Regional Municipality of Waterloo

Planning and Works Committee

Agenda

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

9:00 a.m.

Regional Council Chamber

150 Frederick Street, Kitchener

1. Declarations Of Pecuniary Interest Under The Municipal Conflict Of Interest Act

2. Delegations
   a) TES-DCS-15-04, Fountain Street Improvements, From Kossuth Road / Fairway Road to Cherry Blossom Road, City of Cambridge – Recommended Design Alternative
      i. Dan Weinhardt and Dave Harvey, Royal Oak Road Neighbourhood Association

3. Presentations
   Transportation and Environmental Services Departmental Overview – Thomas Schmidt (Transportation and Transit Services)

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**


   c) **PDL-CPL-15-17**, 2014 Building Permit Activity and Growth Monitoring (Information)

   d) **TES-TRS-15-06**, City of Cambridge - Conestoga College U-Pass Request (Information)

   e) **TES-TRS-15-08** Update on Bike Sharing Initiatives in the Region of Waterloo (Information)

   f) **TES-WAS-15-09.1**, Water Efficient Restaurant Certification Program (Approval)

   g) **TES-WAS-15-10.1**, Water Efficiency Advisory Committee Terms of Reference 2015 (Approval)

---

**Regular Agenda Resumes**

6. **Reports - Planning, Development and Legislative Services**

   a) **PDL-CPL-15-18**, Provincial Review of Various Provincial Planning Documents

   b) **PDL-LEG-15-28**, Proposed Amendments to the Planning Act by Bill 73 – Smart Growth for Our Communities Act, 2015

   c) **PDL-CPL-15-19**, Regional Tourism Organization 4 Inc. Offer to Assist with Further Development of the Kissing Bridge Trailway

**Reports - Transportation and Environmental Services**

**Design and Construction**

   d) **TES-DCS-15-03**, Ottawa Street Improvements, Pattandon Avenue
to Imperial Drive, City of Kitchener – Approval of Project

e) TES-DCS-15-05, Approval of Additional Contract Expenditure - Contract T2013-015, Church Street Reconstruction, Town of Elmira

Transit Services

f) TES-TRS-15-07 Renewal of U-Pass Agreements with Post Secondary Students

Waste Management

g) TES-WMS-15-03, Big Music Fest Update: McLennan Park/Former Kitchener Landfill

h) TES-WMS-15-04, Multi-Residential Waste Collection Service Level Policies and Practices (Staff Presentation)

Water Services

i) TES-WAS-15-12, Revised Source Protection Policies for Waterloo Region (Staff Presentation)

7. Information/Correspondence

a) Council Enquiries and Requests for Information Tracking List

8. Other Business

9. Next Meeting – April 14, 2015

10. Motion To Go Into Closed Session

That a closed meeting of the Planning and Works and Administration and Finance Committees be held on Tuesday, March 24, 2015 immediately following the Planning and Works Committee meeting in the Waterloo County Room, in accordance with Section 239 of the “Municipal Act, 2001”, for the purposes of the following subject matters:

a) potential litigation and advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege related to an agreement
b) advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege related to agreements
c) advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege related to an agreement

11. Adjourn
<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>April 14, 2015</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>May 5, 2015</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., April 15, 2015</td>
<td>2:00 P.M. 7:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Proposed 2015 Transit Service Improvement Plan – Public Information Centre</td>
<td>Regional Headquarters Building Main Lobby 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thur., April 16, 2015</td>
<td>4:00 P.M. 8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Proposed 2015 Transit Service Improvement Plan – Public Information Centre</td>
<td>Real Canadian Superstore Community Room 875 Highland Road West Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed., April 22, 2015</td>
<td>4:00 P.M. 8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Proposed 2015 Transit Service Improvement Plan – Public Information Centre</td>
<td>St. Anthony Daniel Parish Raphael &amp; Michael Rooms 29 Midland Driv Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planning, Development and Legislative Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Region of Waterloo

Transportation and Environmental Services

Design and Construction

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

Date: March 24, 2015

File Code: C04-20, 07303, 05927

Subject: Fountain Street Improvements, From Kossuth Road / Fairway Road to Cherry Blossom Road, City of Cambridge - Recommended Design Alternative

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to the Class Environmental Assessment Study for proposed improvements to Fountain Street from Kossuth Road / Fairway Road to Cherry Blossom Road in the City of Cambridge:

a) Approve the Recommended Design Alternative for Fountain Street as outlined in Report TES-DCS-15-04;

b) Direct staff to file the Notice of Completion for this Class Environmental Assessment Study by means of advertisements in local newspapers and mailings to adjacent property owners, tenants and agencies, and place the Environmental Study Report on the public record for a period of 30 days; and

c) Amend the Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended, upon completion of construction of the Recommended Design Alternative to:

i) Add to Schedule 16 - Lane Designation, northbound left turn, northbound through / left-turn, northbound through, northbound right turn on Fountain Street (Regional Road 17) at Maple Grove Road (Regional Road 38);

ii) Add to Schedule 16 - Lane Designation, southbound left-turn, southbound through / left turn, southbound through / right turn on Fountain Street (Regional Road 17) at Maple Grove Road (Regional Road 38);
Summary:

The Region of Waterloo is currently undertaking a Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) Study to consider improvements to Fountain Street from Kossuth Road / Fairway Road to Cherry Blossom Road in the City of Cambridge. Please refer to Appendix “A” for a Key Plan of the Study Area.

This Class EA Study follows the recommendations of the Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP, 2010) which identified the need to widen Fountain Street to four lanes from Kossuth Road / Fairway Road to Maple Grove Road. The timing of this project presents an opportunity to address other deficiencies on Fountain Street. These deficiencies include a lack of continuous connected pedestrian and cycling facilities as well as deteriorated pavement conditions.

This Class EA Study is being directed by a Project Team consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo and City of Cambridge, Regional Councillor Karl Kiefer and City of Cambridge Councillor Donna Reid. The contribution of former Regional Councillor Jane Brewer is also gratefully acknowledged.

A Public Consultation Centre was held on October 7, 2014 to present plans for the proposed improvements and to receive public input. Comments received from the public were generally supportive of the proposed improvements.

Comments received at the Public Consultation Centre are included in Appendix “G” of this report and the Project Team’s response to the comments received is included in Section 4 of this report.

Based on a review of the technical information gathered for this project as well as a review of all public comments received, the Project Team is now recommending that Regional Council approve the following improvements for Fountain Street from Kossuth Road / Fairway Road to Cherry Blossom Road in the City of Cambridge:

- Reconstruct and widen Fountain Street from Kossuth Road / Fairway Road to Maple Grove Road to provide two (2) through lanes in each direction, plus a combination of raised and flush centre medians;
- Re-pave the existing four lanes on Fountain Street from Maple Grove Road to Cherry Blossom Road;
- Construct a new multi-use trail on each side of Fountain Street from Kossuth Road / Fairway Road to Cherry Blossom Road;

- Install, initially, new street lighting on both sides of Fountain Street from Maple Grove Road to Banat Road, consisting of either (i) double luminaires and fixtures on common poles installed in the median; or (ii) single luminaires and fixtures on poles installed in the boulevard on each side of the road;

- Install, when warranted, new street lighting on both sides of Fountain Street from Banat Road to Kossuth Road / Fairway Road, consisting of either (i) double luminaires and fixtures on common poles installed in the median; or (ii) single luminaires and fixtures on poles installed in the boulevard on each side of the road;

- Install new storm sewers on Fountain Street from Kossuth Road / Fairway Road to Maple Grove Road;

- Install a new sanitary sewer on Fountain Street, from Maple Grove Road to a northern limit between Banat Road and Middle Block Road (exact limit to be determined, pending review by the City of Cambridge) on behalf of the City of Cambridge;

- Install new Regional transmission water main and City of Cambridge distribution water main on Fountain Street from Kossuth Road / Fairway Road to Maple Grove Road;

- Plant new boulevard trees on Fountain Street from Kossuth Road / Fairway Road to Maple Grove Road;

- Construct a new two-lane roundabout at the intersection of Fountain Street and Maple Grove Road, designed to accommodate future expansion to three lanes if required beyond 2028, as previously approved by Regional Council in 2010 in Report E-10-055 and as shown in Appendix “E” of this report; and

- Retain, initially, the 2-way stop-controlled intersection at Fountain Street and Middle Block Road. Construct, when warranted by future traffic volumes on Fountain Street and Middle Block Road, either (i) a new two-lane roundabout (designed to accommodate future expansion to three lanes); or (ii) a new signalized intersection.

Staff is now also recommending that Regional Council direct staff to file the Notice of Completion for this Class EA Study by means of advertisements in local newspapers and mailings to adjacent property owners, tenants and agencies, and place the Environmental Study Report on public record for a period of 30 days.
Construction is currently scheduled to commence in 2018 subject to acquisition of the required property and utility relocations. The work is expected to be implemented in stages over a period of two or more years, depending on traffic volumes and development activity.

The Region’s 2015 10-Year Transportation Capital Program includes funding of $18,180,000 for this project in years 2015 to 2020 to be funded from the Roads Rehabilitation Reserve Fund and the Development Charge Reserve Fund.

Letters notifying interested members of the public that Regional Planning and Works Committee will be considering the approval of the Recommended Design Alternative for this project at its March 24, 2015 meeting were distributed during the week of March 9, 2015.

Report:

1. Background

The Region of Waterloo is currently undertaking a Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) Study to consider improvements to Fountain Street from Kossuth Road / Fairway Road to Cherry Blossom Road in the City of Cambridge. Please refer to Appendix “A” for a Key Plan of the Study Area. This Class EA Study has been initiated by the Region to address several needs on Fountain Street.

1.1 Existing Roadway Configuration and Conditions

Within the Study Area, Fountain Street from Fairway Road / Kossuth Road to Cherry Blossom Road is under the jurisdiction of the Region of Waterloo. Intersecting Regional Roads within the study area include Fairway Road, Kossuth Road and Maple Grove Road. Local intersecting streets under the jurisdiction of the City of Cambridge include Middle Block Road, Banat Road, Allendale Road and Cherry Blossom Road.

Properties abutting Fountain Street from Fairway Road / Kossuth Road to Maple Grove Road are primarily agricultural, with some residential and industrial properties and the Loblaw distribution centre. Properties abutting Fountain Street from Maple Grove Road to Cherry Blossom Road are primarily commercial on the west side of the road, while the Toyota plant occupies the east side of the road.

Fountain Street from Fairway Road / Kossuth Road to Maple Grove Road is currently constructed as a two lane rural road, except at its intersections with Allendale Road and Maple Grove Road, where the road widens to accommodate the intersection geometry. There are no sidewalks on either side of Fountain Street within these limits. Cycling facilities are currently provided through paved shoulders.
Fountain Street from Maple Grove Road to Cherry Blossom Road is currently constructed as a four lane urban road with curb-and-gutter. There are no sidewalks on either side of Fountain Street within these limits, except for a section of sidewalk on the west side of the road from Maple Grove Road to Toyota Gate #1. No cycling facilities are provided within this section of Fountain Street.

The existing roadway asphalt on Fountain Street from Maple Grove Road to Cherry Blossom Road is in a deteriorated condition. Accordingly, the Region’s Ten-Year Transportation Capital Program has identified the need for rehabilitation of the pavement on this section of Fountain Street.

This Project is adjacent to the Fountain Street North Improvements (King Street West to Cherry Blossom Road) project, currently scheduled for construction in 2016, as approved by Council in Report E-14-120 in November 2014.

1.2 Planning Framework

This project is classified as a Schedule “C” undertaking in accordance with the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment planning process. Schedule “C” projects include larger, more complex projects with the potential for significant environmental effects. Please refer to Appendix “B” for a diagram describing the Class EA process.

Planning of the roadway improvements is being undertaken in accordance with the Regional Official Plan, Regional Transportation Master Plan, Regional Context Sensitive Corridor Design Guidelines, the Regional Active Transportation Master Plan, Region’s East Side Lands (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan and other relevant Regional policies and practices.

The Regional Official Plan (ROP) gives direction to balance the design of reconstructed roads to meet the needs of all modes of transportation including walking, cycling, motorized vehicles and transit.

The Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP, 2010), through its vision of sustainable development, seeks to optimize the transportation system, encourage increased transit use and provide enhanced opportunities for cycling and walking. The Regional Transportation Master Plan identifies the need to widen Fountain Street from two lanes to four lanes between Maple Grove Road and Fairway Road / Kossuth Road within the five (5) to ten (10) year time frame in order to provide adequate capacity for the forecasted traffic volumes on this corridor. The Regional Transportation Master Plan fulfills Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the Class EA Schedule “C” requirements. The Fountain Street Study described in this Report TES-DCS-15-04 fulfills Phase 3 and Phase 4 of the Class EA Schedule “C” requirements for the Fountain Street Study Area.
The **Context Sensitive Region Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines** (CDG) is a planning policy document that guides the design of Regional Roads. The CDG identifies design parameters for necessary features within road allowances such as vehicular lanes, cycling lanes, sidewalks and boulevards. According to the CDG, Fountain Street is classified as a “Neighbourhood Connector – Avenue” from Cherry Blossom Road to Kossuth Road. Accordingly, Fountain Street is identified for enhanced pedestrian facilities including sidewalks on both sides of the road with a preferred width of 1.8 metre – 2.1 metre (1.5 metre minimum) or an optional multi-use trail on each side of the road in lieu of sidewalks.

The **Regional Active Transportation Master Plan** is a planning policy document that identifies required improvements to the Region’s walking and cycling network and guides the implementation of these facilities. The Active Transportation Master Plan identifies Fountain Street as a critical link in the area cycling and pedestrian network, and recommends multi-use trails for the section of Fountain Street within the Study Area. Enhanced pedestrian and cycling facilities on Fountain Street as part of this project would link up with planned pedestrian and cycling infrastructure on Fountain Street south of Cherry Blossom Road, existing active transportation facilities on Fairway Road, and both existing and planned active transportation facilities on Maple Grove Road east and west of Fountain Street.

The Region’s **East Side Lands** (Stage 1) **Master Environmental Servicing Plan** (MESP, 2014) identified the need for expansion of transportation facilities, as well as water distribution and sanitary services along the Fountain Street corridor to accommodate forecasted growth in this area. Please refer to Appendix “C” for a key plan showing the East Side Lands.

In 2010, Regional Council approved Report E-10-055 recommending construction of a 3-lane roundabout at the intersection of Fountain Street and Maple Grove Road to accommodate forecasted traffic volumes.

This Class EA Study is being directed by a Project Team consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo and City of Cambridge, Regional Councillor Karl Kiefer and City of Cambridge Councillor Donna Reid. The contribution of former Regional Councillor Jane Brewer is also gratefully acknowledged.

2. **Transportation Study**

A detailed Transportation Study has been completed as part of this Class EA Study. The purpose of the Transportation Study was to examine existing traffic operations within the study area, forecast future traffic volumes to the year 2031, and identify and evaluate alternative transportation solutions for accommodating forecasted traffic volumes and improving traffic operations.
The Transportation Study provided the following recommendations to improve roadway capacity and traffic operations on Fountain Street within the Study Area:

- Widen Fountain Street to provide two (2) through lanes of traffic in each direction from Fairway Road / Kossuth Road to Maple Grove Road;

- Initially retain the existing two-way stop-controlled intersection at Fountain Street and Middle Block Road as part of the planned 2018 construction. In the future, when warranted by traffic volumes on Fountain Street and Middle Block Road, construct either (i) a new two-lane roundabout (designed to accommodate future expansion to three lanes); or (ii) a new signalized intersection;

- Construct a new two-lane roundabout at the intersection of Fountain Street and Maple Grove Road (designed to accommodate future expansion to three lanes, if required beyond 2028) as previously approved by Regional Council in 2010 in Report E-10-055 and as shown in Appendix “E” of this report; and

- Consider implementation of a northbound left-turn lane at the industrial plaza at 1050 Fountain Street (opposite to Toyota Gate #1) to alleviate traffic queues caused by left turning vehicles at this location.

Implementation of a roundabout was also considered by the Project Team to replace the existing traffic control signals on Fountain Street at Allendale Road. The Project Team’s evaluation found that taking into account the estimated capital, operating and societal costs of traffic control signals and roundabouts, collision histories at each intersection and property constraints, a roundabout was not recommended to replace the existing traffic control signals at the intersection of Fountain Street and Allendale Road.

3. **Design Alternatives**

The Project Team developed specific engineering design alternatives to address the needs previously established for the above-noted sections of Fountain Street, including (i) widening of Fountain Street from two lanes to four lanes from Fairway Road / Kossuth Road to Maple Grove Road; (ii) re-paving of Fountain Street from Maple Grove Road to Cherry Blossom Road; (iii) construction of expanded facilities for walking and cycling; and (iv) construction of the roundabout at Fountain Street and Maple Grove Road as approved by Council in Report E-10-055 and as shown in Appendix “E” of this report.
Design Alternative 1 ("Do Nothing" alternative for baseline comparison)

Design Alternative 2

Design Alternative 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Alternative 1</th>
<th>Design Alternative 2</th>
<th>Design Alternative 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A (retain existing configuration)</td>
<td>Reconstruct and widen as 4-lane urban roadway</td>
<td>Reconstruct and widen as 4-lane urban roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountain Street from Fairway Road / Kossuth Road to Maple Grove Road</td>
<td>Re-Pave only; (retain existing configuration)</td>
<td>Re-Pave; Add northbound left-turn lane at Toyota Gate #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountain Street from Maple Grove Road to Cherry Blossom Road</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Re-Pave; Add northbound left-turn lane at Toyota Gate #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking and Cycling Facilities from Fairway Road / Kossuth Road to Cherry Blossom Road</td>
<td>Construct on-road cycling lanes &amp; sidewalks on each side of road</td>
<td>Construct an off-road multi-use trail on each side of road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Public Consultation

A Notice of Study Commencement was mailed and/or hand-delivered to property owners, residents, tenants and businesses within the Fountain Street corridor and also to other relevant agencies and stakeholders in May 2014. This Notice was also advertised in area newspapers.

A letter describing the design alternatives under consideration and inviting recipients to attend the Public Consultation Centre was mailed and/or hand-delivered to property owners, residents, tenants and businesses within the Fountain Street corridor in September 2014. An advertisement advising of the Public Consultation Centre was also placed in area newspapers.

4.1 Preferred Alternative Identified by the Project Team

Prior to the Public Consultation Centre
Prior to the Public Consultation Centre the Project Team evaluated the design alternatives according to the applicable standard criteria set out in the Class EA process. The criteria considered included:

- Natural Environment;
- Social / Economic Environment;
- Transportation Environment; and
- Cost

Please refer to Appendix “F” for a more detailed description of the above criteria.

Please refer to Appendix “G” for the Project Team’s evaluation of the design alternatives presented at the Public Consultation Centre on October 7, 2014.

Based on this preliminary evaluation of the design alternatives using the above noted criteria, for Fountain Street from Fairway Road / Kossuth Road to Cherry Blossom Road, Design Alternative 3 was presented by the Project Team as the Preferred Design Alternative at the Public Consultation Centre.

4.2 Public Consultation Centre: October 7, 2014

The Project Team hosted a Public Consultation Centre (PCC) at the Region of Waterloo Operations Centre, 100 Maple Grove Road in the City of Cambridge on Tuesday, October 7, 2014 from 4:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. Plans showing the proposed design alternatives and the Project Team’s Preferred Design Alternative were on display and Project Team representatives were present to answer questions and to receive feedback from members of the public. Approximately twenty-five (25) members of the public attended the PCC with nineteen (19) members of the public that formally signed in.

4.3 Public Comments and Issues Raised

The Project Team received two (2) comment sheets and five (5) e-mail messages from the public.

Please refer to Appendix “H” for a summary of the written comments received.

The Project Team received primarily positive comments from the public at the PCC regarding the proposed improvements. Of those respondents submitting comment sheets, one (1) respondent indicated that they were in favour of the proposed improvements, and one (1) respondent indicated that they were “not against” the proposed improvements.

The main issues raised by the public are summarized as follows:
**Issue #1:** One (1) comment sheet and one (1) e-mail message were received from residents on the west side of Fountain Street, between Allendale Road and Banat Road (2300 through 2340 Fountain Street), expressing a concern with the potential impact of the roadway improvements on the existing residential driveways. One of these residents suggested that any widening of the road be undertaken toward the opposite (east) side of Fountain Street, adjacent to the Loblaw distribution centre property.

**Project Team Response:** Fountain Street currently provides two lanes in the southbound direction entering the intersection at Allendale Road (adjacent to the residential properties) and one lane in the northbound direction leaving the intersection at Allendale Road (adjacent to the Loblaw property). Accordingly, road widening from one to two lanes in the northbound direction will occur on the east side of the roadway corridor and as close to the Loblaw property as feasible without requiring any removal of the existing berm on the Loblaw property that is designed to shield the residential properties from noise from Loblaw operations. The multi-use trails will be constructed entirely within the existing Regional right-of-way. No permanent property acquisition will be required from the residential properties abutting Fountain Street between Allendale Road and Banat Road. Geometric design of the roadway and entrances will be undertaken in accordance with established principles, guidelines and practices to maximize the safety of access to and from driveways.

**Issue #2:** One (1) comment sheet posed a question as to the responsibility for clearing snow/ice from the multi-use trails in front of residential, commercial and agricultural properties.

**Project Team Response:** The City of Cambridge will assume the responsibility and cost for clearing snow and ice from the multi-use trails.

**Issue #3:** One (1) e-mail message from an area business expressed concern that the proposed roundabout at Fountain Street and Maple Grove Road will not have sufficient capacity to accommodate the large volume of truck traffic at that intersection.

**Project Team Response:** Based on forecast traffic volumes, the proposed 2-lane roundabout is projected to provide sufficient capacity until 2028. The roundabout will include right-turn by-pass lanes on two legs to minimize the number of vehicles within the circulatory roadway. The roundabout will be designed so as to be readily expandable to provide an ultimate configuration with 3 circulatory lanes plus right-turn by-pass lanes, if necessary in the future, subject to Council approval.

**Issue #4:** One (1) e-mail message from a representative of the industrial plaza at 1050 Fountain Street (opposite to Toyota Gate #1) noted that much of the northbound left-turn traffic into the plaza consists of motorists using the plaza entrance to effect a northbound U-turn in order to avoid traffic queues during Toyota shift changes. The plaza representative expressed a concern that the proposed northbound left-turn lane
into the industrial plaza, intended to reduce northbound through-lane queuing, will encourage more motorists to use the plaza entrance to effect the above-noted U-turn.

**Project Team Response:** The Region and Toyota have been meeting on an ongoing basis in order to coordinate traffic studies, share data and work toward coordinated improvements to traffic operations. Some potential solutions may eliminate the need for the left-turn lane proposed at the Public Consultation Centre. Accordingly, staff recommends that the proposed left-turn lane be set aside at this time in anticipation of improvements to traffic patterns resulting from the joint efforts of the Region and Toyota. The traffic at the above-noted entrance will be reviewed in the future following implementation of these improvements.

**Issue #5:** One (1) e-mail from a citizen who often travels on Fountain Street and Maple Grove Road expressed a concern that current traffic volumes on Fountain Street do not justify the project. This citizen suggested that the Region widen Maple Grove Road from Fountain Street to Hespeler Road instead of the proposed widening of Fountain Street, especially in light of traffic associated with Toyota shift changes.

**Project Team Response:** Staff will be commencing the planning for widening of Maple Grove Road from Fountain Street to Hespeler Road starting this year. Based on experience with projects of similar scope and extent, the Class Environmental Assessment, engineering design, property acquisition, utility relocations and receipt of all permits and approvals are expected to take approximately four to five years to complete. Accordingly, construction of the Maple Grove Road widening is currently scheduled to commence in 2020 in the Region’s Transportation Capital Program; however, if staff identifies an opportunity for earlier commencement of construction, a recommendation to Council to advance construction could be made.

The Fountain Street corridor will be the central traffic artery of the East Side Lands, a major planned commercial/industrial "employment lands" area. The Region’s Transportation Master Plan and Transportation Study completed as part of this Class EA confirmed that Fountain Street will need to be widened in order to accommodate the significant traffic demands associated with the East Side Lands development. The timing of the widening will be reviewed by the Region on an ongoing basis.

Improvements to Fountain Street adjacent to Toyota, from Maple Grove Road to Cherry Blossom Road, are currently scheduled to commence in 2018. Toyota and the Region have been in regular communication from the outset of the planning process.

Toyota is currently conducting a review of internal traffic flows and their effects on entrances on Fountain Street, Maple Grove Road, Cherry Blossom Road and Boxwood Drive. Concurrently, Region staff and Toyota staff have established a joint effort to coordinate traffic studies with a goal of identifying opportunities to improve traffic flow on these roads. Accordingly, it is anticipated that reconstruction of Fountain Street from
Cherry Blossom Road to Maple Grove Road may include modifications to the Toyota entrances to improve traffic flow in to and out of Toyota. This work is scheduled to commence in 2018, along with reconstruction of Fountain Street from Cherry Blossom Road to Highway 401 and construction of the new roundabout at Fountain Street and Maple Grove Road.

Additionally, the Ministry of Transportation of Ontario (MTO) will be replacing the Fountain Street / Highway 401 bridge in 2015 and the Region will be reconstructing Fountain Street from Highway 401 to King Street (including significant improvements to the Fountain Street / King Street intersection) in 2016. These two projects should result in some early improvements to traffic capacity in the area in advance of the work on Fountain Street adjacent to Toyota.

Widening of Fountain Street from Maple Grove Road to Fairway Road / Kossuth Road is currently scheduled to be completed in 2019; however staff will review development activity and projected traffic demands on an ongoing basis and staff anticipates that the widening of this section of Fountain Street may be completed in stages over two or more years.

5. **Recommended Design Alternative for Fountain Street from Fairway Road / Kossuth Road to Cherry Blossom Road**

Based on a review of the technical information gathered for this project as well as a review of all public comments received, the Project Team is now recommending that Regional Council approve the following improvements for Fountain Street from Fairway Road / Kossuth Road to Cherry Blossom Road in the City of Cambridge:

- Reconstruct and widen Fountain Street from Kossuth Road / Fairway Road to Maple Grove Road to provide two (2) through lanes in each direction, plus a combination of raised and flush centre medians;
- Re-pave the existing four lanes on Fountain Street from Maple Grove Road to Cherry Blossom Road;
- Construct a new multi-use trail on each side of Fountain Street from Kossuth Road / Fairway Road to Cherry Blossom Road in accordance with Design Alternative 3;
- Install, initially, new street lighting on both sides of Fountain Street from Maple Grove Road to Banat Road, consisting of either (i) double luminaires and fixtures on common poles installed in the median; or (ii) single luminaires and fixtures on poles installed in the boulevard on each side of the road;
- Install, when warranted, new street lighting on both sides of Fountain Street from Banat Road to Kossuth Road / Fairway Road, consisting of either (i) double...
luminaires and fixtures on common poles installed in the median; or (ii) single
luminaires and fixtures on poles installed in the boulevard on each side of the
road;

- Install new storm sewers on Fountain Street from Kossuth Road / Fairway Road
to Maple Grove Road;

- Install a new sanitary sewer on Fountain Street, from Maple Grove Road to a
northern limit between Banat Road and Middle Block Road (exact limit to be
determined, pending review by the City of Cambridge) on behalf of the City of
Cambridge;

- Install new Regional transmission water main and City of Cambridge distribution
water main on Fountain Street from Kossuth Road / Fairway Road to Maple
Grove Road;

- Plant new boulevard trees on Fountain Street from Kossuth Road / Fairway Road
to Maple Grove Road;

- Construct a new two-lane roundabout at the intersection of Fountain Street and
Maple Grove Road, designed to accommodate future expansion to three lanes if
recommended beyond 2028, as previously approved by Regional Council in
2010 in Report E-10-055; and

- Retain, initially, the 2-way stop-controlled intersection at Fountain Street and
Middle Block Road. Construct, when warranted by future traffic volumes on
Fountain Street and Middle Block Road, either (i) a new two-lane roundabout
(designed to accommodate future expansion to three lanes); or (ii) a new
signalized intersection.

The Project Team recommends Design Alternative 3 for the following key reasons:

- Design Alternative 1, the “do nothing” option, does not achieve the planning
recommendations of the Regional Transportation Master Plan and Active
Transportation Master Plan. Specifically, the “do nothing” option does not
provide the traffic capacity necessary to support projected traffic volumes, and
the “do nothing” option does not address the gaps in connectivity in the current
walking and cycling network within the Study Area;

- The multi-use trails proposed under Design Alternative 3 are more consistent
with the recommendations of the Active Transportation Master Plan than the
sidewalk and cycling lane combination proposed under Design Alternative 2;

- Implementation of cycling lanes on Fountain Street from Maple Grove Road to
Cherry Blossom Road would require removal and replacement of all existing
curb-and-gutter and relocation/adjustment of several catch-basins and other
components of the existing storm sewer system in order to widen the overall paved roadway width, whereas implementation of the multi-use trails will not generally require these removals, relocations and adjustments; and

- The cost to implement Design Alternative 3 is slightly lower than the cost of Design Alternative 2.

Please refer to **Appendix “D3”** for a drawing of the Project Team’s Recommended Design Alternative for Fountain Street.

Implementation of the Project Team’s proposed improvements will require that small parcels of property be acquired from approximately twenty-five (25) property owners abutting Fountain Street.

A total of seven potential Cultural Heritage Resources (five farmsteads, one residence, one railscape) were identified within or adjacent to the Study Area. Construction of the planned Fountain Street improvements is not anticipated to adversely impact any of the seven Cultural Heritage Resources.

Staff is now also recommending that Regional Council direct staff to file the Notice of Completion for this Class Environmental Assessment Study by means of advertisements in local newspapers and mailings to adjacent property owners, tenants and agencies, and place the Environmental Study Report on public record for a period of 30 days.

Construction of the new roundabout at Fountain Street and Maple Grove Road will require that Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended, be amended to define the formal lane designations at this roundabout.

6. **Project Timing, Construction Staging and Traffic Management During Construction**

Construction of the Fountain Street improvements is currently scheduled to commence in 2018 in the Region’s Approved 2015 Ten-Year Transportation Capital Program. This construction timing is contingent upon the timely acquisition of required property, utility relocations, and receipt of technical and financial approvals. Staff currently expects that the work will be implemented in stages over a period of two or more years.

Staff currently anticipates that the first stage of road construction will include construction of Fountain Street from Maple Grove Road to Cherry Blossom Road, including construction of the roundabout at the intersection of Fountain Street and Maple Grove Road. The second stage of road construction will include construction of Fountain Street from Maple Grove Road to approximately 1,000 metres north of Maple Grove Road. The third stage of construction will include construction of Fountain Street from approximately 1,000 metres north of Maple Grove Road to the project limits at
Kossuth Road / Fairway Road. The timing of the third stage of road construction will depend on traffic volumes and development activity.

Underground water and sanitary works will generally be undertaken at the same time as the associated road works; however, if a deferral of the third stage of road construction is warranted, certain underground water and sanitary works within the third stage section may be undertaken in advance during the second stage. These water and sanitary works could generally be undertaken without disruption to traffic, and in a manner that facilitates the future third stage works.

Staff will develop detailed staging plans during the detailed design phase of this project. Construction of the Fountain Street improvements from Fairway Road / Kossuth Road to Cherry Blossom Road will be completed by maintaining one through lane of traffic in each direction plus left-turn lanes at intersections where feasible. Traffic may be reduced to one lane for short periods requiring flagging operations to maintain two-way traffic.

8. Estimated Project Cost

The estimated total project cost associated with the proposed 2018-2019 Fountain Street improvements, including engineering, property acquisition, utility relocations construction, inspection, material testing and other project costs is $22,500,000.

The cost apportionment between the Region of Waterloo and the City of Cambridge is summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Description of Works</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Region of Waterloo (Transportation) | ▪ Road works  
▪ Share of storm works (MESP) | $18,000,000 |
| Region of Waterloo (Water Services) | ▪ Transmission water main       | $2,200,000 |
| City of Cambridge             | ▪ Share of storm works (MESP)  
▪ Distribution water main  
▪ Sanitary sewer extension    | $2,300,000 |

9. Next Steps

Subject to Regional Council approval of the Recommended Design Alternative, a Notice of Completion will be filed for this project by means of mail-outs and advertised notices;
and the Environmental Study Report, which will include all relevant documentation regarding the planning and decision-making process, will be placed on the public record for a mandatory period of 30 days. During this 30 day filing period, any party may object to the Recommended Design Alternative by requesting the Ministry of Environment grant a Part II Order requesting that the project be subject to a full environmental assessment. A request for a full environmental assessment must be made in writing to the Minister of Environment with a copy to the Region’s Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services. When the 30 day public filing has expired and if no requests for a full environmental assessment are received by the Minister within that 30 days, the Recommended Design Alternative will be considered approved for implementation.

Subject to Regional Council approval of the Recommended Design Alternative, this Class EA Study will be completed and filed in April 2015 and detailed design will commence in May 2015.

Letters advising of the recommendations contained in this Report TES-DCS-15-04 were mailed to all agencies and those who attended the October 7, 2014 Public Consultation Centre, and hand-delivered to all owners/residents abutting the Fountain Street project limits during the week of March 9, 2015.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

This project supports Strategic Focus Area 2 (Growth Management and Prosperity) and specifically Strategic Objective 2.2 to Develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs. This project also supports Focus Area 3 (Sustainable Transportation), specifically Strategic Objective 3.2 to develop, promote and integrate active forms of transportation (cycling and walking).

Financial Implications:

The Region’s 2015 10-Year Transportation Capital Program includes funds of $18,180,000 in years 2015 to 2020 inclusive for design and construction of the improvements to Fountain Street from Kossuth Road / Fairway Road to Cherry Blossom Road, to be funded from the Roads Rehabilitation Reserve Fund and the Development Charge Reserve Fund, which is sufficient to cover the Region’s share of road construction costs. The Region’s Water Capital Program includes $8,600,000 in 2015 to 2020, inclusive, for watermain upgrades and new watermains, including $2,200,000 allocated for the Fountain Street trunk watermain.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

The Council and Administrative Services Division of the Planning, Development and Legislative Services Department will be required to prepare the amending By-law to
reflect the formal lane designations at the proposed Fountain Street / Maple Grove Road roundabout.

**Attachments**

- **Appendix A**  Key Plan of Study Area and Existing Roadway Configuration
- **Appendix B**  Class Environmental Assessment Process
- **Appendix C**  Key Plan Showing Fountain Street and East Side Lands
- **Appendix D1**  Design Alternative 1 – “Do Nothing”
- **Appendix D2**  Design Alternative 2
- **Appendix D3**  Design Alternative 3 – “Recommended Design Alternative”
- **Appendix E**  Proposed Interim 2-Lane Roundabout at Fountain Street and Maple Grove Road
- **Appendix F**  Detailed Description of Evaluation Criteria
- **Appendix G**  Project Team’s Evaluation Matrix for Design Alternatives
- **Appendix H**  Summary of Written Comments Received at Public Consultation Centre

**Prepared By:** John Stephenson, Senior Project Manager

**Approved By:** Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Appendix “A”

Key Plan of Study Area and Existing Roadway Configuration
Appendix “B”

Class Environmental Assessment Process

Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

Ontario Environmental Assessment Act

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

The key principles of successful environmental assessment planning include:

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

Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schedule “A”</td>
<td>Routine projects that are considered straight-forward and minimally impactful, such as maintenance, operations and emergency activities. Such projects are designated as “pre-approved” under the Class EA and may proceed directly to implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule “A+”</td>
<td>Routine projects that are considered straight-forward with minor or short-term impacts. Such projects are designated as “pre-approved” under the Class EA and may proceed directly to implementation; however, the proponent is required to advise area residents and stakeholders of the pending commencement of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule “B”</td>
<td>Projects with the potential for some adverse environmental effects. Such projects must undergo a program of public, stakeholder and agency consultation and a detailed Project File documenting the planning process must be placed on the public record. Subsequently, the project is considered to be “approved” under the Class EA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule “C”</td>
<td>Larger and more complex projects with the potential for significant environmental effects. Such projects must undergo a program of public, stakeholder and agency consultation, including 3 points of formal public contact. A detailed Environmental Study Report (ESR) must be completed and placed on the public record. Subsequently, the project is considered to be “approved” under the Class EA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Class EA process includes four (4) key phases:

| Phase 1 | Identify the problem, deficiency or opportunity, and develop a clear statement of the issues that are to be addressed. |
| Phase 2 | Identify the reasonable alternative solutions that could be implemented to address the issues. Establish the preferred solution based on an assessment of the environmental impact, including consideration of stakeholder input. |
| Phase 3 | Identify alternative methods of implementing the preferred solution. Establish the preferred method based on an assessment of the environmental impact, including consideration of stakeholder input. |
| Phase 4 | Compile all relevant study information, including study rational, environmental considerations, consultation process and recommendations into a clear and easily understood report entitled an "Environmental Study Report" (ESR), and make the document available for review by interested or affected parties. |

**Public Involvement**

Members of the public that have a stake in the project are encouraged to provide comment throughout the Class EA process. For Schedule “C” projects there are a minimum of three (3) opportunities for public contact. Opportunities for public contact typically include Notices of Study Commencement, Public Consultation Centres (for Master Plans and specific projects undertaken in accordance with approved Master Plans), Notices of Study Completion and other project-specific opportunities for public input.
Class EA Process for Schedule “C” Projects

Change in Project Status – Appeal Provision

It is recommended that all stakeholders (including the proponent, public and review agencies) work together to determine the preferred means of addressing a problem or opportunity. If you have any concerns, you should discuss them with the proponent and try to resolve them. In the event that there are major issues which cannot be resolved, you may request the Minister of the Environment by order to require a proponent to comply with Part II of the EA Act before proceeding with a proposed undertaking which has been subject to Class EA requirements. This is called a “Part II Order”. The Minister will make one of the following decisions:

1. Deny the request (with or without conditions);
2. Refer the matter to mediation; or
3. Require the proponent to comply with Part II of the EA Act, ordering a full Environmental Assessment.

All stakeholders are urged to try to resolve issues since it is preferable for them to be resolved by the municipality in which a project is located, rather than at the provincial level.

To request a Part II Order, a person must send a written request to:

   Minister of the Environment
   135 St. Clair Avenue West
   12th Floor
   Toronto, ON
   M4V 1P5

The request must address the following with respect to the identified concerns:

- Environmental Impacts and specific concerns;
- Adequacy of the planning and public consultation process;
- Involvement of the person in the planning process; and
- Details of discussions held between the person and the proponent.
Appendix “C”

Key Plan Showing Fountain Street and East Side Lands
Appendix “D1”

Design Alternative 1
Appendix “D2”

Design Alternative 2

FOUNTAIN STREET FROM FAIRWAY ROAD/KOSSUTH ROAD TO MAPLE GROVE ROAD

NOTE:
1. REMOVE EXISTING CURBS WIDER THAN 960MM AND CONSTRUCT NEW CURBS TO PROVIDE FOR CYCLING LANE.
2. ADJUST MEDIAN WIDTH TO ACCOMMODATE IMPROVED TURNING LANES IN SELECTED LOCATIONS.
3. RELOCATE STREET LIGHT POLES WHERE REQUIRED.
4. ADD LANDSCAPING WHERE FEASIBLE.

FOUNTAIN STREET FROM MAPLE GROVE ROAD TO CHERRY BLOSSOM ROAD

NOTE:
1. MEDIAN SHOWN IS RAISED BUT MAY BE PLUSH IN CERTAIN LOCATIONS.
Appendix “D3”

Design Alternative 3

[Diagram of Fountains Street from Fairway Road/Kossuth Road to Maple Grove Road]

[Diagram of Fountains Street from Maple Grove Road to Cherry Blossom Road]
Appendix “E”

Proposed Interim 2-Lane Roundabout At Fountain Street and Maple Grove Road
Appendix “F”

Detailed Description Of Evaluation Criteria for Design Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Environment:</th>
<th>How does the alternative affect existing trees, stormwater management, vegetation and wildlife?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Economic Environment:</td>
<td>How does the alternative affect the residential and commercial properties abutting the road (driveway access, on-site parking, property impacts, noise, air quality, archaeological, and cultural heritage)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation:</td>
<td>How does the alternative serve the expected vehicular, transit, pedestrian and cycling traffic in terms of corridor capacity, level of service, transportation network and movement of emergency vehicles?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cost:</td>
<td>What is the total cost of the alternative including the cost for road construction, utility and streetlighting, property acquisitions, intersection improvements and landscaping?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Detailed Description of Evaluation Criteria for Design Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Natural Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Wetlands, Vegetation and Wildlife</td>
<td>How does the design alternative impact the natural features of the corridor and surrounding area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Storm Water Quality/Quantity</td>
<td>How does the design alternative impact the quality and quantity of storm water flow?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Social / Cultural Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Property Impacts</td>
<td>Does the design alternative require property acquisition?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Resident and Business Access</td>
<td>How does the design alternative impact access to residents and businesses?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Noise</td>
<td>How does the design alternative impact noise levels at residential outdoor living areas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Known Archaeological / Built Heritage / Cultural Landscapes</td>
<td>Does the design alternative directly or indirectly impact known sites?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Transportation / Technical</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Traffic Operations</td>
<td>How does the design alternative improve traffic operations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Active Transportation (Pedestrian / Cyclist / Transit)</td>
<td>How does the design alternative serve active transportation modes of travel (walking, cycling)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Transit Services</td>
<td>How does the design alternative serve transit system users?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Operations / Maintenance</td>
<td>Can the design alternative be maintained by the Region and City of Cambridge in an efficient and cost-effective manner?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Future Infrastructure</td>
<td>Does the design alternative facilitate (or not impede) implementation of planned future infrastructure works (e.g. sanitary trunks)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Financial</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Capital (Construction) Cost</td>
<td>What is the estimated total cost of the design alternative ($)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix “G”

#### Project Team’s Evaluation Matrix for Design Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA GROUP / Criterion</th>
<th>Design Alternative 1 “Do Nothing” Rehabilitation in Current Configuration</th>
<th>Design Alternative 2 Reconstruct as Urban 4-Lane Roadway with Median, Cycling Lanes, Pedestrian Sidewalks</th>
<th>Design Alternative 3 Reconstruct as Urban 4-Lane Roadway with Median, Multi-Use Trails</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **TRANSPORTATION ENVIRONMENT** | • Transportation capacity for motor vehicles, transit, pedestrians, cyclists and emergency vehicles.  
• Operations and maintenance.  
• Planning for future infrastructure.  | • Does not align with Region’s Transportation Master Plan.  
• Does not align with draft Active Transportation Master Plan.  
• Does not address capacity needs.  
• Does not address pedestrian and cyclist needs.  
• No improvement to existing conditions for Emergency response times.  
• No improvement to Transit operations.  | • Aligns with Region’s Transportation Master Plan.  
• Aligns with draft Active Transportation Master Plan.  
• Addresses capacity needs.  
• Addresses pedestrian and cyclist needs.  
• Improvement to Emergency response times.  
• Improvement to Transit operations.  |
| **SOCIAL / CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT** | • No change to existing conditions.  
• No change to driveways and entrances.  
• No impact to Heritage Resources.  
• Traffic noise will increase with increasing traffic.  
• Does not mitigate congestion and vehicle emissions.  
• Does not support expansion and development of area business.  | • Some private property required.  
• Minimal impact to driveway entrances and grades.  
• No impact to Heritage Resources.  
• Traffic noise will increase with increasing traffic.  
• Mitigates congestion and vehicle emissions.  
• Supports expansion and development of area business.  | • Some private property required.  
• Minimal impact to driveway entrances and grades.  
• No impact to Heritage Resources.  
• Traffic noise will increase with increasing traffic.  
• Mitigates congestion and vehicle emissions.  
• Supports expansion and development of area business.  |
| **NATURAL ENVIRONMENT** | • No changes to existing conditions.  
• Allows road runoff and salt to continue to flow directly to adjacent ditches and fields.  | • Captures runoff in formal curb-and-gutter system.  
• No impact to watercourses and floodplains.  
• Minor encroachments onto existing fields required.  
• No impacts on aquatic habitat or fisheries.  
• Removal of approximately 40 to 50 larger trees. New boulevard trees to compensate for tree loss.  | • Captures runoff in formal curb-and-gutter system.  
• No impact to watercourses and floodplains.  
• Minor encroachments onto existing fields required.  
• No impacts on aquatic habitat or fisheries.  
• Removal of approximately 40 to 50 larger trees. New boulevard trees to compensate for tree loss.  |
| **ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT** | • $0  | • $18,500,000 (approx.)  | • $18,000,000 (approx.)  |
| **OVERALL EVALUATION** |  |  |  |

**LEAST PREFERRED** | **MOST PREFERRED**  
**PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE**
Appendix “H”

Summary of Written Comments Received at the Public Consultation Centre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William &amp; Mary Forbes</td>
<td>(from Comment Sheet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you support the proposed widening alternative? Not against.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you support the proposed roundabout at Middle Block Road? Not against.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concern (1) to have safe accessibility to our driveway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concern (2) who will be responsible for clearing snow/ice from the path/cycle lane at the front of our property?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concern (3) will sewer service be available at the time of the project? If not, a new driveway would need to be considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e.g. left side of property or behind property or other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hagey</td>
<td>(from Comment Sheet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you support the proposed widening alternative? Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you support the proposed roundabout at Middle Block Road? Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am very pleased to see that there is provision for multi-use trails. Providing a safe area for people to bike, hike,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rollerblade, etc. will make Waterloo Region the place to live and play! (Like Vancouver).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Hanson</td>
<td>(via e-mail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Henry Sr.</td>
<td>(via e-mail)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kevin Westlake  
(via e-mail)

I am a resident at 2310 Fountain St. n. We sit among 5 residential properties in between Allendale and Banat rds. I was not able to make it out on the Tuesday night information session and would like to provide you some of our concerns with the recent drawing we had received on the road expansion.

We were informed when the right hand turn lane was added turning onto Allendale that any future widening of the roadway would take place on the east side of Fountain St. We had already at that point lost approximately 15’ of frontage which brought the fast paced roadway closer to our house than we expected. Along with my neighbours we all agree that losing any more would be unsafe for the family's with children and getting in and out of the driveways. Average speed going through in front of our properties is well over 50km/h. Now based on the drawing sent out it looks like the proposed widening will be going through the middle of my front yard. Which would not be acceptable to any of the residents. I am hopefully reading the drawings wrong but would like some clarification on the proposed work. I do understand the need for expansion and welcome the sewers, sidewalks and roundabouts but not at the expense of losing any more of our frontage.

The eastside of Fountain has no residential properties close to the roadway with ample space for road expansion.

I know this is at the beginning stages so I know designs will change but if I could get some clarification on what is actually being considered I would appreciate any information you could provide.

The property value impact is also very important to us. Closer a regional roadway encroaches on our property will absolutely decrease it's value in the market place.
Keith Wallbank (via e-mail)

I've reviewed the planned changes some time ago and unfortunately was unable to attend the information meeting on Oct. 7.

I live in Cambridge (West Galt) and on a regular basis travel on Fountain St, along with at one time being employed at a business on Maple Grove Rd.

I don't see the necessity at this time for the road to be widened, due to the amount of traffic on it. What is the rationale for the project?

What I do see is an industrial park which has very serious, past due, access challenges:

1) Maple Grove Rd needs to be two lane all the way to Highway #24, which I understand is taking place soon? Truck traffic has significantly increased with Toyota's expansions as well the construction of Loblaws and the overall increase in businesses operating in the area.

Also note that the condition of the two lane section of pavement near Toyota is; unacceptable.

2) Cambridge (Preston) access from Fountain and Speedsville Roads are woefully inadequate; especially during Toyota shift changes. Its gridlock, bumper to bumper traffic.

There needs to be four lane access from Cambridge by either:

- Widening Speedsville to four lanes from Eagle St to Maple Grove. There are however problems with that as it cuts through a neighbourhood, is there enough width to make it four lane and trucks turning from Eagle onto Speedsville would be too tight, as it is now.

- Reconstruction of Witmer St to four lane with either a new bridge over the 401 or link up to Speedsville Rd/401 bridge.

A four lane access road also would benefit drivers travelling to and from Kitchener vs. the King St/Fountain St./Shantz Hill which is badly overloaded. Eagle St feeds the immediate industrial park and Lowell industrial park, four lane access would significantly improve traffic flow to and from those areas.
| Keith Wallbank | The only adequate access to the industrial park is from Highway 8 and King St to Maple Grove (All four lane roads) until it narrows to one lane. The Region needs to focus on the weakest access points vs. changes which will create minimal improvements to traffic flow. When you look at other industrial parks such as Kitchener's south side (Wilson Ave, Homer Watson Rd & Huron Rd), there are four lane road access surrounding this park. Yet at what is either the largest or one of the largest industrial parks in the Region, there isn't? |
Region of Waterloo

Planning, Development and Legislative Services

Community Planning

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

Date: March 24, 2015

File Code: D18-01


Recommendation:


Summary:

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

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

Report:

City of Waterloo

Draft Approval of Plan of Condominium 30CDM-14407

Applicant: Sivon Investments Inc.

Location: 86 University Avenue West

Proposal: To permit the development of 15 residential condominium apartment units and 1 office/amenity unit.

Regional Processing Fee: Paid January 22, 2015

Commissioner’s Approval: February 2, 2015
Draft Approval of Plan of Condominium 30CDM-14407

Came Into Effect: February 24, 2015

Draft Approval of Plan of Condominium 30CDM-14408

Applicant: Spring Village Inc.
Location: 208 Sunview Street
Proposal: To permit the development of 57 residential condominium apartment units, 1 office unit and 1 commercial unit.

Regional Processing Fee: Paid December 16, 2014
Commissioner's Approval: February 2, 2015
Came Into Effect: February 24, 2015

Township of Woolwich

Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-14701

Draft Approval Date: December 9, 2014
Phase: Entire Plan
Applicant: MennoHomes Inc./Woolwich Community Services
Location: 5 and 7 Memorial Avenue, Elmira
Proposal: To permit the development of 24 residential condominium apartment units.

Regional Processing Fee: Paid February 5, 2015
Commissioner's Release: February 9, 2015

Area Municipal Consultation/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 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, Development and Legislative Services
Region of Waterloo
Planning, Development and Legislative Services
Community Planning

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

Date: March 24, 2015  File Code: D15-60 (A)

Subject: Year-End 2014 Population and Household Estimates for Waterloo Region

Recommendation:
For Information.

Summary:
Each year, an estimate of the year-end population and households is produced for the Region and each Area Municipality by Regional staff. The Regional population as of year-end 2014 is estimated at 568,500 including university and college students temporarily residing in the Region.

The annual population growth rate of 1.14% was slightly higher than the previous year (1.12%), but remains below the fifteen-year average rate of 1.63%. The estimated number of households is 203,930, a growth rate of 1.5%, similar to that for population. These levels show that the Region continues to grow at a steady rate, reflecting the diversity of the local economy and the community’s desirability as a place to reside.

The Regional figures are based on Census population and household data; however, they also include an estimate of temporary post-secondary students and the Census undercount, at year-end, and therefore provide a more useful estimate of the total number of people and households that require services such as water, social services, transportation and policing.

Tables in this report are proposed to be included in a Planning Information Bulletin to be distributed to Area Municipalities and other parties, as well as being posted on the Region’s website for broader community access.

Population estimates are used by many Regional and Area Municipal departments,
agencies, boards and community groups to understand land use, plan infrastructure and service programs, calculate service costs per resident, assess housing needs and track health-related trends.

**Report:**

**Population and Household Estimates**

Table 1 provides the year-end 2014 population and household estimates for all Area Municipalities, along with 2013 comparators. The population estimate for year-end 2014 is 568,500. This represents an increase of 6,400 people or 1.14% over the population estimate for 2013 of 562,100. Of the Area Municipalities, Kitchener experienced the highest annual growth rate, at 1.3%. This represented an additional 3,100 people, giving Kitchener the largest absolute growth in the Region as well.

The estimated number of households in the Region is 203,930. Households are equivalent to “occupied dwellings”. Growth in households from 2013 was 3,060 (1.52%), a notable increase over the previous year (1.24%) year. In recent years, Waterloo has seen significant growth in apartments purpose-built for the student market. While this trend continues, in 2014 there were some indications that activity in this niche may be beginning to slow.

The calculated Persons Per Unit (PPU) for year-end 2014 has declined to 2.70, representing the estimated Regional population in regular households in relation to the number of households in the Region. This PPU value includes the students who are resident in the Region, as well as the under-coverage rate applied to Regional population estimates. The decrease in the PPU is visible in the larger proportion of multiple-unit dwellings in the new housing market, and is consistent with a trend that has been evident for several decades. Census data indicate that the trend is likely the result of smaller and fewer families, increased economic well-being and independence, and an aging population.

Although the population and household estimates in this report are intended to provide a standard reference for all Regional activities, it is important to recognize that there are specific needs and perspectives that require variations on the basic definitions used in this report. These differences may apply to the actual timing of the estimates (e.g., mid-year rather than year end), to the geography (such as a service area rather than a municipality), or the content (for example, the exclusion of temporary students). These special considerations apply in many areas, such as health services, road signs, water and wastewater monitoring, and development charge studies. Therefore, values cited in some studies may appear to differ from this report, when in fact they are consistent after allowance is made for the kinds of differences noted above.

The household estimates contained in this report differ from the number of dwellings occupied by usual residents reported in the Census, due to the following adjustments:

- vacancy rates in rental accommodations, which have fallen to 2.3% in 2014 (from 2.9% in 2013) as reported by Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation;
- some student households, since the Census figure does not include dwellings
solely occupied by foreign and temporary residents; and
• growth during the time period from mid-May to year-end.

A more detailed description of the methodology used to create the year-end population and household estimates is contained in Appendix 1 to this report.

Table 1 - Year-end 2014 Population and Household Estimates for Waterloo Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Region of Waterloo**</th>
<th>Cambridge</th>
<th>Kitchener</th>
<th>North Dumfries</th>
<th>Waterloo</th>
<th>Wellesley</th>
<th>Wilmot</th>
<th>Woolwich</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population Year-end 2014*</td>
<td>568,500</td>
<td>133,800</td>
<td>236,500</td>
<td>9,730</td>
<td>132,300</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>20,580</td>
<td>24,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population in Regular Households</td>
<td>551,200</td>
<td>131,900</td>
<td>232,700</td>
<td>9,700</td>
<td>121,600</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>20,320</td>
<td>24,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population in Collective Dwellings***</td>
<td>17,290</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>3,760</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10,690</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population Year-end 2013*</td>
<td>562,100</td>
<td>132,600</td>
<td>233,400</td>
<td>9,630</td>
<td>130,700</td>
<td>10,930</td>
<td>20,350</td>
<td>24,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Population</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Change 2013-2014 (%)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households Year-end 2014*</td>
<td>203,930</td>
<td>48,320</td>
<td>90,560</td>
<td>3,340</td>
<td>42,730</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td>7,370</td>
<td>8,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households Year-end 2013*</td>
<td>200,870</td>
<td>47,790</td>
<td>89,180</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>41,800</td>
<td>3,210</td>
<td>7,280</td>
<td>8,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Households</td>
<td>3,060</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Change 2013-2014 (%)</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons per Unit+</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Population (included above)</td>
<td>22,390</td>
<td>(1,050)</td>
<td>(830)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>24,760</td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>(180)</td>
<td>(160)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Arriving</td>
<td>29,800</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26,040</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in Student Residences</td>
<td>9,490</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,960</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in Other Accommodations</td>
<td>20,300</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>2,290</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17,090</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Leaving++</td>
<td>(7,400)</td>
<td>(1,760)</td>
<td>(3,650)</td>
<td>(130)</td>
<td>(1,280)</td>
<td>(90)</td>
<td>(240)</td>
<td>(250)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Although based on the Census of 2011, this number includes adjustments for students and other foreign/temporary residents, net Census undercoverage, and vacancy rates. Due to various corrections and adjustments, direct comparisons to last year's estimates may not be valid.
** Municipal totals may not add due to independent rounding.
*** Collective Dwellings include student residences, nursing homes, hospitals, jails, larger lodging houses, etc.
+ 'Persons per Unit' (PPU) calculation is based on the 'Population in Regular Households', not on 'Total Population'.
++ These are students who leave home to attend school. They represent the reverse flow of the temporary students arriving here from elsewhere.

Estimates of Post-Secondary Students

The temporary student population contributes a substantial component to the total population. Reviews of the post-secondary student population and housing requirements are on-going and undertaken in conjunction with projects such as Waterloo’s Town & Gown Committee, and based on recent data from the University of Waterloo, Wilfrid Laurier University and Conestoga College. This work is resulting in a better understanding of the many facets of the student population in the Region.
As of November 2014, 58,765 post-secondary students were enrolled in full-time programs of Conestoga College, the University of Waterloo, and Wilfrid Laurier University, on the campuses that are located in Waterloo Region (Table 2). As was expected due to demographics, the student population appears to have stabilized at these levels. The flat or declining enrolments that have been evident in elementary and secondary schools for over a decade are now beginning to be felt at the post-secondary level.

Not included in these figures are the students at smaller schools such as business and technical training colleges, as well as thousands of students with part-time enrolments at our local schools. Typically these students already live in the Region or commute in for these programs, and therefore do not add to the local population.

Table 2 - University and College Enrolment by Institution (Fall 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conestoga</th>
<th>Waterloo</th>
<th>Laurier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Enrolment</td>
<td>12,334</td>
<td>33,367</td>
<td>13,064</td>
<td>58,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuters, co-op work term, etc.</td>
<td>3,833</td>
<td>5,870</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>10,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident in Region</td>
<td>8,501</td>
<td>27,497</td>
<td>12,497</td>
<td>48,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Residents</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>18,918</td>
<td>9,745</td>
<td>29,813</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 58,765 full-time students on local campuses, there are an estimated 10,270 who live outside the Region and either commute in for school, are on co-op work terms, or have other arrangements. However, approximately 48,500 full-time students do reside in Waterloo Region. About 29,800 of these students are only temporarily living in the Region, and their primary place of residence remains elsewhere, typically at the home of their parents.

It is estimated there are approximately 8,740 students living in university or college residences, and 21,000 living elsewhere in the community.

Conversely, there are students whose home is within the Region, but who reside elsewhere during the school year. After considering the flows of students, both into and out of the Region, the net effect of post-secondary students on the year-end population of Waterloo Region is 22,550 people (Table 1).

Population and Household Trends

Adjustments of population and dwelling estimates (that had previously been based on Census data) have been made as National Household Survey data has become available. The new data, as well as cancellation of building permits and other updates to historical data, necessitate retroactive adjustments to previous years’ population and household estimates.

Table 3 provides revised estimates for 2000-2014, together with a preliminary forecast for year-end 2015 based on recent building activity. It is anticipated that 2015 population increase will slightly exceed 2014 growth, despite some recent tapering of new building permit activity, due to the future occupation of large numbers of apartment units that
were issued building permits in recent years.

The fifteen-year period from 2000 to 2014 approximates one typical cycle in the housing market, during which the Region’s population grew by an average of 8,153 per annum, or 1.63%. The most recent five-year period, from 2010 to 2014, has been characterized by more moderate growth, with annual average of 6,660 people (1.22%) and 2,820 households per year (1.44%) in Waterloo Region.

Table 3 – Long-term Trends in Population and Households: Waterloo Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year-end</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Change (%)</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Change (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>454,800</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>161,590</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>465,200</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>164,620</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>474,500</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>167,550</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>485,200</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>170,830</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>497,500</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>175,060</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>507,800</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>178,790</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>517,400</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>182,230</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>523,100</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>185,140</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>532,100</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>188,810</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>535,200</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>189,830</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>543,900</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>193,240</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>551,400</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>196,480</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>555,900</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>198,400</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>562,100</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>200,870</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>568,500</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>203,930</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015(f)</td>
<td>576,200</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>207,370</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5-yr average: 6,660  1.22  2,820  1.44
15-yr average: 8,153  1.63  3,044  1.71

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

This report has been circulated to all Area Municipalities.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

Many of the objectives and actions contained in the Corporate Strategic Plan rely on estimates of population and households, including Strategic Objectives 2.2 “Develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs”, and 5.3 “Ensure Regional programs and services are efficient and effective and demonstrate accountability to the public”.

Financial Implications:

Nil.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Nil.
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Attachment 1

Methodology for Estimation of Regional Year-end Population

An estimate of the current population and households in the Region is prepared by Planning, Development and Legislative Services staff each year. The estimate is primarily based on the most recent Census of Canada, which was May 2011. The Census data provides a 2011 count of 507,096 population and 191,595 occupied dwellings, and is further described in a series of Census Bulletins for Waterloo Region prepared by Regional staff and available on the Region’s website. Additional demographic and dwelling characteristics data, which shed further light on students and other aspects of population and dwellings, became available through the National Household Survey in 2013. The Census estimate of undercoverage for the 2011 Census is now available and has been reviewed by staff. The reported values for Waterloo Region are in line with historical rates. Given the very high degree of uncertainty around the specific estimate of net undercoverage, together with the disruptive effect of making historical changes, it has been decided to continue with the current practice of using a 4% addition to Census values to estimate the actual population. This also effectively maintains consistency with the assumptions used in the Places to Grow forecasts.

While the Region’s population and household estimates are anchored to 2011 Census estimates, in the subsequent inter-censal years (2012 – 2015), the households and their related populations are extrapolated from building activity. Building permits are received from the Area Municipalities, and an estimated occupancy date is assigned to each permit. The estimated lag between building permit issuance and occupancy varies by dwelling type. These sources are supplemented by data from the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC), correlated with a visual inspection of recent aerial photography, and data such as vacancy rates published by Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC). As a result, the growth in households cannot be directly compared to building activity in each year.

Although the Census population and household counts provide the foundational data, the estimate of population contained in this report differs from the population reported by the Census in several important ways. To best reflect the total number of people consuming services at year-end within the Region, adjustments are made to include:

- the Census net undercoverage (those people who were missed or double counted by the Census);
- temporary residents in the Region, most notably students who study at our post-secondary institutions, as well as those who leave to study elsewhere;
- growth during the time period from mid-May to year-end; and
- adjustments for long-term trends in ‘Persons Per Unit’ by type of dwelling, as reflected in changing household sizes.
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Subject: 2014 Building Permit Activity and Growth Monitoring

Recommendation:
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Summary:
This report provides a summary of building permit activity across Waterloo Region in 2014, along with comparisons to previous years. It reflects data related to new construction, according to information contained on building permits issued by the Area Municipalities. Building permit activity is one indicator of the strength of the local economy, as well as a predictor of population growth.

The total value of building permits issued for new construction in Waterloo Region was $1.27 billion in 2014, an increase of 65% over 2013 values. This was the third highest value ever recorded in the Region, and reflects high levels of activity in both the non-residential and residential sectors.

Non-residential building permits were issued for 2.2 million square feet of floor space in 2014, with a total value of $449 million. Substantial year-over-year increases in the value of non-residential building permits were experienced in all three sectors: industrial, commercial and institutional. Industrial square footage increased significantly to over one million new square feet, its highest level in many years. This year’s commercial and industrial permits were mostly for new floor space, unlike the prevalence of additions to existing buildings reported in 2013.

Residential activity was also strong in 2014, with building permits being issued for 3,778 units, approximately 12 per cent higher than the long-term average of 3,383. The value
of these permits was $824.5 million. Residential building activity is typically cyclical as a result of economic factors such as mortgage rates and other financial considerations, as well as demand for housing. There continued to be a high level of activity in the student-oriented market in 2014. The largest component of residential building activity was apartments, with 2,009 units, and representing more than half of new units.

Reurbanization levels can also be monitored using building permit data. Building permits indicate that 62% of new residential units in 2014 were within the built-up areas of the Region. This is the fifth consecutive year that the Places to Grow target of 40% (which comes into effect in 2015) and the Regional Official Plan target of 45% have been exceeded. In addition, 65% of non-residential floor space was inside the built-up areas.

Report:

Building permit activity is one indicator of the strength of the local economy, as well as a predictor of the population growth. This report summarizes building activity in both the residential and non-residential sectors in Waterloo Region for 2014. Building activity data for previous years is provided for comparison purposes. These figures are compiled annually by Regional staff based on data supplied by the Area Municipalities, and are summarized in Figure 1.

Figure 1 - Summary of Building Permit Activity Change (2013-2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total Change from 2013</th>
<th>Percent Change from 2013</th>
<th>2014 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>$281.9 million</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>$824.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,214 units</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>3,778 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>$52.7 million</td>
<td>136%</td>
<td>$91.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>622,000 sq.ft.</td>
<td>163%</td>
<td>1,003,000 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$47 million</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>$111.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>322,000 sq.ft.</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>708,000 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>$118.3 million</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>$246.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-119,000 sq.ft.</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>490,000 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Value of New Construction

The total value of new residential and non-residential buildings for which building permits were issued in 2014 was $1.3 billion, an increase of 65% from 2013 values, and 27% higher than the 10 year average value of $999.8 million in Waterloo Region. This
was comprised of $825 million in the residential sector, and $449 million in the industrial, commercial and institutional sectors (Figure 2).

**Figure 2 - Total Value of New Construction (2005-2014)**

Building Activity in the Non-Residential Sector

The value of non-residential permits issued in 2014 was $449 million, an increase of 94% over the value in 2013. Increases in permit value were seen across all three sectors: industrial; commercial; and institutional, at $53 million, $47 million, and $118 million respectively (Figure 3).

**Figure 3 - Total New Non-Residential Construction Value by Type (2005-2014)**
The highest values for individual 2014 non-residential building permits, by type, were:

- **Institutional**: $150 million for the construction of a new four-storey tower and an extension to the existing four-storey tower at the Cambridge Memorial Hospital, located at 700 Coronation Boulevard in Cambridge.
- **Industrial**: $8.5 million for the construction of a new manufacturing plant for Heroux Devtek (designer, developer and manufacturer of aerospace projects), located at 47 Heroux Devtek Drive in Cambridge.
- **Commercial**: $15 million for the Breithaupt Block brownfield redevelopment project to convert an existing industrial building into office space, located at 25 Breithaupt Street in Kitchener.

Of the 25 permits valued over $4 million, Cambridge issued seven permits worth a total of $185.7 million, Kitchener issued eight permits at $82.1 million, Waterloo issued five at $30.4 million, Woolwich issued four at $22.5 million, and Wellesley issued one permit valued at $4.2 million. Attachment 1 lists the top 25 permits by construction value.

Non-residential building permit values fluctuate from year to year by sector and by municipality (Figures 4 and 5). In 2014, the value of non-residential construction in the cities was $393 million, substantially higher than the 2013 value of $177 million. Cambridge had the highest non-residential construction value at $222 million, followed by Kitchener ($112 million) and Waterloo ($59 million). Most townships also saw an increase in new non-residential construction value relative to 2013. Woolwich led non-residential construction values ($33 million), followed by Wellesley ($10 million), North Dumfries ($8 million), and Wilmot ($5 million).

**Figure 4 - Total New Non-Residential Construction Value by City (2005-2014)**
Over 2.2 million square feet of new non-residential floor space is to be created through these building permits, an increase of 60% compared to permits issued in 2013. This year’s commercial and industrial permits were mostly for new floor space, unlike the prevalence of additions to existing buildings in 2013. Industrial square footage increased significantly (163%) to over 1,003,000 new square feet. The commercial square footage increased by 83% to 708,100, with a mix of office, recreational, and retail uses. The institutional sector was the only sector which decreased, with the 490,000 square feet of new space being 19% less than 2013. Figure 6 illustrates the ten-year historical variation in non-residential floor space.
New non-residential floor space among the cities was highest in Cambridge in 2014 (Figure 7). The amount of new square footage in Cambridge (994,000) and Kitchener (465,000) increased considerably from 2013, while Waterloo (174,000) showed less growth than last year. The townships contributed 26% of the new floor space in the Region, with Woolwich at 209,000 square feet, Wellesley at 151,000, North Dumfries at 113,000, and Wilmot at 96,000 (Figure 8).

Figure 7 - Total Non-Residential Floor Space by City (2005-2014)

Figure 8 - Total Non-Residential Floor Space by Township (2005-2014)
Building Activity in the Residential Sector

The number of new residential units created through building permits issued in 2014 increased substantially over 2013. Building permits were issued for 3,778 units, representing 1,214 more units, or 47% more than last year. The total value of these permits increased 52% to $824.5 million from $542.5 million in 2013. There were increases in the number of units in all structure types with single detached and semi-detached units increasing at rate of 13% each, townhouses at 29%, and apartments at 87%.

The largest component of residential building activity was apartments, with 2,009 units representing more than half of new units (Figure 9). Single detached dwellings represented a quarter of building activity with 957 units. Townhouses and semi-detached dwelling types made up the remaining shares, at 675 and 137 units respectively. Over the longer term, the percentage of single detached units constructed per year has fallen from a peak of 78% in 1998 to a low of 25% in 2014, with a corresponding shift to higher-density housing types.

Figure 9 - New Residential Units by Structure Type (1985-2014)

The overall residential building permit activity at the Regional level in 2014 was 1,214 units, 47 per cent higher than in 2013 (Figure 10). Kitchener, Waterloo and Cambridge saw growth of 69%, 55% and 4% respectively in residential units. Most townships also increased, with Wellesley increasing 37%, North Dumfries 12%, and Wilmot 3%, while Woolwich declined moderately at 11%.
Figure 10 - Total New Residential Units by Type and Municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single detached</th>
<th>Semi-detached</th>
<th>Townhouse</th>
<th>Apartment</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAT</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDU</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEL</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIL</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOO</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMW</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The location of all residential building permits issued for new construction in 2014 is shown on Map 1 (Attachment 2). Each circle is representative of the number of units to be constructed through each building permit. Waterloo Region has seen an increase in the construction of apartments concentrated near the universities in Waterloo and the future transportation hub in Kitchener.

Long-Term Trends in Residential Building Activity

At 3,778 new units, the residential building permit activity in 2014 was 11.7% higher than the long term average of 3,383 residential units over the 30-year period (Figure 11). The graph shows the cyclical nature of residential building activity, which reflects many factors including demand, housing prices and mortgage rates. In addition, other considerations such as pent-up demand from the recession and changes to the Development Charges By-laws likely influenced construction spikes of 2010, 2011 and 2014.

Figure 11 - Historic Residential Building Activity (1985-2014)
Students and Seniors

There continued to be a high level of activity in the student-oriented market in 2014. Residential building permits were issued for 14 student-oriented apartment buildings in 2014, totalling 940 units, as well as a new student residence at the University of Waterloo. There were 12 student-oriented apartment buildings in 2013. While some student-oriented permits were identified as such on the permit itself, Regional staff identified additional student-oriented permits by their location and built form.

No new senior-oriented projects have been specifically identified on building permits since 2012.

Comparisons with CMHC Housing Starts

Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) reported 4,450 housing units were started in 2014 in the Kitchener-Cambridge-Waterloo Census Metropolitan Area (CMA), which covers Kitchener, Waterloo, Cambridge, Woolwich and North Dumfries. Starts are counted at the beginning of construction work on a building, usually when concrete has been poured for the footing. This figure is up 141.8% from the 1,840 starts reported by CMHC in 2013, and is largest increase in the province. Overall, housing starts in the province declined by 4.2%.

Monitoring Growth

On June 16, 2006, the Province brought into force the Places to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Growth Plan), which included an objective to accommodate more growth through re-urbanization. The Growth Plan set a minimum target of 40% of new residential units to be constructed within the Built Up Area (BUA), which delineates areas already developed in 2006. While the re-urbanization target in the Places to Grow Act does not come into effect until 2015, the levels for Waterloo Region from 2006 to year-end 2014 provide an early indication of how the residential building activity currently measures against the target.

Building permits indicate that in 2014, 62% of all new residential units were within the BUA of the Region, exceeding the Places to Grow target of 40% and the Regional Official Plan target of 45%. This is the fifth consecutive year that these targets have been exceeded (Figures 12 and 13). The recent five year annual average (2010 to 2014) is 55%. The Province has recently opened discussion on the method of calculating the indicators, and this initiative may lead to revisions of the re-urbanization numbers reported above.
While there is no policy target for the amount of non-residential activity within the BUA, Figures 14 and 15 show industrial, commercial and institutional building activity both inside the BUA and for the Region as a whole, measured both in size of new construction as well as building value. In 2014, permits for 65% of non-residential floor space were issued inside the BUA, and on average, since June 16, 2006, 63% of non-residential floor space was inside the BUA.
Figure 14 - Non-Residential Floor Area Constructed within the Built Up Area (BUA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Floor Area in Region of Waterloo (ft²)</th>
<th>Total Floor Area Inside the Built Up Area (ft²)</th>
<th>Percent of Floor Area Inside the Built Up Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006*</td>
<td>1,637,159</td>
<td>1,089,946</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2,741,515</td>
<td>1,804,348</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3,284,478</td>
<td>2,247,517</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2,308,849</td>
<td>1,321,072</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3,574,470</td>
<td>1,948,457</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,505,985</td>
<td>986,533</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,905,754</td>
<td>1,443,908</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,376,125</td>
<td>708,593</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2,201,230</td>
<td>1,427,505</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Since effective date of Places to Grow, June 16, 2006.

Figure 15 - Percent of Non-Residential Floor Area in the Region inside the Places to Grow Built Up Area (2006-2014)

* Since effective date of Places to Grow, June 16, 2006.

In 2014, 29% of residential units and 7% of the non-residential floor space were located within 800 meters of the 23 planned Rapid Transit stations in Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo, as illustrated in Figure 16.
Figure 16 - Percent within 800m of the Rapid Transit Station Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Units in Region of Waterloo</th>
<th>Units Within 800m of Rapid Transit Stations</th>
<th>Percent of Units Within 800m of Rapid Transit Stations</th>
<th>Total Floor Area Within 800m of Rapid Transit Stations</th>
<th>Total Floor Area in Region of Waterloo</th>
<th>Percent of Floor Area Within 800m of Rapid Transit Stations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3,219</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2,966,044</td>
<td>752,720</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3,112</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2,741,515</td>
<td>644,728</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2,969</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3,284,478</td>
<td>1,229,238</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2,779</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2,308,849</td>
<td>514,504</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4,006</td>
<td>1,032</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3,574,470</td>
<td>1,110,701</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3,586</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1,505,985</td>
<td>232,339</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2,399</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1,905,754</td>
<td>644,977</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2,564</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1,376,125</td>
<td>339,838</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3,778</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2,201,230</td>
<td>162,859</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

Building permit data is collected by the Area Municipalities and submitted to the Region. This data is compiled for use in Regional development charge calculations, development tracking, forecasts, growth monitoring and reporting. Municipal staff is consulted for verification and insight into the data. Ongoing corrections and building permit cancellations must be taken into consideration when comparing the data in this report to previous building activity reports. Copies of this report have been circulated to Area Municipalities.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

Tracking and reporting building permit activity contributes to Strategic Focus Area 2: Manage Growth to Foster Thriving and Productive Urban and Rural Communities.

Financial Implications:

Nil.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Nil.

Attachments:

Attachment 1 – Top 25 Non-Residential permits by Construction Value
Attachment 2 – 2014 Residential Building Permit Activity

**Prepared By:** Rehan Waheed, Planning Technician

**Approved By:** Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Development and Legislative Services
## Attachment 1 - Top 25 Non-Residential Permits by Construction Value in 2014 - Region of Waterloo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Structure Type</th>
<th>Floor Area</th>
<th>Construction Value</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>700 Coronation Blvd Cambridge</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>250,777</td>
<td>$149,650,389</td>
<td>Cambridge Memorial Hospital - new 4-storey tower along with renovations to existing tower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299 Doon Valley Dr Kitchener</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>24,025</td>
<td>$18,460,000</td>
<td>Conestoga College - Doon (Kitchener) Campus - a 2-storey addition, interior alterations, and conversion of existing industrial building into office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Breithaupt St Kitchener</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>54,737</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>Breithaupt - a brownfield redevelopment project to convert existing industrial building into office building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368 Mill Park Dr Kitchener</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>5,780</td>
<td>$13,369,000</td>
<td>Kitchener Waste Water Treatment Plant - a new Energy Centre building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Heroux Devtek Dr Cambridge</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>115,828</td>
<td>$8,500,000</td>
<td>Heroux Devtek aerospace products - a new manufacturing plant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227 King St S Waterloo</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>6,825</td>
<td>$8,300,000</td>
<td>Clarica &amp; Sun Life Financial - a new emergency diesel generator house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368 Mill Park Dr Kitchener</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>17,029</td>
<td>$8,200,000</td>
<td>Ontario Clean Water Agency (OCWA) - an addition to the Digestion Control Process building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Arthur St N Woolwich</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>38,198</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td>Elmira Pet Products - addition of food processing area to existing pet food plant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329 Glasgow St Kitchener</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>54,964</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td>Westmount Public School (WRDSB) - a new Westmount public school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900 Wabanaki Dr Kitchener</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>149,069</td>
<td>$7,753,796</td>
<td>Fastenal Industrial Supplies (hardware) - distribution centre and head office for Eastern Canada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590 Riverbend Dr Kitchener</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$7,400,000</td>
<td>Economical Insurance - parking structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Langdon Dr Cambridge</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>26,566</td>
<td>$7,038,454</td>
<td>Langdon Hall (Country House Hotel &amp; Spa) - 1 and 3-storey additions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 Westmount Rd N Waterloo</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>34,212</td>
<td>$6,700,000</td>
<td>Renison University College - addition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420 King St N Woolwich</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>53,039</td>
<td>$5,700,000</td>
<td>Home Hardware - 3-storey mixed use building in St. Jacobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 Holiday Inn Dr Cambridge</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>68,850</td>
<td>$5,500,000</td>
<td>Tri-city Centre a mixed use retail office - outdoor products anchor store</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>485 Wes Graham Way Waterloo</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>7,083</td>
<td>$5,500,000</td>
<td>University of Waterloo - addition of 1-storey at the rear of the institutional campus building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Tyler St Cambridge</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>150,659</td>
<td>$5,400,000</td>
<td>Gateway Business Park - a new industrial mall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 University Ave W Waterloo</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>6,506</td>
<td>$5,200,000</td>
<td>University of Waterloo Federation Hall the campus's premier event space - addition and interior renovation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455 Dundas St N Cambridge</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>16,581</td>
<td>$5,200,000</td>
<td>Manchester Public School (Elementary and Junior WRDSB) - demolition of existing portions to construct 7 class rooms, along with interior renovations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5158 Fountain St N Woolwich</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>19,429</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>International Brotherhood of Electrical Worker Local 804 -office and training facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518 Dutton Dr Waterloo</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$4,720,525</td>
<td>ION's maintenance, parking and washing compound - foundation and sites services permit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490 Pinebush Rd Cambridge</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$4,459,000</td>
<td>Domino's Pizza's - Supply Chain Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1270 Geddes St Wellesley</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>57,919</td>
<td>$4,200,000</td>
<td>B.G. Frey Collectibles Inc in Hawkesville for a shop addition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3563 King St E Kitchener</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>1,862</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>Region of Waterloo Sewage Pump House - Replacement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>878 Weber St N Woolwich</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>33,418</td>
<td>$3,800,000</td>
<td>St. Jacobs Farmer's Market Building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Transit Services

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: March 24, 2015
File Code: D28-60(A)
Subject: City of Cambridge - Conestoga College U-Pass Request

Recommendation:
For information.

Summary:
In December 2014, Cambridge City Council approved the following motion based on a recommendation from their Economic Development Advisory Committee (EDAC):

That Council accept the recommendation of EDAC, and send correspondence to Regional Council to initiate the process to offer Conestoga College students the same rate as University Students for Grand River Transit passes as outlines in Report C14-039-CAO.

This report provides some history of the GRT tuition based U-Pass program, including previous details from a review to expand the program to Conestoga College, and then outlines a plan to meet with student and college administration to develop a budget issue paper for Regional Council’s consideration during the 2016 budget process.

Report:
Since the introduction of the Grand River Transit (GRT) tuition based U-Pass program at the University of Waterloo (UW) and Wilfrid Laurier University (WLU), there has been interest from Conestoga College to launch a similar program. The current fee for UW and WLU is $81.15 per student per term. Implementation of the U-Pass program was significantly easier because there was already considerable transit service being provided to the campuses and along the King Street, University and Columbia Avenue...
corridors. Once the U-Pass was implemented students were much more likely to use transit. This resulted in increased passenger loads and more service had to be added to maintain and improve on the existing service.

In 2011 Regional staff worked with Conestoga College student and staff representatives to review the possible implementation of a U-Pass program. This included conducting a student travel survey to forecast the amount of extra service needed to meet student ridership demands, based on all students having universal access to public transit through the tuition based U-Pass program.

At the time, and to preserve the revenue to cost recovery being generated by GRT, the introduction of a U-Pass at Conestoga College was estimated to be priced higher than the programs at UW and WLU. This pricing difference was based on the requirement of 18,000 additional service hours and 10 expansion buses, needed to meet the ridership demands to and from Conestoga College. Since the college is situated remotely from the urban areas, this expansion translated into proportionately more service hours than it would have, had they been located in an urbanized setting where there are a variety of other transit routings in operation which could be utilized to assist with the increased rider demand. It is also very likely that, similar to what occurred at UW and WLU, student use will exceed expectations and that even more service would have to be added after the program started.

Due to budgetary constraints, the Conestoga College U-Pass was not implemented.

The Conestoga College travel survey and financial implications have not been updated since 2011, so staff plans to meet with Conestoga College student and administrative officials to develop a draft 2016 budget issue paper based on the up to date financial implications of introducing a U-Pass at the same rate offered to UW and WLU students.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

Strategic Plan Item 3.1.3 - Develop and implement programs to improve access to and awareness of public transit (GRT and MobilityPLUS).

**Financial Implications:**

The financial implications of this recommendation will be outlined in a 2016 Budget Issue Paper to be presented during the 2016 Regional Budget Process.

**Prepared By:** Eric Gillespie, Director Transit Services

**Approved By:** Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Transit Services

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: March 24, 2015    File Code: T13-60(A)
Subject: Update on Bike Sharing Initiatives in the Region of Waterloo

Recommendation: For information.

Summary:

On June 4, 2014, Regional Council received a delegation from Grand River Public Bikeshare (GRPBS) who presented their plans to launch a bikeshare system in Waterloo and requested sponsorship from the Region to assist in generating start-up capital for their project. GRPBS did not provide Council with a specific dollar amount for their request. In September 2014 GRPBS requested to staff that Region contribute $60,000 to fund their start-up capital in return for advertising opportunities and is also seeking to secure continued annual funding from the Area Municipalities and the Region of at least $50,000.

Reports to the Planning and Works Committee (P-12-104, P-13-067) have described bike share prospects being developed in the region by GRPBS and another not-for-profit Organization: The Working Centre’s Community Access Bicycles (CAB). These reports described characteristics of successful bike share systems and outlined staff’s preference for a single integrated system. Staff have encouraged the two local Bikeshare groups to work together. However, the two groups have chosen to evolve independently.

To date, GRPBS has secured little funding for their project while CAB is in their second year of operation with seven bikeshare locations in Kitchener and Waterloo. There is currently no Regional funding available to provide GRPBS with start-up capital. Although staff support the efforts of both bikeshare projects, the less capital intensive, incremental growth approach that CAB has demonstrated may be the best approach for bikesharing in the Region.
Report:

Background

Bikeshare systems provide short-term access bicycles via docking stations located at convenient locations. Bikesharing has been shown to support active transportation and improve mobility choice. The implementation of a bicycle sharing program in the short term is recommended in the Regional Transportation Master Plan and is supported in the Active Transportation Master Plan. The majority of bikeshares operate in large, dense cities such as Toronto and Montreal, and rely on funding from a government authority, corporate sponsorship, or a combination of both. Most require a significant government subsidy.

In 2011, Regional staff became aware of two groups wishing to create bikeshare programs in the region; Community Access Bikeshare (CAB), operated by the Working Centre, and Grand River Public Bike Share (GRPBS). Staff met with the groups and encouraged them to work together to create an integrated system that could serve residents across the region.

On June 4, 2014, GRPBS presented their plans to Regional Council and requested sponsorship from the Region to assist in generating start-up capital. At the time, GRPBS did not provide a specific dollar amount. However, on September 12, 2014 the group specifically asked that the Region contribute $60,000 to fund their start-up capital in return for advertising opportunities and bikeshare memberships for staff. The group is also seeking to secure ongoing annual funding from the Area Municipalities and the Region of at least $50,000.

Previous reports to the Planning and Works Committee in October 2012 (P-12-104) and June 2013 (P-13-067) have described the characteristics of successful bike share systems and outlined staff’s preference for a single integrated system. Staff have repeatedly encouraged the two local Bikeshare groups to work together. However, the two groups have chosen to evolve independently. Staff have supported each group with opportunities to locate bikeshare stations on Regional property, promote their services through newsletters, and participate at community events.

The Active Transportation Advisory Committee has recommended that staff observe each bikeshare group as they independently work on their respective projects and evaluate their progress.

Status

CAB is in their second year of operation with 60 bicycles at seven bikeshare locations throughout Downtown Kitchener and Uptown Waterloo. The CAB system is typically used 200 times a month by its 150 members who pay a flat $40 seasonal membership
for unlimited use. CAB has been resourceful and received nearly $175,000 in capital funding from a variety of sources including the City of Kitchener, private community grants, the City of Waterloo, advertisements, and the Region through the Community Environmental Fund. CAB has continued to harness grants and reserve funding which will enable their operation for another two years.

GRPBS does not have any bikeshare locations in operation, but estimates their system of 100 bicycles at 10 bikeshare locations will be used 4,100 times a month. The group intends to fund their system through a variety of membership fees, usage fees, sponsorships and donations. The group estimates their first year capital and operating costs to be approximately $400,000 and will operate with an annual loss without ongoing municipal subsidies. To date GRPBS has secured $2,200 in private funding.

Scoping Bikesharing for the Region

As illustrated by both bikeshare groups, bikesharing systems can vary in size, technologies, operations and funding strategies. While bikesharing can be an effective option to help residents with mobility options for short distance trips in dense urban areas, it is similar to transit in that it requires an ongoing government subsidy.

There is no current Regional funding available within operating budgets to provide GRPBS with start up assistance. As CAB has demonstrated, a scalable bikesharing system in Waterloo Region can be started through alternative funding sources without the need for significant or on-going assistance through government subsidies.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

The implementation of a bicycle sharing program in the short term is recommended in the Regional Transportation Master Plan and is supported in the Active Transportation Master Plan.

Bike sharing supports the Region’s improved air quality objective (Focus Area 1) and promotion of active forms of transportation (Focus Area 3). By working with the organizations interested in bike sharing, the Region is strengthening partnerships with area municipalities and community stakeholders (Focus Area 5).

Financial Implications: Nil

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence: Nil

Attachments: Nil

Prepared By: James LaPointe, Principal Planner, Transportation Demand Management

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Water Services

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: March 24, 2015 File Code: E07-30
Subject: Water Efficient Restaurant Certification Program

Recommendation:


Summary:

Nil

Report:

The Water Efficiency Master Plan (WEMP) 2015 – 2025, approved by Council in June 2014, details ongoing and proposed new programs to be delivered during the next ten years (E-14-061.1). The goal is to save a cumulative 1,370 million litres (ML) per year by 2025 across all sectors within the Region, and help defer the estimated $1 billion pipeline to Lake Erie beyond 2051. Table 1 below summarizes the approved WEMP program offerings.
### Table 1 – Water Efficiency Master Plan 2015 – 2025 Program Offerings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Continuing Activities</th>
<th>New or Enhanced Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Sector</td>
<td>General Education and Awareness</td>
<td>Residential Water Savings Assistance Program; Toilet Flapper Program; Rainwater Harvesting Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial, Industrial and Institutional Sectors (CII)</td>
<td>Water Efficiency Technology (W.E.T.) Program</td>
<td>CII E-newsletter; Restaurant Certification Program; Cooling System Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner Professions</td>
<td>Trades Training</td>
<td>New Home Building Incentives; Plumber Sustainability Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-wide</td>
<td>Water Conservation By-Law; Municipal Infrastructure Leakage Management</td>
<td>Enhanced Interactive Website and Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Development</td>
<td>Water Softener Research</td>
<td>Residential Hot Water recirculation System Research; Commercial Sub-Metering Education and Advocacy; Landscape Topsoil Depth Advocacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As staff refines the new or enhanced programs to be delivered, topical reports with recommendations will be brought to committee and Council for approval. This report will focus on the proposed “Restaurant Certification Program”, as highlighted in Table 1 above.

There are an estimated 2,800 food services facilities currently operating within Waterloo Region, with 1,300 classified as restaurants. These restaurants consume nearly three million m$^3$ of water per year and a substantial quantity of energy to heat the water. On average, take out restaurants consume 100 to 9,100 m$^3$ per year of water, while sit down restaurants may use as much as 19,000 m$^3$ of water per year.

During the past 10 years, Water Efficiency staff has built relationships with hundreds of local restaurants by providing free water use reviews and replacing inefficient dishwasher pre-rinse spray valves with efficient models. The 597 valves replaced since 2005 are saving an average of 146 m$^3$ of water per day, for a total of 53,000 m$^3$ per year.

There are many more opportunities for restaurants to conserve water resources and energy by reducing leaks and wasteful employee behaviour, and targeting inefficient equipment. Toilets, spray valves, water softeners, ice machines, steamers, wok tables, faucets, water cooled compressors, dishwashers and hot water systems may all be contributing to water wastage and high overhead costs.
Certification Program

The next step for Waterloo Region is to encourage restaurant owners to do even more to conserve water. The proposed approach is to certify restaurants that implement a variety of measures that conserve water. Certified restaurants would then be listed by the Region as water efficient, and owners would be given promotional material to display to customers.

In order for restaurants to be certified, it is proposed they accumulate at least five points by completing some or all of the following activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A contracted water balance audit</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A water use review with Water Services Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Billing analysis and benchmarking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Proven water savings, post implementation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Employee education and awareness training</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Register for “Blue W” drinking water promotion program</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Water balance audits are currently funded at 50% through the Water Efficient Technology (W.E.T.) program and require the use of approved third party consultants. Water use reviews conducted by staff are done at no charge and provide less detail than full audits. As part of audits and reviews, businesses are encouraged to review historical water bills and consumption and compare them against industry benchmarks to measure efficiency. Restaurants that demonstrate water savings by implementing measures recommended through a water audit or water use review will be credited with three points toward certification and may also qualify for W.E.T. funding at $0.40 per litre per day of water saved.

Water Efficiency staff will develop literature and provide support for restaurant owners wishing to train their staff on ways they can conserve water. Engaged employees will identify leaks that need repairing, change wasteful behaviours, and make recommendations to improve the operation.

In order to promote tap water and to reduce the disposal of single use drinking bottles, Water Services supports the “Blue W” initiative. Blue W is a national non-profit network of shops, restaurants and businesses willing to let visitors refill a reusable bottle with healthy tap water – at no charge. Participating locations are posted on maps on the Blue W website, and are given window decals and print materials. The [www.bluew.org](http://www.bluew.org)
web site currently lists about 125 businesses offering tap water in Waterloo Region. Blue W is a natural fit for the restaurant certification program and will be credited.

**Target Participation**

The goal of the program is to certify at least 50 restaurants during the 10 year implementation period. The water saving target is to reduce annual consumption by 7.5% per restaurant. On an individual basis, estimated water savings will range from 190 m$^3$ per year for a fast-food outlet to 360 m$^3$ per year for a sit-down restaurant.

If half the certified restaurants were smaller business and the other half larger, the estimated annual water savings could reach 13,750 m$^3$ by 2025. This is enough water to supply the needs of 63 average households.

**Communications Strategy**

The restaurant certification opportunity will first be communicated through direct mailings to the 300 restaurant owners that participated in the spray valve replacement program. Mailings and follow up phone calls will also be directed to restaurants that are currently registered under the Blue W program. Further communications will be posted on the Region web site and through social media outlets. The program will also be advertised in local business publications, Region News and Environews newsletters.

Participating restaurants will receive the following communications support:

- Literature to support staff training on water efficiency and conservation.
- The restaurant name posted to a Region web page identifying certified water efficient restaurants.
- A fact sheet outlining the steps restaurants took to achieve water savings.
- A framed certificate proclaiming they are a certified water efficient facility.
- Table-top promotion cards and/or menu stickers (upon request)
- Annual recognition in Environews as a certified water efficient restaurant.

**Next Steps**

The next steps in delivering the program will be to complete the development of communications materials for the program and begin contacting prospective restaurateurs. The anticipated launch of the program will be May, 2015.

**Water Efficiency Advisory Committee Recommendations**

The Water Efficiency Advisory Committee (WEAC) engaged in a detailed review of the proposed restaurant certification program at a meeting held March 10, 2015. Prior to endorsing the program, it was agreed that the restaurant certification initiative be considered a pilot, and that staff would provide updates in six month intervals so that modifications to targets and approach can made as necessary.
In moving forward, staff was directed to do the following:

- Place emphasis on the environmental sustainability message and explore partnership opportunities with Waste Management, Public Health and others
- Consider expanding the program in future to certify other types of businesses
- Publish success stories and case studies
- Consult with Public Health to ensure there are no liability concerns with bottle filling through the Blue W program
- Offer both stickers and certificates to certified restaurants wishing to promote their success on premise

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

Implementation of Water Efficiency programs relates to the Strategic Objective 1.4, to “Protect the quality and the quantity of our drinking water sources.” Action 1.4.3 states the Region of Waterloo should “Update and continue to implement the Water Efficiency Master Plan.”

**Financial Implications:**

A maximum of $15,000 has been allocated to the restaurant certification program from the Capital Budget for Commercial, Industrial and Institutional (CII) water efficiency in 2015. The total approved 2015 Ten Year Water Capital Budget is $210,000.

Water Efficiency Capital Budget is financed through development charges.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Nil

**Attachments**

Nil

**Prepared By:** Steve Gombos, Manager, Water Efficiency

**Approved By:** Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Water Services

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: March 24, 2015  File Code: C06-60/WEAC

Subject: Water Efficiency Advisory Committee Terms of Reference 2015

Recommendation:


Summary:

Nil

Report:

The mandate of Water Efficiency Advisory Committee (WEAC) is to advise Regional staff on issues of water demand management and long-term program review for the residential and industrial/commercial/institutional sectors. The committee also acts as an expanded public forum regarding efficient water use as it relates to the Water Supply Master Plan.

WEAC membership consists of a balance between members of Regional Council and volunteers from the community. Regional Councillors Armstrong, Galloway, and Jowett, and Chair Ken Seiling (ex-officio), have been appointed to WEAC for the current term of Council (December 10, 2014 Council Report RC-15-001).

WEAC members from the community are appointed for three-year terms on a staggered basis to promote knowledge continuity. The six citizens currently appointed to WEAC are detailed below with expiry dates.
### Amendments to WEAC Terms of Reference

The proposed 2015 WEAC membership includes a reduction of one Regional Councillor, for a total of 10 voting members. The quorum, as detailed in the WEAC Terms of Reference (Attachment A), will remain at six (6) voting members.

It is recommended that the Terms of Reference, as detailed in Attachment A, be amended to reflect the proposed membership above.

### WEAC Endorsement

WEAC members endorsed the amendments to the committee Terms of Reference, as detailed in this report, at a meeting held March 10, 2015.

### Corporate Strategic Plan:

Implementation of Water Efficiency programs relates to the Strategic Objective 1.4, to “Protect the quality and the quantity of our drinking water sources.” Action 1.4.3 states the Region of Waterloo should “Update and continue to implement the Water Efficiency Master Plan.”

### Financial Implications: Nil

### Other Department Consultations/Concurrence: Nil

### Attachments

Attachment A – Regional Municipality of Waterloo Water Efficiency Advisory Committee (WEAC) Terms of Reference

### Prepared By: Steve Gombos, Manager, Water Efficiency

### Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Regional Municipality of Waterloo
Water Efficiency Advisory Committee (WEAC)
Terms of Reference

1.0 Name of Committee

The name of the committee shall be the Water Efficiency Advisory Committee (WEAC) of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo.

2.0 Mandate of the Committee

The mandate of the committee is to advise Regional staff on issues of demand management and long-term program review for the residential, educational and industrial/commercial/ institutional sectors. This committee will also act as an expanded public forum regarding efficient water use as it relates to the Water Supply Strategy. The committee will make program recommendations to staff and through staff to Planning and Works Committee and Regional Council. The implementation of initiatives which are approved for action will be overseen by this committee.

3.0 Membership of the Committee

3.1 The committee will comprise of the following:

- three Regional councillors, and Regional Chair, and

- six citizen appointees representing the following areas:
  1. Representative from a Region of Waterloo School Board
  2. Representative from Waterloo Region Chamber of Commerce
  3. Representative from the academic community
  4. Representatives (2) from either environmental or neighbourhood association groups
  5. Representative (1) from major Regional water user

3.2 In addition, non-voting staff resources to the committee include:

1. Director, Water Services
2. Manager, Water Efficiency

3.3 Advertisements will be placed as required in local newspapers through the Regional Clerk’s office to invite applications for persons wishing to sit on this committee.

Applications received will be reviewed by Water Efficiency staff, who will make recommendations for appointments to Planning and Works Committee and Regional Council. Citizens will be appointed on the basis of experience, how their knowledge and skills complement the expertise of the committee and their availability to attend meetings.
4.0 Reporting Structure

4.1 The Water Efficiency Advisory Committee will give direction and make recommendations regarding water-efficiency initiatives and program development to staff and through staff to Planning and Works Committee. Recommendations may originate from staff and committee members.

4.2 The Water Efficiency Advisory Committee will advise the Region by resolution on matters referred to them. Any minority view together with the view of the majority opinion will be recorded in the minutes.

4.3 The Water Efficiency Advisory Committee will be informed of the outcome of Planning and Works Committee as the decisions pertain to water efficiency matters.

5.0 Meetings

5.1 Meetings will be held at six to twelve week intervals as required.

5.2 The Chair and Vice-Chair of the Water Efficiency Advisory Committee will be elected from among the members at the first meeting of each calendar year. The Chair should be able to devote some time between meetings to working informally with Regional staff when circumstances warrant.

5.3 The quorum for a meeting shall be six (6) members.

5.4 The Water Efficiency Advisory Committee shall, from time to time, invite other persons or groups to address the committee and participate (non-voting) in discussions on subjects before the committee or to be briefed on water efficiency initiatives and activities by other organizations or agencies.

5.5 Where all the members present at or participating in the meeting have consented, any member may participate in a meeting of the committee by means of conference telephone, electronic or other communications facilities as permit all persons participating in the meeting to communicate with each other simultaneously and instantaneously, and is considered present at the meeting.

5.6 A resolution in writing, signed by all members of WEAC entitled to vote on that resolution is as valid as if it had been passed at a meeting. A copy of every such resolution shall be kept with the minutes of the proceedings of the committee.

6.0 Conflict of Interest Policy

All members shall adhere to the Conflict of Interest Policy for Advisory Committees, approved by Council on May 28, 2003. All members shall annually review and complete the agreement and signature form attached to the policy. Signature forms are to be returned to the Committee Clerk for safe keeping.

Members are expected to undertake their responsibilities on an impartial and objective
basis. Any member whose financial interests could be in conflict with the interests of
the Region is obliged to disclose same at the meeting. Members will not participate in
any decision or recommendation in which they or their immediate family has any
financial interest except in common with residents of the municipality.
Region of Waterloo

Planning, Development and Legislative Services

Community Planning

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

Date: March 24, 2015   File Code: D15-02

Subject: Provincial Review of Various Provincial Planning Documents

Recommendation:

For Information

Summary:

On February 27, 2015, the Province released a discussion paper entitled Our Region / Our Community / Our Home, a Discussion Document for the 2015 Co-ordinated Review of the Province’s Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (the Growth Plan), the Greenbelt Plan, the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, and the Niagara Escarpment Plan. This paper represents the start of what is to be a broad consultation process by the Province relating to these four Provincial Plans, which are key planning documents that guide growth within the south central part of the Province of Ontario (see Attachment No. 1). Only two of these Provincial Plans have any relevance to the Region of Waterloo, those being the Growth Plan, which applies to the entirety of the region, and the Greenbelt Plan, which applies to a small portion of the Township of North Dumfries (see Attachment No. 2).

Over the next several months the Province will be engaging in the first phase of the public consultation relating to the review of these planning documents, that being to receive feedback on how these Plans are working separately and in coordination with each other, and recommendations for change. This process will involve a series of town hall meetings organized and hosted by the Province, the first of which is scheduled for March 25, 2015 in the City of Kitchener (6:00 pm at Bingeman’s Conference Centre). Regional staff will be in attendance at this meeting as participants. Following the initial consultation process, which concludes on May 27, 2015, it is anticipated the Province
will produce a series of recommendations in the form of potential amendments to the various Plans, with a second round of public consultation relating to these proposed amendments being held likely in late 2015 or early 2016.

From a Regional perspective, the key issues to be addressed through this consultation process include: coordination of the Provincial Plans with corresponding Provincial investment in infrastructure; land budget methodology; clarification of the employment land conversion policies; providing for the designation and protection of longer term strategic employment lands; updating population and employment forecasts; and implications of any potential expansions to the Greenbelt. This report is provided simply as context for Council. A further report with recommendations regarding these issues and any others of Regional significance raised through the consultation process will be brought for Council consideration in May as part of the preparation of a formal submission to the Province relating to this review.

Report:

On February 27, 2015, the Province released a discussion paper entitled Our Region / Our Community / Our Home, a Discussion Document for the 2015 Co-ordinated Review of the Province’s Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (the Growth Plan), the Greenbelt Plan, the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, and the Niagara Escarpment Plan. This paper represents the start of what is to be a broad consultation process by the Province relating to these four Provincial Plans, which collectively govern growth within a significant portion of the south central portion of the Province. A brief description of these Plans is included in Attachment No. 1. Only two of these Provincial Plans have any relevance to the Region of Waterloo, those being the Growth Plan, which applies to the entirety of the region, and the Greenbelt Plan, which applies to a small portion of the Township of North Dumfries (see Attachment No. 2).

The co-ordinated review will be undertaken in two phases. The first phase will seek input into how the various Plans are currently functioning separately and in coordination with each other, and what if any changes to these plans warrant consideration. The Discussion Document contains a series of questions to be addressed through the review (see Attachment No. 3). This process will involve a series of town hall meetings organized and hosted by the Province, the first of which is scheduled for March 25, 2015 in the City of Kitchener (6:00 pm at Bingeman’s Conference Centre). The meeting will include an open house from 6 to 7 p.m., followed by the formal part of the meeting from 7 to 9 p.m. Regional staff will be in attendance at this meeting as participants. Both the open house and the formal portions of the meeting are open to the public and provide an opportunity for all to ask questions and provide input.

Following the initial consultation process, which concludes on May 27, 2015, it is
anticipated the Province will produce a series of recommendations in the form of potential amendments to the various Plans, with a second round of public consultation relating to these proposed amendments being held likely in late 2015 or early 2016.

While the process is structured around the series of questions contained in Attachment 3 to this report, from a Regional perspective, the key issues to be addressed through this consultation process include the following:

1) Coordination of the Provincial Plans with Corresponding Provincial Investment in Infrastructure – One of the key objectives of the Growth Plan is to intensify urban development to make better use of existing services and both intra and inter-regional transit. While municipalities have the authority and responsibility under the provisions of the Planning Act for implementing the land use provisions of the Growth Plan, such actions are only feasible when coordinated with Provincial investment in the infrastructure (particularly transportation infrastructure) required meet the objectives of the Growth Plan.

2) Land Budget Methodology – As demonstrated by the Ontario Municipal Board hearing relating to the Region of Waterloo Official Plan, there is a lack of clarity in the rules related to the development of land budgets to justify urban expansions under the provisions of the Growth Plan.

3) Clarification of Employment Land Conversion Policies – There is a lack of clarity in the rules associated with the conversion of employment lands to other uses.

4) Providing for the Designation and Protection of Longer Term Strategic Employment Lands – There currently is no ability to designate and protect strategic employment lands (such as the Region’s Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve lands) beyond the twenty year time frame of an official plan in order to secure the future economic well-being of the community.

5) Updating the Population and Employment Forecasts – Provisions should be made as part of the review for the updating of the population and employment forecasts following the completion of the 2016 Census.

6) Potential Expansions to the Greenbelt – One of the objectives of the review is to determine opportunities for expansion of the Greenbelt in rural areas beyond the Greater Toronto Area.

This report is provided simply as context for Council. A further report with recommendations regarding these issues and any others of Regional significance raised through the consultation process will be brought for Council consideration in May as part of the preparation of a formal submission to the Province relating to this review.
Area Municipal Consultation:

A consultation process with the Area Municipalities is currently being arranged and will be undertaken to help inform the recommendations in the May report to Council.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

This activity contributes to Strategic Focus Area 2: Manage Growth to Foster Thriving and productive Urban and Rural Communities.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications relating to Regional participation in the consolidated review of the various Provincial Plans. Financial implications associated with any recommendations made through the May report to Council will be addressed at that time.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Staff from Transportation and Environmental Services and Legal Services have been consulted as part of the preparation of this report.

Attachments

Attachment 1 – Description of the Four Provincial Plans Subject to the Comprehensive Review Process.

Attachment 2 – Location of the Provincial Greenbelt in the Region of Waterloo

Attachment 3 – Consolidated Review Discussion Questions

Prepared By:  Kevin Eby, Director Community Planning

Chris Gosselin, Manager Environmental Planning

Approved By:  Rob Horne, Commissioner Planning, Development and Legislative Services
3.2 The Growth Plan: Where and How We Grow

The Growth Plan sets the direction for accommodating growth and development in the region. It requires that municipalities: grow in ways that use land and resources more efficiently, reducing outward growth; build new developments in ways that use existing infrastructure to the fullest potential; and create complete communities.

The goals of the Growth Plan are to:

- accommodate growth through intensification and build at sustainable, livable densities to curb sprawl and avoid the unnecessary loss of farmland and natural areas
- optimize new and existing infrastructure
- focus new development to create complete communities and revitalize downtowns
- plan public transit, reinforced by transit supportive densities, as the first priority for moving people
- plan highways and highway corridors to promote efficient goods movement and to support compact built form
- ensure appropriate land is available to accommodate future employment growth and that it is planned to facilitate economic development
- promote a culture of conservation which includes, but is not limited to, conservation policies within municipal official plans.

The plan distinguishes between how high-density cities, smaller cities and surrounding rural areas should accommodate growth. Central to Growth Plan goals are targets that direct how municipalities will accommodate new growth. The plan requires that a minimum of 40 per cent of new residential development occur within already developed areas (known as the built-up area in the plan) by 2015, and each year thereafter. Additionally, the plan sets a density target for new greenfield developments (development in previously undeveloped areas) that requires they be planned to achieve densities of at least 50 people and jobs per hectare. Existing and emerging downtowns that are identified as urban growth centres in the plan are provided with minimum densities that range from 150 to 400 people and jobs per hectare.

The Growth Plan also calls on municipalities and the province to link planning for growth with planning for infrastructure, so that transit, roads, sewers, schools and other services are in place to meet the needs of the region’s growing communities. The plan encourages active transportation, which contributes to healthier communities, as people can walk and cycle to meet their daily needs. It requires compact development, which is
more energy efficient, diminishes the heating and cooling needs of buildings, and reduces the need to drive, decreasing greenhouse gas emissions. These efforts reduce costs, promote conservation and build greater resiliency.

3.3 The Plans for the Greenbelt: Protecting What Is Valuable

The region’s Greenbelt contains almost two million acres (800,000 hectares) of protected land. It is the largest and most strongly protected greenbelt in the world. It includes the Niagara Escarpment, the Oak Ridges Moraine and the land known as ‘Protected Countryside’ that lies at the centre of the Greater Golden Horseshoe. The Greenbelt contains important natural and agricultural areas, and supports a wide range of recreational and cultural opportunities. Protecting these agricultural lands and natural areas supports the quality of life and health of the region’s communities.

The Niagara Escarpment Plan and Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan were established to protect the ecological and hydrological integrity of these two important geologic features in perpetuity. The Greenbelt Plan builds on the protection provided by these two plans, striving to secure the ecological, social and economic value of the broader rural area. All three plans protect natural features and agricultural lands from urban development. As outlined below, each plan takes a slightly different approach, reflecting their differing policy objectives.

3.3.1 The Greenbelt Plan

The Greenbelt Plan establishes the Protected Countryside, which supports agriculture as the predominant land use and seeks to prevent the loss and fragmentation of agricultural land. It also:

- gives long-term protection to the natural heritage and water resource systems that sustain ecological and human health
- provides for a range of complementary economic and social activities including tourism, recreation and resource uses.

Within the Protected Countryside, the Greenbelt Plan identifies and protects an agricultural system composed of prime agricultural areas, rural areas, and two unique specialty crop areas (the Niagara Peninsula Tender Fruit and Grape Area, and the Holland Marsh). It identifies and protects natural areas and water resource systems that extend from the Niagara Escarpment and the Oak Ridges Moraine. It also includes policies for towns, villages and hamlets within the Greenbelt, although most growth in these settlement areas is guided by the Provincial Policy Statement, municipal official plans and applicable Growth Plan policies.

3.3.2 The Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan

The Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan protects approximately 470,000 acres (190,000 hectares) of the unique moraine landform. It protects the moraine’s important surface water and groundwater resources, as well as its natural features and biodiversity.
The plan’s objectives are to:

- protect the ecological and hydrological integrity of the Oak Ridges Moraine Area
- ensure that only land and resource uses that maintain, improve or restore the ecological and hydrological functions of the Oak Ridges Moraine Area are permitted
- maintain, improve or restore all the elements that contribute to the ecological and hydrological functions of the Oak Ridges Moraine Area, including the quality and quantity of its water and its other resources
- ensure the Oak Ridges Moraine Area is maintained as a continuous natural landform and environment for the benefit of present and future generations
- provide for land and resource uses and development compatible with the other objectives of the plan
- provide for continued development within existing urban settlement areas and recognize existing rural settlements
- provide for a continuous recreational trail through the Oak Ridges Moraine Area that is accessible to all
- provide for other public recreational access to the Oak Ridges Moraine Area.

The Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan sets out permitted users under four land use designations:

- Natural Core Areas and Natural Linkage Areas create a continuous east-west ecological connection across the entire plan area
- Countryside Areas promote agriculture and other rural economic uses
- Settlement Areas are largely governed by the Provincial Policy Statement, municipal official plans and applicable Growth Plan policies.

3.3.3 The Niagara Escarpment Plan

The Niagara Escarpment Plan protects approximately 480,000 acres (195,000 hectares) of land to support a continuous natural environment along the Escarpment. It ensures that development on the Niagara Escarpment and in its immediate vicinity is compatible with protecting the natural environment.

The objectives of this plan are to:

- protect unique ecological and historic areas
- maintain and enhance the quality and character of natural streams and water supplies
- provide adequate opportunities for outdoor recreation
- maintain and enhance the open landscape character of the Niagara Escarpment in so far as possible, by such means as compatible farming or forestry, and by preserving the natural scenery
• ensure all new development is compatible with the purpose of the plan
• provide for adequate public access to the Niagara Escarpment
• support municipalities within the Niagara Escarpment Plan area in their exercise of planning functions conferred upon them by the Planning Act.

The plan contains seven land use designations, with three being predominant:

• Escarpment Rural Areas provide opportunities for development compatible with rural land uses and the natural environment

• Escarpment Natural Areas and Escarpment Protection Areas aim to maintain the natural features of the Escarpment and only allow uses that support this goal.

Urban boundaries within the Niagara Escarpment Plan include Minor Urban Centres, Escarpment Recreation Areas and Urban Areas. This review provides an opportunity to evaluate changes to urban boundaries, as well as urban uses in the Niagara Escarpment Plan area, where appropriate.

The Niagara Escarpment Commission oversees the implementation of this plan, makes recommendations for amendments where necessary and oversees development within the plan area (outside of municipal settlement areas).
ATTACHMENT 2: LOCATION OF THE PROVINCIAL GREENBELT IN THE REGION OF WATERLOO
Attachment 3

Consolidated Review Discussion Questions
(Excerpt from the Discussion Document)

Natural Areas

Discussion questions:

1. How can the plans better support the long-term protection of agricultural lands, water and natural areas?
   
   a. How can the plans better direct urban development to areas already developed?
   
   b. Where are the opportunities to expand the Greenbelt both within urban areas, such as urban river valleys, and in rural areas beyond the Greater Toronto Area?
   
   c. What new approaches or tools could be used to protect agricultural land, water and natural areas?
   
   d. How can we grow and strengthen the region’s network of open spaces to provide for recreational opportunities?
   
   e. How can the agricultural protection that the plans provide enhance the impact of agriculture on Ontario’s economy?

Keeping People and Goods Moving, and Building Cost-Effective Infrastructure

Discussion Questions:

2. How can the plans be strengthened to ensure our communities make best use of key infrastructure such as transit, roads, sewers and water?

   a. How can the plans better leverage transit investments across the region?
   
   b. How can the plans better promote livable, walkable communities that use new and existing infrastructure in the most cost-effective way?
   
   c. How can the plans align long-term infrastructure planning with planning for growth?
   
   d. How can the plans better support goods movement by all modes of transportation?
e. How can the plans identify and better protect the strategic infrastructure corridors needed over the long term?

f. How can the plans better balance the need for critical infrastructure to support economic growth with environmental protection?

FOSTERING HEALTHY, LIVABLE AND INCLUSIVE COMMUNITIES

Discussion Questions:

3. How can the plans continue to support the design of attractive, livable and healthy communities that are accessible to all Ontarians at all stages of life?
   a. How can the plans provide more direction on designing:
      i. Communities that have the right layout and mix of parks, natural areas, public spaces and people-focused streets?
      ii. A safe and interconnected network of streets that support walking and cycling, and that are connected to our transit networks and key destinations?
   b. How can the plans better support the development of a mix of housing that meets the needs of the region’s growing population, including affordable housing?
   c. How can the plans better protect heritage buildings, cultural heritage landscapes and archaeological resources?

Building Communities that Attract Workers and Create Jobs

Discussion Questions:

4. How can the plans better support the development of communities that attract workers and the businesses that employ them?
   a. How can the plans better support the development of vibrant office and mixed-use employment areas near existing and planned transit, as well as the protection of industrial and commercial uses, particularly those near critical transportation infrastructure?
   b. What is the role of retail in building vibrant communities and how can the plans support or direct retail development?
   c. How can the plans balance the need for resource-based employment, including the agri-food and mineral aggregates resource sectors, with protecting the natural environment?
d. How can the plans’ policies better support and foster vibrant rural economies while taking into account the character of rural areas and communities?

Addressing Climate Change and Building Resilient Communities

Discussion Question:

5. How can the plans help address climate change?
   a. How can the plans contribute to reductions in greenhouse gas emissions?
   b. How can the plans provide more direction on building resilient communities that can withstand extreme weather events related to climate change?
   c. Is there a need to consider new policy approaches in the plans to increase the resiliency of our communities by reducing the development pressures on natural areas, open spaces and flood prone areas?

Improving Implementation and Better Aligning the Plans

Discussion Questions:

1. How can the implementation of the plans be improved?
   a. Are there opportunities to better align key components of the plans with each other, and with other provincial initiatives? Are there ways to reduce overlap and duplication?
   b. What policies of the plans do you think have been successful and should be retained?
   c. Should the province develop any additional tools or guidance materials to help support implementation?
   d. Are there other opportunities to better facilitate implementation?
   e. Do the plans appropriately distinguish the differences between urban and rural communities?
Region of Waterloo
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Legal Services

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

Date: March 24, 2015  File Code: L11-20

Subject: Proposed Amendments to the Planning Act by Bill 73 – Smart Growth for Our Communities Act, 2015

Recommendation:
For Information.

Summary:
In late 2013 and early 2014, the Province conducted a review of the land use planning and appeal system in Ontario, which included a formal consultation period, to determine if the system was meeting the changing needs of communities. On March 5, 2015, the Province introduced proposed amendments to the Planning Act to respond to issues and recommendations made during the review and consultation process including: more effective public involvement, more stability in municipal planning documents, and strengthening provincial interests. This report provides a summary of the proposed amendments that relate directly to the Region’s role in the land use planning process. Region staff is working with Provincial Staff to better understand the proposed changes and will complete a detailed review of the proposed amendments and report back to Committee in May, 2015 on implementation matters, potential financial impacts and recommendations for formal comment on Bill 73.

Report:
Following a formal public review of the land use planning and appeal system between October, 2013 and January, 2014 the Provincial Government gave first reading to Bill 73, Smart Growth for Our Communities Act, 2015 on March 5, 2015. This Bill provides for amendments to both the Development Charges Act and the Planning Act that respond to concerns raised during the review. Report COR-FSD-15-07 on the
proposed amendments to the Development Charges Act is being presented to Financial Services & Development Financing Committee on March 24, 2015.

Region staff previously reported on Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing’s formal consultation on Land Use Planning and Appeal Review in Report P-13-122, dated December 3, 2013. At that time Regional Council made several recommendations to the Province including:

- the need for broad systemic changes to achieve greater accountability, efficiency, access and transparency for land use planning in Ontario;
- expanding the scope of the review to include the operations, practices, procedures and reporting requirements of the Ontario Municipal Board, as well as alternatives to the Ontario Municipal Board;
- to clarify and deem key policies and their implementation in municipal planning documents unappealable, particularly with respect to the Provincial Growth Plan; and
- make coordination and merging of key policy documents a priority consideration to achieve greater policy alignment and clarity.

The Land Use Planning and Appeal Review did not include a review of the Ontario Municipal Board or its practices and procedures, however the Province did receive a number of comments that changes to the Ontario Municipal Board are needed and has announced its intent to undertake a review of the scope and effectiveness of the Ontario Municipal Board. No other information on this intended review is available at this time. Staff will monitor this issue and report back to Council in due course. As a result, Bill 73 does not include any amendments to the Ontario Municipal Board Act or any substantial changes to the powers and procedures of the Ontario Municipal Board under the Planning Act. Bill 73 does address the matter of making key policies and their implementation in municipal planning documents unappealable and endeavours to make broader changes to achieve greater accountability, accessibility and transparency within the land use planning system.

From the Regional perspective, the proposed amendments to the Planning Act provide increased opportunities for public input, increased stability with respect to the appeals process, and additional opportunities for dispute resolution at the municipal level. The proposed amendments also make specific amendments to the minor variance, parkland dedication, increase density by-law, and development permit system (now Community Planning Permit System) provisions of the Act which will affect the local municipalities. The proposed changes include:

1. Increased Opportunities for Public Input
Municipalities will be required to include a description in its official plan of its procedures for informing and obtaining the views of the public in respect official plan revisions or amendments, proposed zoning by-laws, plans of subdivision and consents to sever;

All municipalities are required to appoint a planning advisory committee [such as the Region’s Ecological and Environmental Advisory Committee (EEAC)] that must have at least one member of the public;

Approval authorities are required to provide an explanation in their notices of decision relating to official plans and official plan amendments, zoning by-laws, minor variances, plans of subdivision and consents of the effect on their decisions of written and oral submissions relating to the request and made at a public meeting; and

Where an appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board is made for failure to make a decision within the prescribed time frame, the Board must have regard for information and material that was before the approval authority which specifically includes written and oral submissions from the public relating to the matter.

2. Increased Stability with respect to the Appeals Process

- Provincial Policy Statements will be reviewed at 10 year intervals rather than 5 years;
- Mandatory review of a new official plan is extended to 10 years after it comes into force and at 5 year intervals thereafter;
- For a two year period following the adoption of a new official plan no person or public body can request an amendment to the official plan however a municipality may initiate its own amendment (there is a similar suspension of appeals of new comprehensive zoning by-laws);
- Global appeals of an entire official plan are not permitted;
- Similarly appeals of official plans are not permitted in respect of: the identification of an area within a vulnerable area as defined in the Clean Water Act, Greenbelt Area or Protected Countryside, or within a specialty crop area (all as defined in the Greenbelt Act, 2005), identification of forecasted population and employment growth as set out in an approved Growth Plan that applies to the Greater Golden Horseshoe Area, or the identification of a settlement boundary in a lower tier municipal official plan that conforms with an approved upper tier municipal official plan;
- There is no appeal of an approval authority’s failure to make a decision within 180 days with respect to a lower tier municipal official plan where the approval authority states that the official plan or any part thereof does not conform with the upper tier municipal official plan;
• Notices of appeal of official plans must include an explanation of how the decision to approve such plans is inconsistent with a Provincial Policy Statement, Provincial Plan, or in the case of a lower tier municipal official plan with an upper tier municipal plan or risk dismissal of the appeal without a hearing; and
• Where an appeal is filed because of a failure of an approval authority to make a decision on an official plan within 180 days, the approval authority can give notice of the appeal to the Council who adopted the plan, the parties requesting notice, each municipality to which the plan would apply if approved and other prescribed persons or public bodies and, upon giving such notice, any additional appeals must be filed within 20 days.

3. Additional Opportunities for Dispute Resolution at Municipal Level
• There is provision for one extension of the 180 day period giving rise to the right of appeal in the event the approval authority fails to make a decision on an official plan or official plan amendment of up to 90 days, which may be requested by the municipality, the person or public body requesting the amendment or the approval authority, to provide more time to resolve issues. The extension may be terminated by any of those parties upon notice to the others;
• An approval authority may initiate voluntary dispute resolution techniques such as mediation after notice of an appeal relating to approval of an official plan, official plan amendment, zoning by-law amendments, plans of subdivisions and consents to sever. Invitations to participate must be given to the applicant, the Minister, the municipality that adopted the plan, such of the appellants and any other persons or public bodies as the approval authority considers appropriate. The giving of notice of intent to use dispute resolution techniques provides a 60 day extension to the procedural deadline for filing the appeal record with the Ontario Municipal Board.

Bill 73 – Smart Growth for our Communities Act, 2015 has been posted on the Environmental Registry for a 90 day public review and comment period starting March 5, 2015. All comments received prior to June 3, 2015 will be considered as part of the decision-making process by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. A stakeholder working group will be established by the government to provide recommendations on matters such as the contents of the regulation defining what constitutes a minor variance, the implementation of a Community Planning Permit System, and supporting the implementation of local appeal bodies.
Region staff will be reviewing the proposed amendments in detail to assess implementation requirements and any potential financial impacts and will report back to Committee with a further report and recommendations for formal comment on Bill 73 in May, 2015.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

This report supports strategic objectives of Focus Area 2: Growth Management and Prosperity in the Corporate Strategic Plan.

**Financial Implications:**

There are no financial implications associated with this review of Bill 73 – Smart Growth for Our Communities Act. Region staff will assess any potential financial implications associated with the implementation of the proposed legislation in a further report to Committee in May 2015.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Staff from Community Planning has been consulted in the preparation of this report.

**Attachments:**

Nil.

**Prepared By: Fiona McCrea, Solicitor, Property**

**Approved By: Richard Brookes, Solicitor (Acting Regional Solicitor)**
Region of Waterloo
Planning, Development and Legislative Services
Community Planning

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

Date: March 24, 2015  File Code: D12-40/KBT

Subject: Regional Tourism Organization 4 Inc. Offer to Assist with Further Development of the Kissing Bridge Trailway

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to an offer by the Regional Tourism Organization 4 Inc. to assist with the further development of the Kissing Bridge Trailway, as detailed in Report PDL-CPL-15-019, dated March 24, 2015:

a) Allocate up to $40,000 from the Community Environmental Fund in order to attract matching funding from the provincial Regional Tourism Organization 4 Inc. to conduct an engineering feasibility study on replacing the former bridge over the Grand River, and to provide for appropriate wayfinding signage and other necessary improvements to the Kissing Bridge Trailway; and

b) Direct staff to take the necessary steps to take advantage of this opportunity to receive provincial matching funding.

Summary:

Recently, Regional Tourism Organization 4 Inc. (RTO4) staff informed Regional staff that matching funds could be made available before March 31, 2015 for non-capital projects to improve tourism infrastructure within the Region. Two projects relating to Planning, Development and Legislative Services were identified at the meeting. The first is an engineering feasibility study for the replacement of the bridge across the Grand River on the Kissing Bridge Trailway which is also part of the Trans Canada Trail. The original bridge was removed when the Guelph to Goderich railway line was abandoned by the Canadian Pacific Railway in 1990. Since that time, the Kissing Bridge Trailway
has been developed as a multi-use recreational Trailway by six community groups in partnership with the Region and County of Wellington. The Grand River bridge replacement has been identified as the largest trail infrastructure gap in the Trans Canada Trail in Southern Ontario. If replaced, it would result in a 27 kilometre off-road trail between Guelph and Wallenstein by way of Elmira.

Replacement of the bridge would also be a significant step toward achieving the larger RTO4 goal of having an off-road multi-use trail on the former rail right-of-way from Guelph to Goderich. In 2014, a registered charity, the Goderich to Guelph Rail Trail Inc. (G2G), was established to work with the Region and the Counties of Huron, Perth, and Wellington to develop this major “spine’ trail across Southwestern Ontario. Similar to such major trans-municipal trails as the Trans Canada Trail, Bruce Trail, and P’tit Train du Nord, G2G would link networks of smaller local trails and be a magnet to cycling and hiking tourism as well as an amenity for local residents.

The second matching fund project would be the development of new wayfinding signage and potentially other related improvements to the Kissing Bridge Trailway. This would supplement signage installed several years ago by the Region in proximity to the Trailway. The new signage would be more suitable to promoting the Trailway as a tourism amenity as well as directing regional residents to the access points.

It is recommended that staff be authorized to allocate up to $40,000 from the Community Environmental Fund to use as a matching fund to secure the RTO4 funding to complete the feasibility study and pay for upgraded wayfinding signage and other associated improvements to the Kissing Bridge Trailway.

Report:

On March 5, 2015, Planning, Development and Legislative Services staff met with Mr. Napier Simpson, Chief Operating Officer of Regional Tourism Organization 4 Inc. (RTO4) to discuss opportunities to improve the tourism potential of Waterloo Region. Since 2011, RTO4 has shown great interest in the potential of the abandoned railway right-of-way from Guelph to Goderich to serve as an off-road recreational trail across Southwestern Ontario. This “spine” would link up many smaller local trails and create a major off-road cycling network. As is increasingly evident in many parts of the world, cycle trail networks stimulate local tourism industries as they also serve the recreational needs of the local population.

When the Canadian Pacific Railway line was abandoned in 1990, various groups and individuals in communities along its length hoped to see it developed as a multi-use recreational trail from Guelph to Goderich. The Province purchased the right-of-way from the railway in 1993. In 1997, the Region and County of Wellington jointly leased the eastern 44.5 kilometres of the right-of-way from Guelph to Millbank. This has
subsequently been developed as the Kissing Bridge Trailway by six community groups known as Trailway Steward Groups. In 1998, the section from Guelph to Wallenstein was designated as part of the Trans Canada Trail. Until 2011-13, there was little sustained interest in Huron and Perth Counties in developing the western half of the trail. Discussions are now occurring about having the two counties lease their respective segments of the right-of-way. In 2014, the Goderich to Guelph Rail Trail Inc. (G2G) was established as a registered charity with the purpose of fulfilling the original vision for the entire right-of-way. G2G volunteers have worked energetically to engage municipal staff in Huron and Perth as well as the business community and general public. In partnership with the Region, they obtained matching funds from RTO4 to install a new bridge east of Millbank in November, 2014. This bridge has closed the last gap between the Conestoga River at Wallenstein and Millbank such that there is now an unbroken 17 kilometre stretch of off-road trail.

Transforming the abandoned rail right-of-way into a safe and attractive multi-use Trailway has been a lengthy task that has involved replacing ten bridges, installing vehicle barrier gates and signage at roadsides, grading the old railbed, and applying a layer of stonedust to make a surface suitable for cycling. Relatively few tax dollars have gone into this work. By far the greater proportion of the funds used for these purposes were raised by the respective Trailway Steward Groups. At a cost ranging from $15,000 to $50,000 each, replacements of the bridges removed by the railway when it abandoned the right-of-way have been the biggest financial challenge for the Trailway Steward Groups to date. All the small to medium-length bridges have now been replaced, leaving only the two major bridges over the Conestoga and Grand Rivers.

The Grand River bridge north of Line 86 and West Montrose has been identified as one of the largest gaps in the Trans Canada Trail in Southern Ontario. (See Figure 1) It is hoped that such remaining gaps in the Trans Canada Trail can be closed by the sesquicentennial of Confederation in 2017. At approximately 130 metres in length, it is well beyond the resources of the Trailway Steward Groups to complete. In addition to its length, its physical setting is challenging. The east bank of the Grand River is significant higher in elevation than the west bank. Any construction equipment required to install a new bridge would have to use the high steep embankment on the west bank or travel about one kilometre east from the river to descend to the surface of the Trailway and then proceed west to the abutments. When the original bridge was pulled in the early 1990s, the abutments and piers remaining from the original bridge construction in 1904-05 were left behind. Before any new bridge can be designed, it will be necessary to carry out a thorough assessment of the structural integrity of these features. Structural

---

1. These include, from east to west: the Guelph Trail Club, West Montrose Residents’ Association Inc., the Lions Club of Elmira, the Linwood & District Lions Club, the Golden Triangle Snowmobile Association, and the Village of Millbank Association.
engineers may have to be lowered onto the piers by helicopter. Clearly, this would be a complicated project, and an engineering feasibility study would be required to inform the design and construction of the bridge and prepare cost estimates required for any fund-raising efforts.

Figure 1. West abutment (left) and piers (centre and right) of the former C.P.R. bridge across the Grand River north of West Montrose

RTO4 actively participated in the effort by G2G to replace the Millbank bridge and is now keenly interested in seeing a new bridge over the Grand River as this would create a 27 kilometre off-road trail between Silvercreek Parkway in Guelph through Ariss and Elmira to Line 86 in Wallenstein. Once across the short detour around the former Conestoga River bridge, the Kissing Bridge Trailway continues unbroken through Linwood to Millbank, and the Trans Canada Trail swings southward through Wellesley and Woolwich Townships toward the City of Waterloo. To the east of the Grand River the Trailway connects to a new trail the County of Wellington is developing from the Kissing Bridge Trailway up to the Elora-to-Cataract Trail.

RTO4 has set aside funds specifically for projects that can strategically advance the further development of the Trailway, provided they are not capital projects. The
engineering feasibility study for the Grand River bridge replacement would not be considered a capital project and so would be eligible if matching funds can be found. Funds for the potential construction of a new bridge would have to come from other sources such as the Trans Canada Trail Foundation or other fund-raising initiatives.

As further development of the Kissing Bridge Trailway would enhance the enjoyment and safety of Regional residents using the Kissing Bridge Trailway and also provide an opportunity to appreciate the natural heritage of a sweep of the Grand River valley visible from a new bridge, staff recommend that up to $40,000 from the Community Environmental Fund be allocated as matching funds to complete the engineering feasibility study. In addition, staff are advised that matching funds would be available if the Region wished to upgrade and supplement existing wayfinding signage to the Kissing Bridge Trailway. RTO4 has noted that wayfinding signage giving direction to the Kissing Bridge Trailway needs to be improved. Signage posted by the Region is helpful in relatively close proximity to the Trailway, but additional signage is advisable at locations further away from Trailway access points.

If Regional funds are allocated to this matching fund initiative, it is also recommended that Design and Construction staff, Transportation and Environmental Services be tasked with developing Terms of Reference and a Request for Proposals for the Grand River bridge engineering feasibility study, and that staff review the study when it is completed. The study would be the first step in any potential Environmental Assessment process required to construct a new bridge. As the bridge replacement would cross the Grand River, Regional staff would consult with the First Nations about this initiative as part of the Environmental Assessment process.

If the wayfinding signage component is approved, it is also recommended that Transportation staff work with Area Municipal transportation staff to identify suitable locations on Regional and Area Municipal roads where the new wayfinding signage would be most effective.

In conclusion, the offer of matching funds from RTO4 would allow the Region to advance the completion of the Kissing Bridge Trailway as a key piece of recreational and tourism infrastructure for our citizens and visitors and thereby fulfill one of the actions identified in the Strategic Focus 2011-2014.

**Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination**

The Kissing Bridge Trailway is located within the Townships of Woolwich and Wellesley. Regional staff consulted with Township staff on the development of the Trailway. In addition, the Woolwich Trails Co-ordinator attends most meetings of the Kissing Bridge Trailway Advisory Board. Area Municipal transportation staff would be requested to advise on the placement of any potential new wayfinding signage on local roads.
Corporate Strategic Plan:

Completing the Kissing Bridge Trailway would implement action 3.2.1 to work with Area Municipalities and other stakeholders to develop an integrated and safe network of regional, local, and off-road cycling routes.

Financial Implications:

There are sufficient funds in the approved 2015 Regional Budget for the recommended allocation to the RTO4 as well as the Community Environmental Fund projects which will be brought forward later this spring.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Transportation and Environmental Services staff has the expertise to oversee the development of Terms of Reference and a Request for Proposals for the bridge replacement engineering and feasibility study and to guide the placement of new way-finding signage on Regional and Area Municipal roads.

Attachments:

Attachment 1 - Map of the Kissing Bridge Trailway Advisory Board.

Prepared By: Chris Gosselin, Manager, Environmental Planning

Approved By: Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Development and Legislative Services
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Design and Construction

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

Date: March 24, 2015 File Code: C04-30, 5377

Subject: Ottawa Street Improvements, Pattandon Avenue to Imperial Drive, City of Kitchener – Approval of Project

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to the proposed improvements on Ottawa Street (Regional Road 4) from Pattandon Avenue to Imperial Drive in the City of Kitchener:

a) approve the Recommended Design Alternative for Ottawa Street (Regional Road 4) as outlined in Report TES-DCS-15-03; and

b) amend Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended, upon completion of construction to accommodate the proposed improvements as follows:

   i. Remove from Schedule 1, No Parking Anytime, Except Sunday, on both sides of Ottawa Street (Regional Road 4) from Hoffman Street to Pattandon Avenue;

   ii. Remove from Schedule 1, No Parking Anytime, on both sides of Ottawa Street (Regional Road 4) from Pattandon Avenue to the Easterly Limit of Ottawa Street (near Keewatin Avenue);

   iii. Remove from Schedule 1, No Parking Anytime, on both sides of Ottawa Street (Regional Road 4) from Fischer-Hallman Road (Regional Road 58) to Hoffman Street;

   iv. Add to Schedule 1, No Parking Anytime, on both sides of Ottawa Street (Regional Road 4) from Fischer-Hallman (Regional Road 58) to Keewatin Avenue; and
v. Add to Schedule 24, Reserved Cycling Lanes Anytime, on both sides of Ottawa Street (Regional Road 4) from Imperial Drive to Pattandon Avenue.

Summary:

The Region of Waterloo is planning roadway improvements on Ottawa Street between Pattandon Avenue and Imperial Drive in the City of Kitchener. The project is being undertaken as a Schedule ‘A+’ project under the provincial “Municipal Class Environmental Assessment” guidelines. (Please refer to the Key Plan in Appendix “A” for project limits.) Ottawa Street between Pattandon Avenue and Imperial Drive is in need of resurfacing/reconstruction to replace the deteriorated pavement surface and other improvements are proposed in conjunction with the reconstruction.

As part of this project, the Project Team is recommending the addition of sidewalks in sections where they currently do not exist. The addition of new sidewalks will enhance the pedestrian environment on this section of roadway and is consistent with the priorities identified in the Region of Waterloo and City of Kitchener Pedestrian Charters which support the installation of sidewalks within the public right-of-way and encourage people to walk for travel, exercise and recreation. Ottawa Street is identified as a “Neighbourhood Connector – Avenue” in the Region of Waterloo Corridor Design Guidelines which also indicates that sidewalks are a necessary component of the right-of-way. The sidewalks on Ottawa Street will provide a link with existing sidewalks at each end of the project limits.

The Region of Waterloo’s Active Transportation Master Plan also identifies Ottawa Street as a designated cycling route and cycling lanes are therefore proposed as part of this project. In addition, the storm sewer, sanitary sewer and watermain in this area are near the end of their service life and are planned for replacement in conjunction with the road improvements.

A Public Consultation Centre (PCC) was held on May 2nd, 2013 to present the Project Team’s initially preferred design for the improvements on Ottawa Street. The preferred design included on-road cycling lanes, the addition of 1.5 - 1.8 metre wide sidewalks and wide boulevards where possible to accommodate new tree planting in the boulevard.

Approximately nineteen (19) members of the public attended the PCC and no written comments were received from the public as a result of the PCC.

Subsequent to the PCC, the Project Team has reconsidered the type of cycling facility best suited for this section of Ottawa Street. The Project Team is now recommending the implementation of “segregated” cycling lanes (separated from traffic by a rollover curb) instead of the originally proposed on-road cycling lanes to encourage more cycling. This amended design alternative was also endorsed by the Active Transportation Advisory Committee as a more suitable cycling alternative for this section of Ottawa Street.
Staff then consulted with the local abutting property owners and tenants on Ottawa Street by way of a notification letter outlining the proposed change in the cycling facility. Representatives from Central Baptist Church are concerned that the dedicated cycling facility would result in the removal of the existing Sunday on-street parking provision on Ottawa Street between Pattandon Avenue and Hoffman Street. Central Baptist Church acknowledged that the on-street parking is rarely used on Sundays but indicated that they would prefer that the ability to park on Ottawa Street be maintained.

The Project Team is now recommending that the Design Alternative as presented at the May 2nd, 2013 PCC (but including segregated cycling lanes rather than on-road cycling lanes) be approved by Regional Council for construction in 2017. Please see Appendix “B” for a cross section of the Recommended Design Concept. Property acquisitions from a number of adjacent property owners are required as part of this project to accommodate the proposed sidewalk installation. The total estimated Region of Waterloo cost of the Ottawa Street Improvements is $2,430,000. Sufficient funds exist in the approved 2015 Transportation Capital Program to construct this project in 2017.

Report:

1.0 Background

The Region of Waterloo is planning roadway improvements on Ottawa Street between Pattandon Avenue and Imperial Drive in the City of Kitchener. (Please refer to Appendix ‘A’ for a Key Plan.) This project has been initiated to address the condition of the deteriorated roadway and underground sewers and watermains on this section of Ottawa Street. This reconstruction project also presents an opportunity to incorporate enhanced facilities for pedestrians and cyclists.

This project is classified as a Schedule “A+” undertaking in accordance with the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment planning process and can proceed to construction provided that the public is notified in advance of construction. The planning of the roadway improvements is being undertaken in accordance with the Regional Context Sensitive Corridor Design Guidelines, the Regional Active Transportation Master Plan and other relevant Regional policies and practices.

The Context Sensitive Region Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines (CDG) is a planning policy document that guides the design of Regional Roads. The CDG identifies design parameters for necessary features within road allowances such as vehicular lanes, sidewalks and boulevards.

The Regional Active Transportation Master Plan is a planning policy document that identifies required improvements to the Region’s walking and cycling network and guides the implementation of these facilities.

The Regional Official Plan gives direction to balance the design of reconstructed roads
to meet the needs of all modes of transportation including walking, cycling, motorized vehicles and transit.

A Project Team consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo, the City of Kitchener, and City of Kitchener Councillor Frank Etherington was established to direct the planning of this study.

The segment of Ottawa Street within the study area currently consists of two lanes of traffic in each direction. Currently there are no designated cycling lanes within the project area and sidewalk exists only in some sections. Abutting properties are predominantly residential with a mix of institutional and commercial properties.

The roadway requires full roadway reconstruction, replacement of the existing concrete curbs and gutters, replacement of the existing storm sewer system, installation of sections of sidewalks on both sides of the road where they currently do not exist and replacement of the City of Kitchener’s watermain and sanitary sewer systems.

2.0 Project Issues

2.1 Traffic Volumes, Collisions and Operational Issues

A review of existing traffic counts conducted by the Region of Waterloo along this section of Ottawa Street reveals that no additional turn lanes are warranted and staff is not recommending any further traffic improvements be implemented. Staff has reviewed the recent collision history on Ottawa Street between Pattandon Avenue and Imperial Drive and note that there are some collisions occurring on the curve in the Hoffman Street intersection due to the lack of roadway “super-elevation” (ie. banking through the curves). This operational problem will be rectified by implementing proper roadway “super-elevation” during the design and construction stage.

2.2 Cycling, Pedestrian and Transit Needs

In 2014 Regional Council approved the Active Transportation Master Plan. Ottawa Street is identified as a long term on-road cycling route in this plan. Since the existing pavement does not currently have sufficient width to provide an on-road cycling facility, a minor widening of the existing roadway is required to implement the cycling lanes.

The Region of Waterloo and the City of Kitchener Pedestrian Charters both support the installation of sidewalks within the public right-of-way, which encourage people to walk for travel, exercise and recreation. Ottawa Street is also identified as a “Neighbourhood Connector – Avenue” in the Region of Waterloo Corridor Design Guidelines which indicates that sidewalks are a necessary component of the right-of-way. The Project Team is therefore recommending the addition of sidewalks in sections where they currently do not exist. The sidewalks on Ottawa Street will provide a link with existing sidewalks at each end of the project limits.
In addition, Grand River Transit staff has identified a need for upgraded bus stops and new bus shelters along the corridor where possible.

3.0 Initially Preferred Design

The Project Team developed a preferred design for Ottawa Street between Pattandon Avenue and Imperial Drive based on the identified cycling and sidewalk needs. The preferred design initially developed for consideration by the public included road widening to accommodate four 3.35 metre wide travel lanes and two on-road bike lanes. It also included the installation of sections of sidewalks (varying in width from 1.5 to 1.8 metres) on both sides of the road where they currently do not exist along with up to 2.0 metre wide boulevards which would allow for tree planting in some boulevards along the project length.

4.0 Public Consultation

4.1 Public Consultation Centre (PCC) – May 2, 2013

A Public Consultation Centre (PCC) for this project was held at the Central Baptist Church, 358 Ottawa Street South at the east limits of the project on Thursday May 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2013. A plan showing the Preferred Design Concept was on display and staff were present to answer questions and receive feedback.

Approximately nineteen (19) members of the public attended the PCC and no comment sheets/emails were received. Several attendees indicated their verbal support for the installation of the sections of new sidewalk while one attendee indicated he did not support the addition of sidewalks because he would be required to clear the snow from the sidewalks.


Subsequent to the May 2013 PCC, Region staff in consultation with the Region’s Active Transportation Advisory Committee, completed further research on different types of cycling facilities that may provide more comfort for the average cyclist and that encourage more cycling in general. On this project, the Project Team agreed that a “segregated” bike lane separated from the adjacent traffic lane by a 0.7 metre wide mountable “roll-over” curb is a more appropriate type of cycling facility that will also encourage more cycling.

As a result of this change, a letter was sent to all abutting property owners and tenants advising of the proposed change in the preferred cross-section.

Comments were received from the congregations at both St. Mary’s Coptic Orthodox Church (388 Ottawa Street South) and Central Baptist Church (358 Ottawa Street South). Both churches have frontage onto Ottawa Street and the current parking by-law permits on-street parking for church patrons on Sundays in front of the churches.
Representatives from both church congregations expressed concern that any dedicated cycling facility would result in the removal of the existing Sunday on-street parking provision on Ottawa Street between Pattandon Avenue and Hoffman Street.

Staff conducted a parking survey on two Sundays in the Fall of 2013 and no vehicles were observed using the Sunday on-street parking area between Pattandon Avenue and Hoffman Street. Staff again consulted with representatives of both churches to share the parking survey results and to further explain that the on-street parking would need to be removed if a dedicated cycling facility was being included on Ottawa Street. The parking needs to be removed to eliminate the possibility of parked vehicles encroaching over the cycling lane and creating a dangerous situation for cyclists having to manoeuver around parked vehicles.

Staff were also advised that the St. Mary’s Coptic Orthodox Church is planning a site redevelopment and will be providing more on-site parking spaces than currently exist and even more spaces than what the City of Kitchener’s zoning by-laws require. The St. Mary’s Coptic Orthodox church representatives have advised that they have no further concerns with the removal of on-street parking on Ottawa Street.

Representatives from Central Baptist Church acknowledged that the on-street parking is rarely used on Sundays but indicated that they would prefer that the ability to park on Ottawa Street be kept for overflow parking needs, especially during funerals; they indicated that they feel their existing parking lot is small, fills up quickly and that there is insufficient room on the sidestreet (Pattandon Avenue) for overflow parking.

5.0 Recommended Improvements

Since the parking survey showed no on-street parking usage during the two Sundays surveyed, the Project Team is recommending that parking be prohibited on Ottawa Street at all times since any parked vehicles would likely mount the roll-over curb and park over the cycling lane which would create a dangerous situation for cyclists having to manoeuver around parked vehicles.

The Project Team is now recommending that Regional Council approve the following improvements on Ottawa Street between Pattandon Avenue and Imperial Drive:

- four 3.35 metre wide travel lanes
- two 1.5 metre wide segregated cycling lanes
- installation of sections of 1.5 - 1.8 metre wide sidewalks on both sides of the road where they currently do not exist
- 2.0 metre wide grassed boulevards, with tree plantings where possible
- complete replacement of the existing pavement
- replacement of the existing concrete curb and gutters
• replacement of all storm sewers
• replacement of all sanitary sewers
• replacement of the watermain
• upgraded bus stops and added bus shelters where possible
• removal of the Sunday parking provision between Pattandon Avenue and Hoffman Street.

Please see Appendix “B” for the Cross-Section of the Recommended Design Concept.

Property acquisitions from a number of adjacent property owners are required as part of this project to accommodate the proposed segregated cycling lanes and sidewalk installation. There are 6 existing trees in the proposed widening area that require removal to accommodate the new sidewalk installation. As is customary on Region projects, these existing trees (currently on private property) would be replaced on a “2 for 1” basis on the fronting owner’s property. In addition, the Project Team proposes new street trees in the new boulevards where space permits.

The construction of reserved on-road cycling lanes on each side of Ottawa Street will require that Schedule 24 of Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended, be amended to include Reserved Cycling Lanes Anytime, on both sides of Ottawa Street from Imperial Drive to Pattandon Avenue.

6.0 Project Cost

The estimated preliminary cost of the project is broken down as follows:

Region of Waterloo

(Road improvements, new sidewalk and share of storm sewers) $2,775,000

City of Kitchener

(Watermain and sanitary sewer replacements and share of storm sewers) $1,453,000

Total Estimated Project Cost $4,228,000

7.0 Next Steps

Letters notifying adjacent property owners and interested members of the public that Regional Planning and Works Committee will be considering the approval of the Recommended Design Concept for this project at its March 24, 2015 meeting were distributed during the week of March 9, 2015.

Subject to Regional Council approval of the Recommended Design Alternative, staff will commence with the detailed design efforts on this project and obtain the necessary
property for completing the project. Staff will also coordinate the relocation of the necessary existing utility poles.

8.0 Project Schedule

Subject to project approval at the April 1, 2015 Regional Council meeting, the acquisition of the required property would commence in the Spring of 2015 to secure the property in advance of the recommended road improvements from Pattandon Avenue to Imperial Drive in the summer of 2017.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

This project is consistent with the development of Strategic Focus Area 2 (Growth Management and Prosperity). This project specifically addresses Strategic Objective 2.2:

- Develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs.

It is also consistent with the development of Strategic Focus Area 3 (Sustainable Transportation), specifically Strategic Objective 3.2:

- Develop, promote and integrate active forms of transportation (cycling and walking).

Financial Implications:

The Region’s 2015 Ten-Year Transportation Capital Program includes $2,975,000 in the years 2015 - 2018 for the Ottawa Street Improvements project to be funded from the Roads Rehabilitation Capital Reserve Fund.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

The Council and Administrative Services Division of the Planning, Development and Legislative Services Department will be required to prepare an amending By-law to reflect reserved lanes for cyclists on both sides of Regional Road No. 4 (Ottawa Street) from Pattandon Avenue to Imperial Drive.

Attachments
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</tr>
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Prepared By: Michael Halloran, Project Manager, Design & Construction Division

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
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Key Plan

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

Recommended Design Cross-Section

OTTAWA STREET
86' (26.213m) R.O.W.
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Design and Construction

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

Date: March 24, 2014   File Code: C04-30, 07186

Subject: Approval of Additional Contract Expenditure - Contract T2013-015, Church Street Reconstruction, Town of Elmira

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve an additional expenditure of $358,744.69 plus HST on Contract T2013-015 Reconstruction of Regional Road No.86 (Church Street), Herbert Street to Barnswallow Drive to cover extra costs as a result of an increase in the required scope of work determined after construction had commenced.

Summary:

On June 26 2013, Council approved Report F-13-065 to award Contract T2013-015 to Network Sewer and Watermain Ltd. in the amount of $1,999,285.77 plus HST. Part of the work of this contract was undertaken on behalf of the Township of Woolwich, Bell Canada / Rogers Cable and adjacent developers for the Country Club Estates subdivision (Lunor Group Inc. et al). The scope of work on behalf of others is approximately 35% of the contract and includes storm and sanitary sewers, watermain, utility conduit installation and municipal services to existing residential / commercial properties.

Construction started on July 15, 2013 and was anticipated to be completed in its entirety by the end of the 2013 construction season. Most of the work was completed in 2013 however the early onset of winter weather conditions combined with extra work that was required due to encountered site conditions, resulted in construction being carried over into the 2014 construction season. Additional costs were incurred for the extra work added to the contract as well as for the deferral of the work into 2014.
Since the completion of the work in June 2014, Regional staff has been reviewing contract records with the contractor to determine the compensation associated with the extra work. Staff has negotiated and reconciled the extra costs with the contractor and the final extra cost of $358,744.69 is considered fair and reasonable compensation for the additional work beyond that identified at the time of tender.

The Region’s Purchasing By-law 04-093 states that Council must approve the disbursement of additional funds exceeding ten percent (10%) of the original contract price. The total final cost of construction amounts to $2,358,030.46, excluding HST which represents an additional contract expenditure of $358,744.69 (18%) above the contract value of $1,999,285.77. Of the $358,744.69 in additional costs, $198,936.38 (or 10%) is attributable to work undertaken by the Region and the remaining $159,808.31 (or 8.0%) is for work undertaken on behalf of other parties to the contract.

There are sufficient funds remaining in the project budget to fund the Region’s share of the contract increase and no change in the project budget is required.

Report:

Background

The Reconstruction of Regional Road No.86 (Church Street), Herbert Street to Barnswallow Drive in the Town of Elmira, Township of Woolwich, was awarded to Network Sewer and Watermain Ltd. on June 26, 2013 in the amount of $1,999,285.77 plus HST (Contract T2013-015, Council Report F-13-065). The scope of work on this contract included the widening and urbanization of Church Street over a total distance of 970 metres. Improvements included new curb and gutter, sidewalk, cycling / buggy lanes, storm sewers, sanitary sewers / forcemain, replacement of some sections of watermain and new service connections for an adjacent subdivision development.

Approximately one-third of the work of this contract was undertaken on behalf of the Township of Woolwich, Bell Canada / Rogers Cable and adjacent developers for the Country Club Estates subdivision (Lunor Group Inc. et al). The scope of work on behalf of others is approximately 35% of the contract and includes storm and sanitary sewers, watermain, utility conduit installation and municipal services to existing residential / commercial properties.

Construction started on July 15, 2013 and was anticipated to be completed in its entirety by the end of the 2013 construction season. Most of the work was completed in 2013 however the project was carried over into the 2014 construction season as a result of extra work added to the contract combined with the early onset of winter weather conditions. The work is now complete and the final layer of asphalt paving is scheduled for 2015 under a separate Region contract, Contract T2015-101 – “Surface Asphalt at Various Locations”.

Docs 1816221
Additional Scope of Work

Following the commencement of construction on this contract, additional work was required due to encountered site conditions and due to a number of design changes. The scope of additional work can be generally summarized as follows:

- The contract was tendered to allow the re-use of excavated granular material in the sub-base portion of the sewer trench backfill; after tender, the decision was made to use imported new granular material as sub-base backfill in lieu of reclaimed material to achieve a better quality road sub-base. Extra costs were therefore incurred for the relocation of native trench material to other locations on the site, as well as for the imported new granular material. (Additional contract cost = $102,074, cost-shared between Region, Township and Developer);

- At the time of tender, a provisional contract item was included to remove and dispose of any contaminated soil encountered during the installation of sanitary forcemain and storm sewer. The actual quantity of contaminated material requiring removal and disposal was significant and therefore added to the contract cost. The majority of these costs will be recovered from the Developer. (Additional contract cost = $116,175, cost-shared between Region and Developer);

- Overruns in the granular ‘A’ quantities were required to fill in areas where thicker than expected existing removed asphalt was encountered. (Additional contract cost = $40,200);

- Additional excavation was undertaken for the removal of the existing shoulder sub-base which was deemed unsuitable after construction began. (Additional contract cost = $44,892).

- Cold weather construction techniques were required in late Fall 2013. (Additional contract cost = $23,014, cost-shared between Region, Township and Developer);

- Additional asphalt work was required in the Spring of 2014 to replace sacrificial temporary asphalt placed late in 2013 to reopen the road on a paved surface for the winter. (Additional contract cost = $31,849, cost-shared between Region, Township and Developer);

- The additional work described above, combined with the early onset of winter weather conditions, resulted in work being suspended in December of 2013. Work re-commenced in the spring of 2014 resulting in additional extra costs for equipment re-mobilization, extra traffic control and the extension of contract
bonding and insurance. (Additional contract cost = $38,136.41, cost-shared between Region, Township and Developer)

Additional Contract Expenditures

Since the completion of the work in June 2014, Regional staff has been reviewing contract records with the contractor to determine the compensation associated with the extra work. The Contractor originally submitted claims totalling $529,545.08. Staff has negotiated and reconciled the extra costs with the contractor and the final extra cost of $358,744.69 is considered fair and reasonable compensation for the additional work beyond that identified at the time of tender.

The additional scope of work summarized above results in extra expenditures to the contract that was originally approved by Regional Council on June 26, 2013 (Contract T2012-015 approved at a value of $1,999,285.77 plus HST, Council Report F-13-065). The total final cost of construction amounts to $2,358,030.46 including the additional contract expenditure of $358,744.69. The additional expenditure represents an 18% increase above the originally approved contract value of $1,999,285.77. Of the $358,744.69 in additional costs, $198,936.38 (a 10% increase) is attributable to work undertaken by the Region and the remaining $159,808.31 (an 8.0% increase) is for work undertaken on behalf of other parties to the contract.

The Region’s Purchasing By-law 04-093 states that Council must approve the disbursement of additional funds exceeding ten percent (10%) of the original contract value. The final $2,358,030.46 cost of construction is $358,744.69 (or 18%) above the original contract value of $1,999,285.77.

There are sufficient surplus funds remaining in the project budget to fund the Region’s share of the contract increase and additional funding will not be required to facilitate the final payment certificate with the contractor.

Based on the foregoing, staff are recommending that Regional Council approve an increase in Contract T2012-015 by $358,744.69 to a new revised contract total of $2,358,030.46 plus HST.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

Completion of this contract supports Focus Area # 2 of the Region’s Corporate Strategic Plan to continue to prioritize and implement capital projects required to meet community needs and ensure sustainability.

Financial Implications:

The Region’s Transportation Capital Program in 2011-2014 included a total budget of $2,101,000 for Church Street Improvements (Project #7186 and Project #5906), funded from the Roads Capital Levy and Regional Development Charges Reserve Funds.
There are sufficient surplus funds remaining in the project budget to fund the Region’s share of the contract increase and additional funding will not be required to facilitate the final payment certificate with the contractor.

Of the $358,744.69 in additional costs, $198,936.38 (a 10% increase) is attributable for work undertaken by the Region and the remaining $159,808.31 (an 8.0% increase) is for work undertaken on behalf of other parties to the contract.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Corporate Services, Financial Services and Development Financing

**Attachments:**

Nil

**Prepared By: Eric Saunderson**, Project Manager, Transportation Base Program

**Approved By: Thomas Schmidt**, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Transit Services

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: March 24, 2015  File Code: D28-60(A)
Subject: Renewal of U-Pass Agreements with Post Secondary Students

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into agreements with the University of Waterloo Federation of Students, the University of Waterloo Graduate Students Association, the Wilfrid Laurier University Students Union, the Wilfrid Laurier University Graduate Students Association and the English Language Institute at Renison College at the University of Waterloo to implement universal transit pass programs (U-Pass), in a form satisfactory to the Regional solicitor, as described in Report No. TES-TRS-15-07, dated March 24, 2015.

And that the Regional Municipality of Waterloo amend the Region’s Fees and Charges By-law 15-019 with respect to the U-Pass agreements with full-time students at the University of Waterloo and Wilfrid Laurier University, as described in Report TES-TRS-15-07, dated March 24, 2015 to increase U-Pass fees to $81.15 per school term for eligible students, effective September 1, 2015.

Summary:

The Region’s existing U-Pass agreements with the University of Waterloo Federation of Students (the FEDS), the Wilfrid Laurier University Students’ Union (WLUSU), the University of Waterloo Graduate Students Association (UW GSA) and the Wilfrid Laurier University Graduate Students Association (WLU GSA) will expire on August 31, 2015. Staff has worked with student representatives to develop new agreements that would be in effect from September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2020. Staff also worked to include
the English Language Institute at Renison College, an aligned program at the University of Waterloo, in the U-Pass programs though a new agreement under the same terms.

The Wilfrid Laurier University Graduate Student Association (WLU GSA) has decided to hold a referendum on the proposed U-Pass contract terms. A referendum is scheduled for April 1, 2015. If this group no longer wishes to participate in a U-Pass program, members could choose to purchase the Adult Monthly Pass, currently priced at $76 per month.

The proposed new agreements would be for a term of five years and include a fixed rate of fee increase of 4.99% per year. Accordingly, through the life of the agreements the U-Pass fees would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Fee per Student per Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01-Sep-2015</td>
<td>$81.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-Sep-2016</td>
<td>$85.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-Sep-2017</td>
<td>$89.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-Sep-2018</td>
<td>$93.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-Sep-2019</td>
<td>$98.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous U-Pass agreements were for a three year term and fee increases were based on the average annual increase to the general transit fare structure as approved by Regional Council.

Current U-Pass program fees in Ontario vary from between $45.09 per term and $188.00 per term. The average price in Ontario is currently $91.71 per term.

Report:

The Region currently has Universal transit pass programs (U-Pass) agreements with the University of Waterloo Federation of Students (the FEDS), the Wilfrid Laurier University Students’ Union (WLUSU), the University of Waterloo Graduate Students Association (UW GSA) and the Wilfrid Laurier University Graduate Students Association (WLU GSA). These agreements will expire on August 31, 2015.

WLU Undergraduate Students were the first to partner with Grand River Transit (GRT) to provide a U-Pass in September 2005. In September 2007, the UW Federation of Students and WLU GSA successfully launched their U-Pass programs. The UW GSA voted for a U-Pass starting in September 2010. Since the program’s inception, the Region has been working with its U-Pass partners to develop a successful program. In 2014, U-Pass riders accounted for 32 percent of GRT’s ridership, or 7 million rides.

Since 2008 the Region’s U-Pass programs have been annual. Passes are valid year-round and fees are paid at term enrollment. This arrangement allows students to access the transit system while in the Region on work terms.
The English Language Institute at Renison College provides English as a Second Language education to international students, in advance of those students entering undergraduate or graduate studies at the University of Waterloo. These students are not members of either the FEDS or the UW GSA while enrolled in the English Language Institute, and so are not part of a U-Pass program. Extending the program to these students, who number approximately 100 per term, would allow them the benefit of access to the transit system before their regular program of studies begins.

Regional staff has been in discussion with representatives from each student group since late 2014 to develop terms for new agreements. All U-Pass partners have agreed to a proposed annual increase of 4.99%. The new agreements would take effect on September 1, 2015 and last for five years until August 31, 2020.

U-Pass fees for these years would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Fee per Student per Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01-Sep-2015</td>
<td>$81.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-Sep-2016</td>
<td>$85.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-Sep-2017</td>
<td>$89.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-Sep-2018</td>
<td>$93.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-Sep-2019</td>
<td>$98.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Board of Directors of the WLU GSA has chosen to hold a referendum on April 1, 2015. On this day, members will be asked to approve the proposed contract terms. The WLU GSA represents about 900 U-Passes per term. If this referendum is successful, an agreement between the Region and the WLU GSA would be developed that includes the terms outlined above. If this group no longer wishes to participate in a U-Pass program, members could choose to purchase the Adult Monthly Pass, currently priced at $76 per month.

Between 2011 and 2014, GRT fares increased at an average rate of 7% per year, as recommended by the 2011 – 2014 GRT Business Plan. From 2012 to 2014, U-Pass fee increases matched the average annual transit fare increase.

The approved general fare increase for 2015 is 4% whereas the proposed U-Pass fee increase is 4.99% for years 2015 – 2019. The new GRT Business Plan will determine the rate of future general fare increases required to sustain service improvements and continue the progress toward the cost-recovery target where system revenues and the municipal operating contribution are equal. It is anticipated though that future fare increases recommended by the new GRT Business Plan would average closer to 5% rather than the previous 7% average annual increase.

The proposed 4.99% U-Pass fee increase would provide a predictable and reliable source of revenue to the Region while providing U-Pass partners certainty with U-Pass fee levels for the next five years.
The English Language Institute at Renison College has expressed a desire to enter the program sooner than September 1, 2015, and has agreed to pay the current fee of $77.29 per student per term for the Spring/Summer term in addition to the agreed five year contract described above.

U-Pass programs are offered with most universities in Ontario. The average U-Pass price per term in Ontario is $91.71. A summary of Ontario U-Pass program fees is included as Appendix A.

Since U-Pass programs began, a significant amount of service has been added to the university areas. U-Pass ridership increased rapidly after the programs were implemented, but the rate of growth has slowed in recent years suggesting that demand for additional service is slowing. Passenger volumes on routes serving the University areas will continue to be monitored. The additional U-Pass revenue will contribute to achieving the R/C target in the Business Plan, and help offset the costs of future service improvements in the university areas should they be required.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

The U-Pass agreements with post-secondary students support the implementation of Council’s Strategic Focus, identified under Focus Area 3: Develop greater, more sustainable and safe transportation choices.

**Financial Implications:**

The rate increase proposed above, if approved, would increase GRT operating revenue by an estimated $30,000 in 2015. This is in addition to the 2015 GRT budget. U-Pass programs would be expected to generate $7.9 million per year, on average, for five years. This revenue would be factored into the 2016-2019 GRT budgets and would help offset the costs of future service improvements in the university areas.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Finance, Legal and Transit Services were consulted and are in concurrence with this report and its recommendations.

**Attachments**

Appendix A: University U-Pass Programs in Ontario

**Prepared By:** Gethyn Beniston, Project Manager

**Approved By:** Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
## Appendix A: University U-Pass Programs in Ontario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>University(ies)</th>
<th>U-Pass Price per Term</th>
<th>Price Per Month</th>
<th>Year Round</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brantford</td>
<td>Wilfrid Laurier University</td>
<td>$45.09</td>
<td>$11.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>A 4-month summer pass is available for $96.50 under a pilot program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham (DRT)</td>
<td>Durham College/UOIT/Trent (Oshawa)</td>
<td>$89.00</td>
<td>$22.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>A 4-month summer U-Pass is included in student fees and costs $94.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guelph</td>
<td>University of Guelph</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer U-Pass for University students returning to school in fall is available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton (HSR)</td>
<td>McMaster University</td>
<td>$69.33</td>
<td>$17.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London (LTC)</td>
<td>University of Western Ontario</td>
<td>$104.44</td>
<td>$26.30</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga (MiWay)</td>
<td>University of Toronto Mississauga Campus</td>
<td>$84.18</td>
<td>$21.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>A 4-month summer U-Pass is included in student fees and costs $103.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara Falls/ St. Catharines/ Welland</td>
<td>Brock University</td>
<td>$80.50</td>
<td>$20.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>A 4-month summer pass is available for $290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bay</td>
<td>Nipissing University</td>
<td>$81.50</td>
<td>$20.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa (OCTranspo)</td>
<td>Carleton University/Ottawa University</td>
<td>$188.00</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudbury</td>
<td>Laurentian University</td>
<td>$89.50</td>
<td>$22.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo (GRT)</td>
<td>University of Waterloo/Wilfrid Laurier</td>
<td>$77.29</td>
<td>$19.32</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>U-Pass is valid year-round, with fees paid in terms when the student is enrolled in classes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average** | $91.71 | $22.93
Region of Waterloo

Transportation and Environment Services

Waste Management Division

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

Date: March 24, 2015 File Code: E25-40(A)

Subject: Big Music Fest Update: McLennan Park/Former Kitchener Landfill

Recommendation:

For information.

Summary: Nil

Report:

Background

The inaugural “Big Music Fest 2014” (BMF) was held at McLennan Park (the Site) on July 11-13, 2014. The festival was produced by a third party promoter in collaboration with the City of Kitchener’s (City) Economic Development group. It was estimated that the music festival drew nearly 50,000 attendees to the park and generated nearly $7M of economic benefit for the City/Region.

McLennan Park is a 39-hectare site constructed on the former Kitchener Landfill site located at 901 Ottawa Street South. The property is owned by the Region of Waterloo (Region) and the City operates McLennan Park in accordance with a lease agreement with the Region. Under the lease agreement, the City has care and control of surface rights of the former Kitchener Landfill and in this capacity, is responsible for design and implementation of park infrastructure including obtaining necessary approvals and permits as well as overall maintenance/upkeep of the Site. The Region, as per the lease agreement, maintains responsibility for any subsurface environmental control systems such as the operation of a landfill gas collection system and environmental compliance related activities related to the closed landfill. The lease agreement also requires the City to maintain applicable insurance and indemnifications for the Region and repair damages to Regional infrastructure.
Big Music Fest 2014

After the announcement of BMF 2014 was made by the City, Region staff collaborated with City staff and the event promoter in advance of the event to ensure the proposed event plans, site layout and infrastructure was compatible with a closed landfill site and did not pose a public safety risk or compromise the Region’s existing landfill gas (LFG) collection system. In this regard, Region staff reviewed the contract between the City and the promoter, attended a number of meetings and provided correspondence detailing specific conditions that needed to be met related to protection of the Region’s infrastructure, underground utilities, landfill cap and insurance provisions.

As a result of issues identified during the preparations for the event, unforeseen costs in the range of about $24,000 were incurred by the Waste Management Division related to consulting services and additional security services to ensure that any safety concerns related to the former landfill were mitigated. Approximately $23,000 of additional costs were also incurred by Grand River Transit (GRT) to provide appropriate service coverage throughout the weekend long event. These costs were not reimbursed by the City/event promoter and were accommodated through the Waste Management and GRT operating budgets. To respond to these types of community events or unexpected service issues, GRT maintains a provision of approximately 600 service hours as a contingency within the operating budget. Since this music festival is now expected to occur annually an allocation of $25,000 was included in the 2015 operating budget.

Note that other costs incurred by the Region to provide standby EMS and Police services were agreed upon prior to the event as part of the promoters contract with the City and were reimbursed by the event promoter.

Great Lawn Rehabilitation

Following the event, it was agreed that rehabilitation of the Great Lawn area would be beneficial in order to maintain the safe, long term operation of the park, and ensure the landfill cap meets current engineering standards and Ministry of Environment and Climate Change requirements, regardless of whether events like BMF occurred at the site. To this end, the rehabilitation of the Great Lawn area is proposed to occur in the spring of 2015 and will include the reinstatement of a thicker landfill cover system consisting of clay, topsoil and new grass. The City and their engineering consultant are currently finalizing the details of the work in consultation with Region staff. The repair work will be managed and administered by the City with the majority of the costs associated with the repair also provided by the City. The Region’s contribution will be the “in-kind” provision of clay capping material from existing stockpiles of surplus soil material located at the Waterloo Landfill as well as associated loading and transportation costs. The City will provide the required topsoil and seed/sod in addition to completing all works required to place, grade and compact the materials. Of particular note, staff from the City and Region are also investigating the use of a portion of the sediment that was removed as part of the recent Victoria Park Lake rehabilitation project as a topsoil amendment. The sediment was taken to the Region’s Landfill facility in Cambridge in 2012 and has now been remediated to a point where its use as a topsoil amendment would be considered a beneficial reuse (refer to report P-12-011/E-12-020 for further details). Use of the remediated Victoria Park Lake sediment as
part of the Great Lawn rehabilitation provides the City and the Region the opportunity to “close the loop” on the remediated pond sediment.

**Big Music Fest 2015**

The City is planning to host a BMF event at McLennan Park again this year, with BMF 2015 scheduled for July 10-12, 2015. The event is expected to be operated in a similar fashion to last year’s event with utilization of the Great Lawn as the primary location for the concert venue and ancillary activities. As stated above, it is the Region’s understanding that the rehabilitation of the Great Lawn area will be completed prior to the BMF 2015 event and will be sufficient to ensure long term concerns around landfill gas venting/public safety will be mitigated. Nonetheless, staff are proposing to undertake a similar level of due diligence as was provided in preparation for BMF 2014. In this regard, staff will review the plans, layout and staging details, legal agreements and insurance provisions for BMF 2015 to ensure protection of Region infrastructure and interests. The Region will also provide a letter of consent to the City for BMF 2015 to communicate all necessary conditions to protect the Region’s interests and minimise exposure to risk. Similar to 2014, the Region will also request additional security services during the event to ensure the Region’s on-site landfill gas collection and control infrastructure are protected.

It is anticipated that Waste Management Division operating costs in 2015 for the work and services as described above will be less than those incurred in 2014 and in the range of $17,000. It is also anticipated that GRT will again provide expanded service coverage for the event with costs anticipated to be in the $25,000 range, subject to finalization based on discussions with the City and event promoter as to the level of requested services. These costs have been accounted for within the respective Waste Management and GRT Division’s approved 2015 operating budget.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

This report has been prepared consistent with the Corporate Strategic Objective of Focus Area 2 “Growth Management and Prosperity: Manage growth to foster thriving and productive urban and rural communities” and particularly action 2.2 “Develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs” and action 2.4 “Promote and enhance arts, culture and heritage”.

**Financial Implications:**

Operating costs incurred by the Waste Management and GRT Division’s were approximately $47,000 as a result of the BMF 2014. For BMF 2015, operating costs are expected to be in the range of $40,000. These costs will be accommodated through the respective Waste Management and GRT Division’s 2015 operating budget.

Funding for the Great Lawn rehabilitation work will be through a cost sharing agreement between the City and the Region with the majority of the costs and administration of the repair provided by the City. Capital cost implications are not yet known as the City and their consultant are currently finalizing the details of the work. However, preliminary capital cost implications to the Region are estimated to be in the range of $200,000 consisting of the “in-kind” supply of clay capping and approximately $200,000
associated with the loading and transportation of soil materials. The 2015 Waste Management Capital Budget has a provision of $787,000 for capital works associated with decommissioned sites of which, approximately $560,000 is for capital upgrades associated with the former Kitchener Landfill Site and will be sufficient to accommodate the proposed Great Lawn rehabilitation work.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Staff from the Corporate Services Department have been consulted and provided input toward the preparation of this report.

Attachments:

Nil

Prepared By: April Yochim, Environmental Project Engineer, Waste Management

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environment Services
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Waste Management Services

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: March 24, 2015  File Code: E33-30A

Subject: Multi-Residential Waste Collection Service Level Policies and Practices

Recommendation:
That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo:

a) Confirm the existing policy of limiting multi-residential garbage collection services to dwellings consisting of six units or fewer, unless collection vehicles can drive through the complex freely;
b) Direct staff to report back to Planning and Works Committee in the summer of 2015 with a plan to address existing waste collection inconsistencies at multi-residential complexes that currently receive curbside collection in advance of the next waste collection contract; and
c) Direct staff to review multi-residential policies and services as part of the Waste Management Master Plan (WMMP) second level priority recommendations (years 2019 – 2023) and to report back to Planning and Works Committee no later than 2021 with an update on possible collection service options.

Summary:
The Region provides various levels of garbage and recycling collection service at multi-residential properties, and an annual garbage rebate for those properties not receiving municipal garbage collection. In addition, a green cart organics collection demonstration program is currently provided at some multi-residential properties. This report provides general information on the history of municipal collection at multi-residential properties, previous policy review information, current levels of service and inconsistencies under the existing curbside collection contract, and future opportunities.
Garbage collection

When the Region assumed responsibility for garbage collection in 2000, there were a variety of multi-residential collection policies and rebate strategies in place throughout Waterloo Region. In June 2002, Regional Council approved two key policies for multi-residential collection as follows:

1. Limit multi-residential garbage collection to dwellings consisting of six or fewer units.

   The Region is mandated by the Province of Ontario to provide residential recycling collection to properties with six or fewer units. The Region’s eligibility criterion for curbside garbage collection mirrors the six or fewer units per property. Collection of garbage under the Region’s curbside contract is for bagged garbage/standard garbage cans only and does not include larger dumpsters or “in-ground” collection containers which require different collection vehicles. Limiting multi-residential garbage collection to properties with six units or less for curbside collection generally results in fewer bags of garbage placed curbside at any one location, and is considered good practice from a public health, community aesthetics and operational standpoint.

2. Provide garbage collection service to condominium owners and rental townhouses with a target date for implementation of September 20, 2003, where interior road networks allow the large trucks to pass freely; and rebates to all other condominium and rental apartment buildings and townhouse owners not receiving service.

   In general, most complexes did not receive municipal garbage collection prior to 2004. Development agreements indicated that no garbage service, snowplowing, lighting or other municipal services would be provided at these private developments. In exchange, roadway and other infrastructure design did not need to comply with municipal design standards. This new policy changed the previous practice by determining waste collection eligibility based on collection logistics rather than historic development agreements. Over 120 sites (7,000 units) with interior roadways that permitted large garbage trucks to enter and exit the complex freely to collect bagged garbage (without backing up or encountering hazards, such as tight roadways and parked cars) were transitioned to municipal collection service. If garbage trucks can not pass freely through a complex, annual rebates are provided, and garbage collection remains the responsibility of the multi-residential complex.

From time to time, the Region of Waterloo has received requests from landlords or condominium corporations for municipal garbage collection. In February 2007, staff responded to Council’s request to review and report back on current multi-residential service level policies for municipal garbage collection (E-07-126) and other options for collection and rebates. Options presented included no change to current practice,
increase the annual per unit rate of garbage rebates, and eliminate rebates and provide service to all. Tax impacts of the options were estimated to range from zero (no change) to two million dollars (provide full collection service). No changes were made by Regional Council at that time.

Generally, the majority of multi-residential properties are privately serviced for garbage collection, using collection systems such as large dumpsters or “in-ground” collection containers, and the waste does not come to the Waterloo landfill for disposal.

Staff estimate the additional cost to provide municipal garbage collection at all multi-residential properties today would be approximately four million dollars annually, plus additional resources for administration, education, and oversight of the program.

**Multi-residential recycling collection**

As mentioned previously, the Region of Waterloo is mandated to provide recycling services to properties with six or fewer units. Industrial, commercial, and multi-residential properties with seven or more units, however, have a legislated responsibility to implement and sustain a recycling collection program at their own cost. In the early 1990’s the Region of Waterloo implemented the Cart Recycling Program to help these property owners in their multi-residential recycling efforts. This service, which continues today and is provided at no charge, includes weekly collection of large recycling carts, education and promotion materials, training, and the provision, delivery and replacement of recycling containers (unit “carry-down” recycling bags and blue and grey recycling carts). Over 6,300 carts are currently placed and collected at multi-residential sites throughout the Region.

Historically, the volume and quality of recycling materials collected at multi-residential properties on the recycling cart program are much lower than those collected from single family homes. While staff works with property owners to provide continuous promotion and education on recycling, the transient population and the inability to identify those particular citizens who need further education are key challenges to achieving higher diversion of recyclable materials, and reducing contamination in the carts. These issues are common for all municipalities that provide multi-residential recycling collection.

Multi-residential sites that were approved to transition to internal curbside garbage collection in June 2002 also had the opportunity to transition to internal blue box collection (away from the multi-family recycling cart program). Similar to single family homes, recycling collection at each stop provides the opportunity to identify and focus on citizens that may need further education on acceptable recyclables or any other identified collection issue.

To receive any municipal waste collection service, multi-residential property owners must sign a liability waiver prior to municipal trucks travelling onto their private property.
The following chart outlines the number and type of multi-residential properties (seven or more units) in Waterloo Region that receive some level of municipal waste collection or receive garbage rebates. Service ranges from providing garbage rebates only, to full single family home service (blue box, organics, garbage, bulky item), with many variations in between.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Condominiums (home owners)</th>
<th>Rental Properties (businesses)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sites</td>
<td>Units/site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>6,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouses</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>9,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>16,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>1,311</td>
<td>sites totalling 55,261 units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 55,000 units noted above, over 45,000 units (1,107 sites) participate in the Region’s recycling cart program. In 2014, 1,170 sites (over 47,000 units) were eligible for garbage rebates in lieu of garbage collection service of which; 1,015 of those sites (over 44,000 units) took advantage of the rebate program. Approximately $1.3 million in garbage rebates were provided to property owners in 2014.

**Inconsistencies**

When the Region assumed garbage collection service from the area municipalities, curbside service levels in place at that time were maintained. Some multi-residential properties are inconsistent with existing collection policies and receive municipal service, which has been a point of frustration for the majority of multi-residential owners that do not receive municipal collection. Examples include some large, multi-residential sites and commercial properties that continue to pile mixed waste and recycling to the curb for municipal collection, and other sites that have internal blue box collection where trucks cannot drive through freely. In advance of the next waste collection contract, staff intend to report back to Planning and Works Committee in the summer of 2015 with a plan to align collection service with current Regional policy, thereby establishing equity among landlords, condominium, and commercial complexes.

**Green cart demonstration program**

In April 2010, Regional Council approved a green bin demonstration program for some larger apartment buildings and a small range of commercial and institutional properties. The intent of this demonstration program was to assess the suitability of organics collection at multi-residential sites and to demonstrate to commercial and institutional establishments the viability of including the diversion of green bin waste in their waste disposal strategy. This was also done on the premise that a Provincial ban on organic waste from landfill was imminent based on MOECC policy discussions at the time.
Currently 34 multi-residential sites representing 2,200 units and seven commercial/institutional organizations are participating in the green bin demonstration program. Organics collection is also provided at Regional municipal buildings and local schools as part of this program. Participation includes the provision of large green carts, promotion and education, monitoring, and weekly collection of green bin organic material.

Similar to recycling offered in multi-residential sites, organics collection is challenging due to the transient population, inconvenience, storage, location of recycling station areas, and the inability to identify residents who may need further education and support. Compounding this, citizens in multi-residential properties cite the same barriers to participation as those in single family homes, such as the well established “yuck factor”. Participating schools and Regional municipal buildings do not experience the same challenges and have resources to oversee their organics collection program.

Staff propose that any additional large scale organics collection program at multi-residential properties across Waterloo Region be included in an overall multi-residential waste collection service review as described in the future direction section below.

**Future direction**

While staff do not recommend any changes to current multi-residential collection policies and practices at this time, it is noted that the multi-residential sector is expected to grow significantly over the next several years. This presents an opportunity in the future to undertake a significant review of waste collection, including green bin organics, at multi-residential properties in Waterloo Region. The review could include stakeholder discussions, the viability of collection services, private sector impacts, diversion potential, enforcement, future Provincial regulation, legal implications, financial/tax implications, consistent site planning approvals, impacts on the Waterloo landfill and our long term disposal options, and a review of multi-residential collection policies in place at other municipalities.

The Waste Management Master Plan, approved in November 2013, identified opportunities within the multi-residential sectors as a second level priority objective for review in years 2019 to 2023. In this regard, once the new waste collection contract is awarded and implemented, staff intend to undertake a comprehensive review of all aspects of multi-residential waste collection and will report back to Council with an update no later than 2021.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

This report has been prepared consistent with the objectives of the Corporate Strategic Plan to ensure Regional programs and services are efficient and effective and demonstrate accountability to the public.
Financial Implications:
Nil

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:
Nil

Attachments:
Nil

Prepared By:  Susan White, Manager, Waste Collection & Diversion

Approved By:  Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Water Services

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: March 24, 2015  File Code: E06-20
Subject: Revised Source Protection Policies for Waterloo Region

Recommendation:
That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo support the revised policies that apply to Waterloo Region in the proposed Grand River Source Protection Plan as presented in Report TES-WAS-15-12 dated March 24, 2015.

Summary:
The last planning step in fulfilling the requirements of the ‘Clean Water Act’ for watershed-based source water protection is the development of the Source Protection Plan (SPP). The proposed SPP which contains draft policies to reduce the risk from drinking water threats was submitted to the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) in early 2013. The policies in the SPP for Waterloo Region have been subsequently revised in response to MOECC comments received in 2014 and for improved readability.

Notwithstanding the changes to the policies, Region staff relied on the original principles used to design the policies that were presented in previous reports to Regional Council. Therefore the implications to the Region remain the same and include: developing new processes for implementation of the risk management component of the ‘Clean Water Act,’ negotiating risk management plans, updating official plans, and applying to update environmental compliance approvals for properties and activities identified as significant; developing and implementing an incentive program to assist private property owners with the implementation of these policies; and developing education and awareness programs for most activities to help protect municipal drinking water supplies.
The approved 2015 Water Services Capital Budget and Ten-year Forecast already include the costs for design and implementation of the SPP. Additional costs that may occur through the negotiation of risk management plans and updates to environmental compliance approvals in departments with responsibilities for significant activities will be addressed through the annual budget approval process. These implementation costs are estimated to be approximately $44,000 per year for the Region properties with significant threats.

Report:

Background

The ‘Clean Water Act’ (2006) established the legislative framework for undertaking watershed-based source water protection. The purpose of the initiative is to reduce the risks of water quality and quantity threats to drinking water sources. The ‘Clean Water Act’ and related regulations established a multi-step, multi-year process to establish a Source Protection Plan (SPP) for the Grand River watershed that contains policies for reducing the risks to drinking water sources. Several reports to Regional Council in the last eight years provided information on the risk assessment and policy development process. The completion of technical work and policy development in the SPP was a collaborative effort between municipalities and Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) staff. The multi-stakeholder Lake Erie Source Protection Committee (SPC) is responsible for completing a SPP for each watershed in the Lake Erie Source Protection Region.

In Report E-12-075 dated August 14, 2012, staff provided details on the policy development process, the draft policies and the explanatory document (which provides the rational for the policies) that were provided to the SPC for inclusion in the draft SPP. This report also included the financial and staffing implications associated with implementation of the policies. The draft SPP was posted for public comment in August 2012 and again in December 2012 with the policies being revised in response to the comments. Regional Council approved the recommendation to continue supporting the approach and policies that apply within Waterloo Region in Report E-12-089 dated September 25, 2012, and Report E-13-003 dated January 8, 2013. A complete copy of the SPP as well as additional information on development of the SPP can be found at http://www.sourcewater.ca/.

Through the summer of 2014, GRCA staff received comments from the Ministry of Environment (MOE) on the policies in the proposed SPP relating to Waterloo Region. Based on comments, Region staff have reviewed and modified the policies in the proposed SPP. On March 16, 2015, the SPC released the revised, proposed SPP for public comment with the commenting period closing April 24, 2015.

This report provides a summary of the changes to the policies that have been forwarded
to the SPC. It also provides additional background on the main components of the SPP.

The Assessment Report

The Assessment Report provides the results of the technical risk assessment process that forms the basis of the SPP. It includes the identification and ranking of threats (existing and future land uses and activities, intake water quality ‘Issues’ and historic water contamination Conditions) in municipal well head and surface water intake protection areas. Attachment 1 presents the list of threats identified by the MOE that must be assessed as part of this process. Attachment 2 presents a description of the different protection areas and how significant threats or activities are calculated.

The ‘Clean Water Act’ requires policies to prevent future activities from becoming significant (i.e., those that have a high threat ranking in these protection areas where the vulnerability to contamination is high) and for managing existing activities so they cease to be significant. The Assessment Report identified approximately 2750 properties where significant activities could potentially occur. It is important to note that identification of significant activities follows the regulations and rules in the ‘Clean Water Act’ and does not indicate that these properties are impacting drinking water supplies or that there is inappropriate handling of chemicals occurring.

It is also important to note that the Updated Assessment Report does not include the results of the Local Water Budget and Risk Assessment (Tier 3) project that was initiated in 2008 as required under the ‘Clean Water Act’. The Tier 3 project examines the overall water use in Waterloo Region and will assess water quantity threats to the Region’s municipal water intakes. This project is virtually complete and has identified that the Region has a low water quantity risk meaning that water quantity policies will not be needed in the SPP. However, it is anticipated that the protection areas delineated using the results of the Tier 3 project will change. The Tier 3 project is anticipated to be completed in 2015, the results of which will be incorporated into a future update of the Assessment Report as directed by the MOECC.

Content and Scope of the Source Protection Plan

The SPP sets out policies to protect sources of drinking water against the list of prescribed drinking water threats. Region staff have worked collaboratively with staff from the GRCA and other municipalities within the watershed to prepare the policies in the proposed SPP. The proposed SPP is structured into two volumes: Volume 1 which provides the context for the plan; Volume 2 which contains the policies grouped by municipality; and the Explanatory Document, which provides the intent and rationale for the policies. An additional section (Chapter 17) presents all comments on the draft SPP and the SPC’s responses to these comments. The policies proposed for Waterloo
Region are found in Volume 2, Chapter 9. These include policies for the Region’s wells, the surface water intake at the Grand River in Kitchener and the City of Brantford’s intake protection areas that extend into the Region.

As stated in Report E-11-102, the development of the policies has occurred in several steps including:

- Development of a series of discussion papers identifying possible approaches to reducing risk and related advantages and disadvantages for each of the 19 water quality threats identified by the MOE and additional local threats identified by the SPC;

- Development of general principles governing how various evaluation criteria will be considered and how the Region’s Water Resources Protection Master Plan will be used to guide policy development;

- Development of policy approaches for each protection area and identification of the specific risk-reduction tools to be utilized; and

- Development of detailed policy wording and format to meet provincial completeness requirements.

As part of the policy development process, Region staff has consulted with local municipal staff through the Source Water Protection Liaison Committee (formerly the Water Resources Protection Liaison Committee), and held three Public Information Sessions. In addition, presentations were made to the Kitchener-Waterloo Chamber of Commerce and Area Municipal Councils at Cambridge, Kitchener, Waterloo, Wilmot and Woolwich. Staff also met directly with numerous department managers and directors in Cambridge, Kitchener, and Waterloo to discuss the policies. Formal pre-consultation was required for all agencies with implementation responsibilities including, the Province (Environment, Natural Resources, Municipal Affairs and Housing, Transportation, Infrastructure), area municipalities, including Brantford, and the GRCA. Feedback provided through these organizations and groups were considered. As noted above, the revised SPP contains policies that were revised in response to comments by the MOECC on the proposed SPP.

While Region staff are familiar with the scope of several tools that can be used for source protection (e.g. land-use planning or education programs), the ‘Clean Water Act’ provided new tools to municipalities for prohibiting activities and requiring risk management plans to reduce the risk from threats. It also provided a tool that would trigger the prohibition or requirement for development of a risk management plan if a significant threat activity was part of a development application or building permit. Finally, the ‘Clean Water Act’ enabled policies that could direct provincial agencies responsible for issuing Environmental Compliance Approvals (formerly Certificates of
Approval) to revise the instrument to protect drinking water sources. Developing policies that utilized these new tools in the manner prescribed by provincial regulation and rules while meeting the concerns raised by stakeholders was challenging.

As presented in previous reports to Regional Council, many of the proposed policies will utilize risk management plans and prescribed instruments to manage significant threats. These tools are the only ones that can be applied to existing threats, notwithstanding incentive and education programs which can only be used in limited situations. The use of prescribed instruments puts the onus on the provincial agency responsible for issuing Environmental Compliance Approvals to protect municipal water supplies using provincial legislation. Where there are gaps in this legislation, risk management plans are proposed. It is also proposed that incentives be available to assist existing property owners to assist in implementing changes while achieving compliance with the ‘Clean Water Act’, where this does not contradict the ‘Municipal Act.’

For new/future threats, it was hoped that the ‘Planning Act’ could be used to mitigate the risk where Environmental Compliance Approvals are not available. However, the ‘Planning Act’ can only regulate land uses and the SPP must mitigate activities which in many cases are not directly linked to land uses. Accordingly, the risk management and prohibition tools are also proposed to address many of the future threats.

The largest number of threats to drinking water sources in the Region is from the application of road salt. In total, approximately 1200 parking lots have been identified where risk mitigation will be needed. The draft policies will require persons applying salt on over 500 of the large (greater than 80 parking spaces) and medium-sized (eight to 80 parking spaces) parking lots to develop risk management plans to achieve a performance standard equivalent to the Smart about Salt™ accreditation program. For the small (less than eight parking spaces) parking lots and for those further from the supply well, a combination of incentives and/or education programs will be implemented to encourage voluntary adoption. It is important to note that Region staff are recommending that salt application on large parking lots be prohibited where this activity is a new/future activity within 100 metres of a supply well where there is an existing sodium and/or chloride drinking water issue. This means that if a new large parking lot is proposed through a development or building permit application, it would have to use non-sodium and/or non-chloride based de-icing compounds. Ideally, it is hoped that new large parking lots would not be developed within 100 m of these wells because these large paved surfaces also reduce the amount of water seeping into the ground potentially affecting the capacity of the well. As this draft policy is applied to only 10 wellfields that have drinking water Issues, the potential implications are few. City of Waterloo staff has noted that this may affect some parking lots considered in their Uptown Waterloo Parking Strategy, including a proposed large parking lot within 100 metres of the William Street wells.
As for salt application on municipal roads where it has been identified as a significant threat, staff are also proposing to require risk management plans. However, as area municipalities already have existing salt management plans, the proposed risk management plans would rely largely on these existing salt management plans plus require identification and tracking of salt applications in vulnerable well head protection areas. It is envisioned that one plan would be necessary for each of the Region and for each Area Municipality. It is important to note that the intent of risk management plans related to salt application is to ensure appropriate salt application that does not undermine public safety.

Explanatory Document

In addition to the SPP, the SPC is required to approve and submit an explanatory document that provides the rationale for each policy in the SPP. Following a similar format as other municipalities in the Grand River watershed, this document provides a number of components that support the policy development including the degree of municipal consultation and support and how cost was considered in the development of the draft policies. This document also contains a more detailed list of agency comments received during pre-consultation.

As mentioned above, the Region developed a series of principles that were used to guide policy development as well as staff’s threat-specific experience and knowledge developed as part implementation of the Water Resources Protection Strategy. In addition this general rationale, regulations require additional justification in the following situations:

- where an existing activity is prohibited, the SPC must be of the opinion that the activity must be prohibited in order to ensure it ceases to be a significant drinking water threat; and
- where education is the only tool used to address a significant threat, the document must state that the SPC is of the opinion that this tool will achieve the objectives of the plan and regulation or prohibition is not necessary.

Region staff is proposing that activities such as existing below ground storage of fuel/solvents, chlorinated solvents storage, and snow storage sites be prohibited within 100 m of supply wells because of the risk posed by these threats when very close to the wells. Region staff are not aware of any of these activities occurring within 100 m of the wells. Staff is also proposing to prohibit within 100 m of a supply well, activities such as existing chlorinated solvent storage at wells with a Trichloroethylene Issue, snow storage at wells with a sodium and/or chloride Issue and application of manure, confined animal yards, and storage of manure, fertilizer and non-agricultural source material at wells with nitrate Issues. In these situations, these activities could be directly affecting the water quality of the supply well. Again, Region staff are not aware of these activities adjacent to the supply wells.
Revised Policies and Explanatory Document

As noted above, the MOE provided a number of comments on the policies for each of the chapters of the plan. The main purpose of the MOE review was to ensure the draft policies would meet the legislative requirements of the ‘Clean Water Act’, regulations, rules and related guidance. In addition, Region staff rewrote many of the policies to improve their readability particularly where there are several sub-threats and/or where different implementation approaches are proposed for different protection areas. A summary of the major changes are presented in Attachment 3.

Notwithstanding these changes, the overall intent of the policies remains the same. The following provides additional information on the more substantive changes to these policies.

- The definition of existing was clarified in response to MOECC comments. This definition is important as it sets the basis for determining whether the activity is treated as existing or future (e.g. new) particularly where new activities will be prohibited such as fuel storage within 100 m of the supply well. The revised definition includes provisions to ensure the activity continues after approval of the SPP so that the “existing” status can be maintained in subsequent SPPs.

- The policies related to Condition sites were negotiated with the MOECC and substantially changed. Condition sites are properties where there is historic contamination which has moved outside the property boundaries. While the MOECC maintains the jurisdiction to remediate these sites, the revised policies now require the MOECC and the Region to share information on these sites and requires copies of the prescribed instruments issued in relation to the contamination be provided to the Region.

- Policies to prohibit small quantities of hazardous wastes were replaced by an education and awareness policy. The MOECC does issue Environmental Compliance Approvals for these types of wastes and was concerned that prohibition policies could affect the ability of some businesses to operate. The new education and awareness policy will enable gathering of additional information on the extent to which these activities are occurring.

- Policies to require additional construction practices within 100 m of a supply well and for spill response plans for sanitary sewers in high vulnerability areas close to municipal supply wells were added to the revised plan. A reinterpretation of the technical rules resulted in the identification that policies for sanitary sewers were missing. This policy will ensure that when new sewers are constructed beside wells, extra precautions to minimize leakage and spills will be included in Environmental Compliance Approvals issued by the province.

- Policies for application of agricultural source material were modified to prohibit application within 100 m of supply wells which is already a requirement under the Nutrient Management Act. Also the area where Environmental Compliance
Approvals are to include provisions to protect municipal drinking water sources where there is a nitrate issue at the supply well was expanded.

- The area for which application of fertilizer will require a risk management plan where there is a nitrate issue at the supply well was expanded. This will apply to agricultural properties and large green spaces where fertilizer is used within the built up urban area.

- The threshold where large snow storage facilities will be prohibited and/or managed was changed. The new policies specify that where there is a sodium, chloride and/or nitrate drinking water issue, snow storage areas greater than 0.5 Ha (equivalent to a pile the size of 200 parking spots) will be prohibited and those less than 0.5 and greater than 0.05 Ha (equivalent to a pile the size of 20 parking spots) will require risk management plans.

- A policy was added to prohibit existing animal confinement yards within 100 m of a supply well and to prohibit new confinement yards within high vulnerability areas close to wells. These policies will reduce the risk that nitrate and bacteria will enter the subsurface near supply wells.

As required by legislation, where the policy intent or scope changed, the rationale for the revised policy in the Explanatory document was also changed. A specific table identifying where existing activities are to be prohibited was also included in this section. A copy of the revised policies and the Explanatory Document are presented in Attachment 4 and 5.

**Implications of the Revised Policies**

As noted above, the policies for Waterloo Region were revised in response to MOE comments. As part of the rewriting of the policies to improve clarity, a number of policy gaps were identified and new policies created. Notwithstanding these changes, Region staff relied on the original principles to design the policies that were presented in previous reports to Regional Council. Therefore the implications to the Region and to area municipalities remain the same and include the following:

- The Region will be required to administer the risk management and prohibition components of the SPP including designation of a Risk Management Official and Inspectors.

- The Region and area municipalities will be required to negotiate risk management plans, update official plans, and apply to update environmental compliance approvals for properties and activities identified as significant.

- The Region will develop and implement an incentive program to assist private property owners with the implementation of these policies. The scope and content of this program will be presented for Regional Council’s consideration in a future report.

- The Region in cooperation with the GRCA, municipalities, and stakeholders will
develop education and awareness programs for most activities to help protect municipal drinking water supplies.

As noted in report E-12-075, the costs to the Region over a ten year period starting in 2013 were estimated to be $9,400,000. Changes to the Water Services Capital Budget and 10-Year forecast as well as changes to the operating budget for additional staff were included as part of the 2013 budget process. On-going minor changes to this initial estimate have occurred in subsequent years due to delays in approval of the plan by the province, and as a result of increased understanding of the Region’s responsibilities in preparation for implementation. These were incorporated into Water Services budgets as part of the 2014 and 2015 budget processes.

As the scope of changes that may be necessary to meet the risk management plan requirements and environmental compliance approvals is not known, these costs have not yet been allocated in the appropriate departmental budgets that are responsible for the prescribed threats. Report E-12-075 provided a cost estimate for the potential costs to the Region and area municipalities and is included in Attachment XXXX.

Under the ‘Clean Water Act’, threat activities associated with Region properties include application of salt on roads and parking lots, stormwater management facilities, snow storage sites, and septic systems. Region staff has estimated costs to implement the draft policies for each threat activity. The average yearly costs to implement source protection properties for the Region are estimated to be approximately $44,000. Costs in the first year would be slightly higher to cover the initial activity or property assessment. This cost does not include cost for significant upgrades to facilities or equipment that might be identified through the initial assessment. It is assumed that the costs to implement the draft policies on Region-owned properties will be funded through the department responsible to the threat activities (e.g., Facilities, Transportation, etc.).

Attachment 3 also presents the average yearly cost to the Area Municipalities to implement the draft policies on properties they own. The yearly costs is estimated to range from zero (North Dumfries, Wellesley, and Woolwich do not own properties with Significant threats) to approximately $207,000 for Kitchener. As is discussed in Report E12-075, Region staff are proposing to not provide incentives to Area Municipalities or the GRCA to implement the draft policies on their properties. Area municipal staff are aware of the policies that may impact their properties and the associated costs.

The time frame for making any required upgrades cannot be determined until after the effective date has been announced. Region staff intend to phase in Risk Management Plans starting with properties closed to the well and with the highest risk. This should facilitate making incremental changes to base budgets as part of the annual budget approval process.
Next Steps

The GRCA will be holding public consultation meetings during the March to April 2015 consultation period. Prior to these meetings, the GRCA sent letters to individual residents that were identified as have significant activities on their properties. The two public consultation meetings in Waterloo Region are as follows:

- April 9, 2015 at WRESTRC (1001 Erb’s Road West, Waterloo) – 6:30 to 9:00 pm.
- April 15, 2015 at GRCA Auditorium (400 Clyde Road, Cambridge) – 6:30 to 9:00 pm.

Following these meetings the policies may be revised to address any comments received including any comments received during pre-consultation with the province and area municipalities. Revised policies are anticipated to be presented to the SPC in May and subsequently forwarded to the province for approval in June 2015. Approval of the SPP for the Grand River by the MOECC is anticipated by the end of 2015. As part of this process, the province will establish the effective date of the SPP which in other approved plans has been 3 to 6 months following approval.

Region staff are continuing to prepare for implementation including the design of the risk management process and review of the Regional Official Plan. As noted in previous reports, the MOECC continues to support inclusion of source protection policies in official plans in advance of requirements in the SPP.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

The preparation of the SPP contributes to the implementation of the Strategic Objective to protect the quality and quantity of our drinking water sources of Focus Area 1: Environmental Sustainability.

Financial Implications:

The approved 2015 Water Capital Budget includes $2,975,000 for ‘Clean Water Act’ Implementation and $5,190,000 for ‘Clean Water Act’ Incentives between 2015 and 2024. These items are funded from Regional Development Charges and the Water Reserve Fund.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Staff from Planning, Development and Legislative Services have been consulted in the revision of policies and as part of the on-going preparation for implementation. Staff from Transportation and Environmental Services (Transportation) and Corporate Services (Facilities) were contacted regarding potential cost implications and timing of implementation.
Attachments
Attachment 1: List of Prescribed Drinking Water Threats
Attachment 2: Technical Components of the Assessment Report
Attachment 3: Summary of Major Changes to Source Protection Policies for Waterloo Region
Attachment 4: Revised Policies for Chapter 9 (Region of Waterloo) of the Grand River Source Protection Plan – distributed separately (insert link available March 16)
Attachment 5: Revised Explanatory Document for the Region of Waterloo as part of the Grand River Source Protection Plan – distributed separately (insert link available March 16)
Attachment 6: Estimated Costs and Staffing/Workload Implications Per Threat/Site to Region of Waterloo and Area Municipalities as a Property Owner

Prepared By: Eric Hodgins, Manager Hydrogeology and Source Water

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
List of Prescribed Drinking Water Threats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Threat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Establishment, operation or maintenance of waste disposal site within the meaning of Part V of the Environmental Protection Act (EPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Establishment, operation or maintenance of a system that collects, stores, transmits, treats or disposes of sewage within the meaning of the Ontario Water Resources Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Application of agricultural source material to land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Storage of agricultural source material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Management of agricultural source material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Application of non-agricultural source material to land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Storage of non-agricultural source material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Application of commercial fertilizer to land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Storage of commercial fertilizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Application of pesticide to land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Storage of pesticide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Application of road salt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Storage of road salt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Storage of snow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Storage of fuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Storage of a dense non-aqueous phase liquid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Storage of an organic solvent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Management of runoff that contains chemicals uses in the deicing of aircraft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>An activity that takes water from an aquifer or a surface water body without returning the water taken to the same aquifer or surface water body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>An activity that reduces the recharge of an aquifer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The use of land as livestock grazing or pasturing land, an outdoor confinement area or a farm-animal yard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Technical Components of the Assessment Report

The areas in which prescribed threats are assessed and which provide the basis of the Assessment Report are described below.

For municipal supply wells, well head protection areas (WHPA) are delineated using computer based groundwater flow models and maps of aquifer vulnerability. The models are used to delineate the length of time it takes water to flow through the ground to the well (time-of-travel or TOT). Zones of 100 m radius and TOT of two years, five years and 25 years are calculated for each well. These areas are classified as WHPA-A, WHPA-B, WHPA-C, and WHPA-D respectively. In addition, the area within these WHPAs are subdivided into areas of high, medium and low vulnerability to contamination based on the depth to the water table and soil type. A vulnerability score ranging from 2 to 10 is applied to WHPAs with the higher scores applied closer to the wells and in areas of high vulnerability.

For the Region’s surface water intake on the Grand River in Kitchener, intake protection zones (IPZ) are delineated based on the travel time in surface water and the ease with which surface water runs off of the adjacent land. Three intake protection zones are delineated: a 200 m rectangle upstream of the intake (IPZ-1); a two-hour in river travel distance (IPZ-2); and the remainder of the watershed upstream of the intake (IPZ-3). These intake protection zones are scored from 1 to 10 with the higher scores representing areas of high risk.

A final WHPA-E is delineated for wells that are classified as providing groundwater under the influence of surface water. For these wells, the area representing the two-hour in river travel time is calculated and scored.

The ‘Clean Water Act' requires policies to prevent future threats from becoming significant (i.e., those that have a high threat ranking in these protection areas) and for managing existing threats so they cease to be significant. Significant threats can be identified based on the combination of threat and vulnerability scores or through the identification of drinking water issues. In the first method, the MOECC identified specific circumstances in which a threat could be significant such as the volume of a chemical storage tank. Generally, these threats can only be significant in well head and intake protection zones where the vulnerability is equal to 10 and for a few threats at vulnerabilities equal 8. Using this method, significant threats can only be delineated in the areas close to the supply wells and within IPZ-1 of the surface water intake. The second method is based on the presence of chemicals or compounds in the drinking water that are elevated and of concern to the municipality. For these wells, issue contributing areas are delineated, usually aligning with WHPA-D. In these issue contributing area, any threat that uses these chemicals is considered significant. It is in
these issue contributing areas of the Region that the majority of the threats are enumerated.
## Summary of Major Changes to Source Protection Policies for Waterloo Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Number</th>
<th>Change Made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **General**   | • Removed duplication of policies referencing applies in WHPA-A and WHPA-A where there is an issue.  
               • Added policies to ensure all existing and future threats had policies even though there were no enumerated existing threats and/or future threats were impossible due to land use, build out and/or zoning.  
               • Reformatted most threat-specific policies into existing and future circumstances and in some cases by sub-threat to improve readability.  
               • Changes wording in policies that applied in Nitrate ICAs from WHPA to ICA to address a policy gap (i.e. the ICA for some nitrate ICAs lies outside WHPAs).  
               • Changed wording in all education policies to include new threats as well as existing to address a policy gap. |
| **Definitions** | • Revised definition of existing in response to MOECC comments and added a clause requiring operation for 5 years after approval of the plan to ensure existing status will apply in a future plan.  
                 • Added term “equal to” for size of large and small parking lots. |
| 1.11 (Monitoring) | • This policy was deleted as changes required to address MOECC comments duplicated intent of policy 1.12. |
| 1.12 (Monitoring) | • Changed to address MOECC comments to be less prescriptive where requiring MOE to report: reduced scope of what was being asked and used “should” for summary report. |
| 1.15 (Pipelines) | • Changed to address MOECC comments and consistency across the Grand River plan. |
| 1.16 and 1.17 (Conditions) | • Condition policies were discussed with MOECC and revised to become mutually agreeable. |
| 1.18 (Conditions) | • Minor wording change to indicate the area municipal contaminated site protocols were to be similar to Waterloo Region’s protocol. |
| 2 (Waste) | • Removed reference to hazardous wastes defined as p,q,r,s,t,u wastes and moved them to CW-5.  
             • Moved PCB wastes to new policy CW-2.c to enable PCB destruction ECAs.  
             • Added policy application to WHPA C (vulnerability = 8) e.g. 2.a.ii for some waste categories where threats are significant to address a policy gap. |
| 3 and 4 (Waste, no ECA) | • Reformatted to explicitly list waste subcategories to mirror CW-2.  
                             • Added that some subthreats were applicable in IPZ-1, WHPA-E and IPZ-3 to address policy gaps. |
| 5 (Waste) | • Added hazardous wastes defined as p,q,r,s,t,u wastes to education policy and added that it was applicable in IPZ-1 to address a policy gap. |
| 6 to 9 (Sewage - septic) | • Removed clause to be consistent with circumstances as septic policies do not apply in IPZ-1.  
                             • Added that education policy 8.1.b.i which applies in WHPA E vulnerability... |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11 (Sewage – storage & discharge) | - Major reformatting to separate existing/future and five specific subthreats.  
- Split policy in MC-11 which is for prohibitions and MC11.1 which is for management though environmental compliance approvals.  
- Added applicability in IPZ-1 for sewage treatment plants and industrial effluent discharges to address a policy gap.  
- Identified several policy gaps and added prescribed instrument policies to address.  
- Added that policies apply for TCE issues for storage of sewage and industrial effluent discharge to address a policy gap. |
| 12 and 13 (Sewage – sanitary & combined) | - Major reformatting and reinterpretation of where policies apply.  
- Spilt into MC-12 for sanitary sewers and MC-13 for combined sewers. Sanitary sewer policies apply in WHPA A/B (vulnerability =10) and for nitrate issues (vulnerability >=6), whereas combined sewers only apply in IPZ-1 WHPA E (vulnerability >8) and IPZ-3.  
- Region staff understand there are no combined sewers.  
- Added clause to require enhance construction measures for sanitary sewers in WHPA-A. |
| 14 (Sewage – sanitary & combined) | - Narrowed where the policy applies to avoid duplication with prescribed instrument policies. |
| 15 to 20 (Sewage – stormwater) | - Removed application of policy for sodium issues since not significant for stormwater.  
- Added that policies apply in IPZ-1 to address a policy gap.  
- Separated existing from future in CW-20.b.  
- Added that policy MC-19 re. inventory of systems also applies in WHPA- A to address a policy gap. |
| 21 to 23 (ASM) | - Major reformatted to separate existing/future and three specific subthreats.  
- Added that policies apply in IPZ-1 to address a policy gap.  
- Added prohibition of ASM application in WHPA-A in CW-21.  
- Expanded the requirement for ECA revisions or RMP negotiation for storage of ASM in ICAs from vulnerability 8 to 6.  
- Added applicability in WHPA E (vulnerability = 8.1) in policies MC 22 and MC 23 even though these areas do not overlay agricultural areas.  
- Added some additional wording to explicitly identify all requirements of the Risk Management Plan for K26 in MC-23 to address a policy gap. |
| 25 (NASM) | - Major reformatting to separate existing/future and two specific subthreats.  
- Changed policy from a Section 57 prohibition to at ECA prohibition to reflect that all application of NASM occurs through ECAs. |
| 26 and 27 (NASM) | - Major reformatted policies to separate existing/future and two specific subthreats. |
- Added applicability in WHPA E (vulnerability = 8.1) even though these areas do not overlap with agricultural areas to address a policy gap.
- Added policy to require update of ECA in ICA where there is a nitrate issue to address a policy gap.

28 (Fertilizer)
- Added prohibition of existing storage of commercial fertilizer in WHPA A to address a policy gap.

29 (Fertilizer)
- Major reformatted policies to separate existing/future and two specific subthreats.
- Added policy to require RMP for handling/storage where nitrate issue in WHPA (vulnerability >=6 instead of v>=8) to address a policy gap.
- Added applicability in IPZ-1 for application to address a policy gap. Moved future application from prohibition to manage.

32 (Pesticide)
- Reformatted policies to separate existing/future and two specific subthreats.
- Added policies to be applicable in IPZ-1 and WHPA-E (vulnerability = 8.1) to address a policy gap.

34 (Salt)
- Major reformatting to separate existing/future policies.
- Renumbered MC-34 to apply to application and MC-34.1 to apply to storage and handling.
- Identified several policy gaps and added RMP policies to address.
- Clarified that uncovered/handling storage circumstance and related volume threshold only applies where wells have a sodium or chloride issue.

35 (Salt)
- Major reformatting to separate existing/future policies.
- Renumbered MC-35 to apply to application and MC-35.1 to apply to storage and handling.
- Identified several policy gaps and added RMP policies to address.
- Added policies requiring RMP for storage/handling in ICAs (vulnerability >=6) for quantities greater than 1 tonne/1000 L to address a policy gap.

36 (Salt)
- Reformatted.
- Added applicability for sodium and chloride issues in ICA (vulnerability >= 6) and WHPA-E (vulnerability >=6) to address a policy gaps.

37 (Salt)
- Reformatted.
- Added applicable in IPZ-1 to address a policy gap.

41 and 42 (Snow)
- Major reformatting to separate existing/future policies and consolidated policies for nitrate, sodium and chloride issues.
- Removed reference to area threshold where no ICA.
- Combined above ground and below ground storage policies in ICAs into a single area threshold.
- Area thresholds changed to a single value for prohibition where there are nitrate, sodium or chloride issues (>0.5Ha) in MC-41 and range of values for RMP (0.05 to 0.5) in MC-42.
- Changed area where RMP required for nitrate issue to be the same as for chloride/sodium (vulnerability >=6).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>(Fuel)</th>
<th>(DNAPL)</th>
<th>(Solvents)</th>
<th>(Aircraft De-icing)</th>
<th>(Livestock)</th>
<th>(maps)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 45   | • Major reformatting to separate existing/future policies and four subthreats.  
      • Removed reference to single family dwelling in introductory paragraph and explicitly wrote policies for fuel oil where appropriate.  
      • Removed volume references as these are dictated by the table of circumstance.  
| 46   | • Major reformatting to separate existing/future policies and four subthreats.  
      • Added specific RMP policies to apply to municipal supply generators in WHPA-A to address a policy gap.  
      • Added RMP application in several areas to address policy gaps.  
| 48   | • Made minor editorial changes including application in WHPA A and the policy applies to fuel oil in clause a, and applies to property owners rather than homeowners in clause b.  
| 50 and 51 | • Reformatted policies to separate existing/future and handling/storage.  
       • Clarified that policies in TCE ICAs only applies for compounds associated with TCE.  
       • Clarified applicability of policies where RMPS will be required for no issue (vulnerability >=8) and for TCE issue (vulnerability>=6).  
| 54 and 55 | • Reformatted policies to separate existing/future and handling/storage.  
       • Create new policy MC-55.1 to address a policy gap for incentive policy for solvents.  
| 56   | • Reworded policy to specify that RMPS was required for existing activity in areas where it is significant in accordance with the table of circumstances.  
| 57 and 58 | • Reformatted policies to separate existing/future and two subthreats.  
       • Added policy to prohibit existing confinement yards in WHPA-A to address a policy gap.  
       • Reduced prohibition of new confinement yards to WHPA-A but expanded in the WHPA-B (vulnerability >=10) where there is a nitrate issue.  
       • Added requirement for RMP for confinement yards where nitrate ICA WHPA-E (vulnerability >=6) and in IPZ-1.  
       • Added requirement for RMP for grazing in nitrate ICA (vulnerability >= 8) and applicable in WHPA E (vulnerability >= 8) to address a policy gap.  
| 60   | • Added applicability in WHPA-E (vulnerability =8.1) to address a policy gap.  
| Schedule A – L | • Reformatted maps identifying where policies applied to improve readability.  
      | (maps) |
Revised Policies for Chapter 9 (Region of Waterloo) of the Grand River Source Protection Plan – Please use the link below to access the document.

http://www.sourcewater.ca/index/document.cfm?Sec=7&Sub1=11
Revised Explanatory Document for the Region of Waterloo as part of the Grand River Source Protection Plan – Please use the link below to access the document.

http://www.sourcewater.ca/index/document.cfm?Sec=7&Sub1=11
Estimated Costs and Staffing/Workload Implications Per Threat/Site to Region of Waterloo and Area Municipalities as a Property Owner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Threat</th>
<th>Estimated Cost per Site (Initial)</th>
<th>Estimated Cost per Site (Annual)</th>
<th>Staffing and/or Workload Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salt Application (parking lots)</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>One time change to Contracts; negotiating Risk Management Plans; winter tracking; annual reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Application (roads)</td>
<td>$30,000*</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Consultant contracts for program review; winter tracking; annual reporting$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management Ponds (with well)</td>
<td>$25,000**</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>Negotiating new Environmental Compliance Approvals; water quality sampling contracts; annual reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management Ponds (no well)</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>Negotiating new Environmental Compliance Approvals; water quality sampling contracts; annual reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow Storage</td>
<td>$30,000**</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>Consultant contracts for program review; winter tracking; annual reporting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

* Excludes cost to retrofit trucks with advanced spreading and/or automatic vehicular locator equipment, which is assumed to be included in existing salt management strategies

** Includes cost to install one groundwater monitoring well

*** Excludes costs to upgrade facility based on initial site review
### Estimated Average Yearly Costs Over Ten Years to Region of Waterloo and Area Municipalities as a Property Owner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>RMOW</th>
<th>Cambridge</th>
<th>Kitchener</th>
<th>Waterloo</th>
<th>Wilmot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Sites</td>
<td>No. of Sites</td>
<td>No. of Sites</td>
<td>No. of Sites</td>
<td>No. of Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Application (parking lots)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Application (roads)*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management Ponds (with well)**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management Ponds (no well)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow Storage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Average Yearly Cost</strong></td>
<td>$43,950</td>
<td>$185,700</td>
<td>$206,950</td>
<td>$113,750</td>
<td>$38,950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One Risk Management Plan will be developed for each municipality regardless of the number of roads that are identified as a Significant Threat

**Assumed only one in five ponds will require groundwater monitoring as most ponds are not designed to infiltrate groundwater
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting date</th>
<th>Requestor</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Assigned Department</th>
<th>Anticipated Response Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**COUNCIL ENQUIRIES AND REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION**  
**PLANNING AND WORKS COMMITTEE**