an agreement between the Region and the Developers to provide for watermain, sanitary forcemain, storm sewer and concrete ductbank installations within the Church Street road allowance required as part of the Developers’ adjacent subdivision development and all to be fully funded by the Developers.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

Construction of the Church Street Improvements supports Strategic Focus Area # 5 of the Corporate Strategic Plan to provide high quality infrastructure and asset management to meet current needs and future growth.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The total estimated value of these development-related works is $420,000 which would be fully funded by the Developers by way of a financial security received in advance of contract award. There are no costs to the Region associated with the development-related works that would be covered by this agreement.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Staff from the Legal Services Division were consulted in the compilation of this Report.

ATTACHMENTS

Nil

PREPARED BY: Gary MacDonald, Head, Transportation Rehabilitation Program

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Regional Municipality of Waterloo

OTTAWA STREET IMPROVEMENTS
PATTANDON AVENUE TO IMPERIAL DRIVE
City of Kitchener

INFORMATION PACKAGE

Public Consultation Centre
Thursday May 2, 2013
5:30 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.

at

Central Baptist Church
358 Ottawa Street South, Kitchener

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 Consultation Centre.
1. **What is the Purpose of this Public Consultation Centre?**

The Region of Waterloo is currently considering improvements to Ottawa Street from Pattandon Avenue to Imperial Drive in the City of Kitchener as a Schedule ‘A+’ project under the Class Environmental Assessment. (Please refer to Appendix ‘A’ for a Key Plan.) Ottawa Street is an arterial roadway under the jurisdiction of the Region of Waterloo. The watermain, sanitary sewer and gasmain beneath this road are owned and operated by the City of Kitchener.

This project has been initiated to address deteriorated roadway and underground infrastructure within the project limits. Pedestrian and cycling enhancements are also being considered as part of this project.

We encourage you to provide comments on the improvements under consideration and request that you fill out the Comment Sheet attached to the back of this Information Package and place it in the box at this Public Consultation Centre or send it to the address indicated on the Comment Sheet. Your comments will be considered by the Project Team, in conjunction with all of the other relevant information, in establishing a preferred design for roadway improvements for Ottawa Street.

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

The planning for these infrastructure improvements is being undertaken by a “Project Team” consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo, the City of Kitchener and City of Kitchener Councillor Frank Etherington.

3. **What Improvements are being Considered on Ottawa Street?**

Based on technical studies and investigations completed, the Project Team has identified the need for the following repairs to existing infrastructure on Ottawa Street from Pattandon Avenue to Imperial Drive:

- Complete replacement of the pavement structure with a slight narrowing of the existing travel lanes;
- Replacement of the sanitary sewer system;
- Replacement of the watermain system;
- Replacement of the storm sewer system; and
- Replacement of the gasmain system.

Based on the approved Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines, the Regional Cycling Master Plan, the 2013 Cycling Facility Map and other relevant policies/practices, the Project Team is also recommending the following proposed enhancements to the roadway corridor:

- Construction of 1.25 metre wide designated on-road cycling lanes on both sides of Ottawa Street to provide a continuous cycling facility on Ottawa Street within the project limits;
- Construction of new 1.5 metre to 1.8 metre wide sidewalks on the north and south sides of Ottawa Street where none currently exists;
- Enhanced GRT stops and bus shelters; and
- Provision of 1.0 metre to 2.25 metre wide boulevards and enhanced boulevard landscaping where feasible.
It is noted that, in order to accommodate these proposed enhancements on Ottawa Street, there is a requirement for the acquisition of strips of property from some adjacent private properties as well as the removal of some existing trees and encroachment of the work into the grassed front yards of some properties.

Please refer to Appendix “B” for drawings of the Project Team’s Preferred Design for Ottawa Street through the project limits.

4. **Are any Improvements Planned at the Ottawa Street and Mill Street intersection?**

The limits of this project do not include any work at the Ottawa Street / Mill Street intersection; however, the Regional Light Rail Transit (LRT) project is scheduled to be in operation in 2017 through this intersection using the existing track and one new parallel track. There will be some intersection modifications at Ottawa Street and Mill Street to accommodate the new LRT operation (one new track, new crossing protection systems and new pedestrian connections to the new station/platform).

Changes to the existing lane configuration are not being considered at this time in advance of LRT operation. Any re-configuration of the intersection or changes to the traffic lanes at the Ottawa Street / Mill Street intersection will be considered as part of a future Ottawa Street Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Study between Mill Street and King Street. This future Class EA Study is currently scheduled to start in 10+ years and a separate public consultation process will be initiated for this future study.

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

The Project Team is planning these improvements to address both the deteriorated roadway and underground infrastructure as well as to include enhancements to the roadway corridor consistent with Regional Bylaws, policies, plans and practices. The Regional Official Plan gives the direction to balance new and retrofitted roads for all modes of transportation including walking, cycling, autos and transit. The proposed enhancements on this project support the Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) goals of optimizing our transportation system, promoting transportation choice and supporting sustainable development. Regional Council also approved the Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines in 2010 that support the integration of active and sustainable transportation on all Regional Roads.

This project will improve the walking environment by including new sidewalks where they currently do not exist. The sidewalk will be set back from the road with grassed boulevards to further enhance the walking experience. In addition, this project includes the installation of dedicated on-road cycling lanes in support of the Region’s Cycling Master plan which designates this section of Ottawa Street as an official cycling route. Improving the walking and cycling environments will support the Transit Modal Share targets in the RTMP.
6. **Who is Responsible for Clearing Snow from the Proposed New Sidewalks?**

   The City of Kitchener has jurisdiction for the maintenance of sidewalks on Regional Roads. As per the City of Kitchener’s associated by-law, snow clearing to ensure sidewalks are clear of snow and ice will be the responsibility of the property owner. More information concerning sidewalk clearing is available at: [http://kitchener.ca/en/livinginkitchener/SidewalkClearing.asp](http://kitchener.ca/en/livinginkitchener/SidewalkClearing.asp). A copy of the by-law can be found at: [http://code.municipalworld.com/kitchener/687.pdf](http://code.municipalworld.com/kitchener/687.pdf).

7. **Will Property Acquisition be Required for this Project?**

   Implementation of the Project Team’s Preferred Design will require that the Region acquire property from several abutting property owners. These proposed property purchases generally consist of small ‘strips’ of land immediately adjacent to the existing roadway right-of-way to provide room for the proposed boulevards, sidewalks and cycling lanes. In areas where property is required, the property owner will be contacted directly by the Region of Waterloo’s Land Purchasing Officer. Compensation will be provided at fair market rates based on recent similar area sales. The plans presented at this Consultation Centre show the proposed property acquisition that will likely be required. Please refer to Appendix “C” for further information on the property acquisition process.

8. **How will Trees, Driveways and Lawns be Affected?**

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

   Some residential properties along Ottawa Street may currently have hard landscaping features such as rock gardens, ornamental lights, underground sprinkler systems or similar landscape features which are currently situated on the road right-of-way rather than on private property. If your property is identified as having these types of features on the roadway right-of-way, you will be contacted well in advance of construction and be requested to relocate these items from the right-of-way prior to construction.

9. **When will Construction Occur and will there be Detours?**

   Construction on Ottawa Street is tentatively scheduled to occur in 2017. The Region’s Transportation Capital Program is reviewed annually and the timing of projects may change depending on several factors. The timing of this Ottawa Street work will be closely coordinated with the timing of the LRT construction.

   It is tentatively proposed that construction will be accomplished in two (2) stages, by completing half of Ottawa Street at a time during each stage. During the works Ottawa Street will remain open to one lane of traffic in the northbound (downtown bound) direction. Southbound traffic will be detoured via Regional Roads and local City roads as necessary.
Pedestrian access will be maintained on one side of Ottawa Street for the duration of the construction. Where the sidewalk is close to deep excavations, the sidewalk will be separated from the work area by temporary fencing. Signage will be erected in order to direct pedestrians through the project area.

The City of Kitchener Fire Department, Waterloo Regional Police and Ambulance Services will all be advised of the traffic restrictions during the construction period. Grand River Transit service (Routes 3, 11 and 22) will be maintained during construction through the implementation of temporary bus stop locations as required.

As is customary during Regional Road reconstruction projects, motorists will be advised of the construction timing and traffic restrictions through advance signage and through information on the Region's web site.

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

Access to residential driveways will be maintained to the greatest extent possible during construction. The Contractor will be required to temporarily block access to and from driveways on Ottawa Street and side streets for short-term periods when completing certain construction operations. Where a disruption to your driveway is expected, the Contractor is required to hand-deliver a notice at least 48 hours in advance advising you of the time and duration of the driveway disruption. If necessary, alternate parking arrangements will be made, such as provision for temporary parking on adjacent side streets.

For commercial properties, access for customers will be maintained at all times. If only one driveway access exists, the Contractor will endeavour to complete the work across the driveway in two stages where feasible in order to maintain customer access.

Property and business owners are asked to contact the site supervisor if they have any concerns in relation to access, signage or other issues during the project so it can be determined if reasonable changes or modifications can be made.

11. Will there be Water Service Shutdowns during Construction?

 Temporary water service interruptions to your property may be required during construction. Water service interruptions will likely be less than ½ a day in duration and will likely occur between 9:00 am and 2:30 pm Monday to Friday unless other arrangements have been made. “Notices of Water Service Interruption” will be delivered to your front door a minimum of 24 hours before any required water service shutdown.

12. Can my Existing Water Service be Upgraded?

As part of the watermain replacement work, all private water services to affected homes only will be replaced to property line. If property owners wish to increase the size of the water service to their property beyond the standard 19mm size (i.e. to achieve increased flow) they are encouraged to have this work included under this project. Undertaking these improvements in conjunction with the proposed construction typically results in cost savings to the property owner as compared to undertaking the work independently at another time in the future. Subject to a mutual agreement between the City of Kitchener and the property owner, existing water services may be upgraded from the mains under the road to the property line at the property owner’s expense.
If you wish to discuss an increase in the size of your water service to a size greater than the standard of 19mm diameter, please indicate so on your comment sheet. From this information, staff will contact you at a later date to discuss your plans and to provide a cost estimate for your desired improvements.

Additionally, property owners may wish to consider replacing the water service on their private property (i.e. between the property line and their building) as part of this construction. Property owners should arrange this work directly with the Region’s contractor on-site during construction.

13. Can my Existing Sanitary Service be Upgraded?

As part of the sanitary sewer replacement work, all private sanitary services to affected homes only will be replaced to property line. If property owners wish to increase the size of the sanitary service to their property beyond the standard 100mm size (i.e. to achieve increased flow) they are encouraged to have this work included under this project. Undertaking these improvements in conjunction with the proposed construction typically results in cost savings to the property owner as compared to undertaking the work independently at another time in the future. Subject to a mutual agreement between the City of Kitchener and the property owner, existing sanitary services may be upgraded from the sanitary sewer main under the road to the property line at the property owner’s expense.

If you wish to discuss an increase in the size of your sanitary service to a size greater than the standard of 100mm diameter, please indicate so on your comment sheet. From this information, staff will contact you at a later date to discuss your plans and to provide a cost estimate for your desired improvements.

Additionally, property owners may wish to consider replacing the sanitary service on their private property (i.e. between the property line and their building) as part of this construction. Property owners should arrange this work directly with the Region’s contractor on-site during construction.

14. How will Garbage / Recycling be Collected During Construction?

During construction we 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, our Contractor will deliver your garbage and recyclables to an adjacent side street and return the empty containers afterwards. We ask that all residents mark their containers with their address for easy identification.

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 suppression measures (i.e. the application of water and/or calcium chloride) in accordance with the Region’s standard practice.

16. How is the Natural Environment being Considered?

Sediment and erosion control features will be designed, implemented and maintained throughout construction. Key measures of this sediment and erosion control plan will
include silt fencing, temporary tree protection fencing, temporary sediment basins and other Best Practice measures. As noted previously, the Preferred Design will include new boulevard landscaping where feasible in order to enhance the natural environment and to provide a more appealing setting for pedestrians.

17. What are the Expected Working Hours during Construction?

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

18. Will there be any change in Traffic Noise following this Construction?

The Project Team expects no increase in traffic noise levels on Ottawa Street as a result of the proposed improvements. In fact, improvements to the asphalt pavement compared to the existing irregular and cracked surface will tend to decrease vehicular noise levels after reconstruction.

19. Will the Posted Speed Limit on Ottawa Street be Changed?

Following construction, the Region will retain the posted speed limit of 50 km/hr on Ottawa Street from Pattaddon Avenue to Imperial Drive.

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

The Region of Waterloo and the City of Kitchener are funding the road improvements on this project. The estimated total project cost for the Region’s share of the proposed Ottawa Street improvements is $2,430,000. The City of Kitchener has an additional budget of $1,453,000 for funding the watermain and sanitary sewer replacements and for the City’s share of the storm sewer replacement on Ottawa Street.

21. What are the Next Steps?

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

22. 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 and use them as input for recommending a final Design Concept for the Ottawa Street project. This Final Recommendation will be presented to Regional Planning and Works Committee and Council in the Fall 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 this Public Consultation Centre) so that anyone wishing to speak to Committee or Council about this project can do so before final approval.
23. How Can I Voice My Comments At This Stage?

In order to assist us in addressing any comments or concerns you might have regarding this project, we ask that you please fill out the attached Comment Sheet and leave it in the box provided at the registration table. Alternatively, you can mail, fax or e-mail your comments to the Region of Waterloo not later than May 17, 2013.

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

Mr. Michael Halloran, C.E.T.,
Project Manager
Region of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street, 6th Floor
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3

Phone: (519) 575-4529
Fax: (519) 575-4430
Email: mhalloran@regionofwaterloo.ca
Appendix A

Key Plan

OTTAWA STREET (REGIONAL ROAD No. 4)
PATTANDON AVENUE TO IMPERIAL DRIVE
CITY OF KITCHENER
Appendix B

Typical Cross Section

OTTAWA STREET
PATTANDON AVENUE TO IMPERIAL DRIVE
66' (20.213m) R.O.W.

TYPICAL SECTION
OTTAWA STREET
PATTANDON AVE. TO IMPERIAL DR.
Appendix C

Property Acquisition Process Information Sheet

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

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

**Property Impact Plans**

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

**Initial Owner Contact by Regional Real Estate Staff**

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

**Initial Meetings**

The initial meeting is attended by the project engineer and the assigned real estate staff person to brief the owner on the project, what part of their lands are to be acquired or will be affected, what work will be undertaken, when, with what equipment, etc and to answer any questions.

The primary purpose of the meeting is to listen to the owner and identify issues, concerns, effects of the proposed acquisition on remaining lands and businesses that can be feasibly mitigated and/or compensated, and how the remaining property may be restored. These discussions may require additional meetings. The goal of staff is to work with the owner to reach mutually agreeable solutions.

**Goal – Fair and Equitable Settlement for All Parties**

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

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

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

The general steps towards such an offer are as follows;

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

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

**Expropriation**

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

Put simply, an expropriation is the transfer of lands or an easement to a governmental authority for reasonable compensation, including payment of fair market value for the transferred lands, without the consent of the property owner being required. In the case of expropriations by municipalities such as the Region of Waterloo, the process set out in the Ontario *Expropriations Act* must be followed to ensure that the rights of the property owners provided under that *Act* are protected.
COMMENT SHEET
REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO

OTTAWA STREET IMPROVEMENTS
Pattandon Avenue to Imperial Drive
City of Kitchener

PUBLIC CONSULTATION CENTRE

Please complete and hand in this sheet so that your views can be considered for this project. If you cannot complete your comments today, please take this home and mail, fax or e-mail your comments by May 17, 2013 to:

Mr. Michael Halloran, C.E.T.,
Project Manager,
Design and Construction Division
Regional Municipality of Waterloo
Facsimile: 519-575-4430

6th Floor, 150 Frederick Street
Kitchener, ON N2J 4G3
email: mhalloran@regionofwaterloo.ca

Are you interested in upgrading your water service as part of this project?  YES ___ NO ____

Are you interested in upgrading your sanitary service as part of this project?  YES ___ NO ____

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:

For information

SUMMARY:

NIL

REPORT:

On November 6, 2012, the Region’s Planning and Works Committee endorsed the following report recommendation which was subsequently approved by Regional Council on November 21, 2012.

“THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the construction of noise barriers as part of the Fairway Road Extension, for properties backing onto Fairway Road from #2 to #48 Colton Circle (inclusive and from #501 to #541 Landgren Court (inclusive) in 2013, subject to Council approval of the 2013 Transportation Capital Program, as described in Report No. P-12-103/E12-112, dated November 6, 2012.” It should be noted, this report also identified that a noise barrier is not warranted between #50 and #102 Colton Circle.

As a result of concerns raised by a delegation representing residents on Colton Circle and discussions between Committee members and Regional staff, Committee members requested that Regional staff meet with residents to answer questions posed by the delegation with respect to the recent Noise Study undertaken and to inform residents of the landscaping plans in the area from east of Pebble Creek Drive to west of Zeller Drive on the north side of Fairway Road.

Region staff proceeded to meet with City of Kitchener staff and developed two landscaping options (Appendix A – Option 1 and 2). Following this meeting a letter and Information Package was sent to the residents of Colton Circle (from #46 to #102) on March 28, 2013 that explained the Noise Study that was undertaken, illustrated both landscaping options, requested feedback on the landscaping options and informed them of an upcoming Information Meeting to be held on April 11, 2013.
Out of the 26 properties that were circulated both a letter and Information Package, the Region received 3 comment sheets and 8 comments through emails. At the Information Meeting held on April 11, 2013 there were 5 residents in attendance representing 4 properties. Based on the residents feedback at the Information Meeting and from the comments received all residents preferred Option 1 versus Option 2.

City of Kitchener staff has indicated they are supportive of Option 2 and are not supportive of having a portion of the earth berm constructed on the City of Kitchener’s storm water management property as shown in Option 1. By slightly modifying the earth berm under Option 1 to be located on the road allowance only will reduce the height of the earth berm by up to 0.5 metres in height depending on the terrain. This minor modification would not have any affect on the noise levels or screening for the affected properties.

Based on the residents feedback from the Information Meeting and the residents and City of Kitchener comments received, Region staff is intending to proceed with the installation of a modified earth berm (as per the City of Kitchener request) and landscaping adjacent to Fairway Road on the north side of the road from the end of the approved noise barrier to west of Zeller Drive (Option 1). It is anticipated that the construction of the approved noise barrier between #2 and #48 Colton Circle (inclusive) and between #501 and #541 Landgren Court (inclusive) will occur between mid-May and mid-July of 2013 while the installation of the earth berm and landscaping will occur in the fall of 2013.

One issue that was raised at the Information Meeting was the possibility of including the installation of additional landscaping at rear of the residential properties in addition to the landscaping being installed adjacent to Fairway Road. Region staff is not intending to include the installation of this additional landscaping since this type of landscaping is typically undertaken by the property owner on their property or by the City if it is on City lands.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This report addresses the Region’s goal to ensure Regional programs and services are efficient and effective and demonstrate accountability to the public (Strategic Objective 5.3).

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The capital cost to provide an earth berm and landscaping adjacent to Fairway Road on the north side of the road from the end of the approved noise barrier to west of Zeller Drive is approximately $20,000. Funding for this landscaping has been included in the Region’s 2013 Transportation Capital Program under the Fairway Road Extension project and will be funded from the Regional Development Charge Reserve Fund.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

NIL

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix A – Landscaping Options 1 and 2

PREPARED BY: Robert Gallivan, Manager, Transportation Program Development

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Option 1:
Option 2:

FAIRWAY ROAD EXTENSION
SCREENING FOR RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES #52 - #102 COLTON CIRCLE
OPTION 2: CHAIN LINK FENCE WITH LANDSCAPING

COLTON CIRCLE

FAIRWAY ROAD

APPROVED NOISE WALL
(CONSTRUCTION 2013)

EXISTING CITY OF KITCHENER STORMWATER MANAGEMENT AREA

SECTION A-A
TYPICAL CROSS SECTION: #52 - #102 COLTON CIRCLE
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and works Committee

DATE: April 30, 2013

FILE CODE: L07-90(A)

SUBJECT: SURPLUS DECLARATION OF “ST. GEORGE TANK” WATER TOWER, 100 ST. GEORGE STREET, KITCHENER

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo declare the lands described as Part Lot 48, Plan 393, as in A13921 and A45860, all of PIN 22503-0053 (LT), in the City of Kitchener surplus to the needs of the Region, as detailed in Report No. CR-RS-13-033 dated April 30, 2013, and provide the standard public notification as required by the Region’s property disposition by-law.

SUMMARY:

Nil

REPORT:

The Region assumed ownership of the St. George Tank water tower, municipally identified as 100 St. George Street in 1972 by By-law 13-72. The water tower on the lands was demolished in 2011 as it was no longer required for the city of Kitchener’s water supply system. The lands are no longer required for water supply purposes or for any other Regional purposes.

Discussions between Regional and City of Kitchener staff are under way for a proposed conveyance of these lands to the City for use as a community garden.

The Region’s property disposition by-law requires advertising of any proposed conveyance of Regional land in a local newspaper. The requirements of the Region’s property disposition by-law will be met prior to the completion of any conveyance of the lands. All related costs, such as advertising, will be the Region’s responsibility.

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

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The proposed declaration of surplus property supports the Region’s strategic vision of managing growth to foster thriving and productive urban and rural communities.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The Region will be responsible for the costs of compliance with the Region’s real property disposition by-law which will be funded by Water Services and Public Health.
OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

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

ATTACHMENTS

Appendix “A” – location map of lands.

PREPARED BY: Joan Moore, Property Agent

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

DATE: April 30, 2013  CODE: E03-20 /4173; C06-60(A)

SUBJECT: CONSULTANT SELECTION FOR THE CONESTOGO PLAINS WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM CLASS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND PRELIMINARY DESIGN (C2013-04)

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into a Consulting Services Agreement with CIMA Canada Inc. of Kitchener, Ontario, to provide consulting engineering services for undertaking the Conestogo Plains Water Supply (WS) Class Environmental Assessment (EA) and Preliminary Design, at an upset limit of $310,600 plus applicable taxes, as per Report E-13-052, dated April 30, 2013.

SUMMARY:

The Conestogo Plains Water System (CPWS), in the community of Conestogo, Township of Woolwich, was originally constructed by a private developer, and was later assumed by the Region. The WS system was designed based on standards and guidelines at the time, resulting in system capacity greater than the current needs of those supplied by the system.

The Region recently completed the West Montrose Water Supply Class EA (Notice of Completion dated December 2012, Report No. E-12-124), which identified the opportunity for extending the supply from the CPWS to the community of West Montrose, decommissioning the current West Montrose Water Supply System. As part of this alternative, the available capacity in the CPWS was preliminarily assessed against the expected demands for Conestogo Plains, West Montrose, and also demands of potential future connections to those properties that currently have private well supplies. The study subject of this report will be undertaken under the Municipal Engineers Association Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process, and will confirm whether the CPWS can sustain water supply to the above communities, and will also evaluate other potential alternatives that can better meet the above water supply requirements for these communities.

A Request for Consulting Services for the EA and preliminary design for the Conestogo Plains Water Supply Class EA was advertised in the Waterloo Region Record and on the Region's website. Based on a selection process completed in accordance with the Region's consultant selection policy and the Region’s Purchasing By-law, which included review of the consultants' Letters of Interest, Detailed Work Plans, schedules, and upset fee costs, the project team recommends that CIMA Canada Inc. of Kitchener, Ontario, be retained to undertake this assignment at an upset fee limit of $310,600 plus applicable taxes. This total cost includes $84,000 for testing and monitoring the existing wells that will only be used if required.
Completion of this assignment is expected to be in the spring of 2015, after which the Region will proceed with detailed design and construction of the preferred alternatives for long-term water servicing of Conestogo and West Montrose.

**REPORT:**

**Background**

The Conestogo Plains Water System (CPWS), the focus of this study, was originally constructed by a private developer between 1989 and 1992, and was later assumed by the Region. It is situated on the western side of the Grand River in the community of Conestogo and currently serves 115 households. This system consists of two Region wells, C3 and C4, along with an iron sequestering and disinfection facilities, treated water storage and pumping facilities. The CPWS has a permitted water supply capacity of 786 m$^3$/day, based on design standards and guidelines at the time. Over the last five years, the maximum day demand of the system has not exceeded 262 m$^3$/day. The water supply to the remainder of the community of Conestogo is provided by private wells and another Regional water system servicing the Conestogo Golf Course subdivision.

The Region recently completed the West Montrose Water Supply Class EA (Notice of Completion dated December 2012, Report No. E-12-124), which identified the opportunity for extending the supply from the CPWS to the community of West Montrose, decommissioning the current West Montrose Water Supply System. This approach was the preferred alternative to resolve water quantity and quality concerns in the West Montrose system, which requires periodic water trucking from another Regional facility to meet periods of high water demand or when water quality of the wells is impacted by elevated water levels in the Grand River. To develop the preferred alternative, the available capacity in the CPWS was preliminarily assessed against the expected demands for Conestogo Plains, West Montrose, and also demands of potential future connections to those properties that currently have private well supplies.

The preliminary assessment above will be confirmed through a more detailed assessment of the CPWS, which will follow the Municipal Engineers Association Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process. At the current pumping levels, water quality of the CPWS system is generally good with a total of six complaints communicated to the Region in the past five years relating to iron and manganese, an aesthetic parameter. This study will confirm whether the existing system can sustain water supply to Conestogo Plains, West Montrose and properties on private wells. It will also confirm whether water quality will be impacted if the current pumping levels need to be increased and whether additional treatment would be required. This study will also evaluate the alternative of potentially connecting the whole community of Conestogo (Plains, Golf Course and properties on private wells) to another larger water system, such as the City of Waterloo, located approximately 1.2 Km from the community of Conestogo. This alternative may allow decommissioning of all sources in the communities of Conestogo and West Montrose by replacing them with water supply from the City of Waterloo.

**Project Scope**

The main scope of the consultant assignment is to complete the EA study and preliminary design for the long-term water servicing of the Conestogo community, considering projected water demand, and (if compatible with the Conestogo preferred solution) preliminary design of a new watermain to West Montrose and changes to the West Montrose WS.
The consultant will:

- Collect and analyze relevant background information;
- Carry out the activities required to comply with the requirements of the Class Municipal EA process for Schedule ‘B’ projects (as amended in 2011), including public and agency consultation;
- Survey Conestogo properties currently serviced by private wells to gauge the interest in connection to the municipal system;
- Estimate future water demands;
- Assess the condition of existing Conestogo Plains WS facility and sources;
- Conduct a preliminary assessment and evaluation of possible servicing alternatives including maintaining the existing system and connecting to another system such as the City of Waterloo distribution system;
- If required, undertake pumping tests and monitoring of neighbouring wells for confirming the sustainable yield of water from the Conestogo Plains wells;
- If required, assess potential impacts on the water quality of the Conestogo Plains WS at the design capacity of the wells;
- If required, assess the potential impact to nearby private wells from increased water draw at Conestogo Plains WS;
- Prepare an Environmental Study Report (ESR);
- Prepare the preliminary design for the preferred design solution for Conestogo Plains.

Well testing and monitoring for this project will only be conducted if the information about the existing system is insufficient for undertaking an adequate system evaluation and analysis.

Consultant Selection

A Request for Consultant Services (C2013-04) for the Conestogo Plains WS Class EA and Preliminary Design was advertised in the Waterloo Region Record and on the Region’s website in January, 2013.

Evaluation of the consultant submissions was conducted by the Region’s Project Team:

J. Cavalcante, Manager, Engineering and Planning, Water Services
M. Darmalingum, Senior Project Manager, Environmental Engineering, Design & Construction
D. Corbett, Senior Hydrogeologist, Hydrology and Source Water, Water Services
T. Walton, Supervisor, Water Operations, Water Services
D. Arsenault, Project Engineer, Engineering and Planning, Water Services

Consultant submissions were evaluated in accordance with the Region’s consultant selection policy and the Region’s Purchasing By-law in order to select the consultant offering the best overall value to the Region. The criteria and their respective weightings were as follows:

Quality Factors (80%)

- Project Approach and Understanding (25 per cent)
- Experience of the Project Manager (20 per cent)
- Experience of Project Support Staff (20 per cent)
- Experience on Similar Projects (15 per cent)

Equity Factors (5%)

- Current Regional Workload (3 per cent)
- Local Office (2 per cent)
Price Factor (15%)  
- Upset Price (15 per cent)

The Region received Letter of Interest submissions from eleven consultant teams, and these were evaluated by the Project Team according to the above Quality and Equity factors. Three teams were short-listed, as follows:

- CIMA Canada Inc.
- Stantec Consulting Ltd.
- XCG Consultants Ltd.

The three short-listed consulting firms were invited to submit detailed work plans, along with upset fee budgets in separate envelopes, for further evaluation.

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 the project team finalized their evaluation of the Letters of Interest, Detailed Work Plans, and schedules, the upset fee envelopes were opened and the overall scores including the Price Factor were calculated.

The CIMA submission received the highest overall score, and also had the lowest cost. Based on this evaluation, the project team recommends that CIMA Canada Inc. be retained to undertake this assignment at an upset fee limit of $310,600 plus applicable taxes.

Schedule

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

Consultant Upset Limit

The upset limit for consulting fees and disbursements for the Conestogo Plains WS Class EA and preliminary design is $310,600 plus applicable taxes. This total cost includes $84,000 for testing and monitoring the existing wells that will only be used if required. A breakdown of the successful consultant’s upset fee is included in Appendix A attached to this report.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The Conestogo Plains WS Class EA and Preliminary Design supports 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,” and specifically, Strategic Action 2.2.1: “Continue to prioritize and implement capital program projects required to meet community needs and ensure sustainability.”

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The 2013 Ten Year Wastewater Capital Program includes a total of $3.4M for the Conestogo Plains WS project and $5.6 million for the West Montrose WS project between the years 2013 and 2018. The upset fee limit proposed by CIMA Canada Inc. of $310,600 is within the amount allocated for the Conestogo Plains WS total project budget.
OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:
NIL

ATTACHMENTS

Appendix A: Breakdown of Consultant's Upset Fee

PREPARED BY: Dave Arsenault, 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>EA Preparation and Demand Assessment</td>
<td>$28,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>Existing Systems Assessment(1)</td>
<td>$112,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3</td>
<td>Develop Alternatives</td>
<td>$8,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4</td>
<td>Public Consultation and Determination of Preferred Alternative</td>
<td>$33,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5</td>
<td>Determination of Watermain Routing and Watercourse Crossing Methods</td>
<td>$42,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 6</td>
<td>Environmental Study Report</td>
<td>$45,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 7</td>
<td>Preliminary Design Drawings and Design Report</td>
<td>$38,625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Consultant Upset Fee:** $310,600

(1) Task 2 includes $84,000 for well testing and monitoring, which will only be used if required.
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: April 30, 2013                FILE CODE: R03/50-WESTM

SUBJECT: WEST MONTROSE COVERED BRIDGE CONSERVATION MEASURES

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions regarding the West Montrose Covered Bridge, as described in Report P-13-043/E-13-054, dated April 30, 2013:

   a) Approve the planned maintenance and monitoring activities, and the development of a Bridge Management Plan;
   b) Thank the BridgeKeepers (West Montrose Residents Association Inc.) and other community stakeholders for their involvement in monitoring the status of the bridge.

SUMMARY:

The West Montrose Covered Bridge is a heritage structure designated by the Township of Woolwich under the Ontario Heritage Act, is ranked as one of the top ten most historically significant bridges in Waterloo Region, and is the last remaining covered bridge in Ontario. It is highly valued as a tourist attraction, a local community access route, a convenient route for horse-drawn buggies, and as part of a unique cultural heritage landscape.

In the fall of 2012, a crack in a primary load carrying timber was identified on the West Montrose Covered Bridge. The damaged timber was inspected and the bridge was subsequently closed for repair. Following replacement of the damaged timber, the bridge reopened first to pedestrian traffic on Monday November 19, 2012 and then to horse and buggy traffic on Friday December 7, 2012. Additional regulatory traffic signs were posted that indicate that the bridge is not to be crossed by trucks, buses and tractors as these will exceed the 3 tonne load posting of the bridge, and the bridge was reopened to motor vehicle traffic on Monday, February 4, 2013. This structural failure was the first in the known history of the bridge, but has prompted a thorough review of conservation measures for the bridge, to ensure it continues as a viable open bridge while maintaining the heritage integrity.

A Public Information Centre (PIC) was held on Tuesday, February 12, 2013 to present information and gather community input on the various options and cost implications of improvements and maintenance tasks being considered for the bridge, including limiting access, increasing load restrictions, improving fire protection and ongoing maintenance for the bridge.

More than 30 community stakeholders provided comments. The Region is very appreciative of the interest level and the feedback received from the attendees, including the West Montrose Residents’ Association (WRMA). Some WRMA members have independently provided ongoing observations regarding bridge operations to staff. All of the recommendations noted in the WRMA submission to the PIC are addressed in this Report.
In addition, a consulting engineer who is highly knowledgeable about wooden heritage bridges and has had a lengthy involvement with the West Montrose Bridge has provided comments on structural integrity and other aspects. Staff has also consulted with other transportation agencies that own covered bridges.

Based on the input noted above and review by staff, the Region will continue to operate this significant heritage structure with a 3 tonne load limit, which is equivalent to passenger vehicles and horse-drawn buggies. The following conservation initiatives have been completed, or are in the process of being undertaken:

- Installation of additional load restriction signs, including signs specifically restricting tractors, buses, trucks and limousines from using the bridge (complete);
- Installation of early warning signs on routes that lead to the bridge. Each sign will provide advanced warning of the load restriction, and display details on alternate routes. Locations are being finalized, please see Attachment 1 for Aerial view of area and potential sign locations (May);
- Replacement of the roof ridge cap (May-weather dependent);
- Installation of additional survey points for twice-yearly field surveying of the bridge superstructure (Summer);
- Upgrading of specific tongue and groove wood panels to facilitate annual engineering inspection of the internal bailey truss (Summer);
- Delivery of post cards to homes, farms and businesses in Woolwich Township with notification of the load limit (May);
- Notification of the load limit to commercial vehicle operators (limousines, bus, delivery companies, couriers) (complete);
- Installation of a heritage recognition plaque at the bridge (year-end);
- Pruned trees from north (village) end of bridge (complete);
- Updating electronic media and maps, including making information available to map providers such as Google, to indicate bridge restrictions (complete); and
- Improvement of the lighting inside the bridge (summer).

In addition, a longer term Bridge Management Plan, with input from stakeholders and interested parties is planned to be developed by December 2013. It will define the principles to be followed in the ongoing management of the structure. For example:

- Should the structure be strengthened,
- What level of intrusive measures are acceptable (i.e. height restrictors),
- What type of surveillance and/or monitoring systems are needed and effective,
- What fire protection options are feasible in this location, and which option should be implemented.

A key component of the Bridge Management Plan will be the establishment of ongoing annual maintenance measures, and budget estimates.

Since 1998 oversight of the bridge has been the responsibility of Planning, Housing and Community Services, with input from other departments as required. Moving forward, management of the bridge is being transferred to Transportation and Environmental Services, Transportation Division, as part of their ongoing bridge management program. Having the bridge managed by the Transportation Division is consistent with how other covered bridges are managed by government agencies across North America.

**REPORT:**

On September 14, 2012 Regional staff was notified that there was a cracked timber visible on the underside of the West Montrose Covered Bridge. This was immediately investigated and as the
cracked timber was identified as a primary load carrying element, the bridge was immediately closed to all vehicular traffic. Working with project engineering consultants IBI Group (IBI), plans were developed to replace the damaged timber. The bridge was closed to pedestrians during the actual repair, as required by the Ministry of Labour.

Following replacement of the damaged timber, the bridge reopened to pedestrian traffic on Monday November 19, 2012 and to horse and buggy traffic on Friday December 7, 2012. The bridge reopened to motor vehicle traffic on Monday, February 4, 2013 with the removal of road barriers and the addition of regulatory traffic signs that indicate that the bridge is not to be crossed by trucks, buses and tractors as these will exceed the 3 tonne load posting of the bridge.

**Public Information Centre**

A Public Information Centre (PIC) regarding the West Montrose Covered Bridge was held on Tuesday, February 12, 2013 at the Township of Woolwich Council Chambers. The presentation material was included on the January 29, 2013 Community Services Committee agenda. The purpose of the PIC was to present information and gather community input on the various options and cost implications of limiting access, increasing load restrictions, improving fire protection and ongoing maintenance for the bridge.

Notification of the PIC was advertised on the Region of Waterloo and Township of Woolwich websites; a media release sent to local media outlets; email distribution to and by the West Montrose Residents’ Association; printed flyers distributed to and by the Older Order Mennonite community; and notices placed in the Elmira Independent and the Woolwich Observer newspapers.

In early April, Regional staff notified those people who registered at the PIC that this report would be available for review as of Friday, April 26, prior to the Regional Council Committee meetings of April 30, 2013.

**Summary of Public Feedback**

More than 30 community stakeholders provided comments, and the Region was very appreciative of the interest level and the feedback received from the attendees, including the West Montrose Residents’ Association (WRMA). Comments received included: options for additional signage; improvements to signage content and location; the pros and cons of surveillance cameras, weigh scales, restrictive barriers and fines; an interest in investigating structural improvements; support for suggested and additional maintenance; and the importance of public education, ongoing monitoring, and long-term planning and funding. A complete listing of the feedback comments received is included as Attachment 2: Comments Received - Public Information Centre, Feb. 12, 2013. A copy of the West Montrose Residents’ Association (WRMA) submission to the Public Information Centre is included as Attachment 3.

All of the WRMA recommendations noted in their submission are addressed in this Report. Of the 15 recommendations in the submission, Regional staff agree with and are acting on 13 items. The two that are not supported, for reasons described in this report, are legislating a financial penalty for over-load vehicles in excess of that provided in the Highway Traffic Act, and enabling residents to remove graffiti from the bridge.

**Staff Response to Public Feedback, and Recommended Actions**

a)  **Signage**

**Early Warning of Load Restriction**

The Region has investigated different possibilities with respect to early warning signs. When the bridge was closed during the repair, there were 8 locations where temporary signs were placed:
- 2 on Line 86 (1 in each direction, near Covered Bridge Drive);
- 2 on Katherine Street (1 in each direction, near Rivers Edge Drive);
- 1 on Covered Bridge Drive (Township road);
- 1 on Hill Street (Township road);
- 1 on Rivers Edge Drive (Township road);
- 1 on Letson Drive (Township road)

Regional staff agree with the community that some form of early warning signs be placed to alert drivers of the upcoming load restriction, and provide the driver with an alternate route to avoid crossing the bridge.

**Action (May):** Four early warning signs will be placed, one on each road that leads to the bridge:
- Covered Bridge Drive (Township road);
- Hill Street (Township road);
- Rivers Edge Drive (Township road);
- Letson Drive (Township road)

The proposed wording on the new signs is:

**LOAD RESTRICTION ON COVERED BRIDGE**

3 TONNE MAXIMUM

**ALTERNATE ROUTE VIA [XYZ STREET]**

[XYZ STREET] would be Letson Drive, Covered Bridge Drive, Hill Street, or Rivers Edge Drive, depending on the location of the sign.

No advance warning signs will be placed on the Regional roads (Katherine Street, Line 86), as neither of these roads lead to the bridge and the majority of motorists traveling on either of these roads would not be turning off the Regional road. In order to avoid confusion, signs must relate to the road or a bridge on the road currently being traveled.

The Region is currently coordinating with the Township to confirm sign placement. Attachment 1 illustrates the proposed signage locations. The Region will also have a ‘no limousines’ sign fabricated and added to the restricted vehicle signage at both ends of the bridge.

**Narrow Bridge**

The width of the driving area on the bridge deck is 4.4m, which is considered to be too narrow for opposing vehicles to pass one another on the bridge. As such, additional warning signs will be installed on the bridge approaches, indicating that the bridge is considered to be a single lane bridge. A “Yield to Oncoming Vehicles” sign will also be placed at one end of the structure.

**Action (May):** Warning signs that display “Single Lane Bridge”, and “Yield to Oncoming Vehicles” will be placed on the bridge approaches, as a deterrent for motorists to enter the bridge when another vehicle is already crossing from the opposing direction.

**Speed Limit**

Historically the bridge was signed with the words “Any person or persons passing through this bridge faster than a walk will be prosecuted according to law.” In 1937 the Province posted a speed limit of 16 km/h for vehicles crossing the bridge, which is consistent with the speed of a horse and buggy.

Today there is no posted speed limit on the bridge. The speed limit on the approach roads are 50 km/h on Covered Bridge Drive and 40 km/h on River’s Edge Drive. In the absence of posted speed limit signs, the Highway Traffic Act attaches a 50 km/h speed limit on the bridge, however the
natural inclination of drivers is to slow down while crossing the bridge, due to the tunnel-like appearance as they approach. The posting of a speed limit sign at this location is not recommended, as it cannot be effectively enforced, and will therefore have little to no effect on slowing traffic, beyond their already existing inclination to slow down.

**Action:** Warning signs that display “Single Lane Bridge” will be placed on the bridge approaches. In addition to the reasoning mentioned above concerning the narrow bridge, these signs will also reduce the speed of motorists crossing the bridge.

### b) Surveillance / Enforcement

#### Surveillance Cameras

At certain signalized intersections in Ontario, special cameras have been set up to catch vehicles that run a red light. These "red light cameras" take a picture of the offending vehicle, and a notice of infraction is sent based on their license plate as observed in the picture. The Highway Traffic Act (HTA) controls the use of such cameras for the enforcement of the Act. As will be seen in the Fines and Enforcement section of this report, fines for overweight vehicles are specified under section 125 of the HTA. Enforcement of fines under section 125 for overweight vehicles cannot be carried out using camera systems without legislative changes to the HTA at the provincial level.

As a result, an automated camera system, tied to a load sensor, cannot be installed at the bridge without amendments to Provincial legislation.

Alternatively, an initial review has been conducted into a second type of camera system, one not triggered by a load sensor. According to the Region’s video surveillance policy, the use of general surveillance cameras may be feasible; however a larger review is required and will be conducted in conjunction with other monitoring options. With respect to general surveillance cameras, the following outstanding issues will need to be investigated:

- Administration of the cameras (maintenance and upkeep, time required to review video, how/what to enforce);
- Type of equipment to be used;
- Cost; and
- Other surveillance options, including an assessment of the effectiveness of each

Some of the feedback received at the Public Information Session inquired about the installation of un-monitored cameras and/or signs indicating the presence of cameras, with the intent to deter vandals and perhaps overweight vehicles. It is the belief of Region staff that this technique is deceiving as it leads the public into believing the Region is doing something (i.e. conducting video surveillance) that it is not actually doing. Region staff are not pursuing this option.

**Action (Year-end):** Regional staff will continue to investigate the general surveillance option, in conjunction with other monitoring techniques, and report results through the proposed Bridge Management Plan.

#### Monitoring Sensors

An alternative approach to camera surveillance is the use of load monitoring sensors. A number of wired or wireless fibre optic sensors can be installed on the bridge in such a way that traffic loads can be recorded. Leaving the sensors on the bridge for a set period of time (for example 6 months) would determine if overloading was indeed occurring, how many overweight vehicles crossed the bridge, and whether there is any pattern to the crossing of overweight vehicles (i.e. the same time each day). If a pattern is detected, enforcement could be targeted to those specific times as seen in the pattern. If desired, cameras can also be included with such a configuration to provide details such as the type and colour of the offending vehicle.
As well, these monitoring sensors, which could be attached to the concealed bailey truss, are designed to measure how the structure responds to loads in real time (example: a steel beam will deflect when a load is applied. The steel beam should return to its original shape after the load is removed. If the beam does not return to its original shape after loading has been removed, this could mean that irreparable damage is occurring to the beam). These monitoring sensors are designed to detect and record such micro-strains in the structural elements to which they are attached.

The budgetary estimate for monitoring sensors is $25,000 for a 6 month period. An evaluation would then have to be made to continue monitoring, or to not continue monitoring. There will be two primary factors to consider in the evaluation: has there been enough evidence of overloading captured during the particular 6 month period; and how is the bridge reacting structurally to the loads. Typically, it is ideal to monitor for a 12 month period so that the effects of temperature variances can be captured over one full cycle (spring, summer, fall, winter), and compared to the structural response data. Transportation staff is currently setting up a pilot project using the wireless sensors on another Regional bridge. Results from that pilot will be utilized in making the decision to install similar sensors on the covered bridge.

**Action (year end):** Regional staff will assess the outcome of the wireless sensor pilot study already in progress on another Regional bridge before proceeding with monitoring sensors on the covered bridge. The pilot study is expected to be complete by November, 2013, and is costing approximately $23,000.

**Weigh Scales**

There are various types of weigh-in-motion systems available on the market, ranging in complexity and price. Weight sensors can be installed in an unobtrusive manner, but perhaps the more important question is what to do when the scale detects an overweight vehicle. Alarm systems such as a gate coming down to stop the vehicle, flashing lights, audible sounds would all affect the look and or tranquility of the village. Additional research is being undertaken to determine the logistics of how a weigh-in-motion system would function at this location, and the associated costs for installation and ongoing maintenance of such a system. The results of the analysis will be detailed in the Bridge Management Plan.

**Action (Year-end):** Region staff will further investigate weigh scales, and report the results through the proposed Bridge Management Plan.

**Fines and Enforcement**

The Highway Traffic Act (HTA) allows a municipality, through a by-Law, to load post a bridge. The HTA also outlines the penalties for offenders who violate the load posting. In this instance, the Region’s enabling by-law is the Traffic & Parking By-Law, which includes a section for “Reduced Loads on Bridges”. The Region’s by-law states:

“When an authorized sign is on display, no person shall drive a vehicle or combination of vehicles if the gross weight is in excess of the weight posted for a bridge on a highway”

Since load posting signs are already on display at the bridge, it is automatically covered by the by-law, and fines can be levied against violators of the load posting.

By-law enforcement officers are not permitted to stop moving vehicles, and therefore enforcement of this by-law falls under the jurisdiction of the Waterloo Regional Police Service (WRPS).

In order to determine the weight of a vehicle and lay a charge, the WRPS will have to weigh a vehicle suspected of being overweight. Weighing the vehicle could take place at the site using a portable weigh scale if the police officer is equipped with such a device, or the vehicle will need to be escorted to a regulated weigh station by the officer.
Based on Section 125 of the HTA, fines for drivers of vehicles that are over the posted load limit of the bridge range from $100 to several thousand dollars (see Attachment 4). For example, if a vehicle weighing 5000 kg crosses the bridge which is load posted at 3000 kg, the driver will be subject to a fine of $100 (2000 kg over the posted load limit, calculated at $5 per 100 kg). At the weight of 15000+ kg, a fine could be assessed beginning at $3,750 (15000 kg over the posted load limit at $25 per 100 kg).

Region staff is able to request enforcement presence at the bridge from the WRPS Traffic Services Branch. In discussions with WRPS, it was suggested that it may be more effective to provide WRPS with data on suspected vehicle types and/or times of day when the problem is most prevalent, if known, beforehand. A possible strategy would include pre-monitoring the bridge with sensors, and utilizing that data for targeted enforcement.

The Ontario Heritage Act, under which the bridge is a designated heritage structure, does provide for fines for persons or corporations who contravene the Act or its regulations (Section 69). However, the Act does not include a clause about a third party, other than the property owner, damaging a heritage structure, therefore this provision could not be used to fine overloaded vehicles, even if it could be shown that a specific vehicle caused damage to the bridge.

**Action (Year-end):** Enforcement of the load restriction, including fines permitted under the Highway Traffic Act, is possible through the WRPS. To be most effective, a targeted approach is recommended by WRPS. Region staff will assess the outcome of the monitoring sensor pilot project and then determine the best approach to gather the data required to provide WRPS for effective enforcement of the load restriction.

**Restrictive Barriers**

Road width restrictors, built at the entrance to the bridge, are used to restrict the width of the bridge opening to only 1 vehicle. The barriers may also assist in keeping overweight vehicles off the structure, based on the assumption that heavier vehicles are also larger vehicles, and won’t physically fit onto the structure.

Vehicle height restrictors will reduce the opportunity for some vehicles that are over the posted load limit from crossing the bridge. The design of such barriers will need to strike a balance between function (reducing overweight vehicles from crossing the bridge), safety (material used for the barrier (wood/metal/plastic)), whether the barrier will be movable or not (i.e. swinging height restrictor, or fixed), visibility markings (reflective striping), and aesthetics (how the barrier fits the heritage aspects of the bridge).

**Action (Year-end):** As the heritage designation of the bridge is under the Township’s jurisdiction, options for width and height restrictors will be developed for review by the Township, and the Region’s Heritage Planning Advisory Committee (HPAC), before proceeding. This will be addressed through the proposed Bridge Management Plan.

c) **Bridge – Structural**

The covered bridge has had a load restriction in place for decades. In the late 1990s, an engineering analysis was completed, and two primary outcomes were determined:

1. There was a need to strengthen some sections of the steel bailey truss to ensure it’s longevity, and;
2. That the floor beams were the overall load-limiting structural members in the analysis.
As part of the bridge rehabilitation in 1999/2000, sections of the steel bailey truss were strengthened through additional reinforcing. The ability of the steel bailey truss to carry heavier loads is not the issue. In order for the bridge to safely sustain additional loads, the floor beams will need to be strengthened. There are a number of ways to achieve this, many of which include the addition of steel, either under, or alongside the existing floor beams. As much as this would change the look of the underside of the bridge, it would need to be designed to minimize the impact on the designated heritage features. For example, the steel could be painted black to blend in with other steel components already under the bridge.

It is recommended that the current 3 tonne load limit remain in place.

The covered bridge consists of two spans. The load distributed from a crossing vehicle is transferred through various elements of the bridge, and ultimately to the nearest abutment, and the middle pier. Therefore, each span is able to carry a load relatively unaffected by a vehicle on the other span. As such, it is not necessary to restrict vehicles to cross only one at a time.

The sag (or swales as referenced by the Resident’s Association) in each span can be minimized with adjustments to the steel bailey truss hangers. The look of the bridge will change, as the sag/swales are currently visible from both the inside, and outside, of the bridge, but there is merit to reducing the stress induced in the bridge components caused by the bounce effect of vehicles entering the bridge and crossing over the pier.

It must be noted that the structure is a complex entity and one should be prudent when adjusting the shape of the overall structure as many joints etc are dry /friction/compression joints which are at risk to compromise under movement. Straightening of the bridge should be limited and carried out under strict monitoring.

Budgetary estimates for structural strengthening, and removing the swale/sag are $100,000, and $15,000 respectively.

**Action (Year-end):** Region staff will further investigate the requirements, benefits, and costs to structural strengthening, and removing the swale/sags, and report the results in the proposed Bridge Management Plan.

d)  **Bridge – Maintenance**

In 2012, the Region partnered with the West Montrose Residents’ Association to have volunteers paint the tongue and groove paneling on the interior of the bridge. The Region will look after future painting and graffiti removal on an as-needed basis as proposed in the Bridge Management Plan. Use of volunteers is not being proposed because of liability and issues concerning unionized work.

The Region has identified the need to replace the ridge cap that runs the length of the bridge. Quotes have been received to complete this work and it is scheduled in the Transportation Capital Program to be done in spring of 2013, dependent on the weather. The contractor hired to replace the ridge cap will inspect for additional roof repairs that may be required. The bridge will need to be closed to all vehicle and pedestrian traffic for two days.

The overall condition of the wood shingles on the bridge’s roof is good but will need to be scheduled for replacement in the Transportation Capital Program in the next 6-10 years.

As the bridge superstructure is wood, and similar in construction to a barn, contractors in the Mennonite community may have appropriate skill sets for undertaking some types of repairs to the bridge. However, they typically do not meet the requirements of the Region, particularly in regards to liability insurance. Addressing this issue would require a review by Purchasing, Risk Management and Health and Safety.
**Action (Spring):** The ridge cap will be replaced in the Spring of 2013, at an estimated cost of $15,000. The replacement of the roof shingles will be added to the Transportation Capital Program in the 6-10 year time frame.

**e) Fire Safety**

The nature of the construction materials used in covered bridges provides a significant fire risk. Many covered bridges throughout North America have been lost due to fire resulting from natural causes or arson.

Fire response to the West Montrose Covered Bridge is from the Woolwich Fire Department Conestogo Fire Station with an estimated response time of 13 minutes; secondary response is from the Elmira Fire Station.

To mitigate risks from fire, alternatives to be considered include:

*Fire detection systems* to provide alarm to local fire departments. This provides limited protection as level of protection is largely governed by the response times of the fire departments. Significant structure loss can be incurred in a relatively short time. The fire protection system at the Hartland Covered Bridge in New Brunswick owes much of its effectiveness to the close proximity of the local fire hall.

*Fire suppression systems* such as an automated sprinkler system will require an automated pumping system to draw water supply from the Grand River in order to be effective. Dry stand pipe systems (e.g. Hartland Bridge) would have limited value due to the governing factor of response time of the fire department’s pumper trucks. The installation of automated sprinklers requires a significant capital expenditure and requires ongoing testing and maintenance.

*Fire retardant coatings* include both fire retardant chemicals and intumescent coatings. Fire retardants are most effective when applied to new timbers through pressure treatment, however they can be of value particularly on light elements such as siding and shingles which are most easily ignited. Some concerns have been expressed over long term durability of coatings and also on the long term effects on the structural properties of timber. Effectiveness is also governed by the completeness of coverage achievable at any particular bridge. Intumescent coatings provide an insulating layer in the event of fire. Again effectiveness is governed by completeness of coverage, particularly at areas of detail and connection.

*Visibility and Maintenance* It is noted that the majority of loss due to fire involves arson. Vandal-proofing and increase of visibility at the site would provide an effective deterrent. Improved lighting increases visibility and allows for better surveillance. Good house-keeping and removal of debris reduces the opportunities for arson.

**Action (Year-end):** Regional staff will continue to investigate options to improve fire safety at the bridge, and report the results in the proposed Bridge Management Plan. Options for enhanced lighting are being developed for review by the Township and HPAC before proceeding.

**f) Monitoring and Asset Management**

**Inspection and Monitoring**

The bridge is inspected by the Region every two years as required under the Ontario Structure Inspection Manual (OSIM). Due to the historic nature of this structure, the Region has changed the inspection cycle to occur annually for this bridge.
To facilitate the inspection process, it will be necessary to access specific parts of the underlying bailey (steel) truss in a more efficient manner. The bailey truss is concealed by tongue and groove wood cladding. The cladding is difficult to remove, and often results in cracked, and sometimes broken boards. It is proposed that portions of the interior wood cladding be removed and replaced with larger one-piece sections that are easier to remove and re-attach for inspection purposes. The new removable sections will be made to look similar to the existing cladding, so that the overall aesthetics of the bridge will not be affected.

In addition to the standard visual inspection, a number of survey points have been placed on the bridge structure (e.g. on the wood walls and roof) to monitor its physical movement (twisting, sagging) over time. To make the most out of this monitoring effort, it is necessary to add more survey points on the bridge. Each survey point includes a very small mirror that can be targeted by a laser from a tripod-mounted survey instrument. The surveys are conducted by Region staff, and the frequency of these surveys will be increased from annually to twice per year.

**Action (Year-end):** Regional staff will continue annual visual inspections (twice as frequent as legislation requires). To facilitate these visual inspections, staff will pursue having specific sections of the interior wood cladding replaced with one-piece sections allowing easier access for inspectors. Finally, it is recommended that additional survey points be installed on the inside of the bridge structure, and that the Region’s survey crew capture data from these sensors twice per year.

**Landscaping**

The Township of Woolwich has authority for the approaches to the bridge. In March, the Township coordinated the pruning of some trees that have been causing damage to the roof of the bridge and/or obstructing sight lines for drivers. Hydro has been doing some line clearing that addressed additional problems with overgrown trees at the north end of the bridge.

**Action (Complete):** Regional staff will continue to work with Township and Hydro staff to ensure vegetation that may impact the bridge is maintained.
West Montrose Bridge Management Plan

The West Montrose Covered Bridge is a significant heritage artifact in the Region of Waterloo and as such, an Asset Management Plan will be developed to ensure the long term preservation of the bridge.

Covered bridges across North America are owned and/or maintained by local, provincial/state government agencies, not-for-profit organizations and affiliated friends organizations. At the Region of Waterloo, oversight of the bridge has been shared by multiple departments: Corporate Resources, Facilities Management & Fleet Services oversees the wood superstructure on the bridge; Transportation and Environmental Services, Transportation oversees the bridge structure; and Planning, Housing and Community Services, Community Services oversees the heritage stewardship of the bridge and since 1999 has been the lead department in the management of the bridge.

Moving forward, the Transportation and Environmental Services, Transportation will oversee the management of the bridge, and will seek advice, as needed, from other Regional departments and divisions. Having the bridge managed by the Transportation Division is consistent with how other covered bridges are managed by government agencies in North America. Canada’s most prominent covered bridge, the Hartland Bridge in New Brunswick, is managed by the provincial Department of Transportation and Infrastructure. In recent years, the Department has spent upwards of $3M on structural enhancements to the bridge.

**Action (Year-end):** A Bridge Management Plan will be developed, and will include input from all stakeholders and interested parties. This process was followed prior to the last major rehabilitation of the bridge. The Plan will define the principles to be followed in the ongoing management of the structure. For example should the structure be strengthened, what level of intrusive measures are acceptable for enforcing load limits, establishment of ongoing annual maintenance measures and budgets, is visual monitoring of the site desirable, etc. The development of the Plan will be led by Transportation and Environmental Services, Transportation Division, and will be presented to the Planning and Works Committee. The report is expected to be complete by year-end 2013. Although most of the work will be completed by staff, some consultant time is anticipated, at an approximate cost of $5,000.

g) **Public Education and Engagement**

The Region has prepared a post card describing the load limits and restrictions of crossing the bridge that has been distributed to homes, farms and businesses in Woolwich Township. The cost to design, print and distribute was $3,500. The Region will also include information on bridge load limits in a future issue of Region News which is distributed to all households in Waterloo Region.

In late March and early April, local bus companies, limousine operators and delivery companies were notified by mail and/or telephone of the load restrictions. The contact information is being retained in a database so that reminders can be sent as needed.

The Region has updated its website and is working with others to update their websites with current information, reminding people of load limits and other restrictions on the bridge. This includes providing information to GPS data vendors and GPS providers (i.e. Garmin, Tomtom, Magellan) that could be used to inform drivers of bridges within the Region that have load restrictions. In addition, Region staff will update driving tour maps, and provide information concerning load restrictions on the bridge to other sources of heritage resource data.

Through the Region’s Heritage Bridge Recognition Program, the Heritage Planning Advisory Committee (HPAC) is working to install interpretive plaques at significant heritage bridges.
throughout the Region. In *Spanning the Generations: A Study of Old Bridges in Waterloo Region* (2004), the West Montrose Covered Bridge was ranked as the second most historically significant bridge in the Region and it is in line to receive an interpretive plaque. Installation is anticipated in 2014.

The West Montrose Residents Association (Bridgekeepers) has been actively involved in publicizing and commenting on the preservation of the bridge. Their contributions to date are acknowledged and appreciated. The WRMA has requested that meetings be held on a regular basis between themselves, the Region and the Township of Woolwich to discuss issues related to the bridge. Regional staff propose that this request be addressed through the existing organizational structure and established communication channels, rather than instituting a new process.

For immediate concerns related to maintenance, structural damage or operational issues, the public will be directed to contact the Region’s Call Centre (phone 519-575-4400).

Routine maintenance and emergency repairs to the bridge will be made as required, and in accordance with the Township’s Heritage By-Law designation. A larger stakeholder audience, including Regional Transportation Division staff, the Township, HPAC, and the community, will be consulted regarding any proposed upgrades or alterations to the bridge that may impact the heritage attributes of the structure. The development of the proposed Bridge Management Plan would also provide opportunities for stakeholder input.

**Action (Most actions Complete):** Regional staff in the Transportation Division will provide communications to the various potential users of the bridge as required when changes to the bridge are proposed (bridge closures, etc.). The Regional contact information will be publicized and staff will follow up on information received through the Regional Call Centre, or through HPAC meetings.

**Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination**

Staff at the Township of Woolwich have been involved in the discussions regarding the maintenance and preservation of the West Montrose Covered Bridge.

**CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

The maintenance and preservation of the West Montrose Covered Bridge supports Strategic Focus Area 2, Growth Management: Manage growth to foster thriving and productive urban and rural communities.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

Previously, the budget for the West Montrose Covered Bridge was under the jurisdiction of Planning, Housing and Community Services.

Moving forward, capital needs will be funded from the Transportation Capital Program, while operating and maintenance costs will be funded from the Transportation Operations budget.

The approved 2013 Transportation Capital Program includes $150,000 for minor bridge repairs (project #5375), to be funded from the Roads Rehabilitation Reserve Fund. A total of $35,500 in capital needs is estimated in 2013 broken out as follows:

- Replacement of the ridge cap ($15,000)
- Flyer printing and distribution ($3,500)
- Wood panel design and fabrication ($5,000)
- Installation of additional survey points ($2,000)
- Consulting fees for Bridge Management Plan ($10,000)
The replacement of the roof shingles in the 6-10 year time frame, as well as the actions identified in the proposed Bridge Management Plan will need to be incorporated into future Transportation Capital Programs.

The Region will pursue any external funding opportunities for conserving the bridge. For example, an Expression of Interest was submitted in December 2012 to the Infrastructure Investment Initiative administered by the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs. It was proposed to use the funds for maintenance and preservation work on the bridge, including improved signage, roof replacement, improved wiring and lighting, investigation of fire suppression and detection systems, and installation of a structural monitoring system. However, the Province deemed the project ineligible for funding under this program.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

This report has been jointly prepared by staff in Transportation and Environmental Services and Planning Housing and Community Services.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment 1 - Aerial view of West Montrose, showing proposed sign locations
Attachment 2 - Comments Received - Public Information Centre, February 12, 2013
Attachment 3 - West Montrose Covered Bridge Maintenance & Preservation Issues, Submission to Public Information Centre, February 12, 2013 by BridgeKeepers (West Montrose Residents’ Association Inc.)
Attachment 4 - Highway Traffic Act, Section 125, Offences and Fines
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Attachment 1 – Aerial View of West Montrose, showing potential sign locations.
Attachment 2 – Comments Received - Public Information Centre, February 12, 2013

The Region received 15 comment sheets or on-line surveys, and Regional staff has had email, telephone and face-to-face communications with members of the community. The West Montrose Residents’ Association, Inc. (WMRA) also submitted a response (see Attachment D) to the PIC.

The comment sheets asked participants which of four proposed options for limiting access to the bridge they prefer. Most residents chose multiple options:

- Additional signage 8
- Surveillance cameras 5
- Fines (based weight) 7
- Height limiter 8

The following summarizes the individual comments from the WMRA, the PIC, comment sheets, on-line survey, emails and phone calls:

a) **Signs**

   **Informational**
   - Existing signs are sufficient;
   - Don’t create sign clutter;
   - Additional vehicle restrictions should include Jeep, vehicles towing loads, gravel trucks and limousines;
   - Require additional signs with BOLD lettering and add words in addition to symbols;
   - Add symbols that indicate which vehicles are allowed, in addition to which are prohibited;
   - Existing signs will be adequate to stop all overweight vehicles;
   - Add signs on Northfield, Katherine and in village to give advance warning to drivers of heavy loads;
   - All signs should be placed on right hand side of road because that’s where drivers expect to see them;
   - Install larger signs with few words to indicate the bridge restrictions;
   - Develop and install interpretive signage about the history of the bridge, perhaps at Letson Park;
   - Signs be located at multiple points in and around West Montrose, including five large signs at entry points to the village: Northfield & Hill, Jigs Hollow & Hill, Line 86 & Covered Bridge, Katherine & Rivers Edge, and Letson Drive south of the village; and two smaller signs at Rivers Edge & Letson Park, and at Hill & Covered Bridge (WMRA);
   - that information regarding alternate routes be included on the five large signs (WMRA).

**Speed Limiting**

- Establish 40 km/h speed limit; establish 10 km/h speed limit;
- Speed limit would assist horse and buggy drivers from anticipating oncoming traffic.

b) **Surveillance / Enforcement**

   **Cameras**
   - Adding surveillance cameras would provide proof of violation;
   - Do not add surveillance cameras as they will be too costly;
   - Video surveillance equipment should be installed in or around the bridge (WMRA).

**Weigh Scales**

- Install weigh scales and siren to indicate if vehicle is over the load limit;
- Install weigh scales in conjunction with barrier arm gate and red/green lights on the roof of the bridge to indicate whether vehicle can proceed or not;
- Weigh scales would be too intrusive in the landscape;
- Have weigh scales placed at the bridge randomly throughout the year and then fine those vehicles over the load limit.

**Fines**
- Establishing fines will get people’s attention;
- Install weigh scales in conjunction with automated cameras so that fines can be issued to drivers/vehicles that exceed the load limit;
- A fine in the magnitude of $5,000 should be established for those who violate the load limit (WMRA).

**Restrictive Barriers**
- Install height restrictors;
- Install height restrictors but not unsightly black/yellow ones;
- Limiting height of vehicles won’t stop all over-weight vehicles;
- Height limiters (as at ATMs and parkades), located a short, unobtrusive distance from the bridge. Surveillance cameras to catch and fine violators;
- A height limiter would be the most effective option. People seem to choose to ignore the signs which caused the damage in the first place. Surveillance cameras may not be able to identify vehicles effectively and are subject to vandalism;
- Do not install width restrictions at entrance to bridge;
- Do not support the addition of vehicle height restrictors (WMRA).

c) **Bridge – Structural**
- Add steel support to bridge structure;
- Remove swale in the bridge;
- Don’t modify the bridge to increase load limit;
- I organize a charity motorcycle ride for dog guides, providing service dogs for people with disabilities. The route goes over the bridge. I would like this to continue;
- Allow one vehicle at a time on the bridge by installing stop lights a short distance from each entrance;
- The Region should investigate the practicality and cost of adding reinforcement to the bridge to protect the bridge but not to allow for a higher load limit (WMRA);
- The swales should be removed or reduced to minimize the extra strain on the beams (WMRA).

d) **Bridge – Maintenance**
- Ensure interior tongue and groove paneling is secure to keep racoons from nesting in bridge;
- Repair ridge cap now and replace roof only when needed;
- I agree with the proposed maintenance work and as long as it is carried out to maintain the heritage and character of the bridge I think it is a good idea;
- Repaint interior tongue and groove paneling from white to another colour, e.g. same colour as bridge;
- Repair or replacement of the ridge cap, and that this work should be undertaken, weather permitting, as soon as possible (WMRA);
- The roof be more fully inspected when the ridge cap is being replaced, and that a schedule and budget for its eventual replacement be developed (WMRA);
- Remove tree limbs on the north side of the bridge (WMRA);
- The Region supply the Residents’ Association with paint to remove graffiti immediately when it appears (WMRA);
- Future painting should be scheduled in advance, so that it can be budgeted accordingly (WMRA)
e) **Other comments**

- Region should stick to a four point plan: signage, education, deterrent/enforcement, alternative route;
- Need to monitor events that involve people on bridge where the total weight might exceed the load limit;
- Sell wood shingles as a fund raising activity when the roof is re-shingled;
- Install a donation box on each side of the bridge to collect money to preserve the bridge, with suggested donations no more than $5 per vehicle;
- It should be top priority for the Region to preserve this historic bridge. Many tourists come specifically to the area to have their picture taken with the bridge as the backdrop.
- Keep the historic theme of the bridge;
- Bridge needs to be looked after but don’t waste money on unnecessary work;
- The Region should make sure they’ve done their homework on whatever option(s) are chosen before they spend any more money on the bridge;
- A local mailing be sent twice annually (prior to spring planting season, and prior to fall harvest season) as a reminder to local farmers and residents of the load limit and what types of equipment/vehicles would exceed that limit (WMRA);
- An inspection schedule be established for the West Montrose covered bridge that is far more aggressive than those for less vulnerable bridges (WMRA);
- The Region list all recurring capital expenses and then build them into the long-term budgeting process to ensure that funding is available when needed (WMRA).
Attachment 3 - West Montrose Covered Bridge Maintenance & Preservation Issues, Submission to Public Information Centre, February 12, 2013 by BridgeKeepers (West Montrose Residents’ Association, Inc.)

WEST MONTROSE
COVERED BRIDGE
MAINTENANCE & PRESERVATION
ISSUES

REGION OF WATERLOO PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE
FEBRUARY 12, 2013
BridgeKeepers (the West Montrose Residents’ Association, Inc.) is committed to preserving the historic West Montrose covered bridge, and the unique cultural heritage experience of which it is the cornerstone, for residents and visitors.

This presentation has been prepared by BridgeKeepers for the Public Information Centre conducted by the Regional Municipality of Waterloo regarding preservation and maintenance of the West Montrose covered bridge. We hope that the information and recommendations contained herein will assist the Region in preserving the bridge, in order to maintain its rich cultural heritage value and to enhance the enjoyment of the bridge and the West Montrose Cultural Heritage Landscape for current times and for generations to come.

This presentation focuses on the following issues:

A. Protection of the bridge from overloading
   a. Recent damage
   b. Protection
      Alternatives
      1. Full Closure
      2. Restrictive Barriers
      3. “Five-Point Plan”
         a. Local awareness & education regarding load limits
         b. Signage
         c. Penalties for violations
         d. Monitoring & enforcement
         e. Alternate routes

B. Structural Upgrades & Maintenance
   a. Reinforcement of beams
   b. Removal of swales
   c. Roof repair & replacement
   d. Inspection

C. Aesthetic Maintenance
   a. Removal of graffiti
   b. Exterior painting
   c. Interior painting

D. Long-Term Maintenance Plan & Budget

A. PROTECTION OF THE BRIDGE FROM OVERLOADING

Recent damage:
A crack in a structural beam was noticed by passing kayakers in mid-September of 2012. Upon subsequent inspection by Regional engineers, it was determined that the bridge should be closed to all traffic – vehicles, horses & buggies and pedestrians - and that the beam would require replacement. The damage was thought to be the result of a single incident of overloading; specifically use of the bridge by a tractor pulling two wagons full of corn silage.

Local residents have noted use of the bridge by all types of overweight vehicles – tractors and wagons, other farm equipment, vehicles pulling trailers, delivery vans and trucks, RV’s, school-type buses and, on one occasion, even a dump truck.

Protection:
There are three fundamentally different approaches to keeping overweight vehicles off of the bridge:
1. **Full closure**: Erecting barriers to prevent any vehicles from accessing the bridge. Given the convenience to local residents, and the enjoyment that travelling through Ontario’s only remaining covered bridge provides, we do not believe this is a desirable alternative. Further, given that the type of damage incurred last year has happened just once in the 132 years of the bridge’s existence, we do not believe a complete closure to vehicular traffic is necessary. We believe there are better ways and means of minimizing the risk of a recurrence.

2. **Restrictive Barriers**: Assuming overweight vehicles also tend to be over-height and/or over-wide vehicles, access to the bridge could be limited through the erection of barriers that physically restrict the size of vehicle that can get to the bridge. Unfortunately, these types of barriers are extremely unattractive and, given that large trucks (snow plows, garbage trucks and delivery vehicles) need to use the roads immediately at both ends of the bridge, such barriers would need to be located at or very near to the bridge. This would detract from the appearance of the bridge and would most probably not be compatible with the community or the Conservation Plan being developed for the West Montrose Cultural Heritage Landscape.

3. **Five-Point Plan**: The large majority of overweight vehicles can be kept off of the bridge:

   a. **IF** people are aware of what vehicles can and can’t use the bridge. The load limit on the bridge is posted at 3 tonnes (a tonne being a metric tonne – 3 tonnes totaling approximately 6,600 pounds). From the frequent use of the bridge by locally-operated farm equipment, it is clear that many people, including local farmers, have no idea what types of vehicles exceed this 3 tonne limit. For example, a half-ton truck would not exceed the limit, but a three-quarter ton truck or a half-ton truck with a load in the bed would exceed the limit, as would almost any piece of modern farm equipment.

   Prior to a meeting held between Regional staff, Township staff, members of the Old Order Mennonite community and the residents’ association on December 19th, the Mennonite community was largely unaware that their farm equipment would violate the load limit.
The Mennonite community is now well aware of the load limits and the fact that their farm equipment must detour around the bridge if they want the bridge to remain open to horse and buggy traffic.

*We recommend that a local mailing be sent* twice annually (prior to spring planting season, and prior to fall harvest season) as a reminder to local farmers and residents of the load limit and what types of equipment / vehicles would exceed that limit. The West Montrose Residents’ Association is prepared to make this distribution to 250 residences in the vicinity of the bridge, in cooperation with the Region. The Region should share responsibility for this reminder, to the extent of reminding the Association of the need for it, and for taking on the process should the Association cease to operate at some point in the future.

b. *IF* there is adequate signage to alert farmers and motorists of the limits and what types of vehicles can and cannot use the bridge. *We recommend that signage be located at the points highlighted on the map below:*

- Large signage, complete with icons of many of the types of vehicles that would violate the 3 tonne limit – tractors, box trucks, buses, vehicles with trailers, pickup trucks over half-ton, etc., at entry points to the village: Northfield & Hill, Jigs Hollow & Hill, Line 86 & Covered Bridge, Katherine & Rivers Edge, and Letson Drive south of the village. Such positioning would alert drivers to the weight restrictions while they still have one or more good alternatives to turn around or take an alternate route.

- Smaller “reminder” signs located at Rivers Edge & Letson Park, and at Hill & Covered Bridge. Such positioning would reinforce the message contained on the large signs, and still be in a position that large vehicles would have an adequate route to turn around. Note in the illustration below the turn-around
access at the parking lot at Hill & Covered Bridge, and at Rivers Edge & Letson Park.

c. **IF** there is a substantial **penalty** for people who violate the load limit. In the information package for this Public Information Centre, there is a suggestion that an appropriate penalty would be $200-$300. We don’t believe this is an adequate deterrent, and we recommend a fine in the magnitude of $5,000. This may seem excessive on first review, but we refer to the damage of approximately $40,000 caused by the recent violation (paid by the taxpayer and not the violator) and the inconvenience of having the bridge closed for almost five months. We also refer to a recent case in Indiana, where a truck driver who caused serious damage to a covered bridge there was sentenced to 180 days in jail. These two case make a $5,000 fine seem quite reasonable.

d. **IF** there is a reasonable **expectation of being caught**. Information in the package for this PIC suggest that one means of monitoring might be to have an officer onsite, who might have the power to stop suspected violators and subject them to having their vehicles weighed. This is clearly not practical. We recommend that video surveillance equipment be installed in or around the bridge, and that signs be posted to alert the public that the bridge is “protected by video surveillance”. While there may be legal issues of enforcement associated with video surveillance, its simple presence will imply that “you are being watched and, if you violate the weight limit, you will be caught and penalized.” While the signage should be noticeable, the actual video equipment can and should be installed in such a manner that it does not detract from the locale.

e. **IF** drivers of overweight vehicles be made aware of alternate routes, and that notices of alternate routes are posted far enough in advance of the bridge for drivers to proceed or detour appropriately. We recommend that signage for alternate routes be
placed on the weight limit signage, and the alternate routes be marked along Line 86, Northfield Drive, Katherine Street, etc.

**B. STRUCTURAL UPGRADES & MAINTENANCE**

a. **Reinforcement of beams**
   There was some discussion at the December 19th meeting of the possibility of installing reinforcement on the bridge’s beams; possibly steel plates or straps attached to the beams. It was felt that such reinforcement could add to the strength of the beams without unduly detracting from the historic aesthetics of the bridge. It was also noted that the beams are the weak point of the structure, and that the bailey bridge could easily handle the weight of any reinforcement.

   *We recommend that the Region investigate the practicality and cost of adding reinforcement, but that, if added, the reinforcement should be done in such a way as to not detract from the appearance of the bridge. We further recommend that, if reinforcement is added, it be used to protect the bridge and not to allow for a higher load limit.*

b. **Removal of swales**
   There is a substantial swale (dip) in the spans of the bridge, especially the northern span. We were told at the meeting in Woolwich council chambers on December 19th that the swales were left in the bridge to maintain the character of the bridge, and that they could easily be removed.

   Historically, the bridge would not have had these swales, and they most probably only developed as the structure sagged. Most well-maintained covered bridges throughout North America do not have swales, and they tend to make the West Montrose bridge appear to have deteriorated. Further, vehicles driving over the bridge tend to bounce down as they go over the peak of the abutment and into the dip, putting additional strain on the structure as they land.

   *We recommend that the swales be removed or reduced to minimize the extra strain on the beams.*

c. **Roof repair & replacement**
   The Region has noted that section(s) of the ridge cap require repair or replacement, and that this work should be undertaken, weather permitting, as soon as possible. *We support this recommendation.*

   It was also noted that the roof is still intact and not in need of replacement. *We recommend that the roof be more fully inspected when the ridge cap is being replaced, and that a schedule and budget for its eventual replacement be developed as soon as possible so that funds are available when the work is required.*

   Finally, it was recommended at the December meeting that tree limbs overhanging and shading the ends of the bridge be trimmed back to prevent moss from growing on the shingles, and to improve sight lines for horse and buggy traffic. *We support this recommendation.*

d. **Inspection**
   The recent damage to the bridge was noticed by kayakers passing by, presumably a few days after the damage occurred. It’s hard to say how long it might have taken for the damage to be
noticed and addressed if the kayakers had not happened to notice the cracked beam, and how much additional damage might have been incurred in that time.

While we realize the Region can’t conduct a full structural inspection of the bridge every week, or perhaps even every month, we recommend that an inspection schedule be established for the West Montrose covered bridge that is far more aggressive than those for less vulnerable bridges under the Region’s management.

E. AESTHETIC MAINTENANCE

a. Removal of graffiti
Graffiti inevitably ends up on the interior walls of the covered bridge and, invariably, once there is a bit of graffiti, there is temptation for others to add to it. Therefore, it is important that graffiti be removed quickly when it first appears.

It is impractical and probably expensive for the Region to inspect for graffiti regularly and when necessary to send a crew out to West Montrose to paint over it. (Note: there is currently graffiti on the bridge interior that is dated September 13, 2012, just two months after the bridge interior was painted. It remains there now, five months later.) We recommend that the Region supply BridgeKeepers with a small amount of touch-up paint, and we will remove graffiti immediately when it appears.

b. Exterior painting
The exterior of the bridge was painted in 2004, and there is no immediate need for repainting. However, we recommend that future painting should be scheduled well in advance, so that it can be budgeted accordingly. (See “Long-Term Maintenance Planning & Budgeting” below.)

c. Interior painting
The interior of the bridge was painted in 2012, in a partnership between the Region and BridgeKeepers. As above, we recommend that future painting should be scheduled in advance, so that it can be budgeted accordingly.

F. LONG-TERM MAINTENANCE PLAN & BUDGETING

The Region works on a long-term budgeting cycle, and it is difficult, if not impossible, to insert major expenditures into the budget on short notice. Fortunately, most of the major expenditures required to maintain the covered bridge (painting, roof replacement, floor board replacement, etc.) are totally predictable and recur on a consistent cycle. We recommend that the Region list all recurring capital expenses and then build them into the long-term budgeting process to ensure that funding is available when needed.

As always, the West Montrose Residents’ Association is willing and pleased to provide any input, feedback and assistance that would benefit the Region in maintaining and protecting this iconic and treasured cultural heritage resource in our community.
**Attachment 4 – Ontario Highway Traffic Act, Section 125, Offences and Penalties for Violating Posted Load Limits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence and penalty, Part VIII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>125.</strong> (1) Every person who contravenes subsection 115 (1), section 116, 117 or 118, subsection 119 (4), section 120 or subsection 122 (1), (2) or (3) or a regulation made under subsection 123 (1) or a by-law made under subsection 123 (2) is guilty of an offence and on conviction is liable to a fine of,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) $5 per 100 kilograms, or part thereof, for any weight in excess of that permitted under this Act or the regulations, where the overweight is less than 2,500 kilograms, but in no case shall the fine be less than $100;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) $10 per 100 kilograms, or part thereof, for any weight in excess of that permitted under this Act or the regulations, where the overweight is 2,500 kilograms or more but is less than 5,000 kilograms;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) $12 per 100 kilograms, or part thereof, for any weight in excess of that permitted under this Act or the regulations, where the overweight is 5,000 kilograms or more but is less than 7,500 kilograms;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) $15 per 100 kilograms, or part thereof, for any weight in excess of that permitted under this Act or the regulations, where the overweight is 7,500 kilograms or more but is less than 10,000 kilograms;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) $20 per 100 kilograms, or part thereof, for any weight in excess of that permitted under this Act or the regulations, where the overweight is 10,000 kilograms or more but is less than 15,000 kilograms; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) $25 per 100 kilograms, or part thereof, for any weight in excess of that permitted under this Act or the regulations, where the overweight is 15,000 kilograms or more. 1996, c. 20, s. 28.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: April 30, 2013

FILE CODE: D18-20

SUBJECT: MONTHLY REPORT OF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY FOR MARCH 2013

RECOMMENDATION:


SUMMARY:

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

1. Approved the following part lot control exemption by-law;
2. Accepted the following plan of subdivision and plans 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. **Registration of Draft Plan of Subdivision 30T-05102**
   
   Draft Approval Date: May 28, 2008
   
   Phase: Phase 2a
   
   Applicant: Chrisview Custom Homes Ltd.
   
   Location: Water Street and Myers Road
   
   Proposal: To permit the development of 18 single detached and 16 semi-detached units.
   
   Regional Processing Fee: Paid February 20, 2013
   
   Commissioner’s Release: March 8, 2013

2. **Official Plan Amendment No. 40**
   
   Applicant: D5D Enterprises Limited and City of Cambridge
   
   Location: Allendale Road, Fountain Street North and Maple Grove Road
   
   Proposal: To amend Map 15 General Land Use Map of the City Official Plan by re-designating the subject lands from “Class 1 (Prime) Agricultural District” to “Class 2 (General) Industrial District” with special policy 17.49 in order to facilitate the development of five (5) industrial lots and one (1) future commercial block on a 4.66 hectare (11.52 acre) parcel of land through a proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision application. OPA 40 also re-designates two adjacent residential properties at 2200 and 2150 Fountain Street North in order to allow future re-development of these properties.
   
   Regional Processing Fee: Paid February 26, 2013
   
   Commissioner’s Approval: March 15, 2013
   
   Came Into Effect: April 5, 2013
City of Kitchener

1. **Plan of Subdivision Application 30T-13201**
   - Date Accepted: March 5, 2013
   - Applicant: 2269953 Ontario Inc.
   - Location: 701 Homer Watson Boulevard
   - Proposal: To permit the development of 87 freehold townhouse units.
   - Regional Processing Fee: Paid March 4, 2013

2. **Plan of Condominium Application 30CDM-13203**
   - Date Accepted: March 5, 2013
   - Applicant: 2269953 Ontario Inc.
   - Location: 701 Homer Watson Boulevard
   - Proposal: To create a common elements plan of condominium in conjunction with plan of subdivision 30T-13201.
   - Regional Processing Fee: Paid March 4, 2013.

3. **Plan of Condominium Application 30CDM-13202**
   - Date Accepted: March 12, 2013
   - Applicant: Right Angle Holdings Inc.
   - Location: 20 Westmount Road West
   - Proposal: To permit the development of 7 cluster townhouse units.
   - Regional Processing Fee: Paid March 12, 2013

4. **Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-11204**
   - Draft Approval Date: January 24, 2012
   - Phase: Phase II
   - Applicant: Savic Homes
   - Location: 55 Mooregate Crescent
   - Proposal: To permit the development of 9 townhouse units.
   - Commissioner’s Release: March 7, 2013

5. **Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-11204**
   - Draft Approval Date: January 24, 2012
   - Phase: Phase II
   - Applicant: Savic Homes
   - Location: 55 Mooregate Crescent
   - Proposal: To permit the development of 7 townhouse units.
   - Commissioner’s Release: March 7, 2013

6. **Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-08207**
   - Draft Approval Date: April 20, 2009
   - Phase: Entire Plan
   - Applicant: 6799329 Canada Inc.
   - Location: 76-78 Borden Parkway
   - Proposal: To permit the conversion of 28 apartment units to condominium units.
   - Commissioner’s Release: March 27, 2103
Township of North Dumfries

1. Part Lot Control Exemption By-law 2552-13
Applicant: 826543 Ontario Inc. and 839658 Ontario Inc.
Location: Vincent Drive, Ayr
Proposal: To permit the creation of 1 semi-detached dwelling.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid March 21, 2013
Commissioner’s Approval: March 26, 2013

Residential Subdivision Activity January 1, 2013 to March 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>*Kitchener</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>203</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>149</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

For comparison the following table has also been included:

Residential Subdivision Activity January 2012 to March 31, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Units in Residential Registered Plans</th>
<th>Residential Units Draft Approved</th>
<th>Pending Plans (Units Submitted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Kitchener</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>198</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>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dumfries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Waterloo</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>154</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 A: 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
RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the acquisition of 50 real-time passenger information display signs from INIT Innovations in Transportation, Inc. at a total cost of $442,779.47 plus applicable taxes, as described in Report No. P-13-045, dated April 30, 2013.

SUMMARY:

In early 2007, Grand River Transit (GRT) began equipping buses with the Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) transit management system supplied by INIT Innovations in Transportation. The computer-aided dispatch and automatic vehicle location (CAD/AVL) system and automatic passenger counting (APC) systems have provided significant benefits relating to operational efficiency, service quality and customer service.

Currently, the provision of real-time bus arrival information occurs at 62 transit stops equipped with the passenger information displays from INIT. This includes all stops on the current iXpress 200 and 201 Fischer-Hallman iXpress. The passenger information displays show real-time arrival times for all routes serving the iXpress stops.

The new University Avenue iXpress line (P-13-047) scheduled to be implemented September 2013, subject to Regional Council approval, would provide connections to rapid transit and access to major destinations within the Region. Similar to existing iXpress routes, each station on the new University Avenue iXpress would include bus shelters and real-time bus arrival displays. The funds required for this sign acquisition are provided for in the approved 2013 GRT Capital Budget.

REPORT:

The provision of real-time bus arrival information benefits waiting transit customers as it removes the uncertainty of when the next bus will arrive at a bus stop. The provision of real-time bus arrival information is possible because each GRT conventional bus is equipped with the INIT transit management system which provides the following functionalities:

- In-vehicle next stop audio announcements and variable next stop display
- CAD/AVL system for real-time tracking of vehicles at the transit control centre
- Automatic passenger counters (APC)
- Central data processing and analysis software
- Passenger information displays at stops displaying next bus arrival information on a real-time basis
- Transit Signal Priority (TSP) at equipped intersections
Since implementation began in early 2007, the advanced technology has provided significant benefits including the automated announcement and visual display of next bus stops, greater operational efficiency and improved service reliability through central control, improved schedule reliability and the provision of real-time arrival information and schedule information through the EasyGo traveler information system.

The Region currently has real-time passenger information displays at all iXpress stops. The real-time arrival times for all buses serving the stop are displayed. Real-time passenger information displays enhance the attractiveness of the service to transit customers by reducing the uncertainty when waiting at a bus stop of when the next bus will be arriving.

The planned implementation of the new University Avenue iXpress line in September 2013 (P-13-047), would provide connections to rapid transit and access to major destinations within the Region. Similar to the 200 iXpress and 201 Fischer-Hallman iXpress, real-time passenger information displays and bus shelters would be installed at all station locations along this route.

The scope of work is for the supply of real-time electronic passenger information displays from INIT for the transit station shelters at 45 locations for the new 202 iXpress bus route along the University Avenue corridor and the extension of the 201 iXpress bus route as well as at 5 additional bus stop locations. The additional stop locations recommended for passenger information displays include upgrading the current single sided displays to double sided displays at the King and Victoria iXpress 200 stops and at the Uptown Waterloo Public Square. Other new locations for digital displays would include the Sportsworld GO Transit / GRT terminal and stops at the busy King and University intersection.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

As part of the 2013 transit service improvements planning, Area Municipalities were consulted through representation on Steering Committees. The new University Avenue express line and proposed associated amenities were included in circulated material related to service improvement proposals.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The expansion of the provision of real-time information on next bus arrival times for GRT vehicles supports the implementation of Council’s Strategic Focus, identified under Focus Area 2: Growth Management: Manage and Shape Growth to Ensure a Liveable, Healthy, Thriving and Sustainable Waterloo Region. The displays will aid with Strategic Objective 2.3 to enhance, develop, promote and integrate sustainable and active forms of transportation (public transit, cycling and walking).

The acquisition also supports Focus Area 6: Infrastructure: Provide High Quality Infrastructure and Asset Management to Meet Current Needs and Future Growth.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The total cost of acquiring 50 real-time passenger information display signs from INIT is $442,779.47 plus applicable taxes. The approved 2013 GRT Capital Budget includes $3,031,000 for Transit Nodes and Station Development to be funded from development charges and debentures. The funds required for this sign acquisition are provided for in this budget.
The Purchasing By-Law provides that a “Purchase by Negotiation” is appropriate when it is “the extension of an existing or previous contract which would prove more cost effective or beneficial for the Region” and “the acquisition is required or is beneficial in regard to the standardization of goods or services for the Region”. Such negotiated acquisitions still require Council approval when the contract value exceeds $100,000.

Staff negotiated a 5% discount per unit in comparison to prices paid with the 2011 order. Also, staff consulted with York Region Transit (YRT) staff and determined prices quoted by INIT were similar to YRT prices for the same equipment supplied by INIT. The cost of the equipment to be supplied by INIT is considered to be fair and reasonable and reflect current market conditions. INIT Innovations has proven to be a reliable company and its technology effective for GRT use.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

This report was prepared in cooperation with staff from Transit Services and Purchasing.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment A – Images of Passenger Information Display

PREPARED BY: Neil Malcolm, Project Manager, Transportation Planning

APPROVED BY: Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
Images of Passenger Information Display
REPORT:

TO: Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
DATE: April 30, 2013
FILE CODE: D28-20
SUBJECT: PROPOSED NEW GRAND RIVER TRANSIT TEXT MESSAGING SERVICE MODEL

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the implementation of the recommended changes to the next bus short message service aggregation services and the advertising-based model for Grant River Transit users, as described in Report No. P-13-052, dated April 30, 2013.

SUMMARY:

This report has been prepared in response to the approved 2013 Regional Budget, which included a resolution by Regional Council to eliminate fees incurred by the Region ($100,000 annually) to provide the short messaging service (SMS) used by transit customers. The service is used to obtain next bus information for a specified bus stop. Accordingly, this report details the results of staff's investigation into potential options to reduce costs of providing the SMS information service, with a phased plan to achieve the $100,000 annual reduction.

The current GRT SMS, or text messaging service, is used by customers to get next bus information by sending a text with the four digit stop number to the designated short-code, 57555. The SMS service is an integral part of the EasyGO Traveller Information suite that provides convenient access to information for customers to easily understand how and when to use the transit system. In 2012, the SMS information service provided 3.9 million next bus text messages to riders.

To provide the SMS service the Region engages the service of an aggregator agency which acts as an intermediary between the carriers such as Bell, Rogers or Telus and the GRT schedule database. In order for the Region to offset the payment of fees to the aggregator, staff evaluated several options including:

- the implementation of a premium fee for users of the SMS
- the elimination of the current GRT SMS information service, and
- the implementation of an advertising based SMS Model.

Evaluation of the premium fee model concluded that it was not a viable option to offset costs of the SMS service and would jeopardize the viability of maintaining the SMS next bus information service. Industry experience shows that premium fees would result in a significant reduction, perhaps by as much as 90%, in use of the service as the premium fee is in addition to existing text messaging fees paid by customers to their respective carriers. Customers that no longer use the premium SMS service would likely turn to GRT’s free sources of next bus information, including the IVR system and the live agent call centre. This could overwhelm the IVR and call centre possibly increasing costs in those areas. Also, some carriers such as Bell, Rogers or Telus may choose not to participate in the delivery of a premium fee service.
Eliminating the SMS service would be an inconvenience to many existing users who now find the SMS information service an easy way to get next bus information. Without this service, users would turn to GRT’s free sources of next bus information, including the Interactive Voice Response (IVR) system and the live agent call centre which could increase the need for resources.

Based on this evaluation, staff is recommending to proceed with implementation of a new, reduced cost aggregation pricing structure and simultaneously move forward with the implementation of an advertising based service that could off-set most of the costs associated with the SMS next bus information service.

REPORT:

The approved 2013 Regional Budget included a resolution by Regional Council stating:

   THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve an adjustment to the 2013 budget to eliminate $100,000 for item 3.13 payment of text message fees, as set out in Schedule 7 to report F-13-003.

Accordingly, this report details the results of staff’s investigation into potential options to reduce costs of providing the SMS information service.

Current SMS Next Bus Information Service

The current GRT SMS next bus information service, is used by customers to get next bus information by sending a text with the four digit stop number to a short-code, “57555.” The return SMS sent to customers shows the next three scheduled bus times at that stop for all routes, or for a specific route if so selected. The stop number can be found at the bottom right hand section of the bus stop marker and on other GRT marketing materials.

Current SMS Next Bus Information Service Costs

Standard rates for the SMS next bus information service are applied by the customer’s service provider/carrier (Bell, Rogers, or other) and these rates are paid by the customer as part of their monthly cellular bill. No additional fees for this service are charged by GRT at this time.

The provision of the SMS next bus information service requires the Region to engage the service of an aggregator agency which acts as an intermediary between the carriers such as Bell, Rogers or Telus and the GRT schedule database. An aggregator is a third-party that connects content providers such as the Region to multiple carriers in order to offer services to consumers. For this service the aggregator charges the Region based on the following schedule of message volumes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly SMS Volume</th>
<th>Monthly Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 143,000</td>
<td>3.5 cents per SMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143,000 – 250,000</td>
<td>$5,000 up to 150,000 SMS; Incremental 2 cents per SMS between 150,001 and 250,000 SMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,000 – 500,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To deliver the SMS next bus information service in 2012, the Region paid the aggregator $84,000 and paid a license fee to the Canadian Wireless Telecommunications Association (CWTA) amounting to $4,800. These annual costs are ongoing as long as the SMS service is provided. In 2012, the SMS information service provided 3.9 million next bus text messages to approximately 20,000 monthly unique cell phone users. Based on this volume, the cost per message to provide the SMS service is just over 2 cents per message.
Premium Fee SMS Model

In order for the Region to offset payment of fees to the aggregator, staff initiated discussions with the current aggregator agency on the feasibility of implementing a user pay system for the SMS information service. A user pay system would require transit customers who use the SMS information service to be charged a premium fee by their carrier in addition to the costs of their regular cell plans.

Two different types of premium fee models exist that could be implemented by GRT. First, a premium fee could be placed on each SMS that is sent from GRT to the customer. The customer would pay the premium to their carrier through their monthly cellular bill. A fee of $0.25 per message, which is the minimum fee prescribed by carriers, would be charged to transit customers for use of the SMS information service. The Region does not have the ability to set a lower minimum fee per message.

The revenue from the premium fee would be shared by the carrier, the aggregator and GRT. On average, the carrier would receive 43% of revenue generated; the aggregator and GRT would share the remainder, with the aggregators share varying based on fee and message volumes. The percentage taken by the carrier also varies by carrier and message volumes.

Second, a subscription service could be created whereby customers would pay a monthly fee that would allow them unlimited usage of the SMS next bus information system. Proposed subscriptions fees would be $3.00 to $4.00 per month per person.

To operate a premium fee service, a monthly platform fee of $1500 - $2000 would be charged by the aggregator to the Region to deliver the service. Software functionality changes would also be required to provide customers with a preliminarily SMS that would ask customers to either accept the per message fee or to subscribe to the service before receiving the next bus times. Today, this functionality is not required and does not exist in GRT’s current SMS model. Preliminary estimates suggest this will cost GRT $7000-$10,000 to implement.

Based on industry experience, moving to a per message fee or subscription SMS premium fee model, SMS volumes are expected to drop by 90% as some customers will be unwilling to pay the premium and others will use it less often. There are several risks that jeopardize the viability of the implementing a premium fee service:

- The drop in volume of SMS use would generate insufficient revenue from the premium fees to offset the minimum monthly platform fees that the aggregator would continue to charge the Region to deliver the premium SMS service.
- The drop in volume of SMS use would reduce the revenue paid by the Region to the aggregator and could prompt the current aggregator to terminate the existing agreement with the Region to provide the service and would make it difficult for the Region to attract an alternative aggregator to provide the service. Industry wide there is a decline in the use of premium SMS services.
- Some carriers such as Bell, Rogers or Telus, may choose not to offer the SMS premium fee service to their customers since experience with premium fees shows more customer inquiries regarding billing charges and therefore increased Call Centre costs.
- Some customers will switch to other free sources of GRT next bus information including the Interactive Voice Response (IVR) system and the GRT live call centre. Since 72% of the 5.4 million EasyGO traveler information requests in 2012 were made via SMS, it’s reasonable to assume that a large number of customers will switch to these free services and they may require additional resources to handle increased call volumes.
In addition, it should be noted that many transit commuters who use a corporately-provided cell phone may not be able to use the premium SMS service as corporations block the use of premium services.

Staff do not recommend the implementation of a Premium Fee SMS Model as many customers are likely to stop using the service and it is quite possible that carriers may choose not to offer the service.

**Advertising Based SMS Model**

With this option, customers would receive selected e-blasts of advertisements or would receive an ad as part of each next bus SMS they receive. The advertisements would off-set some of the cost of the SMS service so that customers would continue to get GRT next bus information via SMS at no extra charge.

This model would result in:

- No cost to the customer
- General public acceptance of ads exists with free apps and services like SMS
- A separate vendor would be engaged to handle the merchant services associated with the purchase of ad space on the text message
- GRT would be responsible for working with the ad software vendor to obtain advertisers to use the service and would need to manager database of advertisers.
- Ad sponsors could be from the local community, other departments within the Region of Waterloo, or national businesses
- A similar ad based SMS model is currently being used by Edmonton Transit (sample shown below).

![Sample SMS Advertisement](image)

The next steps in implementing an ad based SMS model would be:

- finalize agreement details with vendor to provide an advertising transaction portal,
- integrate ads into existing SMS next bus software architecture, and
- market availability of SMS sponsorship to potential advertisers.

**Elimination of SMS Service**

This option would eliminate the fees paid by the Region to the aggregator who delivers the service amounting to $84,000 annually and fees paid to the Canadian Wireless Telecommunications Association (CWTA) amounting to $4,800 annually.
Elimination of the SMS service could occur September 2013 given the termination provisions included in the existing contact with the aggregator. If this option were to be pursued, staff would endeavour to negotiate an earlier termination date.

The transit riders who now use the SMS information service (3.9 million SMS annually or 16-17,000 average weekday usages) would likely switch to and put greater demands on other free transit information services like the Interactive Voice Response system and the live agent call centre.

Staff do not recommend elimination of the SMS service since it encourages increased ridership by providing a convenient and widely used platform for riders to acquire next bus information.

**New Aggregation Cost Proposal**

Through negotiation with our aggregator, staff have obtained a revised proposal for aggregation services that would reduce the monthly costs by $2,000 per month for our highest SMS volume months. The revised price schedule is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly SMS Volume</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 550,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550,001 – or more</td>
<td>$0.01 per SMS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This would result in an immediate savings of up to $24,000 per year based on current SMS volumes.

**Automated Traveller Information Options**

The SMS service is part of the EasyGO Traveller Information suite which includes interactive voice response (IVR) where customers call (519) 585 – 7555 and automatically receive next bus information for the stop requested, and the web-based trip planner where customers can conveniently plan their trips on GRT.

The EasyGO traveler information system provides convenient access to information for customers to easily understand how and when to use the transit system. In 2012, one in four transit rides or 5.4 million made use of the IVR (12%), Trip Planner (16%) and SMS service (72%).

Staff will continue to monitor and investigate new and innovative ways to provide next bus information to customers via mobile devices. Later this year, the EasyGO traveler information system will be providing real-time bus arrival information instead of the scheduled bus arrival information currently being provided. Real-time information will be made available for use in Google Transit and through the Region’s Open Data initiative for developers who develop apps for smart phones.

**Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination**

Areas Municipalities have been circulated a copy of 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 negotiated reduction in aggregator fees would represent a $12,000 savings in 2013 and $24,000 annually. The timeline to implement the advertising SMS model and obtain sufficient paid advertisements suggests advertising revenues would be minimal in 2013.

Staff would review the transit budget mid-year and identify other reductions transit service reduction if necessary to make-up the 2013 shortfall so that the $100,000 savings target in 2013 can be met. Potential software modifications costs ($7,000-$10,000) to implement the SMS advertising model can be accommodated with the existing GRT transit technology capital budget.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

This report was prepared in cooperation with staff from Transit Services, Transportation and Environmental Services and Purchasing, Finance.

ATTACHMENTS:

NIL

PREPARED BY: Neil Malcolm, Project Manager, Transportation Planning

APPROVED BY: Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services
REGION OF WATERLOO
CORPORATE RESOURCES
Legal Services

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

DATE: April 30, 2013

FILE CODE: L07-90

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZATION TO EXPROPRIATE LANDS (2ND REPORT) DESIGNATED AS PHASE 2 OF STAGE 1 OF RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT RELATING TO PROPERTY AND INTERESTS FROM EBY STREET SOUTH BETWEEN CHARLES STREET EAST AND KING STREET EAST IN THE CITY OF KITCHENER TO BORDEN AVENUE SOUTH AND OTTAWA STREET SOUTH IN THE CITY OF KITCHENER

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT The Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the expropriation of lands for the construction of Phase 2 of Stage 1 of the Rapid Transit Project being comprised of properties commencing at Eby Street South between Charles Street East and King Street East in the City of Kitchener and running East along portions of Charles Street East and King Street East to Borden Avenue South and Ottawa Street South and including lands on Madison Avenue South, Cameron Street South, Pandora Avenue South, and Stirling Avenue South in the City of Kitchener, in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo as detailed in Report CR-RS-13-035 dated April 30, 2013, described as follows:

FEE SIMPLE PARTIAL TAKINGS:

1. Part Lot 12 (H. Eby) South of King Street, Plan 364, being Part 1 on 58R17381, Part of PIN 22501-0067, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (22 Eby Street South, Kitchener)
2. Part Lot 14 (B. Moogk), Part Lot 15 (P. Grab), South of King Street, Plan 364, being Part 2 on 58R17381, Part of PIN 22502-0049, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (301 – 319 King Street East, Kitchener)
3. Part Lot 15 (P. Grab), South of King Street, Plan 364, being Part 3 on 58R17381, Part of PIN 22502-0050, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (No applicable municipal address, Kitchener)
4. Part Lot 16 or 15 (Hueglin), Part Lot 17 (B. Moogk) South of King Street, Plan 364, being Part 4 on 58R17381, Part of PIN 22502-0113, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (21 Cedar Street South, Kitchener)
5. Part Lot 18, South of King Street, Plan 364, being Parts 5 and 6 on 58R17381, Part of PIN 22502-0084, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (220 Charles Street East, Kitchener)
6. Part Lot 18, South of King Street, Plan 364 and Part Lot 19, South of King Street, Plan 365, being Part 7 on 58R17381, Part of PIN 22502-0086, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (230 Charles Street East, Kitchener)
7. Part Lot 19, South of King Street, Plan 365, being Part 8 on 58R17381, Part of PIN 22502-0087, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (28 Madison Avenue South, Kitchener)

8. Part Lots 20, 21 and 22, South of King Street, Plan 365, being Part 9 on 58R17381, Part of PIN 22502-0092, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (471 King Street East, Kitchener)

9. Part Lots 23 and 24, South of King Street, Plan 365, being Part 10 on 58R17381, Part of PIN 22502-0093, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (481 King Street East and 24 Cameron Street South, Kitchener)

10. Part Lot 182, Streets and Lanes and Part Lot 64, Plan 303, being Parts 1 and 11 on 58R17386, Part of PIN 22502-0098, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (310 Charles Street East, Kitchener)

11. Part Lot 207, Plan 303, being Part 2 on 58R17386, Part PIN 22502-0100, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (332 Charles Street East, Kitchener)

12. Part Lot 78, Plan 303 being Part 3 on 58R17386, Part of PIN 22502-0105, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (625 King Street East, Kitchener)

13. Part Lot 16, Plan 634 being Part 4 on 58R17386, Part of PIN 22509-0140, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (22 Pandora Avenue South, Kitchener)

14. Part Lot 15, Plan 634 being Part 5 on 58R17386, Part of PIN 22509-0141, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (354 Charles Street East, Kitchener)

15. Part Lots 10 to 14, Plan 634 being Part 6 on 58R17386, Part of PIN 22509-0142, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (659 King Street East, Kitchener)

16. Part Lot 76, Plan 303, Part Lots 17, 33 and 34, Plan 634 and Part Lot 67, Streets and Lanes being Parts 7 and 8 on 58R17386, Part of PIN 22504-0045, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (355 Charles Street East, Kitchener)

17. Part Lot 41, Plan 634 being Part 9 on 58R17386, Part of PIN 22506-0003, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (21 Stirling Avenue South, Kitchener)

18. Part Lot 1, Plan 404 being Part 10 on 58R17386 and Part Lots 3 and 4, Plan 404, being Part 1 on 58R17395, Part of PIN 22506-0010, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (432 Charles Street East, Kitchener)

19. Part of Park Lot 25, Plan 404 being Part 2 on 58R17395, Part of PIN 22506-00217, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (480 Charles Street East, Kitchener)

20. Part of Park Lot 25, Plan 404 being Parts 3 and 4 on 58R17395. Part of PIN 22506-0009, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (50 Borden Avenue South, Kitchener)

21. Part of Park Lot 25, Plan 404, being Part 5 on 58R17395, Part of PIN 22506-0093, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (512 – 516 Charles Street East, Kitchener)

22. Part of Park Lot 25, Plan 404, being Part 6 on 58R17395, Part of PIN 22506-0091, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (520 Charles Street East, Kitchener)

23. Part of Lot 12, Plan 262 being Part 7 on 58R17395, Part of PIN 22506-0090, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (526 Charles Street East, Kitchener)

24. Part Lot 13, Plan 262 being Part 8, 58R17395, Part of PIN 22506-0089, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (530 Charles Street East, Kitchener)
25. Part Lot 14, Plan 262 being Part 9 on 58R17395, Part of PIN 22506-0088, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (no applicable municipal address, Kitchener)
26. Part Lot 14, Plan 262 being Parts 10 and 11 on 58R17395, Part of PIN 22506-0086, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (534 Charles Street East, Kitchener)
27. Part Lot 15, Plan 262, being Part 12 on 58R17395, Part of PIN 22506-0084, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (542 Charles Street East, Kitchener)
28. Part Lots 16, 17 and 18, Plan 262 being Part 13 on 58R17395, Part of PIN 22506-0080(R) City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (1027 King Street East, Kitchener)
29. Part Lot 19, Plan 262, being Part 14 on 58R17395, Part of PIN 22506-0067, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (564 Charles Street East, Kitchener)
30. Part Lot 20, Plan 262, being Part 15, 58R17395, Part of PIN 22506-0218, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (1081 King Street East, Kitchener)
31. Part Lots 21 and 22, Plan 262 being Part 16 on 58R17395, Part of PIN 22506-0077, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (22 Ottawa Street South, Kitchener)

being in the City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo or such lesser portion(s) of any of the said properties as may be determined to be required through the preliminary design process for the purposes of the construction of the Rapid Transit Project Stage 1.

AND THAT staff be instructed to register a Plan of Expropriation with respect to the said properties, or such lesser portions of any of the said properties as may be determined through the preliminary design process, within three months of the granting of approval to expropriate said properties, in accordance with the Expropriations Act (Ontario) (the “Act”);

AND THAT the registered owners be served with a Notice of Expropriation and a Notice of Possession with respect to the said properties after the registration of the Plan of Expropriation;

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

AND FURTHER THAT the Regional Solicitor be authorized to discontinue expropriation proceedings with respect to any above-referenced lands in the event that the Region is able to otherwise obtain registered title to such lands.

SUMMARY: N/A

REPORT:

The Region is in the process of acquiring lands required for the construction of Stage 1 of the Rapid Transit/Light Rail Transit (LRT) project which commences at Conestoga Mall in the City of Waterloo and ends at Fairview Park Mall in the City of Kitchener. The property acquisition and/or expropriation process for the LRT project has been divided into 3 phases that are temporally sequenced to accommodate the commencement of utility relocation work as early as
2013 and the commencement of the construction of LRT infrastructure as early as 2014.

On August 29, 2012, Regional Council approved the commencement of the expropriation of properties forming part of Phase 2 of the LRT land acquisition/expropriation process (“Phase 2”) as detailed in Report CR-RS-12-051. The appropriate forms were served to initiate formal proceedings under the Act for these properties. All of the affected property owners were previously contacted by Legal Services staff and informed of the project, as well as, the Region’s intention to commence the expropriation process and the Region’s Expropriation Information Sheet was provided to each of them. The Region did not receive any Notices for a Hearing of Necessity from Phase 2 property owners.

A total of thirty-four (34) property owners will be impacted by Phase 2. All land acquisitions are partial takings. The partial takings range in depth from less than 1 metre to approximately 8 metres, with the vast majority falling somewhere in the middle. Two (2) of the required parcels referenced in Report CR-RS-12-051 form part of City of Kitchener lands, namely:

A. Part Lots 76 and 205, Plan 303, being Part 2 on 58R-17414, Part of PIN 22504-0042, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (104 Stirling Avenue South, Kitchener); and

B. Part Lot 12 (A. Geckle) South of King Street, Plan 364, being Part 1 on 58R-1929, Part of PIN 22502-0040, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (no applicable municipal address, Kitchener).

One (1) of the required parcels referenced in Report CR-RS-12-051 forms part of Waterloo Region District School Board (“WRDSB”) lands (occupied by Cameron Heights Collegiate Institute), namely:

Part Lots 63, 64 and 205, Part of Cameron Street (closed by by-law 6362, Instrument No. 363820), Plan 303 and Part Lot 25, South of King Street and West of Cameron Street, Plan 365, being Part 1 on 58R-17414, Part of PIN 22504-0011, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (301 Charles Street East, Kitchener).

Regional staff expect to acquire these City of Kitchener and WRDSB lands through a negotiated settlement and, therefore, these properties have not been included in the list of properties to be approved for expropriation in Report CR-RS-13-035.

Furthermore, it is to be noted that a proposed partial taking from the property identified in Report CR-RS-12-051 as follows:

Part Lot 11, Plan 262 and Part of Lots 6 to 11, Plan 262 being Parts 17 and 18 on 58R-17395, Part of PIN 22506-0215, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (50 Ottawa Street South, Kitchener),

is no longer needed and, therefore, has not been included in the list properties to be approved for expropriation in Report CR-RS-13-035.

Legal Services staff contacted all property owners and informed them of the Region’s intention to continue with the expropriation process, including this Report CR-RS-13-035, in order to ensure that the construction timeline is maintained. Legal Services staff will continue to correspond with all Phase 2 property owners in order to reach a negotiated settlement with as many as possible.
The next step in the expropriation process for the above-listed properties is for Council to approve the expropriation of those property interests. This approval will ultimately be endorsed upon a certificate of approval on the Plan of Expropriation (the “Plan”) for those properties not acquired under agreement. The Plan must then be registered within three months of the approval. Ownership of property vests with the Region upon the registration of the Plan. Notices of Expropriation are then served upon all registered owners, including tenants as shown on the assessment roll.

Once ownership by the Region is secured through the registration of the Plan, it is possible to serve Notices of Possession upon affected parties. The date for possession can be no sooner than three months following the date of service of the Notice of Possession. The Notices of Expropriation and Notices of Possession may be served at the same time. In order to meet the construction time line, possession of all the required lands is needed by September of 2013 in order to accommodate certain early works in that area, as well as, to secure the lands that are necessary for LRT construction commencing in 2014. Accordingly, Legal Services staff will be proceeding expeditiously to register the Expropriation Plan and serve the Notices of Expropriation and Notices of Possession following approval by Regional Council.

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

It is to be noted that the expropriation of lands is on an “as is” basis and upon the registration of the Plan, the Region assumes responsibility for the lands, subject to minor caveats.

The subject lands are shown in the Plan attached as Appendix “A” hereto.

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:

Funding for the property acquisitions related to the Rapid Transit project is included in the approved 2013 ten year capital program for Rapid Transit.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Environmental Services and Rapid Transit staff have been consulted in the preparation of this Report.
ATTACHMENTS

Appendix “A” – Plan showing subject lands

PREPARED BY: Liviu Cananau, Solicitor (Rapid Transit)

APPROVED BY: Gary Sosnoski, Commissioner, Corporate Resources
REGION OF WATERLOO
CORPORATE RESOURCES
Legal Services

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

DATE: April 30, 2013  FILE CODE: L07-90

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZATION TO EXPROPRIATE LANDS (1ST REPORT) DESIGNATED AS PHASE 3 OF STAGE 1 OF RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT RELATING TO PROPERTY AND INTERESTS FROM BORDEN AVENUE SOUTH AND OTTAWA STREET SOUTH TO COURTLAND AVENUE EAST IN KITCHENER AND FROM KING STREET NORTH AND NORTHFIELD DRIVE TO KING STREET SOUTH AND JOHN STREET IN WATERLOO

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT The Regional Municipality of Waterloo direct and authorize the Regional Solicitor to take the following actions with respect to the expropriation of further lands required for the construction of Stage 1 of the Rapid Transit Project commencing at Borden Avenue South and Ottawa Avenue South to Courtland Avenue East in the City of Kitchener and continuing from King Street North and Northfield Drive to King Street South and John Street in the City of Waterloo, in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo in accordance with the Recommended Rapid Transit Implementation Option Report E-11-072 dated June 15, 2011:

A. Complete application(s) to the Council of The Regional Municipality of Waterloo, as may be required from time to time, for approval to expropriate land, which is required for the Rapid Transit Project Stage 1 and described as follows:

Fee Simple Partial Taking:

1. Part of Lots 19 and 20, Plan 404 being Part 1 on 58R-17382, Part PIN 22505-0061, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (321 Courtland Avenue E., Kitchener)

2. Part Lot 38, Plan 394 being Part 1 on 58R-17371, Part PIN 22501-0051, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (17 Benton Street, Kitchener)

3. Part Block C, Plan 1434 being Part 1 on 58R-17311, Part PIN 22283-0129, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (550 King Street N., Waterloo)

4. Part Lots 6 and 7, Plan 1230 being Part 6 on 58R-17313, Part PIN 22280-0072, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (53-55 Northfield Drive West, Waterloo)
5. Part Lot 8, GCT being Part 7 on 58R-17313, Part PIN 22280-0071, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (565 Conestogo Road, Waterloo)

6. Part Lot 2, Plan 1230 being part 2 on 58R-17313, Part PIN 22280-0101, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (29 Northfield Drive West, Waterloo)

7. Part Block 1, Plan 1702 being Parts 1, 2 and 3 on 58R-17312, Part PIN 22283-0006, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (574-584 King Street North, Waterloo)

8. Part Lot 1, Plan 1230 being Part 1 on 58R-17313, Part PIN 22280-0100, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (25 Northfield Drive West, Waterloo)

9. Part Lot 3, Plan 1230 being Part 3 on 58R-17313, Part PIN 22280-0102, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (35 Northfield Drive West, Waterloo)

10. Part Lot 4, Plan 1230 being Part 4 on 58R-17313, Part PIN 22280-0103, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (39 Northfield Drive West, Waterloo)

11. Part Lots 5 and 6, Plan 1230 being part 5 on 58R-17313, Part PIN 22280-0104, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (45 Northfield Drive West, Waterloo)

12. Part Lot 2, Plan 757 being parts 1 and 2 on 58R-17384, Part PINS 22595-0094 and 22595-0110, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (130 Hayward Avenue, Kitchener)

13. Part Lot 7, between Young and Ontario Streets, Plan 401 being Part 2 on 58R-17369, Part PIN 22316-0217, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (56 Duke Street West, Kitchener)

14. Part Lot 7, between Young and Ontario Streets, Plan 401 being Part 1 on 58R-17369, Part PIN 22316-0217, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Parking Lot at Young and Duke Streets, Kitchener)

15. Part Lot 12, GCT being parts 1, 2 and 3 on 58R-17314, Part PIN 22256-0328, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (440 Wes Graham Way, Waterloo)

16. Part Lot 4, Municipal Compiled Plan of Lot 13, GCT being Parts 1 and 2 on 58R-17315, Part PIN 22378-0006, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (310 Westmount Road North, Waterloo)

17. Part Block 1, Plan 58M-272 being Part 6 on 58R-17314, Part PIN 22256-0367, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (300 Hagey Blvd., Waterloo)

18. Part Lot 140, Plan 385 being Part 1 on 58R-17316, Part PIN 22417-0008, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (185 King Street S., Waterloo)
19. Part Lots 30 and 31, Part of the Mill Property, Plan 385 being Parts 2, 3 and 4 on 58R-17322, Part PIN 22377-0003, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (25-31 Caroline Street, Waterloo)

20. Part Lots 23 and 24, Plan 385 and Part Lot 24, Municipal Compiled Plan of Lot 14, GCT being Part 1 on 58R-17322, Part PIN 22377-0181, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (10 Father David Bauer Drive, Waterloo)

21. Part Lot 38, Plan 394 being Part 2 on 58R-17371, Part PIN 22501-0050, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (19 Benton Street, Kitchener)

22. Part Lots 94, 96, 97 and 98, Plan 375 being Part 1 on 58R-17370, Part PIN 22427-0014, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (44 Gaukel Street, Kitchener)

23. Part Lot 21, Plan 380 and Part Lot 4, Plan 393 being Part 2 on 58R-17370, Part PIN 22427-0028, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (15 Charles Street, Kitchener)

Fee Simple Full Taking:

24. Part Lot 16, Plan 384, PIN 22599-0047, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (451 Mill Street, Kitchener)

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

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

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

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

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

SUMMARY: NIL

REPORT:

Introduction
On June 15, 2011, Regional Council approved light rail transit (LRT) as the preferred transit technology from Conestoga Mall in the City of Waterloo to the Ainslie Street Terminal in the City of Cambridge. Stage 1 of the LRT project (Stage 1) will include LRT service from Conestoga Mall in the City of Waterloo to Fairview Park Mall in the City of Kitchener.

The Regional Municipality of Waterloo initiated a Transit Project Assessment (TPA) with respect
to Stage 1 in November of 2011, which has been completed and has provided results that are permissive of the construction and operation of LRT along the proposed corridor.

**Current Project Status**
The functional design of the project is presently underway. Construction of the rapidway is proposed to commence in 2014 to be preceded by certain utility relocation work commencing as early as 2013. Property acquisitions with respect to Stage 1 are being completed in 3 phases in accordance with the required possession date for the various properties.

**Phase 1 Update**
On March 7, 2012, Regional Council approved the commencement of expropriation proceedings with respect to the first phase (Phase 1) of lands required for Stage 1 as set out in Report CR-RS-12-013 dated February 28, 2012. On August 29, 2012, Regional Council, furthermore, approved the expropriation of Phase 1 lands as set out in Report CR-RS-12-049 dated August 14, 2012. Plans of Expropriation with respect to Phase 1 lands were registered in the Land Registry Office of Waterloo Region on November, 22, 2012 vesting title in favour of the Region for all Phase 1 lands that had previously not been acquired by transfer, and excluding lands that are owned by other expropriating authorities, namely: the City of Kitchener, the City of Waterloo and the Waterloo Region District School Board. Regional staff expect to acquire Phase 1 lands owned by other expropriating authorities by acquisition and not expropriation. Regional staff served Notices of Expropriation and Notices of Possession on property owners for all expropriated Phase 1 lands on December 14, 2012. The Region now has full possession rights with respect to those lands and statutory offers have been sent to all required parties as of February 14, 2013. At this time, Regional Staff continue to actively negotiate settlements with Phase 1 property owners.

**Phase 2 Update**
On August 29, 2012, Regional Council approved the commencement of expropriation proceedings with respect to the second phase (Phase 2) of lands required for Stage 1 as set out in Report CR-RS-12-051 dated August 14, 2012. If the expropriation of Phase 2 lands as set out in Report CR-RS-13-035 dated April 30, 2013 is approved by Regional Council, Plans of Expropriation will be registered no later than three (3) months following the date of approval by Regional Council of the expropriation of Phase 2 lands, and Notices of Expropriation and Notices of Possession will be mailed out immediately thereafter. Regional staff are targeting a possession date for Phase 2 lands of September, 2013. At this time, Regional Staff continue to actively negotiate settlements with Phase 2 property owners.

**Phase 3**
This Report CR-RS-13-036 is seeking approval to commence the expropriation process in connection with the third phase (Phase 3) of lands required for Stage 1 of the Rapid Transit Project. Phase 3 entails partial takings from 23 properties and the full taking of 1 property. The depth of the partial takings varies on a property by property basis from under 1 metre to approximately 19 metres, with most being under 10 metres. It is noted that 3 of these properties are owned by the City of Kitchener, namely:

A. Part Lot 38, Plan 394 being Part 2 on 58R-17371, Part PIN 22501-0050, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (19 Benton Street, Kitchener);

B. Part Lots 94, 96, 97 and 98, Plan 375 being Part 1 on 58R-17370, Part PIN 22427-0014, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (44 Gaukel Street, Kitchener); and
C. Part Lot 21, Plan 380 and Part Lot 4, Plan 393 being Part 2 on 58R-17370, Part PIN 22427-0028, City of Kitchener, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (15 Charles Street, Kitchener),

and another 3 of these properties are owned by the City of Waterloo, namely:

A. Part Lot 140, Plan 385 being Part 1 on 58R-17316, Part PIN 22417-0008, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (185 King Street S., Waterloo);

B. Part Lots 30 and 31, Part of the Mill Property, Plan 385 being Parts 2, 3 and 4 on 58R-17322, Part PIN 22377-0003, City of Waterloo, Regional Municipality of Waterloo (25-31 Caroline Street, Waterloo); and


It is expected that all properties required from the City of Kitchener and the City of Waterloo will be acquired through negotiation and not expropriation.

Possession of the Phase 3 properties is required by the Region by spring of 2014.

In order to meet the Rapid Transit Project timelines, the Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services has authorized modified prerequisites for the commencement of the expropriation process with respect to lands required for Rapid Transit in accordance with the Region’s revised land acquisition policy for infrastructure projects. Accordingly, Regional Staff have contacted, in writing, all property owners impacted by Phase 3, and have followed up in person or via telephone with all owners that have made themselves available. The property owners have been informed of the Region’s intention to proceed with the expropriation process, including this Report CR-RS-13-036, and have been provided with the Region’s Expropriation Information Sheet which explains the expropriation process. A copy of the Expropriation Information Sheet is attached as Appendix “A” hereto. As well, each owner has been provided a copy of the Property Acquisition Process Information Sheet and a Property Impact Plan (PIP) illustrating the required taking for each particular property. The owners have also been advised that it is the Region’s intention to seek a negotiated settlement prior to the completion of the Expropriation process and that the process has been commenced only to ensure that possession of the required lands is secured by the date set by Project staff in order to meet the Project timeline.

Should a negotiated settlement be reached with any of the property owners and a conveyance of the required acquisition completed before the expropriation process is complete, the expropriation process with respect such lands would be discontinued by the Regional Solicitor.

It is to be noted that the expropriation of the lands referred to above is on an “as is” basis and, therefore, the Region assumes all responsibility for the said lands upon assumption of title.

For reference purposes, the Project Area has been attached as Appendix “B” hereto.

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:**

Funding for the property acquisitions related to the Rapid Transit project is included in the approved 2013 ten year capital program for Rapid Transit.

**OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:**

Rapid Transit staff have been consulted in the preparation of this Report.

**ATTACHMENTS**

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

**PREPARED BY:** Liviu Cananau, Solicitor  
**APPROVED BY:** Gary Sosnoski, Commissioner, Corporate Resources
The following information is provided as a general overview of the expropriation process and is not legal advice. For complete information, reference should be made to the Ontario Expropriations Act as well as the more detailed information in the Notices provided under that Act.

Expropriation Information Sheet

What is Expropriation?

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

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

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

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

- Regional Council considers a request to begin an application under the Expropriations Act to obtain land and/or an easement for a specific Regional project. No decision is made at this meeting to expropriate the land. This step is simply direction for the Region of Waterloo to provide a “Notice of Application for Approval to Expropriate” to affected property owners that the process has started to seek approval to expropriate the land.
As stated in the Notice, affected property owners have 30 days to request a Hearing to consider whether the requested expropriation is “fair, sound and reasonably necessary in the achievement of the objectives” of the Region of Waterloo. This Hearing is conducted by a provincially-appointed Inquiry Officer. Prior to the Hearing, the Region of Waterloo must serve the property owner with a Notice setting out its reasons or grounds for the proposed expropriation. **Compensation for lands is not determined at this Hearing.** The Inquiry Officer can order the Region of Waterloo to pay the property owner up to $200.00 as compensation for the property owner’s costs in participating in this Hearing, regardless of the outcome of the Hearing.

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

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

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

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

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

Within 3 months of registration of the Plan, the Region of Waterloo must provide the affected property owner with payment for the full amount of the appraised fair market value of the expropriated land or easement and a copy of the appraisal report on which the value is based. If the property owner disagrees with this amount, and/or claims other compensation and/or costs under the *Expropriations Act*, the compensation and/or costs matter may be referred to a provincially-appointed Board of Negotiation in an effort to reach a mediated settlement and/or an appeal may be made to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) for a decision. In any event, the Region of Waterloo continues in its efforts to reach a negotiated settlement with the affected property owner prior to the OMB making a decision.
APPENDIX “B”
451 Mill Street, Kitchener
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: April 30, 2013

FILE CODE: A02-30/PW

SUBJECT: RAPID TRANSIT BRAND NAME RECOMMENDATION

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the selection of ION as the new brand name for the Region’s Rapid Transit service as described in Report E-13-031 dated April 30, 2013.

SUMMARY:

The selection of a brand name for the Region of Waterloo’s Rapid Transit service represents an important milestone for the project. The best brand names are unique, memorable and distinct. A strong brand helps create public awareness and builds excitement and anticipation for the launch. It also assists in communicating the new service to the community, including current and future users.

Rapid Transit is a visionary project focused on shaping the Region for the future and providing new and improved transportation choices for residents. Ultimately, the project is about how the Region of Waterloo will evolve over the next 20 to 30 years.

With these goals in mind, the Rapid Transit Brand Development Working Group (RT Brand Group) as well as the Rapid Transit Senior Management Team and Rapid Transit Steering Committee recommend ION as the new brand name for the Region’s Rapid Transit service.

ION reflects the tech-savvy nature of Waterloo Region. ION represents the brand strategy established for Rapid Transit and meets all of the Region’s brand name criteria. ION is focused on movement, community transformation and innovation.

During the initial Public Consultation phase of the brand development process, ION was the most preferred option of the 814 participants who provided their feedback, registering strong first impressions and word associations. More than 500 names were proposed and collected from the community during this phase. The RT Brand Group reviewed and examined each of these names with one, The Wave, making the final short-list. A telephone survey was then conducted to evaluate ION and The Wave as well as collect additional public comments on the brand.

During the telephone survey, ION once again earned strong first impressions, positive word associations and overall perceptions from the 305 residents surveyed. Two-thirds (66 per cent) of those interviewed said ION matched the brand values outlined for Rapid Transit by the Region.

ION is a powerful brand name that will serve the community long-term and will help attract new riders. It is a unique, memorable and distinct name that will provide plenty of inspiration for the Region to tell the Rapid Transit story now and in the future.
ION connects directly with Grand River Transit and iXpress, providing a family feel for the entire public transit system. It is a “Made in Waterloo Region” solution that highlights the community and works for both technologies – adapted Bus Rapid Transit (aBRT) and Light Rail Transit (LRT).

ION is focused on the future of Waterloo Region, matches the visionary goals of the project and helps establish a new standard for branding Rapid Transit services as the name stands alone in the public transit sector.

REPORT:

In October 2012, following a formal Request for Proposal process, Quarry Integrated Communications was retained by the Region of Waterloo to assist with the development of a brand for its Rapid Transit service.

Project deliverables included: developing a brand strategy; assisting with public consultation; creating a name and logo for the new service; and establishing the brand guidelines, brand voice and graphic design standards.

Working alongside the RT Brand Group, which includes staff from Rapid Transit, Transit Services, Planning, Housing and Community Services, Corporate Communications and Corporate Publishing, Quarry began the process with an intensive research and review phase.

Research and Review
Quarry reviewed more than 4,000 comments collected from residents on the topic of Rapid Transit in the Region. The comments were gathered through a variety of community engagement initiatives over the previous three years.

Quarry also led a series of workshops and briefings with the RT Brand Group and conducted a number of personal interviews with key stakeholders, including local business leaders, community groups, Regional staff and Councillors. Additional research included a scan of citizen comments in traditional and social media as well as a review of transit systems across North America.

Brand Foundation
Three themes – healthy, prosperous and smart – emerged from the research and review phase, creating a foundation for the Rapid Transit brand.

Healthy
- For the Region as low emissions and shared transportation help create compact, walkable communities.
- For the individual as efficient, low-stress transit encourages behaviours that contribute to personal well-being.

Prosperous
- For the Region as smart urban design attracts businesses and talent, enhancing the community with new employment opportunities, revenue and services.
- For the individual as low-cost choices and/or decreased dependence on a car enhances personal wealth.

Smart
- For the Region as the planning process, while complex, has been smooth, integrated and future-focused.
- For the individual as the outcome is a liveable, walkable community with new and improved transportation choices.
Brand Names
A set of general and Region-specific criteria was established to ensure the creation and selection of the best possible brand name for the new service.

General Criteria
- Meaningful, and full of meaning with the ability to unwrap multiple meanings and inspiration over time
- Easy to pronounce, memorable, inspiring, distinctive/ownable

Region-Specific Criteria
- Aligned with the brand foundation: healthy, prosperous, smart
- Able to work for both technologies: aBRT and LRT
- Fits within existing brand family: Region of Waterloo, Grand River Transit, iXpress
- Feels like a "Made in Waterloo Region" solution
- Helps tell the Rapid Transit story: useful now and in the future (pre/post-construction)
- Short and sweet: can be read as the train or bus passes by
- Works beyond Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo: connects the townships and other communities outside the Region

With the criteria in place, the creative process began. Quarry generated more than 300 possible names and ultimately narrowed their list down to 11 using the established criteria. These names (ARC, EO, ION, ITX, iXpress or IX, RIO, RUN, TRIO, VIVEO, The “W” and WiCK) were presented to the RT Brand Group in November 2012.

In December 2012, the RT Brand Group, along with the Rapid Transit Senior Management Team and the Rapid Transit Steering Committee, short-listed the 11 names to three – ARC, ION and TRIO. Those names were presented to Council in January 2013 and released for public consultation.

Public Engagement
Community feedback was collected in two ways: through an online survey (January 8-18, 2013) and at three Public Consultation Centres (Cambridge: January 10, 2013; Waterloo: January 14, 2013; and Kitchener: January 15, 2013).

While not a vote or a competition, the information received through public consultation was critical to the brand development process as it helped identify overall community themes, opinions and priorities. Participants were also given the opportunity to submit their own suggestion(s) for the Rapid Transit brand name.

Results
In total, 814 surveys were completed and the three short-listed names inspired discussion throughout the community, including reports in all local media outlets.

While participants varied in age, gender and tenure in the Region, a majority shared one common trait: more than two-thirds (70 per cent) said they would be a future Rapid Transit user – clearly demonstrating the high level of interest that residents have in the project.

Feedback on the Three Names
Participants were asked to provide their feedback in several ways:
- Overall first impressions of each name
- Word association, choosing up to five words for each brand from a list provided
- Indicating whether there was anything controversial about each name
- Indicating whether they had ever seen or heard the name before
Ranking each name (most preferred to least preferred)

For each name, both positive and negative first impressions were recorded and word clouds were created to illustrate the words most frequently associated with the names.

ARC
- *Positive first impressions*: curve, flexible, intelligent, movement, strong
- *Negative first impressions*: biblical, Noah, Joan, boring, electrical
- *Word association*: strength, science, simple, unique, future
- *Controversial*: biblical, ARC Industries, electric shock
- *Seen or heard before*: ARC Industries, the Bible

ION
- *Positive first impressions*: clever, cool, energizing, futuristic, ‘geeky in a good way’
- *Negative first impressions*: cold, geeky, not transit, sterile, too techie
- *Word association*: science, future, smart, forward-thinking, fast
- *Controversial*: eon, fluoride
- *Seen or heard before*: Saturn car, phone, hair care

TRIO
- *Positive first impressions*: three cities, musical, safe, collaborative, cooperative
- *Negative first impressions*: limiting, boring, old, cheesy, lame
- *Word association*: Waterloo, collaboration, Region, community, simple
- *Controversial*: Tri-Cities only
- *Seen or heard before*: TriOS College, King Street Trio

During the public consultation process, ION emerged as the preferred option, followed by ARC and TRIO.

Community Names
More than 500 names were proposed and collected from a variety of community sources during the public consultation phase. The names were collected from: surveys (online/in-person), the public consultation centres, emails, phone calls, online blogs, Facebook, Twitter and local media outlets (CTV News, the Record, Cambridge Times, Kitchener Post, Kitchener Citizen, Waterloo Chronicle, Imprint and the Cord).

Final Short-list
Quarry and the RT Brand Group examined and reviewed all of the community comments and each of the 500 names collected.

In January 2013, a new short-list of brand names was created. It featured the three original names (ARC, ION and TRIO) as well as 17 named generated by the community (Blueline, Centreline, Connect, The Grand, iKWIC, Iron Horse, The Link, LRT, Pearl, Rapid, Region Express, Spark, TiimM, Trion, The “W,” The Wave, and Zip).

Each of the 20 names on the new short-list was then evaluated using the naming criteria. Two finalists emerged: one from the original list (ION) and one from the community list (The Wave).

ION
- *Meaning*: ‘going’ in Greek; a net positive/net negative electrical charge; always in motion, movement; powers the service, go + electricity = Rapid Transit
- *Feels*: action-orientated, cheerful, efficient, innovative and tech-savvy
- *Is*: brief, memorable and easily pronounced; declarative statement when pronounced
Other Considerations: links to iXpress, offering a family feel within the Region’s transit system; salutes local ties to academic/scientific communities; heritage of electricity; part of RegION, transportatION, visION, innovatION, transformatION

Concerns: discontinued Saturn car, phone and hair care products; eon = a long time; subtle tie to Apple (iPhone, iPad, iPod)

The Wave

Meaning: a transfer of energy from one point to another; motion, free-flowing; a mass movement or wide-spread feeling; a friendly greeting; fun at sporting events

Feels: welcoming, exciting and fun

Is: brief, memorable and easily pronounced; combines elements of art and science

Other Considerations: Universal; clear water connection, a natural link to the environment and/or the Grand River; shares the “W” in Waterloo Region

Concerns: Waiver means skip or forgo; shock wave, tidal wave or tsunami; the name of transit systems in six other cities (Whistler, Wilmington, Nantucket, Mobile, South Padre Island and Virginia Beach)

Final Brand Name Research

Following the selection of ION and The Wave as the final two brand names, a phone survey was conducted by PMG Research. A total of 305 residents took part in the survey, including 100 from each of the three urban centres – Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo.

The purpose of the research was to:

- Test the community’s first impression of each name
- Discover how residents described each name through word association
- Determine if the community’s perception of each name matched with the brand values

The overall results from the survey are included in Appendix A.

First impressions and word associations are important as they represent what the name means to the community, how it could be viewed by future riders and its ability to attract new users. Both positive and negative first impressions were recorded for ION and The Wave. For word association, participants were asked to choose three words to describe each name.

ION

Positive: Better than The Wave, science, like it, electricity, futuristic, high tech, fast, love it, energy, quick, movement, ok, technical, computer technology, modern, incorporate local industry

Negative: doesn’t mean anything, not relevant to transit, don’t like it, silly name, not relevant to the Region, not unique

Word Association: science/chemistry, quick/efficient, particle/electron, electricity, modern/futuristic, energy, technology, interesting/innovative, car

The Wave

Positive: sports wave, sounds like the ocean, makes me think I’m on vacation, moving forward, I like it, it’s ok, fast, better than ION, waving goodbye, water, catch the wave

Negative: silly name, not relevant to the Region, not relevant to transit, I don’t like it, cheesy, like ION better, trendy, not unique

Word Association: water, fast/quick, ocean, beach/surfing, movement, hand gesture, silly/childish, wave pool, vacation
Matching community perceptions with the brand values is critical for any new service as it proves whether or not the name will be accepted and if it truly represents the values of the service. For two-thirds of the participants (66 per cent), ION matched the brand values outlined by the Region, while just over half (55 per cent) thought The Wave matched the brand values.

**Staff Recommendation**

Quarry and the RT Brand Group short-listed ION and The Wave because they are both suitable names for the Region’s Rapid Transit service. Each is aligned with the brand strategy (healthy, prosperous and smart). Both are meaningful, memorable and easy to pronounce. Both have ties to Waterloo Region, ensuring they’ll be viewed as “Made in Waterloo Region” solutions. Each name also works for both technologies (aBRT and LRT) and fit within the existing brand family (Region of Waterloo, Grand River Transit and iXpress).

The major difference between the two names is that ION is a unique and ownable brand in public transit, while The Wave is already used for transit services in six other North American cities.

Rapid Transit is about the future of Waterloo Region. It is focused on innovation, community transformation and collaboration. With these project goals in mind, Quarry and the RT Brand Group as well as the Rapid Transit Senior Management and Rapid Transit Steering Committee recommend ION as the new brand name for the Region’s Rapid Transit service.

ION tested well during public consultation. It was the most preferred option of the 814 participants who provided feedback, registering strong first impressions and word associations. During the final brand name research, ION once again earned high marks for first impressions, word associations and overall perceptions as two-thirds (66 per cent) of the 305 residents surveyed said the name matched the brand values for Rapid Transit outlined by the Region.

ION connects directly with Grand River Transit and iXpress, providing a family feel for the entire public transit system. The name emphasizes the tech-savvy nature of the community and represents the brand strategy and visionary goals established for Rapid Transit.

As a brand name, ION will help attract new riders and serve the community for the long-term. It also helps the Region establish a new standard for branding Rapid Transit services as the name stands alone in the public transit sector.

The selection of a brand name represents an important milestone for the Region of Waterloo’s Rapid Transit service. The best brand names are unique, memorable and distinct. A strong brand helps create public awareness and builds anticipation and excitement for the launch. It also communicates the new service to the community, including new and future users.

ION is a powerful brand name that provides plenty of inspiration for the Region to tell the Rapid Transit story now, and in the future.

**Next Steps**

Once a name is selected by Council, Quarry and the RT Brand Group will begin logo development. The visual identity of the brand, including graphics, typeface and colours, will be influenced by the name that is selected. The name will also help establish the brand voice and will influence the brand guidelines and graphic design standards.

Public consultation on the logo development and visual identity, including the graphics, typeface and colours, will be collected through several focus group research sessions. The feedback and comments received from residents during these group sessions will help Quarry and the RT Brand Group make a recommendation to Council on the logo and visual identity later this year.
CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The report supports Focus Area 3.1 of Council's Strategic Focus: Develop an implementation plan for light rail transit including corridor and station area planning.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The cost of the Rapid Transit Brand Development Process, awarded to Quarry Integrated Communications in October 2012, is $74,951, plus taxes, and is accommodated within the overall Rapid Transit project budget.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

This report was prepared with input from Transit Services, Planning, Housing and Community Services, Corporate Communications, Corporate Publishing and Quarry Integrated Communications.

PREPARED BY: Kimberly Moser, Manager, Rapid Transit Community Relations

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
APPENDIX A: Phone Survey Results from PMG Research

- Quantitative research, 305 participants

Before today, had you ever heard of a Rapid Transit service coming to Waterloo Region?

What are your perceptions of a Rapid Transit service being introduced to our Region? Are they...

- Very favourable: 25%
- Somewhat favourable: 22%
- Neutral: 31%
- Somewhat unfavourable: 8%
- Very unfavourable: 15%
First Impressions: "ION"

- Electricity
- Silly name
- Incorporates local industry
- Not relevant to Region
- Not relevant to transit
- Don’t like it
- Science
- Quick
- Computer technology
- Futuristic
- Like it
- High tech
- Not unique
- Fast
- Love it
- Just call it LRT
- Movement

First Impressions: "The Wave"

- Catch the wave
- It’s OK
- Water
- Just call it LRT
- Trendy
- Not unique
- Better than ION
- Silly name
- Sports wave
- Like ION better
- Moving forward
- Cheesy
- Sounds like the ocean
- I like it
- Fast
- Makes me think I’m on vacation
If you could choose 3 words that you would use to describe the brand, what would they be?

- **Water**: 24%
- **Fast/quick**: 10%
- **Ocean**: 9%
- **Beach/surfing**: 9%
- **Movement**: 8%
- **Hand gesture**: 6%
- **Silly/childish**: 5%
- **Wave pool**: 5%
- **Vacation**: 3%
- **Other**: 18%

- **Science/chemistry**: 31%
- **Quick/efficient**: 9%
- **Particle/electron**: 9%
- **Electricity**: 9%
- **Modern/futuristic**: 8%
- **Energy**: 8%
- **Technology**: 7%
- **Interesting/innovative**: 3%
- **Car**: 3%
- **Other**: 13%

Do the Region of Waterloo’s perceptions match your perceptions of “ION”?

- **No response, 2%**
- **No, 26%**
- **Yes, 66%**
- **Unsure, 6%**

- **Means**: going in Greek; is a net positive/net negative electrical charge, is always in motion and helps power the system
- **Feels**: innovative and tech-savvy, unique, action-oriented and efficient
- **Other Considerations**: links Xpress, salutes local ties to academic/scientific communities, heritage of electricity in the Region
Do the Region of Waterloo’s perceptions match your perceptions of “The Wave”?

- No, 35%
- Yes, 55%
- Unsure, 8%
- No response, 2%

- **Means**: a transfer of energy from one point to another, a mass movement or widespread feeling, a friendly greeting
- **Feels**: Welcoming, fun and exciting, combines elements of arts and science
- **Other Considerations**: Clear water connection – natural link to the environment and the Grand River, Universal – for all ages, cultures

What are your perceptions of the name “ION” for the Rapid Transit service? Are they...

- Very positive: 21%
- Somewhat positive: 27%
- Neutral: 24%
- Somewhat negative: 15%
- Very negative: 13%
What are your perceptions of the name “The Wave” for the Rapid Transit service? Are they...

- Very positive: 13%
- Somewhat positive: 27%
- Neutral: 30%
- Somewhat negative: 15%
- Very negative: 15%
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: April 30, 2013

FILE CODE: T11-60/FAT, T04-10

SUBJECT: LINE 86 (REGIONAL ROAD 86) AND FLORADALE ROAD (REGIONAL ROAD 19) TRAFFIC OPERATIONAL REVIEW

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve in principle the installation of a single-lane roundabout at the intersection of Line 86/Church Street (Regional Road 86) and Floradale Road (Regional Road 19), in the Township of Woolwich as per Report E-13-034 dated April 30, 2013;

AND THAT the construction of a single-lane roundabout at this intersection be considered as part of a “Roundabout Installation Prioritization Program” in the 2014 Transportation Capital Program.

SUMMARY:

NIL

REPORT:

Following a fatal collision that occurred on August 17, 2011, Transportation staff completed a detailed operational review of the intersection situated at Line 86 (Regional Road 86) and Floradale Road (Regional Road 19). Detailed collision analyses are routinely completed following any fatal collision to determine if appropriate collision countermeasures are deemed necessary. On December 6, 2011, staff presented their findings in Report E-11-116, Safety Review of Fairway Road at Thaler Avenue, in City of Kitchener and Floradale Road at Line 86/Church Street, in Township of Woolwich to the Planning and Works Committee. Staff recommended that a roundabout at Line 86 and Floradale Road be assessed in more detail and that an appropriate recommendation be made following this review. In the interim staff relocated northbound and southbound stop bars closer to the intersection to reduce overall crossing distances in November 2011. Figure 1 illustrates the location of this intersection.
Staff has finished reviewing this intersection in more detail to determine the preferred traffic control device to enhance safety at this intersection. Staff considered 4 alternatives as follows:

1. Do Nothing
2. Traffic control signal;
3. Roundabout; and
4. All-way stop control.

As mentioned in Report E-11-116 dated December 6, 2011, a traffic signal is not warranted based on traffic volume or collision warrant criteria set out in Ontario Traffic Manual Book 12, Traffic Signals manual. Traffic signals may be warranted based on traffic volume forecasts in approximately 10 years. Field observations confirm that little delay is being experienced at this intersection today. The all-way stop alternative at this intersection was not carried forward for further study as traffic volume and collision warrants were not met and because this intersection, given its remote location and high speed operating environment, is not well suited for an all-way stop condition.

The 3 remaining alternatives were assessed in detail to estimate future positive or negative impacts on collisions. These impacts were then translated into 20-year present value societal collision costs and compared to a do nothing scenario to determine lifecycle cost benefits. Overall lifecycle costs of each alternative include capital, operating and predicted societal collision costs and are calculated in present day dollars. Following this assessment it has been determined that converting the intersection to a roundabout has the greatest potential to reduce overall societal collision costs or the sum of costs associated with non-injury, injury and fatal incidents at this intersection compared to any other traffic control alternative. A traffic control signal is also predicted to have a positive impact on societal collision costs and produce a positive benefit to society however it has less potential to prevent future injuries and or fatal incidents than a roundabout.

Collision History

From 2007 and 2011 inclusive, the intersection of Line 86 and Floradale Road saw a total of 14 collisions of which 5 were noted as involving injuries. These collision numbers are noted as being unusual since rural stop-controlled intersections with low Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT)
volumes similar to Line 86 and Floradale Road (7300 vehicles per day) are expected to operate with an average of 1 injury collision and 2 non-injury collisions every 5 years.

This intersection ranked 180th for most unexpected collisions at all Regional locations and 7th for most unexpected collisions at rural township stop-controlled intersections in 2012 based on 2007-2011 collision data. No other rural stop-controlled intersection ranking higher experienced a fatal incident.

Following the November 2011 interim measure of relocating stop bars closer to the intersection to reduce crossing distances, there has been one collision involving a northbound vehicle stopping and pulling out in front of a westbound motorcycle. The driver of the westbound motorcycle avoided being struck by the car by swerving his motorcycle into a nearby roadway drainage ditch. The driver of the motorcycle received minor injuries.

Traffic Control Selection Process

This section of the report summarizes the approach used to determine the societal costs of the different traffic controls. The combined societal and direct Region costs are one factor used in selecting the appropriate traffic control.

Historical 5-year injury collisions are reviewed to determine whether injury collision frequency at a given intersection is higher or lower than the average 5-year injury collision frequency at intersections operating under similar environments. The expected 10-year average annual daily traffic volume (AADT) is then obtained to determine an average collision rate for that future operating condition (10-year horizon). The applicable average collision rate selected for a future condition however is factored up or down relative to how well the intersection performed historically. Injury rates for roundabouts are assumed to be 25% that of applicable traffic signal injury rates based on Region of Waterloo and International studies. Using this information staff is then able to anticipate the number of collisions over a 20-year period to determine the total 20-year present value societal injury collision costs for the facility under consideration.

In light of the fatal incidents at this intersection and other recent high-profile incidents across Ontario, the probability of future fatal collisions occurring in the urban or rural environment is now considered in the selection process. To do this, the Region’s collision database is utilized to determine the ratio of fatal to non-fatal injury collisions occurring at intersections in both city and township environments. The following Table 1 summarizes 2007-2011 fatal/non-fatal collision ratios in the Region of Waterloo.

Table 1 – 2007-2011 Fatal / Non-fatal Injury Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>Fatal / Non-fatal Injury Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Stop-controlled Intersection</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township Stop-controlled Intersection</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Traffic Signal</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township Traffic Signal</td>
<td>0.007*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Township Traffic Signal ratio = City Traffic Signal ratio x (Township Stop-controlled Intersection / City Stop-controlled Intersection)

Most research reports that rural road environments experience higher rates of fatal collisions than city road environments. This is most likely associated with vehicular speed. The fatal / non-fatal injury ratios for Regional intersections support this research. Due to the limited number of township traffic signals, the fatal / non-fatal injury collision ratio at township traffic signals was assumed to be 3.5 times higher than city signalized intersections, similar to the difference in ratios seen between
city and township stop-controlled intersections. To help put these ratios into perspective, a city stop-controlled intersection may see on average 1 fatal collision once every 167 injury collisions (1/0.006) while a township stop-controlled intersection may see an average of 1 fatal collision once every 48 injury collisions (1/0.021). In general, township stop-controlled intersections experience fewer injury collisions annually compared to city stop-controlled intersections simply due to differences in traffic volumes.

Table 2 below illustrates the results of the Region’s selection process for Line 86 and Floradale Road intersection.

Table 2 – Summary of Traffic Control Selection Process for Line 86 and Floradale Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stop-controlled Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control Signal</th>
<th>Roundabout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historical 5-year Injury Collisions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical 5-year Non-Injury Collisions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Non-injury Collisions over 20 Years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Injury Collisions over 20 Years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Fatal Collisions over 20 Years</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Year Present Value Non-Injury Collision Cost</td>
<td>$116,380</td>
<td>$48,240</td>
<td>$100,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Year Present Value Injury Collision Costs</td>
<td>$1,060,350</td>
<td>$367,290</td>
<td>$91,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Year Present Value Fatal Collision Costs</td>
<td>$3,693,140</td>
<td>$426,420</td>
<td>$42,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Lifecycle Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,869,870</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,501,950</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,364,810</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This review suggests that a roundabout provides the greatest collision cost reduction benefit and that a roundabout or traffic control signal both result in similar lowest overall lifecycle costs.

From March 4, 2013 to March 15, 2013, Transportation Division staff placed information signs on all approaches to the Line 86/Floradale Road intersection requesting comments from residents through the Region’s website or via telephone; an Internet questionnaire was setup to receive comments and a phone number was provided. As a follow up to the web survey, questionnaires were also mailed to residents who front Line 86 or Floradale Road within a 1km distance of the intersection also requesting comments on the proposed changes.

The questionnaire asked whether the residents were in support of or in opposition to the installation of a roundabout at the Line 86/Floradale Road intersection. A total of 26 responses were received where 5 are opposed and 21 are in favor to the proposed change. Those opposed to the change are generally concerned with large trucks/farm vehicles and horse and buggies negotiating roundabouts. It is anticipated that feedback from the Mennonite community will be obtained during the detailed design of this roundabout and that the roundabout design will sufficiently accommodate all vehicle types.
Staff is recommending that the Region approve in principle a roundabout at this intersection because:

- It is the most effective traffic control option to reduce the probability of more fatal incidents;
- Injury collisions over the next 20 years are expected to be reduced by 21 collisions; and
- A capital investment of $1,100,000 is expected to reduce societal collision costs by an estimated $4,635,000 over 20 years.

The Region’s Roundabout Coordination Committee and staff from the Township of Woolwich support a roundabout at this intersection.

The construction cost of a roundabout at Line 86 and Floradale Road is approximately $1,100,000 and is not currently in the 2013 Transportation Capital Program. Regional staff is currently in the process of developing a Roundabout Installation Prioritization Program that will identify intersections that are anticipated to yield the greatest reduction in societal collision costs.

Staff expects to bring forward a Roundabout Installation Priority Program for Regional Council's consideration as part of the 2014 Transportation Capital Program. Staff is recommending the construction of a roundabout at Line 86 and Floradale Road be considered as part of this program.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

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

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The funding required to retrofit the stop-controlled intersection of Line 86 and Floradale with a single-lane roundabout is approximately $1,100,000 and is not currently in the 2013 Transportation Capital Program. Additional funding or the deferral of other Transportation Capital Projects would be required in order to proceed with the project at this time.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

NIL

ATTACHMENTS:

NIL

PREPARED BY:  Bob Henderson, Manager, Transportation Engineering

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

DATE: April 30, 2013

FILE CODE: E03-20(A)/4157; C06-60

SUBJECT: WATER SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OPERATIONS MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDED STRATEGY

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the strategy recommended in the Water Supply and Distribution Operations Master Plan (WSDOMP) summarized in Report E-13-044 dated April 30, 2013;

AND THAT Region staff be directed to incorporate the WSDOMP recommended projects in the 2014 Ten Year Water Capital Program and Regional Development Charges Study;

AND THAT Region staff be directed to proceed with implementation of WSDOMP recommended projects.

SUMMARY:

Declining water demands in the Region have shifted the need for expanding water systems to a more sustainable approach of extending the life of the existing systems and operating them in the most efficient manner. Based on this, the Region initiated in August 2010 the Water Supply and Distribution Operations Master Plan (WSDOMP) with the goal of optimizing the distribution of water in the Region’s Integrated Urban System (IUS).

A comprehensive program of capital upgrades throughout the IUS has been recommended and are summarized in this report. In addition, operational changes were also recommended to optimize water supply and distribution, and to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

Contingent upon Regional Council approval of the strategy recommended in the WSDOMP staff will distribute the final report to Area Municipalities and other stakeholders, incorporate the recommendations into the 2014 Ten Year Water Capital Program and Regional Development Charges Study, and commence with implementation of the recommended projects. Incorporation of the recommendation into the Ten Year Capital Program will result in a reduction of approximately $44M from the current 2013 Ten Year Water Capital Program.
REPORT:

Background

Since the late 1990’s, Canadian municipalities have faced a trend of declining water demands. This trend is a result of water conservation measures implemented by the municipalities and more conscientious water use by municipal customers. Declining water demands have shifted the need for expanding water systems to a more sustainable approach of extending the life of the existing systems and operating them in the most efficient manner, reducing the operational costs and the potential impacts on the environment.

Based on the above, the Region initiated in August 2010 the Water Supply and Distribution Operations Master Plan (Report F-10-075) with the goal of optimizing the distribution of water in the Region’s Integrated Urban System (IUS). The IUS services the Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener, Waterloo, and the communities of Elmira and St. Jacobs in the Township of Woolwich, and includes multiple sources, treatment plants, water storage facilities, pumping facilities, and a complex network of watermains interconnecting these communities. The Water Supply and Distribution Operations Master Plan (WSDOMP) is the subject of this report.

In parallel to the WSDOMP, the Region initiated in May 2011 the Water Supply Master Plan Update (Report E-11-055) to update the Water Supply Master Plan approved by Regional Council in 2007 (2007 WSMP). The 2007 WSMP recommended the long term water supply strategy for the IUS, which would ultimately require a Great Lake source after the year 2035. The goal of the Water Supply Master Plan Update (WSMP) is to evaluate in detail each water source in the IUS and determine the potential to extend its life beyond 2035, re-evaluating the timing for Great Lake source. This study is ongoing and a report summarizing its findings will be presented to Regional Council in the Fall 2013.

Study Scope

The project consisted of the following major tasks:

- **Task A - Background Review and Assessment:** Collection of distribution and supply system data including consultation with the Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo, Township of Woolwich, and Region’s staff. This consultation was important in understanding system issues and opportunities.
- **Task B - Hydraulic Model and Demand Forecast Updates:** A review and update of the Region’s existing computerized hydraulic network model of the IUS distribution system, including a comprehensive analysis of past water demands and future water demand trends.
- **Task C - Greenhouse Gas Emission Inventory:** A comprehensive inventory of GHG emissions for all Region’s water supply facilities (IUS and rural systems) using a baseline year of 2009.
- **Task D - Identification of Constraints:** A risk-based analysis of opportunities and constraints identified in Tasks A and B.
- **Task E - Identification, Evaluation and Recommendation of Preferred Solutions:** Recommend upgrades and operational changes to improve the long term efficiency of the IUS until the year 2031, including a preliminary implementation schedule and conceptual probable cost estimate for each solution.
**Water Demand Forecast**

A key driver for undertaking the WSDOMP and for updating the WSMP has been the declining water demands since the late 1990’s. Some of the main causes for the declining water consumption include:

- Implementation of the Region’s Water Efficiency Master Plan (currently being updated);
- the Region’s Outdoor Water Use Bylaw;
- large water users making efforts to improve the efficiency of their operations by recycling or reusing water;
- a gradual shift in the Region’s industrial base away from industries that are intensive water users;
- promotion and supply of more water efficient appliances and fixtures;
- a general shift towards a water-conscious public through public education programs.

As a result of the changing trends in water demands, it was necessary to revise the Region’s long term water demand forecasts. Attachment A shows the revised IUS average day and maximum day water demand forecasts, including the boundaries for the more aggressive and less aggressive scenarios (shaded area), and the recommended average day and maximum day forecast (dashed lines within the shaded areas). The maximum day demand forecasts used in the 2007 WSMP are also shown in this figure for comparison. Analysis of the existing water supply capacity completed in the ongoing WSMP Update have shown that there is sufficient capacity to service the projected population beyond 2031 under either scenario. The details of the water supply sources and timing of the Great Lake source will be presented under the WSMP Update scheduled for completion in the Fall 2013.

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory**

A comprehensive inventory of GHG emissions for all Regional water supply facilities (IUS and rural systems) was undertaken as part of this study. The purpose of this task was to create a baseline GHG emission inventory to evaluate whether components of the strategy recommended in this project and in other future projects will increase or reduce the GHG emissions. When comparing alternative solutions to the baseline scenario, the Region will be able to evaluate how “green” the proposed alternative will be.

The inventory of GHG emissions from Regional water infrastructure included:

- Direct combustion emissions from building heating, generators, pumps, and fleet vehicles;
- Indirect emissions resulting from the electricity consumed at Regional facilities; and
- Indirect emissions from non-Region vehicles hauling chemicals to Region facilities.

The single major source of GHG emissions in water supply and distribution facilities is a result of electricity consumption (82 per cent). Therefore, alternatives that reduce or optimize the use of electricity will offer the greatest opportunity to reduce the Region’s GHG emissions. Water Services also has a separate program to monitor and address GHG emissions, which supports the corporate initiative Green House Action Plan.
Distribution System Optimization and Capital Project Recommendations

The goal of the WSDOMP was optimizing the distribution of water in the Region’s Integrated Urban System (IUS). The evaluation of alternatives for this optimization indicated that higher efficiency in water distribution could be achieved by consolidating some of the individual well systems and smaller systems into larger more efficient combined systems. There were also opportunities to optimize the Cambridge and Waterloo systems, making these systems more self-sufficient in terms of water supply, and relying less in intra-municipal water transferring.

The area in the IUS that required more changes to optimize its distribution system was the City of Cambridge. Cambridge initially consisted of three separate systems, Galt, Hespeler and Preston, which were consolidated in the 1970’s into an integrated distribution system. The optimization of this system required reconfiguration of some pressure zones in the northern part of the community, making better use of water transfer from the City of Kitchener into the Preston area and avoiding mixing of chloraminated water from Kitchener with chlorinated water from Cambridge, which have sometimes caused odour concerns. These changes included changes to the existing storage and pumping facilities at the Rahman and Turnbull systems. Optimization of the southern part of Cambridge, mostly supplied by the Middleton system, will require the construction of a new central storage complex on the western side of the City near the boundary of the City of Cambridge and the Township of North Dumfries. This new storage centre will enhance supply and fire protection to most of the City of Cambridge, including downtown Galt.

Optimization of the distribution system in the Cities of Kitchener and Waterloo generally consisted in construction of new watermains to remove system bottlenecks and adding control valves on major watermains to allow better control of water transferring from the Kitchener system, the largest water producing system in the Region, to other systems such as Cambridge and Waterloo. A major recommendation was the consolidation of the William St. System, Waterloo, with the Strange St. System, Kitchener, into a single treatment, storage and pumping facility to be located on the Strange St. site. This consolidated system will allow transferring water to either the Kitchener or Waterloo distribution system as required, enhancing flexibility and efficiency.

Reconfiguration of the existing pressure zones in Elmira, Township of Woolwich, was also recommended in this study. These changes will reduce areas of elevated pressure in this community, and will allow the optimization of the exiting storage in this system.

The above work requiring pressure zone changes and installation of control valves are generally deemed as pre-approved Schedule A Class Environmental Assessments (Class EA) and can proceed to implementation. The work for upgrading or construction of new facilities such as pumping stations, reservoirs and major watermains will require undertaking separate Schedule B or C Class EAs, which will be part of separate assignments and Council reports.

Key WSDOMP recommendations specific to Regional IUS infrastructure in the City of Cambridge, City of Kitchener, City of Waterloo, and Township of Woolwich are summarized in Attachment B, including the proposed project, preliminary schedule and conceptual cost estimates. A summary of the total conceptual costs for Regional projects proposed in the WSDOMP by community is presented below:
### Master Plan Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master Plan Component</th>
<th>Cost (2013 dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td>$59.9M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Kitchener</td>
<td>$43.2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Waterloo</td>
<td>$28.2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township of Woolwich</td>
<td>$2.4M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUS-wide</td>
<td>$3.0M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$136.7M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The amounts above include preliminary conceptual estimate of engineering, contingency and construction costs in 2013 dollars. Attachment D summarizes the proposed changes to the 2013 Water Capital Program. The changes result in a reduction of approximately $44M.

### Next Steps and Schedule

Contingent upon Regional Council approval of the strategy recommended in the Water Supply and Distribution Operations Master Plan, the next steps in the implementation of the proposed projects are:

- Distribution of the WSDOMP final report to Area Municipalities and other stakeholders.
- Incorporation of recommended projects into the 2014 Ten Year Water Capital Program and Regional Development Charges Study.
- Commencement of the implementation of the recommended projects.

The schedule for the implementation of the proposed projects is shown in Attachment B until the year 2023, to coincide with the 2014 Capital Program (from 2014 to 2023). However, the full implementation of the WSDOMP recommendations will extend beyond 2023, as the study horizon was the year 2031. Water Services staff will continuously evaluate water demand trends in upcoming years, and accordingly adjust the schedule of some projects to better reflect the Region’s water supply and distribution needs. The schedule for some projects presented in Attachment B include a dashed line, which indicates projects that may need an earlier implementation in the case of water demands higher than forecasted in the WSDOMP.

### CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

Implementation of the strategy recommended in the WSDOMP will support the Region’s Strategic Plan Focus Area 1: “Protect and Enhance the Environment,” Strategic Objective 1.2: “Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and work to improve air quality,” and 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:

Upon Council approval of this report, the recommendations from the WSDOMP Final Report will be incorporated into the 2014 Ten Year Water Capital Program and Regional Development Charges Study. Changes made to the 2013 Ten Year Water Capital Program reflecting the strategy recommended in this report are highlighted in Attachment C and summarized in Attachment D. Proposed modifications to 2013 Ten Year Water Capital Program will be used in the Regional Development Charges Study. New Development Charges calculated in this study will be used in the preparation of the 2014 Ten Year Water Capital Program. User Rate Impacts will be evaluated during the 2014 budget process.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

NIL

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A - Updated IUS Water Demand Forecast
Attachment B - Summary of Regional Capital Projects Recommended by WSDOMP
Attachment C - Adjusted 2013 Ten Year Water Capital Program
Attachment D – Summary of Changes in the 2013 Ten Year Water Capital Program

PREPARED BY: Kaoru Yajima, Senior Project Manager, Engineering & Planning, Water Services

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
ATTACHMENT A – Updated IUS Water Demand Forecast
### ATTACHMENT B – Summary of Regional Capital Projects Recommended by WSDOMP – Page 1/2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>New PRV at Kresshill PS to provide a connection from Cam 2W to Western Cam 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modifications to Cam 3 to improve capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City + Developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consolidate Rahmans PS, Pinebush WTP, and Well G5 to redirect flows to Cam 2E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Optimize Pinebush WTP wells</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Split Cam 1 into Cam 1 and Cam 1W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>included in other projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convert the Turnbull Reservoir to pumped storage: new pump station to Cam 1 and new pump station to Cam 2E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Place System Wells P6 and G9 into standby status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New floating storage for Cam 1 and new St. Andrews PS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consolidate Hesper Wells (H3, H4, and H5) to one facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Maple Grove WTP (Wells P16 and P19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Work to Address Constraints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>Connect pressure transducers to SCADA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop a decision support system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria St. watermain control valve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weber St. connection between Kit 4/Wat 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hydro-corridor watermain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separate Village of Mannheim from K20's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous watermains (include LRT related work)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Work to Address Constraints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>Consolidate Strange St. and William St. WTPs into a single WTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Optimization of Erb St. Wells</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waterloo North WTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous water mains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Work to Address Constraints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>New pressure zone Elmira East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service St. Jacobs PRV as necessary and adjust valve setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New check valve between Breslau North and Breslau South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous water mains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Work to Address Constraints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUS</td>
<td>General System Optimization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### THE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO
### TEN YEAR CAPITAL FORECAST
### (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

#### DEPARTMENT: TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, WATER SERVICES
#### DIVISION: WATER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4001</td>
<td>Regional Models Recalibration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4005</td>
<td>MOE Source Water Assessment</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4006</td>
<td>Source Water Implementation</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4099</td>
<td>Greenbrook Long Term Assessment</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4124</td>
<td>Source Protection Planning</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4125</td>
<td>Source Protection Technical Assessment</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>5,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4128</td>
<td>Source Protection Monitoring</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>6,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4148</td>
<td>Private Well Incentive Program</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4165</td>
<td>MOE Tier 3 Water Stress Assessment</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4166</td>
<td>Clean Water Act Implementation</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>4,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4167</td>
<td>Historic Compensation Areas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>575</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4170</td>
<td>Monitoring System Management</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4197</td>
<td>GW/SW Assessments</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 100-PLANNING & STUDIES

#### Hydrogeology & Source Water:

- **4001** Regional Models Recalibration
- **4005** MOE Source Water Assessment
- **4006** Source Water Implementation
- **4099** Greenbrook Long Term Assessment
- **4124** Source Protection Planning
- **4125** Source Protection Technical Assessment
- **4128** Source Protection Monitoring
- **4148** Private Well Incentive Program
- **4165** Clean Water Act Implementation
- **4166** Historic Compensation Areas
- **4169** Clean Water Act Incentives
- **4170** Monitoring System Management

#### Water Efficiency:

- **4090** Water Efficiency - Research & Development
- **4102** Toilet Replacement Program
- **4166** Water Efficiency Master Plan
- **4864** Water Efficiency - ICI Programs
- **4943** Water Efficiency - Outdoor Water Use

#### Studies/Masterplans:

- **4007** Water Supply Master Plan
- **4102** Treatment Studies
- **4157** Water Distribution Master Plan
- **4960** ISO Environmental Mgt System
- **4180** Rahman System Upgrades & Expansion

#### TOTAL PLANNING & STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-2022</td>
<td>57,811</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>8,280</td>
<td>8,280</td>
<td>8,580</td>
<td>3,880</td>
<td>3,580</td>
<td>4,155</td>
<td>4,430</td>
<td>5,030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### THE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO

**TEN YEAR CAPITAL FORECAST**

**(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT: TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, WATER SERVICES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION: WATER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 INFRASTRUCTURE REPLACEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL INFRASTRUCTURE REPLACEMENT | 5,847 | 5,513 | 11,055 | 16,568 | 16,090 | 13,890 | 13,655 | 17,650 | 17,690 | 19,495 | 20,450 | 18,895 | 17,725 | 172,108 |
|-------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------|----------|------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|----------------|
| 4014  | Integrated Urban System Groundwater Supply          | 66      | 604      | 604  | 250   | 200  | 400  | 1,000| 2,500| 2,500| 3,000|      |      |      | 8,540           |
| 4015  | Waterloo North Water Supply System                  | 42      | 100      | 100  |       | 200  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | 9,700           |
| 4017**| Greenbrook System Upgrades                          | 805     | 441      | 600  | 1,041 | 178  | 300  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | 1,519           |
| 4018  | Middleton System Upgrades                           | 4,092   | .977     | 1,900| 1,023 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | 1,023           |
| 4021  | Wilmot Centre Wellfield Standby Well - BNHWMP       | 350     | 350      | 600  |       |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | 1,300           |
| 4024  | Mannheim WTP RMP Supematant                         | 99      | 275      | 526  | 801   | 5,000| 3,000|      |      |      |      |      |      |      | 11,501          |
| 4044  | Production Treatment Facilities Sys Expansion       |         |          |      |       |      |      |      |      |      | 2,000| 2,000| 2,000| 2,000| 2,000| 10,000          |
| 4051  | Pumping and Storage Facilities Sys Expansion        |         |          |      |       |      |      |      |      |      | 2,000| 2,000| 2,000| 2,000| 2,000| 10,000          |
| 4106  | Wells W6/W8 Class EA                                | 108     | 200      | 50   | 250   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | 7,950           |
| 4132  | RGMS & Brownfields Redevelopment Strategy           | 26      | 353      |      | 353   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | 353             |
| 4134  | Maple Grove Area Water Supply System                | 110     | 100      | 110  |       |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | 5,810           |
| 4137  | Consolidation of Well Supply                         |         |          |      |       | 200  | 500  | 1,000| 2,000| 2,000| 2,000| 2,000| 2,000|      | 10,000          |
| 4144  | Pumping & Storage Upgrades                          |         |          |      |       |      |      |      |      | 3,000| 3,000| 3,000| 4,000| 4,000| 17,000          |
| 4151  | Mannheim Chemical Storage Building                  | 170     | 1,750    | 600  | 2,358 | 250  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | 2,606           |
| 4160  | William St. & Strange St. Upgrades                  | 300     | 300      |      |      | 300  | 300  | 2,000| 3,500| 5,100| 2,400|      |      |      | 13,900          |
| 4163  | Hespeler Water Supply Cleass EA                     | 300     | 300      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | 100  | 200  | 100  | 1,900           |
| 4598  | Grand Reservoir & Pumping Station                   |         |          |      |       |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | 1,829           |
| 4870  | Cambridge East Source Upgrade                        | 119     | 100      | 100  | 500   | 1,100| 800  | 1,000| 1,200| 600  | 2,250| 1,750| 1,500|      | 9,400           |
| 4904  | LTWS ASR Stages 1 & 2                               | 56      | 44       | 100  | 144   | 200  | 500  | 1,000|      |      |      |      |      |      |      | 6,844           |
| 4920  | Strange St. Upgrades                                | 20      | 409      | 670  | 1,079 | 50   | 500  | 200  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | 1,829           |
| 4930  | West Montrose System Upgrades                       | 144     | 50       | 250  | 300   | 50   | 200  | 1,200| 2,200| 1,700|      |      |      |      |      | 5,650           |
| 4940  | Kitchener / Waterloo Zone 8 Reservoir               | 4,155   | 101      | 3,300| 3,401 | 30   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | 3,431           |
| 4173  | Conestoga Plans System Upgrades                     |         |          |      |       | 250  | 100  | 600  | 1,150| 1,150|      |      |      |      |      | 3,400           |
| 4174  | Turnbull System Upgrades & Expansion                | 100     | 300      | 600  | 1,600| 1,100|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | 3,700           |
| 4175  | New Hamburg Reservoir Expansion                     | 100     | 100      | 600  | 1,000| 1,500| 1,500|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | 4,800           |
| 4176  | Rahman System Upgrades & Expansion                  | 100     | 300      | 1,200| 3,100| 2,200|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | 6,900           |
| 4177  | Cambridge West Water Supply System                  | 100     | 200      | 500  | 5,500| 10,000|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | 36,300          |
| **TOTAL UPGRADES, EXPANSIONS & NEW FAC**           | 10,018  | 3,468    | 9,046 | 12,514| 7,230| 6,526| 9,200| 13,250| 21,150| 18,900| 26,100| 32,850| 31,450| 179,172        |
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THE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO

TEN YEAR CAPITAL FORECAST
( IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS )

---|-------------|---------|----------|------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|----------------|
4045 | Elmira 400 MM WM Twin, Arthur St., Howard Ave. | 592 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
4052 | Dundas St. (Champlain Blvd to Maple Birch) | 587 | 99 | 676 | 700 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 600 | 500 | 300 | 1,469 | | |
4070 | **Glasgow & Belmont (Wells K11/K13 to Gage) | 3 | 169 | 800 | 969 | 1,000 | 1,500 | 1,500 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 17,569 | | |
4074 | Erbsville Rd/Columbia St | 535 | 271 | 404 | 671 | 400 | 550 | 1,350 | 2,150 | 1,700 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 14,921 | | |
4086 | Baden New Hamburg Watermains | 110 | 1,341 | 350 | 550 | 1,100 | 1,100 | 550 | 4,991 | | | | | | |
4150 | St Agatha Watermain | 54 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
4155 | Tri City Distribution Upgrades | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 24,000
4156 | Kitchener Zone(s) 2/4 Distribution Upgrades | 58 | 408 | 434 | 842 | 1,300 | 1,450 | 650 | 650 | 200 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 7,092 | | |
4161 | Kitchener Zone 4 Trunk Watermain | 101 | 95 | 95 | 100 | 500 | 3,300 | 4,400 | 3,300 | | | | | | | 11,495
4711 | Townline Rd (Saginaw-Canamara Pkwy) | 50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
4178 | Weber St. - Connection Kitchener to Waterloo | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 3,400
4179 | Weber St. - LRT Replacement Cost Sharing | 200 | 200 | 700 | 2,900 | 800 | | | | | | | | | 4,600
TOTAL WATERMAINS | 2,098 | 2,383 | 5,104 | 7,487 | 8,250 | 10,050 | 10,700 | 12,400 | 10,850 | 8,100 | 8,600 | 7,500 | 7,300 | 91,237
TOTAL PROPOSED EXPENDITURES | 20,714 | 15,235 | 28,500 | 43,735 | 36,000 | 35,498 | 37,985 | 47,455 | 53,270 | 50,375 | 63,730 | 67,525 | 64,755 | 500,328
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## ATTACHMENT D – Summary of Changes in the 2013 Ten Year Water Capital Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CAPITAL PROGRAM CHANGES</th>
<th>PROJECT COST (x $1000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4015</td>
<td>Waterloo North Water Supply System</td>
<td>Project Deferred by 5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4044</td>
<td>Production Treatment Facilities Sys Expansion</td>
<td>Cost Decrease - No need for some growth related facilities</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4051</td>
<td>Pumping and Storage Facilities Sys Expansion</td>
<td>Cost Decrease - No need for some growth related facilities</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4134</td>
<td>Maple Grove Area Water Supply System</td>
<td>Project Deferred by 6 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4144</td>
<td>Pumping &amp; Storage Upgrades</td>
<td>Cost Decrease - No need for some growth related facilities</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4180</td>
<td>William St &amp; Strange St Upgrades</td>
<td>Cost Increase - Consolidation of William St and Strange St Systems</td>
<td>$5,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4163</td>
<td>Hespeler Water Supply Cleass EA</td>
<td>Deferral of Class EA by 4 years; Facility construction added</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4598</td>
<td>Grand Reservoir &amp; Pumping Station</td>
<td>Eliminated - No need for some growth related facilities</td>
<td>$39,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4904</td>
<td>LTWS ASR Stages 1 + 2</td>
<td>Implementation of Stage 2 deferred by 2 years</td>
<td>$3,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4920</td>
<td>Strange St. Upgrades</td>
<td>Cost Decrease - Most work to be done under the consolidation with William St</td>
<td>$8,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4174</td>
<td>Turnbull System Upgrades &amp; Expansion</td>
<td>New Project - Optimization of Cambridge water distribution system</td>
<td>$3,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4176</td>
<td>Rahman System Upgrades &amp; Expansion</td>
<td>New Project - Optimization of Cambridge water distribution system</td>
<td>$6,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4177</td>
<td>Cambridge West Water Supply System</td>
<td>New Project - Optimization of Cambridge water distribution system</td>
<td>$36,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4155</td>
<td>Tri City Distribution Upgrades</td>
<td>Cost Increase - Additional water mains</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td>$57,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL NET CHANGE</td>
<td></td>
<td>DECREASE OF $43,560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: April 30, 2013

FILE CODE: D28-50

SUBJECT: RECOMMENDED 2013 GRAND RIVER TRANSIT SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the following transit service improvements, effective Monday September 2, 2013, as described in Report No. P-13-047, dated April 30, 2013:

a) Implement a new 202 University iXpress route operating Monday to Sunday providing 15 minute peak and midday service and 30 minute off-peak frequency service;

b) Extend the existing 201 Fischer-Hallman iXpress from the Columbia Street West and Philip Street intersection to Conestoga Mall;

c) Reduce peak hour directional frequency on Route 29 Keats Way from 10 minute service in the peak direction to 30 minute service and reduce Sunday frequency from 30 minute to 60 minute service;

d) Modify and combine Route 5 Erb West and Route 6 Bridgeport to provide an east-west cross town route that travels via Erb Street between The Boardwalk and the Bridgeport neighbourhood, and name this modified Route 5 Erb;

e) Modify Route 35 Eastbridge to provide direct service between Downtown Kitchener, the Eastbridge neighbourhood, and Conestoga Mall. Implement extended evening service from 7:30 p.m. to midnight and provide Sunday service. Rename Route 35 to Route 6 Bridge;

f) Modify Route 31 Lexington to provide local service in the Eastbridge neighbourhood, extend service along Columbia Street West, and provide extended evening service from 6:15 p.m. to 10:30 pm. Rename Route 31 Lexington to Route 31 Columbia;

g) Redesign Route 13 Laurelwood to provide two-way service, an extension from the Erbsville Road and Columbia Street West intersection to The Boardwalk, and an extension into the Laurelcreek Village neighbourhood which would be dependent on the removal of on-street parking along Creekside Drive. Extend Sunday service on Route 13 from 7:30 p.m. to 11:00 p.m.;

h) Relocate Route 12 Conestoga Mall from Carter Avenue to the Lincoln Road area via Weber Street; and

i) Increase Route 9 Lakeshore midday service between University of Waterloo and Parkside Drive at Cedarbrae Avenue from 30 minutes to 15 minutes to improve schedule reliability and reduce over-crowding.

SUMMARY:

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 show in Attachment A.
Feedback from public consultations held in November 2012 and March 2013 was considered by the 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan Steering Committee and was used to finalize the proposed service improvements.

This report details the final recommendations for the 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan and summarises feedback from the March 2013 Public Consultation Centre which was largely supportive. If approved by Regional Council, the 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan would be implemented September 02, 2013.

REPORT:

The approved Grand River Transit 2011-2014 Business Plan recommends annual service improvement priorities that would contribute to the achievement of the Regional Transportation Master Plan ridership targets and to the integration of the conventional transit network with rapid transit. For 2013, service improvements would focus on the implementation of a new “iXpress” route along the University Avenue corridor, an extension of the existing 201 Fischer-Hallman iXpress from the Columbia Street West and Philip Street intersection to Conestoga Mall, and realignment and improved frequency and hours of service for local routes in Waterloo and Kitchener.

Implementation of the final proposed service improvement plan would involve the reallocation of approximately 5,000 service hours and 1 bus, and would provide some 48,200 hours of additional service annually, requiring the purchase of 15 new buses.

Public Consultation

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

- Initial Public Consultation Centres (PCCs) held on November 15, 20, 21, and 22 in 2012 which displayed various transit service improvement options.
- Additional PCCs held on March 18, 19, 21, and 22 in 2013 which presented a refined 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan.
- Online surveys posted on the www.grt.ca website.
- Emails and telephone calls received from the public.

Over 500 people provided input on the refined 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan presented at the March PCCs. This was in addition to the 300 people that provided comments for the initial 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan presented in November 2012. Feedback received has been largely supportive of the proposed changes. Comments from the March PCCs were considered in finalizing the 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan as described below. Attachment B summarizes public feedback and staff’s response.

Recommended 2013 GRT Service Improvements

The 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan was developed to include service improvements that would focus on integration with Rapid Transit Stations, creation of a grid-like network, more direct travel options, and the expansion of the iXpress network. These changes are displayed in Attachment A and are described in detail below.

New 202 University iXpress

A new cross-town iXpress service that would travel via Erb Street West and University Avenue between The Boardwalk at Ira Needles Boulevard, University Avenue and Northfield Drive employment area, and Conestoga Mall. Service on the 202 University iXpress would operate 7 days a week with 15 minute service during weekday a.m. and p.m. rush hour and midday periods, and 30
minute service during off-peak periods. Station locations would include real-time next bus departure displays, bicycle racks, and uniquely branded shelters.

From those that provided a response, the majority, 306 people (92%), were in favour of implementing the 202 University iXpress, with 25 people (8%) opposing the route. More detailed comments received included 21 statements of general approval of the route and 16 comments on the planned station locations. Based on these comments, it is proposed to include an additional station at Northfield Drive East and Davenport Road and relocate the Erb Street West at Gateview Drive station to Erb Street West at Erbsville Court.

Few comments were received regarding opposition to the 202 University iXpress. Two individuals stated that additional buses to Conestoga Mall were not needed. Conestoga Mall currently serves as a key transit terminal and will provide connections to Rapid Transit in the future.

201 Fischer-Hallman iXpress
The 201 iXpress currently travels between Forest Glen Plaza and the intersection of Columbia Street West and Philip Street. An extension of the route to Conestoga Mall is proposed via King Street North.

Public feedback was supportive of the 201 iXpress extension to Conestoga Mall. Of those that provided an answer, 293 people (93%), were in favour of the extension while 23 people (7%) did not support the extension. More detailed comments included 13 suggestions regarding planned station locations, and 26 statements of general approval of the route extension. After evaluating the comments related to station locations, adjustments are not proposed, as locations were selected to balance stop spacing and provide access to major employment, commercial, and residential destinations.

Although little detail was provided regarding opposition to the extension, three respondents stated that they were concerned about the loss of service to Wilfrid Laurier University. Although 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.

Route 29 - Keats Way
As an alternative to Route 29, the 202 University iXpress would be an attractive service along the Erb Street corridor with direct connections to The Boardwalk and the universities. Many Route 29 riders would be within a reasonable walk distance to iXpress service on Erb Street. As a result, it proposed to reduce peak frequency on Route 29 from 10 minute service in the peak direction to 30 minute service, and reduce Sunday frequency from 30 minute to 60 minute service;

Feedback regarding the proposed Route 29 schedule change was mixed, with 19 people stating that they generally agreed with reduced frequency if service was available elsewhere, while nine people stated that it would make the route less convenient. Another six respondents noted that not all Route 29 riders would be within the University iXpress coverage area. These riders would continue to be serviced by Route 29 along the Keats Way corridor. A walkshed map of available transit service along the Keats Way corridor is included as Attachment C.

Route 5 - Erb West
Route 5 would be modified to travel between Uptown Waterloo, the Westvale neighbourhood, and The Boardwalk. Two-way service would be provided along the length of Route 5 to reduce out of direction travel. Travel through the Westvale area would operate via Westvale Drive. This routing provided greater service coverage within the neighbourhood compared to alternative options that were reviewed. Route 5 would be combined with the proposed Route 6 Bridgeport to create a continuous connection along the Erb Street and Bridgeport Road corridor and would be renamed Route 5: Erb.
Public opinion was supportive of the proposed Route 5 change with 186 respondents (83%) in favour of the proposed changes and 37 opposed (17%). Comments related to the proposed changes included eight comments of general approval, seven statements supporting the addition of two-way service, and another eight respondents in favour of the extension to The Boardwalk.

Few details were provided regarding opposition to the proposed route change; however, one person commented that further service to The Boardwalk was not warranted and another individual stated that additional transit service should not be introduced along Westvale Drive. The Boardwalk is planned as a strategically located transit terminal that would facilitate cross town service while providing access to growing commercial and residential developments. As noted above, the Westvale Drive routing provided the greatest level of service coverage in this neighbourhood.

**Route 6 - Bridgeport**

Route 6 would be altered to provide travel to Uptown Waterloo from the Bridgeport neighbourhood via Bridgeport Road and Erb Street East. With this change, Route 6 would be combined with Route 5 in Uptown Waterloo and would be renamed Route 5: Erb, providing continuous service across the Erb Street and Bridgeport Road corridor.

The majority of responses, 135 (77%), were in favour of altering Route 6 to travel to Uptown Waterloo compared to 41 individuals who were not supportive of the change (23%). Feedback related to the change included five statements of general approval. Those opposed to the proposed Route 6 change provided minimal feedback, however two individuals stated that it would introduce an extra transfer into their trip and three individuals stated that transfers between Routes 6 and 35 should be coordinated. Although additional transfers would be introduced for some GRT riders, the proposed Route 6 improvement would reduce travel times for many others. Individuals travelling to downtown Kitchener from the Bridgeport neighbourhood would be able to transfer to the proposed Route 6 Bridge along Bridge Street, Route 8 along Margaret Avenue, or the 7 or 200 iXpress along King Street for service into downtown.

**Route 35 - Eastbridge**

Route 35 would be realigned to provide direct service between Conestoga Mall, the Northfield employment area, the Eastbridge Neighbourhood, and Downtown Kitchener in order to create a north-south connection on the east side of Waterloo and Kitchener. Extended evening service from 7:30 p.m. to midnight and Sunday service would be implemented. With these changes, the route would be renamed Route 6: Bridge.

Public feedback was in favour of the proposed Route 35 change with 120 people (66% of respondents) supporting the route realignment and 62 people (34%) opposing the change. Additionally, there were 10 respondents who specified that they liked the extended hours proposed for the route, eight respondents who favoured the addition of Sunday service, and 10 individuals who liked the direct service proposed along Bridge Street and Lancaster Street.

Of those opposed, six respondents indicated that the Route 35 change would add a transfer to their trip, 13 specified that they currently take Route 35 to travel to Uptown Waterloo, and eight respondents stated that the route would no longer travel in their neighbourhood. While the proposed Route 35 changes would result in transfers for some customers, a greater number of riders would benefit by the direct service and reduced travel times to Conestoga Mall or Downtown Kitchener. Service to Uptown Waterloo from the Eastbridge and University Downs neighbourhoods would be available by travelling on the proposed Route 35 Erb, 31 Columbia, or 202 University iXpress and transferring to the proposed Route 5 Erb at Lancaster Street, Route 7 along King Street or Conestoga Mall, or the 200 iXpress at Wilfrid Laurier University or Conestoga Mall.

The majority of those that indicated they would no longer be served by Route 35 were from the Auburn area. Many of these residents would continue to be within an acceptable walking distance to local transit service along Bridge Street or to iXpress service along University Avenue at Bridge.
Street or at Pastern Trail. A walkshed map of available transit service in the Auburn area is included as Attachment D.

Route 31 - Lexington
Route 31 would be redesigned to travel between Conestoga Mall and University of Waterloo to provide local service through the Eastbridge neighbourhood. Service in West Waterloo would be extended across Columbia Street West past Erbsville Road to provide continuous service across the Columbia Street West and Lexington Road corridor. Evening service would be extended from 6:15 p.m. to 10:30 p.m. With the proposed changes, the route would be renamed to Route 31: Columbia.

Some 146 people (81%) were in favour of the proposed Route 31 change with 35 people (19%) opposing the modifications. Comments related to the Route 31 changes included 11 respondents who liked the extended evening hours of service, five general statements of approval, and five requests for weekend service.

Reasons for opposition to the Route 31 change included the removal of service from the Ring Road at the University of Waterloo campus. Altering the proposed routing on Route 31 is not recommended at this time as it would result in out of direction travel for customers whose destinations are along Columbia Street West or Lexington Road, and would also require an additional bus and added service hours. However, when the University of Waterloo Rapid Transit station is introduced, route alignments around the university campus will be reviewed to integrate conventional bus and Rapid Transit service, including Route 31.

Route 13 - Laurelwood
Route 13 service would be extended from the University of Waterloo and the Laurelwood neighbourhood to The Boardwalk at Ira Needles Boulevard to provide additional travel choices for Laurelwood residents. Two-way service would also be provided along the length of the route and Sunday service would be extended from 7:30 p.m. to 11:00 p.m.

An additional extension further into the Laurelcreek Village area northwest of Laurelwood Drive and Erbsville Road is proposed via Laurelwood Drive and Creekside Drive. This extension would extend transit service to the majority of homes in Laurelcreek Village, but is dependant on the removal of on-street parking along Creekside Drive. If on-street parking is not removed, an alternative extension could operate to the Laurelwood Drive and Blue Beech Boulevard intersection; however, this would reduce service coverage in the Laurelcreek community.

City of Waterloo staff has been consulted regarding the proposed removal of on-street parking along Creekside Drive. If City staff determine that it is feasible to remove on-street parking under the City’s parking regulations, residents would be notified of the proposal, and a recommendation would be brought forward to City of Waterloo Council. Parking changes would require approval by City Council.

Public feedback was in favour of the proposed Route 13 changes, with 215 respondents (93%) in support and 17 respondents (7%) opposed to the changes. The public were also asked to provide their opinion on the proposed extension into Laurelcreek Village. In total, 114 respondents (77%) were in favour while 35 people (23%) were opposed to the Laurelcreek Village extension. Of those who responded favourably, 75 (66%) preferred the Creekside Drive option and 39 respondents (34%) preferred the Blue Beech Boulevard option. Additional comments received from the Laurelcreek Neighbourhood Association and Activa Holdings Incorporated, a local developer, were also in support of the Laurelcreek Village extension to Creekside Drive.

Further input for Route 13 included 13 comments in favour of extending service to The Boardwalk, seven comments in favour of the Laurelcreek Village extension, six statements in favour of two-way service, and nine requests for increased frequency. Few details were received regarding opposition
to the proposed Route 13 changes. One respondent noted that an extension into the Laurelcreek neighbourhood would inconvenience through routing passengers. The Erbsville Road and Laurelwood Drive intersection is a natural dividing point along the route providing service to either University of Waterloo in the east, or The Boardwalk in the west. The proposed extension would not likely result in out of direction travel for many Route 13 riders.

Route 12 - Conestoga Mall:
Route 12 would be modified to relocate service from Carter Avenue to avoid delays caused by the unsignalized left turn from Carter Avenue onto University Avenue.

The public was asked to comment on two different service options for travel to the Lincoln Road area: via Weber Street to Lincoln Road or via Marshall Street to Lincoln Road.

Of those who provided a response, the majority, 77 people (65%), were in favour of the Weber Street to Lincoln Road option while 42 people (35%) preferred the Marshall Street routing. Detailed comments regarding the proposed Route 12 change were limited; however, eight individuals stated that they liked the extension to the Weber Street and Lincoln Road intersection because of the access to either the shopping plaza, residential node, or community centre located in this area.

Route 9 - Lakeshore
Midday frequency on Route 9 would be increased from 30 minutes to 15 minute service between the University of Waterloo and Parkside Drive at Cedarbrae Avenue to reduce overcrowding and improve schedule adherence.

General GRT Feedback
Feedback regarding general GRT service received during the March PCCs included seven requests for improved service to Conestoga College Doon Campus and an additional five requests to keep the College Transit Pass at its current price. Increased service to the campus continues to be considered by Regional staff, but is not included in the current GRT budget.

Additional comments included seven general compliments for GRT service. Verbal statements received during the PCCs included numerous compliments regarding the courteous and helpful service provided by GRT bus operators.

Next Steps

Regional staff will continue to work with City of Waterloo staff regarding the removal of on-street parking in Laurelcreek Village.

If the service improvements recommended in this report are approved by Regional Council, the service improvements would begin on Monday September 2, 2013. In order to effectively launch the changes, a number of marketing measures would take place. These include:

- Posters on buses and at transit terminals and other key locations
- Ads in local newspapers
- Ads on local radio stations
- Alerts to media
- Notices on GRT website
- Announcements via various social media including Rider e-alerts, Twitter and Facebook

As part of ongoing service and operating performance monitoring, the new service improvements would be monitored on a regular basis, and if warranted, staff would recommend service adjustments at a later date.
Future Service Improvements

The 2014 GRT service improvement plan would focus on local service improvements that increase hours of operation and frequency of weekday evening routes and improve weekend service frequency in Cambridge and Kitchener, resulting in an additional 5,670 annual service hours. Implementation of aBRT from Ainslie Street Terminal in Cambridge to Fairview Mall in Kitchener is also planned for 2014.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

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

The proposed removal of on-street parking in the Laurelcreek neighbourhood is being coordinated with City of Waterloo staff.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This 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:

Annual operating costs associated with the proposed 2013 service improvements are approximately $4,204,000. These costs were approved during the 2013 budget process to be funded from the RTMP Reserve Fund.

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

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 – 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan Map
Attachment B – Summary of Feedback from March 2013 Public Consultation Centres
Attachment C – Walkshed map of transit service in along the Keats Way corridor
Attachment D – Walkshed map of transit service in the Auburn Drive area

PREPARED BY: Erica Springate, Principal Planner

APPROVED BY: Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Housing and Community Services
Attachment A – 2013 Transit Service Improvement Plan Map
## Summary Table of Service Improvement Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents Answering Yes</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents Answering No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Do you support the 201 Fischer-Hallman iXpress extension to Conestoga Mall?</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Do you support the new University iXpress to The Boardwalk, the University Avenue East and Northfield Drive East employment area, and Conestoga Mall via the Erb Street West and University Avenue corridors?</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Do you support the proposed changes to Route 5 Erb West which include two-way service and an extension to The Boardwalk?</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Do you support the proposed modifications to Route 6 Bridgeport which would have the route travel to Uptown Waterloo from the Bridgeport Neighbourhood?</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Do you support altering Route 35 Eastbridge to provide direct travel along Bridge Street and Lancaster Street to Downtown Kitchener from Conestoga Mall and the Eastbridge neighbourhood?</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Do you support the changes to Route 31 Lexington which include altering the route to bring local service into the Eastbridge neighbourhood and extending service along Columbia Street West?</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Do you support the addition of two-way service and an extension to The Boardwalk on Route 13?</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Results Table for Service Extension Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which routing do you prefer for the Route 13 extension into the Laurelcreek Village neighbourhood?</th>
<th>Creekside Dr 75</th>
<th>Blue Beech Blvd 39</th>
<th>No Opinion 165</th>
<th>Not Supportive of Extension 35</th>
<th>Supportive of Creekside Dr 50%</th>
<th>Supportive of Blue Beech Blvd 26%</th>
<th>Not In Favour of Extension 23%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which routing do you prefer for Route 12 service to the Lincoln Road area?</td>
<td>Weber St to Lincoln Rd 77</td>
<td>Marshall St 42</td>
<td>No Opinion 193</td>
<td>Supportive of Weber St to Lincoln Rd 65%</td>
<td>Supportive of Marshall St 35%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Summary Table of Detailed Responses for Service Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you have any comments regarding the extended 201 iXpress including proposed station locations?</th>
<th>Total Comments</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General statement of approval/improved convenience</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General statement of disproval</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interline/connect the 201 iXpress and University iXpress</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The majority of 201 and University iXpress trips would be connected at Conestoga Mall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend 201 service to Conestoga College Doon Campus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A 201 iXpress extension to Conestoga College is not planned; however an express route to this destination is planned for 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend to Fairview Mall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>An extension to either the Courtland or Fairview Mall LRT station is planned for future service expansion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reduce the number of stations (suggestions included Philip Street, Weber Street, Columbia Street, and Beehlawn Drive) | 9 | No changes to station locations are currently planned. The proposed locations were chosen to serve key employment, commercial and residential nodes.

Increase number of stations (suggestions included additional stops along Fischer-Hallman Road) | 2 | A route deviation into the University of Waterloo campus is not currently planned to maintain direct service along Columbia Street West.

Add a stop at University of Waterloo Davis Centre | 2 | The proposed route extension to Conestoga Mall was planned to provide express service along Columbia Street West and King Street.

Alter route to travel to Conestoga Mall via Weber Street at Parkside Drive | 1 | The 200 iXpress station is planned at Columbia and Hagey Boulevard to improve coordination between the 200 and 201 iXpress routes. Future adjustments are proposed to connect to the planned LRT station at UW.

Have shared iXpress and future LRT stop locations | 6 | A route deviation into the University of Waterloo campus is not currently planned to maintain direct service along Columbia Street West.

Would like to see even more of a grid system (travel along the length of Fischer-Hallman road) | 1 | A future extension further south along Fischer-Hallman Road is proposed to serve this area as development increases.

Loss of connection at Wilfrid Laurier | 3 | Service to Wilfrid Laurier from the west side of Kitchener and Waterloo would be provided by University iXpress, Route 29, and Route 12.

Start service earlier on Sundays | 1 | This is not in the current budget but will be considered in the future.

Improve service at Highland Hills Mall Terminal | 1 | Service improvements in this area are planned for 2015 with the introduction of the Highland/Victoria express route.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>Do you have additional comments regarding the proposed University iXpress including proposed station locations?</th>
<th>Total Comments</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General approval</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like increased service to University and Northfield area - many workers will soon be moved to this area</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>iXpress stations are proposed at the major intersections and destinations currently served by Route 31.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use existing Route 31 stops on University Avenue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Increased frequency on these routes is not currently warranted, but this will be considered for future service expansion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding should go towards increasing frequency on other routes that do not serve students such as the 4, 3, or 15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Direct service to the universities from the Westvale area would be available along Ira Needles, at The Boardwalk, or along Erb Street, or by transferring to one of these routes from Route 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Westvale area needs direct service to the University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Proposed station locations balance stop spacing and access to major employment, commercial, and residential nodes. However, it is proposed to relocate the Westvale Gate station to Erbsville Court.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove some of the stops to make service more express. Proposed stations to remove included: Philip, Weber, Marsland, Pastern Trail, Westvale Gate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>An additional iXpress station is planned at Northfield Drive East and Davenport Road, and the Erb Street West and Gateview Drive station is proposed to be relocated to Erb Street West and Erbsville Court.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests for additional stations (including Erbsville Court, Northfield and Davenport, and University at Westmount)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>This is planned in 2015 with the proposed Highland-Victoria iXpress.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend service further south along Ira Needles Boulevard and to Charles Street Terminal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>This intersection is served by the 201 Fischer-Hallman Ixpress.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The route should go past the Fischer-Hallman Road and University Avenue intersection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shared stations with the 200 IXpress are planned at Wilfrid Laurier and Conestoga Mall, and with the 201 IXpress at Erb Street and Fischer-Hallman and Conestoga Mall. The higher frequency on these routes would reduce transfer wait times.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Many current Route 29 riders will like the University iXpress as a direct route to Conestoga Mall | 1 | }
Additional buses to Conestoga Mall are not needed | 2 | Conestoga Mall is a key transit terminal and a planned Rapid Transit station.
Like service to RIM Park Sportsplex | 1 |
Request for extended evening service hours | 3 | Extended evening service may be implemented as ridership grows.
Like the later evening and weekend service along University Avenue | 2 |
Laurier stop for University iXpress and 200 iXpress should be moved to the King and University intersection | 1 | This change may be implemented once LRT service is in place.
Request for increased frequency | 3 | Increased frequency would be implemented when ridership warranted it, subject to budget availability.
Like interlining/connection to the 201 iXpress | 1 |

**Do you have any comments regarding the proposal to reduce rush hour service on Route 29 Keats Way? Many Route 29 riders would be within a reasonable walk distance to the University iXpress along Erb Street which would provide 15 minute rush hour and midday service to the universities and The Boardwalk.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Comments</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General disagreement / statement that the change would make service less convenient</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General agreement</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure if students will walk the extra distance to University iXpress</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Route 29 riders are outside of the University iXpress coverage area</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor activity on Route 29 when service is first implemented to see if extra trips are needed</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 29 should continue to run every thirty minutes during weekends</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 29 buses will likely still be crowded after University iXpress is introduced</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rt 29 and iXpress times should be staggered to provide extra travel choices</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must coordinate transfers between University iXpress and other GRT routes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend Route 29 service to Conestoga Mall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for direct service from the Westvale neighbourhood to University Avenue</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you have any additional comments regarding Route 5 Erb West?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Comments</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General approval</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General disproval</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase frequency</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide continuous service along Erb Street</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like the addition of two way service</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like the extension to The Boardwalk</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not take away early morning trips</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces number of transfers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route should be merged with the proposed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Route 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduces a new transfer</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request for extended evening and Sunday service</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like the route running along Westvale Drive instead of Thorndale Drive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorndale would be a better routing option as it goes through the middle of the Westvale neighbourhood</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Boardwalk does not need increased transit service</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not add additional transit service on Westvale Drive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like the creation of a terminal at The Boardwalk</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The change would remove the connection from Uptown Waterloo to the Erb Street and Ira Needles Boulevard intersection</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Do you have any additional comments regarding Route 6 Bridgeport?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Comments</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General approval</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like connections to Uptown Waterloo</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take it to Downtown Kitchener</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would introduce extra transfer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routes 5 and 6 should be combined</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Sunday service in Bridgeport/Bloomingdale area</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend service hours</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that transfers to Route 35 could be made at Bridge and Lancaster</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The route should be renamed Route 35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The change would make the transit network more understandable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erb Street and Bridgeport Road should be converted to two-way service so Route 6 service would not have to split between the two roads</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some stops should be removed to reduce travel times</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Do you have any additional comments regarding Route 35 Eastbridge, such as the proposal to add Sunday service?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Comments</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General approval</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General disproval</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would introduce extra transfer</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would no longer provide local service in my neighbourhood</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion on Bridge could affect this route</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need earlier service on weekends</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday service not necessary</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like extended hours</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like addition of Sunday service</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I currently take 35 to Uptown</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like extended hours</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would prefer local service in Eastbridge neighbourhood</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would make it difficult for Bluevale and Eastbridge PS students</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like direct service along Bridge / Lancaster</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route should travel along Victoria Street instead of Wellington Street</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for service to Woolwich Street</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like the addition of the University iXpress to the Eastbridge area</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route should be renamed to Route 6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Do you have any additional comments regarding Route 31 Lexington, including the proposal to extend evening hours of service?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Comments</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General approval</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like extended evening hours</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for weekend service</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for increased frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like the addition of two way service along Columbia Street west of Fischer-Hallman Road</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service should be coordinated with 200 iXpress</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like current Route 31 service which goes all the way around Ring Road at University of Waterloo</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like direct service on Columbia Street that does not detour into University of Waterloo campus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service should be extended down Hickory Street</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to see Route 31 run straight along Bridge Street, and Route 35 continue to provide local service in the Eastbridge neighbourhood</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Would like to see more service in University Downs neighbourhood  | 2 | Service in the University Downs area would be provided by Route 35 along Bridge Street, the 202 University iXpress along University Avenue at Bridge Street or Pastern Trail, and by Route 12 at University and Bridge.

Like the east/west travel along Columbia Street and Lexington Road  | 1 |  

Service on the west end should be tied to a destination  | 1 | Future service extensions on the west side of Waterloo could include an extension to the planned commercial development along Erb Street West, west of Erbsville Road.

Improves connections for neighbourhoods in West Waterloo who are not travelling to the University  | 1 |  

Service to Conestoga Mall should be more direct  | 1 | Transfers to Routes 7C, 201 iXpress, 200 iXpress, or 12 could be made for more direct service to Conestoga Mall.

Do not like the removal of Saturday service from local streets in Eastbridge  | 1 | Weekend service to the Eastbridge neighbourhood would be provided along University Avenue by the 202 University iXpress and by Route 35 along Bridge Street.

Increase frequency along Columbia Street  | 1 | Service on Route 31 would be implemented as ridership warranted, subject to budget availability. The planned 201 iXpress extension would help to provided additional service along the Columbia Street corridor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8</th>
<th>Do you have any additional comments regarding Route 13 Laurelwood?</th>
<th>Total Comments</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Like extension to The Boardwalk</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like the addition of two-way service</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like the extension to Creekside Drive as it provides more coverage</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend service hours</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase frequency</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Frequency would be increased as ridership warranted, subject to budget availability. Additional frequency along Columbia Street would be provided with the proposed Route 31 extension.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like extension into Laurelcreek Village</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for additional stop locations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The review of stop locations is included as part of the service improvement plan. Additional stops will be provided for two-way service within Laurelwood and existing stop locations would be optimised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for infrastructure at stops</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Route 13 stops have been included in the annual bus stop improvement process which is currently being finalized.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service should be extended to the UW research park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Connections to the UW research park would be available at Columbia Street West and Hagey Boulevard where 200 iXpress stations are planned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlining with Route 9 should be kept so that it extends to the King and University intersection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>This is currently planned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detour into Laurelcreek Village would inconvenience a number of passengers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The intersection of Erbsville Road and Laurelwood Drive seems like a natural dividing point along the route providing service to either the east or along the west side of Laurelwood. Therefore the proposed extension is seen as having minimal impact on Route 13 riders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections between Route 13 and Route 31 should be made at Erbsville Road and Columbia Street West</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Route schedules are based on timed connections at terminals, and may not connect at this intersection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension into Laurelcreek Village should be two-way service to reduce customer confusion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>This service option is being considered, but would be dependent on the removal of on-street parking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9</th>
<th>Do you have any additional comments regarding Route 12 Conestoga Mall?</th>
<th>Total Comments</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 12 should split into two different routes at King and University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General disagreement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber to Lincoln option would take too long</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The northern portion of Route 12 should be extended to Uptown Waterloo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber to Lincoln is preferred since it serves dense residential area</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like extension to Moses Springer Community Centre if the route travels</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber to Lincoln</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like service to Bridgeport Plaza</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service on Route 12 should be more direct</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 12 should be redesigned now that University iXpress is in place</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like that Route 12 has a consistent schedule which improves customer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>convenience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like that Route 12 will stay on Lee Avenue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 12 service should be extended to Dansbury to replace local service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that is being removed with Route 35 change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 8 and 12 service should be staggered along Weber Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for increased frequency during rush hours</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Comments</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa Street needs improved service</td>
<td>Ottawa Street service improvements are budgeted for 2017 with the implementation of the Ottawa Street express.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be a discount for GO bus riders</td>
<td>Numerous routes in Kitchener would be redesigned in 2015 with the implementation of the Highland/Victoria express, and in 2017 with the implementation of the Ottawa Street iXpress and LRT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener needs a redesign</td>
<td>Additional transit priority measures, such as signal priority are planned in the future, especially along iXpress routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure buses run on time</td>
<td>Snow removal at stops is provided by area municipalities or by contractors. With the large volumes of snow experienced this year, removal did take longer than normal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow removal at bus stops needs to improve</td>
<td>Service to the colleges is currently provided along the Ring Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for more transit priority measures</td>
<td>Service hours are expanded/increased as ridership growth warrants it, subject to budget availability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement a route connecting The Boardwalk and Highland Hills Mall</td>
<td>This connection is planned in 2015 with the implementation of the Highland/Victoria express.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service should be provided to the University Colleges (St Jerome’s, Renison)</td>
<td>Service to the colleges is currently provided along the Ring Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater frequency is needed on Route 8</td>
<td>Service hours are expanded/increased as ridership growth warrants it, subject to budget availability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend service hours on Route 22</td>
<td>Service reductions were planned to have minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement Sunday service on Route 4</td>
<td>Service reductions were planned to have minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 19 service should be expanded</td>
<td>Service reductions were planned to have minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand the span of hours on Route 76</td>
<td>Service reductions were planned to have minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase service on Routes 24 and 25</td>
<td>Service reductions were planned to have minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand the span of hours on Route 21</td>
<td>Service reductions were planned to have minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not reduce Route 3 service</td>
<td>Service reductions were planned to have minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not reduce 200 iXpress service</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disproval of service cuts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disproval of fare hikes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not increase price of College Pass</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a dedicated Route along Weber Street</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for improved transit service to Conestoga College Doon Campus / College Upass</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General compliment for GRT service</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redesign Route 7 with introduction of 202 and extension of 201</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Presto Card</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express bus service should run until 2 a.m.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like service extension to Kiwanis Park area</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a direct connection between Hespeler Terminal on Holiday Inn Drive and Sportsworld Terminal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express service to the City of Guelph should be introduced</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliment for GRT bus drivers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route maps are difficult to read</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Sunday service</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve amenities at bus stops (garbage cans, bus schedules, shelters, bike shelters)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for pedestrian island at Columbia and Beechlawn</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve connectivity to Kitchener Train Station</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Impact to customers. Trips along routes affected by the service reductions will be monitored to determine if warrant exists to reinstate service.
- The recommended fare change supports the objective of balancing the revenue received from the municipal contribution and from fares. The proposed fare change would still result in fare levels that are below the average of comparable Ontario transit systems.
- In order to meet the 7% average fare revenue increase for 2013 and not raise other fare types disproportionately, the College Pass is included in the recommended fare structure at a rate of increase of 6% to $240 for a four-month term. This is 1% below the average fare increase and maintains the discount college students receive compared to the purchase of passes at the regular adult monthly rate.
- This route option has been evaluated and could be introduced in the future, subject to budget availability and system priorities.
- Improved service to Conestoga College and a College Upass continue to be evaluated but is not currently in the GRT budget.
- The redesign of Route 7 is planned when LRT service is introduced.
- Options for smart cards for transit fares continue to be evaluated.
- Evening service to 2 a.m. is not currently included in the GRT service standards but will be considered in the future.
- Service to this area continues to be considered; however, estimated ridership levels in this area would not currently support transit service.
- Planned iXpress service proposed for 2017 would provide a direct connection from the Hespeler area to Sportsworld Terminal.
- The provision of such service is not currently included in the GRT budget and would require obtain special licensing for inter-regional service.
- Schematic route schedules were introduced over the last few years to help reduce the amount of time and costs associated with updating and printing schedules. Additional access to schedule information is available through the EasyGO system which includes next bus text messaging and phone calls, an online trip planner, and our customer service staff.
- Improved Sunday service is included as one of the priorities in the 2011-2014 GRT Business Plan. Budget for improved Sunday service is included for every year of the plan for routes in Cambridge, Kitchener, and Waterloo.
- An annual budget exists to improve amenities at stop locations. Since this budget is limited, improvements are prioritised based on stop activity, customer requests, and available space. Placement of garbage cans is also restricted by availability of garbage collection along a route.
- This request has been shared with City of Waterloo staff.
- A shuttle currently exists from Charles Street Terminal to the Kitchener Train Station. Additional service is provided by Route 18. The planned relocation of the Kitchener Train Station to the King and Victoria intersection will improve connections to this destination.
| Additional service to Ira Needles is not required | 2 | Additional service along Ira Needles is planned to provide connections to various commercial and residential developments along the corridor and to the transit terminal at The Boardwalk. |
Attachment C – Walkshed map of transit service in along the Keats Way corridor
Attachment D – Walkshed map of transit service in the Auburn Drive area
RECOMMENDED GRAND RIVER TRANSIT 2013 FARE STRUCTURE

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the following regarding implementation of the 2013 Grand River Transit (GRT) fare structure as described in Report No. P-13-048, dated April 30, 2013:

a) Implement GRT fare structure Option 1 as detailed in Table 1 on July 1, 2013, and;

b) Amend the Region’s Fees and Charges By-law No. 13-001 with respect to the approved 2013 GRT fares.

SUMMARY:

The approved 2013 Regional Budget included a 7% increase to Grand River Transit (GRT) fares. Fare increases help the transit system keep pace with increased costs and help to balance the municipal contribution to transit operating costs with the transit fare revenue contribution. As well, fare increases sustain on-going service improvements.

Two fare options that achieve the 7% average fare increase were developed and presented to the public at a Public Consultation Centre (PCC) held on Tuesday March 26, 2013, as well as at three PCCs for the Proposed 2013 Transit Service Improvements on March 19, 21, and 22, 2013. Following the public feedback that was obtained, staff is recommending the fare change proposed in Option 1, as outlined in Table 1 of this report, be implemented on July 1, 2013.

Various programs exist to assist residents who may not have the means to pay the full transit fare. The Transit for Reduced Income Program (TRIP) provides a subsidy for those who live on a reduced income while the Transit Affordability Pass Program (TAPP) assists Ontario Works participants who are upgrading their education or attending English as a Second Language (ESL) programs. These programs continue to be offered to the community, and the pass subsidy for TRIP is proposed to be increased from $30 to $32 in 2013 to help offset the effect of the fare change for those using this program.

The U-PASS price was set via negotiations with the student associations. These prices were recommended to the Planning and Works Committee in report P-12-040 dated March 20, 2012, and approved by Council on March 28, 2012. The U-PASS price shown in Table 1 takes effect on September 1, 2013.

The high school term pass, purchased by Student Transportation Services of Waterloo Region for eligible students, is included in the proposed fare structure at a rate of increase of 2%. Regional staff met with School Board transportation staff to discuss the proposed 7% average fare increase, because they had expressed concerns with the ongoing transit fare increases which have exceeded the amount of funding increases they have received from the Ministry of Education. Regional staff
proposed limiting their increase in 2013 to 2%, as done in 2012, and this is the proposal contained in this report. Additionally, in September 2012 an upgrade option to the term pass was introduced to offer students unlimited access to GRT service on evenings, weekends, and holidays during term. This upgrade will continue to be offered in September 2013.

**REPORT:**

The approved 2013 Regional Budget includes a 7% increase to GRT fares effective July 1, 2013, consistent with the 2011-2014 GRT Business Plan. A goal of the GRT Business Plan is to implement a fare strategy to keep pace with increasing costs, sustain service improvements and balance the municipal contribution to transit operating costs with transit revenues.

**Fare Change Proposal**

Two options were developed for public consideration that achieve the overall 7% average fare revenue increase, as shown in Table 1, below. The difference between the two options is that Option 1 proposes slightly higher ticket prices than in Option 2, with an increase of $1.00 for a strip of five tickets or $0.20 per ticket, compared to an increase of $0.75 for a strip of five tickets or $0.15 per ticket in Option 2. Conversely, Option 1 proposes a lower increase on pass prices, with a monthly pass increased by $4.00 in comparison to an increase of $5.00 for a monthly pass in Option 2. Both options propose no increase to the $3.00 cash fare or $6.00 day pass fare, which were both increased by 20% in 2012, and are currently priced at round numbers that are convenient for transit customers (the cash fare requires a minimum of only two coins).

Option 1 rewards the most frequent riders of the transit system by proposing a lower increase to monthly passes, continuing to provide significant discounts for pass users, and is the fare change option being recommended in this report.

**Public Consultation**

Feedback from the public was obtained through several means, including:

- A Public Consultation Centre (PCC) held on March 26th at the Regional Administrative Headquarters;
- Displays of the options at the Charles Street Transit Terminal in Kitchener and the Ainslie Street Transit Terminal in Cambridge;
- PCCs held on March 19, 21 and 22 for the Proposed 2013 Transit Service Improvements at various locations in the City of Waterloo;
- An online survey posted on the www.grt.ca website; and
- Comments submitted via telephone, fax or conventional mail.

A summary of comments received is contained in Appendix 1.

Twenty-one people signed in at the PCC on March 26. An additional 133 people signed in at the Service Improvement PCCs. Including comments provided at the terminals, on the website, or through the other means indicated above, 175 responses were received about the fare changes. Option 1 was the preferred fare change option, favoured by 75% of the people stating a preference. Generally, they saw the benefit for those who use transit more frequently and purchase passes. Twelve of the respondents who stated a preference for Option 1 also responded that they would prefer no fare increase, and three of the respondents who stated a preference for Option 2 responded that they would prefer no fare increase, if this was an option presented. From the total number of responses, 41 people preferred neither of the options, or declined to indicate a preference. Thirteen people generally did not support annual fare increases.
An additional question on the comment form provided to the public asked for comments relating to how the current fare system could be improved. A total of 96 people answered this question, representing 55% of all respondents. Comments received have been organized in Appendix 1 under the sub-areas of fare structure, fare affordability, the rate and frequency of fare increases, and fare technology/electronic fare systems. The most frequent comment concerning the GRT fare structure, given by 22 respondents, was that a U-Pass should be implemented for Conestoga College students. This issue is addressed in this report under the heading ‘College Passes’. A further nine people preferred to see the structure of the fare system stay as it is. Other comments suggested making monthly passes transferable, adding a further discount to riders purchasing monthly bus passes for one year, and implementing entirely new fare types, such as a family pass or a pass for retired persons. These comments are of a more strategic and long-term nature, and will be considered as part of the project to develop an electronic fare system for GRT, which presents an opportunity to review the current GRT fare structure.

The most frequent comment concerning fare affordability, stated by seven people, was that the cost of fares does not match the service that is provided by GRT. While the average fare is recommended for an increase in 2013, service improvements are also proposed, and the average GRT fare as recommended would remain one of the lowest among comparable Ontario transit systems (see Appendix 2).

Comments concerning the implementation of new fare technology, such as an electronic fare card or payment by credit card or another device will also be considered as part of the project to develop an electronic fare system for GRT. Fifteen people stated a preference for PRESTO or another electronic fare card.

Comments were also received relating to GRT service generally. A total of 94 people made comments on this subject, representing 54% of all respondents. Nine people complimented GRT operators, emphasizing their friendly and courteous service, while seven people stated drivers should be friendlier to customers. Eight people expressed satisfaction with the service provided to the community by GRT, stating it provides an attractive and efficient transportation choice for moving around the Region. Positive comments that were received concerning the proposed 2013 transit service improvements and the initiative to redesign the transit network for more direct, express routes highlight that these improvements are important to riders.

Other comments were received that dealt with more route-specific or detailed service concerns, such as a request to add a shelter to a certain stop or adding a later trip on a route. These issues will be dealt with as service adjustments are made, and will inform future service improvements.

**Recommended Fare Change**

Following the review of comments from the public, staff is recommending the approval of Option 1, as shown in Table 1 below.

The proposed fare change would still result in fare levels that are below the average of comparable Ontario transit systems, as illustrated in Appendix 2. The frequent rider would continue to be rewarded with discounted passes and tickets compared to the cash fare, which encourages continued ridership growth. The most frequent riders of the transit system, using monthly passes, would have a lower increase in their pass price than presented in Option 2. The recommended fare change is therefore preferable for those riders using concession passes.

The U-PASS price was set via negotiations with the student associations at the University of Waterloo and Wilfrid Laurier University. Prices were recommended to the Planning and Works Committee in report P-12-040 dated March 20, 2012 and approved by Regional Council on March 28, 2012. A three-year term was agreed to between the student associations and the Region, so
that until 2015, the U-PASS price would increase at the same average rate of other fare types (7% for 2013). Fee increases would be determined by the average increase to GRT fares as approved by Council each year.

### Table 1: Transit Fare Options Presented to Public with Recommended July 1, 2013 GRT Fares

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fare Type</th>
<th>Current Fares</th>
<th>% Riders (2012)</th>
<th>2013 Fares Option 1 (Recommended)</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>2013 Fares Option 2</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Monthly Pass(^1)</td>
<td>$68.00</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>$72.00</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>$73.00</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Monthly Pass(^1,2)</td>
<td>$56.00</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>$61.00</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Tickets (Sold in Strip of Five)</td>
<td>$10.50 ($2.10 each)</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>$11.50 ($2.30 each)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$11.25 ($2.25 each)</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Tickets(^2) (Sold in Strip of Five)</td>
<td>$9.00 ($1.80 each)</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>$10.00 ($2.00 each)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>$9.75 ($1.95 each)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Fare</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TravelWise Corporate Pass</td>
<td>$58.35</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>$61.00</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$62.00</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Pass(^1) (per 4-month term)</td>
<td>$227.00</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>$240.00</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>$244.00</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Summer Pass(^1) (July &amp; August)</td>
<td>$95.00</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>$101.00</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>$103.00</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Pass</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIP Pass</td>
<td>$38.00</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$41.00</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-PASS(^3,4)</td>
<td>$67.50</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>$72.23</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>$72.23</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School 5-month Term Pass(^4,5)</td>
<td>$235.00</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>$240.00</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$240.00</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Fare Increase:** 7%

### NOTES:
- Children under five ride free with a paying customer.
- As of July 2012, all GRT fares are available to MobilityPLUS customers. Permanent Registered MobilityPLUS users ride conventional transit vehicles for free.
- Percent of riders column does not include free rides (including the TAPP Pass), GO Co-Fare, and adults riding at the student rate.
- \(^1\) – Photo I.D. charge of $5.00 required – one time fee for Adult and Senior Reduced Monthly Passes; per year for Student Reduced Monthly Passes; per term for Summer Pass, College Pass (except Conestoga College) and High School Pass (paid by student).
- \(^2\) – Reduced fares are available to seniors, elementary & high school students.
- \(^3\) – As approved by Regional Council on March 28, 2012.
- \(^4\) – Fare prices are agreed through separate contract negotiations (with student associations at the universities in the case of the U-PASS and with Student Transportation Services of Waterloo Region in the case of the High School Pass).
- \(^5\) – High School students can top-up the School Board funded High School Term Pass to allow unlimited...
travel during term on evenings, weekends and holidays. The top-up would be equivalent to the difference between the reduced monthly pass rate for five months ($300) and the High School 5-month Pass ($240). Top-up fare is currently $45 and would increase to $60 as proposed.

**School Board Funded Term Passes**

The high school term pass, purchased by the School Board transportation consortium (Student Transportation Services of Waterloo Region) for eligible students, is included in the proposed fare structure in Table 1 at a rate of increase of 2% to $240 for five months. Regional staff held several meetings with School Board transportation staff to discuss the proposed 7% fare increase, because they expressed concerns with the ongoing transit fare increases which have exceeded the amount of funding increases they have received from the Ministry of Education.

Through these discussions, several options were reviewed to look for potential financial gains to offset the proposed 7% fare increase. When no alternatives were found, Regional staff offered to propose limiting their increase in 2013 to 2% (similar to what was done last year). Despite these efforts, the School Board transportation consortium recently made a decision to discontinue using GRT services at two high schools (Resurrection and Galt Collegiate) this fall. They have cautioned that additional reductions may occur if transit prices keep rising, since it makes the yellow school bus a more affordable option. Regional staff will continue to dialogue with the School Board transportation consortium, and plan to explore the development of a longer term fare policy aimed at preserving their student ridership on GRT school services.

Additionally, in September 2012 an upgrade option to the School Board term pass was introduced to offer students unlimited access to GRT service on evenings, weekends, and holidays during the school term as a ‘top-up’ provision to their school-day-only bus pass. An increase is proposed for this upgrade to continue pricing the top-up at the difference between the price of five months at the Reduced Monthly Pass rate ($300 as recommended in Table 1), and the price of the High School 5-Month Term Pass. The top-up provision is currently $45, and is proposed for 2013 at $60 per term.

**College Passes**

In September 2011, Conestoga College student representatives initiated discussions with Regional staff regarding the implementation of a U-Pass program for Conestoga College. The service improvements and financial resources required to implement a Conestoga College U-Pass program are not included in the planned GRT service expansion to be funded from the Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) Reserve Fund. During deliberations for the 2013 Regional Budget, it was determined that current financial challenges precluded approval of the $1.5 million in service improvements required to implement the Conestoga College U-Pass. Despite this decision, service improvements for Conestoga College students have not been ruled out for future years.

In order to meet the 7% average fare revenue increase for 2013 and not raise other fare types disproportionately, the College Pass is included in the recommended fare structure in Table 1 at a rate of increase of 6% to $240 for a four-month term. This is 1% below the average fare increase, maintains the discount college students receive compared to the purchase of passes at the regular adult monthly rate, and is lower than the proposed increase to the College Pass presented to the public in Option 2.

Conestoga College students have circulated a petition against the proposed 2013 transit fare change, stating that transit fares are already expensive and service should be improved first. Regional staff continue to consider options that could improve existing service to the college, but are constrained by the cost of providing additional service to this area, which would require resources above and beyond the RTMP Reserve Fund. While this is the case, GRT currently provides transit
service to Conestoga College that meets current demand and is not overcrowded. The Doon Campus is served by seven GRT bus routes, and two of these routes also serve the Cambridge Campus. The seven routes use 9 peak buses, one BusPLUS vehicle, and 29,820 annual hours of service to provide 144 trips on weekdays, 31 trips on Saturdays and 16 trips on Sundays to Conestoga College. Additionally, the Mid-Region Express planned for 2017 would provide frequent, express bus service to the college from both South Kitchener and Hespeler.

Transit Fare Affordability Programs

The Region provides a subsidy to those who live on a reduced income and want to purchase a bus pass. Residents may qualify for the Transit for Reduced Income Program (TRIP) if their income falls below the low income cut-off (LICO) as determined by Statistics Canada. TRIP currently provides a discount of $30.00 per month to those who are eligible, requiring TRIP clients to pay only $38.00 for a monthly pass regularly priced at $68.00. For 2013, this discount is proposed to be increased to $32.00, to reduce the effect of the fare change on these customers. The customer would then be able to purchase a monthly pass regularly priced at $72.00 under the recommended Option 1 fare change for $40.00. This is an increase of 5%, which is below the 7% average fare increase. Therefore, Option 1 is preferable for transit riders accessing service through the TRIP program.

In the 2012 Regional Budget, an additional $305,000 was included in the TRIP budget to bring the budget to a total of $746,000, which allowed for 2072 people to be served each month at the $30.00 pass subsidy rate. This was an increase from 1313 people each month in 2011. Implementation of this budget expansion eliminated all waiting lists that had accumulated for the program through 2012, allowing more people to access a reduced bus pass. The recommended 2013 fare change and subsequent proposed increase in the pass subsidy to $32.00 allows approximately the same number of people to be served through 2013, at 1943 people per month. Recent pass sales data indicates that about 1900 TRIP passes are sold each month. If the recommended fare change is approved, Regional staff will monitor experience and adjust the program in 2014 based upon experience.

Additionally, the Region offers transportation support to Ontario Works participants through a number of programs. These include: a free monthly bus pass through the Transit Affordability Pass Program (TAPP) to Ontario Works participants who are upgrading their education or attending English as a Second Language programs; medical transportation; and, the provision of a pass or bus tickets to attend employment programs and to travel to Regional Employment & Income Support offices. These programs were outlined during the 2013 Regional Budget deliberations.

Transportation Planning staff are working with Employment & Income Support staff to consolidate initiatives that subsidize transit fares for social assistance clients. A planned survey of TRIP customers will help inform changes and next steps for the program to improve access and convenience. The recently launched project to develop an electronic fare system for GRT also provides an opportunity in this regard. The ongoing development of programs for transit affordability would support the Region’s Comprehensive Approach to Poverty Reduction, approved by Regional Council in December 2012.

MobilityPLUS fares and fare parity

The Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) required communities to introduce fare parity between conventional and specialized transit services on or before January 1, 2013. On July 1, 2012, the MobilityPLUS fare structure was broadened to include all fare categories available to conventional transit customers. All GRT fares are now available to MobilityPLUS customers, and consequently MobilityPLUS fares would increase at the same 7% average rate as recommended in this report.
Next Steps

If the recommended fare changes are approved, staff would implement changes effective July 1, 2013. If the changes are approved, staff would inform customers through a number of means. These would include:

- Ads at fare agent locations;
- A revised fare guide;
- Posters at shelters, terminals and on buses;
- Print ads; and
- Electronic notifications on the GRT website, Facebook, Twitter, Rider Alerts and automated messages on the phone system.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

Area Municipalities were circulated the 2011-2014 GRT Business Plan for information and comment. This document outlined the general fare strategy being proposed. The municipalities were also circulated a copy of this report for information.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The 2013 transit fare changes help sustain ongoing service improvements and therefore support the implementation of Regional Council’s Strategic Focus, under Focus Area 3: Sustainable Transportation: Develop greater, more sustainable and safe transportation choices.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The recommended fare change is expected to increase revenue by $636,000 in 2013. This amount is included in the 2013 GRT revenue budget. On an annual basis, the proposed fare change would increase revenue by $1,272,000.

The additional revenue is expected to generate a 0.9% improvement in the revenue/cost (R/C) ratio of GRT in 2013, with the R/C ratio projected to increase from 37.7% without the fare change to 38.6% if the fare change is implemented. This revenue will offset the short-term effects of the cost of the proposed 2013 service improvements on the R/C ratio, and contribute to covering increasing operating costs. If the proposed 2013 service improvements were implemented without the recommended fare change, the R/C ratio is expected to decrease by 0.7% in 2013, from 38.4% (the estimated R/C ratio of GRT for 2012) to 37.7%.

The recommended fare change will also contribute to the 2011-2014 GRT Business Plan goal of achieving a balance between the municipal contribution to transit operating costs and the contribution from transit fare revenue by 2016, as described in Report P-12-013.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Staff from Finance and Transportation and Environmental Services assisted to develop these transit fare options.

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix 1 - Summary of Feedback from Public Consultation
Appendix 2 - Current and Average Fares for Comparable Ontario Transit Systems
Appendix 1: Summary of Feedback from Public Consultation

Total Responses: 175

Responses in Favour of Option 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower increase on monthly pass prices/ Keeps my fare lower</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Monthly pass prices are designed to reward the frequent rider by offering a lower cost per trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stated general preference with no further comment</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stated preference for Option 1, but also responded that they preferred to see no fare increase</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>GRT Business Plan fare strategy identifies annual fare changes as a method to keep pace with increasing costs and sustain on-going service improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards the most frequent riders of the transit system</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferable for students using the College Pass</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>College students would pay $4 less per term for a pass compared to Option 2, and rate of increase would be below the average of 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides an incentive to switch to monthly passes and use transit more</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to pay more for tickets compared to passes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferable for those using the TRIP program and on lower incomes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Customers using the TRIP program would pay $1 less per month compared to Option 2, and rate of increase would be below the average of 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round number prices are easier to pay for</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>(75%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Responses in Favour of Option 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower increase on ticket prices/Keeps my fare lower</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Both options aim to distribute the fare increase evenly across the different fare types, with differentiation between whether tickets or passes have a higher increase. Due to the relatively low cost of a strip of tickets, an incremental increase in ticket prices appears as a larger percentage change than an incremental increase in monthly pass prices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stated general preference with no further comment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a better spread of the price increase across the different fare types and no increase above 9%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generates additional revenue from higher pass passes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Higher pass prices can discourage customers from using this fare type, and decrease the discount we provide our most frequent riders; both options are expected to generate the required amount of revenue included in the 2013 GRT revenue budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stated preference for Option 2, but also responded that they preferred to see no fare increase</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>GRT Business Plan fare strategy identifies annual fare changes as a method to keep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
pace with increasing costs and sustain on-going service improvements

Makes transit more attractive for the infrequent user who might purchase tickets

Ticket prices remain discounted from the cash fare, and rewarding frequent riders instead of infrequent riders encourages customer loyalty

Total 33 (25%)

General Comments about GRT Fare System

Fare structure comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Staff response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement a U-Pass for Conestoga College students</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>See section in body of report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep it as it is</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a transferable monthly pass</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>This was piloted through the Regional Transportation Demand Management program. The idea will be considered through the review of the GRT fare structure for the electronic fare system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement a program for regular monthly pass users whereby they get a further discount for purchasing passes for 12 consecutive months</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>This is done in Toronto through the Metropass Discount Program (MDP). This idea will be considered through the review of the GRT fare structure for the electronic fare system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider new fare media or fare policies for families, including: extending validity of the day pass to cover an entire weekend; implementing a family weekend pass; offering special holiday passes for families; allowing up to 2 children to ride for free with a parent using a pass</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>This idea will be considered through the review of the GRT fare structure for the electronic fare system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the time of the transfer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Current 90-minute allowance is enough time to get from end-to-end of the transit system or make shorter return trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider new fare media for retired persons, including a reduced monthly pass or a pass valid for a retired couple</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Difficult to assess employment status of a customer when purchasing a pass; would be difficult to enforce and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement a zone-based fare system</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>This idea will be considered through the review of the GRT fare structure for the electronic fare system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move away from calendar month passes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>This idea will be considered through the review of the GRT fare structure for the electronic fare system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer fare price specials on Earth Day to promote transit as an alternative mode of transport</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>This idea will be considered through the review of the GRT fare structure for the electronic fare system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow purchase of individual tickets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tickets are offered in strips of five to encourage customers to make more trips on transit at a discounted price versus the cash fare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fare affordability comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Staff response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost of fares does not match the service that is provided</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Annual service hours are proposed to increase in 2013, and the average GRT fare as recommended would remain one of the lowest among comparable Ontario transit systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep fares low</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash fare is too high</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The current and recommended cash fare is at the median rate for comparable Ontario transit systems, and no increase to the cash fare is recommended for 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower cash fare and ticket fare for children 5-13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Elementary school students can access tickets and passes at a discount to the cash fare. A reduction in the cash fare for this group will be considered through the review of the GRT fare structure for the electronic fare system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase cash fare to make other fare types more affordable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cash fare increased by 20% in 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep the Regional taxpayer in mind when</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The recommended fare change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
considering fare increases

supports the objective of balancing the revenue received from the municipal contribution and from fares

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Lower fare for unemployed persons</strong></th>
<th><strong>2</strong></th>
<th>Difficult to assess employment status of a customer when purchasing a fare; would be difficult to enforce and administer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide customers with a better understanding of specific operating costs that fare increases help address</td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>Operating costs include fuel, labour, vehicle maintenance, customer service. Fare increases also help to financially sustain service improvements, such as those proposed for 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reward frequent riders with lower price increases</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>The recommended fare change option proposes lower increases for pass prices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lower cash and ticket prices to make transit more attractive and affordable for the infrequent user</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>Recommended fare prices are designed to reward the frequent rider, to retain customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implement more ‘ride for free’ days</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>The recommended fare change spreads the increase proportionately across all different fare types so one fare type is not increased disproportionately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Don’t increase fare for reduced tickets and passes</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>Recommended for 2013 through TRIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continue and increase subsidies for those on low incomes</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>Those on ODSP could access the TRIP program for a reduced pass rate. People on ODSP could also meet the criteria for MobilityPLUS, if they are dialysis patients, have a physical challenge, or are legally blind, therefore obtaining access to the specialized transit service and the ability to ride conventional transit service for free.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allow those on ODSP to access reduced passes and tickets in addition to seniors and students</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>Recommended for 2013 through TRIP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rate and frequency of fare increase comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Staff response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Halt annual fare increases</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Fare increases are required to help offset increased operating costs and allow service improvements; significant service improvements are proposed for 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase revenue by generating more ridership as opposed to raising fares</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to see a report evaluating the objective of balancing fare revenue with the municipal contribution to operating costs, and if this should extend to other modes of travel besides transit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In favour of raising the fare to support service improvements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would support an even higher rate of fare increases to provide new routes to under-served areas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing the public to comment on an option is great</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fare technology/electronic fare system comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Staff response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement PRESTO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>These options will be considered through the review of the GRT fare structure for the electronic fare system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce a SmartCard and eliminate passes, tickets, and cash fares</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow passes to be bought online</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement fare payment by mobile phones</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement fare payment by credit and debit cards</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t implement PRESTO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add automated fare collection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### General Comments about GRT Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Staff response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency and reliability of routes is poor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Problems adhering to scheduled times can occur for different reasons on different routes, including construction, weather, and traffic delays; routes continue to have ridership monitored to determine if a bus needs to be added and continue to have schedule issues monitored to determine if run time needs to be adjusted accordingly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers are courteous and friendly</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciate the service, it provides an excellent transportation choice for residents of the Region</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers should be more friendly and considerate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move to more direct, express routes is a step in the right direction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual GRT Service Plans are addressing this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking forward to the 2013 service improvements</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements tend to favour residents in the City of Waterloo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While the proposed 2013 transit service improvements mainly affect routes in Waterloo, service improvements in 2014 and beyond will affect routes across the Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve service in Cambridge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 2012 GRT Service Plan added 3,281 annual hours of service to Cambridge, and the 2014 GRT Service Plan proposes to add 2,080 annual hours of service to Cambridge. In addition, aBRT will start to serve Cambridge in 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve service in Kitchener</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 2014 GRT Service Plan proposes to add 2,520 annual hours of service to Route 23, and an express route is planned for the Highland-Victoria corridor for 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add express service to Guelph</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is outside the current mandate of GRT, but is a service that has been explored and will be reviewed again in the future by staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should not be making service reductions in the same year as raising fares</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed service improvements for 2013 will add many more hours of service than were reduced through 2013 service reductions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve provision of information for customers when a bus will be late or breaks down</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional real-time information will become available later this year which will improve the accuracy of information we provide to customers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase service on Route 61 CAMBRIDGE CENTRE/CONESTOGA COLLEGE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff evaluated this as part of service improvements for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of Conestoga College U-Pass; could be implemented pending availability of additional buses and operating resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Sunday and holiday service levels</td>
<td>The 2014 GRT Service Plan proposes to add 2,080 annual hours of service in Cambridge on Sundays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer iXpress service should not be reduced</td>
<td>Council approved reductions to address financial objectives in the 2013 operating budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking forward to improvements for LRT</td>
<td>The aBRT, scheduled for implementation in fall 2014, will stop at Sportsworld</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iXpress and Phase 1 LRT should stop at Sportsworld</td>
<td>This will be reviewed during the work for the 2015-2019 GRT Business Plan; however, express corridor priority phasing has already been developed through the current GRT Business Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add an express route on Westmount Road</td>
<td>GRT is moving towards a smoke-free environment at its terminals, in accordance with Regional Public Transit By-Law 05-055. Effective January 2, 2013, smoking is not permitted at the Ainslie Street and Charles Street transit terminals, outside of designated smoking areas. Violators are subject to removal from the property and/or a maximum fine of $2000.00. There has been a great improvement with GRT operators using the new designated smoking areas. It is not permissible for operators or other GRT staff to be smoking just off terminal property on sidewalks, roadways or behind buses. Smoking is also strictly prohibited on or at all GRT buses, shelters and designated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do more to provide a smoke-free travel experience, especially with regard to GRT staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washrooms at terminals need updating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GRT waiting areas. Staff continue to monitor this issue and by-law enforcement is involved when no-smoking by-laws are deemed to be in violation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add evening service on Route 57 BLAIR ROAD to 10 PM, Monday to Saturday, and add Sunday service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>This has been noted for future consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public consultation is appreciated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 51 HESPELER ROAD is consistently late in the late evening</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staff will continue to monitor schedule adherence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add new service to townships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>This is an objective of the 2011-2014 GRT Business Plan; will require further discussions with the townships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve security on buses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mobile surveillance systems have been installed on most GRT buses and MobilityPLUS vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not charge a user fee for the EasyGO text messaging service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Options are being considered by staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add real-time information to EasyGO text messaging service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>This is planned for implementation later this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciate the 90-minute transfer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install a shelter at Erb and Ira Needles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New shelters would be installed at stops here for the University iXpress route, proposed for service later this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Sunday service on Route 22 LAURENTIAN WEST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Currently proposed for 2016; to be reviewed and updated during development of the 2015-2019 GRT Business Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve service on the 201 iXpress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Proposed 2013 transit service improvements include an extension of this route to Conestoga Mall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove snow from bus stops faster</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Snow removal at stops is provided by area municipalities or by contractors. With the large volumes of snow experienced this year, removal did take longer than normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Saturday service on Route 75 SAGINAW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ridership on this route is being monitored, and Saturday service will be considered once more ridership data is collected – conventional service was implemented in fall 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciate the service provided by MobilityPLUS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve service to the universities to reduce crowding on other routes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Proposed 2013 transit service improvements are centered around a new iXpress route on University Avenue, and will improve options and service hours for people travelling through the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should add a special route operating weekends that connects major shopping areas, malls, parks, and the 3 cities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200 iXpress serves this purpose; additional proposed express routes will also connect major destinations and run on weekends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2 – Current and Average Fares for Comparable Ontario Transit Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>2013 Cash Fare</th>
<th>2013 Adult Ticket</th>
<th>2013 Reduced Ticket</th>
<th>2013 Adult Monthly Pass</th>
<th>2013 Reduced Monthly Pass</th>
<th>2011 Average Fare*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York Region</td>
<td>$3.75</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$1.85</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>$55.00</td>
<td>$2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
<td>$2.65</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$110.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
<td>$2.70</td>
<td>$1.80</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$2.65</td>
<td>$1.80</td>
<td>$128.50</td>
<td>$106.00</td>
<td>$1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham Region</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$2.70</td>
<td>$1.85</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$40.25</td>
<td>$1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$1.60</td>
<td>$79.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>$2.55</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1.65</td>
<td>$87.00</td>
<td>$71.00</td>
<td>$1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>$3.30</td>
<td>$2.60</td>
<td>$2.60</td>
<td>$96.25</td>
<td>$39.00</td>
<td>$1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudbury</td>
<td>$2.80</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$1.60</td>
<td>$78.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td>$1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thunder Bay</td>
<td>$2.60</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$69.50</td>
<td>$59.50</td>
<td>$1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>$2.75</td>
<td>$1.90</td>
<td>$1.43</td>
<td>$81.00</td>
<td>$57.50</td>
<td>$1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRT Option 1</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$2.30</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$72.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRT Option 2</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$1.95</td>
<td>$73.00</td>
<td>$61.00</td>
<td>$1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Comparable System Median</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$1.80</td>
<td>$87.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Comparable System Average</td>
<td>$2.91</td>
<td>$2.40</td>
<td>$1.83</td>
<td>$88.38</td>
<td>$51.80</td>
<td>$1.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: The above table includes all updates to fare prices for the municipalities shown to January, 2013. 2012 average fare data is not yet available from the Canadian Urban Transit Association, so 2011 data is shown in the average fare column with the exception of the average fare of the proposed options for GRT, for comparison.
To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

From: Robert Gallivan, Manager, Transportation Program Development

Subject: NOISE ASSESSMENT REVIEW FOR BLEAMS ROAD (REGIONAL ROAD 56) BETWEEN FISCHER-HALLMAN ROAD (REGIONAL ROAD #58) AND HOMER WATSON BOULEVARD ROAD (REGIONAL ROAD #28), CITY OF KITCHENER AND INFORMATION ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF NOISE BARRIERS ON IRA NEEDLES BOULEVARD NORTH OF UNIVERSITY AVENUE.

File No: T04-02

The purpose of this memo is to provide further information on the noise assessment review that was completed on Bleams Road between Fischer-Hallman Road and Homer Watson Boulevard in January, 2013 and information concerning the construction of noise barriers for properties on Grange Court, Pitfield Court, Cardiff Street and Heathcliffe Place backlotting onto Ira Needles Boulevard North of University Avenue as requested by Councillor Lorentz.

Bleams Road between Homer Watson Boulevard and Fischer-Hallman Road is mainly comprised of back-lotted residential properties and industrial properties on the north and south sides of the road respectively. The area bounded by Fischer-Hallman Road, Huron Road, Homer Watson Boulevard and Bleams Road is generally commercial and industrial lands. Bleams Road carries an Average Annual Daily Traffic Volume (AADT) of approximately 11,000 to 20,000 vehicles per day with the higher volumes operating in the east end of this section. The percentage of heavy vehicles that make up the AADT is estimated to be approximately 1.0% based on existing turning movement count information.

Bleams Road between Homer Watson Boulevard and Fischer-Hallman Road has 3 noise barriers with a total length of 1171 metres. Figure 1 below shows the section of Bleams Road under consideration and the location of existing noise barrier walls along Bleams Road. The residential properties backing onto Bleams Road between west of Thistledown Drive and Strasburg Road currently do not have a noise barrier.
Region staff undertook a Noise Study along Bleams Road between west of Thistledown Drive and Strasburg Road (Figure 2) with updated traffic counts to determine if a noise barrier wall is warranted under Part C of the Region’s Implementation Guideline for Noise Barriers (Existing Development Impacted by Noise from Existing Regional Roads). If a noise barrier is warranted under Part C of the Noise Policy, the cost of installing this noise barrier could be cost shared 50/50 between the affected residents and the Region and would be built to Regional standards. The average cost of constructing a 1.82 metre (approximately 6 feet) noise barrier is approximately $1,000 per linear metre based on 2012 prices.

Under Part C of the Guideline a noise barrier is warranted when noise levels are greater than 60 dBA. Another important determining factor for warranting a noise barrier in addition to the traffic volumes is the proximity of the Outdoor Living Area (OLA) (3 metres from the rear of the house) to the centreline of the road.
The Noise Study has been completed for the properties at Rushbrook Drive, Nicole Crescent, Springhill Place, Colony Drive and The County Way which backlot onto Bleams Road. This study has confirmed that there are no warrants for a noise barrier for any of these properties as shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1 – Noise Study Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rushbrook Drive</th>
<th>Nicole Crescent</th>
<th>Springhill Place</th>
<th>Colony Drive</th>
<th>The County Way</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance from Centreline of Bleams Road to OLA (metres)</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Noise Levels (dBA)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Daily Traffic Volumes</td>
<td>12,779</td>
<td>12,779</td>
<td>12,779</td>
<td>12,779</td>
<td>13,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Traffic Volume Increase Needed to Warrant a Noise Barrier (*)</td>
<td>9,221</td>
<td>27,721</td>
<td>1,721</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>6,560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) It should be noted that the daily traffic volume increase to warrant a noise barrier is based on the closest residential unit to the centerline of the road (worst case). In some cases, other residential units are further from the centerline of the road which would require a significant further increase in daily traffic volumes to warrant a noise barrier under Part C of the Noise Guidelines.

Since the property at 12 Colony Drive may be warranted in the near future under Part C of the Implementation Guideline for Noise Barriers, a noise barrier could be constructed to Regional standards for this property if the affected property owner wishes to pursue a noise barrier and agrees to cost sharing with the Region 50/50.
Currently the noise issue along this section of Bleams Road is not unlike requests for noise barriers along Regional roads such as, Erb Street, Ottawa Street, Lackner Boulevard, Homer Watson Boulevard, University Avenue, Can-Amera Parkway and Fischer-Hallman Road.

The cost to install a noise barrier in the vicinity of Rushbrook Drive, Nicole Crescent, Springhill Place, Colony Drive and The Country Way is approximately $820,000 assuming an average barrier height of 1.82 metres and length of 820 metres.

Construction of Noise Barriers for Properties on Grange Court, Pitfield Court, Cardiff Street and Heathcliffe Place backlotting onto Ira Needles Boulevard North of University Avenue

As a result of the number of concerns raised by residents in this area relating to traffic noise along Ira Needles Boulevard, Region staff proceeded to undertake a noise assessment review of this area to determine if a noise barrier was warranted. The results of this noise assessment were presented to Regional Council on March 23, 2011 (see attached report E-11-035).

Based on the results of this review it was determined that the noise level did not warrant the installation of a noise barrier under Part B (Existing development Impacted by Proposed Regional Road Undertakings) of the Noise Policy however under Part C (Existing Development Impacted by Noise from Existing Regional Roads) of the policy a noise barrier was warranted.

Regional Council at their meeting March 23, 2011 approved the Region constructing and paying 100% of the cost for installing the noise barrier based on the extenuating circumstances clause under Part C, section 1.5. Council made this decision based on following reasons.

- there is significant commercial development along Ira Needles Blvd. known as the "Boardwalk" which has been generally positive for the community;
- the noise levels have increased more quickly than planned and that noise levels and traffic volumes will only continue to increase due to the expansion of commercial development to 1 million sq. ft. of retail space;
- there is a new residential development on the east side of Ira Needles immediately to the north of the streets in question and also along the east side are receiving noise barriers 100% funded by the developer as per Regional policy; and
- the long term residents along Grange Crescent, Pitfield Place, Heathcliffe Place, and Cardiff St, have every much a right to enjoy their properties and be protected from unreasonable noise as those who are just moving into the neighbourhood.
RECOMMENDATION:

For information.

SUMMARY:

Regional Council at their meeting on February 23, 2011 heard a delegation regarding noise issues on Ira Needles Boulevard and directed staff to report back on this issue at the March 23, 2011 Council meeting.

In December 2007, the construction of Ira Needles Boulevard from Victoria Street to south of Erb Street was completed. As part of the Environmental Assessment Study for this project a Noise Study, under Section 5.5 Part B of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo Implementation Guideline for Noise Policies (Existing Development Impacted by Proposed Regional Road Undertakings), was undertaken for the properties on Grange Court, Pitfield Court, Heathcliffe Place and Cardiff Street that backlot onto Ira Needles Boulevard. This study concluded that a noise barrier was not warranted as part of this project. Appendix A includes a copy of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo Implementation Guideline for Noise Policies.

Since that time there have been a number of concerns raised by residents in this area relating to traffic noise along Ira Needles Boulevard. In response to these concerns, Region staff proceeded to undertake a noise assessment review of this area to determine if a noise barrier was warranted.

Region staff completed the detailed noise assessment review based on Section 5.5, Part B of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo Implementation Guideline for Noise Policies. For this review the “revised” noise level was calculated using current traffic data. Based on the results of this review it was determined that the “revised” noise level does not warrant the installation of a noise barrier under Part B of the Noise Policy however under Part C of the policy a noise barrier is warranted for all the Noise Sensitive Locations.

REPORT:

Regional Council at their meeting on February 23, 2011 heard a delegation regarding noise issues on Ira Needles Boulevard and directed staff to report back on this issue at the March 23, 2011 Council meeting.
The construction of Ira Needles Boulevard from Victoria Street to south of Erb Street was completed in December 2007. As part of the Environmental Assessment Study for this project a Noise Study, under Section 5.5 Part B of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo Implementation Guideline for Noise Policies (Existing Development Impacted by Proposed Regional Road Undertakings), was undertaken for the properties on Grange Court, Pitfield Court, Heathcliffe Place and Cardiff Street that backlot onto Ira Needles Boulevard. This study concluded that a noise barrier was not warranted as part of this project.

Since that time there have been a number of concerns raised by residents in this area relating to traffic noise along Ira Needles Boulevard. In response to these concerns, Region staff proceeded to undertake a noise assessment review of this area to determine if a noise barrier was warranted.

Under Section 5.5, Part B of The Regional Municipality of Waterloo Implementation Guideline for Noise Policies where it has been the decision of Regional Council not to include noise attenuation barriers as part of a road undertaking, affected residents may request the Region to review the need for a noise barrier within 5 years of the road construction. Since noise attenuation barriers were not recommended as part of the construction of Ira Needles Boulevard in the vicinity of the properties on Grange Court, Pitfield Court, Heathcliffe Place and Cardiff Street that backlot onto Ira Needles Boulevard in 2007, Region staff has undertaken a review on whether noise barriers are warranted under Section 5.5 of the Noise Policy. For this review, the “revised” noise level was calculated using current traffic data. The need for a noise barrier was determined by using Section 4.2 of the Policy (as noted below), where the “projected” noise level is replaced with the “revised” noise level. If the review shows the need for a noise barrier, and residents, Area Municipal Council and Regional Council are in agreement; the noise barrier would be constructed and paid for by the Region.

Section 4.2 of the Noise Policy

- where the noise level in ten (10) years exceeds 65 dBA; or
- where the projected noise level in ten (10) years exceeds 60 dBA and the difference between the existing and projected noise levels is 5 dBA or more.

As part of this review, Region staff updated the traffic volumes. Figure 1 below compares the original 2004 Noise Study existing and projected Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) volumes to the updated 2010 AADT volumes. For this noise study review the actual 2010 AADT volumes replace the projected 2012 AADT volumes used in the original study.

Figure 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>2004 Noise Study</th>
<th>2010 Noise Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 AADT</td>
<td>Percentage of Commercial Vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Ave to Thorndale Drive</td>
<td>12,450</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Utilizing the Ministry of the Environment’s STAMSON computerized model, the 2010 AADT volumes were used to calculate the “revised” sound levels for the daytime (7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m.) period for the outdoor living area of each selected property. The results of the noise analysis review have been compared the existing noise levels without Ira Needles Boulevard and projected 2012 noise levels in Figure 2.

### Figure 2

#### Un-attenuated Daytime Noise Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noise Sensitive Locations (NSL)</th>
<th>2004 Noise Study</th>
<th>2010 Noise Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Noise Levels without Ira Needles</td>
<td>Projected 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calculated Outdoor Road Noise Level (dBA)</td>
<td>Calculated Outdoor Road Noise Level (dBA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>665 Grange Court</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187 Pitfield Court</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651 Cardiff Street</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>665 Heathcliffe Place</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By replacing the “projected” noise level with the “revised” noise level the daytime outdoor noise level is the same or 1 to 2 dBA lower than the projected 2012 noise levels. It should be noted, even though the 2010 traffic volumes are higher than the projected 2012 traffic volumes, the noise levels are not higher due to the fact that the percentage of commercial vehicles are lower and that the noise assessment review incorporated the existing property line and outdoor living area elevations. Based on this noise assessment review, a noise barrier is not warranted under Part B of the Region’s Noise Policy since;

- the revised noise level does not exceed 65 dBA; or
- where the revised noise level exceeds 60 dBA the difference between the existing noise levels without Ira Needles Boulevard and revised noise level is not greater than 5 dBA.

As part of the noise assessment review staff asked the consultant to calculate what traffic volume would be required on Ira Needles Boulevard in order to have the “calculated outdoor road noise level” at a noise level that would meet the warrants of Part B of the noise policy. It was determined that a traffic volume of 23,850 AADT would be required if the same percentage of commercial vehicles was used as in the 2010 Noise Study. The noise policy under Part B allows for a review of the need for a noise barrier within 5 years of the road construction and in this case it would be 2012. A noise review was also undertaken using the projected 2012 traffic volume of 17,900 AADT for this section of INB. The results are shown in Figure 3 and they do not meet the warrants for a noise wall under Part B of the noise policy As a result of the commercial development in this area, Region staff is currently updating traffic projections on Ira Needles Boulevard which will be completed by June or July of this year.
### Figure 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noise Sensitive Locations (NSL)</th>
<th>Existing Noise Levels without Ira Needles</th>
<th>Projected 2012 Noise Study</th>
<th>Change in dBA</th>
<th>Projected 2012 Noise Study</th>
<th>Change in dBA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>665 Grange Court</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187 Pitfield Court</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651 Cardiff Street</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>665 Heathcliff Place</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted, that at all the above Noise Sensitive Locations (see Appendix B) the revised noise level exceeds 60 dBA. Under Part C of The Regional Municipality of Waterloo Implementation Guideline for Noise Policies (Existing Development Impacted by Noise from Existing Developments) these locations would warrant the installation of a noise barrier. If the property owners in this area are interested in pursuing this option, the full cost of designing and constructing the noise barrier would be shared between the property owners and the Region in the following way:

- **50% affected property owners; and**
- **50% Region.**

If the affected property owners wish to pursue this option, the Region has determined the noise barrier would be vary between 2.0 to 3.2 metres in height for the Noise Sensitive Locations as shown in Figure 4. This noise barrier would involve 20 residential properties that are currently backlotting onto Ira Needles Boulevard (total length is approximately 460 metres in length). Currently the cost of designing and installing a noise barrier is approximately $460 per square metre. Based on a noise barrier of 460 metres in length with an average height of 2.6 metres it is expected the total cost of this noise barrier would be approximately $550,000. This noise barrier would meet the requirements of attenuating the daytime outdoor living area noise level by 5 dBA or more, to less than 60 dBA. As well, since the height of the wall in some areas will be greater than the maximum wall height of 2.4 metres permitted under the City of Waterloo By-law #05-88, the City of Waterloo would need to approve a wall height exemption. It should be noted that when the 2012 projected traffic volumes where used as part of this 2010 Noise Study the noise barrier height would need to increase in height from 3.2 metres to 3.7 metres at 665 Heathcliff Place. The reason for this increase is a result of the higher dBA achieved with the projected 2012 traffic volumes requiring a higher barrier to mitigate the noise levels by 5 dBA.
### Figure 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noise Sensitive Locations (NSL)</th>
<th>Noise Barrier Height (metres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>665 Grange Court</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187 Pitfield Court</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651 Cardiff Street</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>665 Heathcliffe Place</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The width of the properties backlotting onto Ira Needles ranges from 6 to 50 metres with a total noise barrier cost per property somewhere between $7,200 and $60,000 (assuming and average noise barrier height of 2.6 metres). It should be noted that the 6 metre wide properties are located on Grange Crescent while the properties north of Grange Crescent average width is approximately 37 metres.

Regional staff would then arrange a meeting with the affected property owners, Area Municipal staff and a Regional Councillor representing the Area Municipality to:

- Describe the situation, the individual noise attenuation options available to the property owners and the potential noise barrier solution;
- Outline the Local Improvement Act requirements, the benefitting properties and the approximate costs;
- Discuss whether the residents are interested in a barrier, and whether the Area Municipality would accept a barrier in that location;
- Determine who will represent the property owners; and
- Identify the next steps.

If there is general agreement to proceed, Regional staff will notify all the affected residents and establish a deadline for receiving a petition signed by at least two-thirds of the affected residents representing at least 50% of the property value in accordance with the Act.

Following the response deadline, Region staff would prepare a report for Regional Council, copied to the property owners, with the results of the response, and recommending construction of a noise barrier if sufficient residents support the proposal. Regional Council will circulate the report to the Area Municipal Council prior to considering the recommendation. If approved by Regional Council, Region staff would proceed to contract out the design and construction of the noise barrier. All of these costs, as well as financing costs will be cost-shared between the Region and affected residents (50%/50%). At the completion of the construction of the noise wall, Region staff would inform the property owners of the final cost and the Area Municipality would add the appropriate amount to the tax bill of the property owners, and reimburse the Region as the funds are collected.

Another option the property owners could consider would be to place sections of fencing constructed of high quality wood close to where the noise is heard, such as along individual patios. This could be a lower cost solution that would provide noise attenuation and would be totally within the resident’s power to design and implement.
It should be noted that on December 9, 2010 a letter was sent to all the residents on Grange Court, Pitfield Court, Heathcliffe Place and Cardiff Street that backlot onto Ira Needles Boulevard informing them of the results on the preliminary noise assessment review.

Other Issues

1) Background on how the existing Noise Policy was developed.

The existing Regional Municipality of Waterloo Implementation Guideline for Noise Policies was adopted by Regional Council in 1999 as the final step of a multi-year review of the Region’s policies regarding the assessment and mitigation of noise from roads and railways. The Area Municipalities, development community and members of the public had been broadly consulted during the development of these policies. Area Municipal and Consultant members of a Working Group had reviewed the proposed changes and public notification through the newspaper and mailings to anyone who expressed interest in this Guideline was done prior to Council approval.

In addition, the Implementation Guideline proposed a new set of policies which would apply when residents raised concern about noise from existing Regional roads (Part C-Existing Development Impacted by Noise from Existing Roads). The overall intent of this Implementation Guideline was to discourage the use of noise attenuation barriers (both noise walls and berms). At the time, it was felt by some Regional Council members that noise barriers, particularly noise walls, were not consistent with such initiatives as crime prevention, improved transit access, and neo-traditional neighbourhoods. Other members noted that noise barriers do serve a valid purpose in certain situations and may be the only means available to ensure the safety and comfort of residents. Overall, it was generally agreed that noise barriers can not be eliminated as an option, but that policies should focus on alternatives such as land use setbacks.

Since adding Part C to the Implementation Guideline only one property backlotting onto Dundas Street has been approved by Regional Council for a noise barrier under this section. The Region paid 100% of the total cost for this noise barrier based on the extenuating circumstances clause under Part C, section 1.5. The extenuating circumstance was this road was previously owned by the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) and the residents outdoor living area was located 4.6 metres (15 feet) from the edge of Dundas Street and when the road was widened by the MTO a Noise Study was not undertaken. Currently the noise issue along this section of Ira Needles Boulevard is not unlike requests for noise barriers along Regional roads such as, Erb Street, Ottawa Street, Bleams Road, Lackner Boulevard, Homer Watson Boulevard, University Avenue, Can-Amera Parkway and Fischer-Hallman Road.

In 1999, when the policy was adopted by Regional Council, it was estimated that there were approximately 38 kilometres of Regional roads where residents may request noise barriers at that time or in the future as traffic volumes increase. These sections met the following criteria: backlotted development; high existing or forecast traffic/truck volumes; located in an urban area; subject of noise complaints. Region staff has recently undertaken a second review of the locations where residents could request noise barriers since there has been significant growth in the Region since 1999 and it has been determined that there are approximately 55 linear kilometres where residents could request noise barriers and be warranted under Part C of the Guideline. It should be
noted, that it is not expected that noise barriers would be requested along all of these sections but if they were requested and warranted under Part C of the Guideline, the total cost of installing noise barriers in these locations would be in the range of $45 to $55 million.

2) Complaints relating to the Ira Needles Commercial Centre (The Boardwalk)

The Region and the City of Waterloo have received a number of complaints relating to amount of dust and noise and lighting levels relating to the Ira Needles Commercial Centre (the Boardwalk) that is currently under construction on the west side of Ira Needles Boulevard in this area. City of Waterloo staff has been responding to complaints as they have been received by contacting the consultant and contractor for the development. It should be noted that a noise wall in this location does not address any issues related to noise from the development.

3) Why does the new development north of Heathcliffe Place warrant a noise berm while the existing properties on Grange Court, Pittfield Court, Heathcliffe Place do not warrant a noise barrier?

New developments are covered under Part A (New Developments Impacted by Noise from Roads and Railways) of the Guidelines for Noise Policies. Under this part of the policy a noise berm is warranted based on the projected 10 year outdoor noise level and future berm was warranted since the projected outdoor noise level exceeded 60 dBA.

Costs for noise walls and berms for new development are borne by the developer with presumably full cost of the wall or berm recovered from the eventual purchaser of homes. Included in the price of the noise wall is a requirement to provide 55% of the cost of replacing the noise wall in the future. In essence the full cost of the noise wall or berm and 55% of the cost for future replacement of the noise wall is paid for by the home purchaser.

4) Future road widening of Ira Needles Boulevard

Currently Ira Needles Boulevard from Highview Drive to Erb Street is scheduled in the draft 2011 Transportation Capital Program to be widened equally on both sides of the road in 2019. It should be noted, based on the traffic growth on this section of Ira Needles Boulevard the widening may actually occur earlier than 2019.

It should be noted, since the centreline of the road will remain at the same location, the noise source (centreline of the road) distance to the noise receiver (outdoor living area) will be unchanged and noise levels will vary entirely based on traffic volume and percentage of commercial traffic.

As part of this road widening another Noise Study would be required under Part B of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo Implementation Guideline for Noise Policies (Existing Development Impacted by Proposed Regional Road Undertakings). Based on the results of this Noise Study a noise barrier would be installed (100% Region’s cost) if the Part B warrants are met.
CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This report addresses the Region’s Strategic Focus Area 5: Infrastructure and the following Corporate Strategic Objectives.

- 5.2 – provide infrastructure needed to accommodate growth

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The cost to install a noise barrier in the vicinity of Grange Court, Pitfield Court, Heathcliffe Place and Cardiff Street is approximately $550,000 assuming an average barrier height of 2.6 metres and length of 460 metres. Part C of the Noise policy states that the cost of the noise wall will be shared 50% by the affected residents and 50% by the Region unless there are extenuating circumstances and Regional Council adjusts the cost sharing formula. The draft 2011 Transportation Capital Program includes $250,000 in 2011 for the Region’s share of noise wall retrofits and repairs.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

NIL

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix A - The Regional Municipality of Waterloo Implementation Guideline for Noise Policies. (Document Not Attached)

Appendix B - Map showing the Ira Needles Boulevard at Grange Court, Pitfield Place, Cardiff Street and Heathcliffe Place.
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Noise Study Review Area
Ira Needles Boulevard at Grange Court, Pitfield Place, Cardiff Street and Heathcliffe Place
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15 April 2013

The Region of Waterloo International Airport
c/o Mr. Chris Wood
Airport General Manager
Region of Waterloo International Airport
75 New Germany Lane
Breslau, Ontario N0B 1M0

Dear Mr. Wood:

On behalf of the Board of Directors and members of COPA, I am pleased to inform you that The Region of Waterloo International Airport and you are this year’s recipient of the COPA President’s award, given annually to an individual(s) who has made a very notable contribution to Personal Aviation in Canada.

Support for our sector of aviation, as you balance airline and other airport activity, is evidenced by such notable items as working with the Regional Council on eliminating landing fees for smaller aircraft, providing financial support to help rejuvenate of local COPA Flight and providing meeting space for them, as well as enthusiastically supporting many GA events at the airport.

We will be announcing the award at our Fly-in and AGM in Dawson Creek BC on 22 June to give the Airport and you the national recognition you deserve. You are welcome to attend and although we do not have funding available for your travel costs, we will waive your registration fee. If you are unable to attend, I suggest that your award be presented at this year’s Waterloo Air Show, where COPA will be present at the Canadian Aviation Expo. I will be attending on Sunday and if a few moments can be provided during the air show, I will make sure that your achievement is recognized by all.

For your information, a list of previous award recipients is at www.copanational.org/COPAPastAwards.cfm.

Please let me know your preference for receiving the award. Congratulations!

Yours truly,

Kevin Psutka
President and CEO

Cc: Ken Seiling, Chair, Waterloo Regional Council
Paul Hayes, Chair COPA Board
David Lowe, Captain, Flight 26
<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>April. 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>Spring 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>May 28, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-Mar-13</td>
<td>G. Lorentz</td>
<td>Staff were requested to look into noise barriers on Bleams Road in the City of Kitchener</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>30-Apr-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>
</tbody>
</table>