MEDIA RELEASE:  Friday, September 27, 2013, 4:30 p.m.

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO
PLANNING AND WORKS COMMITTEE
AGENDA

Tuesday, October 1, 2013
12:30 P.M. (This is approximate)
Regional Council Chambers
150 Frederick Street, Kitchener

1. MOTION TO RECONVENE INTO OPEN SESSION

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

3. DELEGATIONS

4. DEPARTMENTAL PRE-BUDGET PRESENTATIONS
   a) PHCS – Community Planning and Transportation Planning - R. Horne
   b) T&ES – GRT, Transportation and Rapid Transit - T. Schmidt

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

5. REQUEST TO REMOVE ITEMS FROM CONSENT AGENDA

6. MOTION TO APPROVE ITEMS OR RECEIVE FOR INFORMATION
   a) P-13-092, Monthly Report of Development Activity for August 2013 (Approval) 1
   b) P-13-093, Amendment to Regional Municipality of Waterloo Controlled Access By-Law #58-87, for an Access to Regional Road #54 (Lackner Boulevard), City of Kitchener (Approval) 4
   c) E-13-094, Installation of Traffic Control Signals at Line 86 (Regional Road 86) and Manser Road (Regional Road 5), Township of Wellesley (Information) 9
   d) E-13-113, Revised Lane Configuration on Cherry Blossom Road at Maple Grove Road (Regional Road 38), City of Cambridge (Approval) 12
   e) E-13-114, Proposed Revisions to the Existing 50 KM/H Maximum Speed Limit on Wrigley Road (Regional Road 49), Township of North Dumfries (Approval) 15
7. REPORTS - PLANNING, HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

COMMUNITY PLANNING

a) P-13-094/F-13-088, Brownfields Financial Incentive Program – Tax Increment Grant Program Application – 55 Mooregate Cr., City of Kitchener

REPORTS - TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION

b) E-13-117, Bridge Barrier Systems on Region of Waterloo Bridges

c) River Road Extension from King Street to Manitou Drive, City of Kitchener

INFORMATION PACKAGE in advance of Public Consultation Centre

TRANSIT SERVICES

d) E-13-112, Mobility Plus Policy Update

TRANSPORTATION

e) E-13-090.1, Reserved Cycling Lanes on Highland Road (Regional Road 6) / Snyder’s Road (Regional Road 6) from Ira Needles Boulevard (Regional Road 70) to 320 Metres East of Notre Dame Drive (Regional Road 12) in the City of Kitchener and the Township of Wilmot

WATER SERVICES

f) E-13-119, Consultant Selection for the Surface Water Quality Monitoring Program

8. INFORMATION/CORRESPONDENCE

a) Council Enquiries and Requests for Information Tracking List

9. OTHER BUSINESS

10. NEXT MEETING – October 22, 2013

11. ADJOURN
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Works Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 22, 2013</td>
<td>1:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Planning and Works Committee</td>
<td>Council Chamber 2nd Floor, Regional Administration Building 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 12, 2013</td>
<td>1:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Planning and Works Committee</td>
<td>Council Chamber 2nd Floor, Regional Administration Building 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, October 1, 2013</td>
<td>Drop In: 4:30 P.M. 7:00 P.M. Presentation: 7:00 P.M. 8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>River Road Extension from King Street to Manitou Drive, City of Kitchener - Public Consultation Centre</td>
<td>Conestoga Place 110 Manitou Drive Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATION:


SUMMARY:

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

- Accepted the following plan of condominium;
- Draft approved the following plan of condominium;
- Released for registration the following plans of subdivision and plans of condominium; and
- Approved the following official plan amendment.

REPORT:

City of Cambridge

Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-12101
Draft Approval Date: November 29, 2012
Phase: Entire Plan
Applicant: AAK Developments
Location: 138 Main Street
Proposal: To permit the development of 12 residential apartment condominium units and 3 commercial condominium units.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid July 15, 2013
Commissioner’s Release: August 15, 2013

City of Waterloo

Plan of Condominium Application 30CDM-13405
Date Accepted: August 12, 2013
Applicant: KW4 Rent
Location: 271 Lester Street
Proposal: To permit the conversion of an existing rental apartment building into 20-5 bedroom residential condominium units.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid July 12, 2013
Draft Approval of Plan of Condominium 30CDM-13401

Applicant: Cook Homes Limited
Location: 435 Winchester Drive
Proposal: To permit the development of 53 residential townhouse units and 2 residential semi-detached units.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid May 24, 2013
Commissioner’s Approval: August 28, 2013
Came Into Effect: September 17, 2013

Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-12401

Draft Approval Date: July 4, 2012
Phase: Entire Plan
Applicant: IN8 (Sage Developments Inc.)
Location: 4, 10, 12 Hickory Street West and 310 Spruce Street
Proposal: To permit the development of 58 residential apartment condominium units and 3 non-residential amenity condominium units.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid August 6, 2013
Commissioner’s Release: August 16, 2013

Township of Wellesley

Registration of Draft Plan of Subdivision 30T-05501

Draft Approval Date: February 3, 2006
Phase: Phase 2
Applicant: Wm. J. Gies Construction Limited
Location: Gerber Road and Greenwood Hill Road
Proposal: To permit the development of 11 residential single detached units.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid July 19, 2013
Commissioner’s Release: August 20, 2013

Registration of Draft Plan of Subdivision 30T-06501

Draft Approval Date: June 6, 2008
Phase: Entire Plan
Applicant: Wm. J. Gies Construction Limited
Location: Gerber Road and Greenwood Hill Road
Proposal: To permit the development of 25 residential single detached units and 18 residential semi-detached units.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid July 19, 2013
Commissioner’s Release: August 20, 2013

Official Plan Amendment No. 6

Applicant: Daniel and Marlene Wagler
Location: 2411 Gerber Road and 1315 Hutchison Road
Proposal: To redesignate the area to Industrial/Commercial Area to accommodate the expansion of Leis Pet Food Manufacturing Ltd., as well as the introduction of a veterinary clinic.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid June 10, 2013
Commissioner’s Approval: August 21, 2013
Came Into Effect: September 11, 2013
Residential Subdivision Activity January 1, 2013 to August 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>162</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</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>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Waterloo</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>69</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 August 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>357</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</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>930</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180</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 consistent with objectives of Focus Area A: Growth Management and Prosperity.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS: NIL

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE: NIL

ATTACHMENTS: 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 an amendment to Controlled Access By-law #58-87 for a full-movement, temporary access on the east side of Regional Road #54 (Lackner Boulevard), approximately 140 metres south of Regional Road # 04 (Ottawa Street) in the City of Kitchener, subject to site plan approval by the City of Kitchener and closure of all existing accesses to the property from Lackner Boulevard as described in Report No. P-13-093, dated October 1, 2013.

SUMMARY:

Hallman Construction Limited is the owner of a vacant parcel of land on the east side of Regional Road #54 (Lackner Boulevard) immediately south of the intersection with Regional Road #4 (Ottawa Street). Hallman Construction Limited is permitting Reid’s Heritage Homes to install a temporary sales trailer on these lands for the purpose of selling homes on a property Reid’s Heritage Homes owns to the south of the proposed sales trailer at 50 Bryan Court in the City of Kitchener (Appendix 1). Reid’s Heritage Homes is requesting a temporary access on the east side of Lackner Boulevard for the temporary sales trailer approximately 140 metres south of Ottawa Street (Appendix 2). The vacant property owned by Hallman Construction is not proposed for additional development at this time. There are two existing accesses from Lackner Boulevard to the property owned by Hallman Construction Limited that have been constructed without approval of the Region of Waterloo. Approval of the proposed amendment to Controlled Access By-law #58-87 for the proposed temporary sales trailer is recommended to be conditional on site plan approval by the City of Kitchener and closure of the existing accesses to Lackner Boulevard.

The temporary access to Lackner Boulevard is to be closed when the sales trailer is no longer required.

Region of Waterloo staff have reviewed the proposed location of the temporary access to Lackner Boulevard and recommend approval of the proposed by-law amendment as the access will meet minimum standards. Approval of the amendment should be subject to site plan approval by the City of Kitchener and closure of the existing accesses to Lackner Boulevard.

City of Kitchener Planning staff, Hallman Construction Limited and Reid’s Heritage Homes are all in support of the location of the proposed temporary access to Lackner Boulevard and the closure of all existing accesses.
As Lackner Boulevard is designated as a Controlled Access Prohibited Road under the Region’s Controlled Access By-law #58-87 from Regional Road #55 (Victoria Street) to Regional Road #53 (Fairway Road), an amendment to this by-law is required to permit this temporary access.

**REPORT:**

By-law #58-87, “A By-law to Designate and Regulate Controlled – Access Roads” was enacted to control the construction or alteration to the geometric design of any private means of access to a Regional Road. All Regional Roads are included in either Schedule “A” or Schedule “B” of the By-law. Regional Roads included in Schedule “A” (Controlled Access-Prohibited) include arterial roads and freeways where access to these roads must be restricted due to high traffic speed and volume. The main function of a Controlled Access – Prohibited Road is to move through traffic. All requests for changes to existing accesses or for new accesses on these roads require an amendment to the By-law. All remaining Regional Roads are included in Schedule “B” (Controlled Access – Regulated). The function of a Controlled Access – Regulated Road is to move through traffic and provide access to adjacent lands. Typically, these roads are front-lotted with access available only to the Regional road or are comparatively lower volume rural roads.

Hallman Construction Limited is the owner of a vacant parcel of land on the east side of Regional Road #54 (Lackner Boulevard) immediately south of the intersection of Regional Road #4 (Ottawa Street) and Lackner Boulevard. Hallman Construction Limited is permitting Reid’s Heritage Homes to install a temporary sales trailer on these lands for the purpose of selling homes on a property Reid’s Heritage Homes owns to the south of the proposed sales trailer at 50 Bryan Court in the City of Kitchener (Appendix 1). Reid’s Heritage Homes is requesting a temporary access on the east side of Lackner Boulevard for the temporary sales trailer approximately 140 metres south of Ottawa Street (Appendix 2). The vacant property owned by Hallman Construction Limited is not proposed for additional development at this time.

Region of Waterloo staff have reviewed the proposed location of the proposed temporary access to Lackner Boulevard and recommend approval of the proposed by-law amendment as the access will meet minimum standards. There are currently two existing accesses to the property that have recently been installed without approval of the Region of Waterloo. It is recommended that approval of the proposed by-law amendment for the proposed temporary sales trailer is recommended to be subject to site plan approval by the City of Kitchener and closure of the existing accesses to Lackner Boulevard.

The temporary access to Lackner Boulevard is to be closed to Region of Waterloo standards when the sales trailer is no longer required.

City of Kitchener Planning staff, Hallman Construction and Reid’s Heritage Homes are all in support of the location of the proposed temporary access to Lackner Boulevard.

As Lackner Boulevard is designated as a Controlled Access Prohibited Road under the Region’s Controlled Access By-law #58-87 from Regional Road #55 (Victoria Street) to Regional Road #53 (Fairway Road), an amendment to this by-law is required to permit this temporary access.

**Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination**

City of Kitchener Planning staff support the location of the proposed temporary access to Lackner Boulevard and the closure of all existing accesses.
CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

Managing access to the Regional Road system is integral to the development approval process and is represented in Focus Area 2: Growth Management and Prosperity: Manage growth to foster thriving and productive urban and rural communities.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Reid’s Heritage Homes will be responsible for all costs to construct the proposed temporary access and to close the access to Region of Waterloo standards when the temporary sales trailer is no longer required.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Corporate Resources would be required to amend Controlled Access By-law #58-87. Upon issuance of a Regional Road Access Permit, Transportation Engineering would issue a Regional Work Permit to perform works within the Regional right-of-way on Lackner Boulevard.

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix 1 – Key Map showing the location of the properties.
Appendix 2 – Location of the proposed temporary access and proposed amendment to Controlled Access By-law #58-87.

PREPARED BY: Jason Wigglesworth, Technician

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

DATE: October 1, 2013

FILE CODE: T01-20/5, T01-20/86, T08-50/2 WELL

SUBJECT: INSTALLATION OF TRAFFIC CONTROL SIGNALS AT LINE 86 (REGIONAL ROAD 86) AND MANSER ROAD (REGIONAL ROAD 5), TOWNSHIP OF WELLESLEY

RECOMMENDATION:

For Information

SUMMARY:

NIL

REPORT:

The intersection of Line 86 (Regional Road 86) and Manser Road situated in the Region of Waterloo and County of Wellington currently operates as a 2-way stop-controlled intersection with stop signs controlling traffic on Manser Road. The posted speed limit on all approaches to the intersection is 80 km/h. Approximately 7900 vehicles enter the intersection on a typical weekday. Figure 1 illustrates the intersection location.

Figure 1 – Intersection of Line 86 and Manser Road
The Region of Waterloo undertook a turning movement count in 2010 and determined based on an assessment of traffic volumes that additional traffic control should be considered at the intersection. To confirm the need for additional traffic control, a follow-up study was completed in 2011. The follow-up assessment yielded similar results thus confirming the need for additional traffic control. The following Table 1 illustrates the results of both traffic control signal warrant analyses.

Table 1 – Traffic Control Signal Warrant Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Justification 1 Minimum Vehicular Volume</th>
<th>Justification 2 Delay to Cross Traffic</th>
<th>Justification 3 Combination Justification</th>
<th>Justification 4 4-hour Volume</th>
<th>Justification 5 Collision Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>Fulfilled</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Fulfilled</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For traffic control signals to be considered, Justification 1, 2, 4 or 5 must be met 100% or Justification 3 must be fulfilled. Justification 3 is considered fulfilled when Justification 1 and 2 both meet or exceed 80%. The intersection experienced 3 collisions between 2007 and 2011 where 3 collisions were expected based on the Region’s collision prediction model.

It is Regional policy to consider the need for a roundabout whenever traffic control signals are being considered. As such, a roundabout screening analysis was completed to determine the preferred traffic control at the intersection. The traffic control yielding the lowest life-cycle cost is typically recommended as the preferred traffic control to operate an intersection. For this intersection the traffic control signal is estimated to yield the lowest overall 20-year present value life-cycle cost.

As the subject intersection is situated on a boundary road shared with the County of Wellington, the Region of Waterloo and County of Wellington must agree upon any capital improvement works before either party can proceed with an improvement. Additionally any capital improvement works proposed by either party requires each respective agency to cost share the improvement equally. Staff at the County of Wellington is in agreement with the installation of a traffic control signal and is planning to include funds in their 2014 capital program to fund the cost of traffic signals 50%. Funds required to construct the traffic control signal will be included in the Region’s 2014 Transportation Capital Program and will be subject to Regional Council approval.

The Region’s Roundabout Coordination Committee has reviewed the need for a roundabout at this location and is in agreement with the recommendation to proceed with a traffic control signal. Township of Wellesley staff has been consulted and support the installation of traffic control signals as well.

Transportation Division staff obtained input from the public on the proposed traffic control signals over a two week period. Of the 39 responses received, 41% support the installation of traffic control signals while 59% do not. Those opposed to the recommendation have generally indicated that they would prefer a roundabout at this location because of concerns with traffic signal delay. In general, travelers by motor vehicle prefer a roundabout and travelers by horse and buggy prefer a traffic control signal. To address concerns, vehicle detection devices will be utilized at the traffic signals to minimize delays to drivers of both motor vehicles and horse and buggies.

As per the agreement between the County of Wellington and Region of Waterloo, staff at the County of Wellington will be responsible for maintaining the traffic control signal.

Concerned parties who have requested to be notified of when this report will be presented to the Region’s Planning and Works Committee have been advised accordingly.
The installation of the traffic signals is expected to be completed in July 2014 provided funding is approved by the Region of Waterloo and the County of Wellington.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This report addresses the Region’s goal to optimize existing road capacity to safely manage traffic throughout Waterloo Region (Strategic Objective 3.3)

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The Region of Waterloo’s 50% of the cost of traffic control signals is estimated to be approximately $50,000 and will be included in the 2014 Transportation Capital Program.

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: October 1, 2013

FILE CODE: T08-50/105C

SUBJECT: REVISED LANE CONFIGURATION ON CHERRY BLOSSOM ROAD AT MAPLE GROVE ROAD (REGIONAL ROAD 38), CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo amend Traffic and Parking By-Law 06-072, as amended, to add to Schedule 16 – Lane Designation, northbound left-turn, left-turn / through / right-turn lane on Cherry Blossom Road at Maple Grove Road (Regional Road 38) in the City of Cambridge, as outlined in Report E-13-113, dated October 1, 2013.

SUMMARY:

NIL

REPORT:

Last year, Transportation Division staff reviewed and revised the timing of traffic signals in the area surrounding the Toyota Motor Manufacturing Canada Inc. (TMMC) plants along Fountain Street in Cambridge. During shift changes thousands of team members exit the plants and enter the Regional road network. During these periods special signal timing plans are in place to limit congestion and increase road safety. With improved signal timing changes in place, the intersection of Cherry Blossom Road and Maple Grove Road continues to operate poorly. Figure 1 below shows typical queuing on Cherry Blossom Road during the PM peak period.

Figure 1- Current Congestion on Cherry Blossom Road at Maple Grove Road
Transportation Division staff has reviewed the existing lane arrangements and determined that changes can be implemented on Cherry Blossom Road to permit dual northbound left-turn lanes. Currently the northbound through and right-turn traffic demand is low. Therefore the curb lane on Cherry Blossom Road can be changed from a through-right lane to a combined left-through-right lane. It is forecasted that the proposed lane configuration will reduce queuing and delay by approximately 50% during the afternoon peak period. Figure 2 below shows the proposed lane configuration.

Figure 2 - Proposed Lane Configuration – Maple Grove Road and Cherry Blossom Road

The proposed lane configuration will require the traffic signals to operate the northbound and southbound movements separately. Figure 3 below illustrates the current and proposed signal phasing concept.

Figure 3 - Current and Proposed Signal Phasing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Maple Grove Left-turns</th>
<th>East/ West Maple Grove</th>
<th>North/ South Cherry Blossom</th>
<th>Southbound Cherry Blossom</th>
<th>Northbound Cherry Blossom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Signal Phasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Signal Phasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cherry Blossom Road is under the jurisdiction of the City of Cambridge. City staff support the proposed lane configuration to increase capacity and reduce congestion.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This report addresses the Region’s goal to identify and address priority transportation bottlenecks to reduce road congestion and improve safety (Strategic Objective 3.3.1).

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The cost associated with implementing the proposed lane configuration on Cherry Blossom Road includes civil work, traffic signal equipment changes, pavement marking adjustments and additional signage totaling $25,000 and is provided for in the 2014 Major Traffic Signal Modernization budget.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

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

ATTACHMENTS:

NIL

PREPARED BY:  Jeff Cornwell, Traffic Systems Management Analyst

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

DATE: October 1, 2013

FILE CODE: T01-20/49

SUBJECT: PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE EXISTING 50 KM/H MAXIMUM SPEED LIMIT ON WRIGLEY ROAD (REGIONAL ROAD 49), TOWNSHIP OF NORTH DUMFRIES

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo amend Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended, to remove from Schedule 18, 80 km/h maximum speed, Wrigley Road (Regional Road 49) from 750 metres east of Stanley Street to Spragues Road (Regional Road 75), in the Township of North Dumfries, as outlined in Report E-13-114, dated October 1, 2013.

SUMMARY:

NIL

REPORT:

At its regular scheduled meeting, on March 4, 2013, Township of North Dumfries Council passed a motion requesting that the Region of Waterloo review the existing 50 km/h speed limit on Wrigley Road (Regional Road 49) to more accurately reflect the settlement boundary of Ayr. A copy of the Township of North Dumfries Council resolution is included in Appendix A.

In 1996, the Township of North Dumfries requested that the Region of Waterloo extend the 50 km/h speed zone on Wrigley Road approximately 350 metres further east to encompass the Hall gravel pit access and this was approved by Regional Council in March 1996.

The settlement boundary limit for Ayr is situated approximately 150 metres east of Hilltop Drive and the existing 50 km/h zone extends to approximately 650 metres east of Hilltop Drive. Transportation Division staff is recommending that the 50 km/h speed zone be changed to align with the single residential property which is just east of the settlement boundary of Ayr. Figure 1 illustrates Wrigley Road east of Hilltop Drive and includes the proposed reduction of the 50 km/h speed zone.
Figure 1 – Wrigley Road Existing and Proposed Speed Limits

Speed surveys conducted on April 9, 2013 captured the travel speed of 1,828 vehicles during a 24-hour period. The survey shows that the average travel speed of motorists along this section of Wrigley Road is 62 km/h with a posted speed limit of 50 km/h. Additional speed surveys conducted in September show an average travel speed of 65 km/h. These measurements likely captured eastbound motorists accelerating and westbound motorists decelerating as they transitioned to and from the different speed zones.

To allow for public comment, Transportation staff placed information signs from August 8, 2013 to August 22, 2013 along Wrigley Road requesting comments from the public through the Region’s website or via telephone. An internet questionnaire was set up to receive comments and a telephone number was provided. As a follow up to the web survey, questionnaires were mailed to residents fronting Wrigley Road within the limits of the proposed revision.

A total of 13 responses were received showing that 54% of respondents are in support of relocating the 50 km/h speed zone to align with the settlement boundary of Ayr and 46% oppose relocating the 50 km/h speed zone. The majority of respondents in opposition to the proposed change indicate that this will result in increased speeds within the residential area west of Hilltop Drive.

Waterloo Regional Police Services were consulted and support staff’s recommendation.
Transportation Division staff is recommending to relocate the existing 50 km/h speed zone to better align with the settlement boundary of Ayr.

As outlined in the Highway Traffic Act (HTA), no person shall drive a motor vehicle at a rate of speed greater than 80 km/h not within a built up area and no person shall drive a motor vehicle more than 50 km/h within a built up area unless otherwise posted. Therefore the existing by-law in Schedule 18 can be removed and signs can be installed to reflect the new proposed speed zone limits.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

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

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The cost to relocate the 50 km/h speed zone is approximately $550 and is provided for in the maintenance budget.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

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

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix A - Township of North Dumfries Council Resolution

PREPARED BY: Patricia Heft, Engineering Technologist, Traffic Engineering

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF NORTH DUMFRIES

March 4, 2013 / Session
No: C-96-1

Moved by:
Seconded by:

That the Region of Waterloo be requested to review the existing 50 km/h speed limit on Wrigley Road (Regional Road #49) to more accurately reflect the settlement boundary of Ayr.

Carried
Lost
Deferred

Rob Deutschmann
Mayor
Township of North Dumfries

Item # 76
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: October 1, 2013

FILE CODE: A31-60

SUBJECT: WASTE MANAGEMENT DIVISION ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM UPDATE (ISO 14001 RE-CERTIFICATION)

RECOMMENDATION:

For information.

SUMMARY:

The Waterloo Waste Management Centre has successfully re-certified the Division’s Environmental Management System to the year 2016. Since being originally certified in 1998, the Division has annually set several environmental goals and programs. Through the successful completion of these programs, environmental performance has been enhanced through reduced impacts to groundwater, surface water and air as well as realizing increases in diversion of waste.

REPORT:

Background

This report provides an update on the Waste Management Division’s environmental management system (EMS) and International Standard Organization (ISO) 14001 Certification.

ISO 14001 is an internationally developed and recognized environmental standard that was established in 1996 by the International Organization for Standardization (ISO). ISO, a worldwide organization based in Geneva, establishes various standards relating to the environment, quality control, and health and safety.

The Region successfully obtained ISO 14001 certification for the Waterloo Waste Management Centre (WMC) in 1998 and has actively maintained certification ever since. It was the first municipal landfill in North America to achieve this designation.

Description of the Environmental Management System:

An Environmental Management System (EMS) is a tool used to assess, measure and track the immediate and long-term environmental impacts of an organization’s products, services and operations. The environmental management system focuses on:

- Developing and communicating an environmental policy (attached),
- Documenting procedures and policies, specifically to reduce environmental impact,
- Conducting environmental training for staff, contractors and suppliers,
- Developing and implementing emergency response procedures,
- Communicating in an open and transparent manner with stakeholders in the community,
- Identifying and evaluating existing and emerging regulatory and legislative requirements, and
- Setting objectives and targets to improve overall environmental performance.

In the fall of 2012, the Ministry of Environment (MOE) conducted a compliance inspection at the Waterloo site that included a site inspection and an in-depth review of various records (including various EMS documents). The inspection verified conformance to applicable legislation and the site specific Certificate of Approval.

**The Certification Process:**

An independent third party audits the EMS and verifies that it conforms to the requirements specified in the international ISO 14001 standards. This information is publicly communicated to any interested stakeholders, made available on the Region’s website and communicated to staff, contractors, consultants and suppliers. In addition to the re-certification audit, Staff performs annual internal audits to ensure adherence to the standards.

In July 2013, the Division participated in a two-day external audit and successfully obtained re-certification (see attached) for a period covering August 16, 2013 to August 15, 2016.

**Benefits of the EMS:**

There are many benefits to implementing an EMS, including:

- Setting ongoing environmental goals which foster continuous improvement,
- Demonstrating environmental compliance,
- Establishing and maintaining standard operating practices,
- Increasing staff and contractor environmental awareness, and
- Strengthening relations with the community and regulators.

Also, many of the elements of the EMS for Waterloo are directly applicable for use at the Cambridge Waste Management Centre and the Rural Transfer Stations and assist staff during MOE inspections of those facilities.

Some examples of the historical environmental goals that have been successfully achieved include:

- Improving surface water quality,
- Reducing community odour impacts,
- Improving air quality inside the Materials Recycling Centre (MRC),
- Conserving landfill space by utilizing alternative daily cover, and
- Recovering additional recyclables in the MRC.

Many of these goals, once the targets have been achieved, are incorporated into our standard operating practices.
CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

Maintenance of the Environmental Management System and re-certification to the international standard ISO 14001 is consistent with the Region’s Corporate Strategic Objective Focus Area 1 “Environmental Sustainability: Protect and enhance the environment”.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

All costs associated with the Waste Management environmental management system discussed in this report are provided for in the approved 2013 Operating budget.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Nil

ATTACHMENTS:

Environmental Policy
ISO 14001 Certificate of Registration

PREPARED BY:  Deanna Dakin, Coordinator, Waste Management
               Linda Churchill, Senior Environmental Engineer, Waste Management

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

Waste Management Division
ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY
June 2011

The Waste Management Division is mandated to provide safe and efficient disposal of residential and industrial solid waste, and waste diversion services within the Regional Municipality of Waterloo.

Our Environmental Policy will govern the operations and programs undertaken at the Waste Management Centre, located at 925 Erb Street, West, Waterloo, Ontario.

The Waste Management Division is committed to an environmental policy which benefits the community and businesses we serve, the people we employ, and the environment we affect. Therefore it is our policy to:

- Make environmental considerations a priority in all planning and decision-making processes;
- Manage our activities so as to meet both the letter and intent of environmental legislation and other requirements to which we subscribe; and to maintain records and report as required to the appropriate authorities on environmental incidents;
- Identify and monitor significant environmental impacts and set measurable objectives and targets to reduce those impacts on the environment through pollution prevention and planning and to continually improve our environmental performance through the establishment and maintenance of an Environmental Management System;
- Conduct regular environmental audits to confirm that practices comply with established environmental policy, procedures, objectives and targets, relevant legislation and the principles of sound environmental management;
- Communicate openly and in a timely manner with the community, businesses, our employees, and other stakeholders on our policies and programs for environmental management and to make the environmental commitments readily available to interested parties; and
- Regularly review this policy, and revise when appropriate, to ensure that it continues to meet the needs and expectations of this organization, our employees, and the communities and businesses we serve.

Linda Churchill, P.Eng.
Environmental Management Representative

Joy Arsenault, P.Eng.
Director, Waste Management
Appendix 2

Certificate of Registration
ISO 14001:2004

Regional Municipality of Waterloo
Waste Management Division/Waste Management Centre
925 Erb Street
Waterloo, Ontario N2J 3Z4 CANADA

Has been granted the authority and license to use the TRC Registered Firm Symbol® and listed in the TRC, Inc. “Listing of Registered Firms” as qualified by the TRC Management System Registration Program Agreement. This certification is for the following environmental scope:

Operation of a municipal solid waste landfill and provision of waste reduction and blue box recycling services.

This certificate is based on an audit demonstrating Environmental Management System conformance and evaluation in accordance with the requirements of ISO 14001:2004.

Original Issue Date: August 16, 2010
Current Term Date of Issue: August 14, 2013
Current Term Expiration: August 13, 2016

Certificate Number: TRC 00719

President, The Registrar Company, Inc.

300 North Coit Road, Suite 800 Richardson, TX 75080
800-966-3291
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: October 1, 2013

FILE CODE: F-25-20

SUBJECT: BROWNFIELDS FINANCIAL INCENTIVE PROGRAM - TAX INCREMENT GRANT PROGRAM APPLICATION – 55 MOOREGATE CR, CITY OF KITCHENER

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following action regarding the property municipally known as 55 Mooregate Crescent in the City of Kitchener:

a) Approve a joint Tax Increment Grant for an amount not to exceed $343,172 to be financed from the incremental tax revenue for the property following remediation and redevelopment;

b) Provide the Tax Increment Grant subject to the completion of remediation and redevelopment on the property and upon final confirmation of any additional brownfield related financial assistance rendered under the Region’s Brownfield Financial Incentive Program or through the City of Kitchener; and

c) Authorize the Region’s Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services and Chief Financial Officer to execute any associated agreements with the registered owner of 55 Mooregate Crescent and the City of Kitchener, as described in Report P-13-094/F-13-088, dated October 1, 2013, with the form and content of such agreement(s) to be satisfactory to both the Regional and City of Kitchener Solicitors.

SUMMARY:

Since the fall of 2012, City of Kitchener and Regional staff have been in discussions with Savic Homes Ltd. (the applicant) regarding a forthcoming application to the joint Tax Increment Grant (TIG) program. On November 27, 2012 the City of Kitchener received a joint TIG application by the applicant in regards to the remediation and redevelopment of the property municipally known as 55 Mooregate Crescent in Kitchener. On February 6, 2013 Regional Council approved a longer term Regional funding framework for the joint TIG program (Report P-13-004/F-13-007). As a result, the applicant’s joint TIG application was accepted by the Region on February 14, 2013.

Approval of the joint TIG would facilitate the redevelopment of a vacant, contaminated, former waste disposal site to accommodate 31 townhomes in an existing residential neighbourhood serviced by Grand River Transit (iXpress Route 201).

The applicant has submitted actual remediation costs for the site of $773,814. This amount, plus a 10% allowance for indirect costs afforded under the joint TIG program ($77,381), less assistance already received under the Phase Two ESA Grant ($11,117) and Regional
Development Charge (RDC) exemptions ($278,690) results in a maximum eligible joint TIG of $561,388. The grant would be cost-shared between the Region and the City of Kitchener with grant proportions determined by each municipality’s share of the municipal taxes levied on the property with 61.1% ($343,172) being provided by the Region and the remaining 38.9% ($218,217) provided by the City of Kitchener. The annual payments, which are estimated to last nine (9) years, would not start until after the property is fully remediated, redeveloped and ultimately reassessed by the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC).

City of Kitchener staff prepared a report recommending the joint TIG application to their General Committee, which was approved on September 9, 2013. The joint TIG application was subsequently approved by Kitchener City Council on September 16, 2013.

The Region’s portion of the joint TIG ($343,172) would be funded from the incremental tax revenue following remediation and redevelopment.

As a condition of approval under the joint TIG program, an Interim Tri-Partite Remediation and Redevelopment agreement between the applicant, the Region and the City of Kitchener would be required.

This report provides details of the application, the site and proposed redevelopment, joint TIG program requirements used to evaluate the application, details of the proposed financial commitments, TIG payment schedules and a recommendation for approval of the Region’s fifth complete joint TIG application.

REPORT:

Brownfield Financial Incentive Program Background

In October 2006, Regional Council approved the framework for a Regional Brownfields Financial Incentive Program (BFIP). The goals of the BFIP are to encourage the remediation and redevelopment of brownfield sites, to promote reurbanization and to reduce the outward movement of the urban area in support of the Regional Growth Management Strategy (RGMS) and the Province’s Places to Grow Growth Plan.

Currently, the BFIP consists of three forms of financial assistance for the development community:

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

2. Regional Development Charge (RDC) exemptions for Brownfields – the RDC by-law provides for development charge exemptions up to the total eligible remediation costs associated with the clean up of contaminated properties outside the core areas of Cambridge and Kitchener;

3. Joint Tax Increment Grants (TIGs) – a joint incentive with participating Area Municipalities to further assist with eligible remediation costs by providing the developer with a grant based on the increase in municipal taxes resulting from the completion of remediation, redevelopment and reassessment of a contaminated property.
The BFIP also provides funding for Area Municipalities to assist in amending or developing Community Improvement Plans (CIPs) to provide for the implementation of the joint TIG program.

**Brownfield Financial Incentive Program Update**

Since 2006, the Region has approved 25 applications under the BFIP comprising of 17 Phase Two ESA grants, 4 RDC exemptions and 4 joint TIGs. These incentives represent a total Regional commitment of $12,043,007, of which $6,490,172 has been approved by the Region through the joint TIG program.

**Application Details: 55 Mooregate Crescent, Kitchener**

On November 27, 2012 the City of Kitchener received a joint TIG application by Savic Homes Ltd. (the applicant) in regard to the remediation and redevelopment of a property municipally known as 55 Mooregate Crescent in Kitchener. On February 6, 2013 Regional Council approved a longer term Regional funding framework for the joint TIG program (Report P-13-004/F-13-007). As a result, the applicant’s joint TIG application was subsequently accepted by the Region on February 14, 2013.

55 Mooregate Crescent is an irregularly shaped parcel consisting of 0.44 ha (1.09 acres) near the intersection of Westmount and Victoria Streets in west Kitchener (please see Attachment 1 for site map). The site is located in an existing urban, residential neighbourhood which is currently serviced by Grand River Transit and is located in close proximity to the iXpress Route 201. Prior to remediation, the site had been vacant and did not contain any buildings or structures. The redevelopment of the site consists of five blocks of three-storey townhomes totaling 31 units.

Environmental site investigations determined that the property formed part of a historical waste disposal site. Environmental contaminants found on the property included concentrations of lead, arsenic, copper and benzo(a)pyrene at levels in exceedance of accepted Ministry of Environment Table 2 standards for residential development. The site is located in a Wellhead Protection Sensitivity Area (WPSA) 7 and 8 (Regional Official Plan, Map 6A).

As part of the application process, a Remedial Work Plan was submitted by the applicant (prepared by a Qualified Person as defined and required by Ontario Regulation 153/04, as amended). This work plan provided an estimate of the remediation costs for the site which City of Kitchener and Regional staff reviewed and found to be acceptable.

Remediation activities have concluded on the site and a Record of Site Condition has been filed and acknowledged by the Ministry of Environment. Redevelopment of the site to accommodate the 31 townhomes is currently underway.

The applicant has submitted actual remediation costs for the site of $773,814. This amount, plus a 10% allowance for indirect costs afforded under the joint TIG program ($77,381), less assistance already received under the Phase Two ESA Grant ($11,117) and Regional Development Charge (RDC) exemptions ($278,690) under the BFIP results in a maximum eligible joint TIG of $561,388. The grant will be cost-shared between the Region and the City of Kitchener with grant proportions determined by each municipality’s share of the municipal taxes levied on the property with 61.1% ($343,172) being provided by the Region and the remaining 38.9% ($218,217) provided by the City of Kitchener. The annual payments, which are estimated to last nine (9) years, would not start until after the property is fully remediated,
redeveloped and ultimately reassessed by the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC). Payments are not expected to commence before 2015.

As a condition of final approval of eligible costs, invoices must be submitted by the applicant and must be approved for eligibility by City of Kitchener and Regional staff.

**Joint TIG Application Review**

As part of staff’s review, the site and proposed redevelopment were evaluated based on the following standard eligibility criteria developed by the Region and Area Municipalities for the joint TIG program:

1. The site must be located within the designated Area Municipal Community Improvement Plan (CIP) Project Area where the CIP allows for implementation of the Regional BFIP;

2. The applicant must be the registered owner of the site or an assignee of the owner;

3. The applicant cannot be responsible for causing the on-site contamination that requires remediation;

4. The remediation and redevelopment undertaken must result in a minimum increased property assessment value of $100,000;

5. The Environmental Site Assessments must be completed by a “Qualified Person” (as per Ontario Regulation 153/04);

6. Redevelopment plans must meet all approved policy and should comply, where feasible and appropriate, with applicable design guidelines;

7. The site must not be in a position of tax arrears or have any outstanding municipal financial obligations; and

8. Application for a TIG must be made prior to issuance of building permit(s) for the redevelopment.

City of Kitchener and Regional staff have reviewed the application for 55 Mooregate Crescent under the above eligibility criteria, and are satisfied that the site and proposed redevelopment have met the requirements of the joint TIG program. On September 9, 2013, the City of Kitchener considered and approved this application at their General Committee (please see Attachment 2). The joint TIG application was subsequently approved at Kitchener City Council on September 16, 2013. Regional staff is recommending that the Regional portion of the joint TIG be approved by Regional Council.

**Joint TIG Calculations and Payment Schedule**

The anticipated joint TIG payments and schedule are determined based on the following key pieces of information:

- Estimate of the anticipated property assessment increment upon completion of redevelopment;

- Estimated increase in municipal (Regional and City) taxes (known as the tax increment) based on the estimated assessment upon completion of the redevelopment; and
Estimate of the total eligible remediation costs (including a 10% allowance for indirect remediation costs but less the total of any additional government financial assistance received for the project).

This information is collectively used to determine the potential maximum joint TIG the site could receive as well as the potential eligible joint TIG amount the site can achieve based on the estimated remediation costs. The resulting grant is equal to the increment between the pre-remediation and redevelopment municipal property taxes and the post-remediation and redevelopment municipal property taxes. The grant is paid to the applicant on an annual basis for a maximum period of 10 years or until total eligible remediation costs have been recovered, which ever comes first.

Table 1 summarizes the estimated potential maximum joint TIG and the estimated potential eligible TIG amount for this application, including a break down of the Regional and City of Kitchener portions.

Table 2 identifies the anticipated payment period. It should be noted that these estimates are preliminary. The joint TIG grant payment schedule will not be finalized until the actual remediation costs are reviewed and the MPAC assessment is received following the redevelopment of the property.

For more detailed information on the tax increment calculations and methodology please see Attachment 3.

**Table 1: Estimated Tax Increment Grants for 55 Mooregate Crescent, Kitchener**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maximum Potential TIG</th>
<th>Eligible TIG Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>$25,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>$39,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total TIG</td>
<td></td>
<td>$64,426</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rounded to the nearest dollar

**Table 2: Estimated TIG Payment Schedule for 55 Mooregate Crescent, Kitchener**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total TIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,043</td>
<td>$39,383</td>
<td>$64,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$25,043</td>
<td>$39,383</td>
<td>$64,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$25,043</td>
<td>$39,383</td>
<td>$64,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$25,043</td>
<td>$39,383</td>
<td>$64,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$25,043</td>
<td>$39,383</td>
<td>$64,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$25,043</td>
<td>$39,383</td>
<td>$64,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$25,043</td>
<td>$39,383</td>
<td>$64,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$25,043</td>
<td>$39,383</td>
<td>$64,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$17,873</td>
<td>$28,108</td>
<td>$45,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total TIG</td>
<td>$218,217</td>
<td>$343,172</td>
<td>$561,389</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rounded to the nearest dollar
Interim Tri-Partite Remediation and Redevelopment Agreement

As a condition of approval under the joint TIG program an Interim Tri-Partite Remediation and Redevelopment Agreement (the “Interim Agreement”) between the land owner(s), the Region of Waterloo and the City of Kitchener will be required. Upon confirmation of the estimated eligible costs under the joint TIG program, the Interim Agreement would be developed and would establish a number of conditions including, but not limited to, the following:

- Owner must pay all property taxes levied upon the property during remediation and redevelopment (failure to pay and keep in good standing all municipal property taxes will deem the owner in default);
- Owner must submit a Record of Site Condition prepared by a “Qualified Person”, as that term is defined by regulation under the Environmental Protection Act, to the Ontario Ministry of the Environment that permits the use of the site as proposed by the Owner; and
- Owner must demonstrate that the remediation and redevelopment of the site has resulted in a Tax Increment of at least $100,000.

Once the remediation, redevelopment and reassessment of the property have been completed and actual costs, through invoice review, and realized reassessment values have been verified, the Interim Agreement will be superseded by the Final Agreement. This Final Agreement will include the final TIG payments and payment schedule based on the actual costs and the realized reassessment value of the development.

It is important to note that the final TIG payment amounts and schedule may change as it is based on the actual costs and realized assessment at the time the development is completed. However, the maximum amount of eligible remediation costs cannot exceed $561,388 of which $343,172 is the Region’s commitment based on Municipal/Regional tax allocation percentages at the time the application was submitted (2012).

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

City of Kitchener and Regional staff have jointly reviewed the application and are satisfied that the application meets the eligibility and application requirements. The City of Kitchener Brownfield Coordinator prepared a report recommending the joint TIG application to its General Committee, which was approved on September 9, 2013. The joint TIG application was subsequently approved at Kitchener City Council on September 16, 2013.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The Regional Brownfields Financial Incentive Program directly addresses Focus Area 2: Growth Management and Prosperity (Manage growth to foster thriving and productive urban and rural communities) and the Strategic Objective 2.1. Encourage compact, livable urban and rural settlement form.

The recommendations in this report are also consistent with the 2011-2014 Corporate Strategic Plan directs that the Region:

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

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The maximum cost for the recommended TIG is $343,172 over a total of 9 years as shown in Table 3. Under the funding model for TIGs adopted by Regional Council earlier this year, the annual TIG payments will be funded from the increased tax revenue on the property occurring in the same year. In other words, the tax revenue resulting from the increased assessment following the redevelopment is used to fund the annual TIG. Payments are not expected to commence before 2015. Once the TIG is fully paid, the increased assessment resulting from the redevelopment will benefit the overall tax levy.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATION/CONCURRENCE:

Staff from Transportation and Environmental Services (Water Services), Finance and Legal Services were involved in the review of the joint TIG application and are in support of staff’s recommendation.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment 1 – Site Map (2013 Aerial Image)
Attachment 2 – City of Kitchener Staff Report
Attachment 3 – Detailed TIG Calculation Methodology

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

APPROVED BY: Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Housing and Community Services
Craig Dyer, Chief Financial Officer
Attachment 1 – Site Map (2013 Aerial Image)
Attachment 2 – City of Kitchener Staff Report

REPORT TO: Finance & Corporate Services
DATE OF MEETING: September 9, 2013
SUBMITTED BY: Brian Bennett, Manager, Business Development, 519-741-2200 x 7230
PREPARED BY: Rob Morgan, Capital Investment Advisor, 519-741-2200 x7734
WARD(S) INVOLVED: Ward 8
DATE OF REPORT: July 8, 2013
REPORT NO.: CAO-13-025
SUBJECT: Brownfield Remediation Program Application
55 Moorgate Crescent

RECOMMENDATION:
1. That the City of Kitchener approve the Brownfield Remediation Program Application, received from Savic Homes Ltd. dated November 20, 2012. In exchange for a completed and filed Record of Site Condition for the property, the City of Kitchener will provide a grant in the form of an annual rebate on City taxes in an amount equal to 100% of the City Tax Increment: where the City Tax Increment is defined as the difference between the City portion of real property taxes for the 2012 Taxation Year and the new City portion of real property taxes levied as a result of a new assessment by the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC) following completion of the project, as compensation for the remediation of the above stated lands. The annual City property tax grant is estimated to be $25,043, payable for eight years with $17,873 being paid on the ninth and final year following re-assessment by MPAC.

2. That the Region of Waterloo Brownfield Coordinator be advised of City Council’s decision regarding this Application.

3. That the Mayor and Clerk be authorized to execute an Agreement amongst the City of Kitchener, the Region of Waterloo and Savic Homes Ltd.

BACKGROUND:
This application relates to the property municipally addressed as 55 Moorgate Crescent further described as Parts 1 and 2 on 56R-14480. The property is 44 ha in size and is situated on Moorgate Crescent off of Hazelglen Drive. The site was used as a waste disposal site in the 1960’s and has been vacant since the 1970’s. The lands are being redeveloped to accommodate 31 residential townhouses.
REPORT:

a) Contamination and Remediation

The Environmental Consultants for this project are LVM Inc. of Kitchener. Referring to the "Remedial Action Plan", dated June 6, 2012, and subsequent addendum dated January 10, 2013, Environmental contaminants found on the property included concentrations of lead, arsenic, copper and benzo(a)pyrene at levels in exceedance of accepted Ministry of Environment Table 2 standards. Remediation of the site involved the excavation and off-site disposal of the impacted soils at an appropriate licensed landfill facility.

Remediation activities have concluded on the site and a Record of Site Condition has been filed and acknowledged by the Ministry of Environment. Redevelopment of the site to accommodate the 31 townhomes is currently underway.

b) Eligible Remediation Cost

Savic Homes Ltd. and their Environmental Consultants, LVM have submitted actual remediation costs for the site of $773,814. This amount, plus a 10% allowance for indirect costs afforded under the TIG program ($77,381), less assistance already received under the Phase Two ESA Grant ($11,177.47) and Regional Development Charge (RDC) exemptions ($273,690) under the BFIP results in a maximum eligible joint TIG of $551,388. The grant will be cost-shared between the Region and the City of Kitchener with grant proportions determined by each municipality’s share of the municipal taxes levied on the property with 61.1% ($343,172) being provided by the Region and the remaining 38.9% ($208,217) provided by the City of Kitchener. The annual payments, which are estimated to last nine (9) years, would not start until after the property is fully remediated, redeveloped and ultimately reassessed by the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC).

c) Existing Assessment and Taxes

There are no tax arrears outstanding on this property. The total 2012 Residential/New Multi-Residential Assessment for the lands was $245,000, and 2012 property taxes were $3070.10 split as follows

- City of Kitchener $962.56
- Region $1545.21
- Education $542.33

Excluding the Education component, the total 2012 Municipal (Region + City) taxes are $2527.77

d) Projected Assessment and Taxes

This development will provide 31 new residential townhomes. The Applicant has estimated the projected post-project Assessment value at $6,500,000.

The attached Table 1 - Tax Increment Grant Calculation provides details of the projected assessment and taxes generated by the development.
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Using the 2012 Tax Rates, the projected annual Municipal Taxes (Region + City) following full completion of the project would be $66,953.77, split as follows:

City of Kitchener $ 26,025.35
Region $ 40,928.42

Based upon this projection, the City’s Annual Tax Increment (i.e. the difference between the existing City tax level and the future City tax level) is estimated at $25,042.79 (26,025.35 - $982.56).

The Regional Tax Increment is estimated at $39,303.21 ($40,928.42 - $1545.21).

e) Sequence of Financial Incentives

The Region – City Brownfield Financial Incentive Program provides the development industry 3 funding instruments which work in the following sequence.

First, the Region provides a 50% grant (up to $40,000) for a Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessment.

Second, the Region provides an exemption in the applicable Regional Development Charge equivalent to (but not exceeding) the “Eligible Remediation Cost”.

Lastly, the Region and the City jointly provide a Tax Incremental Grant (TIG) on any remaining “Eligible Remediation Cost” which has not been funded by Regional Development Charge exemptions.

This development is eligible for all 3 incentives listed above. Staff estimates that the Regional Development Charges for 31 new residential units (using current DC rates) is $278,890.

ALIGNMENT WITH CITY OF KITCHENER STRATEGIC PLAN:

This project implements our Community Vision and the Citizens’ Vision for the Environment:

“Together, we will build an innovative, caring and vibrant Kitchener with safe and thriving neighbourhoods”;

“Our shared vision is for Kitchener to be a community that focuses significant energy and resources on becoming more environmentally friendly through investments in things like bike trails, improved transit systems, tougher environmental bylaws and stricter growth management policies that limit sprawl.”

This project is in keeping with the following Environmental Strategic Direction:

“Endorse and implement the proposed Environmental Remediation Strategy.”

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The approval of this application will obligate The City of Kitchener to provide an annual municipal property tax rebate estimated to be $25,043.00 per year for the first 8 years upon reassessment by MPAC and $17,873.00 for the ninth and final year.
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COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT:
This Application has not been circulated to the public. Staff would note that this approval applies only to the City of Kitchener portion of the proposed Tax Incremental Grant. The Region of Waterloo Council will consider its portion of this application at a future date.

CONCLUSION:
Regional Staff and The Brownfield Steering Committee, consisting of the City's Capital Investment Advisor, Director of Revenue, City Solicitor, and Director of Planning, reviewed the application. Staff support acceptance within the terms and conditions of Region of Waterloo - Kitchener Brownfield Remediation Program.

ACKNOWLEDGED BY: Jeff Willmer, CAO
## Tax Increment Grant (TIG) (2012)

**Project Name:** Moeregate Townhomes  
**Owner:** Savic Homes Ltd  
**Address:** 55 Moeregate Cr, Kitchener

### Tax Increment Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>&quot;*Prior to Remediation&quot;</th>
<th><strong>After Project Completion</strong></th>
<th>Increment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential/New Multi-Residential (RT/NT)</td>
<td>245,400</td>
<td>6,500,000</td>
<td>6,254,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Residential (MT)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (CT,DT,ST,GT,CH)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Vacant/Excess (CU,CX)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Commercial (XT,YT,ZT)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Commercial Vacant/Excess (XU)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial (IT,LT,IL)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Vacant/Excess (I,U,I,U,JK)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Industrial (JT,KT)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Industrial Vacant/Excess (J,U,J,K,XX)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tax Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/Municipal</th>
<th>&quot;*Prior to Remediation&quot;</th>
<th><strong>After Project Completion</strong></th>
<th>Increment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential/New Multi-Residential</td>
<td>0.00400390</td>
<td>0.00400390</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Residential</td>
<td>0.00780760</td>
<td>0.00780760</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>0.00780760</td>
<td>0.00780760</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Vacant/Excess</td>
<td>0.00507494</td>
<td>0.00507494</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0.00780760</td>
<td>0.00780760</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Vacant/Excess</td>
<td>0.00507494</td>
<td>0.00507494</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>&quot;*Prior to Remediation&quot;</th>
<th><strong>After Project Completion</strong></th>
<th>Increment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential/New Multi-Residential</td>
<td>0.0029660</td>
<td>0.0029660</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Residential</td>
<td>0.01227854</td>
<td>0.01227854</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>0.01227854</td>
<td>0.01227854</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Vacant/Excess</td>
<td>0.00798105</td>
<td>0.00798105</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0.01227854</td>
<td>0.01227854</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Vacant/Excess</td>
<td>0.00798105</td>
<td>0.00798105</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>&quot;*Prior to Remediation&quot;</th>
<th><strong>After Project Completion</strong></th>
<th>Increment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential/Multi-Residential (RT,MT,NT)</td>
<td>0.00221000</td>
<td>0.00221000</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (CT,DT,ST,GT,CH)</td>
<td>0.01490000</td>
<td>0.01490000</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Vacant/Excess (CU,CX)</td>
<td>0.00968500</td>
<td>0.00968500</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Commercial (XT,YT,ZT)</td>
<td>0.01260000</td>
<td>0.01260000</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Commercial Vacant/Excess (XU)</td>
<td>0.00190000</td>
<td>0.00190000</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial (IT,LT,IL)</td>
<td>0.01590000</td>
<td>0.01590000</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Vacant/Excess (I,U,I,U,JK)</td>
<td>0.01033500</td>
<td>0.01033500</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Industrial (JT,KT)</td>
<td>0.01260000</td>
<td>0.01260000</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Industrial Vacant/Excess (J,U,J,K,XX)</td>
<td>0.00190000</td>
<td>0.00190000</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annual Taxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/Municipal</th>
<th>&quot;*Prior to Remediation&quot;</th>
<th><strong>After Project Completion</strong></th>
<th>Increment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>982.56</td>
<td>26,025.35</td>
<td>25,042.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Residential</td>
<td>1,545.21</td>
<td>40,926.42</td>
<td>39,381.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Municipal Taxes</td>
<td>2,527.76</td>
<td>66,953.77</td>
<td>64,426.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>542.33</td>
<td>14,365.00</td>
<td>13,822.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Taxes</td>
<td>3,070.10</td>
<td>81,318.77</td>
<td>78,248.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2012 MPAC Assessment
**Estimate only. Actual post project assessment to be determined by MPAC at time of development completion
## Tax Increment Grant (TIG) (2012)

**Project Name:** Moorigate Townhomes  
**Owner:** Savic Homes Ltd.  
**Address:** 35 Moorigate Dr., Kitchener  

### Costs Eligible for TIG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Eligible Remediation Costs</td>
<td>$773,814.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% Allowance</td>
<td>$77,381.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total TIG (before deductions)</strong></td>
<td>$851,195.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Less Other Brownfield Financial Assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional ESA Grant</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>$11,117.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional DC Brownfield Exemption</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>$279,890.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Municipal DC Brownfield Exemption</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Brownfield Financial Assistance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$290,907.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total TIG:** $561,288.10

### Amount of Tax Increment Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Increment Grant</th>
<th>Maximum Potential TIG</th>
<th>Eligible TIG Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Municipal</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>$25,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>$39,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total TIG</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$64,426</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TIG Payment Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total TIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,043</td>
<td>$36,383</td>
<td>$61,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$25,043</td>
<td>$36,383</td>
<td>$61,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$25,043</td>
<td>$36,383</td>
<td>$61,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$25,043</td>
<td>$36,383</td>
<td>$61,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$25,043</td>
<td>$36,383</td>
<td>$61,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$25,043</td>
<td>$36,383</td>
<td>$61,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$25,043</td>
<td>$36,383</td>
<td>$61,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$25,043</td>
<td>$36,383</td>
<td>$61,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$17,873</td>
<td>$26,309</td>
<td>$44,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total TIG</strong></td>
<td>$218,217</td>
<td>$343,172</td>
<td>$561,388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 3 – Detailed Joint TIG Calculation Methodology

The anticipated joint Tax Increment Grant payments and schedule are determined for each application based on the following steps:

The first step includes the preparation of the anticipated assessment increment. These are based on the pre-remediation MPAC assessment values and the estimated post-remediation and redevelopment assessment values for each phase of development as provided by the applicant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Value “Pre”</th>
<th>Assessment Value “Post”*</th>
<th>Assessment Increment*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$245,400 (2012)</td>
<td>$6,500,000 (est.)</td>
<td>$6,254,000 (est.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These values are based on estimates and will be confirmed by MPAC upon project completion.

Estimates are then prepared to identify the anticipated increase in municipal taxes (Region and City) that would be generated by the remediation and redevelopment for each phase, referred to as the ‘tax increment’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Municipality</th>
<th>Municipal Taxes “Pre”*</th>
<th>Municipal Taxes “Post”*</th>
<th>Total Tax Increment*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>$983</td>
<td>$26,025 (est.)</td>
<td>$25,043 (est.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>$1,545</td>
<td>$40,928 (est.)</td>
<td>$39,383 (est.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,528</td>
<td>$66,954 (est.)</td>
<td>$64,426 (est.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tax amounts do not include the education portion of annual taxes levied and are rounded to the nearest dollar.

The final step is to determine the estimated total eligible remediation costs for the joint TIG program which includes a 10% allowance for indirect remediation costs to be applied on top of eligible remediation cost estimates. This total is reduced by an amount equal to any other government financial assistance received for the project. At this time additional financial assistance from other sources is not anticipated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Rem. Costs</th>
<th>Indirect Rem. Allowance (10%)</th>
<th>Less: Other Assistance</th>
<th>Total Eligible Rem. Costs*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$773,814</td>
<td>$77,381</td>
<td>$289,808</td>
<td>$561,388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rounded to the nearest dollar.

These steps culminate in the maximum eligible joint TIG for this application which is then cost shared between the Region and City based on the proportion of each municipality’s share of the municipal taxes levied on the property. The following table summarizes the maximum joint TIG and estimates of the Regional and City financial commitments for this application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum TIG*</th>
<th>Regional Portion (61.1%)*</th>
<th>City Portion (38.9%)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$561,388</td>
<td>$343,172</td>
<td>$218,217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rounded to the nearest dollar.

Payments related to the development do not commence until at least one (1) year following the re-assessment of the development by the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC).

The TIG is not an exemption from the property taxes levied, but a grant payable to the owner according to the payment schedule in accordance with an agreement between the parties.
Therefore the applicant is required to pay all applicable property taxes for the property at all times during and after remediation and redevelopment or until such time as ownership is transferred to the intended end-user (if applicable).

The joint TIG Program applies only to the municipal portion of the tax bill and does not include the education portion that is remitted to the Province.

The final amounts of the TIG payments will be determined by the actual MPAC assessment value and classification and the final net eligible remediation costs, thus the final schedule of payments is subject to change.
REGION OF WATERLOO
TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
Design and Construction

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

DATE: October 1, 2013
FILE CODE: T04-20, 5555

SUBJECT: BRIDGE BARRIER SYSTEMS ON REGION OF WATERLOO BRIDGES

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the use of four different styles of bridge barriers as described in Report E-13-117 on all future new and rehabilitated Region of Waterloo bridges, where a Performance Level 2 barrier as defined under the Canadian Highway Bridge Design Code is required for the bridge barrier.

SUMMARY:

The Region of Waterloo has over 100 bridges under its jurisdiction in the Regional road system inventory. Each bridge includes side barriers (also commonly referred to as “railings”) that are anchored to the bridge deck to protect drivers, cyclists and pedestrians when crossing the bridge. The purpose of this report is to gain Council’s endorsement of a specific limited selection of bridge barriers that would then be routinely used on all future new and rehabilitated bridges.

A Working Group was formed to develop a list of proposed railing styles for future use and included staff from Transportation Infrastructure Management, Transportation Operations, Cultural Heritage, and Design and Construction. The criteria that the group used in developing a shortlist of barrier systems for consideration included: safety and liability (i.e. code compliance); reduced effects of salt (on structure component deterioration and on watercourses); heritage significance and aesthetics (visual appeal, modern vs. heritage); cost-effectiveness; consistency and Region identity; and unobstructed views of watercourses and surrounding landscapes.

Based on the Working Group’s assessment, it is recommended that the following four (4) railing styles be adopted for use on future Region bridge projects:

Railing Style 1 - Open Concrete Balustrade
Railing Style 2 - Open Steel Balustrade with Cascade-Style Concrete Posts
Railing Style 3 - Textured Concrete Parapet Wall with Box-Beam Rails or Aluminum Pickets
Railing Style 4 - Concrete Parapet Wall with Standard Double Tube Rail

The following chart shows the recommended use and approximate unit cost of the four recommended styles of railings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Railing Style</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Unit cost per metre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Open concrete balustrade</td>
<td>On the three heritage bowstring arch bridges (Freeport, Bridgeport and</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Open steel balustrade with cascade-style concrete posts</td>
<td>In all areas where there is a heritage or scenic context</td>
<td>$1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Textured concrete parapet wall with steel rails or aluminum pickets</td>
<td>In or near residential areas where pedestrians are expected</td>
<td>$1,050 (steel rails) $1,200 (aluminum pickets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Concrete parapet wall with double tube rails</td>
<td>In non-residential areas where pedestrians are not expected</td>
<td>$900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The premium cost for a heritage style railing (Style 2) would be in the order of $80,000-100,000 for a typical village bridge over a watercourse, which equates to approximately 10-15% of a typical total project value. This additional cost where applicable for heritage railings, would be included in the individual bridge project budgets in the 10-year Transportation Capital Program.

It is recommended that Regional Council approve the use of the four (4) bridge barrier (“railing”) systems as described in this report for all future new and rehabilitated Regional bridge projects, where a Performance Level 2 barrier as defined under the Canadian Highway Bridge Design Code is required for the bridge barrier.

REPORT:

1. **Purpose of this Report**

The Region of Waterloo has over 100 bridges under its jurisdiction in the Regional road system inventory. Each bridge includes side barriers (also commonly referred to as “railings”) that are anchored to the bridge deck to protect drivers, cyclists and pedestrians when crossing the bridge. Currently, there are many different styles of bridge barriers on Regional bridges, ranging from conventional solid concrete barrier walls to aesthetically-appealing stylized railings with openings for viewing through the barrier. The purpose of this report is to gain Council’s endorsement of a specific limited selection of bridge barriers that would then be routinely used on all future new and rehabilitated bridges. By using only a limited number of bridge barriers, an identifiable Regional standard will be established for use on Regional bridges and future maintenance costs would be minimized for railing repairs and upkeep.

2. **History of Region of Waterloo Bridge Railings**

Many of the bridges inherited by the Region of Waterloo (when the Region was formed in 1973) were constructed using full-height open steel railings that if constructed today, would not meet current bridge design code requirements. An example of this type of railing is shown in the following photo.
Therefore when these railings are replaced as part of bridge rehabilitation contracts, the railings must be upgraded to current standards. The choice of railings for these replacements was, until 2001, very limited since the only railings that were permitted in the province had to have been tested and approved by the Ontario Ministry of Transportation, the regulatory authority that published and maintained the provincial bridge code. This resulted in many Region bridge railings consisting of the very effective but very utilitarian-looking solid concrete wall with a single or double top rail that was popular in the 1960's and 1970's throughout the province, an example of which is shown in the following photo.

In 2001, a new federal bridge design code replaced all provincial codes and the available selection of bridge railing types expanded considerably as it was then permissible to install any railing that had been successfully crash-tested within North America. Accordingly, since 2001 the Region has been able to install a number of more aesthetically appealing railing systems on many of its bridge projects.
Various styles of unique railings that have been installed throughout the Region in recent years include the following:


Open steel balustrade with concrete posts – Canagagigue Creek Bridge, Elmira – 2005.
Textured concrete parapet with rectangular rails - Nith River Bridge, Phillipsburg – 2011, 
Alder Creek Bridge, Mannheim – 2009, 
Schneider Creek Bridge, Kitchener- 2011.

Concrete parapet with aluminum pickets - Hespeler Rd Grade Separation, Cambridge – 2011, 
Traffic barrier wall plus open steel pedestrian/cyclist railing - Fairway Road, Kitchener – 2012.

In addition, the Region has constructed or replaced railings in recent years on the three bowstring-arch bridges (Freeport, Main Street and Bridgeport) and on the Park Hill Bridge in Cambridge with open concrete balustrade railings to replicate the original designs of these heritage bridges.

The Region has also constructed a number of solid barrier walls with specially formed architectural facings to enhance the aesthetics of a bridge structure. Some examples of these architecturally-faced solid concrete wall designs on Regional bridges include:

Formed panel barrier walls on the King Street Bridge in St. Jacobs.
3. Bridge Barrier Ratings

Bridge barrier systems are tested for their ability to withstand vehicle impacts at different speeds. Different “crash tests” are performed using a number of vehicle types, from small automobiles to large tractor-trailer combination trucks. A “Performance Level” as defined under the Canadian Highway Bridge Design Code is then determined for each type of barrier and these Performance Level ratings range from PL-1 (typically low volume, low speed applications) to PL-3 (high speed, high volume freeway-type applications).
The required PL rating to be employed at a specific bridge site is determined using a number of local factors. The criteria that are evaluated to determine the PL rating are as follows:

- number of lanes;
- roadway curvature and grade;
- bridge height;
- water depth (if applicable) below the bridge;
- design speed;
- percentage of trucks;
- lateral clearance to barrier;
- barrier height; and
- purpose of barrier (i.e. protecting traffic, pedestrian, bicycle or combination).

Once a PL-rating is determined based on the bridge geometry and site conditions, the designer can then choose from any barrier that has met the testing requirements for that particular PL-rating.

Only a small number of bridges in the Region’s urban core areas on low speed roadways are classified as PL-1 locations. There are two Regional bridges that have the highest PL-3 rating, the Arthur Street bridge over the Conestogo River and the newly constructed Fairway Road bridge over the Grand River. These two bridges include closed, solid concrete wall traffic barriers that meet the PL-3 classification. The Fairway Road bridge also has a second railing outside of the traffic barrier that serves only pedestrian and cyclist users and the second railing has a PL-1 rating. There will therefore be the occasional unique project where a rating other than PL-2 is applicable, but the vast majority of Regional bridges fall within a PL-2 classification (moderate speed (i.e. 60-80 km/hr) with medium truck volumes). This report therefore refers only to PL-2 rated bridge barrier systems.

4. Suggested (PL-2) Bridge Railing Styles

A Working Group was formed to develop a list of proposed railing styles for future use and included the following staff:

Shawn Buckley, Senior Transportation Infrastructure Engineer;
Ed Switenky, Manager of Transportation Operations;
Anne Fitzpatrick, Cultural Heritage Planner, Planning, Housing and Community Services;
John Stephenson, Senior Project Manager, Design and Construction; and
Gary MacDonald, Head of Transportation Rehabilitation, Design and Construction.

The criteria that the group used in developing a shortlist of barrier systems for consideration included: safety and liability (i.e. code compliance); reduced effects of salt (on structure component deterioration and on watercourses); heritage significance and aesthetics (visual appeal, modern vs. heritage); cost-effectiveness; consistency and Region identity; and unobstructed views of watercourses and surrounding landscapes.

It is felt that the following four (4) proposed railing styles developed by the Working Group provide a good balance of these criteria. Based on the Working Group’s assessment, it is recommended that the following four (4) PL-2 railing styles be adopted for use on future Region bridge projects:
4.1 **Railing Style 1 - Open Concrete Balustrade**

This style of railing would continue to be used on the Region’s three heritage bowstring arch bridges (Freeport, Bridgeport and Main Street bridges) and on the Park Hill Bridge over the Grand River. The open concrete balustrade railing has a distinctive look, unique to these four Grand River bridges that were originally constructed in the 1930’s and that all have regional heritage significance.

4.2 **Railing Style 2 - Open Steel Balustrade with Cascade-Style Concrete Posts**

Open Steel Balustrade with Cascade-Style Concrete Posts.
This railing system includes heavy gauge, black factory-coated steel with concrete posts formed in a cascaded style. This railing has been installed on two Region bridges to date: on the Church Street bridge over the Canagagigue Creek in Elmira (in the photo above); and on the Floradale Road bridge in the village of Floradale.

The railing is an updated and more robust version of the similarly styled railings constructed in Waterloo Region in the mid-1900s in some of the urban core and rural township areas. The current design replicates the original art-deco styling, one example of which is still in existence at the intersection of Peppler Street and Laurel Street in Waterloo. The use of open, decorative railings improves bridge aesthetics and provides unobstructed views to and from the bridge to the surrounding water crossings and landscapes. The open railing design balances the aesthetic appeal of the Regional road system while still meeting safety and maintenance needs.

This prototypical railing is recommended for bridges that contribute to the existing heritage context in an area for example, where there is an adjacent scenic or significant landscape, where the bridge itself is of heritage significance or where the bridge is located in a historic community. It is estimated that this style of railing would be applicable for approximately 20% of the Region’s bridge inventory (or about 20 bridges).

4.3 Railing Style 3 - Textured Concrete Parapet Wall with Box-Beam Rails or Aluminum Pickets

This railing style includes a solid concrete parapet wall formed using a special liner in the formwork to achieve a textured stone facing. Above the parapet are two square-tube horizontal steel rails supported by steel posts, as shown above. An alternative to this style would include vertical aluminum pickets (like on the recently completed Hespeler Grade Separation, as in the photo below) in place of the horizontal steel rails. This railing is recommended for use on all bridges that have no heritage context but that are in or near a residential area where pedestrians are expected. It is anticipated that this style of railing would be applicable for approximately 40% of the Region’s bridge inventory (or about 45 bridges).
Textured Concrete Parapet Wall with Aluminum Pickets.

4.4 Railing Style 4 - Concrete Parapet Wall with Standard Double Tube Rail

Concrete Parapet Wall with Standard Double Tube Rail.

This railing style includes a solid concrete bottom parapet wall with two round steel tube rails above. This style would be applicable in areas where there is no heritage context and where there is no pedestrian activity expected. The use of two rails would still afford a view over the parapet wall. It is anticipated that this style of railing would be applicable for approximately 40% (about 40) of the Region’s bridges.
A summary including costs for the four recommended styles of railings is provided in the chart below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PL-2 Railing Style</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Unit cost per metre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Open concrete balustrade</td>
<td>On the three heritage bowstring arch bridges (Freeport, Bridgeport and Main Street bridges) and the Park Hill Bridge over the Grand River</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Open steel balustrade with cascade-style concrete posts</td>
<td>In all areas where there is a heritage or scenic context</td>
<td>$1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Textured concrete parapet wall with steel rails or aluminum pickets</td>
<td>In or near residential areas where pedestrians are expected</td>
<td>$1,050 (steel rails) $1,200 (aluminum pickets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Concrete parapet wall with double tube rails</td>
<td>In non-residential areas where pedestrians are not expected</td>
<td>$900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the chart above, the cost of these railing systems ranges from $900/m for the conventional parapet wall with tube rails to $1,900/m for the heritage style steel rail with cascaded concrete posts. Based on recent bridge rehabilitation contract costs, the premium cost for the heritage style railing would have been in the order of $80,000-100,000 per bridge, which equates to 10-15% of a typical total project value. This additional cost where applicable for heritage railings, would be included in the individual bridge project budgets in the 10-year Transportation Capital Program. It is estimated that the premium for Style 2 heritage railings over the next ten years in the 10-year Transportation Capital Program would be $200,000-300,000.

5. Cultural Heritage Comments on Proposed Railing Types

Bridges play an important role that goes beyond their obvious function as components of our transportation infrastructure. Many become familiar and characteristic landmarks that contribute to a strong sense of place within the Region. The distinctive appearance of these structures can often be attributed to their railing design, a common element easily viewed from public access. The railing selection approach described in this report will help to conserve bridge styles representative of the various eras of construction and landscape contexts found throughout the Region.

The Region's bridges have been inventoried and evaluated in studies such as Spanning the Generations: Phase 1 Inventory that looked at structures built pre-1950 and an internal inventory prepared by staff documenting post-1950 bridges. From this analysis the top ten most significant bridges were identified and to date, many of them have been rehabilitated and their railing types conserved or reconstructed, such as the bridges discussed using Railing Style 1.
Railing Style 1 will work well for concrete bridges as concrete balustrades can be reconstructed in a site specific manner, taking into account the bridge’s dimensions and the existing configuration of the balustrades.

Although there are a number of significant steel truss bridges in the Region, the four proposed railing styles will not apply to them for two reasons:

1. There are no truss bridges on Regional roads with the exception of the Hartman Bridge (New Hamburg), which was already recently reconstructed; and
2. Truss bridges are not reconstructed, rather they are reinforced, leaving limited opportunity to change railing types.

The proposed style for steel railings (Railing Style 2) will improve safety concerns and ensure a consistent aesthetic appearance for approximately 20% of the bridges across the Region. Although it will represent a loss in the subtle diversity of steel bridge railing designs, it will conserve the art deco style representative of the era in which they were originally built. To date, 21 bridges constructed post-1956 remain with open steel railings. Sixteen of these bridges represent good candidates for Railing Style 2 given their design and heritage context. The remaining five structures may be better suited to Railing Style 3 or 4.

Each of the currently existing open railing bridges represents one of two steel railing designs. One design combines steel balustrades with concrete posts exhibiting varying degrees of decorative intervention (similar to Railing Style 2), while the other follows a similar design but uses only steel to form simple vertical balustrades supported by steel posts. Both of these designs are well represented in the art deco inspired Railing Style 2.

6. Recommendation

Occasionally, there will be circumstances that will arise on future projects where a unique site-specific railing system will need to be considered by the Project Team. But for all other projects where a PL-2 bridge railing is required, it is recommended that Regional Council approve the use of the four (4) bridge barrier (“railing”) systems as described in this report for future new and rehabilitated Regional bridge projects.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The use of alternative railings on Regional bridges is in accordance with the Region’s Corporate Strategic Plan 2.2 to “Develop optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs”. In addition, the use of contextual heritage railings where applicable would achieve Corporate Strategic Plan 2.4 which is to “Promote and enhance arts, culture and heritage”.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The cost for alternative barrier systems would be included in the overall project budget for future bridge works. It is estimated that the premium for Style 2 heritage railings over the next ten years in the 10-year Transportation Capital Program would be $200,000-300,000.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Staff from the Community Services Division of the Planning, Housing and Community Services Department were involved in the preparation of this report.
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110 Manitou Drive
Kitchener

Please fill out the comment Sheet at the end of this Information Package and place it in the box at this Centre or send it to the address on the Comment Sheet.
1.0 Background

In 2004, the Region initiated the South Kitchener Transportation Corridor Study. The study limits as shown in Appendix “A” include an area bounded by Fairway Road to the north, Wabanaki Drive to the south, Manitou Drive to the west and King Street to the east. The study area also includes the Hidden Valley natural area. The purpose of the study was to develop alternative transportation planning solutions, including the establishment of possible transportation corridors, to provide additional east-west mobility in South Kitchener for people and goods movement. The South Kitchener Transportation Corridor Study was a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) study and was being conducted as a Schedule ‘C’ project. Please refer to Appendix “B” for an explanation of the Class EA process. This Municipal Class EA Study is being directed by a Project Team consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo, City of Kitchener, Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA), Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR), Ministry of Transportation Ontario (MTO), Regional Councillors Claudette Millar, Jean Haalboom, and Jim Wideman, and City of Kitchener Councillors John Gazzola and Berry Vrbanovic. Consultants from IBI Group and LGL Limited are assisting the Project Team.

During the initial phases of this Class EA Study, the Project Team reviewed existing traffic operations and expected future traffic operations within this study area. The review of traffic operations revealed that large areas of the existing road network in the study area were congested during peak periods, including Fairway Road, Manitou Drive and King Street East at River Road. The prime objective of this Class EA identified by the Project Team was to address the traffic congestion and reduce delays within these corridors. The Project Team then developed high-level alternative planning solutions to address the problems identified. The alternative planning solutions included the following:

- Do nothing;
- Improvements to all or some of the corridors in the surrounding road network;
- Increased transit use on Fairway Road to reduce total vehicle volumes; and
- Creation of a new 4-lane road parallel to Fairway Road with a new interchange with Highway 8.

The initial study work also included extensive environmental inventories to assess the types of plants and animals that exist within two large environmental areas within the study area: the Hidden Valley and the Schneider Creek Valley.

After extensive public consultation and technical studies to assess the traffic operations and environmental impacts, the Project Team identified the River Road extension from King Street to Manitou Drive as the Preferred Planning Solution for this project. This Preferred Solution was endorsed by Regional Council in July 2006 and subsequently the study was re-named the River Road Extension Class EA.

Following Council’s endorsement of the River Road Extension, the Project Team then developed and assessed various alternative design concepts for the River Road Extension as per Phase 3 of the Class EA process. As part of developing alternative design concepts, the Project Team looked at various Highway 8 interchange configurations, road cross sections, intersection designs and bridge crossing alternatives over Schneider’s Creek. During this phase the Project Team continued to consult with the general public and other interested parties. During the consultation process, some members of the public requested that further investigations be conducted to determine the presence of a threatened species in the Hidden Valley area, namely the Jefferson Salamander. In April 2007, following an advanced species survey conducted in the winter of 2007, the presence of Jefferson Salamanders in the Hidden
Valley was confirmed. Once the presence of Jefferson Salamanders was confirmed in Hidden Valley, the Class EA study was put on hold to allow field studies to determine the extent of the Jefferson Salamander population in Hidden Valley.

In 2010, the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) determined the Regulated limits of the Jefferson Salamander habitat within the Hidden Valley forest area. The new Region Transportation Master Plan (RTMP), completed in 2010, confirmed the need for increased transportation capacity in the Fairway Road transportation corridor, including improved access to Highway 8. With this new information from the MNR and the new RTMP, the Project Team once again reviewed and assessed all the high-level alternative planning solutions and concluded that the River Road Extension was still the Preferred Planning Solution.

Further public consultation regarding this project was conducted in 2011, culminating in a Regional Council meeting on October 5, 2011. At the October 5, 2011 Council meeting, staff once again presented the River Road Extension (identified as Alternative 4C) as the Preferred Planning Solution for this project. Several persons at the Council meeting expressed concern that the proposed River Road interchange at Highway 8 would negatively impact a high-quality woodlot adjacent to existing Hidden Valley Road. Several new options for this project were presented by various members of the public at the October 5, 2011 Council meeting, including some new interchange options that would significantly reduce the negative impacts on the woodlot. Regional Council, at the October 5, 2011 meeting, reaffirmed the previous approval of the River Road Extension (Alternative 4C) as the best Planning Solution for this project, directed staff to proceed to Phase 3 and 4 of the Class EA and to study the new options for the Highway 8 interchange presented by the public with the objective of reducing the impact on the existing woodlot.

Copies of previous Public Consultation Centre (PCC) Information Packages as well as copies of some of the technical studies prepared for this Class EA Study are available for viewing at this Public Consultation Centre. Please ask a Project Team representative if you are interested in reviewing any of this information.

In addition, additional supporting documents for this study have been compiled and are available for review at the Regions website www.regionofwaterloo.ca. A search for “future construction projects” will lead you to a table of projects for which a “detailed Information Sheet” is provided for the River Road Extension, King Street to Manitou Drive, Kitchener.

2.0 What is the Purpose of this Public Consultation Centre?

This Public Consultation Centre (PCC) is a continuation of the public consultation and input process for this project, and in particular, is intended to update the public about additional technical project work conducted since May 2011 including:

- Study of potential impacts on surface water and groundwater resources;
- Updated natural resources inventory and impact assessment;
- Other River Road alignment alternatives that were considered;
- The results of a recent revised evaluation of the previous Preferred Design Concept (4C) including evaluation of Alternative Design Concepts for the Highway 8 interchange and associated municipal road access which consider preservation of the existing woodlot;
- Presentation and assessment of a new Alternative Design Concept 5; and
- Presentation of a Functional Design for the new Alternative Design Concept 5.
Based on the information provided, the Project Team is asking for public comments about the study work completed since May, 2011. The Project Team is also seeking public comments on the new Alternative Design Concept 5 for consideration by Regional Council in completing the Class EA for the River Road Extension.

We kindly request that you fill out the Comment Sheets attached to the back of this Information Package and place them in the box at this Public Consultation Centre or send them to the address indicated on the Comment Sheet.

Your comments will be considered by the Project Team, in conjunction with all other relevant input, to complete the Class EA study.

3.0 Potential Water Resources Impacts

In 2011, concerns were raised by members of the public regarding the impacts of the new River Road on the existing groundwater and surface water resources in Hidden Valley. Specifically, some concerns were in regards to the potential negative effects of salt-laden runoff from the new road on the surface and groundwater in the area. These concerns included the effect on the Region’s water supply wells in the vicinity of Schneider Creek and the effect on the surface water intake at the Manheim Water Treatment Plant on the Grand River located just downstream from the Highway 8 Bridge. To address these concerns, Region staff conducted a comprehensive water resources impact study that included a thorough assessment of the existing water resources via an extensive set of monitoring wells and surface water samples. The study methodology was developed with assistance from the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) and the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA). After a full year of monitoring and an assessment of the potential salt impacts from a new road, the Stage 1 phase of the study has concluded that the new road would have a negligible effect on the surface water and groundwater resources in the Hidden Valley area. This study is ongoing with continued monitoring of the water resources for a second year. The Stage 1 report is available for viewing at this Public Consultation Centre.

4.0 Environmental Resources

Since the PCC on May 17, 2011, the following tasks have been completed to update the inventory of natural resources and assessment of the project’s potential impacts in the study area:

- The classification of environmentally sensitive lands in the Hidden Valley area has been updated as illustrated in Appendix “C”
- The inventory of regionally significant plants has been updated as illustrated in Appendix “C”
- The potential impact on natural resources has been updated as illustrated in more detailed displays at this PCC.
5.0 Additional Study of Alternative Design Concepts for the Highway 8 Interchange

On October 5, 2011, delegations to the Regional Council Meeting presented a description of several alternatives to the previously approved River Road Extension Preferred Design Concept (Alternative 4C). These alternatives are displayed in Appendix “D”. As per Regional Council’s direction from the October 5, 2001 meeting, staff was directed to review and evaluate the alternatives presented by the public and if possible to develop a new alternative that would reduce or eliminate the negative impacts on the existing woodlot adjacent to Hidden Valley Road. The following design alternatives received from the public have been evaluated:

- Do Nothing
- Fairway Road corridor improvements
  - Roundabout Corridor
  - 6-Lane Corridor
- New Highway 8 interchange concepts resulting from the May 11, 2011 PCC and Regional Council meeting of October 5, 2011:
  - ‘Tight turn’ intersection (Alternative ‘S’)
  - Cameo Drive Extension (Alternative “H”)

In addition to the new alternatives received from the public, the Project Team developed a new alternative, Alternative Design Concept 5, by modifying the ‘Tight turn’ intersection (Alternative ‘S’) with a minimum acceptable turn radius from Hidden Valley Road to River Road. Alternative Design Concept 5 is similar to Alternative Design Concept 4C and includes a highly skewed bridge crossing of Highway 8 to minimize direct impact on the land in the Hidden Valley area.

5.1 How Do These Alternatives Address the Transportation Problem?

Each of the new alternatives was assessed in terms of how it would address the traffic congestion in the Fairway Road, Manitou Drive and King Street corridors, including the delays for motorists accessing the existing Highway 8 interchange. For each new alternative, the Project Team reviewed the proposed roadway geometry and expected traffic operations. The “Do Nothing” alternative does not address the traffic congestion problem and therefore was screened out by the Project Team. The alternatives which include Fairway Road capacity improvements via either the addition of multi-lane roundabouts or additional through lanes on Fairway Road, provide additional capacity on Fairway Road; however, the ramp at the existing Highway 8 intersection would still be over-capacity and the portion of Fairway Road approaching the ramp would remain a “bottleneck”. As a result, the Project Team screened out the Fairway Road corridor improvement alternatives from further consideration. The interchange Alternatives (‘S’ and ‘H’) were also screened out by the Project Team because the unacceptable tight turns would result in unacceptable delays and collisions at the intersections due to poor geometry and poor driver visibility. In addition, the Cameo Drive Extension option (Alternative ‘H’) would result in extensive negative property impacts on the east side of Highway 8.
The Project Team spent considerable time reviewing the “Tight Turn” (Alternative ‘S’), including extensive discussion with Mr. Gordon Nicholls. Through discussions with Mr. Nicholls and a review of the geometry, the Project Team developed Alternative Design Concept 5, which is a modified version of the “Tight Turn” option. Alternative Design Concept 5 significantly reduces the impact on the mature woodlot while providing acceptable road geometry for the Highway 8 interchange.

Screening out of alternatives which would not solve the transportation problem leaves Alternative Design Concepts 4C and 5 which would operate equally well. The evaluation of their impacts is tabulated in Appendix “E” and the evaluations are displayed in more detail at this PCC.

5.2 How Well Do Alternatives 4C and 5 Contribute to Preservation of the Existing Woodlot?

In 2010, the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) delineated, confirmed and released the Regulated Limits of the Jefferson Salamander habitat within the Hidden Valley Forest Core Environmental Feature (CEF) which shows that the Preferred Design Concept of the River Road Extension (4C) is outside this regulated area, as shown in Appendix “C”. A relatively small proportion of the Jefferson Salamander population could potentially disperse further from the identified breeding ponds than the 300m distance which marks the extent of the regulated habitat. This potential extended dispersal range is subject to the availability of suitable habitat land and the absence of barriers and other significant threats. There is suitable habitat identified as mature woodlots, located between the regulated habitat and Highway 8. Highway 8 itself represents a formidable limit to dispersal of the Jefferson Salamanders beyond the regulated habitat. While Alternative Design Concept 4C would impact 1.29 hectares of these mature woodlots, Alternative 5 would reduce the impact to these mature woodlots by 35% and would move much of the impact to the adjacent woodlot which is located on the far side of Hidden Valley Road from the regulated habitat. Hidden Valley Road itself is also a significant deterrent to salamander dispersal. Alternative Design Concept 5 is a significant improvement in addressing any potential for Jefferson Salamander dispersal.

Although the proposed River Road Extension would not encroach on the Jefferson Salamander Regulated Habitat, there is some risk that any Jefferson Salamanders that have travelled beyond the limits of the regulated habitat could be impacted by the construction and operation of the new road. Because of this potential risk, the Region will enter into discussions with MNR staff for the purpose of obtaining a Permit under Section 17 of the Endangered Species Act. The purpose of the permit is to establish the measures for the Region to follow in the event that future road construction may encounter Jefferson Salamanders. Preparation of the Region’s request for the Permit and MNR review of that request would proceed as part of this Class EA.

6.0 The Project Team’s Preferred Design Concept 5

The Region’s Project Team has completed an evaluation of Alternative Design Concepts (as summarized above and tabulated in Appendix “E”) and has identified Alternative Design Concept 5 as the Preferred Design Concept.

Detailed displays of a complete functional design of the Road Extension Preferred Design Concept 5 are presented at the Public Consultation Centre, and on the Region’s website, consisting of:

- Typical 4-lane Road Cross-Section Drawing as shown in Appendix “F”
6.1 Cross Section Elements to Address Active Transportation and Grading Impacts

The proposed road design cross-section for Preferred Design Concept 5 will comply with the Region’s Context Sensitive Design Guidelines and will include a major role for Active Transportation (cycling and walking). A multi-use trail for pedestrians and cyclists is proposed on both sides of the proposed River Road Extension and would best fulfill that role. Transit stops would be well accommodated. A proposed continuous raised centre median would prevent many conflicts between vehicles. Construction of the proposed road extension would create embankments. Where these embankments impact natural areas, suitable vegetation and soil reinforcement would be installed to retain slopes at a maximum 2:1 ratio thereby reducing the impact on the natural areas.

6.2 Horizontal Alignment

Most of the proposed road for Preferred Design Concept 5 would follow the alignments of the existing Goodrich Drive, Wabanaki Drive and a portion of Hidden Valley Road. Two segments of the road alignment are new alignments that do not follow existing roads:

- The western section between the planned Manitou Drive/Bleams Road roundabout and Wilson Avenue/Goodrich Drive roundabout will cross the natural, undeveloped Schneider Creek Valley area. The close proximity of two roundabouts will contribute to an expectation of lower operating speeds and thereby permit the road alignment to operate well with a minimum horizontal radius of 150m, suitable for a design speed of 60km/h at the Schneider Creek crossing.
- The eastern section between King Street and Hidden Valley Road will have no roundabouts and the location of Highway 8 access ramps in this section will contribute to an expectation of higher operating speeds, thus requiring a minimum horizontal radius of 200m, suitable for a design speed of 70km/h. In addition, a realignment of the intersection of Wabanaki Road and Hidden Valley Road would provide improved operation of the new River Road corridor.

6.3 Highway 8 Bridge Crossing Design

A bridge crossing Highway 8 is required to complete the River Road extension. The bridge will form a part of an interchange with access to and from the Highway. Preliminary design of the bridge is presented at this PCC as follows:

- A two span 28.25m wide bridge of 108m total length will convey 4 driving lanes and 2 multi-use trails plus a continuous raised concrete centre median.

6.4 Schneider Creek Bridge Crossing Design

The Schneider Creek crossing will accommodate a wide range of design requirements as part of a new road allowance through the Schneider Creek Valley including:

- Provide capacity for the GRCA requirements which include Regional storm regulation and security for the meandering requirements for the creek;
• Accommodate migration/dispersal of a variety of animals safely beneath the bridge;
• Preserve the existing City of Kitchener multi-use trail on the north bank of Schneider Creek beneath the proposed bridge and facilitate a trail connection to the multi-use trails on both sides of the River Road Extension; and
• Preliminary design indicates that a single span 45-50m long bridge will be required. The 24.5m wide bridge will convey 4 driving lanes and 2 multi-use trails plus a continuous 1.5 m raised concrete centre median.
• The Project Team will consider an open-type railing on the bridge to allow pedestrians on the bridge to have a good view of the Schneider Creek Valley.

6.5 Stonegate Drive Access Alternatives

The Project Team is aware of the concerns some residents of the Stonegate Drive area have about increased traffic volumes on Stonegate Drive that may occur as a result of a River Road extension and its intersection with Stonegate Drive. The Stonegate neighborhood currently has access to the intersection at King Street and River Road via a temporary road though a building lot that has been held since the subdivision was constructed. This temporary road was planned to remain in operation until the River Road extension is constructed. That temporary access must be removed when the River Road extension is constructed so that the new intersections will operate well and so that the developer can develop the building lot. The Region met with residents in 2006 to discuss this issue, and a number of traffic control solution options for the River Road/ Stonegate Drive intersection were presented. Based on comments received on two separate occasions from residents of the neighborhood and a review of traffic operations, the Project Team is proposing the following two options for comment by the neighborhood residents. These two options are displayed in Appendix “G” and described as follows:

• **Full Movements Option** - Full access (no restricted turning movements) at the Stonegate/River Road intersection would facilitate easy access to and from the Stonegate neighbourhood. This could result in some increased traffic on Stonegate Drive as a result of motorists’ desire to avoid use of the intersection at King Street and River Road.

• **Right-turn Entry Only Option** - Restricted access whereby only right turns would be permitted entering Stonegate Drive and all movements permitted exiting Stonegate Drive.

6.6 Intersection Control Study Update

A draft Intersection Control Study, updating a previous report prepared in 2007, compares the safety and operations, capital and 20-year study period costs for possible roundabouts at three intersections along the River Road extension. Additional analysis and review of the study will consider the following intersection options:

• Roundabout, stop control and traffic signal alternatives at the Goodrich Drive and Wilson Avenue intersection;
• Roundabout, stop control and traffic signal alternatives at the Goodrich Drive, Wabanaki Drive and Hidden Valley Road intersection; and
• Roundabout and stop control alternatives at the River Road Extension and Wabanaki Drive intersection (north end of Wabanaki Drive near Fairway Road).
6.7 What are the Benefits of the Preferred Design Concept 5?

In addition to all of the benefits that Design Concept 4C would bring, the Preferred Design Concept 5, when compared to Alternative Design Concept 4C, would:

- Reduce potential impact on an endangered species by reducing direct and indirect impact on woodlots that are potential dispersal habitat for the Jefferson Salamanders; and
- Utilize existing road alignments for more of the proposed new road and as a result would minimize the segregation of adjacent lands including environmentally sensitive lands, help conserve more of the core environmental features and minimize the direct and indirect impacts of the new road on those adjacent lands. A full comparison of the Design Concepts 4C and 5 is presented in Appendix “E”.

7.0 What Measures can be Implemented to Mitigate Potential Impacts as Part of Any River Road Extension Design?

In order to reduce or mitigate some of negative impacts on the natural and social environment, Region staff would implement the following measures, where appropriate and feasible:

- Apply minimum acceptable road design standards in some locations to minimize the loss of Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW) and mature woodland loss caused by the roadway and fill slopes along elevated portions across Hidden Valley and the Schneider Creek Valley;
- Use bio-engineering techniques to create steeper reinforced side slopes along the road extension to reduce the “footprint” of the road near all environmentally sensitive areas;
- Develop a stormwater management plan which incorporates appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) in accordance with the completed water resources impact study;
- Provide for safe wildlife passage, beneath the bridge structure over Schneider Creek and further reduce the potential for wildlife mortality by reducing accessibility to the proposed new road surface through the Hidden Valley and Schneider Creek natural areas;
- Consider means to control public access from the new road to the Hidden Valley natural area;
- Develop and implement a plan to locate and protect Jefferson Salamanders prior to and during construction and during the future operation of the proposed road. If required by the Province, this would be documented in an application to the MNR for a permit under the Species at Risk Legislation;
- Develop an erosion and sedimentation control plan to prevent sedimentation into the adjacent natural areas during construction. Ensure that controls remain in place and in good working order until the road side slopes of the fill areas are stabilized and re-vegetated;
- Utilize open areas created by the new road for extensive tree planting such as on the side slopes of the River Road extension between Manitou Drive and Wilson Avenue and between Wabanaki Drive and Stonegate Drive;
- As soon as feasible after acquiring any required property for the road extension, pre-stress the future new edges of the woodland (i.e. selectively clear some of the trees/vegetation on the surrounding edges) along the approved road right-of-way to allow the residual trees some time to adjust to increased exposure to sun, wind, etc.;
- Identify and implement measures to protect the population of Regionally significant Fringed Gentian (a rare plant) through protection from indirect impact and/or transplanting the plants to nearby suitable habitat;
- Implement an environmental monitoring and remediation response plan to assess the effectiveness of measures to mitigate impacts of the new road on the natural environment, identify opportunities to improve the mitigation plan, and enforce compliance with the plan.
8.0 Will Property Need to be Acquired if River Road is Extended, and What Happens if Some of my Property is Required?

While it is the intent of the design process to minimize the need to acquire private property, the preferred River Road extension alignment will require acquisition of private property at several locations. The amount and exact location of property that would need to be acquired will not be known until a detailed design of the Preferred Design Concept is finalized following completion of this Class EA study. For any property identified for acquisition, the owner would be reimbursed by the Region of Waterloo for the required land at fair market value. An independent appraisal would be conducted for the property to determine fair market value. Please refer to Appendix “H” for a summary of the Region’s Property Acquisition Process.

9.0 How much will it Cost to Construct the Preferred River Road Extension Alignment?

At this point the estimated cost of the Preferred Alternative Design Concept 5, including the road construction, Highway 8 interchange, Schneider Creek bridge, environmental protection and mitigation, utility relocation, property acquisition and associated works is approximately $72 Million.

10. Will Noise Walls be Constructed for this Project?

The Project Team acknowledges that the construction of a new road will result in increases in noise levels to adjacent properties. As part of this Class EA Study, the Region of Waterloo will complete a Noise Assessment Study in accordance with Ministry of Environment (MOE) guidelines to determine the potential noise impact on adjacent properties. The study will assess the average existing and 10-year projected noise levels at several key noise sensitive locations where the backyards or side-yards of existing homes are adjacent to Preferred Design Concept 5. The key area within the River Road project where applicable noise sensitive locations are present includes the south side of River Road between Highway 8 and King Street as this section of River Road would be directly adjacent to the backyards and side-yard of the existing homes along Woodview Crescent and Stonegate Drive. According to Regional Policy, noise attenuation will be provided when:

- The projected 10-year noise level exceeds 65 dBA; OR
- The projected 10-year noise level exceeds 60 dBA AND the difference between the existing and 10-year projected noise levels is 5 dBA or more.

Noise attenuation may be in the form of a noise wall or an earth berm where space permits in the road allowance. The Region’s consultant for the Class EA, IBI Group has undertaken to complete a noise study in accordance with Ministry of Environment requirements. Once the study is completed, the results will be communicated to all adjacent owners in the identified noise sensitive locations.
11.0 What Are the Next Steps in Completing the River Road Extension Class EA?

All comments from the public, stakeholders and involved agencies will be considered by the Project Team, in conjunction with all of the other relevant information, to confirm the Project Team’s Preferred Design Concept for the River Road Extension.

To complete this Class EA study, the major completion milestones are:

- Complete a noise impact study. The noise study recommendations will be considered prior to finalizing the Class EA Study.
- Hold a Public Input Meeting with Regional Council in December, 2013 to present the Project Team’s Preferred Design Concept and obtain additional input from the Public;
- Consider Public Input and prepare a Recommended Design Concept for presentation to the Public and to Regional Council for consideration in early 2014;
- Following Regional Council endorsement of a Recommended Design Concept, file the Environmental Study Report with the Ministry in 2014 followed by a period of review by the public and Ministry of the Environment;
- Detailed design, property acquisition, and utility relocations would occur in 2014-2016; and
- Road construction is planned to commence in 2017, subject to budget approval.

12.0 How Will I Receive Further Notification Regarding this Project?

Adjacent property owners and tenants, as well as members of the public who have signed in at this and previous Public Consultation Centres will receive any forthcoming additional information and be notified of future meetings via mail and/or hand delivered notices. Further meeting notices will also be advertised in the local newspaper and on the Region’s project web site.

13.0 How Can I Register my Comments and Opinions About the River Road Extension Class EA Study at this Stage?

In order to assist the Project Team in addressing any comments or concerns you might have regarding this study, we ask that you please fill out the attached Comment Sheets and leave them in the box provided at the registration table. Alternatively, you can mail, fax or e-mail your comments to Wayne Cheater at the Region of Waterloo, not later than October 18, 2013.

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

Mr. Wayne Cheater, P. Eng.                      Mr. Don Drackley, MCIP, RPP, MITE
Senior Project Manager                          Senior Associate
Regional Municipality of Waterloo              IBI Group
150 Frederick St., 6th Floor                   379 Queen Street South
Kitchener, ON, N2G 4J3                         Kitchener, ON N1S 5A5
Phone: 519-575-4757 Ext. 3183                  Phone: 519-745-9455
Fax: 519-575-4430                              Fax: 519-745-7647 ext. 1302
Email: WCheater@regionofwaterloo.ca           Email: ddrackley@ibigroup.com
ONTARIO ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT ACT

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

The key principles of successful environmental assessment planning include:

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

MUNICIPAL CLASS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA)

The Municipal Class EA is a planning process approved under the Environmental Assessment Act that is used by municipalities to plan infrastructure enhancement projects while satisfying the requirements of the Environmental Assessment Act. Under the Class EA process, Schedule “C” projects are described as:

Schedule “C” - Includes larger, more complex projects with the potential for significant environmental affects.

- These projects are subject to all phases of the Class EA and require a minimum of 3 points of public contact.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Members of the public that have a stake in the project are encouraged to provide comment throughout the Class EA process. For Schedule “C” projects there are a minimum of three (3) opportunities for public contact. These typically include two Public Information Centres and the Notice of Study Completion.
MUNICIPAL CLASS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT PROCESS

APPENDIX B-2
Natural Resources Inventory & Impact Assessment in Hidden Valley

Update 2005 Natural Heritage Study - biological conditions and data, status of species, new provincial and Region legislation and designations;

Update LGL Ltd. reports documenting the 2007 and 2008 Jefferson salamander fieldwork;

Evaluate natural heritage impacts; anc...
Natural Resources Inventory & Impact Assessment in Schneider's Creek Valley

On Homer Watson Park ESPA

Direct Impact On Core Environmental Features

Indirect Impact On Core Environmental Features
Alternative Fairway Road Solutions Studied

Roundabout Corridor
Fairway Road capacity improvements with roundabouts does not provide enough relief capacity along Fairway Road to solve forecasted traffic attractions. Ramps at the Highway 8 and Fairway Road interchange, and the Manitou intersection still operate over-capacity.

Conclusion: Fairway Road remains a congested corridor. Roundabouts or widening would provide added capacity, but also attracts added traffic to the corridor so congestion is not relieved.

6 Lane Fairway Road Widening
Fairway Road capacity improvements did not provide enough relief capacity along Fairway Road to solve forecasted traffic attractions. Ramps at the Highway 8 and Fairway Road interchange, and the Manitou intersection still operate over-capacity.
Additional Interchange Concepts resulting from May 17, 2011 Public Consultation Centre

Unacceptable Operational Issues:
Having these tight turns on a River Road Extension could have the following adverse impacts:
- mislead driver expectations;
- cause vehicle control problems at higher speeds, especially under wet/snowy weather conditions; and
- increase the potential for more collisions, particularly rear-ends.

Alternative ‘H’

Traffic Operation & Property Impact Issues
NOT RECOMMENDED

Alternative ‘S’

Traffic Operation Issues
NOT RECOMMENDED
### Natural, Social & Economic Impact Comparisons in Hidden Valley

**GOAL 1: MINIMIZE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT IMPACTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measured Criteria</th>
<th>Alternative 4C</th>
<th>Alternative 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Direct Impacts on PSW Wetlands</td>
<td>2.3% - 0.45 ha</td>
<td>2.0% - 0.39 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Indirect Impacts to PSW Wetlands</td>
<td>15.4% - 2.92 ha</td>
<td>11.5% - 2.19 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Direct Impact to Hidden Valley ESA (existing &amp; candidate ESA)</td>
<td>3.01 ha</td>
<td>1.25 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Indirect Impact to Hidden Valley ESA (existing &amp; candidate ESA)</td>
<td>8.28 ha</td>
<td>7.02 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Direct Impact to Core Environmental Features</td>
<td>2.07 ha</td>
<td>0.97 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Total Impact to Vegetation Community</td>
<td>Low - 3.10 ha</td>
<td>Low - 2.50 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Med - 1.60 ha</td>
<td>Med - 1.14 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High - 1.29 ha</td>
<td>High - 0.84 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 Direct Impact to Woodlands</td>
<td>5.99 ha</td>
<td>4.48 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10 Direct Impacts to Known Locations of Regional Significant Species</td>
<td>17% - 1.29 ha</td>
<td>11% - 0.84 ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GOAL 2: MINIMIZE SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT IMPACTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measured Criteria</th>
<th>Alternative 4C</th>
<th>Alternative 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Property Displacement/Fragmentation</td>
<td>W of Hwy 8 - 8.23 ha</td>
<td>W of Hwy 8 - 4.96 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E of Hwy 8 - 2.67 ha</td>
<td>E of Hwy 8 - 2.61 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.96 ha</td>
<td>7.57 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Property Acquisition Cost</td>
<td>+/- $5.5 Million</td>
<td>+/- $5.2 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not including legal &amp; Injurious Affection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GOAL 4: PROMOTE COST-EFFECTIVE ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measured Criteria</th>
<th>Alternative 4C</th>
<th>Alternative 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Hwy 8 Crossing Structure Construction Cost</td>
<td>Single span, 68m</td>
<td>2-span, 108m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58.7 Million</td>
<td>$15.7 Million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.2 Potential Comparative Cost of Mitigation & Compensation for Natural Environment Impacts**

- Allowance of $750,000 (plantings, erosion controls, slope treatment, etc.)
- Allowance of $250,000 (plantings, erosion controls, slope treatment, etc.)
# Natural Resources Impact Assessment in Schneider’s Creek Valley

## Goal 1: Minimize Natural Environment Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measured Criteria</th>
<th>Alternative 4C and 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1 Direct Impacts on PSW Wetlands</strong></td>
<td>There are no PSWs in the vicinity of the Schneider Creek crossing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2 Indirect Impacts to PSW Wetlands</strong></td>
<td>There are no PSWs in the vicinity of the Schneider Creek crossing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.3 Direct Impact to Hidden Valley ESPA (existing &amp; candidate ESPA)</strong></td>
<td>The alternative will not directly impact the Homer Watson Park ESPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.4 Indirect Impact to Hidden Valley ESPA (existing &amp; candidate ESPA)</strong></td>
<td>The alternative will indirectly impact 0.11 ha of the Homer Watson Park ESPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.5 Direct Impact to Core Environmental Features</strong></td>
<td>The alternative will not directly impact Core Environmental Features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.6 Indirect Impact to Core Environmental Features</strong></td>
<td>The alternative will indirectly impact 0.11 ha of Core Environmental Features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.7 Impact to Vegetation Communities (ELC Classifications)</strong></td>
<td>Low = 0.37 ha, Med = 0.1 ha, High = 0.74 ha, Total = 1.2 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.8 Impacts to Woodlands</strong></td>
<td>Will directly impact 16% (0.74 ha out of 4.56 ha total) of Deciduous Woodland Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measured Criteria (Continued)</th>
<th>Alternative 4C and 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.9 Wildlife Resources</strong></td>
<td>The alternative affects remnant forested, meadow and wetland communities behind industrial properties, where no ‘significant wildlife habitat’ is identified. Local and resident animal habitat linkages and movement corridor function along Schneider Creek will be mitigated with bridge structure crossing that accommodates wildlife passage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.10 Fisheries and Aquatic Habitat</strong></td>
<td>The alternative will cross Schneider Creek which supports a warmwater and coolwater fish community. Mitigation measures include spanning the creek meander belt with a bridge structure crossing to maintain creek corridor functions and maintain fish habitat along this reach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.11 Regional Significant Species</strong></td>
<td>The alternative crosses existing disturbed and remnant forested and wetland habitat. No Regionally Significant Species have been identified within these areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Functional Design – Alternative 5
River Road Extension from King Street to Wabanaki Drive
Functional Design – Alternative 5
River Road Extension from Wabanaki Drive to Goodrich Drive

Selection of a Roundabout vs. Stop Control at this intersection is subject to additional analysis and review.
**Functional Design – Alternative 5**

River Road Extension from Goodrich Drive to Manitou Drive

* Selection of Roundabout vs. traffic signals or stop control at these Goodrich Dr. intersections is subject to additional analysis and review.
Functional Design
River Road Extension from King Street to Manitou Drive

Road Design Criteria: Typical Road Cross-Section

NOTE: Width of Road Will Vary to Minimize Natural Environment Impacts
River Rd / Stonegate Dr. Intersection
Finalist Alternatives

ROAD DESIGN
ALL MOVEMENTS ALLOWED

All Movements Allowed In and Out of Stonegate Dr.

OPTION 4
CHANNELIZATION - ALL OUT MOVEMENTS AND RIGHT-IN ONLY

All Movements Allowed Out of Stonegate Dr., and only Right Turn Allowed into Stonegate Dr.
Appendix H

Property Acquisition Process Information Sheet
(Projects requiring Class Environmental Assessment Approval)

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

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

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

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

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

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

The initial meetings will form the basis 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.

For information on the expropriation process, please refer to ‘Expropriation Information Sheet’.
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 to us October 18, 2013.

Question #1 - Please indicate your opinion on the Preferred Design Concept 5 for this project shown in Appendix _:

I Support it  

Why?  

I Do Not Support it  

Why not?

Please continue to next page 2 of 2
Question #2 – Do you have any concerns or suggestions not identified or adequately addressed through this Class EA study?

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Do you wish to be on the mailing list for this project?    Yes  □  No  □
Name: ___________________________ __   ______________
Address: _   _________ ________________________________
Postal Code:    _______________
Phone & email:  _________________________________________

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 a decision on this project. Questions regarding this collection should be forwarded to the staff member indicated above. All names, addresses and comments will be included in material made available to the general public. Questions regarding this collection should be forwarded to the staff member noted above.
APPENDIX J

COMMENT SHEET #2 - Stonegate Drive Neighbourhood Access
REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO
RIVER ROAD EXTENSION FROM KING STREET TO MANITOU DRIVE

October 1, 2013

This sheet is for input to the choice of what if any restriction on access is preferred at the proposed intersection of Stonegate Drive and River Road Extension. 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 to us October 18, 2013.

Question #1 - Please indicate your opinion on the Preferred Option for Stonegate Drive Access for this project as shown in Appendix “G”:

I Support the full, unrestricted access option YES  NO

Why?__________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

Question #2 - Please indicate your opinion on the Preferred Option for Stonegate Drive Access for this project as shown in Appendix “G”:

I Support the right-turn only entry option YES  NO

Why?__________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

Please continue to next page 2 of 2

Mr. Wayne Cheater, P. Eng.  Mr. Don Drackley, MCIP, RPP, MIE
Senior Project Manager  Senior Associate
Regional Municipality of Waterloo  IBI Group
150 Frederick St., 6th Floor 379 Queen Street South
Kitchener, ON ,N2G 4J3 Kitchener, ON  N2G 1W6
Phone: 519-575-4757 Ext. 3183  Fax: 519-575-4430  Phone: 519-745-9455 Fax:  519-745-7647
Email: WCheater@regionofwaterloo.ca  Email: ddrackley@ibigroup.com
COMMENT SHEET (cont’d)

Question #2 – Are you a resident or owner of property in the Stonegate Drive neighbourhood which requires access to Stonegate Drive? Yes ☐ or No ☐
If yes please provide your name and address below.

Question #3 – Do you have other comments or concerns regarding the requirements for access to the Stonegate Drive neighborhood?

Do you wish to be on the mailing list for this project? Yes ☐ No ☐
Name: ________________________________________________
Address: _____________________________________________
Postal Code: __________________________________________
Phone & email: _________________________________________

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 a decision on this project. Questions regarding this collection should be forwarded to the staff member indicated above. All names, addresses and comments will be included in material made available to the general public. Questions regarding this collection should be forwarded to the staff member noted above.
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: October 1, 2013

FILE CODE: A09-00

SUBJECT: MOBILITYPLUS POLICY UPDATE

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the proposed revisions to MobilityPLUS eligibility criteria and policies as outlined in Report E-13-112, dated October 1, 2013:

a) Update the MobilityPLUS eligibility criteria to: “MobilityPLUS specialized services are intended for transit customers with a Physical disability who are unable to access fixed-route public transit, such as GRT conventional buses, for the majority of their transportation needs. Eligibility is considered on a case by case basis and is not based on a particular disability nor is it based on income level.”

b) Approve the Grand River Transit Policy - Managing Customer Adherence to Scheduled Service Delivery, attached as Appendix A to this report.

c) Approve the creation of a Transit Support Person card (PLUSone card) to be used as a bus fare to allow complimentary travel for one support person, if they are needed by the person with a disability to use transit, in accordance with the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act.

SUMMARY:

The Region of Waterloo’s Specialized Transit Services Advisory Committee is appointed by Council to represent the registrants of the MobilityPLUS service. Recently this group approved the following policy changes and are requesting Regional Council’s approval for a January 1, 2014 introduction.

- **Eligibility Policy:** Remove the reference to being unable to climb or descend stairs for future MobilityPLUS eligibility, since all conventional buses are now low floor and no longer have this barrier. Current customers would be reassessed to this new criterion when their eligibility comes up for renewal. This application renewal process occurs at five year intervals after a customer’s initial registration. Current customers expected to be impacted by the new criteria are those who became eligible due to a disability where using stairs was a barrier.

- **No-Show and Late Cancellation Policy:** Introduce a new policy to enhance accountability for customers who regularly book trips and are either; not there when the bus arrives, or do not cancel early enough for the ride to be rebooked. This policy exists in most other specialized transit services to help ensure these untaken rides can be available for waitlisted customers.

- **Transit Support Person Policy:** Introduce a policy to comply with AODA legislation to allow eligible registrants to travel with one transit support person and that no extra fare is charged.

Upon approval there will be communication by mail with each MobilityPLUS registrant to outline the change to the eligibility criteria and the introduction of the two new policies and programs.
REPORT:

This report recommends the introduction of three MobilityPLUS policies, as outlined in more detail below, to become effective January 1, 2014 as requested by the Region of Waterloo’s Specialized Transit Services Advisory Committee.

1) Eligibility Criteria:

The current MobilityPLUS Eligibility Criteria is outlined below.

In Kitchener, Waterloo and Cambridge, you may be eligible for MobilityPLUS if you meet one of the following requirements:

- Physically unable to climb or descend steps on conventional public transportation
- Unable to walk a distance of 175 metres (575 feet)
- Suffer from a temporary disability, such as a broken leg
- Registered with CNIB

However, there have been significant improvements made to the accessibility of conventional transit services with the introduction of low-floor buses. As of October 2012, all GRT buses in service are low-floor, which means that the physical barrier of having to ascend or descend stairs has been removed.

While improving the accessibility of conventional services does not eliminate the need for door-to-door specialized transit services, the improvements to the conventional buses permits a larger number of people with disabilities to travel on accessible conventional services. In 2012 there were 139,308 trips taken by MobilityPLUS registrants on conventional transit buses. This number continues to grow in 2013.

A review of several Ontario specialized transit systems eligibility criteria indicates that use of the “unable to climb or descend steps” wording has become less prevalent, especially among transit systems that no longer have conventional buses with stairs.

It is recommended that the Region of Waterloo adopt the following eligibility criteria effective January 1, 2014.

“MobilityPLUS specialized services are intended for transit customers with a Physical disability who are unable to access fixed-route public transit, such as GRT conventional buses, for the majority of their transportation needs. Eligibility is considered on a case by case basis and is not based on a particular disability nor is it based on income level.”

It is proposed that this eligibility criterion be used to evaluate prospective applications for both permanent and temporary registrations for MobilityPLUS services.

Existing MobilityPLUS registrants would be reassessed to this new criterion when their eligibility comes up for renewal. This application renewal occurs at five year intervals after a customer’s initial registration. Customers expected to be impacted by the new criteria will be those who became eligible due to a disability which prevented them from climbing or descending stairs.

2) Managing Customer Adherence to Scheduled Service Delivery Policy (Appendix A)

MobilityPLUS customer’s who do not take their previously booked trip and have not communicated their intention to cancel; create an ineffective use of transit resources. While this situation can occur due to unforeseen circumstances, there are many customers who frequently demonstrate this behaviour. These unused trips could have been offered to other waitlisted customers, had they been
cancelled at least 60 minutes in advance. On average there are 7,600 no-show trips experienced annually by MobilityPLUS. To deter this practice many transit systems have implemented No-Show and Cancellation policies to improve customer adherence to their pre-scheduled trips.

In discussion with the Specialized Transit Services Advisory Committee, there was strong consensus on the implementation of this policy. There were several comments regarding not being able to book trip times as requested and then their frustration as they interpret the ridership statistics on how often trips are wasted due to late cancellations or customer no shows.

Based on a review of the best industry practices a Managing Customer Adherence to Scheduled Service Delivery policy was developed (attached as Appendix A.) to address Late Cancellations. The policy defines a Late Trip Cancellation, which is when a customer cancels a trip with less than 60 minutes notice before the beginning of their scheduled pickup. The penalty for five late trip cancellations in a calendar month is a suspension of service for one month. The first occurrence of five cancellations in a month will result in a warning letter to inform the customer that should this occur again in the future their services will be suspended for one month. The letter will also outline the date and time of the Late Trip Cancellations and inform them when the future suspension of service will occur. In addition the letter will outline the appeal process should they wish to challenge the Late Cancellations findings.

The policy also defines No Show trips and outlines what does and does not qualify as a No Show trip. The recommended penalty for three No Shows in a calendar month is the suspension of service for one month. The first occurrence of three No Shows in a month will result in a warning letter to inform the customer that should this occur again in the future their services will be suspended for one month. The letter will also outline the date and time of the No Show occurrences and inform them when the future suspension of services will occur. In addition the letter will outline the appeal process should they wish to challenge the No Show findings.

Other communities that have introduced a No Show and Late Cancellation program have seen significant decreases in these practices. The number of No Shows and Late Cancellations will be monitored and reported quarterly to the Specialized Transit Services Advisory Committee.

3) Transit Support Person Policy

The Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) requires that effective January 2014; transit systems allow a transit support person to travel for free. Currently, GRT and MobilityPLUS both charge a separate fare for support persons.

A support person is defined as an assistant necessary to allow a customer to successfully use transit. If the support person is required for an activity at the end of their trip, but not for transit specifically, then this person would not be eligible to travel with a fare exempt support person.

In 2012 there were 14,132 support person trips provided on MobilityPLUS service. Assuming the support persons were all required for transit support, then the potential future lost revenue is estimated at $42,000. Since we do not track the number of support persons travelling on the conventional service it is difficult to determine the potential for lost revenue. However, using the same ratio for support person trips from MobilityPLUS the estimate would be 9,600 annual trips on the conventional service with the potential for an additional $29,000 in future lost revenue. The combined financial impact of this new support person program could be $71,000 annually.

To manage this AODA requirement, GRT will introduce a Support Person eligibility assessment program to determine which customers require a support person to use transit and they will then be issued a PLUSone card to display for the free travel of one companion.
The following criteria would be used to determine eligibility for the Transit Support Person card:

- cannot successfully travel independently on conventional and/or specialized GRT services
- a resident of the Region of Waterloo

**CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:**

*Focus Area 5.1 Improve the accessibility of Regional programs and services to support our diverse community.*

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

The cost to implement the updated MobilityPLUS eligibility criteria and to introduce the No Show and Cancellation policy are not expected to generate additional cost and will allow for a more effective use of the specialized transit resources.

The introduction of the AODA Support Person Policy will have an impact on transit revenue at an estimated value of $71,000 in lost revenue annually. This amount has been included in the 2014 base transit budget.

**OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:**

NIL

**ATTACHMENTS**

Policy - Managing Customer Adherence to Scheduled Service Delivery

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

**APPROVED BY:** Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Managing Customer Adherence to Scheduled Service Delivery

Original: Date of implementation TBD – DOCS#: 1353926 v2

Focus Area: Customer Service Delivery

Details:
This policy is designed to improve the efficiency of MobilityPLUS services, reduce costs incurred when a trip is reserved but then not utilized, and improve ride availability to other customers.

1) Trip Cancellations:

Definition of a Cancel:
- Customers that cancel a trip with more than 60 minutes notice before the beginning of the 30 minute scheduled pickup window.

Definition of a Late Cancel:
- Customers who cancel a trip with less than 60 minutes notice before the beginning of the 30 minute scheduled pickup window.
- It is preferred that customers call to cancel late rather than not notify us at all, however, the later the notification the less efficiently the customer can be replaced in the schedule.
- 5 or more late cancels per month will initiate a suspension of service process.

Consequence of Repeated Late Cancels:
- Customers who late cancel trips 5 or more times per calendar month will receive a suspension of service of 1 calendar month. For the first incident, customers will receive a Letter of Warning instead of Letter of Notice; ensuring comprehension of the policy requirements and consequences.

2) No Show Trips:

Definition of a No Show:
- a trip is cancelled by the customer within their 30 minute pick-up window,
- the customer is not waiting for just inside their door on the ground level of their building at the beginning of their pick-up window,
- the customer is not ready to leave at the pick-up time (even if the delay is caused by a caregiver)
- customer or their caregiver refuse the ride when it arrives,
- customer is not waiting at the pick-up point for their return trip,
- customer has more parcels than they can independently manage,
- customer has not ensured a safe walk or pathway to their residence door in the winter.
Customer Responsibility – No Shows:

It is the customer’s responsibility to know and be ready for the scheduled pick-up times. Being unaware of time the hospital, their support staff or family booked the ride is not considered an adequate reason for a No Show. The customer or the customer's advocate should make every effort to cancel scheduled trips in a timely manner. It is the customer's or advocate’s responsibility to provide the reasoning for not cancelling a trip. Some missed trips will not be counted as a No Show if it was for reasons beyond the customer's control as outlined below.

Consequence of Repeated No Shows

In any one calendar month three occurrences of a customer No Show will result in a suspension of service for one full calendar month. For the first occurrence of three No Show trips in one month the customers will receive a Letter of Warning. For any future occurrence of three No Show trips in one month the customer will receive a Letter of Notice outlining the details of the trips, the month when the suspension is scheduled to occur and how to challenge the suspension decision. There is additional information on the notification process and review process below.

Definition of a missed trip, that is NOT counted as a No Show:

- when a GRT vehicle arrives outside of the booked window (early or late)
- error made by GRT or contractor staff
- in inclement weather conditions that prevent a GRT vehicle from reaching your location,
- unplanned customer hospitalization (documentation may be requested by GRT),
- program closures due to inclement weather announced by radio stations.
- when the taxi office has not notified GRT dispatch of potential No Show, as dispatch can't verify that every effort was made to contact the customer

Customer Notification Process:

The customer will receive a Letter of Notice by mail by the 21st calendar day of the next month. The notice will include the date, time and destination addresses of rides for which the customer was a Late Cancel or a No Show. The notice will also identify the calendar month for which the suspension will apply. It will be two months away from current month to provide sufficient time for the customer to make alternate transportation arrangements. For example, if the Letter of Notice is dated February 2013, then the month of service suspension will be April 2013.

Review Process

Within 15 business days of the date of Letter of Notice, the customer (or a customer's advocate) may file a verbal or written request for review for any No Shows or Late Cancellation issued by contacting the Coordinator, Education and Training. The Coordinator, Education and Training will then review this appeal with the Supervisor MobilityPLUS Customer Service and the Assistant Manager Specialized Service to determine if there will be an adjustment made to the customer’s No Shows or Late Cancellation record to reverse the service suspension.
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: October 1, 2013

FILE CODE: T01-20/6

SUBJECT: RESERVED CYCLING LANES ON HIGHLAND ROAD (REGIONAL ROAD 6) / SNYDER’S ROAD (REGIONAL ROAD 6) FROM IRA NEEDLES BOULEVARD (REGIONAL ROAD 70) TO 320 METRES EAST OF NOTRE DAME DRIVE (REGIONAL ROAD 12) IN THE CITY OF KITCHENER AND THE TOWNSHIP OF WILMOT

RECOMMENDATION:
For information

SUMMARY:
NIL

REPORT:
As outlined in Report E-13-090, staff proposed the installation of reserved cycling lanes on both sides of Snyder’s Road (Regional Road 6) / Highland Road (Regional Road 6) from Ira Needles Boulevard (Regional Road 70) to Trussler Road and on both sides of Snyder’s Road from Trussler Road to 320 metres east of Notre Dame Drive (Regional Road 12).

At its regular scheduled meeting on August 22, 2013, Regional Council passed a motion requesting that Regional Transportation Division staff prepare a report to consider options to address parking needs of residents and a cycling facility along Snyder’s Road. A copy of Report E-13-090 is included in Appendix A.

Figure 1 shows the subject section of Snyder’s Road and Highland Road under review.

Figure 1 – Section of Snyder’s Road and Highland Road Under Review
Staff assessed various options to accommodate cycling and parking along the shoulder of Snyder’s Road and Highland Road. Table 1 provides a list of all alternatives considered and their associated impacts.

**Table 1 – Alternatives to Reserved Cycling Lanes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option #</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Do not reserve a cycling lane</td>
<td>• Paved shoulder to be free most of the time</td>
<td>Potential parked vehicles on paved shoulder and cyclists may have to ride on travelled lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Parking permitted on shoulder/grass/gravel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reserve cycling lane, but allow parking behind cycling lane</td>
<td>• Cycling lanes to be free at all times</td>
<td>Risk of parked vehicles getting stuck. May be confusing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Parking permitted on grass/gravel shoulder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reserve cycling lane/ restrict parking beyond homes only behind cycling lane</td>
<td>• Cycling lanes to be free at all times</td>
<td>Risk of parked vehicles getting stuck. May be confusing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Parking permitted on grass/gravel shoulder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reserve cycling lanes and prohibit parking on weekdays only.</td>
<td>• No parking allowed on weekdays</td>
<td>Not obvious parking is permitted in cycling lane on weekends. May be confusing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Clear cycling lanes 5 days per week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Construct parking/ provide paving on available shoulder width</td>
<td>• Clear cycling lanes and parking spaces provided</td>
<td>Prohibitively high cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Reserve cycling lanes and Special Event Permit</td>
<td>• Clear cycling lanes.</td>
<td>Residents can request parking to be permitted on the cycling lanes when needed for a special occasion. Difficult to implement and enforce. May be confusing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Parking permitted for residents when needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After reviewing the options, staff is proposing to proceed with Option 1 to not reserve a cycling facility on both sides of Snyder’s Road / Highland Road from Ira Needles Boulevard to Trussler Road and on both sides of Snyder’s Road from Trussler Road to 320 metres east of Notre Dame Drive. This option will provide space for cyclists separate from the vehicular lane and allow residents to use the paved shoulder for parking.

Staff shared the alternative option with the Active Transportation Advisory Committee (ATAC) in order to obtain their feedback. The ATAC serves as a forum for members of the public to raise their viewpoints on particular active transportation issues. A summary of ATAC comments are summarized as follows:
- Pleased with the 1.5 m bike facility (as opposed to the 1m in the past);
- Prefer staff’s original recommendation given the few number of homes affected;
- Support the revised alternative to mark the edges of the 1.5 m “lane” and if it is ok from a risk and liability point of view to mark it with the bike symbol;
- If feasible suggest to mark the shoulder with a bike symbol everywhere but in front of the houses; and
- Cautioned that this could be precedent setting and others may demand similar preferential treatment.

As previously noted Report E-13-090 proposed the installation of reserved cycling lanes and proposed the installation of a “No Parking Anytime” restriction. It is now proposed that a shared use facility be installed to accommodate both cyclists and parking. As such, those that have indicated that they wish to be advised when this matter will be dealt with by the Regional Planning and Works Committee as per Report E-13-090 have been notified.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

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

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

NIL

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

NIL

ATTACHMENTS:

NIL

PREPARED BY: Jyoti Nair, Engineering Technologist (Traffic)

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

REGION OF WATERLOO
TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
Transportation

TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
DATE: August 13, 2013
FILE CODE: T01-20/6
SUBJECT: RESERVED CYCLING LINES ON HIGHLAND ROAD (REGIONAL ROAD 6) / SNYDER’S ROAD (REGIONAL ROAD 6) FROM IRA NEEDLES BOULEVARD (REGIONAL ROAD 70) TO 320 METRES EAST OF NOTRE DAME DRIVE (REGIONAL ROAD 12) IN THE CITY OF KITCHENER AND THE TOWNSHIP OF WILMOT

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo amend Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended, to:

a) Add to Schedule 1 No Parking Anytime on both sides of Highland Road (Regional Road 6) from Ira Needles Boulevard (Regional Road 70) to Trussler Road;

b) Add to Schedule 1 No Parking Anytime on both sides of Snyder’s Road (Regional Road 6) from Trussler Road to 320 metres east of Notre Dame Drive (Regional Road 12);

c) Add to Schedule 24 Reserved Cycling Lanes on both sides of Highland Road (Regional Road 6) from Ira Needles Boulevard (Regional Road 70) to Trussler Road;

d) Add to Schedule 24 Reserved Cycling Lanes on both sides of Snyder’s Road (Regional Road 6) from Trussler Road to 320 metres east of Notre Dame Drive (Regional Road 12)

in the Township of Wilmot and the City of Kitchener, as outlined in Report E-13-090, dated August 13, 2013.

SUMMARY: NIL

REPORT:

Snyder’s Road (Regional Road 6) east of Notre Dame Drive (Regional Road 12) is scheduled for resurfacing in the Region’s Transportation Capital Program. The resurfacing works are scheduled to be complete during the summer months in 2013. The Region of Waterloo is proposing reserved cycling lanes on both sides of Highland Road (Regional Road 6) from Ira Needles Boulevard (Regional Road 70) to Trussler Road and on both sides of Snyder’s Road from Trussler Road to 320 metres east of Notre Dame Drive. This section of Snyder’s Road/Highland Road is identified as a designated cycling route in the Region’s draft Active Transportation Master Plan. Township of Wilmot staff had also requested that the Region consider the provision of cycling facilities on Snyder’s Road as part of an initiative to provide cycling connections between the various settlement areas in Wilmot Township.

1400099
From May 27 to June 3, 2013, Transportation staff placed information signs along Snyder’s Road / Highland Road requesting comments on the proposed changes from the public 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, 76 questionnaires were delivered to residents fronting Snyder’s Road / Highland Road within the project limits also requesting comments on the proposed changes.

A total of 22 responses were received, of which 68% (15 of 22) are in favour of installing reserved cycling lanes on both sides of the road. Those residents in opposition of the reserved cycling lanes are concerned about the loss of parking on Snyder’s Road which they use occasionally during family events or gatherings. Staff has observed very little to no parking activity on Snyder’s Road / Highland Road and the residences within the project limits generally have driveways in excess of 85 feet.

A few residents were also concerned with heavy truck traffic and cyclists’ safety on Snyder’s Road. A review of the collision history between 2007 and 2011 shows that there has been 1 collision involving a cyclist on Snyder’s Road / Highland Road within the proposed limits. A motorist travelling westbound on Snyder’s Road lost control of the vehicle attempting to avoid a cyclist travelling in the same direction within the centre of the westbound travel lane. Based on the 5-year collision history Transportation Division staff do not anticipate an increase in collisions with regard to cyclists. As proposed, cycling lanes would be provided allowing cyclists to avoid travelling in the vehicular lanes. Figure 1 illustrates the proposed reserved cycling lanes and proposed no parking limits.

Figure 1 – Proposed Reserved Cycling Lanes and No Parking Anytime Restrictions on Snyder’s Road / Highland Road

The Township of Wilmot and City of Kitchener staff support the installation of reserved cycling lanes on Snyder’s Road / Highland Road within the proposed project limits.
CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

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

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The cost for installing the reserved cycling lanes along Snyder’s Road is approximately $12,000 and is included in the budget for the Rural Recycling project for Snyder’s Road.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

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

ATTACHMENTS:  NIL

PREPARED BY:  Jyoti Nair, Engineering Technologist (Traffic)

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

TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
DATE: October 1, 2013
FILE CODE: C06-60; E12-20/ 8281

SUBJECT: CONSULTANT SELECTION FOR THE SURFACE WATER QUALITY
MONITORING PROGRAM

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into a Consulting Services Agreement with LGL Limited to provide consulting services over at 5.5 year period for undertaking the Surface Water Quality Monitoring Program, at an upset limit of $1,994,735 plus applicable taxes, as per Report E-13-119 dated October 1, 2013.

SUMMARY:

The Region has been conducting water quality monitoring of the middle Grand River and its tributaries since 2004. The current Surface Water Quality Monitoring Program includes water quality monitoring in the Grand, Speed, Nith, Conestogo rivers and Canagagigue, Laurel and Schneider’s Creeks on a quarterly basis, every year.

The main objective of this work is to collect the information which allows for continued evaluation of the performance of the Region’s wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) and potential impact of planned wastewater treatment plant upgrades to surface water quality. In addition, the monitoring program will allow for more detailed assimilative capacity studies required for plant upgrades or plant expansions in the future. The scope of this assignment involves collection, analyses, assessment and management of water quality data and reporting over a 5.5 year period.

A Request for Consultant Services for Surface Water Quality Monitoring Program was advertised in The Record and on the Region’s Purchasing website. Based on the selection process completed in accordance with the Region’s consultant selection policy and the Region’s Purchasing By-law, which included review of the consultant’s Letter of Interest, Detailed Work Plans, schedules and upset fee costs, the project team recommends that LGL Limited be retained to undertake this assignment at an upset fee of $ 1,994,735 plus applicable taxes.

It is anticipated that upon receiving Regional Council approval, continuation of the Water Quality Surface Monitoring Program will commence in October 2013, and the assignment will be completed in spring 2019. This study involves a complex sampling and analysis program. Additionally, the data is compared and trended for both water quality and biological result from previous years.
REPORT:

Background

The Region conducted water quality monitoring of the middle Grand and lower Speed Rivers as part of the Wastewater Treatment Master Plan from 2004 to early 2009. In 2009, the Region consolidated these monitoring efforts into one long-term assignment to help reduce overall costs and bring efficiencies in terms of both data collection and management. The current program includes water quality monitoring upstream and downstream of the Waterloo, Kitchener, Preston, Galt, Hespeler, Wellesley, New Hamburg, Ayr, St. Jacobs and Elmira WWTPs. Laurel and Schneider’s Creeks are also monitored at the estuary to Grand River to verify their impact on the river’s water quality. The water quality monitoring program includes quarterly analyses for routine chemistry and nutrient parameters, analyses of benthic and fish communities every three years, as well as biennial longitudinal surveys.

The objective of this comprehensive monitoring program is to build a water quality database, which will allow the Region to better and continually assess effects of its WWTP discharges into the receiving streams and continually evaluate the impacts of planned upgrades to the Region’s wastewater treatment plants on surface water quality.

Data collected by the Region in the last 10 years as part of the surface water quality monitoring program have provided better information for undertaking several assimilative capacity studies for streams receiving effluent from the Region’s WWTP. These studies have assisted the Region in defining the required level of treatment for the future plant upgrades and the best time to implement the upgrades. As an example, the recently completed assimilative capacity study for the Speed River identified that the Region could likely delay the installation of filters as the proposed Hespeler WWTP upgrades, deferring approximately $15 million past 2041.

This program also fulfills the mandatory monitoring requirements of the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (CCME) Canada-wide Strategy for Managing Municipal Wastewater Effluent. The proposed strategy addresses issues related to governance, wastewater facility performance, effluent quality and quantity, and infrastructure needs while ensuring funding for improved treatment is managed in an equitable and sustainable way. Environmental monitoring at a watershed level is considered important under the strategy as the results provide indication that measures for the protection of the environment are taken.

Scope of Work

The main scope of this consultant assignment is to complete Surface Water Monitoring Program planned work including:

- Quarterly collection of water quality data, including seasonal/routine water quality monitoring;
- 950 samples analyzed for chemistry and additional sampling for fish studies and benthic analysis;
- Biennial longitudinal survey of monitored streams;
- Benthic and fish communities analyses every 3 years;
- Data processing and database management;
- Preparation of quarterly reports and annual summary Reports.
Consultant Selection

The Request for Consultant Services (C2013-20) for Surface Water Quality Monitoring Program was advertised in The Record and on the Region’s Purchasing website in June 2013. Evaluation of the consultant submissions was conducted by the Region’s Project Team:

J. Cavalcante, Manager, Engineering and Planning, Water Services
T. Brown, Senior Project Engineer, Engineering and Wastewater Programs, Water Services
D. Celmer-Repin, 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 evaluation criteria and their respective weightings were as follows:

Quality Factors (80%)
- Project Understanding and Approach (25 percent)
- Experience of the Project Manager (20 percent)
- Experience of the Project Support Staff (20 percent)
- Experience on Similar Projects (15 percent)

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

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

The Region received a Letter of Interest from fourteen (14) consultant teams, and these were evaluated by the Project Team according to the above Quality and Equity factors. Three (3) teams were short-listed:
- LGL Limited.
- Matrix Solutions Inc.
- Stantec Consulting Ltd.

The three short-listed consultants 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 the evaluation of the Letters of Interest and Detailed Work Plans, the upset fee envelopes were opened and the overall scores, including the Price Factor, were calculated. The LGL Limited submission received the highest overall score, with the second lowest price. Based on this evaluation, the project team recommends that LGL Limited be retained to undertake this assignment at an upset fee of $1,994,735 plus applicable taxes.

Consultant Upset Fee

The upset fee for consulting fees and disbursements for Surface Water Quality Monitoring Program is $1,994,735 plus applicable taxes. A breakdown of the consultant’s upset fee is included in Appendix A attached to this report.
Schedule

Subject to Council’s approval of this report, the proposed schedule is approximately 5.5 years commencing in October 2013 and ending in April 2019.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The Surface Water Quality Monitoring Program supports the Corporate Strategic Plan Focus Area 1: Environmental Sustainability; and Strategic Objectives: “1.1 - integrate environmental considerations into the Region’s decision-making” and “1.4 - protect the quality and quantity of our water sources.”

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The cost of the proposed Surface Water Quality Monitoring Program, subject to this report, is $399,000 per year, which is within the Council approved 2013 Wastewater Capital Program that includes $400,000 per year to cover the cost. The average yearly cost for this program from 2004 to 2009 was $381,000 per year. This project is funded from the Development Charge Reserve Fund and the Wastewater Reserve Fund.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Finance Department, Financial Services, and Procurement and Supply Services

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix A: Breakdown of consultant’s upset fee

PREPARED BY: Dominika Celmer-Repin, Project Engineer, Water Services

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collection of Water Quality Data</td>
<td>$1,486,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Data Processing and Database Management</td>
<td>$102,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>$405,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Consultant Upset Fee</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,994,735</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting date</td>
<td>Requestor</td>
<td>Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-Jun-13</td>
<td>G. Lorentz</td>
<td>Staff to review signage on Trussler Road/Ira Needles Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-Jun-13</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Operation of Raised Crosswalks Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Haalboom</td>
<td>Staff continue to lobby the Province for changes to the <em>Highway Traffic Act</em> providing right of way to pedestrians and on an as needed basis provide an update to Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>