MEDIA RELEASE: Friday, November 8, 2013, 4:30 p.m.

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO
PLANNING AND WORKS COMMITTEE
AGENDA

Tuesday, November 12, 2013
12:30 P.M.
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 (1:00 p.m.)
   a) John Shortreed re: Light Rail Transit (LRT)

   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.

4. REQUEST TO REMOVE ITEMS FROM CONSENT AGENDA

5. MOTION TO APPROVE ITEMS OR RECEIVE FOR INFORMATION
   b) CR-RS-13-091/P-13-099, Surplus Declaration and Dedication of Lands
      Adjacent to Goodrich Drive, City of Kitchener, as Road Widening to the City of
      Kitchener (Approval)
   c) P-13-110, Amendment to Regional Municipality of Waterloo Controlled Access
      by-law #58-87 for an Access to Regional Road #80 (Can-Amera Parkway), City
      of Cambridge (Approval)
   d) Uptown Waterloo King Street North Streetscape Improvement Project from
      Rapid Transit (Ion) Tracks to Central Street and King Street North
      Reconstruction from Central Street to University Avenue, Municipal Class
      Environmental Assessments – Information Package in advance of Combined
      Public Consultation Centre (Information)
   e) E-13-131, Trussler Road (Regional Road 70) Post 1-Year Construction Posted
      Speed Limit Review, City of Kitchener / Township of Wilmot (Information)
REGULAR AGENDA RESUMES

6. REPORTS - PLANNING, HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

a) P-13-106, Electronic Fare Management System Project Update 42

REPORTS - TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

RAPID TRANSIT


WASTE MANAGEMENT

c) E-13-127, Waste Management Master Plan: Final Study Report (Staff presentation) 61

d) E-13-136, Waste Management Funding Models 71

e) E-13-134, IC&I Waste Tonnage Reduction Impacts 75

7. INFORMATION/CORRESPONDENCE

a) Structural Design Innovation Award for Fairway Road Grand River Bridge 82

b) Provincial Review of Land Use Planning and Appeal System 83

c) Council Enquiries and Requests for Information Tracking List 84

8. OTHER BUSINESS

9. NEXT MEETING – December 3, 2013

10. ADJOURN
### NEXT MEETINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning and Works Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 3, 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>January 7, 2014</td>
<td>9:00 A.M.</td>
<td>Planning and Works Committee</td>
<td>Council Chamber 2nd Floor, Regional Administration Building 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation and Environmental Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed. November 13, 2013</td>
<td>5:30 P.M. – 8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Uptown Waterloo King Street North Streetscape Improvement Project from Rapid Transit (Ion) Tracks to Central Street and King Street North Reconstruction from Central Street to University Avenue - Municipal Class Environmental Assessments – Combined Public Consultation Centre</td>
<td>Hauser House Waterloo Memorial Recreation Complex 101 Father David Bauer Drive Waterloo, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue., December 3, 2013</td>
<td>7:00 P.M. – 9:30 P.M.</td>
<td>Public Input Meeting for the River Road Extension from King Street to Manitou Drive Kitchener.</td>
<td>Council Chamber 2nd Floor, Regional Administration Building 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed., December 4, 2014</td>
<td>4:00 P.M. – 8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Mill Street at Ottawa Street Intersection Modifications</td>
<td>Concordia Club 429 Ottawa Street S. Kitchener, N2M 3P6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Shortreed,

Presentation outline for November 12, 2013 to Regional council committee

Request Region to undertake a 1 million dollar due diligence study on the LRT in next 3-4 Months

Early next year the Region will commit to a one billion dollar capital and operating expenditure over the next 20 years, in addition to the approximate 80 million committed expenditures so far on the LRT focused transit system.

Since the approval of the LRT project there has been considerable investment in the transit system, sufficient that the impacts of increased transit service can be observed.

It is prudent for the Region, particularly with the strong negative opinions of the taxpayers, to undertake due diligence prior to final approval of the LRT. The Region should welcome the opportunity to have an independent assessment of changes in transit use and development confirm the existing transit oriented transport plans. It is estimated that such a study could be done in 3-4 months and cost about 1 million dollars or about one tenth of one % of the remaining capital and operating costs over the next 20 years.

The Region’s transport plan, focused on the LRT, envisages a shift of 15% of the 90% car usage away from the car mode and to transit, walking, and reduced trips. The intense introduction of increased transit service, cross town express buses to feed the existing iXpress service, which mirrors almost exactly the route and travel times for the LRT, has allowed for realistic assessment that the expected changes in trip behaviour have begun to take place.

It should also be possible, for example, to examine assumptions in the plan associated with the doubling of activity in downtown Kitchener, the biggest employment and commuter oriented core in the Region which is essential to achieving higher “choice transit” usage involving transfer of trips from cars to transit. To put this in context, the plan requires by 2031 a 200% increase in per capita use of transit and the majority of that increase is from car users getting out of their cars and onto transit. The so called “choice transit” users are planned to go from a few people today to over 100,000 trips per day.

The study would examine the shift of some 100,000 trips per day over the initial 2-3 years of the 20 year planning period. This examination would depend heavily on the existing data collected by GRT on boardings, alightings, and the characteristics of passengers (university passes, regular fares, school passes, special passes, etc) collected on a regular basis and invaluable for identifying who is using transit and where the growth in ridership is happening.

For example, I recently sent each member of Regional Council a copy of a very preliminary study of the i202 route from the Boardwalk to Conestogo Mall via the two Universities (attached below). That study indicated that the passengers in the PM peak were more than 90% University Students using their prepaid passes, so the revenue was very small and the costs of the service are reported as 4.2 million per year operating – not a good omen for the Region’s plan, especially the 50% target for operating cost recovery.

A study independent of Regional staff and with an advisory board of local business people, university and college representatives and knowledgeable taxpayers would ensure the impartiality of the study.
The study should also undertake a poll to update the current but dated information that shows about 60% of the population opposed to the LRT, especially if the poll were taken once the trends and how they inform on the Region’s targets were estimated and published.

The largest investment in the Region’s history must follow well developed business and economic practise and invest in a realistic and evidence based 11th hour review to ensure that recent trends support the assumptions made in planning the LRT and provide confidence to go ahead with the billion dollar investment.

***************supporting attachment%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%%***************

Sept 27, 2013 – A RIDE on the i202 feeder bus rapid transit service (sent to Regional Council and the Record for an unpublished letter to the editor)

The 3,600 daily riders on iXpress 202 (reported in the Record a few days earlier) is praised by councillor Wideman and the Record as an omen that the Region’s goals will be reached.

To check this omen, I took a ride on the iXpress 202 from the Boardwalk to Conestoga Mall, and then back again, in the afternoon peak. I counted each person getting on and getting off and the number on board. The results are an omen but not a good one.

There were in total 97 people who got on the bus, all but 5 were students using a University pass. The riders, when expanded to a daily total estimated 3,880 rides per day, slightly more than the 3,600 estimated by GRT. The pattern of riders was that of a University service, with the maximum load being at the University of Waterloo and WLU, ridership dropped off quickly and on one trip there were 9 stops on University Avenue East with no one boarding or alighting.

So while the costs of this service are 4.2 million per year plus capital costs, less some savings due to reduction in routes serving the same area, the revenue is close to 0 as the students all used their passes to board the bus and likely many of them just rode the 202 rather than some other bus to get to where they wanted to go. Unless the cost of the bus pass is increased there is no new revenue except for the 5% non-student riders.

While the future may bring a dramatic increase in non-student riders the target of more transit use and less car use is not supported by the existing use of the iXpress routes.

It would be good if the Region and the Record did their own survey on the ridership and who is riding the buses and if the aggressive targets for reduced car usage are indicated at all by the current ridership, they could then share this with the taxpayers.
A ride on iXpress 202, Friday Sept 27, 2013
Boardwalk 3:05 trip and Conestogo 4:25 trips

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boardwalk</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ira/Thorn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ira/Erb</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erb/ville</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erb/Fishr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erb/Amos</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erb/west</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ/Segr</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ/Phlp</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurier</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ/Wbr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConstogC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ/Lnkn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ/Brdg</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ/Past</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ/Aub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ/Lexi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ/Bed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RimPark</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB/Nrthf</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brdg/Nor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nrth/Dav</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CnstMall</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So expanding to daily by x40 = \(3880\) (daily)
Or to yearly using 250 since students = \(970,000\) (yearly)
and summer may not be as high
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: November 12, 2013

FILE CODE: D18-01

SUBJECT: MONTHLY REPORT OF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY FOR OCTOBER 2013

RECOMMENDATION:


SUMMARY:

In accordance with the Regional By-law 01-023, as amended, the Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services has:

- Accepted the following plans of subdivision and plan of condominium;
- Draft approved the following plans 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

Plan of Subdivision Application 30T-13102
Date Accepted: October 24, 2013
Applicant: Grand Ridge Estates Limited
Location: Salisbury Avenue and Freure Drive
Proposal: To permit the development of 161 single detached units and 120 townhouse units.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid September 4, 2013

Draft Approval of Plan of Condominium 30CDM-13103
Applicant: Mattamy (Hespeler) Limited
Location: 125 Black Bridge Road
Proposal: To permit the development of 13 residential townhouse units.
Commissioner’s Approval: October 16, 2013
Came Into Effect: November 6, 2013
City of Kitchener

Registration of Draft Plan of Subdivision 30T-08201
Draft Approval Date: June 18, 2012
Phase: Stage 1
Applicant: Tru-Villa and 2040796 Ontario Limited
Location: Fischer-Hallman Road
Proposal: To permit the development of 14 street-fronting townhouse units, 73 single detached units and 7 live/work townhouse units.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid September 16, 2013
Commissioner’s Release: October 8, 2013

Registration of Draft Plan of Subdivision 30T-08201
Draft Approval Date: June 18, 2012
Phase: Stage 2
Applicant: Tru-Villa and 2040796 Ontario Limited
Location: Fischer-Hallman Road
Proposal: To permit the development of 128 single detached units.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid September 16, 2013
Commissioner’s Release: October 8, 2013

Registration of Draft Plan of Subdivision 30T-08201
Draft Approval Date: June 18, 2012
Phase: Stage 3
Applicant: Tru-Villa and 2040796 Ontario Limited
Location: Fischer-Hallman Road
Proposal: To permit the development of 27 single detached units, 24 street-fronting townhouse units, 32 back-to-back townhouse units and 13 townhouse units.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid September 16, 2013
Commissioner’s Release: October 8, 2013

Registration of Draft Plan of Subdivision 30T-08201
Draft Approval Date: June 18, 2012
Phase: Stage 6
Applicant: Tru-Villa and 2040796 Ontario Limited
Location: Fischer-Hallman Road
Proposal: To permit the development of 60 to 100 medium density residential units and 32 to 50 mixed use residential units.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid September 16, 2013
Commissioner’s Release: October 8, 2013

Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-13201
Draft Approval Date: March 28, 2013
Phase: Entire Plan
Applicant: Deerfield Homes
Location: 255 Maitland Street
Proposal: To permit the development of 42 multi residential units.
Regional Processing Fee: Not applicable
Commissioner’s Release: October 1, 2013
Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-13207
Draft Approval Date: September 13, 2013
Phase: Entire Plan
Applicant: Will-O Homes (CS) Inc.
Location: 1180 Countrystone Drive
Proposal: To permit the development of 24 residential townhouse condominium units.
Regional Processing Fee: Not applicable
Commissioner’s Release: October 4, 2013

Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-13204
Draft Approval Date: July 30, 2013
Phase: Stage 1
Applicant: Deerfield Homes Ltd.
Location: 1650, 1670, 1680, 1690 and 1720 Fischer-Hallman Road
Proposal: To permit the development of 20 residential townhouse units.
Regional Processing Fee: Not applicable
Commissioner’s Release: October 31, 2013

Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-13204
Draft Approval Date: July 30, 2013
Phase: Stage
Applicant: Deerfield Homes Ltd.
Location: 1650, 1670, 1680, 1690 and 1720 Fischer-Hallman Road
Proposal: To permit the development of 32 residential townhouse units.
Regional Processing Fee: Not applicable
Commissioner’s Release: October 31, 2013

City of Waterloo

Plan of Condominium Application 30CDM-13406
Date Accepted: October 8, 2013
Applicant: 144 Park Ltd. (Mady Development Corporation)
Location: 144 Park Street
Proposal: To permit the development of 8 residential townhouse units and 140 residential apartment units.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid September 5, 2013

Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-13401
Draft Approval Date: August 28, 2013
Phase: Phase 1
Applicant: Cook Homes Limited
Location: 435 Winchester Drive
Proposal: To permit the development of 32 residential townhouse units.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid October 9, 2013
Commissioner’s Release: October 9, 2013
**Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-13402**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft Approval Date</td>
<td>June 4, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Entire Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>TCP King Street Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>186 to 188 King Street South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>To permit the development of 63 residential apartment units, 3 commercial units and 1 defined use unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Processing Fee</td>
<td>Paid October 10, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner's Release</td>
<td>October 10, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Official Plan Amendment No. 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Kappeler Masonry Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>300 Northfield Drive East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>To apply a Special Provision Area which permits a maximum of 25% of the existing buildings floor area be used for the servicing, repair and supplies, and to permit limited outdoor storage of masonry materials associated with the office of a masonry business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Processing Fee</td>
<td>Paid October 24, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner's Approval</td>
<td>October 28, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Township of Wellesley**

**Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-02001**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft Approval Date</td>
<td>April 23, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Phase 3 (Final)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Wellesley Pond View Residential Community Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Queen’s Bush Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>To permit the development of 6 residential semi-detached units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Processing Fee</td>
<td>Paid August 12, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner's Release</td>
<td>October 8, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Township of Wilmot**

**Draft Approval of Plan of Condominium 30CDM-11601**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Westcap Development Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>250 Hostetler Road, New Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>To permit the development of 13 residential townhouse units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Processing Fee</td>
<td>Paid August 26, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner’s Approval</td>
<td>October 22, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Came Into Effect</td>
<td>November 13, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Township of Woolwich**

**Plan of Subdivision Application 30T-13702**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Accepted</td>
<td>October 16, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Sunset Hills Estates Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>31 Homestead Drive, Maryhill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>To permit the development of 38 single detached units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Processing Fee</td>
<td>Paid October 4, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Residential Subdivision Activity January 1, 2013 to October 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>1625</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>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>569</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>1801</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1053</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 October 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>40</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>194</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 and releases, including consultations 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
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: November 12, 2013

FILE CODE: L07-90

SUBJECT: SURPLUS DECLARATION AND DEDICATION OF LANDS ADJACENT TO GOODRICH DRIVE, CITY OF KITCHENER, AS ROAD WIDENING TO THE CITY OF KITCHENER

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo declare the lands described as Part Lot 10, RCP No. 1524 designated as Part 1 on Reference Plan 58R-6831 in the City of Kitchener surplus to the needs of the Region as described in Report No. CR-RS-13-091/P-13-099, dated November 12, 2013, and provide the standard public notification as required by the Region’s property disposition by-law;

AND THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve and execute all documentation related to the dedication of the lands described as Part Lot 10, RCP No. 1524 designated as Part 1, Reference Plan 58R-6831, City of Kitchener, at the cost of the Region, to the Corporation of the City of Kitchener for road widening purposes, for the sum of $1.00 as detailed in Report No. CR-RS-13-091/P-13-099, dated November 12, 2013 pursuant to the Region’s property disposition by-law and to the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor.

SUMMARY:

Region staff is recommending that a 6 metre wide strip of land owned by the Region of Waterloo along the south side of Goodrich Drive, between Wilson Avenue and Wabanaki Drive, be declared surplus to the needs of the Region and dedicated to the City of Kitchener as a road widening of Goodrich Drive for $1.00 (please see Attachment A). The 6 metre wide property was purchased by the Region in 1989 for $80,000 for the purposes of installing a raw water transmission main from Hidden Valley to the Mannheim Water Treatment Plan.

As the strip of land in question is not designated open road allowance, any vehicles requiring access to properties along the south side of Goodrich Drive must cross Region property to enter and exit Goodrich Drive. This issue was brought forward as a result of a recent site plan application for a proposed development on the southwest corner of Goodrich Drive and Wabanaki Drive.

Goodrich Drive between Wilson Avenue and Wabanaki Drive has been identified as the Preferred Alignment for the proposed River Road Extension by the Project Team. It is proposed that the entire Goodrich Drive road allowance would be assumed by the Region of Waterloo as part of the Regional Road system after the Environmental Assessment has been approved.

Region of Waterloo and City of Kitchener staff has no objection to the dedication of the property as a road widening of Goodrich Drive as it will provide access to the open public road to three
other properties. In accordance with the practice of the City of Kitchener, upon completion of the transfer of title, City staff plan to recommend a by-law be passed by City of Kitchener Council to open the lands as part of the public highway known as Goodrich Drive.

REPORT:

In 1989, the Region purchased a 6 metre wide strip of property along the south side of Goodrich Drive between Wilson Avenue and Wabanaki Drive for $80,000 for the purposes of installing a raw water transmission main (please see Attachment A). The transmission main extends from Hidden Valley to the Mannheim Water Treatment Plant. The strip of land is owned by the Region of Waterloo but is not designated as road allowance. As a result, the properties on the south side of Goodrich Drive must cross Region property to enter and exit from Goodrich Drive.

This issue was brought forward through the recent site plan application for a new development on the lands on the southwest corner of Goodrich Drive and Wabanaki Drive. The site is proposed to be developed for industrial uses and the developer has requested an access to Goodrich Drive (City of Kitchener road). Through the review of the site plan application, it was determined that there is a 6 metre wide strip of Region-owned property that lies between the privately owned lands and the City open road allowance of Goodrich Drive.

The current alignment of Goodrich Drive between Wilson Avenue and Wabanaki Drive is the Preferred Alignment of the proposed River Road Extension in this area identified by the Project Team in the ongoing Environmental Assessment process. A recommendation to Regional Council for the Environmental Assessment is currently scheduled for February 2014. The River Road Extension is currently planned for construction in 2017-2018. It is proposed that the entire Goodrich Drive road allowance would be assumed by the Region of Waterloo as part of the Regional Road system after the Environmental Assessment has been approved.

To facilitate development of this site by providing direct access to Goodrich Drive, and to provide direct road access to the existing properties along the south side of Goodrich Drive, staff recommend that the Region of Waterloo declare the 6 metre strip of Region-owned property as surplus to the needs of the Region and dedicate it to the City of Kitchener as a road widening of Goodrich Drive for $1.00. As part of the City road allowance, the Region will have the same right of access to its water main infrastructure as it has to other Regional infrastructure located in City road allowances.

Pending consideration of the dedication by Regional Council and passing of a by-law by City of Kitchener Council, an encroachment agreement has been entered with the development proponent to provide interim access across the 6 metre strip of land owned by the Region.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

City of Kitchener staff support the dedication of the 6 metre wide strip of property as a road widening of Goodrich Drive and plan to recommend City Council pass a by-law opening the strip of land as part of the public highway upon completion of the transfer of title in accordance with the City’s standard practice. It is proposed that the entire Goodrich Drive road allowance would be assumed by the Region of Waterloo as part of the Regional Road system after the Environmental Assessment has been approved. City of Kitchener staff also concurs with the Region assuming the entire Goodrich Drive road allowance as part of the Regional Road system after the Environmental Assessment has been approved.
CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The proposed declaration of surplus property and dedication of lands as part of Goodrich Drive supports the Region’s strategic focus on managing growth to foster thriving and productive urban and rural communities.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The Region of Waterloo will be responsible for all costs associated with declaring the property surplus including public notification and dedication to the City of Kitchener. The estimated cost for advertising and registration of the deed is approximately $500 which can be covered under the Planning Housing and Community Services Advertising Account.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Transportation and Environmental Services, Corporate Services and the Rapid Transit office have been circulated the proposal to dispose and dedicate the property and no issues have been identified. Water Services has identified that their water transmission mains are normally located within road allowances.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment A - Plan showing the 6 metre wide strip of Region owned property on Goodrich Drive between Wilson Avenue and Wabanaki Drive

PREPARED BY:  
Fiona M. McCrea, Solicitor Property  
Bruce Erb, Supervisor, Corridor Management

APPROVED BY:  
Debra Arnold, Regional Solicitor  
Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Housing and Community Services
Attachment A – Plan Showing Subject Property
TO: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: November 12, 2013

FILE CODE: T15-40/80, C13-20/CA

SUBJECT: AMENDMENT TO REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO CONTROLLED ACCESS BY-LAW #58-87 FOR AN ACCESS TO REGIONAL ROAD #80 (CAN-AMERA PARKWAY), CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve an amendment to Controlled Access By-law #58-87 for a right in/right out, permanent access on the north side of Regional Road #80 (Can-Amera Parkway), approximately 140 metres east of Bishop Street in the City of Cambridge, as described in Report No. P-13-110, dated November 12, 2013.

SUMMARY:

Paracom Properties (Cambridge) Ltd is the owner of a vacant parcel of land on the north side of Regional Road #80 (Can-Amera Parkway) at the intersection of Bishop Street in the City of Cambridge (please see Appendix 1). Paracom is developing the subject property into a mixed use complex with commercial/retail uses and an office building. They are requesting a permanent right in/right out access on the north side of Regional Road #80 (Can-Amera Parkway), approximately 140 metres east of Bishop Street in the City of Cambridge (please see Appendix 2). This proposed access is needed to facilitate transport truck deliveries to the site, separating delivery vehicles from customer vehicles. The site will also be served by a permanent full movement access on Bishop Street which is a City of Cambridge street.

The proposed location of the permanent right in/right out access, along with the extension of the existing centre median on Can-Amera Parkway, meets current design standards. Staff recommend the approval of the access and the amendment to Controlled Access By-law #58-87.

City of Cambridge Planning staff, and Paracom Properties (Cambridge) Ltd. are in support of the location of the proposed access to Can-Amera Parkway.

As Can-Amera Parkway is designated as a Controlled Access Prohibited Road under the Region’s Controlled Access By-law #58-87 from Regional Road #33 (Townline Road) to Regional Road #24 (Hespeler Road), an amendment to this by-law is required prior to issuance of an Access Permit by staff.

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.

Paracom Properties (Cambridge) Ltd. is the owner of a vacant parcel of land on the north side of Regional Road #80 (Can-Amera Parkway) at the intersection of Bishop Street in the City of Cambridge (please see Appendix 1). Paracom is developing the subject property into a mixed use complex with commercial/retail uses and an office building. They are requesting a permanent right in/right out access on the north side of Regional Road #80 (Can-Amera Parkway), approximately 140 metres east of Bishop Street in the City of Cambridge (please see Appendix 2). This proposed access is needed to facilitate transport truck deliveries to the site, separating delivery vehicles from customer vehicles. This separation between the delivery vehicles and the customer vehicles will provide for effective on site circulation. The site will also be served by a permanent full movement access on Bishop Street which is a City of Cambridge Road.

The proposed location of the permanent right in/right out access meets current design standards. The existing centre median on Can-Amera Parkway will be extended past the proposed access physically limiting turning movements to right in/right out. The developer is responsible for all costs associated with the construction of this median. Staff recommend the approval of the access and the amendment to Controlled Access By-law #58-87.

City of Cambridge Planning staff, and Paracom Properties (Cambridge) Ltd. are in support of the location of the proposed access to Can-Amera Parkway.

As Can-Am-Amera Parkway is designated as a Controlled Access Prohibited Road under the Region’s Controlled Access By-law #58-87 from Regional Road #33 (Townline Road) to Regional Road #24 (Hespeler Road), an amendment to this by-law is required prior to issuance of an Access Permit by staff.

**Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination**

City of Cambridge Planning staff support the location of the proposed access to Can-Amera Parkway. A copy of this report has been sent to the City of Cambridge as well.

**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:**

Paracom Properties (Cambridge) Ltd. would be responsible for all costs to construct the proposed permanent access and centre median extension to Region of Waterloo standards.
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 Can-Amera Parkway.

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix 1  –  Key Map showing the location of the property
Appendix 2  –  Location of the proposed access to Can-Amera Parkway and proposed amendment to Controlled Access By-law #58-87

PREPARED BY:  Richard Parent, Transportation Planner

APPROVED BY:  Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Housing and Community Services
APPENDIX 1

Key Map Showing Property Location
APPENDIX 2

Regional Road #80
Can-Amera Parkway

Proposed Amendment to Controlled Access By-Law #58-87

Extended Centre Median
City of Waterloo
and
Regional Municipality of Waterloo

COMBINED PUBLIC CONSULTATION CENTRE FOR:

UPTOWN WATERLOO KING STREET NORTH STREETSCAPE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT from Rapid Transit (Ion) Tracks to Central Street and
KING STREET NORTH RECONSTRUCTION From Central Street to University Avenue
MUNICIPAL CLASS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS

INFORMATION PACKAGE

Wednesday, November 13, 2013
Drop-In Anytime: 5:30 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.

Hauser House
Waterloo Memorial Recreation Complex
101 Father David Bauer Drive
Waterloo

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

In 2010 the City of Waterloo started a Schedule ‘B’ Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) of planned streetscape improvements in Uptown Waterloo along King Street North from Erb Street to Central Street. In early 2011 the project was put on hold to await final information on the approved route of the Region’s Rapid Transit line through Uptown Waterloo, and the results of a study of underground utility conditions and overall servicing needs in the Uptown. Information on these important subjects has been finalized, and the Streetscape Improvement Project recommenced with the intent to complete the EA process in early 2014.

The Streetscape Improvement Project aims to make improvements to King Street North in the Uptown core from Central Street to just south of Erb Street at the Rapid Transit (ION) Tracks. This project has several objectives:

- To make King Street North more accessible for all modes of transportation, including pedestrians and cyclists;
- To create a streetscape environment that offers a safe, lively, accessible and attractive place to work, live, shop, learn and play; and
- To co-ordinate streetscape design elements and improve the quality of business and economic life in Uptown Waterloo.

When the City’s project was recommenced earlier this year, the Region began preparation of a concept for changes to King Street North from Central Street to University Avenue. Proposed improvements to this section of King Street North include: replacement of the deteriorated pavement and sidewalks, replacement of aging underground municipal services, reduction of traffic lanes and accommodation of active transportation needs.

The Region project is also being conducted as a Schedule ‘B’ Municipal Class EA project. It is not scheduled for construction until 2019, but is being planned in conjunction with the City’s project to the south, and information on both projects is presented at this Public Consultation Centre. The two projects are being planned and presented together to ensure there is consistency and continuity along the entire King Street corridor from the ION Tracks to University Avenue.

The study area for the City’s Streetscape Improvement Project is shown in Appendix ‘A’, along with the associated study area for the Region’s King Street North project. King Street North through both projects is a Regional Road, so the Region is the road authority and owns the road allowance.

2. What is the purpose of this Public Consultation Centre?

This Public Consultation Centre (PCC) is the third held as part of the City’s Uptown Waterloo King Street North Streetscape Improvement Project, and the first for the Region’s King Street North Reconstruction project. The purpose of this combined PCC is for you to:

1. Review why changes are being planned for King Street North in Waterloo;
2. Consider streetscape improvements and design changes preferred by the Project Team;
3. Ask questions of staff from the City, Region and their consultants from IBI Group;
4. Provide any comments you may have about the changes being planned; and,
5. Learn more about next steps in the planning and design process.

We kindly request that you fill out the Comment Sheet attached to the back of this Information Package and either place it in the Comment Box at this PCC, or send it to the address noted on the Comment Sheet by mail or fax no later than November 27, 2013.

Additional project information can also be found on the following web-sites:

- Uptown Streetscape Improvement: www.waterloo.ca/uptownstreetscape

Your comments will be considered by the Project Team in conjunction with all other relevant information to confirm the preferred design improvements for the sections of King Street North under study.

3. Who is directing the Project?

A Project Team consisting of staff from the City of Waterloo and Region of Waterloo is directing this project along with City Councillor Melissa Durell and consultants from the Waterloo Region office of IBI Group. The City’s Streetscape Improvement Project has also received assistance from a seven-member Task Force of representatives from the Uptown Waterloo Business Improvement Association and the community.

4. What changes are proposed for King Street North?

For the Uptown Waterloo Section from the Rapid Transit (ION) Tracks to Central Street:

- Replace the existing street lighting with new, upgraded light fixtures to provide improved illumination that meets Region standards, and provides improved pedestrian lighting;
- Replace existing sidewalks between the Rapid Transit (ION) Tracks and Central Street;
- Provide opportunities for the City and businesses to improve accessibility along King Street North in the project area for people with disabilities, as required by The Accessibility of Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA);
- Support City and Regional Council endorsed policies such as; “Complete Streets”, draft “Active Transportation Master Plan” and “Corridor Design Guidelines” by designing for pedestrians, transit service, on-street parking and cycling on King Street North;
- Reconstruct King Street North as shown in Appendix ‘B’:
  (a) Rapid Transit (ION) Tracks to Bridgeport Street - one travel lane per direction (as planned south of the Rapid Transit Tracks), plus left turn lanes approaching Erb Street and Bridgeport Road, a 1.0m wide painted centre median, on-street parking and dedicated bike lanes; and,
  (b) Bridgeport Street to Central Street - one travel lane per direction (as proposed on King Street to the north), a continuous centre left turn lane, on-street parking and dedicated bike lanes.
• Potentially improve underground services under King Street North if further study concludes this is required;
• Create opportunities for a more pedestrian-friendly streetscape through sidewalk widening and improved King Street North pedestrian crossings; and
• Associated improvements to street furniture, transit shelters, vegetation and signage to provide a coordinated Uptown Waterloo streetscape character that encourages pedestrian traffic and supports Uptown business.

For the King Street North Section from Central Street to University Avenue:

• Reconstruct King Street North as shown in Appendix ‘B’:
  Central Street to University Avenue - one travel lane per direction (as proposed on King Street to the south), a continuous centre left turn lane and dedicated bike lanes.
• Add pedestrian crossing refuge / landscape islands where feasible and remove the pedestrian signals at Wilfrid Laurier University and Marshall Street;
• Construct intersection improvements where required to improve traffic flow and pedestrian crossing safety;
• Underground infrastructure improvements as required; and
• Provide a coordinated King Street North streetscape consistent with proposed improvements south of Central Street including transit shelters, bike racks, landscape treatments and street furniture.

5. Why are these road changes being planned?

Lighting Replacement – The existing pedestrian-level street lights along the section of King Street North between Allen and Spring Streets are 30-years old, do not meet current standards and can no longer be cost-effectively maintained. The City plans to replace the light fixtures and supporting electrical system between the Rapid Transit (ION) Tracks and Central Street. This underground electrical system replacement will involve the removal and subsequent replacement of the existing sidewalk and other portions of the streetscape. This is the primary reason why the earlier light fixture replacement project considered in 2004 has evolved into a streetscape improvement project.

Sidewalk Reconstruction – As noted above, the existing sidewalks will have to be replaced in order to upgrade the street lighting system. The surface along some existing sections of the sidewalks is also in poor condition and replacement is needed. This replacement offers two important benefits: (1) it can provide opportunities to enhance accessibility along the sidewalks for persons with disabilities, and (2) it can provide added sidewalk width where available to enhance pedestrian mobility and offer more opportunities for sidewalk activities (merchandizing, seating, patios, advertising, etc.).

“Complete Street” and Corridor Design – King Street North currently functions to primarily serve auto traffic. The existing travel lanes in the study area are narrow and transit buses must straddle both lanes in order to navigate safely, and there is no space for cyclists and left turn lanes at intersections. The resulting collision rates along this section of King Street North are higher than would normally be expected. In addition to this public safety concern, the street does not meet “Complete Street” and “Corridor Design” policies. The planned road improvements are designed to serve all users on King Street North, thereby turning it into a Complete Street.
Road Safety – As noted above, travel lanes on King Street North in Uptown Waterloo are narrow and don’t meet current Region of Waterloo standards. Collision rates are some of the highest in the Region for collisions involving pedestrians and cyclists. Examples of these collision types and their associated rankings Region-wide include:

- King Street, Willis Way to Erb Street - ranks #1 for collisions involving a municipal bus;
- King Street, Erb Street to Dupont Street - ranks #2 for side swipe collisions;
- King Street, Dupont Street to Princess Street - ranks #1 for collisions with parked cars;
- King Street and Bridgeport Road intersection - ranks #2 for pedestrian collisions; and
- King Street, Erb Street to Central Street - 7 collisions involving cyclists (2007 to 2011).

Transportation Planning Policies – Policies of the Region and City of Waterloo, documented in their Transportation Master Plans, support the provision of "Complete Streets" for the safe use of all road users. King Street North in Uptown Waterloo primarily serves auto traffic, but the goal is to increase the amount of walking and cycling in the Uptown with more pedestrian-friendly routes and cycling lanes, in addition to providing space for public transit and movement of goods through strategic road improvements.

Centre Left Turn Lane – Left turn lanes at traffic signals greatly improve intersection operations, traffic flow and roadway capacity by eliminating backups behind left turning vehicles. While such lanes are not warranted at all intersections along King Street North between Erb Street and University Avenue, providing a continuous left turn lane from Bridgeport Road to University Avenue will improve traffic operations along the street and provide access to residential / commercial driveway entrances.

Reduced Travel Lanes - King Street North from Erb Street to Central Street is a very narrow, constrained four-lane road with on-street parking. Changing the four lane configuration to two lanes improves the lane widths while still maintaining most of the on-street parking south of Central Street. This modification can provide space for cyclists and pedestrians, can incorporate left turn lanes and central islands where needed, all while providing wider sidewalks with more streetscape and outdoor business space. A traffic analysis conducted for these projects shows that over the next 20 years, King Street North can operate at an acceptable level-of-service with only one travel lane per direction. This is due in part to the planned turning lanes, the Region’s continued arterial road network improvements (along alternative routes such as Weber Street) and the increasing trend in transit ridership.

Other Streetscape Improvements – Wider sidewalks provided by the proposed changes to the King Street North cross-section geometry in Uptown Waterloo offer opportunities for improved landscaping, signage, outdoor seating and other outdoor business, pedestrian and cycling activities. The proposed cross-section would also provide sufficient space for delivery and emergency response vehicles through Uptown Waterloo along the King Street corridor. Confirmation of new streetscape features will be finalized during the detailed design of the street following completion of the Environmental Assessment process.

6. What other road changes were considered and why are they not preferred?

Through consultation with City and Region staff and the Project Task Force, and with feedback provided by some BIA merchants and the public starting in 2010, the Project Team developed the following six (6) alternatives for consideration for the King Street North right-of-way in Uptown Waterloo. Road cross-section concepts of each alternative are provided in Appendix ‘C’ of this Information Package.
These alternative road cross-sections are as follows:

- Alternative 1A: 4-Lane Typical Existing Mid-Block Configuration (i.e. “Do-Nothing” alternative)
- Alternative 1B: 4-Lane To Region Standard Widths with Uptown Parking
- Alternative 2: 3-Lane Reconfiguration with Uptown Parking
- Alternative 3: 2-Lane Reconfiguration with Uptown Parking
- Alternative 4: 2-Lane Reconfiguration with Bike Lanes / Uptown Parking
- Alternative 5: 3-Lane Reconfiguration with Bike Lanes / Uptown Parking

The Project Team evaluated each of these alternative concepts using criteria related to transportation, streetscape, and natural conditions/vegetation, economic/business and physical infrastructure. The evaluation concluded that the King Street North right-of-way configuration that best responds to these criteria is Alternative 4, followed closely by Alternative 5. As a result, the Project Team recommends the following combination of improvements:

- Preferred Alternative 4 from Rapid Transit (ION) Tracks to Bridgeport Road – two (2) travel lanes with turn lanes at the Erb Street and Bridgeport Road intersections, bike lanes, on-street parking and a 1.0m wide painted centre median to allow passing of stopped vehicles (e.g. delivery trucks, transit buses, etc.);
- Preferred Alternative 5: Bridgeport Road to Central Street – three (3) travel lanes including a continuous centre left turn lane, bike lanes and on-street parking; and,
- Preferred Alternative 5: Central Street to University Avenue – three (3) travel lanes including a continuous centre left turn lane with pedestrian crossing refuge islands, bike lanes and landscaped boulevards / islands

The proposed three (3) lane cross-section between Bridgeport Road and Central Street is preferred because of the number of driveway entrances, where without a left turn lane; left turn vehicles would block through traffic and disrupt the flow of travel. Driveways are limited between the Rapid Transit (ION) Tracks and Bridgeport Road and a continuous centre left turn lane is not required for these turning movements. Left turn lanes are proposed at Erb Street and Bridgeport Road to improve the flow of traffic at signalized intersections.

7. What changes will be made to on-street parking south of Central Street?

Between the Rapid Transit (ION) Tracks and Central Street, there are currently 54 marked on-street parking spaces. The Project Team's current concept can add up to 12 additional on-street parking spaces depending on how the spaces are laid out. The final on-street parking supply will be confirmed based on additional design work since adding bike parking and accessible parking spaces may also impact the final number of spaces. Also, the layout of on-street parking spaces will be flexible to allow some businesses, if they wish, to temporarily transform parking space in front of their business for their commercial use. Involvement of business owners during the detailed design will confirm these opportunities.
8. How will the preferred plan impact traffic conditions on King Street North?

The traffic impact analysis conducted in 2010 for the King Street North Streetscape Improvement Project in Uptown Waterloo has been updated, incorporating new traffic counts and 2031 traffic volume forecasts. Traffic operations have been reviewed for each alternative design concept using the Region’s travel demand forecasting model. The results show that over the next 20 years, King Street North in Uptown Waterloo can continue to operate at an acceptable level-of-service with one travel lane per direction plus turn lanes where required.

The same conclusion has more recently been made for the section of King Street North from Central Street to University Avenue.

These findings are due to three main factors; (1) the planned introduction of a continuous left turn lane; (2) continued improvements to alternative travel routes such as Weber Street North; and (3) the increasing trend towards more transit ridership and the use of other transportation alternatives to auto use. This is why King Street North is being designed as a “Complete Street” to include these other modes of transportation.

9. What changes will be made to the existing street trees and planting beds on King Street North?

Studies have been conducted of the existing street tree conditions on King Street North between the Rapid Transit (ION) Tracks and Central Street. The conclusion is that while some trees are in generally good condition, they are not thriving in their current environment and further growth is likely stagnated. Furthermore, trees in good condition may still experience root damage as a result of sidewalk and curb reconstruction, and in these cases they would have to be removed and replaced.

At this point in the design process it is expected that all existing street trees will be replaced with better quality species in improved growing environments. It is anticipated that all replacement trees will have a trunk diameter of approximately 70-80mm, providing there are no conflicts with the root ball and underground utilities. Exceptions to maintain specific trees may be made through business owner input, but only if root damage can be avoided.

Once the Class Environmental Assessment process is completed and the detailed design begins, planting plans will also be prepared for other streetscape vegetation. One option expected to be considered will be the use of moveable planters as currently used elsewhere in Uptown Waterloo. This approach provides advantages in terms of planting location flexibility, and more efficient sidewalk maintenance during winter months when these planters are stored away.

10. How will the preferred plan impact Uptown Waterloo business?

In terms of traffic changes and their expected impacts on King Street North business, most of the current peak period motorized traffic in Uptown Waterloo involves through trips with no stop in the area. Some of these through trips are expected to divert to alternative travel routes once the ION (Light Rail Transit) service is operating on King Street through Uptown Waterloo. It is estimated that the proposed changes to King Street North would cause the diversion of an additional 5-15% of Uptown King Street traffic to alternative routes. Based on a forecasted year of 2031, this diversion would equate to approximately 200 vehicles total for a projected volume of 1800 vehicles in the PM peak hour period.
On the other hand, Uptown Waterloo is a designated growth node, and will experience more pedestrian and cyclist traffic from new residents living in this area. More transit riders from buses and the Light Rail Transit are also expected. This increased non-auto traffic will add potential clientele to King Street North, benefitting existing and future Uptown businesses. Most of these businesses already cater to destination-oriented customers rather than impulse shopping, and serve both a local and a regional market, so they are expected to benefit from the growth in Uptown Waterloo.

This growth currently involves 57 redevelopment projects with 1,600 residential units being built and planned within 800 metres of King Street in central Waterloo. It is anticipated that more people will be living in and around the Uptown, therefore walking, cycling, and transit amenities are critical elements of the King Street design. These new residents will likely be younger professionals and empty nesters who tend to support nearby businesses for their daily needs (e.g. personal services, restaurants, groceries, culture and entertainment).

The main goal of streetscape improvements proposed on King Street North in Uptown Waterloo is to create a safe and comfortable environment to attract more people to King Street through a variety of travel modes to shop, eat, play and enjoy. There are similar main streets in other smaller Ontario cities that have one lane of travel lane/direction and are contributing to successful main street business. Examples include King St in Dundas, Brant St. in Burlington, Lakeshore Rd. E in Oakville, Broadway St. in Orangeville, Main St. in Unionville (Markham) and King St. in downtown Kitchener. Some such as Main Street in Unionville (Markham) have undergone a reduction from four to two lanes. As in Uptown Waterloo, all of these downtowns include vibrant businesses and a healthy, growing residential community surrounding the downtown.

The City of Waterloo continues to support business retention and expansion in Uptown Waterloo through their site plan, urban design and redevelopment processes, as well as the façade improvement and special event programs. For more information, please contact the City of Waterloo at 519-886-1550 or visit www.waterloo.ca

11. When is construction anticipated to occur?

Following the Public Consultation Centre, the Project Team will compile public comments and consider adjustments to the current plans. For both the City’s King Street North Streetscape Improvement and the Region’s Reconstruction projects, a final recommendation to City of Waterloo and Waterloo Region Councils for approval to proceed to construction is planned this winter. Once approved, the notice of study completion of both projects will be advertised in the Waterloo Chronicle / The Record and mailed to all contacts on the project mailing list. This process will complete the Class Environmental Assessment of both projects.

Uptown Waterloo King Street North Streetscape Improvement Project from the Rapid Transit (ION) Tracks to Central Street:

Following confirmation of all required funding and completion of detailed design and construction tendering, the section from the Rapid Transit (ION) Tracks to Central Street is tentatively scheduled to start in 2014 and will likely extend into 2015 depending on the staging of the work and construction budget approved by Waterloo Region and City Councils. Overall, this project is anticipated to take approximately 6-8 months to be completed in its entirety and will be phased over two construction stages; the first stage of construction is tentatively planned between the Rapid Transit (ION) Tracks and Bridgeport Road; and, the second stage between Bridgeport Road and Central Street.
The impacts on business deliveries and customer access during construction will be discussed during the detailed design stage, including further consultation with merchants, business owners and area residents. A Public Information Centre will be arranged before construction is started to review the plan and discuss construction arrangements (i.e. traffic, parking, signage, delivery, etc.). Also, the involved stakeholders will be able to provide input through the design process in response to regular project updates, newsletters, BIA information, one-on-one meetings and website updates.

Tentatively, it is the intent of the Project Team to maintain traffic flow in the southbound direction at all times during construction but closures may be required for short-term durations in order to complete various aspects of the project, including for example, underground infrastructure work. During construction, it is anticipated that Regina Street will be used as a detour route and will provide an alternate route for motorists travelling to/from Uptown Waterloo.

In certain cases, the Contractor will endeavor to work outside of normal business hours for specific types of operations involving, for example, after-hour water service interruptions or sidewalk replacement. It is important to note that temporary access and temporary pedestrian facilities will be provided at all times during construction for business customers, staff and deliveries. Property and business owners are asked to contact the City’s Project Manager if they have any concerns pertaining to access, signage or other construction related matters.

King Street North Reconstruction Project from Central Street to University Avenue:

Once construction is complete on the Uptown Streetscape Improvement project, detailed design and construction preparation will begin on the Region’s King Street North Reconstruction Project from Central Street to University Avenue. It is anticipated that detailed design will be completed on the Region’s project in 2016/17 with construction tentatively scheduled for the spring of 2019. This project is anticipated to take approximately 6 months to be completed in its entirety and will be phased over two construction stages; the first stage of construction is tentatively planned between Central Street and Marshall Street; and, the second stage between Marshall Street and University Avenue.

12. What is the estimated cost of the proposed improvements?

Uptown Waterloo King Street North Streetscape Improvement Project from the Rapid Transit (ION) Tracks to Central Street:

A detailed cost estimate for this work is currently being finalized by the Project Team and will be presented to City and Waterloo Region Councils for final approval in 2014. Collectively, the City of Waterloo and Region of Waterloo have budgeted approximately $3.0 million in their respective capital forecasts for the Uptown Waterloo King Street North Streetscape Improvement Project, between the Rapid Transit (ION) Tracks and Central Street.

During the preliminary planning phase of this project in 2010, the City of Waterloo budgeted approximated $2.0 million for streetscape improvements on King Street North in Uptown Waterloo. These improvements generally include: pedestrian level / decorative street lighting, sidewalk replacement, curb/gutter replacement, landscaping enhancements and pavement reconstruction between Rapid Transit (ION) Tracks and Bridgeport Road.
In 2013, the Region of Waterloo identified additional work to be completed as part of the project and has earmarked an additional $1.0 million for these improvements. The Region’s cost sharing commitment generally includes: traffic signalization upgrades at Erb Street and Bridgeport Road intersections, paving stone cross-walk replacement with ladder markings, the cost of conventional street lighting upgrades (as per the Region’s illumination and lighting policy), new Grand River Transit (GRT) transit shelters and pavement reconstruction between Bridgeport Road to Central Street.

King Street North Reconstruction Project from Central Street to University Avenue:

The Region of Waterloo’s estimated cost of the proposed King Street North improvements from Central Street to University Avenue is $2,755,000. This estimate includes the cost of: roadway reconstruction, new curbs, sidewalk repairs, storm sewer works, driveway ramps, boulevard restoration and landscaping.

The City of Waterloo has identified improvements required for underground infrastructure work and will be funding the cost for sanitary sewer / watermain replacement and associated cost sharing of storm sewer works. An estimate for this work will be developed as part of the City’s 2019 budget deliberations.

13. What is the next step before finalizing the design for these projects?

Prior to finalizing the final recommended design concepts for King Street North, the Project Team is asking for the public’s input on the proposed work. This Public Consultation Centre is your opportunity to ask questions, provide suggestions, and make comments. Once your input is received, either through this Public Consultation Centre or on-line survey (via the City’s website), all input will be considered by the Project Team, in conjunction with all other relevant information, to finalize the recommended design.

14. When will final decisions be made for these projects?

The Project Team will review the public comments received from this evening’s Public Consultation Centre and use them as input for recommending a final design concepts. This final recommendation will be presented to the Region of Waterloo and City of Waterloo Councils in the winter of 2014 for approval. In advance of these meetings, letters will be sent to all adjacent businesses, property owners and tenants (as well as members of the public who registered at this Public Consultation Centre or project website) so that anyone wishing to speak to Committee or Council about these project can do so before final approval.

15. How can I voice my comments at this time?

In order to assist us in addressing any comments or concerns you might have about this project, we ask that you please fill out the attached Comment Sheet and leave it in the box provided at the registration table. Alternatively, you can mail, fax or e-mail your comments to the City of Waterloo and/or Region of Waterloo no later than Wednesday, November 27, 2013.
We thank you for your involvement and should you have any questions please contact:

**Uptown Waterloo Streetscape Improvement:**

Barb Magee Turner, O.A.L.A., C.S.L.A  
Landscape Architect, Engineering &  
Construction, Integrated Planning & Public  
Works Department, City of Waterloo  
100 Regina Street S, P.O. Box 337, Stn  
Waterloo  
Waterloo, ON N2J 4A8  
Phone: 519-747-8757  
Fax: 519-747-8523  
E-mail: barb.mageeturner@waterloo.ca

**King Street North Reconstruction:**

Eric Saunderson, PMP CET EIT  
Project Manager, Design &  
Construction,  
Transportation and Environmental  
Services Department, Regional  
Municipality of Waterloo  
150 Frederick Street, 6th Floor  
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3  
Phone: 519-575-4746  
Fax: 519-575-4430  
Email: esaunderson@regionofwaterloo.ca

Additional information on previous consultation materials prepared for the Uptown Waterloo King Street Streetscape Improvement Project is included on the project web-site at [www.waterloo.ca/uptownstreetscape](http://www.waterloo.ca/uptownstreetscape).
Appendix A: Study Areas
Appendix B: Proposed King Street North Cross-sections

(a) Rapid Transit (ION) Tracks to Bridgeport Road

(b) Bridgeport Road to Central Street
Appendix B: Proposed King Street North Cross-sections (continued)

Central Street to University Avenue - with centre left turn lane

Central Street to University Avenue - with pedestrian refuge / landscape island
Appendix C: Alternative Road Cross-sections

Alternative 1A:
4-Lane Typical Existing Mid-Block Configuration

NOTE: This ‘do nothing’ alternative is not feasible as it does not comply with current lane width design standards.

Alternative 1B:
4-Lane to Region Standard Widths with Uptown Parking
Appendix C: Alternative Road Cross-sections (continued)

Alternative 2:
3-Lane Reconfiguration with Uptown Parking

Alternative 3:
2-Lane Reconfiguration with Uptown Parking
Appendix C: Alternative Road Cross-sections (continued)

Alternative 4:
2-Lane Reconfiguration with Bike Lanes / Uptown Parking

Alternative 5:
3-Lane Reconfiguration with Bike Lanes / Uptown Parking
COMMENT SHEET
City of Waterloo - Regional Municipality of Waterloo
PUBLIC CONSULTATION CENTRE – November 13, 2013

UPTOWN WATERLOO KING STREET NORTH STREETSCAPE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT and
KING STREET NORTH RECONSTRUCTION

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 sheet home and mail, fax or e-mail your comments by Wednesday, November 27, 2013 to:

Uptown Waterloo Streetscape Improvement:
Barb Magee Turner, O.A.L.A., C.S.L.A
Landscape Architect, Engineering & Construction, Integrated Planning & Public Works Department, City of Waterloo
100 Regina Street S, P.O. Box 337, Stn Waterloo
Waterloo, ON N2J 4A8
Phone: 519-747-8757
Fax: 519-747-8523
E-mail: barb.mageeturner@waterloo.ca

King Street North Reconstruction:
Eric Saunderson, PMP CET EIT
Project Manager, Design & Construction, Transportation and Environmental Services Department, Regional Municipality of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street, 6th Floor
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3
Phone: 519-575-4746
Fax: 519-575-4430
Email: esaunderson@regionofwaterloo.ca

QUESTION 1: What do you LIKE about the preferred plans for King Street North?

From the Rapid Transit (ION) Tracks to Central Street?
_______________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________

From Central Street to University Avenue?
_______________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________

Turn Page Over
QUESTION 2: What do you NOT LIKE about the preferred plans for King Street North?

From the Rapid Transit (ION) Tracks to Central Street?

_______________________________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

From Central Street to University Avenue?

_______________________________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

Other comments or concerns regarding the projects:

_______________________________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________________________

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION (Optional)

For purposes of data analysis, please provide your age, gender and interest. This is entirely optional:

☐ Male  ☐ Female

☐ under 19  ☐ 19-34  ☐ 35-44  ☐ 45-54  ☐ 55-64  ☐ 65-74  ☐ 75+

Your use of Uptown:

☐ I work Uptown  ☐ I live in Uptown  ☐ I have a business Uptown

☐ I live or work outside Uptown  ☐ Other ________________________________

Name: ________________________________________________________________

Address: ________________________________________________________________  Postal Code:_________

Email: ________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your time and input into this project
TO: Jim Wideman and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

DATE: November 12, 2013

FILE CODE: T01-20/70 Trussler

SUBJECT: TRUSSLER ROAD (REGIONAL ROAD 70) POST 1-YEAR CONSTRUCTION POSTED SPEED LIMIT REVIEW, CITY OF KITCHENER / TOWNSHIP OF WILMOT

RECOMMENDATION:

For information.

SUMMARY:

NIL

REPORT:

Trussler Road (Regional Road 70) between Bleams Road (Regional Road 4) and New Dundee Road (Regional Road 12) is a two-lane Regional road and is a boundary road between the City of Kitchener and the Township of Wilmot. This section of Trussler Road was reconstructed in 2012 primarily to rehabilitate the existing deteriorated asphalt surface and to improve visibility. In addition to pavement rehabilitation the reconstruction also included the following:

- Improvements to the existing vertical and horizontal alignments;
- Intersection improvements at Plains Road and Bleams Road;
- Storm drainage improvements; and
- Enhancements for cyclists and pedestrians using the road corridor.

The speed limit along Trussler Road prior to reconstruction had a posted speed limit of 60 km/hr. Speed surveys conducted in 2010 showed that the average travel speed along Trussler Road was 75 km/hr. Typically, speed limits are set at or about the average travel speeds because this is most likely to produce a uniformly moving traffic stream.

Based on the speed survey data collected in 2010, the recommended posted speed limit after the reconstruction of Trussler Road was 70 km/h and subsequently approved by Council. It was also requested that staff prepare a report 1-year post construction with regards to the 70 km/h posted speed limit. Figure 1 shows the project limits along Trussler Road where the posted speed limit was changed from 60 km/h to 70 km/h post construction.
The full reconstruction of Trussler Road was complete in October 2012. 1-year after construction, on October 1, 2013, staff completed speed surveys along Trussler Road. The following table summarizes our recent 2013 speed surveys and also summarizes our 2010 speed surveys for comparison.

### Table 1 – Post Construction Speed Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posted Speed</td>
<td>Average Speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trussler Road btwn Bleams Road and Huron Road</td>
<td>60km/h</td>
<td>75km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trussler Road btwn Huron Road and Bethel Road</td>
<td>60km/h</td>
<td>75km/h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in the above table motorists are travelling slightly faster along the section of Trussler Road between Bleams Road and Huron Road; the difference in average travel speeds before and after the reconstruction is 8 km/h higher. The section of Trussler Road between Huron Road and Bethel Road shows a 1 km/hr increase in the average travel speeds of motorists. It is speculated that the average travel speeds may have increased due to the increased sight lines related to the improvements to the vertical and horizontal alignments, improved riding surface and wider pavement lanes.

Currently, the Region’s collision database hosts collision records obtained from Waterloo Regional Police up to the end of August 2013, therefore 8 months of collisions (January to August) were assessed. A review of the collision history along Trussler Road between Bleams Road and New Dundee Road (8 months in 2010 and 8 months in 2013) shows that collisions have increased from 3 to 11. Table 2 summarizes the before / after collision history.

**Table 2 – Before / After Collision Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>8 Months Before</th>
<th>8 Months After</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trussler Road at Bleams Road</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trussler Road btwn Bleams Road and Huron Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trussler Road at Huron Road</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trussler Road btwn Huron Road and Bethel Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trussler Road at Bethel Road</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trussler Road btwn Bethel Road and Plains Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trussler Road at Plains Road</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trussler Road btwn Plains Road at New Dundee Road</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of collisions (8 of 11) after the reconstruction of Trussler Road occurred within the midblock sections of Trussler Road. The following summarizes the midblock collisions:
- 1 deer;
- 5 single motor vehicle (loss of control);
- 1 rear-end; and
- 1 turning movement (private access).

A recently released publication, An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Wider Edge Line Pavement Markings, by the Texas A&M Transportation Institute suggests that wider edge lines on rural two-lane roadways can reduce loss of control type collisions (non winter) by 15 to 30 percent. The publication suggests that increasing the edge lines from 10 cm to 15 cm increases the distance the lines are detectable by motorists. Wider edge lines may improve a motorist’s ability to stay within their lane.

Since the collision history shows an increase in collisions post construction (8-month period) along Trussler Road and that the majority of collisions are the result of a motorist losing control, wider edge line pavement markings will be installed along Trussler Road between Bleams Road and New Dundee Road. Transportation Division staff will continue to monitor the collisions to determine the affects of wider edge line pavement markings on loss control type collisions. It is expected that the wider edge line pavement markings will be installed by the end of November weather permitting.
CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

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

FINANCIAL IMPlications:

The cost to install a wider edge line along both sides of Trussler Road between Bleams Road and New Dundee Road is approximately $3,225 and is provided for in the Region’s maintenance budget.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

NIL

ATTACHMENTS:

NIL

PREPARED BY: Mike Jones, Supervisor Traffic Engineering

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

DATE: November 12, 2013

FILE CODE: D28-60(A)

SUBJECT: ELECTRONIC FARE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM PROJECT UPDATE

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo issue a Request for Proposals for the supply and implementation of a turnkey Electronic Fare Management System based on a functional performance requirements specification as described in Report No. P-13-106, dated November 12, 2013.

SUMMARY:

The approved Regional Transportation Master Plan (see Report P-10-059) and the 2011 – 2014 Grand River Transit Business Plan (see Report P-12-013) include recommendations that the Region initiate a project to implement an electronic transit fare collection system. The approved 2013 GRT capital budget includes funding for the Electronic Fare Management System (EFMS), which would be an electronic transit fare solution for the Region of Waterloo to be used for fare payment on GRT buses, Mobility Plus, and ION LRT and aBRT service. EFMS hardware and software would be implemented on GRT buses and MobilityPLUS vehicles in 2015 to allow installation and commissioning of fare payment devices on ION platforms to be completed before launch of LRT service in 2017.

The research phase of the EFMS project has been concluded. The goals of the research were to:

- confirm whether the Region’s EFMS functionalities can be provided by a reasonable number of system vendors;
- identify which of the Region’s requirements should be considered to be mandatory, desirable and optional, and;
- review the potential of procuring the Presto fare system by negotiating a Memorandum of Understanding with Metrolinx in comparison with issuing a Request for Proposals (RFP).

To achieve this, staff issued a Request for Information (RFI) to seven EFMS vendors including Metrolinx (Presto). Six vendors, including Presto, responded and representatives of those vendors met separately with staff to discuss their approach to meeting the Region’s needs in detail.

Metrolinx has confirmed that since Presto was procured by the Province of Ontario through a public process, Metrolinx does not respond to RFPs and it will not participate in a competitive procurement process. Acquisition of a Presto system could only be accomplished by negotiation of a Memorandum of Understanding with Metrolinx that would include EFMS devices, functionalities, installation timelines and operating and capital costs.

Five of the six vendors already deliver systems with substantially all the EFMS functionality that the Region would require. In each instance, the level of new development required is deemed to be modest and does not pose undue schedule or quality risks.
The Presto system, as per present day operations, does not include some of the important EFMS functionality that the Region would require. Presto is working on development of solutions for some of these gaps though operating parameters and timelines are set in conjunction with Toronto Transit Commission and Union Pearson Express deliveries commencing in 2014/15. Such development substantially increases schedule, quality and financial risks. In addition, because of ongoing development of the Presto hardware, software and business model, Metrolinx has not finalized operating or capital costs for the system in relation to installation in the Region at this time. The Province currently does not have a formal expansion program or funding model for a Presto installation in the Region.

Accordingly, the project Steering Committee has decided that the Region should prepare and issue a Request for Proposals for the supply and implementation of a turnkey EFMS based on a functional performance requirements specification. This recommended approach has also been discussed directly with Presto staff to ensure clarity around project requirements.

REPORT:

The Electronic Fare Management System (EFMS) would be an electronic transit fare solution for the Region of Waterloo to be used for fare payment on GRT buses, Mobility Plus, and ION LRT and aBRT service. As noted in Report P-013-065 on June 18, 2013, the system would support seamless transferring between all transit modes. A customer would use an electronic Smart Card to register a fare payment or transfer on a GRT bus or on a Rapid Transit platform. Cash payment would also continue to be accepted.

The EFMS Project is guided by a Steering Committee composed of Councillor Jim Wideman and staff from Transportation Planning, Transit Services, Rapid Transit, Finance, Procurement and Information Technology Services.

Staff has now concluded the Market Sounding phase of the EFMS project. The purpose of this phase was to:

- confirm whether the Region’s EFMS functionalities can be provided by a reasonable number of system vendors;
- identify which of the Region's requirements should be considered to be mandatory, desirable and optional, and;
- review the potential of procuring the Presto fare system by negotiating a Memorandum of Understanding with Metrolinx in comparison with issuing a Request for Proposals (RFP).

Market Sounding Process

To review the current state of the market for electronic fare systems, staff issued a Request for Information (RFI) to seven EFMS vendors including Metrolinx (Presto). This request outlined the Region’s draft requirements for the EFMS. Six vendors, including Metrolinx, responded and representatives of those vendors met separately with members of the Project Team to discuss their approach to meeting the Region’s needs in detail.

Metrolinx has confirmed that since Presto was procured by the Province of Ontario through a public process, Metrolinx does not respond to RFPs and it will not participate in a competitive procurement process. Acquisition of a Presto system could only be accomplished by negotiation of a Memorandum of Understanding with Metrolinx that would include EFMS devices, functionalities, installation timelines and operating and capital costs. Therefore, the Market Sounding process included an assessment of the two available procurement methods:
1. Negotiate a contract exclusively with Metrolinx for the supply and hosting and possibly financing of a turnkey Presto EFMS and for providing managed card management and customer services, or

2. Procure a turnkey EFMS through a competitive RFP process, possibly involving alternative service scenarios including:
   - Hosted by the EFMS vendor,
   - Card management and customer services managed by the EFMS vendor, or
   - Financed by the EFMS vendor.

The review of the Region’s draft technical specifications provided to EFMS vendors as part of the RFI process also helped to identify which of the Region’s requirements should be considered to be critical, desirable and optional. Key functional requirements include:

- Accommodation of cash fare payment and cash fare transfer on GRT buses, Mobility Plus, and ION LRT and aBRT service;
- Provision for period passes and pay as you go fare payment;
- The ability to incorporate U-Pass programs, co-fare agreements with GO Transit and discount pass programs for low-income residents;
- Provision of Ticket Vending Machines (TVMs) for installation on ION platforms that would allow customers to purchase tickets and reload electronic fare media
- Provision of Handheld Card Readers for fare card inspection, and;
- Integration of new validating fareboxes into the EFMS.

**Results Summary**

Vendor proposals included devices and functionality that would meet almost all of the Region’s requirements. In most cases gaps were minimal, and vendors were willing to commit to develop the additional functionalities within requested timelines.

**EFMS Devices**

Three of the vendors manufacture their own validating fareboxes and two of the vendors are willing to procure validating fareboxes from another manufacturer to be included in a turnkey EFMS. Metrolinx (Presto) stated that they would consider future development of a strategy to integrate with a farebox system.

Three of the vendors already supply all the other EFMS devices that the Region would require. The TVM manufactured by a fourth vendor, BEA, would require some development to meet all the Region’s requirements. The final two vendors, INIT and Metrolinx (Presto), supply some of the required devices today, but both would need to develop several of the required devices. Such device development increases schedule, quality and financial risks.

**Functionality**

Five of the six vendors already deliver systems with substantially all the EFMS functionality that the Region would require. In each instance, the level of new development required is deemed to be modest and does not pose undue schedule or quality risks.

The system currently delivered by Metrolinx (Presto) does not include some of the important EFMS functionality that the Region would require. These functionalities could be mandated as required deliverables in an agreement with Presto and would then be developed to meet the Region’s needs however, such development substantially increases schedule, quality and financial risks. Key EFMS functionalities are discussed further in relation to the capability of the Presto system below.
During the RFI review, vendors presented both card-based and account based solutions to meeting the Region’s requirements with a range of fare payment technologies. As a result of this information, the Project Team determined that an RFP based on functional requirements could allow vendors maximum flexibility to offer solutions that best fit the Region’s current business requirements while offering the potential to adapt the fare system over time to meet changing needs and to integrate new technologies.

**Presto System Overview**

The original functionality of the Presto fare system was developed by Metrolinx to create a single fare payment system for commuters in the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area (GTHA). In 2012, the Province of Ontario extended the Presto system to include Ottawa and Toronto. The inclusion of these systems required a commitment to provide additional functionality.

Presto has met with varying degrees of success in the GTHA. In March 2013, 14% of transit customers in Mississauga used Presto and 6% of customers in Hamilton used Presto. Lower usage levels can be attributed to service providers not retiring traditional fare media in relation to Presto smartcard introduction. Presto continues to work on solutions for key functionality gaps including a solution for paratransit service integration that is appropriate for client needs and a functioning U-Pass program.

Municipalities where Presto has been more successful include Brampton (64%), Oakville (49%) and Burlington (33%). Brampton’s success is largely a result of its relatively simple fare structure which has allowed it to transition away from most of its old fare products. Oakville and Burlington have higher Presto usage as both serve large volumes of commuters who transfer to GO Transit.

The above noted functionality gaps represent a significant portion of the Region’s transit customers. As a result, if Presto were implemented in the Region of Waterloo, usage would likely remain low until these gaps were addressed. In the interim, the Region would have to continue to operate its current fare system in parallel with Presto, using paper tickets and passes, and the U-Pass program would continue as it does today until these issues were resolved.

Based on written information submitted by Metrolinx as part of its RFI response and on information provided verbally by Metrolinx staff during their in-person presentation, the following conclusions have been reached concerning the suitability of the Presto solution for the Region’s EFMS requirements.

**Fare Payment on ION Platforms**

The ION service is planned to use a Proof of Payment (POP) system where fares are paid before boarding. A smart card would retain the necessary record of payment for this system, while simplifying transfers between RT, GRT bus and/or MobilityPLUS service. Fare payment on ION platforms would be accomplished using Platform Fare Transaction Processors (PFTPs) and Ticket Vending Machines (TVMs).

The Platform Fare Transaction Processor (PFTP) is a free standing electronic payment terminal where a customer could tap a smart card for fare payment. Ideally, this device would include an optical reader capable of scanning barcodes to allow customers to also validate paper transfers issued on buses and MobilityPLUS vehicles. The purpose of the PFTP is to allow rapid fare payment for the most frequent transactions. Multiple PFTPs could be installed on busy platforms. The Presto PFTP does not include barcode scanning capability and cannot validate a paper transfer.

The Ticket Vending Machine (TVM) would be a more complex device designed to handle less frequently performed transactions. The TVM should be able to accept cash, credit, debit payment for single journeys, and issue single ride paper tickets that can also function as machine readable transfers on conventional GRT and MobilityPLUS vehicles. The TVM should also accept payment by smart card to allow the device to act as a backup for PFTPs. Ideally, the TVM should also allow customers to add...
value to, and potentially purchase smart cards. TVMs would be installed at all ION LRT and aBRT stations and would also be considered for key locations throughout the Regional transit network. Customers would also be able to purchase and reload smart cards at third party fare agents, online, or over the phone.

The Presto Single Ride Vending Machine (SRVM) is proposed by Metrolinx as a form of TVM for the EFMS. This device is under development for installation on TTC streetcar lines in 2015. As shown in Table 1, below, the SRVM provides some, but not all of the functionality the Region would require for the EFMS.

Table 1: Presto SRVM Functionality Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region’s EFMS Requirement</th>
<th>Presto SRVM Functionality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sell and dispense machine readable single ride paper tickets that can also function as transfers to conventional GRT and MobilityPLUS vehicles</td>
<td>Sell and dispense single ride paper tickets that can also function as transfers. SRVM tickets will not be machine readable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept payment by cash, credit or debit card</td>
<td>Accept payment by cash, credit and debit card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sell and/or load prepaid electronic fare cards</td>
<td>Issue short term use non-reloadable smart media, in a future revision (post 2015) Presto relies on a separate, standalone device, the Add Value Machine (AVM) to reload fare cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act as a fare payment device for customers using electronic fare cards</td>
<td>Act as a fare payment device for customers using electronic fare cards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a result of this gap, customers would not have the option of reloading smart cards through the SRVM at an ION platform without the installation of an additional device dedicated to that function. Paper tickets would require manual validation by fare inspectors and transit operators.

Cash Fare Payment and Transfer

The Presto operational concept does not include provision for cash fare payment on buses. If the Region were to contract with Presto, it would inherit the responsibility for acquiring and integrating fareboxes. In this case, cash fare and transfer reporting functionalities would not be integrated with the electronic fare payment system unless a solution was developed as part of the Presto contract.

MobilityPLUS Integration

The Region has implemented transit fare parity, in compliance with the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA). All current fare payment methods are able to be used on conventional GRT buses and MobilityPLUS vehicles. The EFMS needs to be capable of supporting this integration.

Ideally, the EFMS would provide MobilityPLUS operators with a handheld fare payment device that can issue transfer tickets. This device should be able to read electronic fare cards as well as 2D barcodes, and to print transfers for cash paying customers. A mobile payment device would allow the operator to take the payment acceptance device to the customer rather than requiring the customer to come to a fixed point of sale on the vehicle or to surrender their fare media for payment. This is an important feature for clients of MobilityPLUS service who may have challenges accessing a fixed device to pay fares.
Presto intends to develop a solution for fare payment on paratransit vehicles but one is not currently available. The parameters and timeline for development of Presto's solution are undefined. As a result of this gap, MobilityPLUS would not be able to be integrated into the EFMS until an unspecified future date after the system is launched and its customers would need to continue to use paper based fare products.

**Single Ride Prepaid Tickets**

Currently Public Health and Social Services agencies distribute large numbers of single ride paper tickets to their clients. The total annual value of these programs is approximately $300,000. Third party social service agencies also purchase single ride tickets for distribution to their clients. To support this requirement, the Region’s draft specification stipulates that the EFMS be capable of providing low-cost single ride electronic tickets to these agencies.

Presto currently has no functionality available that would meet this need. Presto is considering the potential of short term use non-reloadable smart media as a solution for this. Staff estimates that implementing this type of smart media would increase the cost of providing prepaid tickets by 20% when compared to the costs of providing paper tickets.

**U-Pass**

U-Pass customers represented approximately 28% of GRT riders in 2012. U-Pass programs are implemented in partnership with the universities and student associations and are governed by contracts built around the expectations and business rules of the partners.

While Metrolinx is working on the development of a solution to provide a U-Pass, it currently does not have a functioning U-Pass solution. The parameters and timeline for development of Presto's solution are undefined.

Integration of U-Pass programs poses challenges for the Presto system as its business model is built on the expectation of uniform fare products and policies and U-Pass programs vary significantly between municipalities. As a result of this gap, there is a risk that U-Pass customers would not be able to use the EFMS until an unspecified future date after the system is launched and would continue to use their Student ID cards for proof of U-Pass validity.

**Governance**

If the Region adopted Presto, the Region would join the current 10-member Presto Business Process Transformation Committee (BPTC), comprised of the existing transit service providers in the GTHA and Ottawa that have adopted Presto. The BPTC would evaluate new business processes such as implementation of a U-Pass or new fare payment methods for paratransit service and recommend them to the Presto Executive Client Committee.

Presto is currently developing Version 3.0 for implementation with the TTC, which could be implemented by the Region. The functionalities included in that version are not fully defined at present, and will be developed partially in response to the requirements of the other 10 service providers. A risk exists that if the requirements of the member systems change or diverge from those of the Region, then the Region would likely have to pay and wait for the development of unique system functionality.

During the presentations, Metrolinx also noted that any additions or changes to system functionality can potentially be influenced and would need to be approved by the other Presto Service Providers. This would have particular impact on the configuration of the future Presto solutions for U-Pass and MobilityPLUS.
If the Region were to implement the Presto system, it would be required to adopt a number of baseline ‘global’ fare policies that every Presto service provider has agreed to adopt such as:

- Core passenger classifications (Adult, Senior, Child, Student),
- Pass-back time window, and
- Any future global fare policies adopted by Presto.

Any change to global fare policies would have to be agreed to by every Presto service provider. However, GRT would have the option of creating unique fare policies and product structures which exist outside the global rules. These products would be uniquely available to GRT customers.

Cost

Currently, Presto is implementing new software versions and developing new hardware to implement for the TTC and for the Union Pearson Express in 2015. Because of the significant impact of these ongoing changes, Metrolinx has not finalized any guidance for the Region concerning potential operating or capital costs for the Presto system at the time of this submission.

A conversation has been initiated with the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) to explore the potential for Provincial assistance, given the financial risk. The province currently has no formal program or authority to help fund a Presto installation in the Region; however discussions between Metrolinx and the MTO are ongoing for this initiative. Both parties have expressed interest in determining a funding model for Presto expansion. For the installation of Presto in the GTHA and Ottawa, the Province cost shared one third of the municipal capital portion and one third of transition costs.

Risk Assessment

The likelihood of each of the following risk factors was assessed for the two alternative procurement scenarios:

1. Procure Presto EFMS and managed services from Metrolinx, or
2. Procure an EFMS from a vendor other than Metrolinx through a competitive RFP process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessed Risk Factors</th>
<th>Presto Likelihood Assessment</th>
<th>Other Vendor Likelihood Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suitability of scope of EFMS supplied</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitiveness of system capital cost</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitiveness of system operating cost</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitability of project schedule at contract signing</td>
<td>Low to Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral to High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability of Region to control project schedule after contract signed</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral to High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitability of EFMS device design</td>
<td>Neutral to High</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitability of EFMS functionality</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability of Region to influence EFMS device design or functionality development after contract signed</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral to High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for external agencies to influence EFMS device design or functionality development after contract signed</td>
<td>Neutral to High</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ability of Region to respond in future to changing customer requirements by acquiring additional functionality after start of EFMS operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Conclusion**

The EFMS Steering Committee has discussed the results of the Market Sounding process and concluded that while Presto is willing to commit to deliver a system that would meet the Region's needs, many of the EFMS devices and functionalities that are deemed essential by the Region are not currently included within the Presto system, including:

- A mobile payment device capable of accepting payment on MobilityPLUS vehicles;
- The ability to integrate a U-Pass program;
- The ability to issue machine readable paper tickets/ transfers from TVMs;
- Fareboxes for GRT buses that can be integrated in the EFMS;
- The ability to issue and read machine readable paper transfers, and;
- A very low cost method of issuing single ride prepaid tickets for social service agencies.

These functionalities could be mandated as required deliverables in an agreement with Presto and would then be developed to meet the Region's needs. However, this development increases risk to both timing and cost. Metrolinx and the MTO have not yet confirmed the estimated capital and operating costs to the Region for procuring and operating the Presto system, as these items, and a subsequent funding model, remain in development.

At least three of the other EFMS vendors that were consulted can provide a solution that includes all of the devices and functionalities deemed essential by the Region. Based on the range of proven solutions proposed, a Request for Proposals for the supply and implementation of a turnkey EFMS based on a functional performance requirements specification would allow the Region to acquire a solution that best fits the Region’s current business requirements while offering the potential to adapt the fare system over time to meet changing needs and to integrate new technologies.

**Next Steps**

Staff would prepare a Request for Proposal for the supply and implementation of a turnkey EFMS based on a functional performance requirements specification, to be issued early in 2014. The RFP would:

- permit responsive proposals to be submitted that meet the functional performance requirements that are based on either stored value closed-loop card-based solutions or open-loop account-based solutions; and
- permit responsive proposals to be submitted with several options including:
  - Hosted central system,
  - Managed customer services and card services, and
  - Financed system supply with fees based on transactions processed.

The turnkey EFMS should include the supply and integration of all the devices stipulated in the GRT Project Overview in the Vendor Consultation Document with the possible exception that the Region may agree to procure the validating farebox separately provided the EFMS solution provider would be responsible to integrate the new farebox system with the supplied EFMS. The Region would have a preference for proposals that include the supply of the validating farebox.

Following conclusion of the RFP process, a report would be brought to Regional Council in mid- 2014 recommending award to the successful vendor. As shown in Appendix 1, EFMS hardware could be installed in GRT buses and MobilityPLUS vehicles in 2015, allowing the fare system to transition to electronic media in advance of TVM installation on ION platforms.
Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

Area municipal staff will be kept informed of the status of the EFMS project and will receive a copy of this report.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The EFMS project supports Regional Council’s Strategic Objective 3.1 “Implement a Light Rail Transit System in the Central Transit Corridor fully integrated with an expanded conventional transit system”.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The approved 2013 GRT Capital Budget and 10 Year Forecast includes $8,096,000 from 2013 – 2015, to be funded from development charges and the RT/RTMP Reserve Fund, to complete the EFMS project. This funding is intended to support the implementation of the EFMS through to the Commissioning phase. Funds for any ongoing operating or support costs will be quantified and included in the 2015 GRT operating budget subject to Council approval. The approved Rapid Transit (RT) project budget includes funding for the purchase and installation of TVM’s at all RT platforms.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

The EFMS project is managed by a Steering Committee and a Project Team with representation from Planning, Housing and Community Services, Transportation and Environmental Services, Corporate Resources and Finance.

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix 1 - EFMS Critical Path Summary 2014 – 2016

PREPARED BY: Gethyn Beniston, Project Manager

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

- **Milestone**
- **= Steering Committee Meeting**
- **= Expected completion period**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Due</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare RFP for release</td>
<td>Dec 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue RFP</td>
<td>Jan 6, 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bid Evaluation</td>
<td>Mar 2014 – Apr 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>select preferred bidder</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor Agreement Negotiation</td>
<td>Dec 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install Fareboxes per Vendor agreement</td>
<td>Aug 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install Card Readers in GRT buses and MobilityPLUS vehicles &amp; backend systems per vendor agreement</td>
<td>Aug 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase Out Legacy Fare Media</td>
<td>Jun 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install TVMs on ION Platforms</td>
<td>Dependent on ION construction timelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REGION OF WATERLOO  
CORPORATE RESOURCES  
Legal Services  
TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES  
Rapid Transit

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

DATE:  November 12, 2013  FILE CODE:  L04-20

SUBJECT:  SOUTHERN ONTARIO LOCOMOTIVE RESTORATION SOCIETY – REQUEST FOR FUNDING

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo support the continuance of the not-for-profit activities of the Southern Ontario Locomotive Restoration Society (“SOLRS”) within the Waterloo Region by permitting SOLRS to re-use existing rail fixtures owned by the Region and additionally providing up to $150,000 in funding to assist the organization in relocating its tourist train operation to the north side of Northfield Drive near Conestoga Parkway in the City of Waterloo, as described in Report CR-RS-13-086/E-13-128 dated November 12th, 2013, and that the Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services enter into such agreements as may be satisfactory to the Commissioner and the Regional Solicitor to provide such assistance.

SUMMARY:

On June 18th, 2013, Ross White, President of the Southern Ontario Locomotive Restoration Society (“SOLRS”) appeared as a delegation to the Planning and Works Committee and provided an overview of his organization’s concerns regarding the continuation of its tourist train service in 2014, once construction of the LRT commences. At that time, Mr. White advised that he intended to make a request for financial assistance to the Region on behalf of his organization. In September, Regional staff received an outline of the plan for SOLRS to continue its operations in the Waterloo Region. This report provides some additional information regarding the organization’s challenges and a recommendation for the provision of in-kind and financial supports which will assist the organization transition to a new location once construction of the LRT within the Waterloo Spur rail corridor commences in 2014.

REPORT:

Background

The Southern Ontario Locomotive Restoration Society (SOLRS) is a not-for-profit federally licensed corporation run by volunteers. SOLRS undertakes two primary activities, namely the restoration of vintage rail stock at its maintenance facility in St. Jacobs and the operation of a passenger train service from Waterloo to St. Jacobs. It expects to carry approximately 20,000 passengers in 2013 and its gross revenues are approximately $250,000. The organization is headed by a volunteer board that has consistently grown the economic footprint of the service within the Waterloo Region year by year. The future plans of SOLRS include an enhanced effort to attract filming opportunities to the Region of Waterloo and to establish a base of operations on the north side of Northfield Drive making that a destination for school/learning excursions. Opportunities exist for the Region to collaborate with SOLRS to recognize its
ticket holding passengers on the LRT service once it becomes operational. Such collaboration could also take the form of a reciprocal marketing campaign creating opportunities for both the Region and SOLRS to expand their respective ridership.

SOLRS has operated in the Region of Waterloo since 2007. It has two agreements with the Region of Waterloo, namely an agreement to license lands in St. Jacobs for its maintenance facility and an agreement to operate on the Waterloo Spur, owned by the Region. SOLRS also has an agreement with the City of Waterloo to utilize the City-owned rail station in Waterloo and nearby public parking. In 2007, the plans of the Region to utilize the rail corridor for, at that time, a possible LRT system were made known to SOLRS and for that reason, prior agreements with SOLRS were limited to a one year term, renewed annually subject to the plans and requirements of the Region in connection with the LRT system. The Region of Waterloo SOLRS pays the Region an annual fee of $1,500 in connection with its use of Regional property and the rail corridor. The current agreements – both with the City and the Region - will expire in June of 2014.

Construction and Operation of LRT

Construction of the LRT is slated to commence in 2014 with fare service to commence in 2017. During construction, the SOLRS operation cannot be accommodated south of Northfield Drive as any operational use of the railway corridor during this time will have to be restricted to late night hours (between 11:00 pm and 7:00 am). As well, once the LRT is operational, SOLRS will not be able to operate as heavy train movements within a portion of the rail corridor will be subject to more stringent restrictions with limitation of freight movements between 11:30 pm and 5:00 am. SOLRS has been made aware of these restrictions and has participated in a series of stakeholder consultations that have been ongoing since the fall of 2012 concerning planned train operations within the shared LRT/Waterloo Spur corridor. Given the required restrictions, the current routing utilized by SOLRS for its passenger train operation will not be possible and it has proposed, as an alternative, a round-trip passenger service from Northfield Drive (where the Waterloo Spur crosses Northfield near the Conestoga Parkway) to Elmira with stops in St. Jacob’s.

Plan for Continuance of SOLRS Operation in Waterloo Region After 2014

In order to facilitate the continuance of its operation after 2014, SOLRS will be required to make a significant financial investment in the order of $500,000 which is detailed in Appendix “A”. Attached to this report is a “Request for Funding” brief that SOLRS has submitted to Regional staff. The most significant aspect of the funding is the cost ($400,000 to as much as $500,000) for a 700 foot long “passing track” to be constructed north of Northfield Drive in Waterloo. This cost would include new track, grading and installation of switches, to be constructed within the existing rail corridor owned by the Region. This track would be used for storage of the SOLRS passenger train. Currently the train is stored on a passing track located in uptown Waterloo adjacent to the train station. There is currently a passing track in St. Jacobs however it is too short for SOLRS operation. Similarly, there is a passing track in Elmira however it will likely be required for freight car storage and switching.

In discussions with the SOLRS Board of Directors, they believe that the cost of constructing this passing track can be greatly reduced (by more than $100,000) if the organization were permitted to re-use the existing track and switches in front of the existing Waterloo station and install them in the rail corridor on the north side of Northfield Drive. This material belongs to the Region and would be removed by the LRT contractor once LRT construction commences. The material would not be otherwise used for the LRT project and would be resold for its salvage
value. It is recommended that SOLRS be permitted to remove and re-install this material at its
own cost in connection with its transition from its base in Uptown Waterloo to Northfield Drive.

In discussions with the SOLRS Board of Directors, Regional staff has encouraged it to explore
all options to secure financial support, indicating that possible financial support from the Region
of Waterloo might be one aspect of a comprehensive financial solution which may include
fundraising, exploring other sources of revenue or financial support from corporate sponsors or
other levels of government. Should Regional Council wish to supplement its support to SOLRS
with the provision of financial assistance, it is recommended that any financial assistance be
provided on condition that additional funding be secured up to an upset limit so as to encourage
support from other community partners for the continuance of the SOLRS operations within
Waterloo Region. The provision of up to $150,000 together with the reuse of Region-owned
siding track and switches would provide for a level of support that would address approximately
one-half of the financial requirements of SOLR’s plan for continuance within Waterloo Region. It
is recommended that the following conditions also be included in an agreement with SOLRS:

• That any funding be conditional upon SOLRS approving an overall business plan for
  the relocation of its operation which will include particulars of any public parking that may
  be required;

• That Regional funding be conditional upon SOLRS obtaining other funding
  commitments to fund the balance of any work that must be done;

• While it is not recommended that SOLRS repay the proposed funding provided it
  continues operations within the Waterloo Region, it is recommended that a condition of
  any funding be that the principal be repaid should SOLRS cease to so operate; and/or

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This report supports the Region’s strategic focus of implementing a light rail transit system
within the Central Transit Corridor.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

In June 2011, Council approved the implementation of the RT project, including LRT and aBRT,
with estimated capital costs of $818 million, in 2014 dollars, with capital funding to be provided
by the Province (up to $300 million), the federal government (one third of eligible project costs to
a maximum of $265 million) and the Region ($253 million). The RT project and improvements to
conventional transit are financed through an annual tax rate increase of 1.5% for a period of
7 years.

The funding assistance has been accommodated within the overall Rapid Transit Project
budget.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

The Finance department has been consulted in connection with this report.
ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix “A” – Request for Funding Brief prepared by SOLRS dated September, 2013

PREPARED BY: Jeff Schelling, Solicitor, Solicitor (Corporate)  
Darshpreet Bhatti, Director, Rapid Transit

APPROVED BY: Jeff Schelling, Acting Regional Solicitor and Director of Legal Services  
Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Appendix "A"

Southern Ontario Locomotive Restoration Society
o/a
Waterloo Central Railway
50 Isabella Street – P.O. Box 546, St. Jacobs ON N0B 2N0
Tel: 519-664-0900
Fax: 519-664-0896

Request for Funding
Submitted to the
Planning and Works Committee
of the
Region of Waterloo

September 2013


**Background**

The Southern Ontario Locomotive Restoration Society (SOLRS), is a not-for-profit federally licensed charitable corporation of volunteers, who have spent seven years building the Waterloo Central Railway (WCR) into a major tourist attraction and mode of transportation in Waterloo Region. Since our first season of operation in 2007 when we carried only a few hundred riders between Waterloo and St. Jacobs, we have worked hard to build our value here, expecting ridership to exceed 20,000 this year.

In the summer of 2014, Waterloo Central Railway will lose part of its trackage rights on the Waterloo Spur, upon commencement of construction of the Region’s Light Rail Transit (LRT) system, resulting in the following changes to the WCR’s operation:

- loss of the use of Waterloo Station and crew office in uptown Waterloo
- loss of the use of the parking lot for riders and volunteers
- loss of the use of the 800 foot rail passing track, for storage of our train

WCR was advised that it could utilize the remaining track from Northfield Drive in Waterloo to the end of track at Elmira, however there are some issues that need to be resolved in order to make this new route viable. These issues are outlined in the following pages of this document.

**WCR is determined to continue operation** of its vintage tourist train and transportation service in Waterloo Region and is working diligently to find alternatives to the facilities that will be lost. Lack of parking for its customers and a storage track for the train, present significant obstacles.

We are submitting this Request for Funding, as one of the solutions that will allow us to continue to provide an essential Waterloo Region tourism attraction that is fun, educational and family oriented, and that will assist the Region to move forward by providing its citizens and businesses with an alternative mode of transportation.
Key Issues

1. **Passing Track:** The track used for its operation is owned by the Region of Waterloo and is shared by the Waterloo Central Railway in the daytime and by the Goderich Exeter Railway (GEXR) at night. There are ‘run around/passing’ tracks at Waterloo Station, St. Jacobs and Elmira. Our train is currently stored, between days used, in the passing track at Waterloo Station.

   The passing track at St. Jacobs is too short for our train and the one in Elmira must be left open for freight car switching by the GEXR.

   In the spring of 2012 when the LRT decision was presented, we requested an estimate of the cost to replace the passing track, which was given as $1.5 million dollars. WCR annual gross revenue is about $250,000 so funding such an amount from operating revenue is not possible.

   We recently obtained two quotations from industry-proven commercial rail contractors, which are in the range of $400 to $500 thousand for a 700 foot passing track, including the two switches needed and the roadbed preparation. The drainage system will likely be an additional cost, but until a final location is chosen and local conditions are examined, an exact price cannot be determined.

   The existing passing tracks and this proposed new one are attached to the main line track, owned by the Region. In the long run this will be a benefit to the Region.

   WCR is proposing that the Region pay for this replacement track, which is needed for proper operations and train storage.

2. **Passenger Platform:** A further item, which will also be located on the railway right-of-way, is a platform for the safe loading and unloading of passengers, many of whom are small children or seniors. Estimates for a 300’ x 8’ concrete platform are in the $15,000 range.

3. **Fencing:** At Waterloo Station our equipment has been quite safe and secure, with only occasional acts of vandalism. At a new location such as Northfield Drive, the passing track will require a gated, lockable chain link fence for security purposes and to prevent vandalism. Video surveillance security may also be required. Initial estimates are in the $20,000 range.
4. Parking: To date, the WCR has not found any solution for our parking requirement, which is estimated to be 100 spaces. We continue to look for possible locations. Both the NCR site re-developer and the St. Jacobs Farmers’ Market have indicated they are unable to provide space for us. Any associated costs outlined in this request do not include cost of a parking solution.

Conclusion

**SOLRS and WCR are committed** to having all planning completed and decisions made by December 31st, in order to have time to complete the necessary work in 2014, before our current agreement with the Region expires on June 30.

If this application is not approved, it is inevitable that WCR will be unable to continue operation of this tourist attraction in Waterloo Region.

We are well established in this community and obviously *prefer to remain in the Region of Waterloo* where we have worked hard to provide our citizens with an attraction that is innovative and has become highly regarded. About half our ridership originates from outside the Region.

According the Ontario Tourism Regional Economic Impact Model (TREIM), we contribute over $2 million annually to the local economy. Our passengers shop at the market, in the village and in Waterloo. Many make our train trip their focus of a family weekend in Waterloo, increasing hotel occupancy and meal purchases. Television and film producers are an increasing part of our revenue. A recent episode of a national series involved a cast and crew of 116, here for two days of shooting. Our ridership is more than 30% ahead of last year and no doubt will be our best year to date.

Please refer to the Summary of the requested expenditures on page 5.

Thank you for taking time to review our request. We hope it meets your criteria and your ability to say “yes”. For further information, please contact the writer at president.wcr@gmail.com or by telephone 519-884-5111 (home) or 519-240-0044 (cell).

Respectfully submitted by
Southern Ontario Locomotive Restoration Society

Ross White – President
Southern Ontario Locomotive Restoration Society

Request for Funding - Summary

Item 1. New ‘run around/passing’ track – final location to be determined, probably between Northfield Dr. & Randall Dr.
   High estimate $500,000
   Quotation Probable cost $400,000

Item 2. Passenger platform
   Verbal Estimate Probable cost $20,000

Item 3. Security fence – around ‘run around/passing’ track
   Written Estimate Probable cost $20,000

10% contingency, arising from final detailed quotes above
   Possible cost $44,000

Request for Funding – not more than TOTAL $484,000

Item 4. Customer parking costs TBA

We ARE a good investment for this Region.

September 2013
RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the Waste Management Master Plan Final Report, including recommended actions as itemized in Report E-13-127, dated November 12, 2013. The preferred strategy targets three primary and complementary areas of focus, and includes the following recommended actions:

Diversion

- Consideration of curbside collection policy changes to increase diversion (e.g. bag limits, bi-weekly garbage collection, standardized Regional residential waste collection), and consider “user pay” options (e.g. bag tags).

Residual Waste Management

- Further investigate thermal technology options (e.g. Feasibility Study, Business Case, Life Cycle Analysis, Environmental Impacts Study).
- Continue pursuit of opportunities with the Water Services Division to maximize inherent synergies for processing and disposal of residual waste and biosolids.

Planning

- Adopt a waste hierarchy that includes “Recovery” as the 4th R and consider recovery of energy and resources above waste disposal.
- Establish an inter-municipal working group to explore potential partnership opportunities for both diversion and residual waste management.

SUMMARY:

A new Waste Management Master Plan (WMMP) study was initiated in April 2012 to establish a long-term strategic direction for sustainable waste management options that are consistent with the Region’s corporate and strategic vision. The majority of the waste management program expansion and diversion initiatives recommended in the last WMMP (originally published in 1986 and last updated in 2011) have been implemented, resulting in a more than threefold increase in the amount of material diverted from landfill between 1995 and 2012. Further, the most recent projected remaining capacity at the Regional Landfill site is approximately 20 years; coincident with the typical planning horizon for a master plan.
The new WMMP is founded upon the principles described in the Region’s Environmental Sustainability Strategy and builds upon the successes and experience gained over the last 25 years. Stakeholder involvement was key throughout the process, and included communication and consultation with Regional Council, area municipalities, the general public, private entities, and government agencies. The WMMP documents the current status of the Region’s waste management practices, programs, operations and facilities, provides projections of future diversion rates and residual waste generation volumes, and establishes a strategy to guide waste management services over the next 20 years that is aligned with the planning, regulatory and technical context.

REPORT:

Introduction

A new Waste Management Master Plan (WMMP) study was initiated in April 2012 to establish a long-term strategic direction for sustainable waste management options that are consistent with the Region’s corporate and strategic vision over the next 20 years. Long term strategic planning has laid the foundation for waste management in Waterloo Region since the 1980’s. The last Waste Management Master Plan (WMM) was completed in 1986 and has been updated on a five year basis, with the last review occurring in 2011. Over the past 27 years the Region has implemented the majority of the recommendations outlined in the 1986 WMM, including infrastructure modernization, service integration, and program initiatives. The result has been a threefold increase in the amount of material diverted from landfill between 1995 and 2012 despite a population increase of nearly 35% over the same period. Additionally, numerous changes in the planning, regulatory and technical environments have occurred since the WMMP was first approved over twenty five years ago. Further, the most recent projected remaining capacity at the Regional Landfill site is approximately 20 years; coincident with the typical planning horizon for a master plan.

Building upon the successes and experience gained over the last 25 years, the Region embarked on the development of a renewed strategy to guide waste management services and establish a strategic direction in the focus areas of Residual Waste Management, Diversion and Planning over the next 20 years.

The objectives of the new WMMP include:

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

A major focus of the WMMP study was to establish baseline information in a number of areas to facilitate comparison of options and inform decision-making. Baseline information was developed for current waste management programs and performance, projections of future waste tonnages and landfill capacity remaining, and public sentiment about existing and future waste management programs and services. Opportunities in the realms of diversion, residual waste management and
planning were identified and evaluated. This body of work is documented in a series of reports as follows:

- Mission Statement and Guiding Principles Report;
- Communication and Consultation Plan,
- Interim Report No. 1: Waste Generation Projections & Landfill Capacity Assessment
- Interim Report No. 2: Current Waste Management Profile
- Interim Report No. 3: Review and Preliminary Evaluation of Residual Waste Management Options
- Interim Report No. 4: Opportunities & Constraints
- Interim Report No. 5: Sustainability Evaluation of Residual Waste Management Options
- Interim Report No. 6: Life Cycle Assessment & Evaluation of Short-Listed Alternatives
- Interim Report No. 7: Waste Reduction and Diversion Opportunities
- Interim Report No. 8: Evaluation of Waste Reduction and Diversion Opportunities
- Interim Report No. 9: Waste Reduction and Diversion Study
- Full-Cost Accounting Analysis for Waste Disposal at the Waterloo Landfill
- Soils Management Feasibility Study
- Consultation Series 1 Summary Report
- Consultation Series 2 Summary Report

All reports and study material is available on the study webpage at: [http://www.regionofwaterloo.ca/en/aboutTheEnvironment/Wastemanagementmasterplan.asp](http://www.regionofwaterloo.ca/en/aboutTheEnvironment/Wastemanagementmasterplan.asp)

Progress updates have been provided to the Planning and Works Committee in September 2012 (E-12-088), February 2013 (February 26, 2013 Memo to Committee) and September 2013 (E-13-101).

**Communication, Consultation and Study Governance**

The WMMP study was directed by three groups, as follows:

**Project Team:** The Project team was comprised of technical staff from the Waste Management and Design and Construction divisions, and the Planning, Housing and Community Services and Corporate Resources departments. The project team provided day-to-day study direction and oversight and worked closely with the Region’s consultant, Golder Associates Ltd.

**Steering Committee:** The Steering Committee was comprised of senior management from the Transportation and Environmental Services and Public Health departments and Legal Services division, in addition to appointed Regional Council representatives. The Steering Committee met at key milestones to endorse study deliverables and provide high level direction to the project team.

**Stakeholder Group:** The Stakeholder Group was made up of third parties representing various stakeholders such as business, education and special interest groups, as well as the community-at-large. The Stakeholder Group met at key milestones to review material to be presented to the public, endorse study deliverables and provide high level guidance to the project team.

Together, the three groups developed a Mission Statement and Guiding Principles for the study to establish a shared vision within the community, as follows:

Mission Statement: *To develop a sustainable waste management master plan, in consultation with the community, that is environmentally, socially and fiscally responsible while meeting the current and future needs of Waterloo Region.*
Guiding Principles: *In the development of the Waste Management Master Plan, the Region will:*

1. **Consider options which support waste reduction, reuse, recycling, and recovery ahead of disposal.**
2. **Use an open and transparent decision making process to explore, evaluate and recommend responsible waste management services.**
3. **Foster innovation and incorporate flexibility to adapt to emerging technologies, policies, growth and opportunities for collaboration.**

A Communication and Consultation Plan was developed at the outset of the WMMP study process to support the WMMP study by informing, engaging and obtaining feedback from a diverse range of stakeholders. The plan included traditional consultation means such as Public Information Centres (PIC’s), which were leveraged using other engagement tools such as social media, on-line surveys and public outreach within the community.

Two formal consultation series were held over the course of the study. Consultation Series 1 focused on current waste management services and diversion programs, and was held in Fall 2012. Activities included Public Information Centres in the Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo and Woolwich Township, outreach at community events, as well as a digital engagement program including an online survey. Feedback was collected from a total of 616 individuals. Consultation Series 2 was conducted in Spring/Summer 2013 focused on residual waste (garbage) disposal options. Activities included Public Information Centres in the Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo and Wilmot Township, as well as a digital engagement program including an online survey. Feedback was collected from a total of 211 individuals.

As part of the consultation plan, the Region hosted an Inter-municipal Workshop in June 2012. Waste management representatives from several neighbouring municipalities including the Cities of Brantford, Guelph, Hamilton, London, Counties of Brant, Oxford, Wellington, Norfolk and Region of Halton participated in an open dialogue regarding common challenges, opportunities, leading/best practices, and to explore opportunities for future collaboration.

**Background - Current Waste Management Programs and Performance**

The Waste Management Division is responsible for providing waste collection, diversion and disposal services for Waterloo Region’s residential sector. Waste collection services offered by the Region to multi-residential households, including townhouses and apartments, are subject to limitations. A portion of multi-residential sites are required to contract private waste collection services. The Region does not have direct control over the management of wastes generated by local Industrial, Commercial and Institutional (IC&I) establishments. IC&I waste diversion and disposal is governed through provincial regulations. However, the Region’s Waste Management Division offers the following services for Waterloo Region’s IC&I sector, should they choose to use our services:

- Receipt and proper disposal or diversion of waste at select Region waste management facilities according to an approved tipping fee schedule;
- Receipt, processing and marketing of recyclables and other recoverable materials (subject to eligibility); and
- The provision of information and guidance on waste reduction and diversion opportunities.

A comparison of residential and IC&I waste disposal quantities between 2006 and 2012 indicates that historically approximately 60% of the waste disposed of at the Waterloo Landfill originates from Waterloo Region’s IC&I sector as shown in Table 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Residential Waste Landfilled (tonnes)</th>
<th>ICI Waste Landfilled (tonnes)</th>
<th>Total Waste Landfilled (tonnes)</th>
<th>Residential Waste Diverted (tonnes)</th>
<th>Residential Diversion Rate</th>
<th>Provincial Average Residential Diversion Rate</th>
<th>Waste Disposed per Capita (kg/person)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>103,093</td>
<td>167,298</td>
<td>270,391</td>
<td>79,000</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>99,867</td>
<td>145,991</td>
<td>245,858</td>
<td>80,952</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>101,357</td>
<td>153,186</td>
<td>254,543</td>
<td>91,418</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>95,259</td>
<td>120,065</td>
<td>215,324</td>
<td>97,476</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>93,573</td>
<td>122,548</td>
<td>216,121</td>
<td>96,772</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>92,932</td>
<td>116,975</td>
<td>209,907</td>
<td>99,691</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>92,366</td>
<td>89,718</td>
<td>182,084</td>
<td>102,163</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>Not yet available</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Residential and IC&I waste disposal quantities 2006-2012

Notable trends include the following:

- a decline in IC&I waste disposal since 2006. This is a result of a combination of factors, including decreasing IC&I waste generation, improved IC&I waste diversion practices, “light-weighting” (i.e. a given volume of material weighs less now than it does in the past), and export of waste for disposal at privately operated waste management facilities outside of Waterloo Region. It is important to note that 2009 to 2011 data coincides with recession and economic slowdown, and therefore may impact the overall trend that is observed.

- A plateau in residential diversion rate since 2009. This reflects high voluntary participation in the blue box program where approximately 77% of material that is eligible for diversion through the blue box program is captured. This capture rate of 77% is reflective of a mature program. The green bin capture rate is low at 19%, and is reflective of a less mature and voluntary program.

- A plateau in total waste disposed per capita of approximately 170 kg/capita since 2010. This figure is approximately 5% lower than the national average, and the lowest amongst similar sized municipalities in Ontario, meaning that residents of the Region dispose of marginally less garbage compared to the rest of the country.

Waste management programs are funded by a combination of tax levy and revenue generated from various sources, including sale of recyclables, provincial (Waste Diversion Ontario) funding, tipping fees and royalties on the sale of landfill gas, as shown in Figure 1.
Background – Projections of Future Waste Tonnages and Landfill Capacity Remaining

Projections for diversion rates and diversion streams, residual waste production and landfill capacity were developed in consideration of evolving demographics, housing patterns, diversion patterns, waste composition and market share of IC&I waste. The evaluation concluded that the remaining capacity in the Waterloo Landfill is approximately 18 years in a status quo scenario, and may vary between 16 and 20 years dependant on the variables listed above. The number of years of remaining capacity is significantly increased even further (from 20 years to upwards of 30 years) if IC&I tonnage significantly drops or is eliminated all together.

Key drivers include:

- Assuming steady growth, the annualized average growth rate for Waterloo Region from 2011 to 2031 is 1.79%. The population is projected to increase from 553,000 in 2011 to 729,000 in 2031.
- Assuming residential diversion rates remain constant at 52%, residential waste requiring disposal is projected to increase from about 93,000 tonnes in 2011 to 130,000 tonnes in 2031.
- Should a higher diversion rate (e.g. 60%) be achieved, residential waste requiring disposal in 2031 is estimated at 108,500 tonnes.
- As of December 2011 the total volume remaining at the Waterloo Landfill Site was 7,380,405 m$^3$. This is equivalent to 4,428,243 tonnes at an actual average gross waste density of 600 kg/m$^3$.

Waste Reduction and Diversion Opportunities

Curbside Collection

The Region’s Strategic Plan identifies reducing the amount of waste requiring landfill as a core objective, and as such, the Region will continue to make waste diversion a priority, even after a new residual waste solution has been identified. An evaluation of waste reduction and diversion opportunities identifies priority initiatives to increase waste diversion and reduction. These initiatives include consideration of bi-weekly garbage collection, reduction and standardization of garbage bag limits, implementation of a user pay system, standardization of waste programs, modification of depot drop-offs, enhancing programs to maximize diversion, and continuing to encourage residents to reduce waste.
During Consultation Series No. 1, participants were asked to provide feedback on opportunities to improve participation in existing diversion services and possible new diversion initiatives. Over half of respondents (359 of 616 total) rated encouraging full participation in the blue box and green bin program via avenues such as bi-weekly garbage collection as Very Important.

A separate report including further discussion of potential curbside collection policy changes will be provided to Council later in 2013/early 2014.

*Soils and Materials Management*

Further to the recommendation included in P-12-011/E-12/020 (February 28, 2012) a feasibility study to examine how impacted soils and other materials are managed within the Region and explore opportunities for alternative management to divert these materials from landfill and towards beneficial re-use was completed as part of the WMMP.

The study found that significant volumes of excess soils are also anticipated to be generated primarily by development, and to a lesser extent by Regional and Provincial transportation infrastructure projects including development of the Region’s Rapid Transit System and highway expansion projects. There are currently no infrastructure projects within the Region that are confirmed to act as receiving sites or sinks for excess soil materials. Potential sinks include aggregate pits and quarries that currently operate within the Region.

The specific environmental and physical or geotechnical characteristics of excess materials, and the requirements of potential receiving sites represent the greatest uncertainties regarding the feasibility of a management or recycling facility. In light of these uncertainties, the establishment of a fixed soil banking or recycling facility within Waterloo Region may be premature. Further, as soil treatment costs are generally greater than landfilling, the financial feasibility of a fixed soil management centre or treatment facility would likely be dependent on the ability to recover costs for the reuse of treated materials rather than relying on primary (i.e. virgin) aggregate sources. At the present time an opportunity exists to develop a tracking system to collect information about the geographic location, environmental and geotechnical characteristics of excess soil materials. This information can be used to identify sources of excess material and aid in siting receiving sites, including future fixed collection or treatment facilities.

*Residual Waste Management Opportunities*

Residual waste management alternatives evaluated during the study included consideration of all available technologies such as landfilling, mechanical, biological and thermal processes, and including energy and resource recovery potential. The three technologies are defined as follows:

- **Landfill:** waste is compacted and buried in an open section (a cell) of the landfill site that has been lined to prevent contaminated water from entering groundwater. After a cell is full, it is covered and a new cell is opened. Materials in the landfill decompose to produce landfill gas. Landfill gas can be collected and used to generate a moderate amount of energy.

- **Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT):** a combination of mechanical separation and digestion is used to process waste. Recyclables and wastes that cannot be digested are removed by a mechanical process. Following separation, the remaining primarily organic waste is treated biologically to produce compost and/or biogas. MBT can generate a moderate to significant amount of energy and requires that a moderate amount of remaining post-processing waste be landfilled.

- **Thermal Treatment:** heat is used to convert waste into biogas or heat energy. Before treatment, recyclables and large items are removed. Thermal treatment can generate a significant amount of energy and results in a minimal amount of post-processing waste.
Alternatives were evaluated according to a customized methodology that incorporated the principles of the Region’s Environmental Sustainability Strategy, and considered both local and global impacts in the technical, social, environmental and economic dimensions.

Overall, thermal treatment is the best performing option when all dimensions are considered together. Conventional thermal technologies such as the mass burn incineration facility being constructed at the Durham York Energy Centre (Region of Durham) convert garbage into significant heat energy which can power a turbine to generate electricity and heat steam for industrial processes or district heating. Emerging thermal technologies such as the gasification facility being constructed by Enerkem Alberta Biofuels (City of Edmonton) convert garbage into a synthetic gas which can be refined to produce biofuels such as methanol and ethanol, or combusted to power a turbine to generate electricity, and heat steam for industrial processes or district heating.

Thermal technologies can minimize local environmental and social impacts due to:

- the advent of high performing emissions control equipment,
- small footprint requirement,
- opportunities for significant conversion of residual waste to energy, and
- significant volume of waste reduction and corresponding low residual requiring disposal.

The percentage of residual remaining as ash or slag after thermal treatment can vary between 10 – 20% depending on the specific technology. The ash or slag can be post-processed to recover both ferrous and non-ferrous metals, and some ashes can be beneficially re-used as an adjunct to aggregate in the production of concrete. If beneficial re-use is not possible then the ash or slag is disposed of by landfilling.

In order to evaluate the impact of thermal treatment on a global scale, a Life Cycle Analysis was completed to compare a variety of residual waste management scenarios. Life Cycle Analysis allows for the assessment of the environmental footprint from all stages of a waste management system.

Notable results include:

- thermal treatment could result in a net avoidance of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions equivalent to keeping almost 4,000 cars off the road or burning over 44,000 barrels of oil. This is primarily as a result of avoided emissions by off-setting the need to generate electricity from fossil fuels.
- thermal treatment has a significant impact on avoided resource depletion, equivalent to the resource consumption impact of almost 10,000 individuals. This is due to material recovery, and more significantly, energy generation. Virgin resources used to manufacture materials and fossil fuel used for energy production are displaced by renewable energy from thermal treatment.

Capital costs for complete integrated thermal treatment facilities are marginally higher compared to other technologies such as mechanical-biological processes. The estimated capital cost for a thermal treatment facility capable of processing between 100,000 – 150,000 tonnes of garbage annually could range between $200-$300 million depending on the specific technology and associated pre- and post-processing infrastructure required. By contrast, siting and development of a new landfill to provide 20 years of disposal capacity could range between $100-$200M. Operating costs for thermal treatment facilities are typically higher than those for both landfilling and mechanical-biological processes, however net operating costs can approach those of traditional
landfilling when operating costs are offset by a revenue stream from the sale of energy or cost avoidance, in the case of district heating for example.

The Region’s projected future residual waste tonnage is in excess of 100,000 tonnes annually, which represents the low end of economic viability for thermal technology. Therefore, exploring opportunities to partner with the Region’s Water Services Divisions to include biosolids as a feedstock, with municipal neighbours facing similar future landfilling constraints and/or the private sector is recommended to achieve economies of scale and optimal efficiency. Establishing an intermunicipal working group to explore potential partnership opportunities is a recommended next step.

Both the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the European Union formally recognize energy recovery as an important component of the waste management hierarchy. The recent Rethink Waste (March 2013) report from the Ontario Waste Management Association also advocates for a redefinition of Ontario’s waste hierarchy to recognize material and energy recovery. Formal adoption of a waste hierarchy for the Region of Waterloo that includes “Recovery” as the 4th R, and considers recovery of energy and resources above waste disposal aligns the philosophy embodied in the Environmental Sustainability Strategy with high level strategic direction for waste management in the Region. Setting a future direction for waste management that includes resource recovery is key from both an environmental and economic perspective.

During Consultation Series No. 2, participants were asked to provide feedback on the technology evaluation process and preferred future garbage disposal technologies. Over 68% of respondents (165 of 241 total) were either Satisfied or Very Satisfied with the evaluation process. Respondents were asked to rank the three short-listed garbage disposal technologies (thermal treatment, mechanical biological treatment and landfill) in order of preference. The most preferred technology was thermal treatment at 66% (144 individuals). Mechanical biological treatment was most preferred by 33% (69 individuals) of respondents and 6% (12 individuals) felt that landfill was the most preferred option. Overwhelmingly, the least preferred option for 82% (166 individuals) of survey respondents was landfill. Thermal treatment and mechanical biological treatment were least preferred by 9% (20 individuals) and 7% (15 individuals) of respondents, respectively.

Thermal treatment affords the opportunity to implement a locally and globally sustainable solution to residual waste management for the Region of Waterloo. Several jurisdictions in Canada are either implementing or planning for the implementation of thermal treatment, including the Cities of Montreal, Ottawa, Edmonton, Greater Vancouver and the Regions of York, Durham and Peel, and it appears that thermal treatment is gaining momentum. However, at this stage on the Region’s planning horizon, further study is warranted to differentiate amongst the various technologies at a greater level of detail, understand the feasibility of integrating thermal treatment with the Region’s diversion programs, explore the business case for the implementation of thermal treatment by the Region of Waterloo, and determine whether such a facility is best located within the Region or at a third party site outside the Region.

Implementation Schedule

Implementation of the recommendations will proceed according to the following schedule, and staff will report back to the Planning and Works Committee at key milestones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of curbside collection policy changes to increase diversion (e.g. bag limits, bi-weekly garbage collection, standardized Regional residential waste collection), and consider “user pay” options (e.g. bag tags).</td>
<td>Short term. Staff report to be provided to Council later in 2013/early 2014.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further investigate thermal technology options (e.g. Feasibility Study, Business Case, Life Cycle Analysis, Environmental Impacts Study).


Continue pursuit of opportunities with the Water Services Division to maximize inherent synergies for processing and disposal of residual waste and biosolids.

Commencing 2014 coincident with Biosolids Master Plan Update.

Adopt a waste hierarchy that includes “Recovery” as the 4th R and consider recovery of energy and resources above waste disposal.

Immediate.

Establish an inter-municipal working group to explore potential partnership opportunities for both diversion and residual waste management.


CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

The new WMMP supports the Corporate Strategic Plan Objectives of Focus Area 1 Environmental Sustainability, including 1.1 “Integrate Environmental Considerations Into the Region’s Decision-Making” and 1.3 “Reduce the Amount of Waste Requiring Landfill”.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The Council-approved 2013 Waste Management Ten Year Capital Program includes sufficient funding in 2013-2016 to implement the recommendations above for further study and collaboration as identified in the Waste Management Master Plan.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Planning Housing and Community Services has provided comments from the Heritage Planning Advisory Committee (HPAC) regarding opportunities to discourage building demolition and recover re-usable building materials.

PREPARED BY: Donna Serrati, Manager Engineering & Programs, Waste Management
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SUBJECT: WASTE MANAGEMENT FUNDING MODELS  

RECOMMENDATION: For Information.  
SUMMARY: NIL  

REPORT:  

Waste Management staff was requested to provide information on options available for funding waste management services including user pay and utility models given the current revenue shortfalls from Industrial, Commercial and Institutional (IC&I) landfill tipping fees and marketing of recyclable material.  

This report provides an overview of the various options typically available for funding waste management programs and services including the option of a “waste utility”, and provides some of the advantages and disadvantages of user pay systems.  

Current Waste Management Programs and Services:  

The Waste Management Division is responsible for providing waste collection, diversion and disposal services for Waterloo Region’s residential sector. Waste collection services offered by the Region to multi-residential households, including townhouses and apartments, are subject to limitations. A portion of multi-residential sites are required to contract private waste collection services. The Region does not have direct control over the management of wastes generated by local Industrial, Commercial and Institutional (IC&I) establishments. IC&I waste diversion and disposal is governed through provincial regulations. However, the Region’s Waste Management Division offers the following services for Waterloo Region’s IC&I sector, should they choose to use our services:  

- Receipt and proper disposal or diversion of waste at select Region waste management facilities according to an approved tipping fee schedule;  
- Receipt, processing and marketing of recyclables and other recoverable materials (subject to eligibility); and  
- The provision of information and guidance on waste reduction and diversion opportunities.  

Current Waste Management Program Costs and Funding:  

In 2013, the total cost of waste management services in the Region is $46,223,606 which includes the curbside collection of all waste, diversion programs and landfill disposal. Also included in the total cost is debt financing for construction, replacement or expansion of the capital infrastructure required to provide waste management services.
Two traditional approaches exist to fund waste management costs including some form of a user pay system and municipal property taxes. The Region of Waterloo currently uses both of these approaches to fund the total cost of all waste management programs and services.

Industrial, Commercial and Institutional (IC&I) waste generators are charged a fee on the basis of the quantities of waste requiring disposal at the Regional landfill. Residential waste management services are funded by revenues generated from the sale of recyclables and extended producer responsibility (EPR) funding for the Blue Box and Municipal Hazardous or Special Waste (MHSW) programs. Based on the approved 2013 budget, the balance of the costs, approximately 66% of the total, is funded from the property tax levy with an average household impact of $127 per year ($2.44 per week) for a property with an assessed value of $281,000. The Region’s cost per household for waste management services is one of the lowest household tax levy impacts when compared to other similar size municipalities offering similar services and programs.

**Summary of Waste Management Funding Options:**

Summarized below are the funding options that are typically used to fund waste management services based on an industry scan.

**Property-Tax Levy:** The most common traditional practice among municipalities has been to fund waste management service costs with the property tax levy calculated on the assessed value of residential and non-residential properties. The charge is included on the property tax bill with higher assessed properties paying a greater proportion of the costs for all municipal services including waste management. Under this option, properties that do not receive service also pay.

**User Pay System:** A user pay system is based on the principle of charging a fee based on the usage of the service and in the case of waste management services, residents pay a direct fee for the quantity of waste set out. The objective of the program is to provide an incentive for residents to decrease the amount of waste they generate and increase their participation in waste diversion programs.

Depending on the user pay system implemented, revenues generated from these fees typically fund all or a portion of garbage collection and disposal. The cost of waste diversion services are still typically funded from the property tax levy. There are currently 119 (out of a total of 230) municipalities in Ontario that have implemented some form of user pay system.

Various types of user pay systems used by municipalities are summarized below:

1. **Full user pay program:** Requires the homeowner to pay for every bag or can of garbage set at the curb.

2. **Partial user pay program:** Municipalities decide on a maximum number of bags or containers of garbage that will be collected and paid for by property taxes. Usually between one and three bags are “free” before bag tags or stickers are required to be purchased for collection of additional bags or containers.

3. **Variable user pay program:** Users select a container from a range of sizes available with pricing for the container corresponding to the amount of waste generated.

4. **Waste Management Utilities:** Utilities are another form of a user pay system where residents are charged a variable fee to cover operating costs and long term capital requirements of waste management services. The model directly links the service
recipient to the payment for the service received. Under a utility model, the current cost per household (based on an average assessed value) that is charged on the property tax bill would shift to a utility bill with a rate (either uniform or variable) that is charged on a monthly or annual basis.

Similar to a full user pay system, a utility’s reliance on the property tax levy can vary and in more highly sophisticated models, utilities can be financially self sustaining as all of the revenue generated is from the rates charged on the utility bill. However, costs to administer a utility system can be one of the highest when compared to any of the other funding models.

There are some significant considerations to take into account when implementing a utility model including a re-balancing or shifting of all of the waste management costs to the residential property tax base. Currently, property taxes from the non-residential sector also contribute towards the cost for waste management services even though a number of non-residential properties arrange for their own waste services. Similarly, a re-shifting between higher assessed properties to lower assessed homes would occur. Consideration would need to be given on how to handle non-residential properties including the BIAs, schools, universities, nursing homes, etc. that currently receive curbside waste management services.

**Municipal Examples of Funding Models:**

A few examples are mentioned below based on a preliminary review of municipal funding models currently in place in the Province.

The Region of Niagara has a user pay system whereby a $2 garbage tag fee covers garbage collection and disposal costs (excluding any tipping fee revenue). The balance of their waste management services (i.e. diversion programs) are funded from other sources including property taxes.

The City of Toronto has implemented a combination of a partial and volume-based (i.e. variable rate) user pay program where residents are charged an annual rate based on the size of garbage container or cart they use. User fees (i.e. annual container/cart fee) fund 70% of the City’s solid waste operating budget, while the remaining 30% is funded through tipping fees at transfer stations, revenue from recyclable material and extended producer responsibility programs.

**Advantages:** The advantages or rationale for a user pay system are as follows:

- A user pay program with a very limited number of “free” bags provides the greatest incentive to generators to reduce waste by providing a direct financial incentive;
- Reduction in waste for landfill would result in extending the life of the landfill and thereby, deferring costs of expansion or replacement costs;
- Increased participation in diversion programs (i.e. Blue Box, Green Bin, yard waste, etc.). Studies have found that recycling tonnage increased while waste disposal decreased significantly following implementation of user pay systems; and
- Residents become aware of their sources of waste and could adjust their purchasing habits accordingly.
Disadvantages: However, there are some disadvantages of implementing a user pay system and include:

- Public resistance due to long established residential curbside waste collection practices;
- Potential increase in illegal dumping which can be off-set by public education and enforcement;
- Additional funding and administrative requirements (i.e. billing and tracking) including costs of bag tag production and sales, increased enforcement, an increase in public education and handling complaints and inquiries;
- Depending on the user pay system implemented, full or partial costs of delivering waste management services are recovered. Where only partial costs are funded, reliance on the property tax levy is still likely to be required;
- User pay systems are challenging to implement in apartment buildings and other non-residential properties including the BIAs, schools, universities, etc. that currently receive curbside collection; and
- Increased health and safety issues for the collection workers with more dense or heavy garbage bags or cans as residents try to fit as much as possible into their containers/bags.

The recently completed Waste Management Master Plan (Report E-13-127) identified that some form of user pay system be considered for implementation within the next five (5) years and that it be directly related to the level of service provided to residents. In this regard, Staff intend to undertake a detailed assessment and evaluation of the various funding models in conjunction with identifying a preferred level of service for the next curbside collection contract and will report back to Council in late 2014/early 2015.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This report has been prepared consistent with the Corporate Strategic Objective of Focus Area 1 “Environmental Sustainability: Protect and enhance the environment” and particularly action 1.3 “Reducing the Amount of Waste Requiring Landfill.”

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS: NIL

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE: NIL

ATTACHMENTS: NIL

PREPARED BY: Shahin Virani, Manager, Finance and Administration, Waste Management

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

DATE: November 12, 2013
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SUBJECT: IC&I WASTE TONNAGE REDUCTION IMPACTS

RECOMMENDATION: For Information.

SUMMARY:

With the continued high level of site activities, shift of operational activities from landfill disposal to waste diversion and continued curbside residential tonnage remaining at consistent levels, the tonnage and corresponding revenue shortfall observed from the IC&I sector results in:

- No corresponding reduction in fixed operating expenditures associated with landfill disposal;
- Some variable cost savings associated with waste hauling and fuel consumption but significantly less than would be required to offset lost revenue; and
- Extension of the site life of the existing landfill and therefore the potential to defer capital costs associated with future residual waste disposal.

REPORT:

Background

In response to a request from Regional Council, Waste Management Staff has prepared this report to identify impacts related to the continuing decline of IC&I waste from landfill disposal at the Region’s Waterloo Landfill Site and specifically, the anticipated implications on cost, revenue and remaining landfill capacity if IC&I waste was no longer received for disposal.

As previously identified, a general trend of lower landfill tonnage has been observed across the entire waste industry (both public and private sectors) since the 2008 recession and a return of landfill tonnage to levels seen prior to 2008 has not materialized nor is it anticipated given current market conditions. The primary factors leading to this trend include:

- an observable transition to a lighter (less dense) residual waste stream;
- an overall reduction in the amount of residual waste being generated; and,
- increased IC&I waste exporting from the Region by the private sector.

Specific to the third bullet above, the Region has no mandate to control the flow of waste generated by the IC&I sector. In recent years, the larger private waste hauling/disposal companies that own landfill capacity have been (and are anticipated to continue) to use their own landfill sites as much as possible to ensure profitability. This has become very apparent in the last few years as tonnage from these larger account customers has declined significantly. Historically, the Region has attempted to maintain a balance between a reasonable tipping fee and convenient service for the local business sector. For the most part, this continues to be the case as the majority of IC&I waste now disposed of at the Waterloo Landfill comes directly from
small to medium sized businesses that may not have the same discounted fee structure or accessibility to the larger private waste management firms that larger IC&I waste generators have. Given the above and in the absence of any other policy changes, it continues to be a challenge to forecast annual IC&I landfill tonnage (and resulting revenue).

**IC&I Waste Reduction Impacts**

**Staffing Levels/Operational Shift**

A noticeable operational and program shift away from landfill disposal activities towards waste diversion activities has been observed while the number of customer visits and materials handled at Waste Management Division sites has remained relatively consistent. This has required an adjustment in operating and administrative practices to respond to new diversion related operations and expanded levels of service while maintaining consistent staffing levels. Figure 1 (Appendix A) identifies that Division staffing levels have remained consistent or decreased proportionately in comparison to the number of service level/program expansions over the past 15 years, including the consolidation of collection services at the Regional level in 2000. Since 1993, staffing levels have decreased by approximately 24 FTEs while customer transactions have increased from about 170,000/year to 460,000/year.

Figure 2 (Appendix A) presents a high level overview of typical operational activities undertaken at the Waterloo Landfill Site and include:

- acceptance and weighing of IC&I and residential waste and recyclable materials at both Gate 1 (main scales) and Gate 2 (small vehicle transfer station)
- IC&I and residential residual waste (garbage) directed to the landfill tipping face for final disposal
- Blue box recyclables are directed to the Materials Recycling Centre for processing and eventual transport to end markets for sale
- Green bin organics and yard waste/leaves are directed to the waste diversion area where they are dropped and then transferred to either Guelph (for processing of green bin materials) or the Cambridge Landfill Site (for outdoor windrow composting of yard waste/leaves)
- Other waste materials such as hazardous waste, pallets and drywall are received and eventually transferred offsite for final disposal or diversion

As identified in Figures 1 and 2, the number of FTEs and level of activity related to waste diversion operations has become more significant than landfill disposal operations.

**Operational Cost Impacts**

While IC&I landfill tonnage levels are continuing to decline, fixed costs related to landfill disposal have not been largely impacted nor are they expected to be impacted significantly in the absence of IC&I waste as the amount of residential waste that requires landfill remains consistent at approximately 90,000 to 95,000 tonnes per year. In this regard, the same level of resource allocation (staff and equipment) is required throughout the operating day in order to meet compliance with the landfill’s site operating permit and regulatory standards as well as best practices. Specifically, landfill related activities such as spotting/supervision at the tipping face, heavy equipment operation (e.g. dozers and compactors), operation of environmental controls (odour control and leachate management), litter picking (at and around the site) and daily cover placement are still necessary regardless of the tonnage of material received for landfill disposal.
In 2013, it is projected that approximately $200,000 in savings associated with variable costs will be observed with respect to waste hauling (Cambridge Transfer Station to Waterloo Landfill) and reduced fuel consumption. These savings have already been incorporated into the 2014 base budget projection. Any additional reductions in IC&I tonnage would be expected to result in further annual variable cost savings related to hauling and fuel consumption. Staff will continue to monitor these costs and make any necessary adjustments as part of future budget processes.

**Revenue Implications**

The 2013 budget forecast revenue of approximately $7,440,000 (based on 100,000 tonnes of IC&I waste received for landfill disposal). The revised revenue forecast for 2013 is anticipated to be about $5,000,000 million (based on projected end of year IC&I tonnage of approximately 65,000 to 70,000 tonnes). In the absence of IC&I waste disposal, revenue would reduce to $0 and would result in an additional funding shortfall.

**Landfill Site Life**

Based on the current projected IC&I waste tonnage (i.e. 65,000 to 70,000 tonnes/year), a landfill closure date of around 2033 or 2034 is anticipated (approximately 20 years landfill capacity). If IC&I waste is no longer received for disposal, it is anticipated that landfill closure would occur around 2043, providing another 10 years of landfill capacity and the potential to defer capital investment for future waste disposal capacity.

**Household Tax Impact**

The 2013 budgeted cost per household tax levy impact for all residential waste management services from collection through diversion and disposal was anticipated to be about $127. Due to the projected revenue shortfall from IC&I waste, it is now revised to be approximately $137 per household. In the absence of IC&I waste revenue, the projected cost per household would increase to approximately $158. In comparison to other Ontario municipalities with similar service levels and programs, the household impact would still remain at the lower end of the range as shown in Figure 3 (Appendix A).

Table 1 below summarizes the above discussion as it relates to anticipated implications on costs, revenue, landfill site life and household tax impact based on the 2013 budget forecast, current IC&I landfill tonnage projection and a scenario where IC&I waste is no longer received for landfill disposal.

**Table 1: IC&I Waste Tonnage Reduction Impact Projections**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IC&amp;I Tonnage Scenarios</th>
<th>Operating Cost Savings</th>
<th>Projected Revenue ($74/tonne)</th>
<th>Loss of Revenue</th>
<th>Projected Landfill Site Closure</th>
<th>Household Tax Impact (2013)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100,000 (2013 Budgeted)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$7,400,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>$127/household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65,000 to 70,000 (2013 projected)</td>
<td>Approximately $200,000 already identified</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
<td>2034</td>
<td>$137/household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (No IC&amp;I Waste Disposal)</td>
<td>Approximately $250,000 additional savings possible</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>$158/household</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: Regardless of IC&I tonnage disposed, residential waste disposed at the landfill is approximately 90,000 to 95,000 tonnes/year.

The IC&I tonnage/revenue reductions observed are not unique to the Region of Waterloo. Other municipalities in the Province that own disposal capacity are facing similar challenges and, in the absence of other funding mechanisms, have either:

- Reduced their reliance on landfill revenue from the IC&I sector over time by maintaining higher tipping fees and offset the revenue loss through increases to the tax levy or by implementing user pay models. This approach also results in reserving landfill disposal capacity for residential waste, deferring capital investment and maintenance for future waste disposal capacity and providing for a stable funding source for operating residential collection, diversion and disposal programs.

- Kept a lower tipping fee (or some form of tiered tipping fee) to try and maintain a stable tonnage and revenue stream. Although this approach may provide a more consistent but reduced year over year revenue stream, the revenue generated typically only covers a portion of the cost of landfill disposal and does not assist in offsetting costs for diversion programs.

CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN:

This report has been prepared consistent with the Corporate Strategic Objective of Focus Area 1 “Environmental Sustainability: Protect and enhance the environment and particularly action 1.3 “Reducing the Amount of Waste Requiring Landfill.”

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The most recent year-end projection forecasts that approximately 65,000 to 70,000 tonnes of IC&I waste will be landfilled resulting in a 2013 revenue shortfall impact of approximately $2.40 million. If no IC&I waste is received for landfill disposal, a further revenue loss of approximately $5 million would result and, in the absence of any other funding sources, would need to be funded from the property tax levy. Of note, the proposed 2014 budget currently forecasts IC&I landfill tonnage at 60,000 tonnes resulting in revenue of approximately $4,440,000.

OTHER DEPARTMENT CONSULTATIONS/CONCURRENCE:

Staff from the Finance Department have reviewed and provided comment on this report.

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix A – Trends and Comparisons

PREPARED BY: Jon Arsenault, Director, Waste Management

APPROVED BY: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Summary of Staffing vs Landfill & Diversion Transactions

Figure 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Landfill Transactions</th>
<th>Diversion Transactions</th>
<th>Total FTE's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transactions (000's)
Gate 1 - Main Scales
Hours: 7:00am - 5:00pm
- 1 inbound scale
- 1 outbound scale
• 250 - 300 transactions/day
• 2 FTE’s - Scale Operators

To MRC (100% Residential)

Landfill Disposal
Tonnage Landfilled: Residential - 90,000 tonnes/yr.
ICI - 92,000 tonnes/yr.
• 120 - 150 transactions/day
• 8 FTE’s - 1 Supervisor
  - 1 Lead Hand
  - 1 Spotter
  - 4 Equipment Operators
  - 1 Maintenance Operator

Nyle Ludolf Materials Recycling Centre (MRC)
Blue Box Recycling: Residential 26,000 tonnes/yr.
• 60 - 100 transactions/day
• 1 FTE - 1 Supervisor

SVTS/Waste Diversion Area (GB/YW/MHSW)
Green Bin - 6,200 tonnes/yr.
ICI Yard Waste - 8,800 tonnes/yr.
Residential Yard Waste - 9,500 tonnes/yr.
• 800 - 1,200 transactions/day
• 10 FTE’s - 1 Supervisor
  - 1 Lead Hand
  - 2 Spotters
  - 2 Equipment Operators
  - 4 Maintenance Operators

Gate 2 - Small Vehicle Transfer Station
Hours: 7:00am - 6:00pm
- 1 inbound scale
- 1 outbound scale
• 750 - 1,250 transactions/day
• 2 FTE’s - Scale Operators

To Waste Diversion Area (35% ICI / 65% Residential)

To SVTS (25% ICI / 75% Residential)
Residential Garbage - 12,000 tonnes/yr.
ICI Garbage - 3,000 tonnes/yr.
Blue Box Recycling - 600 tonnes/yr.
MHSW - 400 tonnes/yr.
Pallets/Drywall - 400 tonnes/yr.
Yard Waste - 3,500 tonnes/yr.
Household Impact Comparison

Figure 3

- Waterloo: $127
- Halton: $137
- Hamilton: $145
- Durham: $155
- Niagara: $164
- Toronto: $184
- Peel: $229
- Hamilton: $241

* 2013 data not available.

Legend:
- 2013 Budget
- 2013 Projected
- No ICI Waste Revenue
Congratulations!

MMM GROUP LIMITED

has been selected to receive the

STRUCTURAL DESIGN INNOVATION AWARD
Cast-In-Place Concrete

for

FAIRWAY ROAD GRAND RIVER BRIDGE

LEAD CONSTRUCTION TEAM:

Owner: Regional Municipality of Waterloo
Architect of Record: du Toit Allsopp Hillier du Toit Architects Limited
Engineer of Record: MMM Group Limited
General Contractor: Grascan Construction Ltd.
Bridge Construction
Sub-Contractor: Torbridge Construction Ltd.
Material Supplier: Dufferin Concrete, a division of Holcim (Canada) Inc.

NOTE: An award plaque will be presented to the Lead Construction Team only, not the Additional Participants.

IMPORTANT: Please check the spelling of your company name, as all award engraving will be based on this information. Any changes should be made no later than Friday, November 8, 2013.

Submitted by: Scott Leitch, MMM Group Limited

This project will be honoured at the Ontario Concrete Awards Banquet to be held at Concrete Canada, Metro Toronto Convention Centre, on Wednesday, December 4, 2013. We hope that you and your associates will attend and accept this award on behalf of your firm.

Our Master of Ceremonies will give a brief overview of your project and introduce your lead construction team, at which time a single spokesperson from your team will give a 5-7 minute acceptance speech.

Please provide 5-9 pictures that best highlight your project, as well as the name of your spokesperson by November 20, 2013, to bkanters@rmcao.org or contact Bart Kanters directly at 905-507-1122.

Congratulations again on your award winning project, and we hope you will enter even more projects in next year’s competition.

Click here to download Banquet Registration.
To: Chair Jim Wideman and Members of Planning and Works Committee

From: Rob Horne, Commissioner
Planning, Housing and Community Services

Subject: PROVINCIAL REVIEW OF LAND USE PLANNING AND APPEAL SYSTEM

Regional staff wish to advise Council of a recently announced review of the land use planning and appeal system in Ontario. Comments are due by January 10, 2014, and a consultation document has been released.

This is a very important review for municipalities across Ontario, and an opportunity to achieve meaningful changes to our current planning system.

A Provincially-sponsored workshop will be held in Kitchener on November 14, 2013, which Regional staff will attend and communicate the position of Regional Council on a variety of issues.

A formal staff report is scheduled to be tabled at the Planning and Works Committee meeting in either December 2013 or January 2014, including detailed recommendations.

If you have any questions in the interim, please do not hesitate to contact me.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting date</th>
<th>Requestor</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Assigned Department</th>
<th>Anticipated Response Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05-Jun-13</td>
<td>G. Lorentz</td>
<td>Staff to review signage on Trussler Road/Ira Needles Boulevard</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-Jun-13</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Operation of Raised Crosswalks Study</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>Mid 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Haalboom</td>
<td>Staff continue to lobby the Province for changes to the <em>Highway Traffic Act</em> providing right of way to pedestrians and on an as needed basis provide an update to Council</td>
<td>Transportation and Environmental Services</td>
<td>as required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>