Regional Municipality of Waterloo

Planning and Works Committee

Consolidated Agenda

Tuesday, May 26, 2015

9:00 a.m.

Regional Council Chamber

150 Frederick Street, Kitchener, ON

*Denotes Item(s) Not Part of Original Agenda

1. **Motion To Go Into Closed Session**

   That a closed meeting of Planning and Works and Administration and Finance Committees be held on Tuesday, May 26, 2015 at 8:30 a.m. in the Waterloo County Room in accordance with Section 239 of the Municipal Act, 2001, for the purposes of considering the following subject matters:

   a) potential litigation and receiving of advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege related to a legal matter

   b) potential litigation and receiving of advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege related to a matter before an administrative tribunal

   c) personal matters about identifiable individuals related to committee appointments

2. **Motion to Reconvene Into Open Session**

3. **Declarations Of Pecuniary Interest Under The Municipal Conflict Of Interest Act**

4. **Delegations**
a) **TES-TRS-15-09**, Recommended 2015 Grand River Transit Service Improvement Plan

   i. Mary Ann Wasilka
   
   ii. Peter McAllister

* iii. Mark Jackson-Brown

* iv. Tim Mollison

**Recommendation: See Agenda pages 9 and 10**

b) **TES-WMS-15-06**, Curbside Service Levels - Next Waste Collection Contract

   i. Mary Ann Wasilka

* ii. Uwe Kretschmann

* iii. Chuck Kruse

**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the following residential curbside collection service levels for the next waste collection contract, commencing March 6, 2017:

a) **Bi-Weekly Garbage Collection (new standard)**

   Four garbage bag/container limit per bi-weekly collection (**new standard**);

   Unlimited weekly blue box and green bin collection (**new standard or service in some rural Township areas**);

   Bi-weekly yard waste collection (April to November); (**new service in some rural Township areas**);

   Bi-weekly appliance and bulky item pick-up, three item limit (**new standard**); and

   Existing special and downtown business services.

b) Approve, in principle, a garbage bag/container tag program to accommodate garbage bag/container set-out beyond the four bag/container limit, and direct staff to report back to Council in the spring of 2016 with a detailed plan on implementing a bag/container tag program, including an exemption program for
special circumstances; and

c) Reduce the garbage bag/container limit to three bags per bi-weekly collection period within the first two years of the new waste collection contract.

c) **PDL-CPL-15-32**, Blue Dot Declaration (For Direction)

   i. Jim Marston, Co-organizer of the Waterloo Region Blue Dot Movement

* d) **PDL-CPL-15-30**, Regional Road #58 (Fischer-Hallman Road) Traffic Operations at Proposed West Oak Trail Drive North of Huron Road, City of Kitchener

   i. Chris Pidgeon, GSP Group

**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve right-in, right-out only traffic movements from West Oak Trail Drive onto Regional Road #58 (Fischer-Hallman Road) North of Huron Road, City of Kitchener as described in Report No. PDL-CPL-15-30, dated May 26, 2015.


   i. Bill Green, Waterloo Region Home Builder’s Association

**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo forward Report No. PDL-CPL-15-31, dated May 26, 2015, to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing as Regional Council’s formal response to the first stage of the Province’s co-ordinated review of the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, the Green Belt Plan, the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan and the Niagara Escarpment Plan.

5. **Presentation**

   a) **TES-TRP-15-10**, New Highway 7 Construction Activity for 2015 presentation by Robert Bakalarczyk, Ministry of Transportation (Information)

   b) New EasyGO Real-Time Desktop Map and Mobile App presentation by Sandy Roberts and Shelly-Ann Rusu, Transit Services

   c) Waste Management’s New Green Bin Promotion Video, the Mommy
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.

6. Request to Remove Items from Consent Agenda

7. Motion to Approve Items or Receive for Information

f) Erb Street Improvements - Fischer-Hallman Road to Wilmot Line, City of Waterloo - Information Package in Advance of Public Consultation Centre No. 1 (Information)

g) Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street Improvements, Township of North Dumfries- Information Package in Advance of Public Consultation Centre No. 2 (Information)

h) Fountain Street Improvements, Blair Road to East of Preston Parkway, City of Cambridge - Information Package in Advance of Public Consultation Centre No. 1 (Information)


Recommendation:


j) PDL-CPL-15-29, Amendment to Regional Municipality of Waterloo Controlled Access By-Law #58-87 for Access to Regional Road #33 (Townline Road), City of Cambridge

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve an amendment to Controlled Access By-law #58-87 for an access on the west side of Regional Road #33 (Townline Road), approximately 328 metres south of Saginaw Parkway in the City of Cambridge, as describe in Report No. PDL-CPL-15-29, dated May 26, 2015.

**Recommendation:**


---

**Regular Agenda Resumes**

8. **Reports – Transportation and Environmental Services**

**Rapid Transit**

a) **TES-RTS-15-06**, Recommended ION LRT Stop Names

**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the ION LRT stop names as outlined in Report TES-RTS-15-06, dated May 26, 2015.

**Transportation**

b) **TES-TRP-15-05**, Consideration of Traffic Control Signals at the Intersection of Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10) and Lobsinger Line (Regional Road 15), in the Township of Wellesley

**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo maintain the current 2-way stop control at the Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10)/Lobsinger Line (Regional Road 15) intersection, in the Township of Wellesley, as outlined in Report TES-TRP-15-05, dated May 26, 2015.

c) **TES-TRP-15-09**, Homer Watson Boulevard (Regional Road 28) and Block Line Road Roundabout Operational Review (Information)

Recommendation:

That the Region of Waterloo adopts the recommended bike-box installation criteria as outlined in Report TES-TRP-15-11, dated May 26, 2015.

Water Services

e) TES-WAS-15-14, Conestogo Plains Water Supply Class Environmental Assessment: Notice of Completion

Recommendation:


And that the Regional Municipality of Waterloo publish the Notice of Completion for the EA and provide the Environmental Study Report for public review and comment for a 30-day period, in accordance with the Municipal Engineers Association’s Class Environmental Assessment process

9. Information/Correspondence

a) Council Enquiries and Requests for Information Tracking List

10. Other Business


12. Adjourn
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 16, 2015</td>
<td>9:00 A.M.</td>
<td>Planning and Works Committee</td>
<td>Council Chamber&lt;br&gt;2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Floor, Regional Administration Building&lt;br&gt;150 Frederick Street&lt;br&gt;Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 11, 2015</td>
<td>1:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Planning and Works Committee</td>
<td>Council Chamber&lt;br&gt;2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Floor, Regional Administration Building&lt;br&gt;150 Frederick Street&lt;br&gt;Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thur., May 28, 2015</td>
<td>4:30 P.M. – 8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Erb Street Improvements - Fischer-Hallman Road to Wilmot Line, City of Waterloo - Public Consultation Centre No. 1</td>
<td>Kitchener-Waterloo Bilingual School&lt;br&gt;600 Erb Street West&lt;br&gt;Waterloo, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon., June 8, 2015</td>
<td>4:00 P.M. – 7:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street Improvements, Township of North Dumfries - Public Consultation Centre No. 2</td>
<td>North Dumfries Community Complex&lt;br&gt;2958 Greenfield Road&lt;br&gt;Ayr, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue., June 16, 2015</td>
<td>4:30 P.M. – 7:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Fountain Street Improvements, Blair Road to Preston Parkway, City of Cambridge - Public Consultation Centre No. 1</td>
<td>Four Points by Sheraton&lt;br&gt;210 Preston Parkway&lt;br&gt;Cambridge, Ontario</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: May 26, 2015

File Code: D28-50(A)

Subject: Recommended 2015 Grand River Transit Service Improvement Plan

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the following transit service improvements to be implemented effective Monday, September 7, 2015, as described in Report No. TES-TRS-15-09, dated May 26, 2015:

a) New 204 Highland-Victoria iXpress – would provide limited-stop service between The Boardwalk and the Ottawa Street and Lackner Boulevard intersection, via Highland Road West and Victoria Street North. Service would be provided every 15 minutes during the day on weekdays, with 30-minute evening and weekend service.

b) New Route 1 Queen-River – would provide an east-west crosstown route between The Boardwalk and Fairview Park Mall, via Downtown Kitchener. Direct service would be provided along Ira Needles Boulevard, Queens Boulevard, Krug Street, River Road and Fairway Road. Service would be provided every 15 minutes during weekday peak periods, with 30-minute service during other periods, including weekends.

c) New Route 2 Forest Heights – would provide service between Downtown Kitchener and the Forest Heights and Forest Hill neighbourhoods, with service to Highland Hills Mall. Two-way service would be provided on Westheights Drive, Greenbrook Drive, Stirling Avenue South and Highland Road East. Service would be provided every 30 minutes, Monday to Saturday.

d) New Route 20 Victoria-Frederick – would provide an east-west crosstown route between The Boardwalk and Stanley Park Mall, via Downtown Kitchener. Direct
service would be provided along Victoria Street South and Frederick Street, every 15 minutes during weekday peak periods, with 30-minute service during other periods, including weekends.

e) New Route 23 Idlewood service through the Lackner Woods neighbourhood, with service travelling between Fairview Park Mall and Stanley Park Mall via Fairway Road North, Zeller Drive, Oldfield Drive, Ottawa Street North, and Holborn Drive. Service would be provided every 30 minutes, Monday to Saturday.

f) New Route 34 Bingemans to serve the employment area along Wellington Street North, Shirley Avenue, Bingemans Centre Drive and Centennial Road. Service would be provided every 30 minutes during weekday rush hour periods, with one late-night run.

g) Realign the 7B branch of Route 7 Mainline along Weber Street East between Kinzie Avenue and Fairway Road North, to provide more direct travel between Downtown Kitchener and Fairview Park Mall.

h) Operate the Route 8 Franklin branch via Weber Street East between Borden Avenue and Frederick Street at all times, including evenings and Sundays, to provide more consistent and direct travel between Downtown Kitchener and Fairview Park Mall.

i) New Sunday service on Route 22 Laurentian West between Highland Hills Mall and Forest Glen Plaza, from approximately 10 a.m. to 6:30 p.m., every 60 minutes.

j) New 201 iXpress stop at Fischer-Hallman Boulevard and Queen’s Boulevard, to allow transfers between Route 1 Queen-River, Route 2 Forest Heights, and the 201 iXpress.

k) Additional 200 iXpress stop at Parkside Drive and Northfield Drive, to build ridership patterns for ION and improve access to transit in the North Waterloo Industrial Park.

l) Improve the service frequency of Route 27 Chicopee on weekday evenings and weekends from every 60 minutes to every 30 minutes.

Summary:

The Council-approved Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) establishes long-term transit modal share and ridership targets to be achieved through the implementation of ION rapid transit and an integrated bus network based on a series of limited-stop express bus (iXpress) corridors. In order to implement the RTMP, the approved Grand River Transit (GRT) Business Plan details annual service improvement
priorities based on implementation of an iXpress corridor and associated local route restructuring every second year.

Accordingly, the recommended 2015 Transit Service Improvement Plan includes a new crosstown iXpress service along the Highland Road West and Victoria Street North corridors, along with streamlining of local routes in west and east Kitchener and minor changes to Routes 7 and 8 in the Central Transit Corridor (CTC), as shown in Attachment A.

Additional transit improvements for 2015 that are not part of the service improvement plan include the implementation of ION aBRT improvements between Ainslie Street Terminal in Cambridge and Fairview Park Mall in Kitchener, and new weekend service on the 203 Maple Grove iXpress in Cambridge.

Feedback from public meetings held in November 2014 and April 2015, steering and external committees, and comments submitted directly to GRT through various media were considered by staff and used to finalize the recommended service improvement plan. From both the November and April consultation periods, comments were received from almost 1,000 respondents. Feedback was largely supportive; however, there was some concern about increased walk distance to access transit in several neighbourhoods, due to streamlining of routes. Key issues from public feedback received in April 2015 are summarized in Attachment B.

This report details the final recommendations for the 2015 Transit Service Improvement Plan, and summarizes feedback from the April 2015 Public Information Centres (PICs). If approved by Regional Council, the 2015 Transit Service Improvement Plan would be implemented on September 7, 2015.

Report:

The RTMP recommends increased investment in transit in the Region, and to integrate bus service with ION rapid transit to achieve increased transit ridership targets. The GRT Business Plan established priorities for service improvements that included: implementing iXpress corridors, improving frequency and hours of service, and extending service to developing areas.

Subject to Regional Council approval, transit service improvements recommended for September 2015 include a new east-west iXpress corridor in Kitchener along Highland Road West and Victoria Street North, along with streamlining of local routes in west and east Kitchener and minor changes to routes in the CTC.

Public Consultation

In addition to the Public Consultation Centres in November 2014, three PICs were held throughout Kitchener in April 2015 to present the preferred service improvement plan to
the public and gather feedback to inform the development of a final service improvement plan. PICs were well-attended, with over 200 individuals registering at the three meetings, and over 270 comments were received through various means. After a review of the public comments, key issues were addressed by fine-tuning the preferred plan. The key issues from public feedback (determined by the number of comments received) are summarized by route in Attachment B. Comments were largely positive; however, there was some concern about increased walk distance to access transit due to streamlining of routes and specific stop locations.

**Recommended 2015 GRT Service Improvement Plan**

The 2015 Transit Service Improvement Plan was developed to expand the iXpress bus network, provide more direct transit service to major destinations throughout the region, and integrate GRT bus routes with ION light rail. These changes are displayed in Attachment A, and described in detail below:

a) New 204 Highland-Victoria iXpress – would provide limited-stop service between The Boardwalk and the Ottawa Street and Lackner Boulevard intersection, via the Highland Road West and Victoria Street North corridors. Service would be provided every 15 minutes during the day on weekdays, with 30-minute evening and weekend service.

b) New Route 1 Queen-River replaces existing Route 1 Stanley Park, Route 17 Heritage Park and Route 25 Queen South, and would provide an east-west crosstown route between The Boardwalk and Fairview Park Mall via Downtown Kitchener. Direct service would be provided along Ira Needles Boulevard, Queens Boulevard, Krug Street, River Road and Fairway Road. Service would be provided every 15 minutes during weekday peak periods, with 30-minute service during other periods, including weekends.

c) New Route 2 Forest Heights replaces existing Route 2 Forest Hill and Route 24 Highland, and would provide service between Downtown Kitchener and the Forest Heights and Forest Hill neighbourhoods, with service to Highland Hills Mall. Two-way service would be provided on Westheights Drive, Greenbrook Drive, Stirling Avenue South and Highland Road East. Service would be provided every 30 minutes, Monday to Saturday.

d) New Route 20 Victoria-Frederick replaces existing Route 15 Frederick, Route 19 Victoria South and Route 20 Victoria Hills, and would provide an east-west crosstown route between The Boardwalk and Stanley Park Mall via Downtown Kitchener. Direct service would be provided along Victoria Street South and Frederick Street, every 15 minutes during weekday peak periods with 30-minute service during other periods, including weekends.
e) New Route 23 Idlewood service through the Lackner Woods neighbourhood, with service travelling between Fairview Park Mall and Stanley Park Mall via Fairway Road North, Zeller Drive, Oldfield Drive, Ottawa Street North, and Holborn Drive. Service would be provided every 30 minutes, Monday to Saturday.

f) New Route 34 Bingemans to serve the employment area along Wellington Street North, Shirley Avenue, Bingemans Centre Drive and Centennial Road. Service would be provided every 30 minutes during weekday rush hour periods, with one late-night run.

g) Realign the 7B branch of Route 7 Mainline along Weber Street East between Kinzie Avenue and Fairway Road North, to provide more direct travel between Downtown Kitchener and Fairview Park Mall. Other Route 7 branches and service levels would remain unchanged.

h) Operate the Route 8 Franklin branch via Weber Street East between Borden Avenue and Frederick Street at all times, including evenings and Sundays, to provide more consistent and direct travel between Downtown Kitchener and Fairview Park Mall. Other branches and service levels would remain unchanged.

i) New Sunday service on Route 22 Laurentian West between Highland Hills Mall and Forest Glen Plaza, from approximately 10 a.m. to 6:30 p.m., every 60 minutes.

j) New 201 iXpress stop at Fischer-Hallman Boulevard and Queen’s Boulevard, to allow transfers between Route 1 Queen-River, Route 2 Forest Heights, and the 201 iXpress.

k) Additional 200 iXpress stop at Parkside Drive and Northfield Drive, to build ridership patterns for ION and improve transit access to the North Waterloo Industrial Park.

l) Improve the service frequency of Route 27 Chicopee on weekday evenings and weekends from every 60 minutes to every 30 minutes.

Based upon staff analysis of feedback following the November public consultation centres, staff made a number of revisions which are outlined in more detail in Report TES-TRS-15-10. Revisions included:

- Adjusting Route 1 Queen-River to travel along Thaler Avenue;
- Adjusting Route 20 Victoria-Frederick to continue service to Stanley Park Mall;
- Adjusting Route 2 Forest Heights to travel along Highland Road East to Queen Street and come off of Mill Street and Stirling Avenue;
- Adding some additional 204 iXpress stops;
• Deferral of the Central Transit Corridor Service Improvements – significant detours are occurring on the Route 7 & 200 iXpress during the next few years as a result of ION construction; deferral will avoid further customer confusion and provide more time to evaluate possible route adjustments around the University of Waterloo;
• Deferral of the partial implementation of the 205 iXpress on Ottawa Street until the whole route can be implemented in 2017.

Notable changes or features of the recommended plan which address public feedback received in April 2015 include:

• An additional 204 iXpress stop on Ottawa Street North, to improve connections to the revised Route 23 Idlewood;
• Shifting the proposed alignment of Route 23 Idlewood near Stanley Park Mall, to improve transfers between routes by reducing the walk between stops and continue to provide service along Holborn Drive;
• Additional 200 iXpress stop at Parkside Drive and Northfield Drive, to build ridership patterns for ION and improve transit access to North Waterloo Industrial Park.

Additional transit improvements for 2015 that are not part of the service improvement plan include the implementation of ION aBRT improvements between Ainslie Street Terminal in Cambridge and Fairview Park Mall in Kitchener, and new weekend service on the 203 Maple Grove iXpress in Cambridge. Both of these projects are funded through other sources, and have been presented to Council in previous reports. The aBRT stations are part of the ION project, and will be opened over the next few months. The additional service on the 203 iXpress is part of the Transit Supportive Strategy for Cambridge. This strategy also includes initiatives such as pedestrian enhancements at the Ainslie Street Transit Terminal and continuing the Conestoga College transit pass discount. Weekend service on the 203 iXpress will also allow for consistent service on Route 51 in the Hespeler area, including weekend service on Queen Street West.

Measures to Address Increased Walk Distance to Transit

Staff are currently reviewing measures to improve access to transit where walk distances would increase as a result of streamlining routes to provide more direct service. In addition to the issues noted below, staff will work towards upgrading bus stops or relocating shelters to bus stops which will serve as the closest alternative to streamlined or realigned service.
Route 20

Some concerns have been expressed by residents about the walk distance to transit created by the proposed elimination of the Route 20 loop along Hazelglen Drive and Ingleside Drive (see Attachment C). Elimination of the loop had originally been considered in 2011; however, following Council direction, the proposal for this change was deferred until after the walkway between Hazelglen Drive and Fischer-Hallman Road was made fully accessible, so all potential riders could access the 201 iXpress on Fischer-Hallman Road.

In 2012, the existing staircase was replaced by an accessible ramp. Staff reviewed the area again in November 2014, and are pursuing some additional improvements to the visibility of the walkway from both adjacent roadways, by increasing the transparency of the existing noise wall and adding pedestrian-oriented lighting.

Staff are working with a contractor and City of Kitchener staff to evaluate adjustment options for the existing noise wall and explore pedestrian lighting options, including a cost-sharing agreement for both initiatives.

Route 2

To reduce the walk distance to transit for residents in the Southmoor/Avalon area (see Attachment D), a feasibility study has been completed for an active transportation bridge across Highway 7/8 near Chandler Drive. This link would connect residents of the area not only to GRT service on Chandler Drive, which provides service to Downtown and Forest Glen Plaza, but also to the Laurentian Power Centre and commercial area at Ottawa Street South and Strasburg Road. It would also improve the active transportation network in this part of Kitchener, which is currently disjointed. This project will have to be planned in coordination with the Ministry of Transportation (MTO), and an environmental assessment may need to be undertaken to establish the need, identify and evaluate alternative options, and recommend a preferred solution. Further development of this initiative will be the subject of a future report to the Planning & Works Committee.

175 Queen Street North

Concerns were expressed from residents along Queen Street North due to the proposed removal of Route 15 Frederick from this section of Queen Street (see Attachment D). Seniors would be required to walk a greater distance to service at Queen Street and Margaret Avenue, or along Victoria Street or Frederick Street. Options were reviewed; however, the current proposal is still recommended as it provides better overall service, avoids route duplication, avoids out of direction of travel for a large number of other customers, and avoids an operationally difficult turn from Queen St North to Lancaster Street West.
In order to assist the residents at 175 Queen Street North as well as other customers in the vicinity, a 204 iXpress stop is proposed to be added at Victoria Street and Lancaster Street West. This will place them within a 270m walk of the iXpress service.

**Next Steps**

Regional staff will continue to work with City of Kitchener staff regarding the addition of pedestrian-oriented lighting for the walkway to Hazelglen Drive, and on improvements to the existing noise wall.

Regional staff will also work with MTO staff to determine the feasibility of the pedestrian overpass between Avalon Place and Chandler Drive.

Staff will also review possible improvements to bus stops (i.e., adding pads and/or shelters) where customers face a longer walk to access service, to improve customer convenience.

If the service improvements recommended in this report are approved by Regional Council, the service improvements would begin on Monday, September 7, 2015. In order to effectively launch the changes, a number of marketing measures would take place. These include:

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

Implementing the service changes would also require adjustments to bus stop locations, development of iXpress stations, final scheduling of routes, hiring of additional operators, and changing bus stop markers, among other tasks.

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

**Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination:**

A Steering Committee for the 2015 Transit Service Improvement Plan was appointed following municipal elections on October 27, 2014. It was composed of Regional Councillor Geoff Lorentz, City of Kitchener Councillors Zyg Janecki and Sarah Marsh, a staff representative from Transportation Planning at the City of Kitchener, and Regional staff.
All Area Municipalities have been circulated material related to the service improvement proposals, and will be circulated with this report.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

The recommended 2015 Transit Service Improvement Plan supports the implementation of Council’s Strategic Focus, identified under Focus Area 3 – Sustainable Transportation: Develop greater, more sustainable and safe transportation choices. The plan will contribute to Strategic Objective 3.1.2.: Expand the bus network and begin to integrate it with the future Light Rail Transit System.

**Financial Implications:**

Annualized operating costs associated with the recommended 2015 service improvements are approximately $2,224,000. These costs were approved during the 2015 budget process to be funded from the RTMP Reserve Fund.

Costs that may be associated with walkway improvements on Route 20 would be financed from the existing GRT capital budget (Project 66041 - Transit Infrastructure Improvements), as required.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Staff from Planning, Development and Legislative Services and Transportation and Environmental Services worked together to develop the recommended service improvement plan.

**Attachments:**

Attachment A – Recommended 2015 Transit Service Improvement Plan Map
Attachment B – Summary of Public Consultation
Attachment C – Walkshed Map of Transit Service in Hazelglen/Ingleside Area
Attachment D – Walkshed Map of Transit Service in the Southmoor/Avalon Area
Attachment E – Walkshed Map of Transit Service in the Queen Street North Area

**Prepared By:** Eric Pisani, Principal Planner, Transit Development

**Approved By:** Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Attachment A – Recommended 2015 Transit Service Improvement Plan Map
Attachment B – Summary of Public Consultation

Public feedback used to develop the recommended 2015 Transit Service Improvement Plan was collected through several means, including:

- Initial Public Consultation Centres (PCCs) held in November 2014, which displayed various transit service improvement options;
- Direct meetings with the U-PASS Working Group and the Grand River Accessibility Advisory Committee (GRAAC);
- Additional Public Information Centres (PICs) held on April 15, 16, and 22 in 2015, which presented a preferred 2015 Transit Service Improvement Plan;
- Online surveys posted on the www.grt.ca website;
- Emails, telephone calls, and petitions received from the public; and,
- Comments posted to GRT social media sites such as Twitter and Facebook.

Summary of Feedback from April PICs

1. Feedback Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th># of Respondents¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iSurvey (paper forms, online forms, phone, fax, mail)</td>
<td>256²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Issue Forms</td>
<td>11²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>10²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES
1 – As of May 2015 when comment period closed
2 – Recognizable duplicates and ‘no responses’ removed

2. Overview of Key Issues by Route

204 Highland-Victoria iXpress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Issues</th>
<th>Number of Comments Received</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support for Implementation</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Comments noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[28] - General support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6] - Faster, more direct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[5] - Additional stops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Stop Requests</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[7] - Queen/Courtland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[6] - Ottawa/Oldfield or Shaftsbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[2] - Lackner/Lorraine or Lackner/Banbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Routing Changes</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>[13] - Continue to Stanley Park Mall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[4] - Extend along Ottawa Street/combine with 205 iXpress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[2] - Service to Breslau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[6] - Decrease # of stops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[3] - Victoria Street needs sidewalk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Route 1 Queen-River

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Issues</th>
<th>Number of Comments Received</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Routing Changes</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Thaler will get two-way service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[50] – Provide two-way service from Stanley Park Mall to Thaler Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>Highway Centre will be accessed via other routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[49] - Access to Highway Centre and Fairway Plaza</td>
<td></td>
<td>Holborn will be served by Route 23 Idlewood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] - Go down Holborn Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop Requests</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Requests noted and will be reviewed during final stop adjustment analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[57] - Thaler Avenue (both sides)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Route 2 Forest Heights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Issues</th>
<th>Number of Comments Received</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Support for Implementation</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Comments noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[16] - General support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] - Routing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] - Saturday service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> Routing Changes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Southmoor service extension difficult to provide within schedule, and is a major deviation for through-riders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] - Keep extension to Southmoor and Avalon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Milk is often impassable in winter due to snow issues, so the new routing provides consistency year-round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] - Keep route along Mill Street and Spadina Road East</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yellow Birch is within walk distance of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] - Operate along Yellow Birch Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> Scheduling</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Request noted for future improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] - Add Sunday service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Stop Requests

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional time to do this is not available in the schedule; Highland Hills Mall is accessible from Queens Boulevard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Route 7 Mainline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Issues</th>
<th>Number of Comments Received</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Support for Implementation</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Comments noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[21] - General support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[10] - Faster, more direct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> Routing Changes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Comments noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[8] - Service Thaler/Kinzie area instead of Route 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6] - Against realignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] - Further simplify route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> Miscellaneous</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Comments noted; Route 7 restructuring to occur when ION is operating in 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5] - Don’t postpone other Route 7 restructuring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] - Don’t use letters for the branches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] - Weber Street should have its own continuous, direct route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Route 8 University/Fairview Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Issues</th>
<th>Number of Comments Received</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Support for Implementation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Comments noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[13] - General support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] - Consistent routing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Routing Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>Routing Changes</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>Comments noted; Route 8 will be reviewed for changes in 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>- Go on East Avenue/service the Aud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Service Thaler Avenue area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Connect to Stanley Park area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Extend across Highway 8/service Kingsway Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Keep old route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scheduling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>Scheduling</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Comments noted; Route 8 will be reviewed for changes in 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increase frequency, especially during evenings and Sundays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Route 20 Victoria-Frederick

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Issues</th>
<th>Number of Comments Received</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support for Implementation</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Comments noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[16] - General support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[12] - Routing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] - Sunday service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Routing Changes                                  | 32                          | Downtown routing being reviewed to provide connections to other routes. Routing will be affected and limited by ION construction detours |
| [11] - Go into Charles Street Terminal           |                             | Hazelglen walkway improvements being pursued                                  |
| [9] - Keep Hazelglen/Ingleside loop              |                             | Lackner/Ottawa serviced via other routes                                       |
| [4] - Service Lackner/Ottawa intersection        |                             | Bankside serviced by 204 iXpress, with a higher overall                        |
| [3] - Keep Route 19/stop on Bankside Drive       |                             |                                                                                |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th></th>
<th>level of service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>[2] - Better explain transfer routes if no connection is made to Charles Street Terminal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Communications issues noted and will be implemented to assist customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[2] - Operate as a continuous route on Queen/Highland/Victoria/Frederick corridors; don’t “criss-cross”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Criss-crossing based on analysis of highest demands and access to more of the downtown area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[2] - Property values will go down</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[2] - Connect Stoke Drive to Hazelglen Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stop Requests</th>
<th></th>
<th>Requests noted and will be reviewed during final stop adjustment analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>[3] - Lorraine/Heritage</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[2] - Kitchener Public Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Route 23 Idlewood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Top Issues</th>
<th>Number of Comments Received</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Support for Implementation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Comments noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[5] - Routing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Routing Changes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Service to Charles Street provided via other routes; cost prohibitive to also extend Route 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[6] - Extend to Charles Street Terminal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[5] - Keep old route (gap in Idlewood area)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Scheduling</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Noted for future improvements; budget does not allow for this in current year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Stop Requests</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Stops for connections to 204 iXpress are being reviewed; the portion of Lackner Boulevard south of Ottawa Street cannot be served in order to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[3] - Connection to 204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
iXpress
[2] - Keep Lackner Boulevard stops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route 34 Shirley-Bingemans Centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top Issues</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[24] - General support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] - Faster, more direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] - Routing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9] - Off-peak service for Bingemans (specifically in summer or on weekends for shows)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routing changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] - Extension to Breslau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Comments on Preferred Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Issues</th>
<th>Number of Comments Received</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support for Implementation</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Comments noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[15] - General support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] - Grid-like, legible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] - Concerns are being heard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routing Changes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Comments noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] - More service on Ottawa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Issues</td>
<td>Number of Comments Received</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Notice provided via various means, with 7 public meetings in total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>[8] - General support</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Routing Changes</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Comments noted; adjustments are being made where it provides the most benefit for the most customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Other Comments/Suggestions/Ideas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Issues</th>
<th>Number of Comments Received</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Routing Changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[51] - Ensure seniors can access grocery stores and various appointments</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments noted for future service planning reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] - Provide continuous Ottawa Street service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] - Extend service to Mattamy development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] - Extend service to Breslau/Regional Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] - Extend 201 iXpress to connect Forest Glen Plaza to Fairview park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5] - Add sidewalks and shelters where missing</td>
<td></td>
<td>There are ongoing programs for adding sidewalks and shelters; additions will be made where feasible as soon as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] - Better signage, maps, route names, and wayfinding strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments noted; staff are reviewing naming conventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] - Some drivers lack good customer service</td>
<td></td>
<td>Specific complaints are deal with on an as-needed basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] – Real-time displays on all routes</td>
<td></td>
<td>The cost is prohibitive, so implementation is on a limited basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scheduling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[11] - Improved service or higher frequency on Routes 9, 10, 12, 13, 16, 22, 33, 200</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments noted; staff continually review levels of service and route performance to make adjustments as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6] - Improved connections and timing on all routes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[7] - General support</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[5] - Drivers are good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment C – Walkshed Map of Transit Service in Hazelglen/Ingleside Area
Attachment D – Walkshed Map of Transit Service in the Southmoor/Avalon Area
Attachment E – Walkshed Map of Transit Service in the Queen Street North Area

Legend:
- Proposed Local Walkshed
- Proposed Express Walkshed
- New Sunday service
- More frequent service

Proposed Removal of Service From Queen St. North Above Margaret Ave.

Additional 34km

Additional 31km

1.75 Queen St N

Walk from 75 Queen

Walk from 204 King

Note: Stop locations may be slightly adjusted as the new routes are implemented.

Walkshed from 75 Queen

Walkshed from 204 King

Walkshed from 1.75 Queen North Above Margaret Ave.
PLEASE HELP

STOP TRANSIT CUTS

ON MAY 26TH/2105 - GRAND RIVER TRANSIT WILL RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CUT ROUTE 15 SERVICE ON QUEEN STREET AS PART OF STREAMLINING PUBLIC BUS SERVICES. THIS WILL INCREASE THE DISTANCE TO WALK ON SEVERAL ROUTES OR CUT SERVICE. (ROUTE 15)

Please email or call: to stop the transit cuts

Jeff Lorentz  glorentz@regionofwaterloo.ca  519-575-4404 x3413 regional rep.
GRT service improvement.
Karen Redman  Kredman@regionofwaterloo.ca  519 570 3838
Berry Vrbanovic  bvrbanovic@regionofwaterloo.ca  519-575-4404 x3403
Tom Galloway  Tgalloway@regionofwaterloo.ca  519-575-4404 x3401.
Wayne Wettlaufer  Wwettlaufer@regionofwaterloo.ca  519-575-4404 x3402
Regional Chair Ken Seiling  kseiling@regionofwaterloo.ca  519-575-4585

More info: Grand River Transit 519 585 7555

If you would like to help keep this GRT route operating or help stop other route cuts contact: mwasilka@hotmail.com

There are neighbours on Queen Street who use the service, and frequently do not own cars. Service reductions make their trips longer and more difficult. There are seniors on this street who use Transit to Frederick Mall and the medical services there or use 15 to connect to services downtown. Removing the Route 15 will affect the seniors in this area to travel in all weather. Please help us increase the public transit service levels or keep the existing levels.
Please Help
Stop Transit Cuts

On May 26th/2105 - Grand River Transit will recommend approval to cut the Route 8 Evening and Weekend Service on East Avenue as part of Streamlining public bus services. This will increase the distance to walk on several Routes or cut service. (route 8 via East)

The city of Kitchener is also currently considering lane reduction on East Avenue at the same time the GRT buses being removed.

Please email or call: to stop the transit cuts

Jeff Lorentz  glorentz@regionofwaterloo.ca  519-575-4404 x3413 regional rep. GRT service improvement.
Karen Redman  kredman@regionofwaterloo.ca  519 570 3838
Berry Vrbanovic  bvrbanovic@regionofwaterloo.ca  519-575-4404 x3403
Tom Galloway  tgalloway@regionofwaterloo.ca  519-575-4404 x3401.
Wayne Wettlaufer  mwettlaufer@regionofwaterloo.ca  519-575-4404 x3402
Regional Chair Ken Seiling  kseiling@regionofwaterloo.ca  519-575-4585

More info: Grand River Transit 519 585 7555

If you would like to help keep this GRT route operating or help stop other route cuts contact: mwasilka@hotmail.com

There are neighbours on East Avenue who use the evening service, and frequently do not own cars. Service reductions make their trips longer and more difficult. Removing the Route 8 East will also remove public transit to 2 churches and direct access to the Kitchener Memorial Auditorium. Please help us increase the public transit service levels or keep the existing levels. GRT has better options to service Weber Street without removing route on East Avenue.*

*route 7 via Weber could run service down the entire length of Weber and improve service to business and Eastwood Collegiate
1. Service Proximity /Walking Distance/Density

Background
The proximity standard is meant to address the accessibility of transit by targeting a maximum walking distance that a customer will have to travel to reach a transit stop. GRT will attempt to operate routes throughout the Urban Service Area so that this standard is met.

An important distinction with this service standard is the measure of ‘proximity’ to population and employment instead of focus on ‘geographic coverage’. Proximity takes into account the density of an area that is serviced by transit as part of the walking distance calculation where geographic coverage addresses only the physical area within walking distance of transit service. This will provide a more accurate measure of the ability of residents, students and employees to access transit services. It will also lead to more effective decisions being made on where to focus transit services to meet minimum service proximity targets.

Recognizing the link between transit and land use and the need to increase ridership to meet the transit modal share target identified in the Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP), a standard was also developed to encourage the location of Express Routes and stations in areas with transit supportive densities.

Proximity Standard

1. Design transit services so that at least 95 percent of residents, places of work and public facilities in the Urban Service Area are within the targeted walking distance of a Grand River Transit bus stop (identified below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Maximum Walking Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime and Evenings</td>
<td>450m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Evenings; All Day Sunday/Holiday</td>
<td>800m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The purpose of this standard is to set land use density targets (existing and planned) within a 500 metre and 1 kilometre radius of existing and planned Express stations. Targets are based on an average land use density (gross population/employment per hectare) for all stations along each corridor.* Express Routes will be planned only where this minimum density standard is met.
1. Express and Base routes should provide direct access to at least one major node or transfer point.

2. Express and Base routes should be designed as a direct two-way corridor service where possible, with looping to extend coverage only near the extremities of the route.

3. Route deviations from a linear path on all Express and Base routes should generally not exceed 500 metres away from that path.

**Attainment of Goal**

**Goal 1.7: Travel Time**

**Goal 4.5: Response to Growth**

**Monitoring Plan**

This data is available to Grand River Transit during the route design process. New routes and any route modifications should take this service standard into account.

---

### 5. Stop Spacing

**Background**

This standard guides the frequency and spacing of stops and stations along a route. The standard represents a trade-off between two competing goals: maximizing access along transit routes and minimizing user travel time on the bus. Too many stops on a route segment may significantly slow vehicles down and cause delays if there is passenger activity at each stop. This can lead to missed transfers at terminals or other key locations. Too few stops will reduce access to transit routes for residents. Setting a standard for stop spacing will assist Grand River Transit in making decisions on stop locations and responding to requests for new or relocated transit stops.

Stop locations must also be sensitive to the ease and safety of pedestrian movement and the proximity of major travel demand centres. Subdivision road/ sidewalk design and orientation of buildings, offices and retail centers need detailed review to ensure transit users can easily and directly walk between bus stops and origins/ destinations.

**Standard**

1. **Locate transit stops on public roadways based on the spacing guidelines below.**
   Where significant deadheading occurs due to lack of development that is accessible by customers, stop spacing may be increased.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Stop Spacing (metres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum (metres)</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum (metres)*</td>
<td>Major destination s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (metres)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: maximum spacing requirements can be exceeded in undeveloped areas

2. Give priority to transit stop locations at major intersections and near the entrance of major destinations (avoid mid-block locations if possible). At signalized intersections far side locations are generally preferred for operational efficiency.

3. For each stop location, confirm with Planning Department and Engineering staff that there are good pedestrian connections to and from actual trip origins and destinations.

4. Refer to the GRT Bus Stop Design Guidelines for further design specifications for stops and stop areas.

### Attainment of Goal

**Goal 1.5: Availability**

**Goal 1.7: Travel Time**

### Monitoring Plan

Grand River Transit currently uses GIS mapping to identify bus routes and stops. This allows the Region to calculate the average stop spacing per route and by route segment. This should be updated and monitored whenever route changes are proposed, and be used as a guide in responding to requests for new or relocated stops.

### 6. Bus Shelter Location Warrants

**Background**

This performance measure addresses customer comfort, defined in terms of the ratio of the number of bus shelters to the number of bus stops as well as the appropriate placement of shelters. The placement of shelters needs to consider the customer activity at each stop, pedestrian and traffic safety, customer demands for shelters, customer characteristics at each stop, local micro-climate conditions and the incidence of shelter vandalism. It may also be appropriate to establish a warrant system for the provision of a bus shelter. For example a shelter warrant will be met if there are 20 or more boardings per day at a particular stop. This
Region of Waterloo  
Transportation and Environmental Services  
Waste Management Services

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

Date: May 26, 2015  
File Code: E33-30A

Subject: Curbside Service Levels – Next Waste Collection Contract

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the following residential curbside collection service levels for the next waste collection contract, commencing March 6, 2017:

a) Bi-Weekly Garbage Collection (new standard)
Four garbage bag/container limit per bi-weekly collection (new standard); Unlimited weekly blue box and green bin collection (new standard or service in some rural Township areas); Bi-weekly yard waste collection (April to November); (new service in some rural Township areas); Bi-weekly appliance and bulky item pick-up, three item limit (new standard); and Existing special and downtown business services.

b) Approve, in principle, a garbage bag/container tag program to accommodate garbage bag/container set-out beyond the four bag/container limit, and direct staff to report back to Council in the spring of 2016 with a detailed plan on implementing a bag/container tag program, including an exemption program for special circumstances; and

c) Reduce the garbage bag/container limit to three bags per bi-weekly collection period within the first two years of the new waste collection contract.

Summary:

The April 2015 report TES-WMS-15-05, Preliminary Service Level Options for Consideration for a New Waste Collection Contract, established, in principle, two
curbside waste collection options for Regional Council consideration, with the recommendation that these options be presented to the public for input and comment and that a special Planning and Works Committee meeting be held for more public input. On May 6, 2015 the special meeting was held, and the results of the meeting and other input from the public are provided herein. This citizen feedback, combined with the outcome of the waste management master plan (WMMP), previous public engagement findings, discussions with the WMMP Working Group, and research and discussions with several other municipalities, has helped shape this new waste collection service level recommendation.

The current contract for curbside waste collection expires on March 4, 2017. If approved, this report establishes the key elements of the bid documents and the introduction of a bag/container tag program to accommodate curbside collection on those occasions when more garbage than the allowable limit is generated.

Report:

As part of the new Waste Management Master Plan (WMMP) and with the impending end of the current waste collection contract, staff undertook significant research and public engagement on possible new curbside waste collection service levels. This included options to increase the diversion of valuable resources that are still disposed of in the Regional landfill. The April 2015 report, Preliminary Service Level Options for Consideration for a New Waste Collection Contract (Attachment A), provided details on the research and public engagement initiatives and provided the following two curbside collection options for Council consideration:

Option 1- (Bi-Weekly Garbage Collection)
Four garbage bag limit per bi- weekly collection (potential to reduce to three bags);
Unlimited weekly blue box and green bin collection;
Bi-weekly yard waste collection (April to November);
Bi-weekly appliance and bulky item pick-up, three item limit;
Existing special and downtown business services; and
Bag tag program.

Option 2 – (Weekly Garbage Collection)
Two garbage bag limit per week (potential to reduce to one bag);
Unlimited weekly blue box and green bin collection;
Bi-weekly yard waste collection (April to November);
Bi-weekly appliance and bulky item pick-up, three item limit;
Existing special and downtown business services; and
Bag tag program.

Both options are expected to further improve residential waste diversion efforts and result in net cost savings but would also provide increased levels of program complexity
compared to the current curbside collection contract.

To allow citizens to have an opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed waste collection service options presented, a special meeting of the Planning and Works Committee was held on the evening of May 6, 2015.

Citizens were informed of this event through various media, including print ads, social media and the Region’s website. Citizens unable to attend the meeting were invited to submit comments in writing. Ten delegations attended the meeting to provide feedback, and 38 written submissions were received via email, mail and fax.

Of the delegations who attended the meeting, four spoke in favour of bi-weekly collection (and of these two supported starting with a three bag limit, rather than four), two spoke against bi-weekly collection, two stated that improved green bin education would improve participation, and one suggested that either option discriminates against large families. One delegate asked only questions. Council was asked to consider occasions for exceptions to the bag limits, student housing areas, and the potential for bag tags to be stolen, as well as the potential for multi-residential diversion and thermal treatment of garbage.

Of the comments received in writing, 12 wrote in favour of Option 1 (two of which said they preferred Option 1 without a bag limit), ten wrote in favour of Option 2, and two preferred a combined approach of Option 1 in the winter and Option 2 in the summer. Three preferred no change at all to service, and 13 asked questions or posed alternate solutions. Written submissions asked Council to consider families with children in diapers, or with a family member with a medical condition causing a legitimate need to generate more waste. Citizens expressed concerns with storing diapers, feminine hygiene products or raw meat packaging for up to two weeks. Council was also asked to consider the impact on citizens of missing a week of collection for any reason, smell, animals, cost of bag tags, how the limits will be policed, and the issue of dumping: either of extra bags in front of others’ houses, or roadside. Citizens also suggested mandatory use of green bin/blue box to receive garbage collection, the use of clear garbage bags, cart collection of recyclables, single-side of the street collection, and thermal treatment of garbage.

Attachment B includes the minutes from the Planning and Works Public Input Meeting of May 6, 2015, and the written responses received from those unable to attend the meeting.

The WMMP Working Group, consisting of Regional Councillors Tom Galloway, Jane Mitchell, Joe Nowak and Karl Kiefer and staff, also reviewed this additional feedback, and support the new service level recommendation.
Preferred Option

Based on the extensive research of programs undertaken in other comparable municipalities, the public engagement activities undertaken, the expected increase in waste diversion and potential for net savings, staff recommend Option 1 for the new waste collection contract beginning March 6, 2017.

Option 1 involves Region-wide bi-weekly garbage collection, with a four bag/container limit. Service levels to over 5,500 homes in the townships will increase to weekly blue box and green bin collection, and bi-weekly yard waste collection. All township citizens will see increased bulky/appliance collection to a bi-weekly service, and tri-city citizens will move from weekly to bi-weekly service. Ultimately, all citizens will have a new three item bulky/appliance limit per bi-weekly collection period. Yard waste collection would continue to be collected bi-weekly, on alternating weeks from the bulky/appliance collection, thereby increasing efficiency.

A summary of the proposed service level option in comparison to current curbside policy is presented in the table below.

Option 1- (Bi-Weekly Garbage Collection)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Current Level of Service</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage</td>
<td>– Weekly collection (3 – 10 bags depending on municipality)</td>
<td>4 bag limit per property (to 3 within 24 months of contract start) - New standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bi-weekly – New standard in the tri-cities and townships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue box</td>
<td>– Weekly or bi-weekly (rural townships)</td>
<td>Unlimited quantities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weekly - New standard in rural areas of the townships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green bin</td>
<td>– Weekly or no service (rural townships)</td>
<td>Unlimited quantities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weekly - New service in rural areas of the townships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard waste</td>
<td>– Bi-weekly (April to November) or no service (rural townships)</td>
<td>Unlimited quantities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bi-weekly (April to November) - New service in rural areas of the townships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulky items and</td>
<td>– Weekly unlimited (tri-cities) or monthly</td>
<td>3 item limit - New standard in the tri-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bi-weekly - New standard in the tri-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Generally, the Region provides residential waste collection service to single family homes and multi-residential properties with six or fewer units. The proposed four bag garbage limits per bi-weekly collection would apply to single-family homes, and may not be sufficient for the six unit or under sites. At those sites, which would include student rental properties where the Region collects, staff are proposing up to a maximum of ten bags (the current limit) per bi-weekly collection. It is recognized that each of these units usually produce less garbage than a single family home.

The proposed new standard would apply as in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current garbage limit per weekly collection</th>
<th>New garbage limit per bi-weekly collection</th>
<th>Additional bags?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single family home</td>
<td>up to ten bags</td>
<td>up to four bags</td>
<td>bag tag program transfer station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to six legal units</td>
<td>up to ten bags</td>
<td>up to ten bags</td>
<td>bag tag program transfer station</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback from citizens who participated in the various public engagement activities is closely divided between bi-weekly (Option 1), and weekly (Option 2) curbside garbage collection, with Option 1 slightly more favoured with approximately 60 percent of all responses. In recommending Option 1, staff considered this feedback, findings from other municipalities, feedback from the WMMP Working Group, the potential to improve diversion of recyclables and organic materials, and waste collection efficiencies that could result in the most net savings for the taxpayers in Waterloo Region. As well, bi-weekly garbage collection, coupled with weekly organic and recycling collection, is widely recognized as Best Practice. Several benefits are realized with Option 1:

- The recyclable and organic material found in residential garbage bags are valuable resources, and should not be buried in the landfill, and, as found in other municipalities, bi-weekly garbage collection presents the best opportunity to divert these resources for beneficial re-use;

- When blue boxes, green bins and other diversion programs are fully utilized by citizens, only a small amount of waste requires curbside pick up for disposal in the landfill;
• Collection efficiencies are realized when this leftover waste is collected on a bi-weekly basis. Fewer garbage trucks are required and this provides the optimal opportunity for collection contract savings;

• Other municipalities identified a decrease in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions with bi-weekly collection due to fewer trucks on the road;

• Maximizing diversion of organic material will reduce methane production (odour) from the landfill; and

• Implementation of Option 1 is anticipated to increased residential waste diversion by approximately 5 per cent to 10 per cent or the equivalent of an additional 15,000 tonnes of waste materials being beneficially re-used/recycled as opposed to landfilled, thereby extending the life of the landfill.

Additionally, diverting waste from landfill is a core priority for the Region of Waterloo. The Region’s Strategic Plan includes waste diversion as a strategic objective, identifying support and continued improvement of recycling, reuse and waste diversion programs to protect and enhance the environment.

Curbside waste audits and citizen surveys have identified that the average garbage bag/container set-out is 1.7 bags (2.4 for larger households). While it is recognized that a four garbage bag/container limit per bi-weekly collection period may appear excessive given the audit results, it does introduce the concept of phasing in bag/container limits to tri-city citizens who are not accustomed to limits. Waste diversion potential is expected to be higher when the bag/container limits are changed to three bags/containers per bi-weekly collection, and staff recommend implementing this change within the first 24 months of the new waste collection contract.

With the new limit in bulky item/appliance collection, some materials, such as carpet replacement and home construction and demolition debris, would require citizens to work with their retailer or installers to dispose of this waste. Alternatively, citizens would still have the option of utilizing the closest waste transfer station for materials not eligible for curbside collection.

**Implications on resources**

While public engagement feedback noted that many citizens could make bi-weekly garbage collection work at their home, staff recognize that a shift from weekly garbage collection to bi-weekly, in addition to the other proposed service level and collection frequency changes, represents a significant change for citizens. This option is expected to have the highest impact on diversion and result in the greatest potential for cost savings, however, it will also require more resources for public education, and to implement, administer and enforce the new service levels and standards. As reported
previously (TES-WMS-15-05, Preliminary Service Level Options for Consideration for a New Waste Collection Contract), municipalities with well established services similar to the proposed service level have significantly more resources to implement, administer and enforce their collection contracts. As well, these municipalities transitioned from weekly garbage collection to bi-weekly collection gradually, after applying stringent bag/container limits, and after their citizens had incorporated the full spectrum of diversion programs in their day-to-day waste disposal habits. Currently in Waterloo Region, particularly in the tri-cities, whatever is placed out curbside each week is generally collected. Transitioning to the new service levels is expected to be challenging, with increased citizen telephone calls, curbside collection concerns, and on-street customer service issues at launch and for the duration of the new waste collection contract. Attachment A includes a comparison of curbside service levels and resource implications in place at other comparator municipalities in Ontario.

**Existing business and special collection services**

The proposed garbage bag limits or collection frequency options may not be appropriate for certain areas that currently receive municipal collection. Examples include eligible properties with multiple units (six and under), twice per year collection at off-campus student rental properties, and business improvement areas that have more frequent garbage collection and in some cases, a larger bag limit. These areas represent a very small percentage of the overall collection contract and staff are proposing no change to current bag limits (10) and, in business improvement areas, no change to the collection frequency. Waste diversion remains a priority at these sites as well, and staff will continue to work with them to improve their diversion efforts.

**Garbage bag/container tag program**

Most communities also offer a bag/container tag program when stringent bag/container limits and/or bi-weekly garbage collection is implemented. A bag/container tag program acknowledges that there are situations where more waste than the allowable limit is generated, but still provides citizens with the convenience of curbside collection. Bag/container tags also support the concept that the individual user bears some cost of the collection of their additional waste rather than spreading that cost across all taxpayers in Waterloo Region.

Staff recommend launching a phased approach to a bag/container tag program with the provision of a limited number of “free” bag/container tags for the first several months of the new collection contract to support residents as they adapt to the new curbside policy. This concept is a common practice in other municipalities and by requiring a bag/container tag, albeit initially a free one, the intention is to build awareness of the waste generated and encourage full participation in available diversion programs. A fee based bag/container tag program could then then be implemented at a later date (possibly with the transition to a three bag/container limit) with exemptions for special
circumstances such as residents with medical considerations, large families with children in diapers, etc.. Numerous municipalities currently have bag/container tag programs in place that have proven effective. Attachment C provides information on some of these typical exemption programs, and other concerns identified by citizens.

Staff will report back to Planning and Works Committee in the spring of 2016 with a report providing the details of a bag/container tag program and applicable exemptions that could be implemented in Waterloo Region.

Next steps

Should Regional Council approve these recommendations, staff will immediately undertake the development and advertisement of bid documents for the new waste collection contract. Given that the contractors require a minimum of 12 – 15 months lead time to obtain resources, vehicles, and prepare the work to fulfil these contracts, staff plan to advertise for bids no later than August 2015 for award in November/December 2015.

Further Regional Council reports related to the new waste collection service levels include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject of the reports</th>
<th>Tentative Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aligning waste collection practices at multi-residential properties with Regional policy</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract award by Regional Council of the new waste collection contract</td>
<td>November/December 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of a garbage bag tag program, including applicable exemptions</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public education and engagement plan to launch and sustain the new waste collection service levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- will include annual calendars for all residents (current practice in the townships)</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff will also update the current waste by-laws (By-law 98-87 A By-law to Regulate the Receiving, Dumping and Disposing of Waste, and By-law 02-011 By-law to Prohibit and Regulate the Collection of Waste) to include the approved waste collection policies and procedures.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

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

**Financial Implications:**

While the actual savings of Option 1 will not be known until the new collection contract is awarded in the fall of 2015, the proposed changes in the collection standards and frequency are expected to result in net annual savings of approximately $500,000 to $1.5 million, as well as extending the life of the landfill. These projections are based on savings achieved in other comparable municipalities and from discussions with the collection contractors. It is anticipated that the collection contract savings will assist with off-setting the additional resources (i.e. staff) and costs associated with responding to the more restrictive curbside collection standards and frequency. The additional costs are based on experiences in comparable municipalities with similar curbside service levels. Additional program costs/impacts include increased resident phone calls, on-street customer service, an extensive public education program, increased potential for roadside dumping and by-law enforcement. An additional inventory of blue box (one-time) and green bin collection containers is also provided for resident encouragement and is considered a best practice at the launch of any new initiative such as this.

Further refinement of the financial implications will be presented in the fall of 2015 as part of the report to Council on the award of the new waste collection contract.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

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

**Attachments**

Attachment A: Report TES-WMS-15-05, Preliminary Service Level Options for Consideration for a New Waste Collection Contract

Attachment B: Summary results from the public meeting of the Planning and Works Committee, May 6, 2015, and written comments from citizens

Attachment C: Information from other municipalities on exemption programs, and other concerns identified by citizens

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

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

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: April 14, 2015          File Code: E33-30A
Subject: Preliminary Service Level Options for Consideration for a New Waste Collection Contract

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve a special meeting of the Planning and Works Committee for the evening of Wednesday, May 6, 2015, to allow for public feedback on the proposed collection service options presented in report TES-WMS-15-05, with the intent of a final service level option recommendation forthcoming in late May 2015.

Summary:

The current contracts for garbage, recycling and green bin/cart collection expire March 4, 2017. This presents an opportunity to consider and implement the diversion recommendations of the new Waste Management Master Plan (WMMMP) which was approved by Regional Council in November 2013 (E-13-127). These recommendations included consideration of reduced bag limits, bi-weekly waste collection, a bag tag program, and standardizing service levels and programs in all seven area municipalities.

Extensive research and public engagement supports diversion efforts and helped to shape the service level options presented. Public and stakeholder engagement resulted in over 7,500 citizens being informed of and providing feedback on service level options, using various media such as telephone surveys, electronic surveys, home delivery information, social media, newspaper ads and coverage on local television and radio stations. Stakeholder discussions included a survey and discussions with area municipal public works and by-law enforcement staff, and consultation with the members of the WMMP Implementation Working Group, consisting...
of four Regional councillors and staff involved in the WMMP. Building on the findings in
the WMMP, staff also engaged municipalities outside of Waterloo Region to research
their waste collection service levels, policies and practices.

This report establishes, in principle, two options for consideration for curbside service
levels as part of the next waste collection contract as follows:

Option 1- (Bi-Weekly Garbage Collection)
  Four garbage bag limit per bi- weekly collection (potential to reduce to three
  bags);
  Unlimited weekly blue box and green bin collection;
  Bi-weekly yard waste collection (April to November);
  Bi-weekly appliance and bulky item pick-up, three item limit;
  Existing special and downtown business services; and
  Bag tag program.

Option 2 – (Weekly Garbage Collection)
  Two garbage bag limit per week (potential to reduce to one bag);
  Unlimited weekly blue box and green bin collection;
  Bi-weekly yard waste collection (April to November);
  Bi-weekly appliance and bulky item pick-up, three item limit;
  Existing special and downtown business services; and
  Bag tag program.

Both options presented would be expected to further improve residential waste
diversion efforts and result in cost savings but would also provide increased levels of
program complexity compared to the current curbside collection contract. Specifically,
Option 1 is preferred by staff as it is anticipated to provide the greatest opportunity to
both maximize diversion from landfill as well as result in net cost savings.

To allow citizens to have an opportunity to provide their final feedback on the proposed
waste collection service options presented, Staff recommend a special meeting of the
Planning and Works Committee be scheduled for the evening of May 6, 2015. A final
recommendation report would be forthcoming in late May 2015.

Given that the contractors require a minimum of 12 – 15 months lead time to obtain
resources, vehicles, and prepare the work to fulfil these contracts, staff plan to advertise
for bids no later than August 2015 for award in November/December 2015.

Report:

Citizens of Waterloo Region, particularly in the tri-cities, enjoy one of the highest levels
of curbside waste collection service in the Province. Participation in waste diversion
programs is voluntary, with a strong emphasis on public education as a means of
diverting waste from landfill. Attachment A outlines the curbside collection services
currently available to citizens and while convenient for citizens, they generally do not
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encourage citizens to divert waste or to fully utilize the diversion options available to them. Waste composition audits completed in 2013 estimate that over 50 per cent of the contents of garbage bags by weight could go in the green bin and 14 per cent could go in the blue box. Additional waste diversion of these “resources” that still remain in the garbage stream for beneficial re-use/recycling will reduce environmental impacts (i.e. leachate production and landfill gas odours) as well as extend the life of the landfill.

In November 2013, Regional Council approved an updated Waste Management Master Plan, which included the following primary recommended action regarding waste diversion:

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

With the pending expiry of the current waste collection contract on March 5, 2017, this presents the optimal opportunity to consider and implement the diversion recommendations of the new WMMP.

Citizen and stakeholder engagement

Citizen feedback was an integral part of the WMMP, with over 600 citizens responding to questions about diversion programs, and this feedback shaped the diversion recommendations of the WMMP. Nevertheless, it was recognized that any potential change to curbside collection practices would have considerable impact on citizens receiving curbside collection. Additional public feedback and education was required to ensure citizens were engaged and informed. Staff undertook a second public engagement initiative from November 2014 to January 2015, which included a telephone and online survey, public advertisements, home delivery of information, staff presentations and extensive media coverage. Over 7,500 citizens provided more feedback on the diversion options highlighted in the WMMP, and also provided over 6,000 additional comments on services and programs. Findings of the public engagement initiative include:

Waste set out

Citizens were asked about the type and amount of waste they put to the curb weekly:

- Average garbage bag set-out is 1.7 bags
- Average set out for green bin users is 1.5 bags, average for non green bin users is 1.8 bags
- Larger households set out more garbage, their average is 2.4 bags
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- 86 per cent of citizens are putting out less than three bags per week, regardless of household size, green bin use, etc.
- 50 per cent of citizens report using the green bin and 97 per cent the blue box at least once per month

When asked what a reasonable garbage bag limit would be for weekly collection, the majority of respondents (68 per cent) indicated one or two bags. The bag limit preferences are slightly more conservative than current set out rates actually show.

The garbage bag set out rates reported by citizens in the survey is reflective of the set out rates obtained by staff through curbside waste audits. These curbside waste audits, done separately as part of the WMMP study, show that the average household set out is 1.7 bags as well (1.3 bags for green bin users), and that 84 per cent of citizens are putting out less than three bags per week.

**Bi-weekly garbage collection**

Citizens were then asked whether their household could manage bi-weekly garbage collection, if unlimited blue boxes and green bins continued to be picked up weekly. Exactly half of the citizens surveyed reported that their current practices would allow them to manage bi-weekly garbage collection, while half were opposed to it. Support for bi-weekly collection is strongest among green bin users.

Citizens were asked their thoughts on a reasonable bag limit for bi-weekly garbage collection. The majority of citizens (66 per cent) would be served by a bi-weekly four bag limit, which corresponds with the reported current set-out rates of approximately two bags per week.

When asked about possible issues with the bi-weekly collection of garbage, respondents listed smell, storage and animals as their top three concerns.

**Extra waste**

Finally, citizens were asked how, in the case of bag limits, they would prefer to handle having more waste than the limit allows. Citizens were given the choice of three options, all or some of which are in use by other municipalities: purchase a bag tag to allow for items to be collected curbside; store items and wait until a few times a year when bag limits are increased; or take items to the transfer station.

Citizens closely preferred either bag tags (41 per cent) or storing items until amnesty/double-up days (37 per cent) over bringing items to the transfer station (22 percent). Citizens preferred the options which allowed for the convenience of curbside collection of additional waste.

Further details on the December 2014 waste survey are attached in Attachment B.
While residential waste collection is the responsibility of the Region, area municipalities are involved and impacted by the services the Region offers and the interests of citizens mutually served. Staff initiated a survey and subsequent discussions with area municipal staff involved in public works and by-law enforcement to obtain their feedback on diversion challenges and opportunities unique to their municipality. Opportunities such as standardization of services across the Region, weekly bag limits and changes to bulky/appliance collection frequency were generally acceptable, with some implementation challenges and repercussions identified. These included the potential for increased road side dumping, bag limits at off-campus rental properties, enforcement, and downtown waste collection limits and collection frequency. As a first step, bi-weekly garbage collection was not recommended by area municipal staff, and an intensive public education and promotion program was cited as critical to success. Not unexpected, bag limits and collection frequency of bulky/appliance collection were less of a concern in the townships, as these are current, well established practices in those municipalities.

The WMMP Working Group, consisting of Regional Councillors Tom Galloway, Jane Mitchell, Joe Nowak and Karl Kiefer and staff, with a mandate to implement the recommendations of the Master Plan, also reviewed and considered various diversion options and curbside collection practices, as presented in this report.

Service level and/or service frequency recommendations

Staff recommends that residential waste service levels and collection frequencies be standardized across Waterloo Region, providing all eligible homeowners with the same curbside collection and waste diversion services. As seen in other communities, the following curbside collection policies/practices have proven to be the most effective in increasing residential diversion rates:

- unlimited weekly recycling and green bin collection with bi-weekly collection of a limited number of garbage bags/containers (option 1); or

- unlimited weekly recycling and green bin collection with weekly collection of a limited number of garbage bags/containers (option 2).

Additionally, limiting the number of garbage bags is an established best practice to drive waste diversion results. The WMMP identified that a minimum of three bags per property per week is required to support any type of waste diversion program, and recommends a two or less bag limit to encourage citizens to more actively participate in the diversion programs available to them. Based on curbside audits and the public engagement survey findings, the set-out of two bags (or less) per week is already occurring in the majority of households in Waterloo Region.

Each collection service level option will require additional resources to implement and administer the new program. Particularly in the tri-cities, citizens are not accustomed to
garbage or collection frequency restrictions and generally everything they place out for collection is picked up. Additional program impacts/costs for the Waste Division would include additional staff to handle increased phone calls, on-street customer service, an extensive public education program, and an increased, one-time inventory of blue box and green bin containers. Ensuring the availability of free blue boxes and green bins at the start-up of the new collection contract will support citizens in transitioning successfully to the new reduced garbage bag/container limits while also ensuring their participation in diversion programs.

For comparison purposes, Attachment C outlines the collection services and resources in place at other municipalities of similar size and with similar programs. As identified, those municipalities with reduced bag limits or bi-weekly garbage collection frequencies collect significantly more organic materials.

Therefore, based on extensive research of programs undertaken in other comparable municipalities and through the public engagement activities undertaken, two service level options have been developed for consideration and are as follows:

### Option 1- (Bi-Weekly Garbage Collection)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Current Level of Service</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garbage</td>
<td>Weekly collection (10 – 3 bags depending on municipality)</td>
<td>4 bag limit per property (to 3 or less) - <strong>New standard</strong></td>
<td>Bi-weekly – <strong>New standard</strong> in the tri-cities and townships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue box</td>
<td>Weekly or bi-weekly (rural townships)</td>
<td>Unlimited quantities</td>
<td>Weekly – <strong>New standard</strong> in rural areas of the townships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green bin</td>
<td>Weekly or no service (rural townships)</td>
<td>Unlimited quantities</td>
<td>Weekly – <strong>New service</strong> in rural areas of the townships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard waste</td>
<td>Bi-weekly or no service (rural townships)</td>
<td>Unlimited quantities</td>
<td>Bi-weekly (April to November) – <strong>New service</strong> in rural areas of the townships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulky items and appliances</td>
<td>Weekly unlimited (tri-cities) or monthly</td>
<td>3 item limit – <strong>New standard</strong> in the tri-</td>
<td>Bi-weekly – <strong>New standard</strong> in the tri-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Option 1 involves Region-wide bi-weekly garbage collection, with a four bag limit and the opportunity to reduce to a three bag limit. Service levels to over 5,500 homes in the townships will increase to weekly blue box and green bin collection, and bi-weekly yard waste collection. All township citizens will see increased bulky/appliance collection to a bi-weekly service, and tri-city citizens will move from weekly to bi-weekly service. Ultimately, all citizens will have a new three item bulky/appliance limit per collection period. Yard waste collection would continue to be collected bi-weekly, on alternating weeks from the bulky/appliance collection, thereby increasing efficiency.

While public engagement feedback noted that many citizens could make bi-weekly garbage collection work at their home, staff recognize that a shift from weekly garbage collection to bi-weekly, in addition to the other proposed service level and frequency changes, represents a significant change for citizens. Generally, other municipalities transitioned from weekly garbage collection to bi-weekly collection after applying stringent bag limits, and after their citizens had incorporated the full spectrum of diversion programs in their day-to-day waste disposal habits. Option 1 would be expected to have a high impact on diversion and result in greater potential for cost savings in comparison to Option 2. However, it will also require significantly more resources for public education, and to implement, administer and enforce the new service levels and standards. While the actual costs and any resulting savings will not be known until the new collection tender is awarded in late fall of 2015, staff estimate that the net annual budget impact would result in savings estimated to be between $500,000 and $1.5 million. This estimate is based on experiences observed in comparable size municipalities and discussions with collection contractors.

Option 1 is staff’s preferred option, with the potential for a five to ten per cent increase in residential diversion anticipated (or approximately 15,000 tonnes per year diverted from landfill). Most of the diversion is expected to be green bin organic material that would eventually be expected to maximize our current processing capacity/availability.

**Option 2 – (Weekly Garbage Collection)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Current Level of Service</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage</td>
<td>– Weekly collection (10</td>
<td>2 bag limit per property (to 1 bag)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– 3 bags depending on municipality)</td>
<td>New standard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blue box (rural townships)</th>
<th>Unlimited quantities</th>
<th>Weekly - New standard in rural areas of the townships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly or bi-weekly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green bin (rural townships)</td>
<td>Unlimited quantities</td>
<td>Weekly - New service in rural areas of the townships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly or no service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard waste (rural townships)</td>
<td>Unlimited quantities</td>
<td>Bi-weekly (April to November) - New service in rural areas of the townships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-weekly or no service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulky items and appliances</td>
<td>3 item limit - New standard in the tri-cities and townships</td>
<td>Bi-weekly - New standard in the tri-cities and townships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly unlimited (tri-cities) or monthly 5 item (townships)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 2 involves continuing weekly garbage collection, initially with a two bag limit and an opportunity to further reduce to one bag, thereby balancing diversion through stringent bag limits with the collection frequency citizens are most familiar with. As in Option 1, service levels to over 5,500 homes in the townships will increase to weekly blue box and green bin collection, and bi-weekly yard waste collection. All township citizens will see increased bulky/appliance collection to a bi-weekly service, and tri-city citizens will move from weekly to bi-weekly service. All citizens will have a new three item bulky/appliance limit per each collection period. Yard waste collection would continue to be collected bi-weekly, on alternating weeks from the bulky/appliance collection, thereby increasing efficiency.

This option is expected to have a moderate (2 bags) to high (1 bag) impact on diversion and would also likely result in contract savings but not as significant as Option 1. Staff estimate moderate impacts on resources for promotion and education, implementation and ongoing contract administration. As previously mentioned, while the actual savings will not be known until the new collection contract is awarded in late fall of 2015, staff anticipate net annual cost savings is estimated to be between $250,000 and $750,000 based on results of comparable service level collection contract awards in other municipalities and discussions with collection contractors.

Option 2 is estimated to increase residential diversion by three to five per cent, or approximately 8,000 tonnes per year diverted from landfill. Again, most of this diversion is expected to be green bin organic material.

**User pay options (i.e. bag tags)**

Most communities also offer a bag tag program when stringent bag limits and/or bi-
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Weekly garbage collection is implemented. A bag tag program acknowledges that there are situations where more waste than the allowable limit is generated, but still provides citizens with the convenience of curbside collection.

Bag tags also support the concept that the individual user bears some cost of the collection of their additional waste rather than spreading that cost across all taxpayers in Waterloo Region.

Staff recommend launching a phased approach to a bag tag program with the provision of a limited number of "free" bag tags for the first twelve months (March 2017 to February 2018) of the new collection contract followed by a fee based bag tag program thereafter (with consideration of exemptions for special circumstances such as residents with medical considerations, home daycares, etc.).

This has been common practice in other municipalities with bag tag programs and by requiring a bag tag, albeit initially a free one, the intention is to build awareness of the waste generated and encourage full participation in available diversion programs. Staff will report back to Planning and Works Committee in the fall of 2016 with a detailed report on how a fee based bag tag program could be implemented.

A report to Council, Waste Management Funding Models (E-13-136), provided some general information on user pay systems and waste utility options.

Existing business and special collection services

The proposed garbage bag limits or collection frequency options may not be appropriate for certain areas that currently receive municipal collection. Examples include eligible properties with multiple units (six and under), twice per year collection at off-campus student rental properties, and business improvement areas that have more frequent garbage collection and in some cases, a larger bag limit. These areas represent a very small percentage of the overall collection contract and staff are proposing no change to current bag limits (10) and/or in some cases, the collection frequency.

For some materials, such as carpet replacement and construction and demolition debris, the new limit would require citizens to work with their retailer or installers to dispose of this waste. Alternatively, citizens would still have the option of utilizing the closest waste transfer station for materials not eligible for curbside collection.

Next steps

After the special meeting of the Planning and Works Committee meeting to solicit citizen input, Staff will prepare a final curbside collection service level recommendation report incorporating citizen feedback and Council direction. This report would be expected to be presented in late May 2015 and would form the basis of the next curbside collection contract that will commence in March 2017.
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Once the final curbside service levels are approved by Council, further staff reports would include details on the design and implementation of a garbage bag tag program (including exemptions where applicable), and a Region-wide public education and promotion plan to support citizen transition to the new waste collection service levels.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

This report has been prepared consistent with the Corporate Strategic Objective of Focus Area 1 “Environmental Sustainability: Project and enhance the environment” and particularly action 1.3 “Reducing the Amount of Waste Requiring Landfill.” Waste reduction is a core priority for the Region of Waterloo.

Financial Implications:

While the actual savings of either Option 1 or Option 2 will not be known until the new collection contract is tendered and awarded in the fall of 2015, staff have provided projections based on savings achieved in other comparable municipalities and from discussions with the collection contractors. The savings resulted from the proposed changes in the collection standards and frequency in the new collection contract with either Option 1 or Option 2 are expected to result in net savings of approximately $250,000 to $1.5 million. It is anticipated that the collection contract savings will assist with off-setting the additional resources (i.e. staff) and costs associated with responding to the more restrictive curbside collection standards and frequency. The additional costs are based on experiences in comparable municipalities with similar curbside service levels. Additional program costs/impacts include increased resident phone calls, on-street customer service, an extensive public education program, increased potential for roadside dumping and bylaw enforcement. An additional inventory of blue box and green bin collection containers is also provided for resident encouragement and is considered a best practice at the launch of any new initiative such as this.

Further refinement of the financial implications will be presented as part of the final service level recommendation report in late May 2015.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

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

Attachments

Attachment A: Current waste collection service levels
Attachment B: Waste management survey results: possible curbside changes
Attachment C: Waste collection services comparison between municipalities of similar size and/or service levels
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Prepared By: Susan White, Manager, Waste Collection & Diversion

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
**WHAT ARE OUR CURRENT COLLECTION SERVICES?**

**DID YOU KNOW...**
Collection crews make over 1.5 million stops each month to provide these curbside services

### Residential Waste Collection Services on Garbage Day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Blue Box Recycling</th>
<th>Green Bin</th>
<th>Garbage per property</th>
<th>Large Items</th>
<th>Yard Waste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Kitchener Waterloo</td>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>April - November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dumfries</td>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Every second week</td>
<td>Weekly blue box collection: Weekly</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>April - November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley</td>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Every second week</td>
<td>Weekly blue box collection: Weekly</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>April - November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Every second week</td>
<td>Weekly blue box collection: Weekly</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>April - November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>Weekly collection</td>
<td>Every second week</td>
<td>Weekly blue box collection: Weekly</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>April - November</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waste management survey results: possible curbside changes

Background

Following the endorsement of the WMMP Diversion recommendation:

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

Regional Council directed staff to conduct ongoing public awareness and more community engagement on the potential changes. In the fall of 2014, staff engaged in a number of activities, culminating in a survey, with the following goals:

- Inform residents of pending changes endorsed through WMMP;
- Educate residents about possible curbside changes and what they mean;
- Encourage public feedback on options endorsed through WMMP; and
- Use resident feedback to help develop curbside policy recommendations.

The survey was conducted in two ways:

1. Demographically representative (2011 Census) of 511 single family households across Waterloo Region ("demographic survey"). This group would serve as a control group, to balance concerns that a random survey is mainly completed by self-selected parties interested in waste management.

2. Online survey (could also complete via telephone through the call centre) promoted and randomly open to all residents of Waterloo Region; over 7,000 responses ("random survey").

While the random survey respondents provided valuable comment and input, they do skew slightly "greener" in their results. In order to prevent any bias, the results presented below are mainly based on the demographic survey, which is meant to be representative of the average citizen of Waterloo Region.
Survey Results

Garbage set out

- **Average garbage bags per week**
  - Three+: 14%
  - Two: 29%
  - One: 57%

- **Average bags per week: overall, by household, and by GB use**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bags per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH 1-2 people</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH 3-4 people</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH 5+ people</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Bin Weekly</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Weekly Green Bin</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current waste set out habits in Waterloo Region:

- Average bag set-out is 1.7
- Average set out for green bin users is 1.5, average for non green bin users is 1.8
- Larger households set out more, their average is 2.4 bags
- 86% of residents are putting out less than three bags per week, regardless of household size, green bin use, etc.
- 50% of residents use the green bin and 97% the blue box at least 1x per month

**Weekly bag limits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekly bag limit preference (Demographic survey)</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>Two</th>
<th>Three</th>
<th>Four</th>
<th>5-6</th>
<th>7+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked what a reasonable bag limit would be for weekly collection, the majority of residents (68%) indicated one or two bags. The bag limit preferences are slightly more conservative than current set out rates. Even residents who regularly put out only 1 or 2 bags can likely think of occasions when they had additional waste, and may want to ensure they have capacity for that additional curbside set out.

Based on the self-reported set out rates, only 14% of residents are putting out 3 or more bags of waste. A 2-bag limit would serve 86% of residents, given current set-out habits and practices. It is worth noting that of 150,000 household served, 14% is still a significant number, representing about 21,000 households, who would have to adjust their waste habits, and will likely require customer service calls requiring education, assistance and possibly enforcement.

**Bi-weekly collection**

Residents were asked whether their household could manage bi-weekly collection:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household could manage bi-weekly garbage collection (Demographic survey)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>HH 1-2 people</th>
<th>HH 3-4 people</th>
<th>HH 5+ people</th>
<th>Green Bin Weekly</th>
<th>No Green Bin Weekly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Half of residents surveyed reported that their current practices would allow them to manage bi-weekly garbage collection. Support was highest among smaller households and green bin users, while larger households or those not using the green bin reported the largest potential impact from bi-weekly collection.
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Bi-weekly bag limits

Residents were asked their thoughts on a reasonable bag limit for bi-weekly garbage collection:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bi-weekly bag limit preference</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographic survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-weekly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7+</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of residents (66%) would be served by a bi-weekly four bag limit, corresponding to current set-out rates of approximately two bags/week. Again, this reflects current waste habits of residents. Support for bi-weekly collection is strongest among green bin users.

Concerns with bi-weekly collection

Residents who reported that bi-weekly collection would have either a big or some impact on their household were asked why, and their concerns were recorded. The top three concerns mentioned were the same as those reported through the online survey (although the numbers varied slightly).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Big/some impact due to:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smell</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These issues, while all valid when it comes to handling waste, should be manageable for residents if they use the blue box and green bin weekly. It is apparent from write-in comments that many of these concerns have to do with storing garbage containing food waste among non green-bin users, and diapers/personal hygiene products among those who do use the green bin. These concerns can all be addressed through education.
The more engaged households reported being in diversion programs (i.e. blue box and green bin) the more likely they were to support bi-weekly collection.

**Extra waste**

Finally, residents were asked how, in the case of bag limits, they would prefer to handle having more waste than the limit allows. As the issue of what to do with extra waste beyond the bag limit affects all residents regardless of current practices, the results of the online survey are included here as well. Residents were given a choice of three options, all or some of which are in use by other municipalities: purchase a bag tag to allow for items to be collected curbside; store items and wait until a few times a year when bag limits are increased; or take items to the transfer station.
Alternative disposal options

Percent chosen first
(Random survey)

- Transfer Station: 11%
- Bag Tags: 47%
- Store Items: 42%

In the case of both surveys, residents closely preferred both bag tags and storing items until amnesty days over bringing items to the transfer station. These two options reflect both a user-pay (bag tag) and no-cost option, but overwhelmingly, the majority of respondents preferred the option that allowed for the convenience of curbside collection. Write-in comments also reflects many residents who do not drive, rely solely on public transit, or otherwise may not be able to get to a transfer station.

Additional observations

The majority of set out information reported by residents in the demographic survey is reflective of the set out rates obtained by staff through waste audits. Curbside waste audits show that the average household set out is 1.7 bags (1.3 bags for green bin users), and audits further show that 61% of households put out 1 bag, 23% put out 2 bags, and 16% put out 3 or more bags (compared to 57%, 29% and 14% respectively for the survey responses).

While self-reported green bin use through the survey is higher than that reported in audits (50% versus 19-35%) there could be several reasons for the discrepancy. Users of the survey were asked if they had set the green bin out at least one time in the last month; this occasional use of the green bin would account for lower participation rates in the weekly snapshot of the curbside audits. It may also be that survey respondents were reluctant to report not using the green bin when asked directly as part of a waste survey.
Self-reported blue box participation rates are also slightly higher than those reported in audits (97% versus 82%) but the same reasons for discrepancy in green bin participation percentage may apply.

The concerns that residents have with bi-weekly collection (smell, storage, animals) can nearly all be addressed with proper green bin use. Outside of items that can be handled by the green bin, the items most likely to cause concern are diapers and personal hygiene products. According to various public health departments (including ROW Public Health) these items are safe to hold for two weeks if properly handled/stored.
### Waste Collection Services Comparison between Similar Municipalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Garbage</th>
<th>Recycling</th>
<th>Organics</th>
<th>Yard Waste</th>
<th>Bulky/Applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Region – tri-cities</td>
<td>weekly</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>weekly</td>
<td>bi-weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Region – townships</td>
<td>weekly</td>
<td>3 to 6</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>weekly**</td>
<td>bi-weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara Region (427,000 population)</td>
<td>weekly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes ($2)</td>
<td>weekly Two-stream</td>
<td>weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hamilton (520,000 population)</td>
<td>weekly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes (free)</td>
<td>Weekly Two-stream</td>
<td>weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Peel*** (1.3 mil population)</td>
<td>weekly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes ($1)</td>
<td>Weekly One stream</td>
<td>bi-weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton Region (518,000 population)</td>
<td>bi-weekly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>yes ($2)</td>
<td>Weekly One stream</td>
<td>bi-weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Ottawa (820,000 population)</td>
<td>bi-weekly</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Bi-weekly*** Two stream</td>
<td>bi-weekly bulky, no appliances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Customer Service/Contract Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Calls</th>
<th>Sent to Waste</th>
<th>In-office Staff</th>
<th>On-road Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Region – tri-cities</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara Region (427,000 population)</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hamilton (520,000 population)</td>
<td>102,000</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Peel*** (1.3 mil population)</td>
<td>97,000</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton Region (518,000 population)</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Ottawa (820,000 population)</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Municipality of Waterloo

Public Meeting of the Planning and Works Committee

Minutes

Wednesday, May 6, 2015

6:00 p.m.

Regional Council Chamber

150 Frederick Street, Kitchener, ON

Present were: Chair T. Galloway, S. Foxton, H. Jowett, K. Kiefer, G. Lorentz, J. Mitchell, K. Seiling, S. Shantz, and W. Wettlaufer


Open Remarks

Chair T. Galloway provided opening remarks regarding the purpose of the meeting and the advertisement history.

Declarations of Pecuniary Interest Under The Municipal Conflict of Interest Act

None declared.

Staff Presentation

Jon Arsenault, Director, Waste Management provided a presentation that provided background information, opportunity to divert more, Waste Management Master Plan Recommendation, Objectives of Public Engagement, Engagement Summary, Waste Collection – Current Services, Standardization/Best Practice, Curbside Collection Options, and Timelines to a New Contract. A copy of the presentation is appended to the original minutes.
Delegations

i. Robert Stephens appeared before Committee and explained that he felt the survey was bias towards the two options. He stated that option 1 is the best way to go and felt we are being too generous with the bag limit and suggested we set a higher goal since most residents already achieve that goal. He suggested that the blue bin and green bin be picked up every two weeks to help diversion and save taxpayers money and also implement the green bin program at apartment buildings. He also pointed out that the Provincial and Federal Governments need to regulate packaging on consumer goods.

ii. Chuck Kruse appeared before Committee expressing his concern about the decisions past Council has made. He talked about the green bin program not working and asked why the green bin will get picked up every week and not your regular garbage. He suggested that bag tags are a revenue grab. He highlighted that the problem is with the miscalculation of green bin tonnage being sent to Guelph and suggested increasing the tipping fees at the landfill.

iii. Dennis Watson appeared before Committee highlighting the services the Region provides stating garbage pick up is the one service everyone uses and now the Region wants to charge more for less service. He stated he pays enough in taxes for services he never uses. He noted he is against bi-weekly pick up because of smell and against bag tags. He talked about how research can be interpreted.

iv. Carson O’Neill appeared before Committee highlighting his support for Option #1 to move to bi-weekly collection and encouraged Committee to move to a 3 bag limit. He provided a list of suggestions to help with the transition. A copy of the presentation is appended to the original minutes.

v. Kate Daley appeared before Committee stating her support of bi-weekly garbage collection. She highlighted that she recently read a report of the Region of Waterloo Commission dated March 1979 that talked about the state of garbage collection before the creation of the Region, highlighting the problems listed then still exist. She said the Region has shown leadership with the blue bin but stated we are behind on bi-weekly garbage and suggested the Region look to other municipalities to learn from their experiences. She highlighted that this is better for budget, environment and long term planning.

vi. Charlotte Prong appeared before Committee in support of Option #1 with a 3 bag limit. She stated residents need to be forced to reduce and reuse. She talked
about her experience moving and was surprised how much garbage was picked up and how little cost. She highlighted that she is part of the problem but wants to be part of the solution and pointed out this is about the planet and encouraged best practice.

Chair T. Galloway made a call for additional delegations.

vii. Jeremy Schlueter appeared before Committee to voice his concern. He asked if he will receive a refund in the mail from his taxes since the level of service is changing. He suggested these changes discriminate against larger families and is a money grab. He explained that the need for people to recycle more and to change habits but that shouldn’t come at his expense. He suggested that the garbage be burned for energy.

Committee members provided clarification on tax rates and larger family exemptions.

viii. Joyce Palubiski appeared before Committee expressing her concern that the Region is going about it the wrong way, explaining the success of the blue box program. She stated the problem was the introduction of the green bin program and how people were exposed to it. She highlighted that residents need to be educated properly on the green bin program. She briefly talked about bag tags and the potential of them getting stolen.

ix. Kim Dallimore appeared before Committee highlighting her family currently uses 3 blue bins and they don’t produce a lot of garbage but wondered about the odd occasion when they may need more than the limit and wondered if there would be exceptions. She also raised concerns about the student housing and how that will be handled.

Chair T. Galloway explained that student housing is on their radar and are aware of the concerns.

x. Tineke Vos appeared before Committee stating she lives in a townhouse complex and pointed out the low participation rate of green bin users. She raised concerns about businesses not recycling and asked how that would be handled.

J. Arsenault provided clarification on businesses recycling and garbage collection.
A Committee member highlighted that the five members from Landfill Liaison Committee would like to see weekly garbage pick up, one member would like to see bi-weekly pick-up and one member suggested shipping the garbage to Michigan.

Adjourn

Moved by K. Kiefer
Seconded by S. Foxton
That the meeting adjourn at 7:15 p.m.
     Carried

Committee Chair, T. Galloway

Committee Clerk, E. Flewwelling
Written feedback received regarding preliminary service level options for consideration for a new waste collection contract

The following written comments were received from residents unable to attend the Planning and Works Public Input Meeting on May 6, 2015:

From: Tara Rigby
Sent: 2015-04-18 07:18:42.0
To: waste@regionofwaterloo.ca
Subject: Garbage collection feedback-Jon Arsenault

Hello

I am writing to let you know that I think that the new proposed garbage restrictions are unfair for larger families. I do not think that it is fair that a family of three or four has the garbage limit as that of a seven person family.

I am out of the country when the May 6 meeting takes place or I would attend.

As a family of seven I try to reduce, reuse recycle with my green and blue bins but still end up with about three bags of garbage per week.

Why not start with a garbage audit system. Those that are consistently not using the green and blue bins and putting out a number of bags gets a ticket?

I hope to see a fair plan rolled out. I believe strongly in recycling but I also believe in fairness.

Tara Rigby
Kitchener

From: Margaret Strobel
Sent: Tuesday, April 21, 2015 2:07 PM
To: Jon Arsenault
Subject: Discussion on upcoming changes to garbage pick-up

Mr Arsenault,
As the discussion continues regarding the upcoming changes that are a necessity to make garbage collection in Waterloo Region more efficient, and I read in the Cambridge Times of last week that the preferred option of the Region is biweekly pick-up, (the implied reason) due to this being the lesser cost option, I would like to make a comment at this time while the subject is still open for discussion.

I totally agree that streamlining is needed at this time, in order to persuade people to use their green bins since very few on my street do.

However, my preference for the continuation of weekly pick-up of black bags, together with a reduction of bags permitted (2 sounds reasonable to me as proposed) and the option of purchasing extra tags is a very strong preference for the following reasons:

- On my small premises, I do not have the space to stockpile any garbage for an extra week, especially during gardening season when I already have garden bags storing awaiting their bi-weekly pick-up
- If a household misses a bi-weekly pick up for some reason, being out of town that week for example, it would then be a whole month until one was able to dispose of garbage.
- The black bags will continue to contain feminine hygiene products which cannot be placed in the green bins nor should they be flushed. Especially in summer, ten days - two weeks is way too long to have this type of garbage sitting around the house uncollected. And I am sure that the Region Water Treatment facilities do not want a surge of such garbage clogging their systems!

Since the Region will already make an approximate $750 000 saving should the above option be agreed on, and tax payers (customers) will continue to pay the same rate as currently, please will you keep our services practical and with the customer in mind, rather than cost saving being the key priority. Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,
Margaret Strobel
Cambridge

From: Dan Davison
Sent: 2015-04-24 11:12:21.0
To: waste@regionofwaterloo.ca
Subject: Comments regarding potential curbside collection waste collection changes

To whom it may concern:

I am a Waterloo resident who actively participates in both the blue box and green bin programs. My family of 4 generates in a typical week one garbage bin, 2 to 3 recycling bins, and a full green bin.

I would like to express my concern about going to a biweekly garbage pick-up scheme. With weekly pick up, we already have problems with smells in the summer. The smelliest item for us is raw meat packaging that cannot be put in the green bin. I can hardly imagine what the smell
will be like after two weeks of rotting in the heat. And how about situations where a family goes on vacation for a week, and thereby misses a garbage pick up:
theoretically the smelly garbage will be sitting in our garage for up to 4 weeks! I fear that if we go to biweekly pick up, people will dump their smelly garbage in public bins, which already have overflow problems in the summers, or in the parks or in other neighbourhoods.

In short, I prefer Option 2 over Option 1. Please do not go to biweekly garbage pick up.

Thank you,
Dan Davison and family
Waterloo

From: Gloria and Steve Smith
Sent: 2015-04-27 13:10:56.0
To: waste@regionofwaterloo.ca
Subject: How Will Curbside Garbage Collection Policy Affect Litter Collection?

Submitted by Gloria (and Steve) Smith, St Agatha.

For 36 years, my husband Steve has been the ONLY person picking up litter on our road, Carmel-Koch Rd, St Agatha, between our home and Wilmot Line. This results in an entire extra bag from our residence for weeks in spring, and partial bags throughout the year. And no, we are not going to sort among used condoms, cigarette butts, flower pots, broken toys and MANY dirty beer tins and liquor bottles! It is enough of an effort to collect it all from road edges, ditches and wetlands. It all gets bagged as garbage. Most of the litter has been thrown or dumped from vehicles, and the occasional pieces have been wind-blown locally.

Our personal household bag number is usually small as we already have compost bins totalling 500 cubic feet.

While we have been thankful for the assistance of the Wilmot road crews in picking up larger items (furniture, car parts, paint drums etc) as necessary, we don?t think it a wise use of their time to drive here to pickup up a bag or partial bag of litter from our residence.

We would like a definitive answer in writing as to how any new policy re: bag limits will affect our own household limit when much or some of the garbage is not ours.

If you wish to phone, our number is xxxxxxxxxxxx. Please call after 11:00 am.

With thanks,
Gloria and Steve Smith

From: Joyce and Walter Ireson
Sent: 2015-04-27 14:52:32.0
To: waste@regionofwaterloo.ca
Subject: Comment
Good Morning:

We are following this topic with great interest. We feel it is so important and continually scold people for not seeing the significance of waste management.

Our feeling is that the "powers" bite the bullet and go to bi-weekly garbage collection. The people that are concerned about smell are obviously not utilizing the green boxes the Region so kindly provided so that concern is really a non-concern but it is a non compliance.

Our garbage output is usually one small grocery-size bag every two weeks.

We do see the importance of green bins and blue boxes being collected on a weekly basis.

We're a progressive community in many ways - let's be a leader in waste management.

If we stay at a hotel anywhere that doesn't provide blue boxes, we make sure to advise the duty manager that we couldn't possibly stay at their hotel again unless their policy changed.

You have our full support.

Joyce and Walter Ireson – Elmira

From: Sheryl Williams
Sent: Wednesday, April 29, 2015 8:28 AM
To: Regional Clerk
Subject: Waste Collection

I have two questions.
1. If the bag limits are 4 for biweekly pick up, how does the city handle when going from curb to curb and come across a home that has 5 bags? Do they collect it and "bill" a resident? I ask this because I have put my garbage out Sunday night and I know I put 2 bags out, but I wake up and all of a sudden there is an "extra" bag on my curb. Normally this would not bother me, but when this change takes effect, I'll be damned to pay of a bag or bags that isn't mine. How can you regulate this?
2. If you are doing unlimited weekly blue and green bins, is this not a waste of money?, especially for green bin pick up, since the green bins go in the same truck as regular garbage, unless Waste Management are getting trucks that are just for green bins. To send a crew out to just pick up garbage, does it not make sense to "kill two birds with one stone?"

From: Dennis Watson
Sent: Wednesday, April 29, 2015 9:32 AM
To: Regional Clerk
Subject: Proposed Changes to Garbage Pick Up

First let me say that we rarely exceed one bag of garbage a week, make use of the blue box program and mulch all organic waste, (don't use the green bin as we don't need to).

I am opposed to a reduction of garbage pick up from one week to bi-weekly. I worry about health issues that could be caused by storing of garbage for an extended period of time. 2
weeks between pickups is too long and should the home owner miss a pickup for any reason they would be storing their garbage for up to a month. Living in a heavily wooded area I see this as an invitation for rodents to move in.

Then there is the issue if a one bag limit. There are 3 adults living in our home and it is rare that we exceed 1 garbage can a week but it does happen and I would not want to have to pay for an additional bag per week. also if a pickup was missed for any reason the home owner may have 2 bags by the time the next pick up rolls around...would they be charged for the additional bag?

I feel that are taxes are high enough that we can afford to maintain a weekly level of garbage pickup and would like to point out that garbage service is one thing that EVERY RESIDENT uses unlike public transportation, hockey arenas and a host of other services that are paid for by all taxpayers but only used by a minority.

If we need to find a way to reduce overall spending wouldn't we be better to look at a service that isn't used by everyone?

Respectfully submitted for your consideration

Dennis Watson

From: Kelly Harrington
Sent: 2015-04-28 17:34:51.0
To: waste@regionofwaterloo.ca
Subject: Bag tags

Hello,

I am wondering how the bag tag program might work. Can you put a bag tag on a specific sized garbage can or does it have to go directly on the bag.

My concern is having to purchase large bags to put my smaller bags of garbage in. The concern is doubling up on plastic - not from a cost perspective but an environmental one. The size of our kitchen garbage can is smaller because of the space the green bin takes up. We do not have enough space to accommodate a larger size can and the green bin.

As well, the garbage can cannot sit under my sink for the every other week pick up without odour becoming a problem. Using a smaller bag allows me to put a full bag of garbage in the outdoor can before the smell becomes a problem.

I would hope that a curb side garbage can could hold multiple smaller bags without having to use extra tags.

I would appreciate your comments on this.

Thank you
Kelly Harrington

From: James R. Clark
I own property that has 2 houses on site with one being rented out to 2 separate tenants. I would like to know what will happen when the new rules come out. The tenants from the back house put their garbage out on Norfolk ave as there is no garbage pickup on Roxboro rd where the house faces onto. The address of the houses is xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx, Cambridge. I would appreciate a response as this could be a serious problem. Thank you James R. Clark

Donna

I fully support Option 1 - bi-weekly collection and the 3 bag limit!! Adding to this should be blue box and green bin collection from businesses. Even starting with paper and paper towel pick up could divert A LOT of recyclable and compostable materials from the landfill - probably several garbage bags/day from my small employer alone.

Kenneth Coe, Mary Ann Wasylycia

This is in response to your request for public input at a meeting 6 May. 2015. I am unable to attend that meeting but would like my observations to be considered.

First and foremost, the public does not respond well to accepting responsibility for what they leave at the curb, how it is presented there and what is the appropriate way to dispose of household trash and items.

Observing in our neighbourhood, clearly the green bin is a rarity at the curb. So are properly secured items for removal both in terms of sizr, stowage and placement. Trash is piled high on snow banks, oversized, and generally dumped at the curb with the expectation that the Region will accept whatever is there. And sadly it does.

If the Region reduces the bag limits, which would have no effect on our household, the garbage would be dumped elsewhere or put in front of less utilized properties such as ours. Park garbage receptacles are already full of household waste in many locations and this would increase in frequency. Our community is not convinced that the garbage they put at the curb is theirs--personally and completely theirs! It would appear that the prominent belief is that if they don't want it, the Region must deal with it.

We would suggest that the fairly limitless garbage collection of present be continued but be reduced to biweekly for everything not properly in a green or blue bin. That way, I will not inherit by neighbours' garbage either out front or in a local park or on the roadways.
We would recommend that green and blue bin collection be continued as a weekly pickup providing some compliance is demanded of residents to use both of these containers properly. If, after a reasonable period of time, the bins continue to contain inappropriate items, the pick up should be suspended for that week. This should require some compliance oversight by either the waste management crews or Region officials randomly monitoring containers for a reasonable period.

Observance of the bin requirements would eventually be followed if residents knew they had to comply.

Since there should be few items in regular biweekly "trash" that would attract vermin or produce foul odours, residents should be able to safely store trash items for even a few weeks. Clearly green bin pickup must be weekly.

It would be a challenge for the Region to attempt to educate the public as to its responsibilities as far as garbage pick up is concerned but I feel the effort would be well worth well in ultimate tax savings, cleaner environments and neater residential communities.

Personally we have carefully handled our garbage and recyclables for decades. It requires a few extra minutes daily and a bit of thought when planning the removal of something like electronics or old paint but the task is not onerous or complicated if residents understood the correct procedures and the cost of non-compliance in terms of taxes and long term environmental problems. It would be beneficial if the community realized the cost of landfill and the proximity to what goes there and their drinking water and the air they breathe.

We would support limiting the frequency of "trash" pickup but not the volumes as now permitted. Our fear is that what does not get picked up at the curb ends up where it should not be.

Good luck with your change proposals.

Kenneth Coe, Mary Ann Wasylycia

From: Nicole Pletz
Sent: Friday, May 01, 2015 5:00 PM
To: Regional Clerk
Subject: Proposed Garbage Collection

Hi,

I have received an email and am submitting my opinion as I am unable to attend the community meeting on May 6th.

I feel that option #2 would make more sense for a few reasons.

1. the trucks will already be making the rounds weekly to collect green bin composting items and recycling

2. not everyone has a garage to keep garbage bags in and I think you will have more garbage blowing around and animals getting into it if you leave it every two weeks
3. after two weeks, I feel there will be considerable odour in garages with items that can't go in the green bin like diapers (speaking from experience)

Nicole Pletz

From: John Lambert
Sent: Friday, May 01, 2015 7:24 PM
To: Regional Clerk
Subject: Curb side collections

Hi there,
Start with the crescents, on the short side, convince all of the residents to put their garbage on one side of the crescent for easier collection. Only one side has to be collected, look at the time saved as well as gas and wear and tear on the vehicles. Only one side to collect from.
But we have to be aware of residents who have cottages and come back from their cottages with one or two weeks of garbage and put it out with this weeks garbage big problem. Too cheap to pay for garbage collection at there cottage. Has to be policed.
So this is just one of my ideas, what do you think ? Please reply.
John L.

From: Adom Postma
Sent: Sunday, May 03, 2015 7:56 AM
To: Regional Clerk
Subject: Waste collection feedback

To Whom It May Concern,

I would like to voice my support for the moving of curbside garbage collection to bi-weekly. I see this as being key to helping move people toward waste reduction and increased use of green bins and blue boxes. Given that our landfill is nearing the end of its useful life and our contract with Guelph, increased use of these programs is key. In order to help people with the transition, this will have to be accompanied by lots of information and tips on using green bins and blue boxes (which has already been done, but will need to be done again).

I know that every family's situation is unique, but I find that by using the green bin and blue boxes our two person household only outs outs out half a kitchen bag of garbage a week on average. Additionally, with a paper liner in the green bins and putting it to the curb weekly, the smell and maggots are rarely a problem.

Once again, I would like to reiterate my support for bi-weekly garbage collection as this is key to introducing a change in lifestyle to people to encourage them to use the blue boxes and green bins as part of their regular activities.

Thank you,
Adom Postma
Kitchener, ON
From: Carmen Nave  
Sent: Monday, May 04, 2015 11:10 AM  
To: Regional Clerk  
Subject: Curbside Pickup Collection Changes

I'm writing to support Option 1. With weekly greenbin pickup, this should be no hardship to anyone, and will be a great benefit to our community. Our household of three generates less than half a bag of garbage on an average week, so the four bag limit should be quite workable for larger families, for those who use more bulky packaging, or when cleaning out the basement/Christmas/moving and so on. Reducing our waste is necessary as our community grows, and I am glad that the Region is creating effective support for households through the recycling and greenbin programs. Reducing the curbside pickup is fiscally and environmentally the right choice.

From: Kathleen Janzen  
Sent: Monday, May 04, 2015 10:47 AM  
To: Regional Clerk  
Subject: Proposed Changes to Garbage Collection

I have major concerns over the administration of either the proposed options/changes regarding bag limits.
1. Who is going to monitor the bag limits? The busy garbage collector????
2. What happens if someone exceeds the bag limit?
3. Will you employ "garbage police" to fine these people?
4. What happens when people who are going to exceed the bag limit choose to dump their extra bags at other houses?
5. What do I do if someone dumps their extra bags at my house so that I have exceeded the limit?
6. Who will be monitoring the weight and size of these bags?
7. We use a garbage can. How will these bag limits affect us?
8. We are 2 retired people who generate very little garbage and will never exceed the bag limits. How fair is this limit to a large family?????

My recommendation is to adopt bi-weekly collection of garbage without a bag limit and continue weekly collection of all recyclables. (green and blue bins).
From: Sharon Gilroy-Dreher
Sent: Monday, May 04, 2015 11:15 AM
To: Regional Clerk
Subject: Waste proposals

Hello –

I am unable to attend the meeting re: waste proposals for the Region and would like to share my concerns and ask some questions:

My concern is for families (such as mine) that have 6 residents – 5 of which are 18 and older. While I can appreciate the goal we are all working towards, I think we need to be reasonable in how these new rules are applied to households dependent on their size. It would be unfair to apply the same limit to homes with 5 or 6 (or more) residents as you would to homes with 1 or 2 residents. Hopefully extra bag tags would be given free to homes with larger families, to be fair.

Will additional green bins be available at no cost if homes require more than one?

Will we be required to use large green garbage bags for the “count” to be accurate? We use garbage cans – so we deposit several of the smaller white kitchen garbage bags or even smaller bathroom garbage bags inside. Will we now be required to purchase large green garbage bags? It makes no sense to force residents to put smaller bags inside larger bags and then into a garbage can - increasing the plastic going to the landfill. How will bags be counted if they are various sizes? Will you count 2 large garbage bins as equal to one household limit - to account for the same allowed number of bags?

How will the Christmas holiday season be handled when there is always increased garbage due to celebrations, gifts, etc.? We fill an extra blue box over the holidays already (filling 3 instead of the normal 2) but our garbage count also increases due to non-recyclable gift packaging and increase in people in our home. Will there be allowances over the holidays when people tend to host large family functions and parties resulting in increased garbage?

Will drop off at transfer stations be free for people who have additional garbage due to various reasons throughout the year?

How will garbage be counted that is normally left at the curb not in bags? For example – furniture, wood, larger items that don’t fit in garbage bags, household items that often get collected overnight by scavengers who are looking for used items.

I’d appreciate answers to the above if you can provide them.

Sharon
From: Jayne & Robert Wagner  
Sent: Monday, May 04, 2015 11:55 AM  
To: Regional Clerk  
Subject: Potential curbside waste collection changes

We want option 2.

Option 2:  
*Weekly Garbage Collection  
•Two garbage bag limit per weekly collection (potential to reduce to one bag); •Unlimited weekly blue box and green bin collection; •Bi-weekly yard waste collection (April to November); •Bi-weekly appliance and bulky item pick-up, three item limit; •Existing special and downtown business services; and •Bag tag program

From: Walter Strobl  
Sent: 2015-05-04 09:54:07.0  
To: waste@regionofwaterloo.ca  
Subject: waste changes

I would like to respond to the proposed waste changes. I can understand that the region has in mind to reduce the waste collection costs, but in the summer the odds of maggots are extremely high. There is currently rarely a summer where I don’t have maggots in my garbage can or green bin no matter how hard I try. Going 2 weeks will just increase this and create a maggot nightmare. I would actually like to propose a third option, where in the winter you go with option 1 and in the summer you go with option 2. Of course not accomplishing that option 2 would be a better choice.

Although the 1 bag potential will be very limiting when it comes into effect. There is no way for anyone to do spring cleaning or if you have extra garbage from some special project like painting (rags and drop sheets etc). Recently my basement flooded and I had to throw away the carpet.

I’m not sure if this went with the large garbage pickup or the regular garbage as it was put out on the same day. There should at least be some special provision for this. Either once a month or some kind of extra pickup if it doesn’t fall into the large pickup category. Currently I rarely am in need of my second garbage can, but there are times I use it.

I feel if the region does not provide provisions for garbage then the likely hood of "dumping" will increase. This will put an unfortunate burden on the people on the receiving end.

Regards,  
Walter Strobl  
Ayr, Ontario

From: Len Kurt  
Sent: 2015-05-04 14:21:11.0  
To: Tgalloway@regionofwaterloo.ca; waste@regionofwaterloo.ca  
Subject: Waste Management Collection - Service Level Options

Good afternoon Tom. I trust this message finds you well.
As Chair of the Planning and Works Committee, I'm attaching a written submission for consideration by yourself and Members of Council at the upcoming Public Input Meeting scheduled for Wednesday May 6th at the Regional Council Chambers. While I plan to attend in person, I wanted to provide the submission in advance in order for Council members to prepare for the upcoming meeting accordingly.

I look forward to the meeting.

Best regards,
Len

Thank you,
Len Kurt, CHRL

(begin attachment)

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

Re: Preliminary Service Level Options for Consideration for a new Waste Collection Contract

Propose: Option 3 as outlined below for consideration

Option 3 – essentially a blending of Option 1 & 2 (suggestions highlighted in bold)

October 1st to May 31st inclusive – (Bi-Weekly Garbage Collection)
Four garbage bag limit per bi-weekly collection (potential to reduce to three bags);

June 1st to September 30th inclusive – (Weekly Garbage Collection)
Two garbage bag limit per week (potential to reduce to one bag);

Note: no changes proposed for the items listed below;

Unlimited weekly blue box and green bin collection;
Bi-weekly yard waste collection (April to November);
Bi-weekly appliance and bulky item pick-up, three item limit;
Existing special and downtown business services; and
Bag tag program.

Rationale

Homeowners

- Engages homeowners with a graduated change in waste collection services and hopefully promotes and encourages the wider use of green bins and blue boxes
- Reduces the ‘ick’ and ‘smell’ factor during the typically warmest months of the year
The summer months are when there are more social events ie. BBQ.s, family picnics, reunions, birthdays, anniversaries and other milestone occasions thereby creating more waste

- Reduces the potential for rodents and other animals to tear open and strew garbage around the streets
- Reduces the potential for homeowners to dump their garbage or ‘extra garbage’ in commercial containers at malls and/or other job sites or in the ditches or surrounding wooded lots – particularly after a weekend social event

Collection Contractor

- Maximum utilization of equipment ie. garbage and green bin can be collected using the same truck. Blue bins are collected using a different truck since the materials are sorted and diverted using a different stream
- Maximum utilization of labour ie. balancing the scheduling of manpower resources
- May preserve and/or create a few jobs

Additional Considerations

- Encourage and promote the use of the green bins in multi- dwelling residential units
- Encourage and promote the use of the green bins in small businesses – particularly those in multi-unit locations and strip malls.
- Consider expanding the hours of operation at the transfer station on Erb Street. With the new Costco development along with other businesses in the area, traffic congestion, longer line-ups, wait times, etc. will continue to be a challenge for homeowners who are willing to take their materials to the landfill. Where the convenience of utilizing the transfer station and landfill is reduced, it is likely that residents will choose other options such as containers in commercial establishments, wooded lots in the area and/or roadside ditches.

Respectfully submitted,
Thank you.

Len Kurt
Kitchener

---

From: Daryl Koenig  
Sent: 2015-05-04 14:52:52.0  
To: waste@regionofwaterloo.ca  
Subject: waste collection

My family does fostering for the Region of Waterloo

We do newborns to 2 years of age which means a lot of dirty dipers
In the summer when it's hot, I get enough maggets appearing not to mention the smell.

I can't even think how bad this would be if it became every 2 weeks for garbage pickup.

Please keep every week garbage pickup.

I recycle & have a back yard black composter that I use all the time.

I don't use a green bin as our new house doesn't have one, but when we did try it at our old house, the paper bag inside of it was never taken.

Thanks for your consideration & I look forward to your response.

Daryl Koenig
(City of Waterloo resident)

---

From: Keith Kenning
Sent: Monday, May 04, 2015 8:57 PM
To: Regional Clerk
Subject: waste changes

In reading the various suggestions regarding the lack of use of green bins, it seems that all of them have a negative impact on those of us who are currently using them. I wonder if a simpler (many residents already have trouble putting their yard waste out on the right week) solution might be "no blue bin, no green bin = no garbage." If a household does not have a blue box and green bin out then we don't pick up their garbage. Sure there are ways around this (putting out empty bins or putting your garbage with your neighbours who do have their bins out) but it would likely embarrass most people and at least only be an inconvenience to those of us who are not doing their bit to help with the problem.

Another advantage would be that this simpler solution could be started immediately. Then, if after trying this for the next year or two, we could then try one of the other proposed solutions that all require waiting until the existing contract expires in 2017.

---

From: Urs Hengartner
Sent: Monday, May 04, 2015 3:14 PM
To: Regional Clerk
Subject: Potential curbside waste collection changes

I support Option 1: Bi-weekly Garbage Collection.

---
From: Phil Keppler
Sent: Monday, May 04, 2015 7:14 PM
To: Regional Clerk
Subject: Garbage Collection Changes

Erin Flewwelling (regional clerk)

Re: Concerns Regarding Garbage Collection Changes

I am contacting you in regards to some of the proposed changes to garbage collection in Waterloo Region. I understand the reasons for the proposals, however I feel that I must make you aware of the impact of these decisions on a number of households and citizens in our region and wish that these concerns be part of the meeting slated for Wed evening May 6.

My wife requires daily home dialysis due to kidney failure. Her treatment (9 hours every night) does generate significant garbage issues in the form of cardboard boxes and associated plastic bags (for required fluid exchange), as well as special tubing. The cardboard we recycle in tied bundles (2x2 size) each week along with our usual blue bin recyclables. The other materials are NOT a biohazard, but can not be recycled. This results in 2 large green garbage bags per week, (occasionally 3 bags in some weeks). We also use the green bins for kitchen wastes, but because there are only 2 of us, the green bin is placed out for collection once every 2 weeks. This makes the cost of the green bin bags more acceptable.

If Regional Council decides to proceed with a 2 week pick up schedule for garbage and recycling, we would find it extremely difficult to STORE both garbage and recycling materials for that length of time. We simply do not have the physical space for this. We also find that odours from the green bin garbage to be very objectionable during the summer months. If council also decides to limit the number of bags per pick up we would forced to purchase additional bag tags due to my wife’s medical condition.

I am uncertain as to how many other citizens are dealing with life sustaining medical treatments at home that have increased their garbage output, however I feel that regional council should try to minimize the impact of their decisions in this regard.

I wish to encourage council to maintain the weekly collection of both recycling, and other household wastes, but impose a 2 bag limit weekly, (not 4 bags every 2 weeks). If people require additional bags, tags could be purchased for a fee NO HIGHER than $2.00 per bag, but for people with medical issues the cost of additional bag tags be reduced to 50 cents or free.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter, I am hopeful that a reasoned sensitive decision will result.

Respectfully,

Phil N Keppler
New Hamburg
From: Regina Ertel  
Sent: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 9:13 AM  
To: Regional Clerk  
Subject: Garbage collection

The region has increased it’s population, but you want garbage pick-up DECREASED, and limited? Absolute hogwash!!!! We will soon look like Detroit!!!!!!!!It's all well and good to limit garbage bags, and reduce pick-up to bi-weekly. What about families (like mine) who have an invalid mother who requires "diapers" (not a baby, but a grown-up) and we have 2 dogs. We should "bottle-up" that waste in the silly little green bucket for... it will seem like an "eternity" You will see people dumping their garbage in mall containers, and parkland. The garbage bins have already been removed at bus stops and entrances to trails. I remember waste container all over the city with the slogan "Keep Kitchener Klean” What happened to that??? Ridiculous!

From: Doug Bell  
Sent: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 10:01 AM  
To: Regional Clerk  
Subject: waste collection changes feedback

Option 1 can be improved upon by also collecting *bi-weekly* grey/blue *carts* which have more room for recyclables. This will be less confusing for residents and provide more space for recyclables. Green bins currently are big enough to hold at least 2 weeks of food waste for my family of 4.

Regardless of the scheduling that council goes with, switching to a grey/blue cart system will make recycling a much easier task since blue boxes can fill up so quickly. As a family (of 4) that always fills at least 2 blue boxes we frequently throw recyclables into the garbage because of lack of blue box space. In addition to more space, a cart will not blow away on a windy day and recyclables will stay in the cart instead of blowing down the street.

One last point of feedback. Styrofoam should be accepted for recycling as it is in many other communities. It can be a bulky item and quickly take away garbage bag "quota". It is currently being recycled in other communities so we need to facilitate the recycling of styrofoam and keep it out of our landfill.

Thank you,
Doug Bell
Resident of Heidelberg, Township of Woolwich

From: Nadia Ursacki  
Sent: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 10:12 AM  
To: Regional Clerk  
Subject: Curbside Collection Service Changes

I would like to say that I and my family are in full support for Option 1 that is proposed by the staff. We need to take action now for our future and the future of our community by giving all residences a further push towards using the green bin and blue bin. Far too much green and
blue bin items are ending up in our landfill. There is no need for these items to go there. Moving to bi-weekly garbage pickup will help move those items to the correct bins for collection. As I see it, Option 2 is not an option at all as it gives hardly any push to more green and blue bin use. Please listen to the staff's recommendation and move to implement Option 1 as soon as possible.

I also encourage the Region to step up and deliver garbage, green and blue bin collection to apartment and condo buildings. The LRT and other planning is hoping to increase our density, with people living in apartments and condos rather than single-family houses. The Region needs to take the responsibility to collect garbage, green and blue bin items from these dwellings, the same that homes receive.

Thank You,

Nadia V. Ursacki
Kitchener

From: Angie Hallman
Sent: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 1:26 PM
To: Regional Clerk
Subject: Waste Collection

Dear Waterloo Region Council and Staff,
I am a rural resident of Wilmot Township and we currently are not offered the green bin service. Living in the rural community it is not ideal to compost everything that we could put in the green bin. We do not want to draw in unwanted wildlife with scrap meat or food onto our property and risk infection or the life of our animals by wild animals being present. I understand the need for change to conserve our landfill but please provide green bin services to rural communities as apart of the for seen changes.
Thank you,
Angie Hallman

From: Rachel Vaillancourt
Sent: Wednesday, May 06, 2015 10:40 AM
To: Regional Clerk
Subject: Waste Management Curbside Collection Changes

We prefer Option #1. This is an easy solution and will save money. Some questions: Is the bag size specified? Will we actually have to put garbage in the larger bags - we use small white garbage bags and put them into a small plastic garbage can. We only put one small bag a week but others may put a number of small white bags so how would that work? Sometimes when we do spring cleaning we fill the plastic garbage can but it is still not the equivalent to 1 green garbage bag. We don't necessarily want to purchase larger green garbage bags. That in itself seems wasteful to use more plastic bags.
A four bag limit (if you mean the green/black) garbage bags is plenty, even for a larger family. If that is not enough, I would not be opposed to my neighbours putting a bag or two with our garbage if needed as long as they don't put it out the night before so the animals get at it.

From: Freida Walker  
Sent: Wednesday, May 06, 2015 3:55 PM  
To: Regional Clerk  
Subject: waste- inout for curbside garbage collection

Option 2 ---
I do not want my garbage sitting around for two weeks that is far too long in the hot days/night. the green bin is rang smelling enough at the end of a week

From: Rob Payne  
Sent: 2015-05-06 14:45:24.0  
To: waste@regionofwaterloo.ca  
Subject: Comments on the proposed garbage changes

The concerns I have is what happens if you are away and are unable to get your garbage out? And then the next week you have twice as much garbage? How will this be addressed? I see small business that use the garbage collection, I thought it was only for residential customers only. Cut those people out and that will save us some room at the dump and cost savings for the company that picks up the garbage! If it is a user pay system does that mean we would get the money back that we currently pay for garbage collection with our property taxes so that we can use it to buy tags? Another concern I have is the fact that we need to rinse out the containers before we put them in the blue box! This costs us money! And with the way the water bills have been increasing, every little drop that comes out of the tap is money down the drain! We're is our compensation for this? I know that the region has already made up there mind on what they are doing with no disregard for what the residents say! Thanks for reading

From: John Zaloznik  
Sent: Thursday, May 07, 2015 12:45 PM  
To: Regional Clerk  
Subject: Proposed Curbside Waste Collection Changes

Hello,

My name is John Zaloznik and I am supportive of Option 1 for the proposed curbside waste collection changes. I believe that moving from weekly to bi-weekly curbside waste collection is the most effective waste diversion option presented and it will make better use of the Region's investment in the green bin program.

According to the staff report "TES-WMS-15-05," residents put out an average of 1.7 bags each week, with the numbers varying based on green bin usage and household size. Based on these
average figures provided, neither of the two options encourage waste diversion on their own since residents are already meeting the proposed garbage bag targets. Option 1 becomes the favourable of the two options because it alone encourages residents to place their organics in the green bin to ensure weekly collection and the mitigation of odours. If garbage gets collected weekly with a 2 bag allowance, as is proposed in Option 2, residents don't have an incentive to change the way they go about disposing their waste.

As it pertains to the economic and ecological interests of Waterloo Region, I believe that Council should move forward with Option 1 and allow for a necessary transition/educational phase for residents. Opportunities for expanding the green bin program to include multi-residential buildings should also be explored.

John Zaloznik

From: Joyce Palubiski
Sent: Thursday, May 07, 2015 9:53 PM
To: Tom Galloway; Ken Seiling; Berry Vrbanovic; Helen Jowett; Doug Craig; Geoff Lorentz; Karl Kiefer; Jane Mitchell; Karen Redman; Wayne Wettlaufer; Les Armstrong; Sue Foxton; Sean Strickland; Sandy Shantz; Cari Howard
Subject: May 6 Meeting - Waterloo Region garbage concerns/ideas

Thanks for the opportunity to express some opinions and ideas about moving forward and creating a new initiative to change the present garbage and move from the status quo....

I appreciate the WR councillors being at the meeting and the presentation by Mr. Arsenault as to two possible programs to address the concerns of the Waste Management Committee.

As mentioned I do feel that the present pickup situation can be improved.

1. Instead of focusing on weekly v.s. biweekly collection ....I believe the **focus should be on how to get our households to use the green bin and eliminate much of the garbage that goes into bags**
   - this would decrease the amount of compost type material that goes into the landfill and increase the amount of material going to green bins thus increasing the amount for our contract with the green bin disposal program (i.e. Guelph)

2. expanding the already successful BLUE BOX program by eliminating the households that put recycle into black garbage bags
   - this can be done by changing the policy to **only pick up garbage that is in clear bags** (see through) and this works as I have personally experienced as a landowner in NEMI (Manitoulin Island Municipal Government - North East Manitoulin and the Islands)
   - In Nemi this has eliminated brush, grass, twigs, small branches that previously went into the black bags and added to the fill in the landfill site and deducted years from the length of operation of the landfill site
• In Nemi this has eliminated the hazardous waste, paint cans etc that take up a lot of the space of a landfill when stuffed into black garbage bags
• In Nemi lots and lots of newspapers, cardboard, paper cups, fast food containers etc. stuffed into black garbage bags and taken to the landfill added again to the already ongoing problem of not reducing garbage and filling the landfill site

Clear see through bags are part of the solution and would increase the already expanding use of blue boxes...

• Clear see through bags would have large paint cans (hazardous waste) etc. eliminated from the landfill
• Clear see through bags would eliminate the mounds of cardboard and paper that is put into black bags and my thoughts that these items would be put into blue boxes eliminating landfill and increasing blue box recycling
• Clear see through bags would increase the mulching and composting of the Region by use of paper yard waste bags for mulching/compost

Clear see through bags would not significantly in my opinion increase the green bin use by making these mandatory - but it would be a starting point. This starting point would/could become a program of increasing awareness of the benefits by using a green bin.

• the benefits - less garbage and less garbage bags for pickup
• how to use the green bin....by using bags inside and I have now successfully got my green bin to not smell, not be a problem with having to use the lined expensive bags but can use the cheaper ones and still have success
• what can go into the green bin...i.e. paper towels after using around the kitchen area, or when drying hands or wiping up messes, peelings, watery items can be soaked up with newspaper as a buffer between and many other ideas to increase green bin usage
• small crawly things can also be eliminated by adding fill of a paper towel etc.
• smell can be a concern but done properly this too can almost be totally eliminated.

3. Increasing the use of green bins by mini contests of "giveaway bags with a note"

 e.g. We noticed your use of the green bin and the increased use on the block/street...we are congratulating you by the awarding of a 'month's use of bags'...thanks...(this type of promotion should expand and gradually many, many more households will use the green bin....

The problem as I see it is the startup of green bin use was flawed....start over and have a goal of increased use of green bins over the next 4 months...(for example) initiating some sort of incentive to green bin use, bags left on a street for most green bins out etc.

As another thought...I believe that weekly garbage collection with a bag limit (stickers to attach to sides of bag that cannot be removed or stolen when garbage bags are put out on the street) would be the best choice with garbage in clear bags and not picked up if recycled material or shrubbery or cardboard etc. was seen through the clear bag. This indeed would encourage green bin use, and blue box use and paper bag use for clippings/grass etc. It would
also eliminate the hazardous materials that people put into black plastic bags and it then gets carted to the landfill site.

Joyce Palubiski,
270 Morrison Road, Unit 6B,
Kitchener, ON

---

From: Dan Adema
Sent: 2015-05-08 08:26:14.0
To: waste@regionofwaterloo.ca
Subject: Curbside collection comments

Hello

I originally missed the survey, but would like to provide some comment.

My household is diligent in using our green bin and blue boxes. The amount of garbage we put out to the road on a typical week is at maximum 2 small grocery bags. As such, I have no concerns about going to bi-weekly garbage pick-up, and in general am supportive of having bag limits.

However, there does need to be a way for me - on rare occasions - to put a large quantity of garbage out by the curb. The particular example that I am thinking of is garbage from small renovation projects (some drywall, carpet etc.). I understand that the objective is to divert whatever possible from the landfill if it can be more appropriately dealt with elsewhere, but there are legitimate occasions where I will have a large amount of landfill-appropriate garbage. The option of bringing it to the landfill site is unduly onerous, as I’ve experienced on several occasions a longer than 2-hour round trip for me even for small quantities of waste.

Additionally, I am very concerned about the amount of illegal dumping that will occur with the proposed bag limits if there is not an option for occasional overages. I annually participate in the spring community cleanups and witness plenty of illegally dumped material now, which I fear would only get worse.

Some suggestions:

1. Bag tags (so that I can keep my average garbage under 2/week, but can have a larger amount on rare occasions)

2. Overage permits - can contact the Region to get a permit to put extra amounts curbside. This can be managed similar to water permits for sod/grass etc. Limit the number of overages per year for a given address.

Thanks.

Dan Adema

---

From: Laura M. Bart
Sent: 2015-05-11 17:27:04.0
To: waste@regionofwaterloo.ca
Subject: changes in garbage collection

I am writing to ask that the following consideration be made as our Region charges ahead with changes to garbage pick up.
I live in downtown Kitchener. As in older neighbourhoods, the space for a garden shed is sometimes dictated by a small driveway. I have a small shed at the end of my driveway. It holds my yard care equipment, one garbage can and my blue box. Each week I put out ONE bag of garbage. Every three weeks I put my blue box out, as it takes that long to fill it. I do not use the green bin, as it takes over a month for me to fill it with wet waste. The smell. The rats from the river. Enough said.
Bottom line, I would suggest that many other older, single family homes, would have the same limitations.
We NEED weekly garbage pick up. Having recycling weekly makes no difference. Green bin use cannot be forced, by limiting bag garbage.

Finally, I ask, (1) the Record newspaper today said nearly half of the council were absent from the meeting for discussion and to hear from concerned citizens, yet they will vote at the end of the month. Informed? (2) Kate Daley spoke on the noon news, Monday last week, suggesting the decision was in fact made, to limit garbage bags and to reduce pick up to every other week ... Decision made prior to the Wednesday meeting? (3) will the new firm hired in two years be a more responsible company, taking care (not even greater, just care) with the unloading and placement of the bins when they collect. I am happy to send you photos of the blue boxes tossed in our gardens, green bins laying in the road, and green bins, not emptied completely, so that when they get slammed onto the sidewalk the wet waste spills on the sidewalk. It's not pretty.

Sincerely,
Laura M. Bart
Kitchener

From: Wayne Rowat
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2015 9:43 AM
To: Colleen Sargeant
Subject: garbage pick up

I believe garbage pick up is a core function of municipal government and feel that there should be no extra charge for or restriction on extra weekly garbage. Don't change the present system of garbage pick up. Thank you Wayne Rowat
Region of Waterloo Fax 519-747-4944  
Waste Management Division  
925 Erb Street West,  
Waterloo, ON N2J 3Z4

April 28, 2015

To whom it may concern:

There is a solution for dealing with household refuse that is not recycled or composted. The city of Montreal uses a system called Plasma Waste Destruction. This process blasts garbage into gases H2 and CO2. “H2 can be used as ecological fuel to generate heat energy and electrical energy decreasing significantly (even to zero) cost of plasma formation and waste utilization. Regained metals from dissociation process can safely return to metallurgic industry, and slag can be used as an additive to road and construction materials.” “The utilization of municipal waste using this method does not cause the emission of foul odours and does not produce a harmful ash, which is something that normally takes place in an incinerating plant.” [www.plasmanwastedisposal.com](http://www.plasmanwastedisposal.com)

“The main advantages of plasma technologies for waste treatment are:

- Clean destruction of hazardous waste,  
- preventing hazardous waste from reaching landfills,  
- no harmful emissions of toxic waste,  
- production of clean alloyed slag which could be used as construction material,  
- processing of organic waste into combustible syngas for electric power and thermal energy.  
- production of value-added products (metals) from slag.” [wikipedia.org/wiki/Plasma_gasification](http://wikipedia.org/wiki/Plasma_gasification)

“Main disadvantages of plasma technologies for waste treatment are:

- Large initial investment costs relative to landfill and  
- The plasma flame reduces the diameter of the sampler orifice over time, necessitating occasional maintenance.” [wikipedia.org/wiki/Plasma_gasification](http://wikipedia.org/wiki/Plasma_gasification)

It is time to improve the health of all earth’s inhabitants as well as the environment. If we do not do a better job of environmental management, we will suffer severe consequences.

Yours truly,

Pauline Duench Miller
To help people recycle

I have a suggestion to make people use their recycle bins. Up in Calhoun Lake Area they have them using clear bags. If the garbage man sees one thing that should not be in the bag he will not pick it up. This has worked miracles in that area.

T. Bechtel
Waterloo

I wrote a letter - have no computer
**ATTACHMENT C**

Information from other municipalities on exemption programs, and other concerns identified by citizens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resident concern/suggestion</th>
<th>Addressed by</th>
<th>Highlights from other municipal programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diapers, incontinence products, and/or additional waste capacity needed for family member with a medical condition</td>
<td>Application for diaper/medical exemption</td>
<td>Households apply to receive free bag tags to set out additional bags on their regular collection day in nearly every municipality. City of Ottawa allows these households to set out one bag on their bi-weekly off-week. In Halton Region, clear bags containing diapers can be brought to the transfer station at no charge. Can also apply to daycares and group homes run out of residential facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death in the family and/or moving</td>
<td>Application for moving exemption</td>
<td>Unique to the City of Ottawa, residents can apply for a moving and/or family death exemption. Upon approval, materials beyond the bag limit must be properly prepared for collection and only placed to the curb on the regular, bi-weekly garbage day. Failure to comply with rules results in a fine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra waste around the holidays</td>
<td>Designated collection weeks when the bag limits are expanded</td>
<td>Residents can &quot;double up&quot; (set out additional bags) for collection following certain holidays, such as New Years, Victoria Day and Labour Day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident concern/suggestion</td>
<td>Addressed by</td>
<td>Highlights from other municipal programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large families</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No municipality offers a “large family exemption” to either their bag limit or bi-weekly collection. With a diaper program available, and unlimited green bin/blue box set out, the proposed 4 bag limit equals 200 lbs of garbage per collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home renovations</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No municipality offers an exemption for renovation waste. This is considered construction/demolition material outside of normal curbside service, and can be brought to the local transfer stations for a fee or handled by a private waste management firm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odours from pet waste, diapers, feminine hygiene products, raw meat packaging</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Pet waste can go in the green bin. Diapers, feminine hygiene products and raw meat packaging should be tightly bagged in plastic, and placed in a container with a lid for storage in a cool, dry location. Rinsing Styrofoam meat trays is also recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basement apartments, in-law suites</td>
<td>Regulation</td>
<td>Houses with registered, permitted apartments can set out the applicable bag-limit per unit. Non-permitted apartments are not eligible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumping: either in front of another home, or roadside</td>
<td>Education and fair regulation</td>
<td>Other municipalities saw a small initial increase, however the issue quickly diminishes and does not continue long term. Municipalities work with residents to offer a fair solution. If dumping becomes an ongoing issue, by-law officers are involved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Resident concern/suggestion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resident concern/suggestion</th>
<th>Addressed by</th>
<th>Highlights from other municipal programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory use of green bin and blue box in order to receive garbage collection</td>
<td></td>
<td>It would be possible to introduce this requirement at some point in the future, if desired by Council. Some residents currently manage their organic waste in a backyard composter instead of the green bin, and some residents prefer to bring their containers in once they are emptied – evidence of green bins or blue boxes may not always be evident at the curb when the garbage truck arrives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory use of clear bags for garbage</td>
<td></td>
<td>It would be possible to introduce this requirement at some point in the future, if desired by Council. Other municipalities using clear bag programs won't collect garbage if they see organics or recyclables in the clear garbage bag. It would require a supporting policy banning organics and recyclables from collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cart collection of recyclables</td>
<td></td>
<td>The current setup of the Region’s Materials Recycling Centre requires containers (plastic, metal, glass) to be separated from fibre (paper and cardboard). This sorting is currently done by collection crews onto trucks when material is collected, and the Region receives more revenue for our recyclables when they are marketed. Cart collection would not allow for sorting, and is therefore not compatible with the Region's current two-stream program. The large capital expense to supply every household with collection carts is another consideration that would need to be addressed, should Council desire to look into this type of program for the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident concern/suggestion</td>
<td>Addressed by</td>
<td>Highlights from other municipal programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single side of the street collection</td>
<td></td>
<td>It would be possible to introduce this requirement at some point in the future, if desired by Council. Challenges include public safety when crossing roadways, and which side of the street to select: some residents would prefer it to be their side, while others would prefer that it not be. An additional challenge becomes identifying which household the waste belongs to, in the case of bags beyond the limit, uncollectable waste or other issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal treatment of garbage</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Waste Management Master Plan, endorsed by Council in November 2014, recommends further research into thermal treatment of waste as the preferred option for residual garbage once the landfill is full. A thermal treatment feasibility study is underway, and information is available on the Region’s website at <a href="http://www.regionofwaterloo.ca/waste">www.regionofwaterloo.ca/waste</a>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region of Waterloo
Planning, Development, and Legislative Services
Community Planning

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

Date: May 26, 2015  File Code: D03-80

Subject: Blue Dot Declaration

Recommendation:
For direction.

Summary:
The Blue Dot movement was initiated by the David Suzuki Foundation to encourage the federal and provincial governments to emulate numerous other countries and enshrine the right of citizens to a clean and healthy environment in the Constitution. A Model Blue Dot Declaration is being circulated across Canada (please see Attachment 1). Individual Canadians are invited to sign it, and it is also being submitted to Municipal Councils for consideration of adoption. As of the end of April 2015, some form of the Model declaration has been adopted by approximately 45 municipalities ranging from Vancouver and Montréal down to small rural towns. In Ontario, Hamilton, Richmond Hill, and Ajax have adopted a version of the Declaration.

Local Blue Dot organizers are requesting Regional and Area Municipal Councils in Waterloo Region to adopt the Blue Dot Declaration. They hope that as local communities pass municipal declarations respecting people’s right to live in a healthy environment, all provinces and territories will follow suit and eventually result in environmental rights being enshrined in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

An inter-municipal working group of Area Municipal and Regional environmental planning and sustainability staff has analysed the text of the Model Declaration. While there is no fundamental disagreement about the basic principle of enshrining the right to a clean environment in federal or provincial statutes or the Constitution, several areas of concern have been identified. First, as creatures of their respective provinces,
municipalities do not have legal authority to grant rights other than development rights through planning approvals. Also, some provisions duplicate existing legal measures at other levels of jurisdiction or fall under multiple jurisdictions. Some of the recommended rights related to the Precautionary Principle and “full cost accounting” could be impracticable on a regular basis. “Prioritizing” active modes of transportation would go beyond municipal efforts to promote a more sustainable balance of active and vehicular transportation modes. Thus, staff caution that endorsing the original version might have the potential to commit municipalities to actions outside their jurisdictions or that might not always be practicable. In appearing to recognize rights, staff is concerned that municipalities could later be challenged when the high standards endorsed in the Model Declaration cannot reasonably be achieved.

Should Council wish to take action on this request, however, the inter-municipal working group has adapted the original Blue Dot Declaration to better reflect the responsibilities and realities of municipal government, both Regional and Area Municipal. It contains a clear, succinct resolution addressing the overriding goal of the Blue Dot movement by calling upon the senior levels of government to enshrine environmental rights in the Ontario Environmental Bill of Rights and Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Staff have also sought to enhance the potential impact of the Declaration, if it is supported by Regional and Area Municipal Councils, by presenting essentially the same version of the Declaration with appropriate modifications to reflect actions appropriate to the respective municipalities.

Report:

The Blue Dot movement was initiated by the David Suzuki Foundation and Ecojustice Canada. It seeks to encourage the federal and provincial governments to follow the lead of numerous other countries and enshrine the right of citizens to a clean and healthy environment in the Constitution. To this end, a Model Blue Dot Declaration is being circulated across Canada (please see Attachment 1). It became widely publicised through a 2014 trans-Canadian tour by Dr. David Suzuki. Individual Canadians are invited to sign it, and it is also being submitted to Municipal Councils for consideration of adoption. As of the end of April, 2015, some form of the Model declaration has been adopted by approximately 45 municipalities in several provinces. These have ranged from large cities such as Vancouver and Montréal down to small rural towns. Ontario, Hamilton, Richmond Hill and Ajax have adopted a version of the Declaration.

The Blue Dot organizers have been actively working to encourage the Regional and Area Municipal Councils adopt the Blue Dot Declaration. The Blue Dot website notes that municipalities make decisions affecting a range of environmental matters that influence human health and well-being. It states that:

“. . .local governments can introduce declarations of environmental rights to show
their support for residents’ rights to clean air, water and safe food. Declarations are also a commitment by municipalities to address local environmental concerns. . . . A municipal declaration of environmental rights is a commitment to decision-making principles that will protect, fulfill and promote the right to a healthy environment.

The Blue Dot organizers hope that as “local communities to pass municipal declarations respecting people’s right to live in a healthy environment, decision-makers across all provinces and territories will take notice. This will put pressure on provinces to follow suit and pass environmental bills of rights.” Eventually, they foresee the day when environmental rights will be added to the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

An inter-municipal working group of Area Municipal and Regional environmental planning and sustainability staff has analysed the text of the Model Declaration. While there is no fundamental disagreement about the basic principle of enshrining the right to a clean environment in federal or provincial statutes or the Constitution, several areas of concern have been identified. In general, they can be summarised as follows:

1. Municipalities are creatures of their respective provinces and as such do not have legal authority to grant rights other than development rights through planning approvals.

2. Some provisions duplicate existing legal measures at other levels of jurisdiction. For example, item 1(e) “The right to know about pollutants and contaminants released into the local environment” is already addressed through the National Pollutant Release Inventory under the Canadian Environmental Protection Act. Further, item 1(f) “The right to participate in decision-making that will affect the environment” is already enshrined in various federal and provincial statutes (e.g., Environmental Assessment Act, Planning Act, Ontario Environmental Bill of Rights).

3. Some of the stated rights such as “The right to consume safe food” fall under multiple jurisdictions. Municipal public health departments oversee food safety in restaurants and at public events, but responsibility for other aspects of food safety such as pre-packaged foods, meat-packing plants, pesticide residues, and additives rests with senior level of government.

4. The Precautionary Principle stated in Item 3 is generally accepted as a good idea, but can be challenging to implement if it delays necessary actions or pushes Planning Act applications beyond the statutory time period and risks an appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board for failing to make a decision. In any case, the Ministry of the Environment has jurisdiction where pollution poses risks to human health.
5. While full cost accounting is intuitively a good approach to sustainability, it can be methodologically more challenging than life cycle costing which is similar but more focused in scope and perspective (i.e., proponent costs vs. costs to society-at-large and the natural environment). Further, it may be a practice more appropriate to federal and provincial levels of government than for municipalities.

6. Item 5(a), the prevention of “pollution hotspots” would be extremely difficult to achieve in the current land development regime which is to a large extent proponent-driven within land use designations in official plans. For the most part, municipalities are careful to segregate sensitive land uses from chemical, biological, air, noise or agricultural pollution sources pursuant to provincial legislation and guidelines.

7. Item 5(e) to “prioritize walking, cycling and public transit as preferred modes of transportation” would go beyond municipal efforts to promote a more sustainable balance of active and vehicular transportation modes.

To assist Council in determining whether to endorse the Blue Dot Declaration, the foregoing analysis is intended to avoid supporting a draft that may commit municipalities to actions outside their jurisdictions or to standards that may not always be practicable. Also, in appearing to recognize rights, staff is concerned that municipalities could later be challenged when the high standards endorsed in the Model Declaration cannot reasonably be achieved.

Should Council wish to take action on the request to endorse the Blue Dot Declaration, the inter-municipal working group has adapted the original Declaration to better reflect the responsibilities, limitations, and realities of municipal government, both Regional and Area Municipal. It contains a clear, succinct resolution addressing the overriding goal of the Blue Dot movement by calling upon the senior levels of government to enshrine environmental rights in the Ontario Environmental Bill of Rights and Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Staff has also sought to enhance the potential impact of the Declaration, if it is supported by Regional and any Area Municipal Councils, by presenting essentially the same version of the Declaration with appropriate modifications to reflect actions appropriate to the respective municipalities.

**Proposed resolution**

The alternative text of the Blue Dot Declaration prepared by Area Municipal and Regional staff is as follows:

Whereas the Regional Municipality of Waterloo and its constituent Area Municipalities, have for many years striven within their respective areas of jurisdiction to maintain a healthy environment for all our citizens through initiatives including, but not limited to, official plan policies and by-laws protecting
agricultural land and natural areas, making efficient use of urban land and infrastructure, the provision of clean and safe drinking water, sustainable use of water and energy, air quality and climate action plans, waste reduction strategies, transit and active transportation, promoting food safety, and providing outdoor recreational opportunities;

And Whereas the Municipality operates under provincial and federal statutory authority, and does not have constitutional authority to confer human rights, but nonetheless endeavours to respect and promote the rights and quality of life of its citizens and pursues the public interest in all its actions;

And Whereas the Municipality understands that people are part of the environment, and that a healthy environment is inextricably linked to human health and the social and economic well-being of our community;

And Whereas the Municipality within its jurisdictional mandate supports in principle the right of all people to live in a healthy environment, including:

(a) the right to breathe clean air
(b) the right to drink clean water
(c) the right to consume safe food.
(d) the right to access nature
(e) the right to know about pollutants and contaminants released into the local environment.
(f) the right to participate in decision-making that will affect the environment.

Therefore Be It Resolved:

(a) That the Regional Chair, on behalf of Regional Council, be directed to forward this resolution to the Prime Minister of Canada with the request that the right of all citizens to live in a healthy environment be enshrined in appropriate federal legislation and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms;

(b) That the Regional Chair, on behalf of Regional Council, be directed to forward this resolution to the Premier of Ontario with the request that the right of all citizens to live in a healthy environment be enshrined in appropriate provincial legislation including the Ontario Environmental Bill of Rights;

(c) That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to all local Members of the Parliament of Canada and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario; and
(d) That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and the Association of Municipalities of Ontario.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

The revised version of the draft was developed by environmental planning and sustainability staff of the Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener, Waterloo, and Region.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

The Blue Dot Declaration relates to many of the actions listed under “protect and Enhance the Environment.”

Financial Implications:

Nil.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Legal Services assisted with the preparation of this report. In the event Council adopts a version of the Blue Dot Declaration, Council and Administrative Services staff would forward the adopted text as directed in the recommendation.

Attachments:

Attachment 1 – Blue Dot’s Recommended Model Municipal Declaration: The Right To A Healthy Environment

Prepared By: Chris Gosselin, Manager, Environmental Planning

Approved By: Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Development and Legislative Services
Attachment 1 - Model Municipal Declaration: The Right to a Healthy Environment

Whereas the Municipality understands that people are part of the environment, and that a healthy environment is inextricably linked to the well-being of our community;

The Municipality finds and declares that:

1. All people have the right to live in a healthy environment, including:

   (a) The right to breathe clean air

   (b) The right to drink clean water.

   (c) The right to consume safe food.

   (d) The right to access nature

   (e) The right to know about pollutants and contaminants released into the local environment.

   (f) The right to participate in decision-making that will affect the environment

2. The Municipality has the responsibility, within its jurisdiction, to respect, protect, fulfill and promote these rights.

3. The Municipality shall apply the precautionary principle: where threats of serious or irreversible damage to human health or the environment exist, the Municipality shall take cost effective measures to prevent the degradation of the environment and protect the health of its citizens. Lack of full scientific certainty shall not be viewed as sufficient reason for the Municipality to postpone such measures

4. The Municipality shall apply full cost accounting: when evaluating reasonably foreseeable costs of proposed actions and alternatives, the Municipality will consider costs to human health and the environment.

5. By 2017, the Municipality shall specify objectives, targets and timelines and actions the Municipality will take, within its jurisdiction, to fulfill residents’ right to a healthy environment, including priority actions to:

   a) Ensure equitable distribution of environmental benefits and burdens within the municipality, preventing the development of pollution “hot spots”;

   b) Ensure infrastructure and development projects protect the environment, including air quality;

   c) Address climate change by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and implementing adaptation measures;
d) Responsibly increase density;

e) Prioritize walking, cycling and public transit as preferred modes of transportation;

f) Ensure adequate infrastructure for the provision of safe and accessible drinking water;

g) Promote the availability of safe foods;

h) Reduce solid waste and promote recycling and composting;

i) Establish and maintain accessible green spaces in all residential neighbourhoods.

The Municipality shall review the objectives, targets, timelines and actions every five (5) years, and evaluate progress towards fulfilling this declaration.

The Municipality shall consult with residents as part of this process.
Region of Waterloo

Transportation and Environmental Services Department

Transportation Division

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

Date: May 26, 2015

File Code: T04-40/7

Subject: New Highway 7 Construction Activity for 2015

Recommendation:

For information.

Summary:

Nil

Report:

The Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO) is working on the design of the planned new Highway 7 between Kitchener and Guelph (Appendix A). The new four-lane freeway will connect to Highway 85 (the Conestoga Parkway) at the Wellington Street interchange and will divert inter-regional traffic away from Victoria Street.

MTO is continuing with detail design and property acquisition in advance of constructing the highway. One major task will be construction of the multi-level interchange at Wellington Street (Appendix B). Constructing this interchange will involve the following main activities:

- Riverbend Drive/Shirley Avenue realignment: Wellington Street currently ends at its intersection with Riverbend Drive/Shirley Avenue. The intersection is to be eliminated, with Riverbend Drive realigned to the north of the highway, Shirley Avenue ending in a cul-de-sac and Wellington Street extended directly into Shirley Avenue;

- Bruce Street extension: Bruce Street will be extended from Victoria Street to Wellington Street. The extension will include a bridge over the CN railway;
• Edna Street ramp extension: The southbound off-ramp that connects to Edna Street will be extended to start at the current Wellington Street off-ramp; and

• Victoria Street bridge replacement: The Victoria Street bridge over Highway 85 will need to be completely replaced with a new, longer structure to accommodate the ramps connecting Highway 85 to the new Highway 7. Replacement of the bridge will require full closure of Victoria Street for an entire construction season.

Over the next three years, MTO’s advance construction work will be as follows:

• 2015: Widening of the Guelph Street overpass and utility relocations at the Victoria Street bridge;

• 2016: Continuation of the Victoria Street bridge utility relocations and realignment of Shirley Avenue; and

• 2017: Victoria Street Bridge replacement.

In 2014, Regional staff met with MTO and City of Kitchener staff to discuss traffic detours for the duration of the Victoria Street bridge closure. Completing the extension of Wellington Street to Shirley Avenue in advance of the Victoria Street closure will give traffic on Victoria Street another route around the construction area. Staff also discussed other detour options. The preferred detour routes and responsibility for maintaining the detours will be determined as these consultations continue.

The utilities along the Victoria Street Bridge currently include a watermain and a sanitary sewer. Regional staff continues to work with MTO regarding the 2015 and 2016 utility relocations off the bridge in advance of its replacement.

Regional Council previously approved the recommendation for a raised centre median as part of the planned reconstruction of Victoria Street between Edna Street and Bruce Street to mitigate the high incidence of mid-block collisions associated with traffic congestion and turning movements at commercial driveways (Report E-13-042). Once the new Highway 7 is completed, traffic on Victoria Street is anticipated to be lower, resulting in a reduction of expected collisions. The raised centre median is being designed such that it can be removed and converted to a centre two-way left turn lane, reinstating full access movements to adjacent businesses when the new Highway 7 is completed and operational.

In accordance with Council’s motion in approving the raised centre median, staff was directed to report back to Council once MTO’s schedule for the Victoria Street Bridge is known. The Region’s work to construct the median is to be incorporated into the MTO contract for the replacement of the Victoria Street Bridge, to be completed in 2017. Regional staff will notify adjacent businesses and property owners when construction
schedules have been confirmed with MTO.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

The new Highway 7 (Kitchener – Guelph) is consistent with Focus Area 3 (Sustainable Transportation) of the 2011-2014 Strategic Plan. It advances Strategic Objectives 3.3 (Optimize existing road capacity to safely manage traffic throughout Waterloo Region) and 3.4 (Encourage improvements to intercity transportation services to and from Waterloo Region).

Financial Implications:

Nil

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Nil

Attachments

Appendix A – New Highway 7 (Kitchener to Guelph) Key Map

Appendix B – Planned Highway 7/85 Interchange at Wellington Street

Prepared By: Geoffrey Keyworth, Acting Manager, Strategic Transportation Planning

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
New Highway 7 (Kitchener to Guelph) Key Map
Planned Highway 7/85 Interchange at Wellington Street

- Wellington Street SB off-ramp extended to Edna Street
- Riverbend Drive realignment
- Shirley Avenue realignment (2016)
- Bruce Street extended to Wellington Street
- Victoria Street Bridge fully replaced, raised centre median between Edna Street and bridge (2017)

Legend:
- VE Recommendation
Erb Street Improvements
Fischer-Hallman Road to Wilmot Line
City of Waterloo

Public Consultation Centre #1
Information Package

What: Road Widening and Active Transportation Improvements on Erb Street

Where: Erb Street from Fischer-Hallman Road to Wilmot Line in the City of Waterloo

Why: To provide needed pavement reconstruction and road improvements for traffic growth and transportation system improvements for transit, pedestrians and cyclists along the Erb Street corridor in the City of Waterloo

When: Construction in 2018

Who: Region of Waterloo Project Manager
William Gilbert, P. Eng.
Region of Waterloo
Phone: (519) 575-4603
Email: WGilbert@regionofwaterloo.ca

Public Consultation Centre #1
Thursday May 28, 2015, 4:30PM to 8:00PM
Kitchener- Waterloo Bilingual School
600 Erb Street West
Waterloo, Ontario

There is a comment sheet at the back of this package. Please fill it out and share your comments with us.
1. Why is the Region considering this project?

The section of Erb Street west of Fischer-Hallman Road to Gateview Drive is exhibiting poor pavement conditions and has been identified as in need of major reconstruction. In addition, sections of Erb Street from Fischer-Hallman Road to Erbsville Court, and west of Ira Needles Boulevard to Wilmot Line, are lacking sidewalks and or cycling facilities and thus do not provide pedestrians and cyclists’ access throughout the entire road corridor and to transit stops along the corridor. The Region’s Active Transportation Master Plan has identified Erb Street as a core on-road cycling route.

The 2010 Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) has identified the sections of Erb Street from Gateview Drive westerly to Erbsville Court, and Ira Needles Boulevard westerly to Wilmot Line, for future widening to meet increased traffic demands associated with development in the area.

2. Who is directing this project?

The planning and design for this project is being directed by staff from the Region of Waterloo and City of Waterloo, along with Region of Waterloo Councillor Jane Mitchell and City of Waterloo Councillor Bob Mavin. The consulting engineering firm of WalterFedy has been retained by the Region of Waterloo to provide design services on this project and to provide contract administration and inspection services during construction.

3. How is this project being planned?

This project is being planned in accordance with the requirements of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA). The Municipal Class EA is a planning and decision-making process approved under the Environmental Assessment Act that is used by municipalities to plan public infrastructure projects so that potential environmental impacts are considered before a project is approved. It requires consultation with the public, involved stakeholders and agencies in consideration of alternatives and their impacts on the project environment. This project is being planned as a Schedule ‘C’ Class EA project which applies to larger, more complex projects with the potential for significant environmental impacts (natural, social, cultural and economic) and requires multiple opportunities for public input.

This project is in the early phase of the Class EA process and this initial Public Consultation Centre is being held for members of the public to become aware of the project and to provide input into the project for further development of alternatives and their environmental impacts.
4. What is the purpose of this Public Consultation Centre?

The purpose of this Public Consultation Centre is to have interested groups and individuals learn about and provide input on:

a) The needs and opportunities for improvements on Erb Street;

b) The project environment (natural, social, cultural/heritage and economic);

c) The alternative solutions for improvements being considered by the Project Team;

d) How the alternative solutions for improvements will be evaluated and how a preferred alternative will be identified; and

e) Future public input opportunities planned.

Region and City staff as well as the project consultant are available at this Public Consultation Centre to answer any questions you may have. We kindly request that you fill out the Comment Sheet attached to the back of this Information Package and either put it in the Comment Box at the Public Consultation Centre or send it to the address noted on the Comment Sheet. Your comments will be considered by the Project Team in conjunction with all other relevant information in recommending a preferred alternative for this project.

5. What alternatives are being considered for this project?

The following alternative solutions for improvements are currently being considered by the Project Team;

1) **Do Nothing** – aside from general maintenance (asphalt repair/overlay, etc.), this alternative would retain the road in its current number of traveled lanes without widening or the addition of curbs and a drainage system, sidewalks or cycling facilities;

2) **Maintain the Existing Road and Add Active Transportation Facilities** - This alternative would retain the current number of traveled lanes similar to alternative 1, but would include for the addition of cycling facilities (either on-road or off-road) and pedestrian sidewalks;

3) **Urbanize the Existing Road (west of Ira Needles) and Add Active Transportation Facilities** – This alternative would retain the current number of traveled lanes, and add the following facilities:
   - Curb and gutter and a storm drainage system;
   - Cycling facilities (either on-road or multi-use trails);
   - Pedestrian sidewalks;
4) **Widen the Road to 4-lanes and Add Active Transportation Facilities** – This alternative would include all improvements under Alternative 3, as well as widening of Erb Street to 4-lanes between Gateview Drive and Erbsville Court, and west of Ira Needles Boulevard to Wilmot Line.

Common to all alternatives is the consideration of intersection design alternatives such as turn lanes, roundabouts and traffic signals, as well as turn lanes at driveway entrances and the provision of transit stop pads and shelters as necessary.

### 6. What other improvements are planned or underway in the project area and how do they impact this project?

As part of the Region’s Transportation Capital Program, other road improvements in the project area that are currently planned are as follows:

- Development of the West Waterloo Commercial Centre lands (known as the Costco site) on the north side of Erb Street, west of Ira Needles Boulevard and opposite the Region’s Waste Management Centre, has been approved for which current plans have identified the need for two roundabouts on Erb Street in providing access to the development site as well as a connection to a future north-south City collector road. Potential construction of the proposed roundabout road improvements are scheduled for early 2016 (subject to Regional Council approval).

- Widening of Ira Needles Boulevard to 4 lanes from University Avenue to Erb Street and improvements to the roundabout at Erb Street are scheduled for 2016 (pending property acquisition).

The detailed design and construction information for these other road improvements will be incorporated into the background information for this EA study.

In addition, improvements for the addition of a second inbound scale at the Region’s Waste Management Centre Small Vehicle Transfer Station (Gate 2) are underway. This second scale will enhance current operations at the Small Vehicle Transfer Station (Gate 2) which will be monitored for reductions in traffic queueing onto Erb Street.

### 7. How do the improvements being considered relate to the objectives of the Regional Transportation Master Plan, the Active Transportation Master Plan and the Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines?

The Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) is a high-level strategic plan that assesses existing and future traffic patterns and volumes across the entire Regional road network to determine the short and long-term needs for road improvements. The RTMP was approved in 2010, and centered on four key goals to get people and goods around the Region through to 2031. These four goals are shown in Table 1:
Table 1: RTMP Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Optimize the Transportation System</td>
<td>Make the most of what exists: preserve and maximize the use of facilities and services — avoid or defer the need for new infrastructure that does not support the other goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Transportation Choice</td>
<td>Provide and maintain a transportation system that offers competitive choices for moving people and goods in an integrated and seamless manner while minimizing single occupancy vehicle trips.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster a Strong Economy</td>
<td>Provide a transportation system that supports the retention of existing businesses and attraction of sustainable economic activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Provide and maintain a transportation system that supports sustainable growth in both urban and rural areas and reduces transportation contributions to climate change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The RTMP considers a variety of strategic road improvements necessary to keep people and goods moving into the future. However, the provision of transportation choice is integral to several of the RTMP goals. With this in mind, and recognizing that local context will influence transportation design choices, priority will generally be given in the following order of decreasing priority:

- Walking;
- Cycling;
- Public transit;
- Carpooling and other smart commute strategies; and
- Single occupant vehicles.

Erb Street provides an important east-west transportation link from the surrounding area to Uptown Waterloo through the predominately residential areas east of Ira Needles Boulevard. The 2010 RTMP identified the need to widen Erb Street to four lanes between Gateview Drive and Erbsville Court, as well as between Ira Needles Boulevard and Wilmot Line, in the five to ten year horizon (approximately 2015 to 2020) to meet traffic demands associated with development in the area.

The Region of Waterloo’s Active Transportation Master Plan (ATMP) recommended sidewalks and on-road bike lanes on both sides of Erb Street between Fischer-Hallman Road and Ira Needles Boulevard. On-road bike lanes currently exist on Erb Street west of Ira Needles Boulevard to St. Agatha and east of Fischer-Hallman to Westmount Road and as part of the EA the Project Team will evaluate the opportunity and benefit of other facilities for sidewalks and multi-use trails along this section of road.
The Context Sensitive Regional 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 the road allowance such as vehicle lanes, cycling facilities, sidewalks and boulevards. In accordance with the CDG, Erb Street is identified as a “Neighbourhood Connector – Avenue”. Designing Erb Street to support active transportation modes including walking and cycling is a fundamental character of this road classification.

Given that portions of the Study Area currently have transit (GRT Routes 5 & 29) and that more routes are planned for the future, the Regional Official Plan, the Transportation Master Plan and the Active Transportation Master Plan (ATMP) all support complete and continuous pedestrian facilities on this section of Erb Street for the full length of this project. Sidewalks or multi-use trails on both sides of the road will meet this need.

8. Who will be responsible for the winter maintenance of the new sidewalks/multi-use trails?

Maintenance of new back-lot sidewalks or multi-use trails along Regional roads is the responsibility of the local municipality and adding new sections of back-lot sidewalks or multi-use trails will be subject to confirmation of available maintenance funding by the local municipality.

9. How will existing trees be affected?

Existing trees along the road corridor may require removal to accommodate new sidewalks, multi-use trails or widening of the road to 4-lanes and/or implementation of on-road cycling lanes. Any potentially impacted trees will be reviewed as to their significance and health and a determination made if disturbance should and/or could be avoided. A streetscape design will be completed for planting of any new trees and any trees removed will be considered for replacement with nursery stock of a Region-approved native species on a two for one basis.

10. Are noise barriers being considered for this project?

Noise barriers will be considered as part of the project and the noise study and any recommended barrier installations would follow the Region’s Implementation Guidelines for Noise Policies. Potential noise attenuation will be addressed later in the EA process once a preferred alternative has been chosen for this project.
11. **Is any private property required for this project?**

One of the goals of the planning and design process for this project is to minimize the impact on adjacent properties and minimize the need to acquire private property. An initial review of the existing road allowance indicates that along the majority of the road corridor, the width of the road right-of-way is sufficient for all options being considered. However, with the 4-lane option, it is anticipated that the Region would need to acquire some strips of property from several abutting property owners. Identification of property needs will be completed during the evaluation of alternatives as the study proceeds and will be presented at a future Public Consultation Centre.

In areas where property is required, the property owner would be contacted directly by the Region of Waterloo’s Land Purchasing Officer. Compensation would be provided at fair market rates based on recent similar area sales. Please refer to Appendix “A” for further information on the property acquisition process.

12. **How is the natural environment being considered?**

As part of the environmental inventory for the project, a Natural Environment study has been undertaken documenting the natural features and wildlife within the study area. The review determined that there is no significant wildlife, fisheries or areas of natural significance at the project site. A wetland area on the south side of Erb Street, west of Ira Needles Boulevard, was identified as a “Regulated Area” by the GRCA. If any development or alteration is to take place in this regulated area, a permit for Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses will be required. Further consultation with the GRCA will be required to confirm the boundary of this regulated area and if there will be any overlaps with the road expansion.

Of the endangered species or species of concern as listed in the Endangered Species Act (ESA), the only species observed and considered to have moderate or high probability to occur at the site are the Snapping Turtle and Barn Swallow. The road expansion is not expected to directly affect these species or their habitat; however, further consultation will be undertaken with the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF).

13. **What is the estimated cost of this project?**

The cost of this project will depend on the approved improvement alternative, as well as necessary infrastructure relocations and property acquisitions. Funding of $11.675 million for improvements on Erb Street is included in the Region’s 2015 Ten Year Transportation Capital Program.
14. What is the project schedule and what are the next steps for improvements on Erb Street?

The Project Team will review the public comments received from this Public Consultation Centre and use them as input for completion of the Erb Street Class Environmental Assessment. An assessment of the potential impacts of each alternative on the project environment will be completed and the Project Team will evaluate the alternatives for presentation of a preferred improvement alternative at a second Public Consultation Centre anticipated to be held in the Fall of 2015 for further public review and input. After consideration of the technical information completed and all public input received, the Project Team will present a recommendation to Regional Council in the Winter/Spring of 2015/2016 for approval of an improvement alternative that best meets the needs of the public while minimizing the impact on the project environment.

Pending project approval by Regional Council, detailed design and property acquisition would be completed throughout 2016 and 2017 with utility relocations in late 2017 and construction commencing in 2018.

15. How will I receive further notification regarding this project?

Property owners abutting the project site and members of the public registering at this Public Consultation Centre will receive all forthcoming public correspondence, and will be notified of all future meetings.

16. How can I provide my comments?

In order to assist the Project Team in addressing any comments or concerns you might have regarding this project, we ask that you fill out the attached Comment Sheet and leave it in the comment box provided at the registration table. Alternatively you can mail, fax or e-mail your comments to the Project Team member listed below, no later than Friday June 12, 2015.

We thank you for your involvement and should you have any questions or concerns please contact one of the following:

Mr. William Gilbert, P. Eng.
Senior Project Manager
Region of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street, 6th Floor
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3
Telephone: (519) 575-4603
Fax: (519) 575-4430
Email: wgilbert@regionofwaterloo.ca

Mr. Mark Christensen, P. Eng.
Partner
WalterFedy
675 Queen Street S., Suite 111
Kitchener, ON N2M 1A1
Telephone: (519) 576-2150, ext. 285
Fax: (519) 576-5499
Email: mchristensen@walterfedy.com
17. How can I view project information following the PCC?

All of the PCC display materials and other relevant project information, notifications of upcoming meetings and contact information are available for viewing at the Region of Waterloo municipal office as identified above. Alternatively, you may visit the Region’s website at www.regionofwaterloo.ca.
Appendix A

Property Acquisition Process Information Sheet

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

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

Property Impact Plans

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

Initial Owner Contact by Regional Real Estate Staff

Once the PIPs are finalized and available, Regional Real Estate staff will retain an independent appraiser to provide preliminary valuations of the land requirements and their effect on the value of the property. As this process nears completion Real Estate staff will contact the affected property owners by telephone and mail to introduce themselves and set-up initial meetings to discuss the project, appraisals and proposed acquisitions.

Initial Meetings

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

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

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

Steps Toward Offer of Settlement or Agreement of Purchase and Sale

The general steps towards such an offer are as follows;

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

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

Expropriation

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

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

For information on the expropriation process, please refer to ‘Expropriation Information Sheet’.
The following information is provided as a general overview of the expropriation process and is not legal advice. For complete information, reference should be made to the Ontario Expropriations Act as well as the more detailed information in the Notices provided under that Act.

Expropriation Information Sheet

What is Expropriation?

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

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

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

- Regional Council considers a request to begin an application under the *Expropriations Act* to obtain land and/or an easement for a specific Regional project. No decision is made at this meeting to expropriate the land. This step is simply direction for the Region of Waterloo to provide a “Notice of Application for Approval to Expropriate” to affected property owners that the process has started to seek approval to expropriate the land.

- As stated in the Notice, affected property owners have 30 days to request a Hearing to consider whether the requested expropriation is “fair, sound and reasonably necessary in the achievement of the objectives” of the Region of Waterloo. This Hearing is conducted by a provincially-appointed Inquiry Officer. Prior to the Hearing, the Region of Waterloo must serve the property owner with a Notice setting out its reasons or grounds for the proposed expropriation. **Compensation for lands is not determined at this Hearing.** The Inquiry Officer can order the Region of Waterloo to pay the property owner up to $200.00 as compensation for the property owner’s costs in participating in this Hearing, regardless of the outcome of the Hearing.

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

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

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

- Within 30 days of registration of the Plan, the Region of Waterloo must serve a Notice of Expropriation on the affected property owner advising of the expropriation. Within 30 days of this Notice, the property owner may serve the Region of Waterloo with a Notice of Election selecting the valuation date under the *Expropriations Act* for calculation of the compensation.
• In order to obtain possession of the expropriated lands, the Region of Waterloo must also serve a Notice of Possession setting out the date that possession of the land is required by the Region of Waterloo. This date has to be 3 months or more from the date that this Notice of Possession is served on the affected property owner.

• Within 3 months of registration of the Plan, the Region of Waterloo must provide the affected property owner with payment for the full amount of the appraised fair market value of the expropriated land or easement and a copy of the appraisal report on which the value is based. If the property owner disagrees with this amount, and/or claims other compensation and/or costs under the Expropriations Act, the compensation and/or costs matter may be referred to a provincially-appointed Board of Negotiation in an effort to reach a mediated settlement and/or an appeal may be made to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) for a decision. In any event, the Region of Waterloo continues in its efforts to reach a negotiated settlement with the affected property owner prior to the OMB making a decision.
Comment Sheet

Regional Municipality of Waterloo

Erb Street Improvements

Public Consultation Centre #1, May 28, 2015

Please complete and hand in this sheet so that your comments can be considered for this project. If you cannot complete your comments today, please take this home and mail, fax or email your comments by Friday, June 12, 2015 to:

Mr. William Gilbert, P. Eng.
Senior Project Manager
Region of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street, 6th Floor
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3
Telephone: (519) 575-4603
Fax: (519) 575-4430
Email: wgilbert@regionofwaterloo.ca

Mr. Mark Christensen, P. Eng.
Partner
WalterFedy
675 Queen Street S., Suite 111
Kitchener, ON N2M 1A1
Telephone: (519) 576-2150, ext. 285
Fax: (519) 576-5499
Email: mchristensen@walterfedy.com

Comments regarding this project:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Name:
Address:
Postal Code:
Phone: Email:

Collection Notice

All comments and information received from individuals, stakeholder groups and agencies regarding these projects and meetings are being collected to assist the Region of Waterloo in making a decision. Under the “Municipal Act”, personal information (such as name, address, telephone number, and property location) that may be included in a submission becomes part of the public record. Questions regarding the collection should be forwarded to the staff member noted above.
Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street Improvements  
Township of North Dumfries  

Information Package  

What: Reconstruction of Northumberland Street  
Stanley Street and Swan Street, Ayr  

Where: From the CPR Tracks to Hilltop Drive  

Why: To Replace the Pavement Structure and Underground Pipes  

When: Construction in 2018 and 2019  

Who: Region of Waterloo Project Manager  
Mr. Delton Zehr, C.E.T., C.R.S.  
Phone: (519) 575-4757 ext. 3637  
DZehr@regionofwaterloo.ca  

We Want Your Input!  

There is a Comment Sheet at the back of this package.  
Please fill it out and share your comments with us.  

Public Consultation Centre No. 2  
Monday, June 8th, 2015, 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.  
North Dumfries Community Complex, 2958 Greenfield Road, Ayr
1. **Why is the Region of Waterloo doing this Project?**

The Region of Waterloo is currently considering improvements to Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street from the CPR Tracks to Hilltop Drive in the Township of North Dumfries. Please refer to Page 2 of this Information Package for a Key Plan of the project area. Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street are arterial roadways under the jurisdiction of the Region of Waterloo. The watermain and sanitary sewer beneath these roadways are also owned and operated by the Region of Waterloo.

This project has been initiated primarily to address the deteriorated roadway and underground pipe condition within the project limits. The need for the roadway reconstruction also presents an opportunity to incorporate enhanced facilities for pedestrians and cyclists along this section of Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street.

2. **Is this the First Public Consultation Centre for this Project?**

An initial Public Consultation Centre (PCC) was held at the Ayr Community Centre (ACC), 7 Church Street, Ayr in the Township of North Dumfries on Tuesday, November 18th, 2014 from 4:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. Following the first PCC, the Project Team met to review the public comments received. The Project Team has now developed a Revised Design Concept for the proposed improvements and is now conducting a second PCC in order to present this Revised Design Concept to the public and to receive further input.

3. **Who is Directing this Project?**

The planning of these infrastructure improvements is being undertaken by a “Project Team” consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo, the Township of North Dumfries, Regional Councillor/North Dumfries Mayor Sue Foxton and Township of North Dumfries Councillor Rod Rolleman. The Region has retained the consulting engineering firm of WalterFedy to assist with the planning, design and contract administration of this project.
4. How is this Project Being Planned?

This project is classified as a Schedule A+ undertaking in accordance with the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment planning process and is pre-approved to proceed to construction provided that appropriate public notification is undertaken.

5. What is the Purpose of this Second Public Consultation Centre?

The public is invited to this Second PCC to:

- Review the Revised Design Concept for this project;
- Ask questions of staff from the Region of Waterloo and the Township of North Dumfries; and,
- Provide comments and input regarding the planning and design of the improvements being considered.

A Comment Sheet is attached to the back of this Information Package. Interested members of the public are requested to fill out this Comment Sheet and put it in the box or send it to the address indicated on the Comment Sheet. All comments received will be considered along with other information received over the course of the project to assist the Project Team in completing the planning and design for this project.

6. What Improvements are Now Being Considered?

In view of the public comments received at the November 2014 Public Consultation Centre, the existing roadway features, constraints, and the heritage and scenic characteristics of Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street, the Project Team developed the following Revised Design Concept for the improvements to Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street:

- Complete replacement of the pavement structure including new concrete curbs on each side of the roadway;
- Extension of the existing storm sewers on Swan Street from approximately 100 metres south of Burnside Drive to Hilltop Drive, replacement of sections of storm sewer on Northumberland Street and Swan Street and...
replacement of the watermain and associated water services to property line on Swan Street from approximately Hilltop Drive to Stanley Street, on Stanley Street to Northumberland Street and on Northumberland Street from Stanley Street to Gibson Street;

- Construction of new on-road cycling lanes on each side of Northumberland Street from the CPR Tracks to Inglis Street and on Swan Street from the southerly intersection of Mitchell Street and Swan Street to Hilltop Drive;

- Construction of shared lanes on Northumberland Street from Inglis Street to Stanley Street, on Stanley Street from Northumberland Street to St. Andrew Street and on Swan Street from Stanley Street to the north leg of Mitchell Street;

- Replacement of some sections of the existing concrete sidewalks;

- Construction of a new concrete sidewalk on the west side of Northumberland Street from Hall Street to the downtown area of Ayr;

- Construction of a new section of concrete sidewalk on the east side of Swan Street from the northerly leg of Mitchell Street to the existing sidewalk terminus located midway between both intersections of Mitchell Street and Swan Street;

- Replacement of the existing bridge deck within the travelled portion of the roadway on Northumberland Street adjacent to the Watson Pond;

- Construction of a new 300mm diameter watermain on Swan Street from Hilltop Drive to Stanley Street, on Stanley Street from Swan Street to Northumberland Street and on Northumberland Street from Stanley Street to Gibson Street;

- Retention of approximately 44% of the existing on-road angled parking on Northumberland Street and Stanley Street and conversion of approximately 56% of the on-road angled parking to parallel parking;

- Installation of new 3-way stop control at the intersection of Northumberland Street and Stanley Street including painted pedestrian crossing lines on the westerly leg of Stanley Street at Northumberland Street;
• Construction of new left-turn lanes southbound on Northumberland Street at Inglis Street and southbound on Swan Street at Hilltop Drive; and,

• Planting of boulevard trees where feasible

Please refer to Appendix “A” for drawings of the Project Team’s Revised Design Concept for Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street.

7. How do the Initially Proposed Improvements Presented at the First Public Consultation Centre compare to the Revised Improvements at this Second Public Consultation Centre?

At the November 2014 PCC, preliminary plans showing the Project Team’s proposed improvements under consideration at that time were on display and the Project Team representatives were present to answer questions and to receive feedback from members of the public. Approximately one-hundred and fifty (150) members of the public attended this initial PCC and one-hundred and fourteen (114) members of the public formally signed in. Fifty-six (56) comments sheets, letter or emails were received as a result of this first PCC.

In view of the public comments received at the November 2014 PCC, the existing roadway features, constraints, and the heritage and scenic characteristics of Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street, the Project Team developed a Revised Design Concept for the improvements to Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street.

Please refer to the table below for a general summary of the proposed improvements presented at November 2014 PCC compared to the improvements now proposed as part of the Project Team’s Revised Design Concept:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvements Presented at the November 2014 PCC</th>
<th>Revised Design Concept (June 2015)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roadway Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Replace the existing pavement structure including new concrete curbs on each side of the roadway</td>
<td>• No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Replace the existing bridge deck within the travelled portion of the roadway on Northumberland Street adjacent to the Watson Pond</td>
<td>• No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Construct new left-turn lanes southbound on Northumberland Street at Inglis Street and southbound on Swan Street at Hilltop Drive</td>
<td>• No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plant boulevard trees where feasible</td>
<td>• No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On-Road Parking</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Replace all existing angled parking on Northumberland Street and Stanley Street with on-road parallel parking spaces</td>
<td>• Retain approximately 44% of the existing angled parking spaces and convert the remaining 56% of angled parking to parallel parking spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Construct 5.5 metre long parallel parking spaces (with 7.0 metre long parallel end spaces)</td>
<td>• Construct 7.0 metre long parallel parking spaces (except for 2 spaces on Stanley Street to be 5.5 metres long and 1 space on Stanley Street to be 6.7 metres long)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide 1 accessible parking space overall</td>
<td>• Provide 2 accessible parking spaces (1 on Northumberland Street and 1 on Stanley Street)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide a total of 46 on-road parking spaces (compared to 48 existing on-road spaces)</td>
<td>• Provide a total of 47 on-road parking spaces (compared to 48 existing on-road spaces)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Stanley Street & Northumberland Street Intersection Improvements

- Convert to “Tee” Intersection
- Create a pedestrian plaza area
- Maintain the existing 2-way stop control
- Create a sidewalk bump-out in the northwest corner of the intersection to shorten the pedestrian crossing distance
- No change
- No change
- Implement 3-way stop control
- Retain the existing curb location in the northwest corner of the intersection

### Cycling Facilities

- Construct new on-road cycling lanes on each side of Northumberland Street from the CPR Tracks to Hall Street
- Construct new on-road cycling lanes on each side of Swan Street from the south intersection of Mitchell Street and Swan Street to Hilltop Drive
- Construct shared lanes for vehicles and cyclists (on Northumberland Street from Hall Street to Stanley Street, on Stanley Street from Northumberland Street to St. Andrew Street and on Swan Street from Stanley Street to the south leg of Mitchell Street)
- Construct new on-road cycling lanes on each side of Northumberland Street from the CPR Tracks to Inglis Street
- No change
- Provide shared lanes as previously proposed at the November 2014 PCC and extend the shared use lanes on Northumberland Street from Hall Street to Inglis Street

### Sidewalks

- Construct new concrete sidewalk on the west side of Northumberland Street from Hall Street to downtown Ayr
- No change
- Construct new concrete sidewalk on the east side of Swan Street from Stanley Street to the existing sidewalk located midway between the intersections of Mitchell Street and Swan Street
- Construct new concrete sidewalk on the east side of Swan Street from the northerly intersection of Mitchell Street to the existing sidewalk located midway between the intersections of Mitchell Street and Swan Street
- Retain the existing sidewalk on the west side of Swan Street
- Retain the existing sidewalk on the west side of Swan Street
Underground Piping

| • Extend the existing storm sewers on Swan Street from approximately 100 metres south of Burnside Drive to Hilltop Drive | • No change |
| • Replace sections of storm sewer on Northumberland Street and Swan Street | • No change |
| • Construct a new watermain on Swan Street to service the development lands in the south part of Ayr | • Construct a new watermain and water services to property line to service the development lands in the south part of Ayr on Swan Street from approximately Hilltop Drive to Stanley Street, on Stanley Street from Swan Street to Northumberland Street and on Northumberland Street from Stanley Street to Gibson Street (Recently identified need to upsize watermains in their current locations) |

Please refer to Appendix “B” for a detailed summary of the Project Team’s response to all public comments received at the November 2014 PCC.

8. How do the Improvements Being Considered Relate to the Objectives of the Regional Transportation Master Plan, the Active Transportation Master Plan and the Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines?

The Project Team is planning these improvements to address both the deteriorated roadway and underground pipes on Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street as well as to include enhancements to the roadway corridor consistent with Regional Bylaws, policies, plans and practices. The Regional Official Plan gives direction to balance new and retrofitted roads for all modes of transportation including walking, cycling, automobiles and transit. By considering improvements to cycling and pedestrian facilities on Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street, the planning of this project supports the Regional Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) goals of optimizing our
transportation system, promoting transportation choice and supporting sustainable development.

The Region’s Context Sensitive Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines (CDG) is a document approved by Regional Council to guide the planning and design of Regional Roads. The CDG identifies design parameters for desired elements within the road allowance for various roadway classifications. According to the CDG, these sections of Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street should be designed to include active transportation modes including walking and cycling. Additionally, the Region’s Active Transportation Master Plan (ATMP) identifies these roadway sections as a candidate for enhanced pedestrian and cycling facilities; however, the ATMP depicts this section of Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street as a “constrained corridor”. A “constrained corridor” has limited space for various roadway elements including cycling lanes, sidewalk, boulevard landscaping and utilities due to the existing area topography and/or the proximity of adjacent buildings to the road.

9. **How will the Proposed Improvements Enhance the Pedestrian Environment on this Project?**

Under the Project Team’s Revised Design Concept, new sidewalk will be constructed on the west side of Northumberland Street from Hall Street to the existing sidewalk in the downtown area of Ayr and on the east side of Swan Street from the end of the existing sidewalk at Mitchell Street to the northerly intersection of Mitchell Street and Swan Street. The existing section of sidewalk on the west side of Swan Street will be retained in its current location. Raised tactile domes will also be provided at all intersection sidewalk ramps to assist visually impaired pedestrians. The existing school crossings identified with pavement markings and school crossing warning signs on Northumberland Street at Hall Street and on Swan Street at Burnside Drive will remain in place. A new pedestrian crossing complete with pavement markings will be provided on Stanley Street at the west side of Northumberland Street in conjunction with implementing the new 3-way stop controlled at the intersection of Northumberland Street and Stanley Street. A pedestrian plaza area will be created beside the cenotaph providing a place for patrons to meet downtown and access the cenotaph.
10. Who will be Responsible for the Winter Maintenance of the New Sidewalks?

Currently, the Township of North Dumfries Public Works Department clears snow from the existing sidewalks on Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street and would also clear snow from all new sidewalks constructed on Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street as part of this project.

11. Will the Posted Speed Limit be Changed?

Following construction, the Region will retain the current 50 km/h posted speed limit within the project limits.

12. How will Existing Trees, Driveways, Retaining Walls and Lawns be Affected?

Construction will be confined to the Region’s road allowance (following the Region’s acquisition of property from abutting owners as required). Disturbed driveways, lawns and boulevard areas will be fully restored to preconstruction conditions or better. Driveways will be re-graded as necessary to blend smoothly with the reconstructed roadway.

Where there are existing retaining walls that are impacted by the road improvements or are in need of repair, consideration will be given during detailed design to either replace the retaining wall with a concrete block wall with an architectural facing or eliminate the retaining wall through re-grading if possible.

It is expected that approximately nine (9) trees will have to be removed during construction to accommodate the proposed improvements. All of these trees are located within the Region’s right-of-way are generally in fair to poor condition. The plans presented at this Public Consultation Centre show trees that likely will require removal in order to construct the roadway improvements. In accordance with Region policy, a minimum of two (2) new trees will be planted for every tree removed where space permits in the right-of-way.
13. Is Any Private Property Required for this Project?

During the early planning stages of this project, the Project Team retained an Ontario Land Surveyor to undertake a comprehensive search of all existing property boundaries along Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street from the CPR Tracks to Hilltop Drive. This search revealed that there are two (2) existing properties along Stanley Street and Swan Street where existing sidewalks are partially or wholly located on privately-owned property rather than within the Region’s road allowance.

It is in the best interest of both the Region and abutting property owners to ensure that all public roadway elements (including sidewalks) are situated within the Region-owned public right-of-way for Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street. Accordingly, the Region intends to purchase these small sections of properties from abutting property owners as part of this project. Additionally, three (3) small strips or parcels of additional property have been preliminarily identified that the Region would need to acquire to undertake the proposed improvements to Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street under the Project Team’s Revised Design Concept. Please refer to Appendix “C” for a preliminary list of properties that the Region would need to acquire in order to implement the Revised Design Concept.

Following Council approval of the Recommended Design for this project, Regional Real Estate staff will contact the affected property owners to discuss the necessary property acquisitions. It is the Region’s standard practice to negotiate agreements of purchase and sale with the affected property owner based on an independent appraisal of the land’s fair market value. If agreements cannot be reached in time to meet the project schedule, the Region may acquire the needed lands through Expropriation. For further information, please see the Property Acquisition Process Information Sheet and Expropriation Information Sheet in Appendix “D”.
14. Will any Heritage Resources be Impacted by this Project?

Heritage resources, including buildings, can be designated or listed under the Ontario Heritage Act. Please refer to Appendix “E” for definitions of the various heritage classifications under the Ontario Heritage Act. The Project Team has identified 3 designated properties under the Ontario Heritage Act, 78 municipally listed properties and 7 cultural heritage landscapes on or adjacent to Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street within the project limits. Construction of the proposed improvements will be confined to the roadway corridor (following acquisition of the required property) and is therefore not expected to adversely impact any abutting properties, including designated or listed heritage properties.

The Regional Heritage Planning Advisory Committee and the Township of North Dumfries Heritage Committee has been circulated the Heritage Impact Assessment and the detailed project information, and will be providing heritage related comments as the project moves through the public consultation and design stages.

During the detailed design and approaching construction, the Region will be working with a consultant to conduct a pre-condition assessment/survey of all homes and buildings, including those identified as heritage resources, to document existing conditions of the structures prior to commencement of construction.

The Region’s Scenic Roads and Special Character Streets Resource Document identified the following streets in Ayr as having Scenic or Special Character qualities:

- Northumberland Street from Gibson Street to Stanley Street and Stanley Street from Northumberland Street to Main Street are identified as “Extremely Scenic”;
- Northumberland Street from Gibson Street to the CPR Tracks are identified as “Scenic”; and,
- Swan Street from Stanley Street to Hilltop Drive is identified as having “Some Scenic” qualities.

This Resource Document provides guidelines to preserve the scenic nature of the road and is being used in the design of Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street. The Project Team has considered these guidelines in
developing the Revised Design Concept for the proposed improvements to
Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street and believes that the
improvements proposed maintain and enhance the scenic character of this
section of Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street.

15. When will Construction Occur? Will there be Detours?

The reconstruction of Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street
from the CPR Tracks to Hilltop Drive is currently scheduled to commence in 2018
in the Region’s approved 2015 Transportation Capital Program. Due to the
extent of the work, construction will require two seasons to complete. The timing
of this project is subject to receipt of all technical and financial approvals,
acquisition of required property and final approval of Regional Council.

During construction, all non-local traffic (without an origin or destination within
Ayr) will be detoured around Ayr via either Drumbo Road, the Oxford Brant
County Road/Trussler Road and Cedar Creek Road or via Drumbo Road,
Pinehurst Road/Spragues Road, Wrigley Road, Dumfries Road and Cedar Creek
Road. The westerly detour (i.e., Drumbo Road, Oxford/Brant Boundary Road,
Trussler Road) will be able to adequately accommodate truck traffic following the
rehabilitation of Trussler Road from Cedar Creek Road to Waterloo/Brant
Boundary Road, currently scheduled for completion in years 2015 through 2017
in the Region’s 2015 Transportation Capital Program. Please refer to Appendix
“F” for a drawing of this detour route for all non-local traffic during construction.

At the November 2014 PCC, the Project Team provided a preliminary
construction staging plan. In view of the public comments received and upon
further consideration of optimizing the construction staging to minimize disruption
to the core area of Ayr, the Project Team has now developed a revised
construction staging plan, described as follows:

Year 1 Construction

Stage 1a – complete the reconstruction of Northumberland Street from the CPR
Tracks to Gibson Street. This work is expected to occur from May to July. One
lane of through traffic will be maintained in the southbound direction at all times
during this work.

Stage 1b – complete the reconstruction of Northumberland Street from Gibson
Street to Stanley Street and Stanley Street from Northumberland Street to St.
Andrew Street. This work is expected to occur from July to November. One lane of through traffic will be maintained in the southbound direction on Northumberland Street and the eastbound direction on Stanley Street at all times during this work.

**Year 2 Construction**

Stage 2a – complete the reconstruction of Swan Street from Stanley Street to midway between the two Mitchell Street intersections. Swan Street will be fully closed to through traffic during this work; however, local and emergency traffic and pedestrian traffic will be maintained at all times.

Stage 2b – complete the reconstruction of Swan Street from midway between the two Mitchell Street intersections to Hilltop Drive. Swan Street will be fully closed to through traffic during this work; however, local and emergency traffic and pedestrian traffic will be maintained at all times.

Please note that the Region does not specifically arrange local detours with signage on local streets as these streets are under the jurisdiction of the Township of North Dumfries.

**16. How will Access to Properties be Maintained During Construction?**

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

For commercial properties, access for customers will be maintained at all times. If only one driveway access exists, the Contractor will endeavour to complete the work across the driveway in two stages where feasible in order to maintain customer access.
Property and business owners are asked to contact the site supervisor if they have any concerns in relation to access, signage or other issues during the project so it can be determined if reasonable changes or modifications can be made.

Fire and emergency services vehicles will have access to all properties within the active construction zone for each stage of construction. The Region will be in regular contact with Fire Services staff to ensure they are aware of the current location of active construction and access to fire hydrants.

There will be some reduction of on-road parking during construction due to the lane restrictions and it may be necessary for some business patrons to use the Township Municipal Lot on Gibson Street. The Region will provide additional signage during construction to provide direction to available parking.

**17. Will there be Water Service Shutdowns During Construction?**

Water service shutdowns will be required to provide both a temporary above ground water supply system and the new underground permanent water supply system.

Due to the limited space available in the road, the new larger diameter watermain is proposed to be constructed in the same location as the existing watermain under the road. This will require that an interim water supply system be provided for the duration of the watermain replacement construction. The interim water supply system will be installed above ground on each side of the road and connected to each property’s water service before construction commences to replace the existing underground watermain.

In order to make connections to the existing water system for the interim water supply system and the new permanent underground watermain, temporary water service interruptions will be required as part of this work at each stage of watermain construction. Water service interruptions will likely be less than ½ a day in duration and will likely occur between 9:00 a.m. and 2:30 p.m. Monday to Friday unless other arrangements have been made. A “Notice of Water Service Interruption” will be delivered to your front door a minimum of 24 hours before any required water service shutdown.
18. Can my Existing Water Service be Upgraded?

Replacement of the existing watermain on Northumberland Street from Gibson Street to Stanley Street, on Stanley Street from Northumberland Street to Swan Street and on Swan Street from Stanley Street to Hilltop Drive is being proposed as part of this project and, as such, water service replacements (from the watermain to the property line) are being completed as a result. However, if property owners wish to increase the size of the water service to the property beyond the standard 25mm (1”) for residential and commercial properties, i.e., to achieve increased flow, they may choose at their own cost to have this work included during this project. Undertaking these improvements in conjunction with the watermain and road construction typically results in cost savings to the property owner as compared to undertaking the work independently at another time in the future. Subject to a mutual agreement between the Region of Waterloo and the property owner, existing water services may be upgraded from the main under the road to the property line at the owner’s expense.

If you do wish to discuss an increase in the size of your water service, please indicate so on your comment sheet. From this information, staff will contact you at a later date to discuss your plans and any further requirements.

Additionally, property owners may wish to consider replacing the water service on their private property, i.e., between the property line and their building, during the construction activities. Property owners can inquire to arrange this work directly with the Region’s Contractor on-site during construction but it cannot be guaranteed that the Contractor will be able to accommodate this additional work request.

19. How will Garbage and Recycling be Collected During Construction?

For residential properties on Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street, garbage, green bins, yard waste and blue boxes will continue to be picked up curbside as usual. When work is occurring in front of your property and waste collection vehicles do not have access to your driveway on garbage collection day, the Region’s construction contractor will deliver your garbage and recyclables to an adjacent side street for collection and return the empty
containers afterwards. We will ask that all residents mark their containers with their address for easy identification.

For properties with private garbage collection, driveway access will be maintained during each phase of construction to provide access for private garbage collection.

20. What Are the Expected Working Hours During Construction?

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

21. What is the Estimated Cost of this Project? How will it be Funded?

The Region of Waterloo is funding the road works portion of this project from its Roads Rehabilitation Reserve Fund and the watermain replacement is funded from the Water Development Charges Fund. The estimated cost of the proposed work including road reconstruction, new sidewalk, bridge rehabilitation, on-road cycling facilities, property, utility relocations, as well as driveway and boulevard restoration, is approximately $8.4 Million. The cost of the watermain replacement including new services to property line is approximately $950,000.

22. What are the Next Steps?

Prior to finalizing the preliminary design of this project for Regional Council's approval, the Project Team is asking for the public's input on the improvements being considered. This PCC is your opportunity to ask questions, provide suggestions, and make comments. The Project Team will use the comments obtained from the public during this PCC to refine the proposed design in conjunction with other technical data.
23. When will a Decision be made?

The Project Team will review the public comments received from this PCC and use them as input for identifying a Recommended Design for the Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street Reconstruction Project. The Recommended Design will be presented to Region of Waterloo Planning and Works Committee and Council in the Fall 2015 for approval. In advance of this meeting, letters will be sent to all adjacent property owners and tenants (as well as to all members of the public specifically registering at this PCC) so that anyone wishing to speak to Committee or Council about this project can do so before final approval.

24. How will I Receive Further Notification Regarding this Project?

Adjacent property owners and members of the public registering at this PCC will receive all forthcoming public correspondence, and will be notified of any future meetings.

25. How can I Provide my Comments?

In order to assist the Project Team in addressing any comments or concerns you might have regarding this project, we ask that you fill out the attached Comment Sheet and leave it in the comment box provided at the registration table. Alternatively you can mail, fax or e-mail your comments to the Project Team member listed below, no later than Friday, June 19, 2015.

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

Mr. Delton Zehr, C.E.T., C.R.S. Project Manager
Region of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street, 6th Floor
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3
Telephone: (519) 575-4757 x 3637
Fax: (519) 575-4430
Email: DZehr@regionofwaterloo.ca

Mr. Stuart Mitchell, P.Eng. Sr. Project Manager
WalterFedy
Suite 111, 675 Queen Street South,
Kitchener, ON N2M 1A1
Telephone: (519) 576-2150 x 276
Fax: (519) 576-5499
Email: smitchell@walterfedy.com
26. How Can I View Project Information Following the PCC?

All of the PCC display materials and other relevant project information, notifications of upcoming meetings and contact information are available for viewing at the Region of Waterloo municipal office as identified above. Alternatively, you may visit the Region’s website to view project specific documents, drawings or Regional Master Plans and design guidelines by clicking on the links below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Category</th>
<th>Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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The main comments received at the Public Consultation Centre and the Project Team’s responses to these comments are summarized as follows:

Comment 1 – Concern with the Proposed Conversion of On-Road Angled Parking to On-Road Parallel Parking

Thirty-six (36) written comments received expressed strong opposition to the Project Team’s proposed conversion of the existing on-road angled parking to on-road parallel parking in core area of Ayr, while four (4) comments received supported the proposed parking conversion. Specific comments included:

a) The proposed conversion of on-road parking from angled to parallel results in a reduction of available parking spaces and increases the walking distance from the parking to area businesses;
b) Parallel parking is not as convenient as angled parking, and may be more difficult for some motorists;
c) The length of the proposed parallel parking spaces is inadequate for larger vehicles such as pick-up trucks;
d) Parallel parking reduces the number of parking spaces in front of high turn-over businesses that will result in a reduction of business;
e) Angled parking in small towns is more aesthetically appealing and adds to the ambiance of these towns;
f) Local businesses will lose substantial money or go out of business;
g) I really like the parallel parking;
h) Traffic delays due to the time required for motorists blocking traffic to parallel park will cause gridlock during rush hour;
i) Extension of parallel parking along houses on Stanley Street will prevent use of driveways, eliminate front yards and result in a loss in property value; and,
j) There are no problems or collision concerns with the current angled parking configuration.

Project Team Response

The Project Team’s proposed improvements presented at the first Public Consultation Centre in November 2014 proposed the conversion of the existing on-road angled parking to on-road parallel parking for the following reasons:

a) With the existing on-road angled parking, the back of some larger vehicles encroaches into the travel lane when parked in an angled space
b) When vehicles are parked in the angled parking configuration, a motorist’s view can be obstructed by an adjacent parked vehicle, making it difficult to back up into the travel lane.

c) The Project Team’s proposed improvements did not include dedicated cycling facilities through the core area of Ayr. The Project Team believes that parallel parking is potentially more ‘cyclist friendly’ than the current angled parking.

The Project Team recognizes that there are pros and cons associated with converting the angled parking to parallel parking. Upon review of the public comments, the Project Team developed a modified parking configuration which maintains approximately half of the existing angled on-road parking spaces. Under the Project Team’s Revised Design Concept, approximately 25 existing angled parking spaces would be converted to parallel parking spaces. These parking spaces are located on Northumberland Street from Stanley Street to 24 Northumberland Street and on Stanley Street from Swan Street to 62 Stanley Street. Further, under the Project Team’s Revised Design Concept, the number of on-road parking spaces will decrease by one (1) from existing conditions. The conversion of some angled parking to parallel parking on Northumberland Street and on Stanley Street is being proposed in order to improve the turning radius for large trucks at the intersections of Stanley Street at Northumberland Street and at Swan Street.

**Comment 2 – Concern with On-Road Cycling Lanes**

**Summary of Comments**

Sixteen (16) comments received expressed either strong opposition to the proposed cycling lanes or indicated that cycling lanes were not needed in Ayr. Six (6) comments received supported the proposed cycling lanes, and two (2) comments were received from area residents expressing a desire to have the cycling lanes extended through the downtown core. Excerpts from comments received include the following:

a) Why put bike lanes in when bike lanes are not possible all the way?;
b) Bike lanes are dangerous for kids and the trucks will scare everyone but the most serious cyclists on to the sidewalk;
c) Prohibiting trucks would eliminate the need to consider bike lanes;
d) There are only a handful of cyclists at best on weekends that ride in Ayr;
e) There are not enough cyclists in Ayr to warrant the expense;
f) Cycling lanes are not necessary as traffic is slow and bicycles can coexist with vehicle traffic;
g) Green space is more important than bike lanes;
h) Proposed bike lanes merging into traffic suddenly seems more dangerous; and,
i) My wish was to see bike lanes all the way downtown on both sides of the road.
Project Team Response

The Region’s Active Transportation Master Plan identifies Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street through Ayr as candidate locations for cycling facilities in a “Constrained Corridor”. The Project Team recognized from early in the planning process that constructing cycling lanes through the core area of Ayr would require the removal or conversion of existing on-road parking on at least one side of Northumberland Street and Stanley Street. Constructing cycling facilities on Swan Street from Stanley Street to the southerly leg of the Mitchell Street intersection would require widening Swan Street and would severely impact a number of abutting properties, including some designated or municipally listed heritage properties on Swan Street. In order to avoid severe impacts to on-road parking and abutting properties, the Project Team initially developed the November 2014 Preferred Design Concept to include proposed on-road cycling lanes only on Northumberland Street north of Hall Street and on Swan Street south of the southerly leg of Mitchell Street. The Project Team recognized that constructing largely discontinuous cycling facilities within Ayr was not ideal and proposed the use of “sharrows”, which are painted roadway markings, to connect the disjointed cycling lanes.

Following the November 2014 PCC, the Project Team re-evaluated the implementation of the cycling lanes within Ayr on Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street. The Project Team considered the following information:

a) The Region’s Active Transportation Master Plan denotes these roadway corridors as “constrained” in recognition of the potentially adverse impacts to the environment to implement cycling facilities; however, where practical and space permits cycling lanes should be considered;
b) On-road cycling lanes exist on Northumberland Street from the CPR Tracks northerly;
c) There are cyclists that travel through Ayr from time-to-time that may stop in the downtown core;
d) There are some residents of Ayr that like to cycle in and through Ayr;
e) Where space is limited or constrained, shared use lanes rather than on-road cycling lanes provides greater boulevard width and separation of the sidewalk from the roadway; and,
f) The majority of the public comments received did not support the construction of cycling lanes as part of the project.

In considering all of these relevant factors, the Project Team’s Revised Design Concept includes construction of on-road cycling lanes on Northumberland Street from the CPR Tracks to Inglis Street and on Swan Street from the southerly leg of Mitchell Street to Hilltop Drive and shared lanes on the remainder of the roadway sections within the
project limits. This change from the configuration proposed previously still provides for the construction of some dedicated on-road cycling facilities while minimizing the overall impacts to abutting properties and providing for greater boulevard area (and associated separation of pedestrians on the sidewalk from traffic) on the section of Northumberland Street from Inglis Street to Hall Street.

Comment 3 – Concern with Proposed Changes to the Intersection of Northumberland Street and Stanley Street

The Project Team’s November 2014 initially proposed improvements included creating a new tee-intersection at the intersection of Stanley Street and Northumberland Street, and included closing the existing right-turn lane on Stanley Street and constructing a pedestrian plaza area. Under this design concept, the existing cenotaph at the intersection of Northumberland Street and Stanley Street would be maintained.

Summary of Comments

Nine (9) comments were received that expressed the following concerns:

1) Tractor trailers would have difficulty making the turn at the intersection of Northumberland Street and Stanley Street at the proposed tee-intersection, and the right-turn lane on Stanley Street is necessary for heavy trucks to make the turning movement.

2) Construction of a pedestrian plaza area would impede delivery trucks by converting space adjacent to the cenotaph currently used for deliveries to a boulevard area

3) The intersection of Northumberland Street and Stanley Street should be a 3-way stop controlled intersection (rather the current 2-way stop control)

Seven (7) comments received indicated support for the pedestrian plaza area or the proposed tee-intersection adjacent to the cenotaph.

Examples of comments received with respect to modifications to the intersection of Stanley Street and Northumberland Street are as follows:

a) Please maintain the pedestrian plaza at the cenotaph as it would be wonderful for encouraging residents to support local business

b) Turning radius at Northumberland and Stanley, and at Swan and Stanley is too tight for truck traffic and will be problematic. It will not work.

c) There will not be space for businesses accepting deliveries as they currently use the area beside the cenotaph

d) Need three way stop or lights at Northumberland Street and Stanley Street

e) I really like the plaza area by the cenotaph and the closure of the road by the cenotaph area as it may discourage trucks in the core
f) Leave the north side of Stanley Street by the cenotaph open. The north sidewalk creates a tough turn for trucks.

g) The cenotaph is a key feature of Ayr’s core and should be retained as part of implementing the concrete plaza that may provide some aspect of traffic calming to the intersection.

Project Team Response

The Project Team’s response to the various issues raised pertaining to the intersection of Stanley Street and Northumberland Street are as follows:

1) Turning Movements

Due to the location of the cenotaph, both the existing right-turn lane configuration and or the proposed tee-intersection configuration require large trucks (i.e., 53 foot trailer) to encroach into the opposite lane of traffic to make the right-turn movement from Stanley Street to Northumberland Street. However, the Project Team has determined that the extent of the encroachment is less under the tee-intersection configuration, and the tee-intersection is an improvement over the existing right-turn lane configuration. Following the first Public Consultation Centre, the Project Team optimized the proposed configuration of the tee-intersection by maximizing the available area adjacent to the cenotaph and by eliminating the initially proposed bump-out in the northwest corner of the intersection of Stanley Street and Northumberland Street. In summary, the Project Team’s Revised Design Concept maintains the tee-intersection concept, which has now been slightly modified from the earlier concept to improve turning movements for large trucks.

2) Pedestrian Plaza Area

The Project Team believes that construction of a pedestrian plaza area provides the benefits of offering direct access to the cenotaph as well as a more pedestrian friendly boulevard area in the core area. The existing road and parking configuration do not provide a designated drop-off or “loading zone”. A “loading zone” could be provided with a bylaw amendment and signage; however, this would result in the elimination of on-road parking spaces. Accordingly, businesses would need to arrange for deliveries at times during the day when on-road parking spaces are more readily available or not being used. The Project Team’s Revised Design Concept maintains the pedestrian plaza concept that was developed in November 2014 only slightly reduced in size to accommodate the proposed angled parking on Stanley Street.
3-Way Stop Control

Following the November 2014 PCC, the Project Team brought the request for a 3-way stop control at this intersection to Regional Traffic staff for consideration. Regional Traffic staff support the conversion of the Stanley Street/Northumberland Street intersection to a 3-way stop control as well as the installation of new pedestrian cross walk lines. Regional Traffic staff plan to present this request to Regional Planning and Works Committee for consideration later in 2015.

Comment 4 – Comments Regarding the Proposed Sidewalk Improvements

The Project Team’s November 2014 proposed improvements included construction of a new concrete sidewalk on the west side of Northumberland Street from Hall Street to the downtown area of Ayr and construction of a new concrete sidewalk on the east side of Swan Street from Stanley Street to the existing sidewalk located midway between both intersections of Mitchell Street and Swan Street.

Summary of Comments

Eight (8) comments received expressed support for the proposed sidewalk plans. Three (3) comments were received from property owners on Swan Street expressing opposition to the construction of a new sidewalk along the east side of Swan Street as it results in the roadway shifting closer to the homes on the west side of Swan Street. Concerns raised by abutting property owners on the west side of Swan Street included roadway snow clearing operations causing snow to be thrown through the front window of the home, and the shift in the roadway to the west will result in shorter driveways.
Project Team Response

Due to the constrained right-of-way on Swan Street, construction of sidewalks on both sides of the roadway would result in severe impacts to abutting properties. The Project Team’s proposed improvements from November 2014 included relocating the existing sidewalk on the west side of Swan Street between Stanley Street and Mitchell Street to the east side of Swan Street in order to provide a continuous sidewalk section along one side of Swan Street, avoiding the need for pedestrians to cross Swan Street at Mitchell Street to use the sidewalk.

Based on the comments received from the public and a review of the impacts associated with the proposed sidewalk relocation, the Project Team agrees that the impacts to several properties along the west side of Swan Street are too severe to warrant the sidewalk relocation. Accordingly, the Project Team’s Revised Design Concept maintains the existing sidewalks on Swan Street in their current location. Under the Revised Design Concept, the existing sidewalk on the east side of Swan Street will be extended from its current end location to the north leg of Mitchell Street.

The Project Team’s Revised Design Concept maintains the proposed new sidewalk on Northumberland Street as there was support from the public for this new sidewalk.

Following the November 2014 Public Consultation Centre, the Project Team arranged for additional pedestrian crossing counts to be conducted at various locations on Swan Street and Northumberland Street in order to determine if formal pedestrian crossing controls (such as pedestrian signals, pedestrian crosswalks, refuge islands) were warranted at any locations. Based on this assessment, no new formal pedestrian crossing controls are warranted. Regional Traffic staff strongly recommend against providing unwarranted pedestrian crossing controls as they incorrectly lead pedestrians to believe that they have the right-of-way.

The two existing school crossings on Northumberland Street at Hall Street and on Swan Street at Burnside Drive will remain in place with the same signage and pavement markings as currently exists.
Comment 5 – Request for Heavy Truck Restrictions and Truck Bypass around Ayr

Summary of Comments

Nine (9) comments received suggested implementing a “No Heavy Truck” prohibition to restrict heavy trucks through Ayr and expressed support for a Truck Bypass.

Project Team Response

By definition all Regional Roads are truck routes and should be designed for heavy trucks. Large trucks are not prohibited from using Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street through Ayr. The Project Team is aware that there have been requests received in the past from members of the public to prohibit large trucks from travelling through Ayr via Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street. As part of the planning for this project, the Project Team arranged for a heavy truck destination count to be completed on June 17, 2014 from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. The results of the study indicated that a total of 71 large trucks used either Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and/or Swan Street through the downtown core of Ayr on Tuesday, June 17th. Of these 71 large trucks, 27 drove entirely through Ayr. Although this count was conducted over the course of only one (1) day and results would vary somewhat from day-to-day, the key finding of the counts is that the large majority of trucks travelling through the core of Ayr have a local origin or destination within Ayr.

The Region’s policy allows for consideration of heavy truck restrictions on Regional Roads when one or more of the following conditions exists:

- The section of road was not designed or constructed for heavy trucks;
- The section of road is primarily front-lotted urban residential with numerous driveways, and a suitable alternate route (less than 1.5 times longer but not more than 4.0 kilometres longer than the existing route) is available; and,
- The road has critical height and/or weight restrictions on the section of roadway.

As none of the above noted conditions has been met, the Region does not recommend any heavy truck restrictions on Swan Street, Stanley Street and Northumberland Street.

Once the reconstruction of Trussler Road and the Oxford/Brant Boundary Road is completed (currently scheduled for 2015 to 2017), trucks will be able to utilize this alternate route to avoid travelling through Ayr. In view of the relatively low number of large trucks travelling through Ayr and the planned upgrades of Trussler Road and the Oxford/Brant Boundary Road, the Project Team is not recommending any restrictions on large trucks on Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street.
Comment 6 – Request to Bury Overhead Hydro in Downtown Core

Summary of Comments

Eight (8) comments were received that requested burying of the existing overhead hydro in downtown Ayr.

Project Team Response

The Project Team notes that overhead power lines can be buried but they are typically not buried unless required by the local Hydro Utility due to the extremely high cost. For this project, Cambridge and North Dumfries Hydro has determined that it is not necessary to bury the hydro lines through the Northumberland Street, Stanley Street and Swan Street corridor. Therefore, the Region would be responsible for the full cost of burying the hydro lines through this section of Ayr. The Region obtained a preliminary cost estimate of $2 Million or more from Cambridge North Dumfries Hydro to bury the hydro in downtown Ayr. Cambridge North Dumfries Hydro has indicated that the overhead hydro line is due for replacement in approximately twenty (20) years and that would be the best time to review the possibility of burying the overhead hydro. The Project Team also considered that if the overhead was buried, new overhead street light poles would need to be provided to provide lighting since the existing streetlights are located on the hydro poles. Additionally, additional costs beyond the $2M would be incurred for concrete encasement of the buried hydro under the roadway if the on-road parking configuration remains in addition to the cost of new streetlight poles. The Project Team does not support burying of the overhead hydro poles as part of this project.

Comment 7 – Request for Accessible Parking

Summary of Comments

Two (2) comments suggested that six (6) accessible parking spots are required today.

Project Team Response

The Region’s guidelines specify that the equivalent of up to 2% of the existing available on-road parking spaces should be designated as accessible parking spaces. The actual locations of the accessible parking spaces are to be determined in consultation with the Grand River Accessibility Advisory Committee (GRAAC).

The Project Team supports the conversion of on-road parking spaces to designated accessible spaces in accordance with Region guidelines. Based on the number of on-road parking spaces currently available on Northumberland Street and Stanley Street, the Project Team recommends that two (2) accessible parking spaces be provided as
part of the road improvements, one (1) each on Stanley Street and Northumberland Street. It is noted that accessible parking spaces are larger than a regular space size and may reduce the number of available parking spaces from the current number of parking spaces. The plans presented at this PCC indicate the proposed locations for these designated on-road accessible parking spaces but still require consultation with GRAAC to finalize the locations.

Comment 8 – Request for Decorative Streetlighting

Summary of Comments

Four (4) comments were received requesting that the existing streetlights be improved including installation of decorative lights and poles to replace the overhead hydro.

Project Team Response

Under the Region’s cost-sharing policy with Area Municipalities, the cost for decorative lights or poles is to be funded by the Area Municipality. The Township of North Dumfries has indicated that it does not wish to fund the cost of decorative street lighting on this project.

Comment 9 – Concern with the Proposed Realignment of Swan Street

Summary of Comments

One (1) comment suggested the proposed curve alignment should be maintained more in line with the existing alignment as the proposed shift of the road to the west would bring traffic in closer proximity to existing residences.

Project Team Response

The Project Team originally modified the design of the alignment to provide a larger radius for trucks and cyclists while improving sight lines for motorists at the southerly intersection of Mitchell Street and Swan Street. Following the November 2014 PCC, the Project Team reviewed the existing alignment and found it to have adequate geometry for trucks and cyclists. Therefore, under the Revised Design Concept, the existing alignment of Swan Street will be retained.

Comment 10 – Request to Provide a 3-way Stop at Swan Street and Mitchell Street (South Leg) and a Right-Turn Lane on Swan Street and on Mitchell Street (South Leg)
Summary of Comments

Two (2) comments submitted suggested a new 3-way stop or traffic control signals should be installed at Mitchell Street (south leg) and Swan Street.

One (1) comment suggested right-turn lanes are needed on Swan Street and on Mitchell Street

Project Team Response

Based on the updated traffic counts, Region Traffic staff conducted a warrant assessment for a new stop control and turn lanes. Based on this warrant assessment, warrants were not met for a new 3-way stop and/or new right-turn lanes. Therefore, the Project Team does not recommend the implementation of a new 3-way or new turn lanes at the southerly intersection of Mitchell Street and Swan Street.

Comment 11 – Concern with the Location of Steel Beam Guiderail

Summary of Comments

One (1) comment suggested new steel beam guide rail should be installed between the road and the sidewalk.

Project Team Response

Based on a review of the Ontario Roadside Safety Manual, steel beam guiderail is not generally recommended to be installed between the curb and sidewalk. The need for steel beam guiderail will be reviewed during the detailed design stage of the project.
Appendix “C”

List of Properties Required for Road Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Preliminary Parcel Size (m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79 Stanley Street</td>
<td>Permanent Road</td>
<td>12.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Stanley Street</td>
<td>Permanent Road</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302 Swan Street</td>
<td>Permanent Road</td>
<td>79.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1255 Swan Street</td>
<td>Permanent Road</td>
<td>9.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1259 Swan Street</td>
<td>Permanent Road</td>
<td>11.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix “D”

Property Acquisition Process Information Sheet

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

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

Property Impact Plans

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

Initial Owner Contact by Regional Real Estate Staff

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

Initial Meetings

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

Goal – Fair and Equitable Settlement for All Parties

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

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

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

The general steps towards such an offer are as follows;

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Expropriation**

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

Put simply, an expropriation is the transfer of lands or an easement to a governmental authority for reasonable compensation, including payment of fair market value for the transferred lands, without the consent of the property owner being required. In the case of expropriations by municipalities such as the Region of Waterloo, the process set out in the Ontario Expropriations Act must be followed to ensure that the rights of the property owners provided under that Act are protected.
The following information is provided as a general overview of the expropriation process and is not legal advice. For complete information, reference should be made to the Ontario Expropriations Act as well as the more detailed information in the Notices provided under that Act.

Expropriation Information Sheet

What is Expropriation?

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

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

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

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

- Regional Council considers a request to begin an application under the *Expropriations Act* to obtain land and/or an easement for a specific Regional project. No decision is made at this meeting to expropriate the land. This step is simply direction for the Region of Waterloo to provide a “Notice of Application for Approval to Expropriate” to affected property owners that the process has started to seek approval to expropriate the land.

- As stated in the Notice, affected property owners have 30 days to request a Hearing to consider whether the requested expropriation is “fair, sound and reasonably necessary in the achievement of the objectives” of the Region of Waterloo. This Hearing is conducted by a provincially-appointed Inquiry Officer. Prior to the Hearing, the Region of Waterloo must serve the property owner with a Notice setting out its reasons or grounds for the proposed expropriation. **Compensation for lands is not determined at this Hearing.** The Inquiry Officer can order the Region of Waterloo to pay the property owner up to $200.00 as compensation for the property owner’s costs in participating in this Hearing, regardless of the outcome of the Hearing.

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

- If no Hearing is requested by the property owner, then Council may approve the expropriation of the land after expiry of a 30 day period following service of the Notice of Application for Approval to Expropriate.
• If Council approves the expropriation then, within 3 months of this approval, the Region of Waterloo must register a Plan at the Land Registry Office that describes the expropriated lands. The registration of this Plan automatically transfers title of the lands to the Region of Waterloo, instead of by a Deed signed by the property owner.

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

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

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

Cultural Heritage Definitions

Designated Properties – Protected from demolition and other adverse impacts

A designation confers a legal status on a property by a specific municipal by-law under the Ontario Heritage Act. Designation may fall under one of two categories under the Ontario Heritage Act: Part IV (individual designation) or Part V (district designation). Designation is an Area Municipal responsibility. The Area Municipal Council has the legal authority to refuse an application that will adversely affect the property's heritage attributes.

Municipally Registered/Listed Properties – Interim protection from demolition

The municipal register is the official list or record of cultural heritage properties that have been identified as being important to the community. The register includes all properties in the municipality that are designated under Part IV (individual designation) and Part V (district designation) of the Ontario Heritage Act. In addition, the municipal register may include properties of cultural heritage value or interest that have not been designated under the Ontario Heritage Act. This is commonly known as “listing.” The Area Municipal Council must be given at least 60 days notice of intention to demolish or remove a building or structure on the property. This allows time for the municipality to decide whether to begin the designation process to give long term protection to the property.

Pre-1900 Residential Properties – For information

Residential structures in the project area that were built prior to 1900 have been identified. These identified historic structures have no formal heritage protection. However, historic buildings that have maintained their heritage value could be candidates for further heritage protection. Property data is taken from the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC). The date that is assigned to a property represents the oldest structure on the lot.

Scenic Roads – Identified as possessing cultural value and require additional design consideration

Certain transportation corridors are characterized by natural, cultural heritage and recreational features that contribute to their scenic value or special character. Area municipalities are responsible for the designation of those municipal roads that possess scenic or cultural value. Likewise, the Region has identified sections of Regional road corridors that are considered scenic. The Special Character Streets and Scenic Roads Resource Document is a supplement to the Implementation Guidelines for Regional
Transportation Corridor Design. It identifies and provides recommendations for the treatment of Scenic Roads and Special Character Streets that are part of the Regional road system within the Region of Waterloo. These recommendations should be considered before undertaking any work on a road that has been identified as possessing scenic value.
Appendix “F” – Through Traffic Detour Routes

REGIONAL ROAD 58 (NORTHUMBERLAND ST/SWAN ST) REGIONAL ROAD 4 (STANLEY ST) IMPROVEMENTS PRELIMINARY CONSTRUCTION THROUGH TRAFFIC DETOUR ROUTES TOWNSHIP OF NORTH DUMFRIES

Region of Waterloo
Comment Sheet

Regional Municipality of Waterloo

Northumberland Street, Stanley Street & Swan Street Improvements

CPR Tracks to Hilltop Drive

Township of North Dumfries

Please complete and hand in this sheet so that your comments can be considered for this project. If you cannot complete your comments today, please take this home and mail, fax or e-mail your comments by Friday, June 19, 2015 to:

Mr. Delton Zehr, C.E.T., C.R.S.
Project Manager
Region of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street, 6th Floor
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3
Telephone: (519) 575-4757 x 3637
Fax: (519) 575-4430
Email: DZehr@regionofwaterloo.ca

Mr. Stuart Mitchell, P.Eng.
Sr. Project Manager
WalterFedy
675 Queen Street South, Suite 111
Kitchener, ON N2M 1A1
Telephone: (519) 576-2150 x 330
Fax: (519) 576-5499
Email: smitchell@walterfedy.com

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

Comments or concerns regarding this project:
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________
Name: ________________________________________________________________

Address: _______________________________________________________________

Postal Code ____________________________________________________________

Phone: __________________________ Email: ________________________________

Collection Notice

All comments and information received from individuals, stakeholder groups and agencies regarding this project are being collected to assist the Region of Waterloo in making a decision. Under the “Municipal Act”, personal information such as name, address, telephone number, and property location that may be included in a submission becomes part of the public record.
Fountain Street Improvements,
Blair Road to Preston Parkway,
City of Cambridge

Information Package

What: Reconstruction of Fountain Street, City of Cambridge

Where: From Blair Road to east of Preston Parkway

Why: To Replace the Pavement Structure, Provide Pedestrian and Cycling Facilities, and Replace the Fountain Street Bridge Over the Grand River

When: Construction in 2017 and 2018

Who: Region of Waterloo Project Manager
Mr. John Stephenson, P.Eng.
Phone: (519) 575-4096
JStephenson@regionofwaterloo.ca

We Want Your Input!

There is a Comment Sheet at the back of this package. Please fill it out and share your comments with us.

Public Consultation Centre No. 1
Tuesday, June 16, 2015, 4:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.
Four Points by Sheraton, 210 Preston Parkway, Cambridge
1. **Why is the Region of Waterloo Undertaking This Project?**

The Region of Waterloo is currently undertaking detailed design of proposed improvements to Fountain Street from Blair Road to Preston Parkway in the City of Cambridge. Please refer to the **Key Plan** for a drawing of the project area.

Fountain Street provides an important transportation link from the Highway 401 / Homer Watson Boulevard interchange to the Region of Waterloo International Airport, linking communities on each side of the Grand River.

The proposed improvements are intended to address the following issues:

- The existing asphalt pavement is approaching the end of its service life;
- Traffic demands related to the new Limerick Road development are increasing demand at the Limerick Road intersection;
- Traffic demands related to area development are increasing demand at the Preston Parkway intersection;
- The current rural roadway cross section is not consistent with the increasing pedestrian, cyclist and vehicle demands;
- There are many trails leading to the Blair and Preston neighbourhoods; however, there is a discontinuity in the trail network between Blair and Preston. Accordingly, the Region’s Active Transportation Master Plan (ATMP) identifies this section of Fountain Street as a candidate for improved pedestrian and cyclist facilities such as multi-use trails;
- There are currently no formal pedestrian crossings of Fountain Street;
- The existing sidewalk terminates approximately half way between Shantz Hill Road and Preston Parkway. Accordingly, it does not provide a continuous facility for pedestrians between Preston Parkway to Shantz Hill Road;
- The existing girders, deck and railings are nearing the end of their usable life. The existing bridge deck does not provide adequate facilities for pedestrians and cyclists and is not wide enough to support the proposed addition of improved pedestrian and cyclist facilities. The existing railings do not meet current design codes for crash resistance or bicycle safety; and
- The existing bridge is considered to be safe and normal repairs are being carried out on the bridge on an as-required basis; however, it will be more cost-effective in the long run to replace the aging bridge components rather than to undertake a major rehabilitation of the existing bridge.

Please refer to **Section 5** for a description of the proposed improvements to address the above issues.
2. Who is Directing the Planning of the Improvements?

This Project is being directed by a Project Team consisting of Region of Waterloo staff and City of Cambridge staff. The Region has retained the consulting engineering firm Parsons to assist with the planning, engineering design, architectural design and contract administration of this project. The Region has also retained the construction engineering firm Brown & Company to develop demolition and reconstruction plans for the bridge.

3. How is this Project Being Planned?

Under Ontario’s Environmental Assessment Act, routine infrastructure projects are planned in accordance with the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) Process. Projects are planned in accordance with a “category” or “schedule” depending on the complexity and potential severity of the environmental impacts associated with the project, ranging from Schedule “A” and Schedule “A+” projects (minimal environmental impacts) to Schedule “C” projects (potential for more significant environmental impacts). Please Refer to Appendix “A” for more information about the Class EA process.

The improvements to Fountain Street from Blair Road to Preston Parkway are being undertaken as a Schedule “A+” project. Schedule “A+” projects are defined as routine projects that are considered straight-forward with minor or short-term environmental 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 project in advance of construction.

4. What is the Purpose of this Public Consultation Centre?

The public is invited to this Public Consultation Centre (PCC) to:

- Review the improvements that have been developed by the Project Team for Fountain Street from Blair Road to Preston Parkway;
- Ask questions of staff from the Region of Waterloo and City of Cambridge; and
- Provide comments and input regarding the proposed improvements being considered.

Please note that additional information about this project, including electronic versions of the display boards at this Public Consultation Centre, are available online at:
We ask that you complete the Comment Sheet attached to the back of this Information Package and put it in the box at the Consultation Centre, or send it to the address indicated on the Comment Sheet. Your comments will be considered along with other information received over the course of the project to assist the Region of Waterloo in completing the planning and design for this project.

5. What Improvements are Being Considered?

This section of Fountain Street currently includes:

- Two (2) lanes of through traffic;
- Rural cross section with paved shoulders;
- No designated pedestrian facilities;
- A one-way stop-sign controlled intersection at Limerick Road;
- A one-way stop-sign controlled intersection at Preston Parkway;
- Storm drainage via grassed ditches; and
- A four-span concrete bridge crossing the Grand River just east of Blair Road.

In order to address project objectives and issues identified in Section 1, the Project Team has developed a Preferred Design Concept including the following key elements:

- Reconstruction of the existing roadway base and asphalt pavement on Fountain Street from Blair Road to Preston Parkway;
- Construction of a new eastbound left-turn lane at Fountain Street at Limerick Road;
- Construction of a new eastbound left-turn lane at Fountain Street at Preston Parkway;
- Construction of curb and gutter on Fountain Street from Blair Road to Preston Parkway;
- Construction of a new 3.0 metre wide asphalt boulevard multi-use trail on the north side of Fountain Street from Blair Road to Preston Parkway, and a new 3.0 metre wide asphalt boulevard multi-use trail on the south side of Fountain Street from Blair Road to approximately 150 metres east of Preston Parkway;
- Construct new pedestrian refuge islands on Fountain Street at Limerick Road and Preston Parkway;
- Construction of an infill sidewalk on the south/east side of Fountain Street from approximately 150 metres east of Preston Parkway to meet the existing sidewalk terminus 420 metres southwest of Shantz Hill Road; and
• Replacement of the deteriorated girders, deck and railings of the existing Fountain Street / Grand River Bridge with new components designed to accommodate the additional width required to support the multi-use trails.

Please refer to Figure 1 and Figure 2 for a drawing showing the Project Team’s Preferred Design Concept.

6. How Do the Improvements Being Considered Relate to the Objectives of the Regional Official Plan, Regional Transportation Master Plan, Cycling Master Plan, Active Transportation Master Plan, and the Regional Transportation Context-Sensitive Corridor Design Guidelines?

These improvements are being planned in accordance with relevant Regional by-laws, policies, plans 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 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 Blair Road to Limerick Drive and as a “Residential Connector” from Limerick Drive to Preston Parkway. Accordingly, Fountain Street is identified for enhanced pedestrian facilities including either (i) sidewalks on both sides of the road as well as on-road cycling lanes; or (ii) a multi-use trail on each side of the road in lieu of sidewalks and cycling lanes.

The Regional Active Transportation Master Plan (ATMP) is a planning policy document that identifies desired 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 from Blair Road to Preston Parkway. Enhanced pedestrian and cycling facilities on Fountain Street as part of this project would link up with existing and planned pedestrian and cycling infrastructure on Fountain Street at Blair Road.
(including the Riverside Trail and Trans Canada Trail), Limerick Road, Preston Parkway, Shantz Hill Road and King Street.

7. Did the Project Team Consider Expansion of the Roadway to 4 Lanes?

The Regional Transportation Master Plan, completed in 2010, considered projected traffic volumes on Fountain Street from Blair Road to Shantz Hill Road. The projected traffic volumes account for increased demand due to area growth and improvements to nearby alternate routes and expansion of the transit system. Based on these projected traffic volumes, two travel lanes on this section of Fountain Street will be adequate to convey traffic over a long-term planning horizon.

8. Who will be Responsible for Winter Maintenance of the New Sidewalks and Multi-Use Trails?

From Blair Road to Preston Parkway, the City of Cambridge would be responsible for clearing snow from the new multi-use trails.

Where new infill sidewalk is proposed on Fountain Street from Preston Parkway to Shantz Hill Road, property owners abutting Fountain Street would be responsible for clearing snow from sidewalks.

9. Will the Posted Speed Limit be Changed? Can the Existing Passing Zone be Retained?

The current posted speed limit on Fountain Street is 70 km/h from Blair Road to 200 metres west of Preston Parkway, and 50 km/h from 200 metres west of Preston Parkway to Shantz Hill Road. The Region proposes that the posted speed limit on Fountain Street from Blair Road to 200 metres west of Preston Parkway be changed to 60 km/h following construction of these improvements when the road is re-opened to traffic.

The existing passing zone, from 350 metres east of Blair Road to 50 metres west of Limerick Road, cannot be retained due to the addition of the left-turn lane and intersection improvements at the intersection of Fountain Street and Limerick Road.

10. How Will Driveways, Trees, Boulevards and Private Lawns be Affected?

Driveways - There are no residential or commercial driveways on Fountain Street from Blair Road to Preston Parkway. Between Preston Parkway and 420 metres
southwest of Shantz Hill Road, minor re-grading of existing residential driveways may be necessary in order to blend smoothly with the newly constructed infill sidewalk. All driveways will be reinstated to pre-construction or better condition at no cost to the property owner.

**Trees** - It is expected that approximately six (6) existing medium sized trees between Blair Road and Preston Parkway will have to be removed during construction to accommodate the proposed improvements. The **Display Boards** at this Public Consultation Centre indicate the existing trees that would be affected by this project.

It is the Region's practice to plant two replacement trees for each tree removed as a result of any road projects. The Project Team proposes replacing any removed trees with large diameter replacement salt tolerant trees (i.e. 75 mm to 80 mm calliper).

In addition to replacing any trees removed on a 2-for-1 basis, new boulevard landscaping, including additional salt-tolerant trees, will be included as part of the project where feasible. Please refer to **Figure 1** for details of the proposed new trees and boulevard landscaping. The **Display Boards** at this Public Consultation Centre also indicate the proposed new trees and boulevard landscaping.

The Project Team has retained a tree expert (arborist) to assess the condition of existing trees and other vegetation within the road corridor. The arborist's work includes the development of any required tree preservation or protection strategies to be implemented during construction.

Please note that boulevard trees and landscaping are typically planted as part of a separate landscape contract in the year following the road construction.

**Boulevards and Lawns** - Any grassed areas disturbed during construction will be repaired to equal or better condition with topsoil and seed or sod at no cost to the property owner.

11. **Does the Region of Waterloo need to Acquire Private Property for this Project?**

The intent of the design process is to minimize the need to acquire property; however, in order to construct the infill sidewalk from 150 metres east of Preston Parkway to 420 metres east of Preston Parkway, the Region will need to acquire narrow strips of property from three (3) abutting property owners.

Additionally, the Region will be required to acquire nine (9) temporary easements in order to facilitate construction activities.
Please refer to Appendix “B” for a list of these potentially impacted property locations and the tentatively estimated area of property required. A more detailed map showing the locations where the Region will need to acquire property and easements is provided in the Display Boards at this Public Consultation Centre.

As the project proceeds, the Region’s Real Estate staff will contact affected property owners to discuss the necessary property acquisitions. It is the Region's standard practice to negotiate agreements of purchase and sale with the affected property owner, based on an independent appraisal of the land’s fair market value. If agreements cannot be reached in time to meet the project schedule, the Region may acquire the needed lands through Expropriation. For further information, please see the Property Process Information Sheet in Appendix “C”.

12. Are any Heritage Resources Impacted by the Improvements? How does the new Bridge Design Complement its Surroundings?

Blair Area Context

Heritage resources, including buildings and bridges, can be designated or listed under the Ontario Heritage Act. Please refer to Appendix “D” for definitions of the various heritage classifications under the Ontario Heritage Act.

Fountain Street from Blair Road to Limerick Road is within the Primary Area of the Blair Heritage Conservation District. The road and bridge are considered as part of the Natural Environment in the inventory of Historic Landscapes. Several roads in the Blair area are identified as having specific heritage conservation goals which are defined in the Blair Heritage Conservation District Plan; however, Fountain Street is not among these designated roads. Additionally, the Fountain Street / Grand River bridge is not identified as a Heritage Structure in the Blair Heritage Conservation District Plan.

Fountain Street / Grand River Bridge

The Project Team has engaged a senior Cultural Heritage planner to undertake a Cultural Heritage Assessment of the bridge.

Key findings of the Cultural Heritage Assessment are as follows:

- The existing bridge is a simple, functional structure that does not detract from the surrounding landscape, and has open railings that afford views of the river and valleylands; and
- The existing bridge structure itself does not have significant heritage value or interest from a design, contextual or associative perspective.
Guidance for Design of New Bridge Components

The Cultural Heritage Assessment made the following recommendations for new bridge design:

- The design should enhance views to and from the structure. For example, the design should incorporate open railings rather than concrete barriers; and
- The design should enhance pedestrian and cyclist access to Fountain Street and the numerous trails in the area.

Key Features of the New Bridge Components

In accordance with the guidance provided by the Cultural Heritage Assessment, the bridge design incorporates the following key features:

- New vaulted steel girders with a similar profile to the existing bridge girders;
- Customized open railings to enhance views to and from the Grand River;
- Architectural end parapets with stone masonry cladding; and
- Transitions to and from connecting walking and cycling paths.

Please refer to Figure 2 for drawings showing the new bridge components.

13. How is the Natural Environment Being Considered?

The Region has compiled a detailed inventory of flora and fauna in the project area.

The roadway is being designed so that no new encroachments into the adjacent rare™ Charitable Research Reserve lands are required. The proposed curb-and-gutter will provide for more control of roadway runoff.

The new bridge deck will eliminate the deck drains of the existing bridge, thereby preventing the direct discharge of roadway runoff and contaminants into the Grand River. Stormwater runoff from the bridge deck will be directed to the nearest catch-basins to the end of the bridge and directed to naturalized drainage channels allowing for soil infiltration.

The new bridge girders and deck are being designed to allow for re-use of the existing bridge piers, thereby avoiding the need for disposal of existing pier material and resources used to build new piers. The new abutments will be situated further back from the river’s edge than the existing abutments, thereby improving river flow under the bridge and providing better passage for animals.
The Region has engaged the services of an experienced construction engineering firm to develop a demolition and replacement plan for the Fountain Street bridge girders, deck and railings. The proposed demolition and replacement plan will allow the existing deck and girders to be demolished without requiring in-water works and without discharging demolition debris into the Grand River.

14. When Will Construction Occur? How Will Traffic Be Maintained?

Construction Timing

Construction of the Fountain Street improvements is currently scheduled to be undertaken in 2017 and 2018 in the Region’s approved 2015 Transportation Capital Program. Final surface course asphalt and landscaping work will be scheduled for either 2018 or 2019.

The timing of this project is subject to receipt of all technical and financial approvals, acquisition of required property and final approval of Regional Council.

Bridge Closure to Vehicles / Bridge Availability to Pedestrians and Cyclists

Demolition and reconstruction of the bridge girders and deck requires that the bridge will be out of service to motorized vehicles for a period of 18-24 months. The bridge is expected to be open to pedestrians and cyclists at most times during construction.

Detours and Road Access

During the bridge reconstruction, vehicular traffic will be detoured via Fountain Street west of Blair Road to Highway 401 to King Street and Shantz Hill Road and back to Fountain Street. Please refer to Figure 3 for a map showing the detour route.

From Limerick Road to Shantz Hill Road, traffic will generally be maintained in both directions during construction. Periodic lane restrictions may be in place to allow for certain construction activities. At certain critical times, it may be necessary to employ short-duration full road closures to allow for completion of key project components. In such instances, the duration of full closures will be kept to a minimum, detours will be provided and appropriate signage posted. Local traffic will be maintained at all times during construction.

Emergency Services, Grand River Transit, School Bus Services

The City of Cambridge Fire Department, Waterloo Regional Police and Ambulance Services, Grand River Transit and area School Board bus services have all been contacted through the project planning process. All of these services have indicated that they are developing plans to re-route vehicles during the bridge closure.
Pedestrian and Cyclist Access

During construction, pedestrian and cycling traffic on Fountain Street will be maintained at most times; however, it is noted that it may be necessary to temporarily restrict pedestrian and cyclist traffic for short durations.

Driveway Access

Access to driveways on Fountain Street will be maintained to the greatest extent possible during construction. The Contractor will be required to temporarily block access to and from driveways, directly in front of the driveway, for short-term periods when completing certain construction operations. Where a disruption to a driveway is expected, the Contractor will be required to hand-deliver a notice at least 48 hours in advance advising you of the time and duration of the driveway disruption.

Area residents will receive further communication from the Region well in advance of construction providing detailed information regarding traffic detours, Grand River Transit service, Emergency vehicle access and other relevant information pertaining to the construction.

Garbage and Recyclables Collection

For residential properties on Fountain Street, garbage, green bins, yard waste and blue boxes will continue to be picked up curbside as usual. When work is occurring in front of your property and waste collection vehicles do not have access to your driveway on garbage collection day, the Contractor will deliver your garbage and recyclables to an adjacent side street for collection and return the empty containers afterwards. We will ask that all residents mark their containers with their address for easy identification.

For properties with private garbage collection, driveway access will be maintained during each phase of construction to provide access for private garbage collection.

15. Were Options Considered to Maintain Vehicular Traffic across the River During Replacement of the Existing Bridge Girders and Deck?

Could One Lane of Traffic Be Maintained?

Both sides of the existing and/or new bridge will be required for construction activities at all times until the new bridge deck is opened to vehicular traffic. Accordingly, it will not be possible to maintain one lane of traffic on the bridge during construction.
Please note that there will be sufficient space available to provide a temporary facility for pedestrians and cyclists. Please refer to the Display Boards for a drawing showing the demolition and reconstruction sequence.

**Could a Temporary Bridge Be Used to Maintain Traffic?**

During the planning of the project, the Project Team investigated the feasibility of providing a temporary bridge (e.g. a “Bailey Bridge”) to maintain traffic across the river during replacement of the existing bridge girders and deck. The following key findings are noted:

- The available detour route is readily accessible for vehicular traffic and does not add considerable time or distance to a typical trip;
- The removal and replacement plan for the girders and deck will allow the Region to provide passage for pedestrians and cyclists during construction;
- Grand River Transit will re-route bus services as required in order to provide continued service in this area;
- Emergency Services (Fire, Police, Ambulance) have indicated that they can manage access and response times, even when the bridge is not available to vehicular traffic;
- School bus services have indicated that they can alter their routes to accommodate the bridge construction activities;
- A temporary bridge would require construction, and eventual removal, of temporary piers in the river;
- The need for in-water works affecting the bed of the river would add constraints to the construction schedule due to federal and provincial laws and regulations pertaining to in-water work. These laws and regulations would affect the construction start date and the allowable dates during which in-water works could be undertaken. Accordingly, the duration of the construction project would be increased;
- The site geometry has numerous constraints that would make it difficult to shift the road to a temporary bridge alignment while still maintaining safe road geometry (curves, etc.); and
- The cost of a temporary bridge is estimated to be approximately $3.5 million, based on previous experience with temporary bridges.

Based on the above findings, the Project Team is not recommending the use of a temporary bridge to maintain vehicular traffic during bridge construction.
16. What Measures Are Being Considered to Shorten the Duration of Bridge Construction?

The Project Team recognizes that removing the Fountain Street / Grand River bridge from service will present inconvenience to the public. During the planning phase of the project, the Project Team has considered a number of options to potentially reduce the duration of the bridge closure.

Could Extended Working Hours Be Used to Accelerate Construction?

The contract for the bridge construction will require the bridge contractor to work up to 12 hours per day in order to complete the construction within the specified timeline. Work during late evening and overnight hours will generally not be acceptable due to the close proximity of homes in the village of Blair; however, the Region will consider applying to the City of Cambridge for short-term noise by-law exemptions where critical construction operations can benefit from further extended hours.

Could “Rapid Demolition” and “Rapid Replacement” Techniques be Used?

“Rapid Bridge Demolition” and “Rapid Bridge Replacement” techniques have been used to demolish and replace certain bridges crossing 400-series highways in Ontario. Rapid Bridge Demolition typically involves use of explosives, or removal of entire bridge segments using specialized heavy-lift vehicles. Rapid Bridge Replacement typically involves placement of entire pre-fabricated bridge segments using specialized heavy-lift vehicles. These techniques are not generally feasible for longer-span bridges and bridges crossing water courses such as the Fountain Street / Grand River bridge.

Could Pre-Fabricated Bridge Components be Used?

Pre-fabricated bridge components will be specified as part of the bridge design where feasible. For example, the bridge design will employ pre-fabricated deck form panels in lieu of traditional wooden forms for casting of the concrete deck. These panels speed placement of the deck forms and eliminate the need for form removal after curing of the concrete deck. The bridge railing system will also be pre-fabricated off-site, in lieu of on-site forming and casting of the railing system.

17. What is the Estimated Cost of this Project and How will it be Funded?

Bridge works, roadworks, multi-use trails and infill sidewalks will be funded by the Region of Waterloo in the estimated total amount of approximately $13,970,000 to be funded from the Roads Rehabilitation Reserve Fund and the Development Charge Reserve Fund.
18. What are the Next Steps for this Project? When will a Decision be Made for this Project?

Prior to finalizing the detailed engineering design, the Region is interested in receiving public feedback on the proposed improvements. This Public Consultation Centre is your opportunity to ask questions, provide suggestions, and make comments. The Project Team will use the comments obtained from the public during this Public Consultation Centre to refine the proposed improvements in conjunction with other technical data.

The Project Team will review the public comments received from the Public Consultation Centre and use them as input for refinement of the proposed improvements. It is planned to present the proposed improvements to Region of Waterloo Planning and Works Committee and Council in Fall 2015 for approval. In advance of this meeting, letters will be sent to all adjacent property owners and tenants (as well as to all members of the public specifically registering at the Public Consultation Centre) so that anyone wishing to speak to Committee or Council about this project can do so before final approval.

19. How Will I Receive Further Notification Regarding This Project?

Adjacent property owners and members of the public registering at the Public Consultation Centre will receive all forthcoming public correspondence, and will be notified of any future meetings.

Additionally, project information is available on-line at:


20. How Can I Provide My Comments?

In order to assist the Project Team in addressing any comments or concerns you might have regarding this project, we ask that you fill out the attached Comment Sheet and leave it in the comment box provided at the registration table. Alternatively you can mail, fax or e-mail your comments using the attached comment sheet to the Project Team member listed below, no later than June 26, 2015.

We thank you for your involvement and should you have any questions or concerns please contact:
21. How Can I View Project Information Following this Public Consultation Centre?

All of the Display Boards from this Public Consultation Centre and other relevant project information, notifications of upcoming meetings and contact information are available for viewing at the Region of Waterloo municipal office as identified above. Alternatively, you may visit the Region’s website at:

Figure 1  Proposed Design for Reconstruction of Fountain Street from Blair Road to Preston Parkway

PREFERRED DESIGN CONCEPT
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Figure 1  Proposed Design for Reconstruction of Fountain Street from Blair Road to Preston Parkway
Figure 2   Proposed Design for New Bridge Girders, Deck and Railings
            (Bridge Configuration)
Figure 2 (cont’d)  Proposed Design for New Bridge Girders, Deck and Railings
(Bridge Configuration)
Figure 2 (cont’d) Proposed Design for New Bridge Girders, Deck and Railings (Open Railing Concept)
Figure 3  Proposed Detour Route
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Class EA 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>
## Property Acquisition Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Description of Property Required</th>
<th>Estimated Approximate Area of Property Required (m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>483 Fountain Street</td>
<td>Temporary easement</td>
<td>37.8 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495 Fountain Street</td>
<td>Temporary easement</td>
<td>33.1 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505 Fountain Street</td>
<td>Temporary easement</td>
<td>64.0 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519 Fountain Street</td>
<td>Temporary easement</td>
<td>68.5 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531 Fountain Street</td>
<td>Temporary easement</td>
<td>70.4 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543 Fountain Street</td>
<td>Temporary easement</td>
<td>75.5 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555 Fountain Street</td>
<td>Permanent property</td>
<td>8.8 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555 Fountain Street</td>
<td>Temporary easement</td>
<td>161.0 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565 Fountain Street</td>
<td>Permanent property</td>
<td>23.0 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565 Fountain Street</td>
<td>Temporary easement</td>
<td>63.6 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>575 Fountain Street</td>
<td>Permanent property</td>
<td>0.3 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>575 Fountain Street</td>
<td>Temporary easement</td>
<td>59.1 m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 10,000 m² equals 1 ha (hectare).
* 1 ha equals approximately 2.47 acres.

### NOTES
1. Temporary easements may also be required from other properties not listed above, in order to facilitate construction activities.
2. Permanent easements may be required from certain properties for specific utilities apparatus (e.g. guy cables).
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Appendix C-1

Property Acquisition Process Information Sheet

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

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

Property Impact Plans

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

Initial Owner Contact by Regional Real Estate Staff

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

Initial Meetings

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

Goal – Fair and Equitable Settlement for All Parties

The goal is always to reach a fair and equitable agreement for both the property owner and the Region. Such an agreement will provide compensation for the fair market value of the lands and address the project impacts (such as repairing or replacing landscaping, fencing, paving) so that the property owner will receive the value of the lands acquired and the restoration of their remaining property to the condition it was prior to the Project.
Appendix C-2

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

Steps Toward Offer of Settlement or Agreement of Purchase and Sale

The general steps towards such an offer are as follows;

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

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

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

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

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

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

Expropriation

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

Put simply, an expropriation is the transfer of lands or an easement to a governmental authority for reasonable compensation, including payment of fair market value for the transferred lands, without the consent of the property owner being required. In the case of expropriations by municipalities such as the Region of Waterloo, the process set out in the Ontario Expropriations Act must be followed to ensure that the rights of the property owners provided under that Act are protected.
The following information is provided as a general overview of the expropriation process and is not legal advice. For complete information, reference should be made to the Ontario Expropriations Act as well as the more detailed information in the Notices provided under that Act.

Expropriation Information Sheet

What is Expropriation?

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

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

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

- Regional Council considers a request to begin an application under the *Expropriations Act* to obtain land and/or an easement for a specific Regional project. No decision is made at this meeting to expropriate the land. This step is simply direction for the Region of Waterloo to provide a “Notice of Application for Approval to Expropriate” to affected property owners that the process has started to seek approval to expropriate the land.

- As stated in the Notice, affected property owners have 30 days to request a Hearing to consider whether the requested expropriation is “fair, sound and reasonably necessary in the achievement of the objectives” of the Region of Waterloo. This Hearing is conducted by a provincially-appointed Inquiry Officer. Prior to the Hearing, the Region of Waterloo must serve the property owner with a Notice setting out its reasons or grounds for the proposed expropriation. **Compensation for lands is not determined at this Hearing.** The Inquiry Officer can order the Region of Waterloo to pay the property owner up to $200.00 as compensation for the property owner’s costs in participating in this Hearing, regardless of the outcome of the Hearing.

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

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

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

- Within 30 days of registration of the Plan, the Region of Waterloo must serve a Notice of Expropriation on the affected property owner advising of the expropriation. Within 30 days of this Notice, the property owner may serve the Region of Waterloo with a Notice of Election selecting the valuation date under the *Expropriations Act* for calculation of the compensation.
• In order to obtain possession of the expropriated lands, the Region of Waterloo must also serve a Notice of Possession setting out the date that possession of the land is required by the Region of Waterloo. This date has to be 3 months or more from the date that this Notice of Possession is served on the affected property owner.

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

Ontario Heritage Act – Cultural Heritage Definitions

Designated Properties – Protected from demolition and other adverse impacts

A designation confers a legal status on a property by a specific municipal by-law under the Ontario Heritage Act. Designation may fall under one of two categories under the Ontario Heritage Act: Part IV (individual designation) or Part V (district designation). Designation is an Area Municipal responsibility. The Area Municipal Council has the legal authority to refuse an application that will adversely affect the property's heritage attributes.

Municipally Registered/Listed Properties – Interim protection from demolition

The municipal register is the official list or record of cultural heritage properties that have been identified as being important to the community. The register includes all properties in the municipality that are designated under Part IV (individual designation) and Part V (district designation) of the Ontario Heritage Act. In addition, the municipal register may include properties of cultural heritage value or interest that have not been designated under the Ontario Heritage Act. This is commonly known as “listing.” The Area Municipal Council must be given at least 60 days notice of intention to demolish or remove a building or structure on the property. This allows time for the municipality to decide whether to begin the designation process to give long term protection to the property.

Pre-1900 Residential Properties – For information

Residential structures in the project area that were built prior to 1900 have been identified. These identified historic structures have no formal heritage protection. However, historic buildings that have maintained their heritage value could be candidates for further heritage protection. Property data is taken from the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC). The date that is assigned to a property represents the oldest structure on the lot.

Scenic Roads – Identified as possessing cultural value and require additional design consideration

Certain transportation corridors are characterized by natural, cultural heritage and recreational features that contribute to their scenic value or special character. Area municipalities are responsible for the designation of those municipal roads that possess scenic or cultural value. Likewise, the Region has identified sections of Regional road corridors that are considered scenic. The Special Character Streets and Scenic Roads Resource Document is a supplement to the Implementation Guidelines for Regional Transportation Corridor Design. It identifies and provides recommendations for the treatment of Scenic Roads and Special Character Streets that are part of the Regional road system within the Region of Waterloo. These recommendations should be considered before undertaking any work on a road that has been identified as possessing scenic value.
Comment Sheet

Regional Municipality of Waterloo
Fountain Street Improvements
Public Consultation Centre

Please complete and hand in this sheet so that your views can be considered for this project. If you cannot complete your comments today, please take this home and mail, fax or e-mail your comments by June 26, 2015 to:

Mr. John Stephenson, P.Eng.,
Senior Project Manager
Region of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street, 6th Floor
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3
(T) 519-575-4757 (F) 519-575-4430
(E) jstephenson@regionofwaterloo.ca

Comments regarding this project:
(Please feel free to attach a separate sheet if you require more space for your comments)

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your interest and time.

Collection Notice

All comments and information received from individuals, stakeholder groups and agencies regarding these projects and meetings are being collected to assist the Region of Waterloo in making a decision. Under the Municipal Act, personal information (such as name, address, telephone number, and property location) that may be included in a submission becomes part of the public record. Questions regarding the collection should be forwarded to the staff member noted above.
To:   Chair Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee

Date:  May 26, 2015   File Code:  D18-01

Subject:  Monthly Report of Development Activity for April 2015

Recommendation:


Summary:

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

- Approved the following part lot control exemption by-laws;
- Modified the following plans of condominium;
- Released for registration the following plan of condominium; and
- Approved the following official plan amendments.

Report:

City of Cambridge

Official Plan Amendment Number 6

Applicant:  Grand Ridge Estates
Location:  Freure Drive and Salisbury Avenue
Proposal:  To amend the land use designation on a 14.54 hectare property located west of Hard Castle Drive, Freure Drive and Salisbury Avenue from “Future Urban Reserve” to “Low/Medium Residential” and “Natural Open Space System” in order to facilitate a future residential plan of subdivision.
Official Plan Amendment Number 6
Regional Processing Fee: Paid November 27, 2014
Commissioner’s Approval: April 7, 2015
Came Into Effect: April 28, 2015

Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-11102
Draft Approval Date: June 19, 2012
Phase: Entire Plan
Applicant: 1663680 Ontario Ltd.
Location: 507-539 Parkview Drive
Proposal: To permit the development of 17 residential condominium townhouse units.

Regional Processing Fee: Paid April 1, 2015
Commissioner’s Release: April 30, 2015

City of Waterloo
Part Lot Control Exemption By-law 2015-016
Applicant: Heisler Homes Inc.
Location: Cider Mill Drive and Grey Silo Road
Proposal: To create access easements over a portion of the rear yards of townhouse units in favour of adjacent units.

Regional Processing Fee: Paid April 10, 2015
Commissioner’s Approval: April 14, 2015

Part Lot Control Exemption By-law 2015-017
Applicant: East Forest Homes Ltd.
Location: Sweet Gale Street and Ginseng Street
Proposal: To create access easements over a portion of the rear yards of townhouse units in favour of adjacent units.

Regional Processing Fee: Paid April 10, 2015
Commissioner’s Approval: April 14, 2015
Modification of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-14406

Draft Approval Date: March 18, 2015
Applicant: IN8 (Sage III) Developments Inc.
Location: 62 Balsam Street
Proposal: To identify a patio area (Exclusive Use) that was inadvertently missed from the draft approved plan and to clarify signage requirements for visitor and barrier free parking spaces and to reflect parking regulations.

Regional Processing Fee: Paid April 22, 2015
Commissioner’s Approval: April 27, 2015
Came Into Effect: Immediately

Township of Wilmot

Modification of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-01601

Draft Approval Date: April 17, 2002
Applicant: Stonecroft Corporation
Location: Haysville Road
Proposal: To reflect a change in the phasing, including a change to the units to be registered with Phase 7, and the removal of all subsequent phasing lines.

Regional Processing Fee: Paid January 19, 2015
Commissioner’s Approval: April 13, 2015
Came Into Effect: Immediately

Township of Woolwich

Official Plan Amendment Number 24

Applicant: St. Jacobs Countryside Inc. and Sunlife Assurance Company of Canada
Location: 25 Benjamin Road
Proposal: To amend site-specific Policy 7.23.7 in the Township’s Official Plan defining a Factory Outlet Mall in order to permit non-manufacturer outlet stores as ancillary commercial uses within the Factory Outlet Mall, to a maximum of 20% of the gross leasable floor area.
**Official Plan Amendment Number 24**

Regional Processing Fee: Paid February 20, 2015  
Commissioner’s Approval: April 24, 2015  
Came Into Effect: May 15, 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 included 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.

**Prepared By:** Andrea Banks, Program Assistant

**Approved By:** Rob Horne, Commissioner of 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: May 26, 2015
File Code: T15-40/33
Subject: Amendment to Regional Municipality of Waterloo Controlled Access By-Law #58-87 for Access to Regional Road #33 (Townline Road), City of Cambridge

Recommendation:
That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve an amendment to Controlled Access By-law #58-87 for an access on the west side of Regional Road #33 (Townline Road), approximately 328 metres south of Saginaw Parkway in the City of Cambridge, as describe in Report No. PDL-CPL-15-29, dated May 26, 2015.

Summary:
Hira Custom Homes Incorporated has been retained by Mr. Dhadda Singh, the property owner of 480 Townline Road in the City of Cambridge, to construct a single family home on the property (please see Attachment 1). A permanent access for the property is required on the west side of Regional Road #33 (Townline Road) approximately 328 metres south of Saginaw Parkway (please see Attachment 2).

Townline Road is designated as a Controlled Access – Prohibited road under the Region of Waterloo Controlled Access By-law #58-87 from Regional Road 39 (Pinebush Road) to Avenue Road, and as a result, an amendment to this By-law would be required prior to issuance of an Access Permit by staff.

Region of Waterloo staff have reviewed the proposed location of the access to Townline Road and recommend approval of the proposed By-law Amendment. The proposed access meets Region of Waterloo design standards.
Report:

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

Hira Custom Homes Incorporated has been retained by Mr. Dhadda Singh, the property owner of 480 Townline Road in the City of Cambridge, to construct a single family home on the property (please see Attachment 1). Regional staff has been contacted by Hira Custom Homes Incorporated to obtain a permanent access to the property on the west side of the road approximately 328 metres south of Saginaw Parkway (please see Attachment 2).

Townline Road is designated as a Controlled Access – Prohibited road under the Region of Waterloo Controlled Access By-law #58-87 from Regional Road 39 (Pinebush Road) to Avenue Road, and as a result, an amendment to this By-law would be required prior to issuance of an Access Permit by staff.

Region of Waterloo staff have reviewed the proposed location of the access to Townline Road and recommend approval of the proposed By-law Amendment. The proposed access meets Region of Waterloo design standards.

City of Cambridge staff and Mr. Singh are in support of the proposed access location.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

City of Cambridge staff supports the location of the proposed access.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

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

Financial Implications:

Mr. Singh would be responsible for all costs associated with the construction of the access.
Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Upon issuance of a Regional Access Permit, Transportation Engineering would issue a Regional Work Permit to perform works within the Regional right of way.

Corporate Resources would be required to amend Controlled Access By-law #58-87.

Attachments:

Attachment 1 – Key Map showing the location of the property

Attachment 2 – Plan showing the location of the proposed access and proposed amendment to Controlled Access By-law #58-87

Prepared By:  Cheryl Marcy, Transportation Planner

Approved By:  Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Development and Legislative Services
ATTACHMENT 2
PROPOSED ACCESS TO
480 TOWNLINE ROAD
(REGIONAL ROAD #33)
Region of Waterloo
Planning, Development and Legislative Services
Community Planning

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: May 26, 2015
File Code: D15-02
Subject: Co-ordinated Review of Ontario’s Land Use Policy Plans

Recommendation:
That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo forward Report No. PDL-CPL-15-31, dated May 26, 2015, to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing as Regional Council’s formal response to the first stage of the Province’s co-ordinated review of the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, the Green Belt Plan, the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan and the Niagara Escarpment Plan.

Summary:
Earlier this spring, the Province of Ontario initiated a co-ordinated review of its four land use policy plans – the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Growth Plan), the Greenbelt Plan, the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan and the Niagara Escarpment Plan. This review is being completed in two separate stages. As part of the first stage of the review, the Province is seeking public feedback on how the four plans can be improved to better meet their objectives. The information and viewpoints collected in this stage will assist in the development of proposed amendments to the plans. In the second stage of the review, the Province will then focus on obtaining feedback on any potential amendments to the plans. This report provides comments to the Province relating to the first stage of the review.

The four plans were developed over 10 years ago as part of the Government of Ontario’s Strong Communities Initiatives, a landmark set of new plans, policies and legislation intended to reduce urban sprawl and better protect the environment. Of the four plans, only two apply to the Region of Waterloo.

The Growth Plan covers 21 upper- and singer-tier municipalities in the Greater Golden Horseshoe including the Region of Waterloo (please see Attachment 1). The Greenbelt
Plan applies to a broad band of permanently protected land that builds on the Niagara Escarpment and Oak Ridges Moraine. A small portion of the Greenbelt extends into the Beverly area of the Township of North Dumfries (please see Attachment 2). The Growth Plan and the Greenbelt Plan, along with the Regional Official Plan and Area Municipal Plans, work together to accommodate future growth, protect the environment and support job creation in our communities.

As part of this first stage of the review, the Ministry is seeking input on how to make the Province’s four plans stronger and work better together. It is also looking for feedback on what parts of the plans are working well and should not be changed.

The comments in this report reflect staff’s experience in working with the Growth Plan and the Greenbelt Plan over the past ten years. The key messages of this report are:

1. Regional staff continue to endorse the policies of the Growth Plan and the Greenbelt Plan to reduce urban sprawl, support economic development, and better protect the region’s natural areas and valuable water resources for current and future generations. Taken together, the two plans provide a solid and essential foundation on how to accommodate future growth in the Greater Golden Horseshoe in more a sustainable way. The two plans provide for the development of a more compact and transit-supportive urban form, while seeking to protect the region’s valuable farmlands and natural resources.

We commend the Province for the leadership it has provided over the past several years in developing the four plans, and for initiating the present review to determine how the plans can be improved. We encourage the Province to maintain the overall policy directions of the four plans, and to continue in its efforts to improve the ways in which our communities will grow and develop over the long-term.

2. Despite our ongoing support for the Growth Plan and the Greenbelt Plan, the two plans could be improved in several key areas, especially in regard to:

   • the method used to convert population and employment forecasts into the amount of land designated for development (i.e., land budgeting process);
   • long-term planning for employment areas;
   • updating the Region’s population and employment forecasts;
   • Provincial investments in public transit infrastructure;
   • potential extension of the Metrolinx planning area to include Waterloo Region;
   • density targets for designated greenfield areas;
3. When the Growth Plan came into effect in June 2006, municipalities in the Greater Golden Horseshoe were given three years to bring their official plans into conformity with the policies, forecasts and targets in the Growth Plan. In spite of this deadline, many municipalities, including the Region of Waterloo, have been unable to fully implement the Growth Plan because of several protracted disputes before the Ontario Municipal Board.

The root cause of many of these disputes relate to unclear policy language, a lack of supporting tools or guidance materials to support implementation, and inconsistent messaging from the Province on how to implement the key elements of the Growth Plan. Unless these challenges are addressed by the Province as part of the current review, the Growth Plan will continue to be applied unequally and inconsistently across the various jurisdictions comprising the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

The above points are discussed in more detail below in the “Key Messages/Feedback” section of this report. If approved by Regional Council, this report would be forwarded to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing to help inform the development of proposed amendments to the Growth Plan and the Greenbelt Plan. These proposed amendments would then be reviewed as part of stage two of the review later this fall. Regional staff will report back to Regional Council at that time to respond to any amendments proposed by the Province.

Staff has consulted with all of the Area Municipalities in the preparation of this report.

Report:

On February 27, 2015, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing initiated a coordinated review of the Province’s four land use plans – the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Growth Plan), the Greenbelt Plan, the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, and the Niagara Escarpment Plan.

The Ministry developed the four plans separately over 10 years ago as part of the Government of Ontario's Strong Communities Initiatives, a ground-breaking suite of new plans, policies and legislation intended to reduce urban sprawl, maximize the use of existing infrastructure, and better protect our environment and valuable natural resources.

Of the four plans, only the Growth Plan and the Greenbelt Plan apply to the Region of Waterloo. The two plans are important and relevant to the Region because under the Planning Act, any decisions made by Regional Council in respect of a planning matter
must conform to the Growth Plan and the Greenbelt Plan. As such, the two plans are foundational documents and directly affect how our community will grow over the long-term. The two plans are summarised below.

**The Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe**

The Growth Plan came into effect on June 16, 2006. It was prepared under the Places to Grow Act, 2005 with the overall goal of reducing urban sprawl and better managing growth to the year 2031. The Growth Plan applies to 21 upper- and singer-tier municipalities in the Greater Golden Horseshoe, including the entirety of the Region of Waterloo (see Attachment 1). The key policy directions of the Growth Plan include:

- accommodate growth through intensification and build at sustainable, livable densities to curb sprawl and avoid the 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; and
- promote a culture of conservation which includes, but is not limited to, conservation policies within municipal official plans.

The Growth Plan also includes measurable targets that further direct how municipalities must accommodate new growth. For example, the Plan sets a density target for new greenfield areas that requires they be planned to achieve densities of at least 50 residents and jobs per hectare. Additionally, the Growth Plan requires that a minimum of 40 percent of new residential development occur within already built-up areas in the Plan by 2015, and each year thereafter. The new Regional Official Plan sets out a slightly higher intensification target of 45 percent. Over the past five years, Waterloo Region has consistently exceeded this target with an average annual intensification rate of 55 percent.

**The Greenbelt Plan**

The Province established the Greenbelt Plan in 2005. It applies to a broad band of nearly two million acres (800,000 hectares) of protected land surrounding the Greater Golden Horseshoe. Despite its large area, only a very small portion of the Greenbelt
extends into the Region of Waterloo near the Beverly area of the Township of North Dumfries (please see Attachment 2).

The Greenbelt builds on the landscape level features of the Niagara Escarpment and Oak Ridges Moraine. It identifies where urbanization should not occur to permanently protect the agricultural land base, ecological features and groundwater resources occurring within this landscape. The key policy directions of the Greenbelt include:

- support agriculture as the predominant land use and prevent loss and fragmentation of agricultural land;
- provide long-term protection to the natural heritage system that sustain ecological and human health;
- protect, improve or restore the quality and quantity of ground and surface water and integrity of the wetlands; and
- provide for a range of complementary economic and social activities including tourism, recreation and resource uses.

The Ministry is seeking feedback on how to make the Province’s four plans stronger and work better together. It is also looking for input on what parts of the plans are working well and should not be changed. This input will help inform the Province on potential amendments to the plans, which would be presented to the public during the second stage of the review later this fall.

Key Messages/Feedback on Co-ordinated Review

This section highlights Regional staff’s comments on the Province’s co-ordinated review. It reflects and is based on staff’s experience in working with the Growth Plan and Greenbelt Plan over the past ten years.

General Comments

Regional staff continue to endorse the policy directions of the Growth Plan and the Greenbelt Plan to reduce urban sprawl, support economic development, and better protect our natural areas and valuable water resources for current and future generations. Taken together, the two plans provide a solid and much needed foundation on how to accommodate growth in the Greater Golden Horseshoe in a more sustainable way. The two plans provide for the development of a more compact and transit-supportive urban form, while seeking to protect the region’s valuable farmlands and natural resources.

The goals of the Growth Plan and the Greenbelt Plan are fully in line with the Region of Waterloo’s long-standing commitment to balanced growth and environmental
stewardship. Many of the goals contained in the two plans reflect policies that the Region of Waterloo and its Area Municipalities have been advocating for many years. The Region’s work in the areas of ground water protection, Environmentally Sensitive Landscapes, the Countryside Line, and the construction of the ION rapid transit system are just some examples of where the Region’s goals align with the goals of the Growth Plan and the Greenbelt Plan.

Despite our overall support for the two plans, Regional staff has identified the following key areas where the plans could be further strengthened.

1. **Land Budgeting Exercise**

A key challenge associated with the Growth Plan relates to the method of converting growth forecasts into a municipality’s future land requirements. This process typically occurs through a study called a land budget. In simple terms, a land budget estimates how much land a municipality should designate for development to accommodate its forecasted population and employment growth, taking into account its available land supply and other variables.

If the land budget concludes that the municipality’s forecasted growth will exceed the capacity of both the existing built-up area and the available supply of vacant land in designated greenfield areas, the municipality may designate additional land for development by expanding its urban area boundary. The extent of any such expansion is therefore largely dependent on the municipality’s growth forecast and its underlying land budget methodology. If a municipality assumes business-as-usual development patterns, more land would be needed to accommodate its forecasted growth. Conversely, if a municipality anticipates a shift towards more medium- and high-density development, less land would be set aside for growth.

Although the Growth Plan allocates the growth forecasts for each upper-and single-tier municipality, it requires the municipalities to determine how much land they actually need to accommodate their forecasted growth. Unfortunately, when the Province released the Growth Plan in 2006, it did not provide a clear set of rules or standards on how municipalities should prepare a land budget, relying instead on the policy framework in the Growth Plan as providing appropriate direction.

Without a clear set of rules, the majority of the municipal planners, planning consultants and land economists who prepared land budgets employed a range of previously used approaches to accommodate the forecasted growth, while others used the policy direction provided by the Growth Plan. These differences, in turn, led to inconsistencies in how the Growth Plan has been applied by municipalities and the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) across the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

One frequently cited inconsistency relates to the OMB’s decisions on two separate, but
related hearings in the Region of Waterloo and the Municipality of Port Hope, Ontario.

In its January 2013 decision relating to the Region of Waterloo’s land budget, the OMB “preferred” the appellants’ market based land budget methodology over that of the Region. The appellants’ methodology, which relied heavily on the Province’s 1995 Projection Methodology Guideline, argued that the Region’s future land requirements should be based primarily on the Region’s historical housing choices adjusted to meet the intensification targets of the Growth Plan.

The Region of Waterloo’s land budget, on the other hand, employed a methodology based on achieving both the intensification and the greenfield density targets of the Growth Plan within the 2031 planning horizon, rather than on extrapolating historical development patterns (see page 4 of this report, “The Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe”). To highlight the differences, the Region’s land budget called for 85 hectares of new land to be made available within the 2031 planning horizon of the Growth Plan, whereas the appellants’ land budget called for 1,053 hectares within the same planning horizon.

The OMB ruling on the Region of Waterloo hearing stands in sharp contrast to a decision made by the OMB a few months earlier in the Municipality of Port Hope. In that hearing, the OMB rejected the appellants’ use of the Province’s 1995 Projection Methodology Guideline as the basis for Port Hope’s land budget exercise. The Board’s decision noted:

“While this methodology (1995 Projection Methodology Guideline) may have been previously recognized as a “best practise” for estimating future housing needs, it fails to capture the essence of the Growth Plan legislation. Specifically, this methodology is not as responsive to the new Provincial planning policy direction and Growth Plan directives aimed at optimizing land use, promoting compact urban form through intensification in built-up areas, and the protection of high-quality agricultural lands.”

Further, the Board commented that under the Growth Plan, it is inappropriate for municipalities to predict their future land requirements primarily on the basis of past housing market trends:

“The appellant’s approach to meeting future growth demands is firmly grounded in the concept that past housing market performance (as influenced by demographics) is the gauge for predicting how the Municipality can expect to grow over the next twenty years. However, this approach is counter to the Growth Plan’s directives which require Greater Toronto Area municipalities to adopt new growth patterns and land use efficiencies. In this regard, the Board finds that the market demand argument is more appropriately a challenge of the intent and legislative authority of the Growth Plan.”
In the absence of clear guidance from the Province, this issue will continue to dominate future conformity updates to municipal official plans and affect the long-term ability of the Growth Plan to consistently achieve its objectives.

2. Long-Term Planning for Employment Areas

The Growth Plan contains several policies that require municipalities to plan for a variety of employment uses, including “industrial, commercial and institutional uses”. The Growth Plan also includes policies requiring municipalities to protect their existing employment areas by establishing a series of tests that must be met before any lands within an employment area can be converted to non-employment uses, such as residential.

While Regional staff continue to support the intent of these policies to support job growth, we recommend that the policies be strengthened in the two key areas, 1) conversion of employment lands, and 2) the planning horizon for strategic employment areas. Staff will provide additional comments relating to employment lands as part of the second stage of the Province’s review.

Conversion of Employment Lands

Under the Growth Plan, municipalities may permit the conversion of lands within employment areas to non-employment uses only through a municipal comprehensive review. This is to ensure, among other tests, that there is a need for the conversion and that the municipality does not require the lands to achieve its long-term employment forecasts. To help implement this policy, the Growth Plan defines the term “employment areas” as:

“Areas designated in an official plan for clusters of business and economic activities, including, but not limited to manufacturing, warehousing, offices and associated retail and ancillary facilities.”

This definition stands in direct contrast to the definition of “employment uses” found in Section 2.2.6.2 a) of the Growth Plan, which states that such uses include industrial, commercial and institutional uses. The two definitions are not the same. Instead, the definition of “employment areas” is a subset of the definition of employment uses in Section 2.2.6.2 a). Unfortunately, since the word “employment” is used differently in both definitions, a great deal of confusion has arisen on how the related policies should be interpreted. This has led many people to incorrectly assume that a job is a job and that all types of jobs should be permitted in employment areas.

One example of how these policies have been misinterpreted relates to what types of commercial uses should be permitted within an employment area. For example, the words “associated retail and ancillary facilities” in the above definition of employment
areas indicate that any retail uses occurring within an employment area should be secondary and devoted exclusively to the employment function of the area (e.g., a shop or restaurant serving the employees working in the immediate area). However, because the definition of employment uses in Section 2.2.6.2 a) also includes “commercial” uses, this section has been interpreted to mean that employment areas should permit all types and sizes of retail uses, not just the ones that are secondary or ancillary to the employment area.

This policy is further complicated by the Growth Plan’s references to “major retail uses”. The Growth Plan states that “major retail uses” are considered non-employment uses for the purpose of the employment conversion policy. However, the Growth Plan does not provide a definition of “major retail uses” (e.g., shopping centre, arterial commercial store, large-format retail store). Without a definition, the Province’s employment conversion policy has been interpreted differently across the Greater Golden Horseshoe, resulting in an uneven and inconsistent application of the Growth Plan.

When the City of Cambridge adopted its new Official Plan in 2012, the City removed major retail uses as a permitted use within its designated employment areas. This change in policy was subsequently appealed to the OMB by a major grocery retailer on the grounds that since retail uses generate jobs, they should not have been excluded from the City’s employment areas. This issue is still under appeal before the Board.

The Province needs to clarify its intent with respect to the implementation of this policy framework. If the intent is that employment in “employment areas” is a subset of what the policies define as employment, the Province could resolve this confusion by referring to the universe of jobs as “non-residential uses” rather than as “employment uses”.

**Planning Horizon for Strategic Employment Areas**

The Growth Plan requires municipalities to maintain an adequate supply of employment lands to ensure they can accommodate their forecasted employment growth. If a municipality does not have an adequate supply of land, it may designate additional land by expanding its urban boundaries, provided the expansion does not exceed a time horizon of twenty years.

The twenty-year planning horizon is intended to ensure that municipalities use land more efficiently and do not over-designate land for employment, which could lead to increased pressure to convert them to non-employment uses in the future. Although Regional staff support the intent of this policy, there is a growing consensus among municipalities that strategic employments areas should to be designated over a time period longer than the twenty-year period currently in use, and that many employment uses are very locationally sensitive.
Strategic employments areas include large clusters of prime industrial land. These areas are planned to support major economic activities in a municipality, such as large-lot manufacturing, business parks, and land extensive warehousing and logistic uses that require close proximity to major highways, railway corridors and other transportation infrastructure. Strategic employment areas offer development ready sites and are to be reserved for major new economic investments in a municipality.

One of the challenges with the twenty-year planning horizon relates to the cyclical nature of the employment land market. During periods of strong economic growth, the price of employment land may rise sharply because of the higher demand for development ready sites. Although this is a sign of robust economy, an increase in demand for employment sites often leads to market pressures to subdivide strategic employment areas into smaller employment lots. These pressures may make it difficult for private property owners to bear the cost of holding strategic employment lands for very long periods.

To address this challenge, the Province should consider allowing upper-tier municipalities to designate strategic employment areas over a thirty-year planning horizon, or implement other alternative approaches that balance the need to protect against sprawl with the need for market responsiveness.

3. Updating the Region’s Population and Employment Forecasts

The Growth Plan prescribes population and employment forecasts that upper and single-tier municipalities must use for planning and managing growth. Given the inherent uncertainty of long-term demographic and economic forecasting, the Province has committed to reviewing the forecasts contained in the Growth Plan at least every five years to ensure the forecasts remain appropriate.

The last review of the Province’s forecasts occurred in 2013 and resulted in Amendment 2 to the Growth Plan. This amendment updated the original population and employment forecasts and extended the growth planning horizon to 2041 (see Report P-13-079 “Approval of Amendment 2 to the Provincial Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, dated August 13, 2013).

Waterloo Region’s growth outlook remains both very positive and is somewhat consistent with that experienced over recent decades, although its current growth rate is slower than originally forecast in the Growth Plan. This trend is not unique to Waterloo Region and is being experienced by virtually all of the municipalities in the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

Given the importance of the Region’s growth forecasts for land use, infrastructure and financial planning, Regional staff recommend that the Province review the Region’s population and employment forecasts (e.g., in conjunction with the results of the 2016
4. **Provincial Investments in Public Transit Infrastructure**

One of the key objectives of the Growth Plan is to promote better coordination and consistency among land-use and transportation planning and investments by all levels of government and other transportation stakeholders. While this objective is important for all communities, it is critical for upper-tier municipalities like the Region of Waterloo that are implementing rapid transit to move people, shape growth and create a more compact and transit-supportive urban form.

Since the Growth Plan came into effect, the Province has been a major partner in the construction of the Region’s new ION rapid transit system. To date, the Government of Ontario has committed a total of $300 million towards the $815 million capital costs of Phase 1 of ION connecting Kitchener to Waterloo. The balance of the project is being funded by the Government of Canada ($265 million) and the Region of Waterloo ($253 million).

The Region will require additional financial support in the coming years to fully implement rapid transit. For example, while construction of Stage 1 of ION is already underway, the Region is only in the early stages of the Transit Project Assessment for Stage 2 of the project, which would extend ION from the City of Kitchener to the City of Cambridge. The completion of Stage 2 will only be feasible through an ongoing funding commitment from the Province and other levels of government.

Provincial investment in inter-regional transit service is also critical because it supports the Urban Growth Centres (i.e., downtown core areas) that form the foundation of each community in the Growth Plan. If residents can travel from downtown Kitchener to other core areas, such as downtown Toronto, Hamilton and Brampton, without needing to drive on the Provincial highway network, the Urban Growth Centres will become more viable locations for people to live and work.

The Province has made significant investments in GO Rail to Waterloo Region. In 2010, the Province introduced Go Train service between Kitchener and Toronto. Currently, there are two trains departing for Toronto each weekday morning, and two trains returning to Kitchener each weekday afternoon. In 2016, two additional morning trips to Toronto and two additional afternoon trips to Kitchener are to be added. However, the timing of two-way, all-day service, including limited stop express GO Train service, to Kitchener is currently uncertain because of heavy CN freight rail traffic along portions of the line.

The Region continues to partner with the City of Cambridge in studying and advocating for GO Train service from Cambridge to Toronto via Milton. This service is currently identified in Provincial documents as a long-term initiative. However, this service would...
promote the development of the downtown Cambridge Urban Growth Centre and give residents an alternative route to the rest of the GTHA.

5. Potential Extension of the Metrolinx Planning Area

Metrolinx is the Provincial agency responsible for developing and implementing an integrated multi-modal transportation plan for the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area (GTHA). In 2008, Metrolinx released its regional transportation plan for the GTHA, entitled “The Big Move: Transportation in the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area” (The Big Move). A primary objective of The Big Move is to implement the inter-regional transportation network and policies of the Growth Plan. Though the Region of Waterloo is located within the planning area for the Growth Plan, it is not included within the Metrolinx planning area, which only extends as far west as the Region of Halton.

Outside of Metrolinx's jurisdiction, inter-regional transportation infrastructure has been planned by the Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO). As MTO does not have a multi-modal transportation plan for the Province, transportation between the Region and the GTHA has been planned on a project-by-project basis. This approach has mainly focused on the Province’s highway corridors as opposed to developing a more balanced, multi-modal transportation system that would better integrate the GTHA with the Region of Waterloo, Wellington County and other surrounding municipalities.

Consequently, projects such as the planned widening of Highway 401 to ten lanes, the GTA West Corridor and the Niagara to GTA Corridor only incorporated transit improvements along those same corridors outside the Big Move. The lack of a comprehensive multi-modal transportation strategy works against one of the primary goals of the Growth Plan, which is to reduce automobile dependency by developing a more integrated and efficient transportation system. Additionally, economic development opportunities are increasingly being tied to the ability to link communities through inter-regional transit services.

One way to address this problem would be to include the Region of Waterloo and other intervening communities within the Metrolinx planning area. Another option would be for the Province to undertake a sub-area assessment (i.e., inter-regional transportation planning study) to identify current and future travel patterns, and to identify any required transportation improvements in conjunction with the GTHA. The Region is currently partnering with the Cities of Brantford and Guelph, Brant and Wellington Counties, and MTO on such a study. This study may recommend that Waterloo Region be included in the Metrolinx planning area as well.

6. The Greenbelt

Prior to approving the Greenbelt Plan in 2005, the Province released a discussion paper entitled, “Toward a Golden Horseshoe Greenbelt: Greenbelt Task Force Discussion
Paper”, dated May 2004. This document outlined a draft framework for establishing a Greenbelt in southern Ontario to permanently protect environmentally sensitive lands and farmlands, and to help manage and contain urban growth.

As part of its consultation process for the Greenbelt Plan, the Province invited public feedback on what lands should be included, or not included, in the Greenbelt. In response to the call for comments, in June 2004, Regional Council adopted Report P-04-069 “Waterloo Region’s Response to the Proposed Golden Horseshoe Greenbelt Legislation (Bill 27) and Preliminary Comments Regarding Related Provincial Planning Reform Initiatives”, dated June 15, 2004.

The report recommended that the Province include portions of Waterloo Region within the Greenbelt Study Area, or that it draft parallel legislation to give the Galt, Paris and Waterloo Moraines the same level of protection as the Oak Ridges Moraine. The intent of this recommendation was to provide permanent protection to the water recharge areas of the Galt, Paris and Waterloo Moraines consistent with the objectives of the Regional Growth Management Strategy (2003). These recharge areas are the source of approximately 75 percent of the Region’s drinking water. They also serve an important function in maintaining the overall water balance in many streams and wetlands, and the ecological health of the Grand River watershed that supports nearly one million residents.

In October 2004, the Province released its proposed first draft of the Greenbelt Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, which included the western tip of Beverly Swamp in southeast corner of the Township of North Dumfries. The Province held a second round of public consultation to determine if the Greenbelt Plan should be extended to include various “outer ring” communities, such as Waterloo Region.

In response to the second round of consultation, Regional Council adopted Report P-04-134 “Waterloo Region’s Response to the Proposed Draft Greenbelt Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Bill 135)”, dated December 7, 2004. This report reiterated the Region’s previous support for the Greenbelt Plan, and again requested the Province to consider extending the Greenbelt into Waterloo Region to permanently protect the Waterloo, Galt and Paris Moraines and some of the intervening environmentally significant features.

On February 3, 2005, Chair Seiling provided a formal submission to the Province’s Standing Committee on General Government regarding Bill 135, the proposed Greenbelt Act, 2004. His submission outlined the Region’s continued support for the Province’s Greenbelt initiative, and requested the Province to extend the Greenbelt to Waterloo Region to include the Paris, Galt and Waterloo Moraines, proposed Environmentally Sensitive Landscapes, and prime agricultural areas in keeping with the objectives of the Region’s Growth Management Strategy (see Figure 3). However, the
Region’s support for such an extension was conditional upon the Greenbelt Plan being revised to provide such features the same or higher level of protection that was currently provided under the Regional Official Policies Plan (i.e., in 2005).

The Province released the final version of the Greenbelt Plan in 2005. Although the final version continued to include the southeast corner of North Dumfries in the Greenbelt, it did not include the Paris, Galt and Waterloo Moraines as recommended by Regional Council.

Regional Council’s support for the Province’s Greenbelt initiative was based in part on the Region’s ground-breaking work in the area of Environmentally Sensitive Landscapes (ESL). An ESL is an area that contains large clusters of inter-connected, high quality environmental features and the farmlands and settlements that surround them. The main reason for identifying an ESL is to maintain or improve the linkages and ecological functions between and among these natural features. The concept of protecting environmental systems at the landscape level, rather than just protecting the individual features within them, is very similar to the natural systems approach used in the Greenbelt Plan.

Between 2004 and 2006, the Region carried out an extensive consultation process to obtain public feedback on a proposed ESL policy framework. This collaborative process included several focus group sessions, open houses and public meetings with a wide range of stakeholders, including farmers, aggregate producers, environmental groups, land developers and other private property owners. At the end of this process, there was broad community support for the need to identify and protect ESLs in Waterloo Region.

In May 2006, Regional Council adopted an amendment to its Official Plan to formally designate two ESLs in Waterloo Region, making it one of the first municipalities in Ontario to identify and protect these landscape level environmental features. The amendment was subsequently appealed but upheld by the OMB in September 2007.

In 2007, Regional Council initiated a review of the 1995 Regional Official Policies Plan. The key objectives of the review were to implement the Regional Growth Management Strategy, build on the Region’s earlier work regarding ESLs, and to introduce new planning policies to conform to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe that came into effect in June 2006.

Given the Province’s decision not to extend the Greenbelt into Waterloo Region, Regional Council directed staff to incorporate, to the extent possible, some of the key concepts of the Greenbelt Plan directly into the Region’s new Official Plan.

On June 16, 2009, Regional Council adopted a new Regional Official Plan that included several policies modelled after the Province’s Greenbelt Plan. Examples of these
policies include:

- A new Protected Countryside designation to permanently protect a broad band of environmental features, agricultural lands, and portions of the Paris, Galt and Waterloo Moraines;

- An enhanced Greenlands Network to provide natural systems approach to protecting and enhancing the health, diversity, and connectivity of the region’s natural heritage features and four new Environmentally Sensitive Landscapes;

- New agricultural policies to foster and support a strong, vibrant and healthy agricultural economy, while providing opportunities for certain tourism, recreational, and rural institutional uses in the countryside;

- Refined mineral aggregate policies to better protect the quality and quantity of ground and surface water, promote proper site rehabilitation, and maintain the health, size and diversity of key natural heritage features; and

- A new Countryside Line to better direct urban growth into existing settlement areas.

On December 22, 2010, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing approved the new Regional Official Plan, with modifications, thereby endorsing the Region’s overall growth management strategy and the policies noted above. However, the new Regional Official Plan was subsequently appealed in its entirety, and remains before the OMB at this time.

7. Density Targets for Designated Greenfield Areas

Designated greenfield areas are lands that are not currently urbanized but are designated for future urban development. Under the Growth Plan, designated greenfield areas must be planned to achieve a minimum density target that is not less than 50 residents and jobs combined per hectare. This target is intended to make better use of the existing land supply, and is considered the minimum density needed to support public transit. Although Regional staff continue support the intent of this target, the implementation of this target has been problematic in two key areas.

First, the Growth Plan states that designated greenfield areas will be “planned to achieve” the minimum density target. The Growth Plan also states that such targets are meant to be achieved within the planning horizon of the Growth Plan. This policy framework was intended to ensure the capacity associated with the minimum density targets was used in determining justification for any future expansions to urban areas. Unfortunately, the terminology "planned to achieve" has been interpreted by some, including the OMB, as meaning that the lands simply need to have the planning done
for their future development within the life time of the Growth Plan. This interpretation provides the basis on which the market based justification (discussed earlier in this report in Section 1, “Land Budgeting Exercise”) is established.

Under the market based scenario, there is no need to assume all land is used up within the planning horizon, but rather that it is simply planned for. If that planning results in a shortfall of one particular type of housing, typically single detached dwellings, then under the market based scenario additional expansions are justifiable even though considerable amounts of land for other types of housing may sit vacant throughout the planning period and in some case for the foreseeable future. This interpretation helps to facilitate the very form of sprawl that the Growth Plan sought to stop and works against the Growth Plan's goal of optimizing the use of existing land and infrastructure. The Province should provide clear direction regarding its intent with respect to the terminology "planned to achieve".

A second challenge with the density target relates to the method for calculating density. Under the Growth Plan, the minimum density target is to be measured over the entire designated greenfield area, excluding certain areas and features where development is not permitted. These areas, commonly referred to as “take outs”, are to be excluded from the density calculations for designated greenfield areas. They include Provincially-significant wetlands, woodlands, valley lands, fish and wildlife habitat, and habitat of endangered species and threatened species.

However, when the Province released the Growth Plan, it did not provide guidelines on how municipalities should calculate the greenfield density targets, depending instead on the policy framework in the Growth Plan to provide such guidance. Without a standardized approach, municipalities across the Greater Golden Horseshoe chose to take out or exclude from the density calculation a wide variety of other lands not otherwise permitted to be excluded under the policies of the Growth Plan. Examples of such lands include parks, cemeteries, pipelines, hydro corridors, railway lines, highways and major roads, estate residential developments and the buffer areas surrounding significant environmental features.

By excluding these additional lands from their density calculations, some municipalities were able to justify larger expansions to their settlement boundaries than municipalities such as the Region of Waterloo that used the criteria for take-outs provided within the Growth Plan. This discrepancy has contributed to an uneven application for Growth Plan, and has resulted in some municipalities significantly over-designating their greenfield areas.

One way to address this problem would be for the Province to provide a standardized method or framework for these density calculations. This should be achieved either through refinements to the Growth Plan itself, or through the preparation a separate
guideline anchored in the Growth Plan.

Finally, it may also be worthwhile to consider separating “people” from “jobs” in calculating densities.

8. Land Use Compatibility

One of the challenges of facilitating more intensification in Waterloo Region relates to land use compatibility. While intensification can provide many community benefits, it can also lead to some potential land use conflicts as sensitive land uses (e.g., a new residential unit, or a day-care centre) encroach on adjacent industries, transportation corridors, and other sources of noise, vibration and odours.

The Province’s D-1 and D-6 Guidelines, published by the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change, represent the current standard for assessing land use compatibility issues in Ontario. These guidelines were originally developed over twenty years ago to support Ministry staff in reviewing planning documents. Today, the guidelines are used by municipalities on a regular basis to address any potential land use compatibility issues identified during the development review process.

The primary purpose of the D-1 and D-6 series guidelines is to address potential conflicts between sensitive land uses and industrial land uses in newly developing areas. The guidelines were not intended to focus on such issues within intensification areas. Although the guidelines do provide some provisions for “areas in transition” (i.e., areas where infill or redevelopment may be occurring), these provisions have often been difficult to apply to various intensification proposals. The Ministry has been aware of this problem for several years now and has indicated that it would be updating its D-1 and D-6 guidelines. To date, however, this update has not yet occurred.

In August of 2013, the Ministry also published a new Environmental Noise Guideline (i.e., NPC0-300 Guidelines), which updated and consolidated several old noise guidelines dating from the 1990s. The main objective of the update was to harmonize previously inconsistent noise limits, and to relax some of the Province’s noise mitigation requirements to facilitate intensification.

A key change under the new NPC-300 Guidelines relating to land use compatibility was the introduction of a new “Class 4” area. In the past, the Ministry’s noise guidelines only included three classes of areas – Class 1 (Urban), Class 2 (Suburban), and Class 3 (Rural). The new guideline gives municipalities the option of designating a new “Class 4” category for areas undergoing intensification. This new category has significantly relaxed noise limits and is intended to facilitate intensification.

Although this change represents a significant improvement, it is not clear how municipalities should formally designate a Class 4 area. In the absence of such
direction, very few municipalities have developed any policies in their official plans regarding the process for designating Class 4 areas.

9. Cultural Heritage Conservation

Cultural heritage conservation is an important priority for community planning in the Region of Waterloo. Currently, the Growth Plan, the Greenbelt Plan, the Niagara Escarpment Plan and the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan all address heritage conservation in different ways and to different degrees. This has contributed to an uneven approach to heritage conservation in the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

The Niagara Escarpment Plan contains several policies related to the conservation of built heritage resources, archaeological sites and cultural heritage landscapes. Of the four plans being reviewed, this plan provides the strongest and most encompassing policies to require heritage conservation.

The Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan makes no direct reference to cultural heritage, only natural heritage. Policies consistent with the other plans being reviewed should be incorporated into this plan to encourage the conservation of built heritage resources, archaeological sites and cultural heritage landscapes located with the Oak Ridges Moraine.

The Greenbelt Plan includes policies related to Cultural Heritage Resources in Section 4.4. The policies and definitions are somewhat consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, the Ontario Heritage Act, and the Standards & Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada. However, these policies could be strengthened, for example, by providing municipalities with clearer direction on conserving heritage within the Protected Countryside in their Official Plans.

Currently, the only reference to heritage conservation in the Growth Plan is found in Section 4.2.4(1)(e), which reads:

“4.2.4  1) Municipalities will develop and implement official plan policies and other strategies in support of the following conservation objectives:

   e) Cultural heritage conservation, including conservation of cultural heritage and archaeological resources where feasible, as built-up areas are intensified.”

The above policy should be strengthened to include the terminology used in the Provincial Policy Statement and perhaps some of the language in the Niagara Escarpment Plan. The Growth Plan’s goal of encouraging intensification should be balanced with clearer and stronger policies to protect the many significant cultural heritage resources located in the historic core areas of intensifying communities.
Overall, to be more effective, Regional staff recommend that the four plans take a more unified policy approach to heritage conservation. As a minimum, the plans should be harmonized with the policies and terminology used in the Provincial Policy Statement, the Ontario Heritage Act, and the Standards & Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada. In this way, the policies stand to be better aligned, minimizing the potential for conflict, confusion and appeals.

Conclusion

In summary, Regional staff continue to support the policies of the Growth Plan and the Greenbelt Plan to accommodate future growth in more a sustainable way. These policies complement and will help implement many of the policy directions that the Region of Waterloo and its Area Municipalities have been advocating for many years, such as promoting a more compact urban form, increasing transportation choices, protecting the environment and fostering a strong and competitive economy.

We commend the Province for the leadership it has provided over the past several years in developing its four land use plans, and for initiating the present co-ordinated review to determine how the plans can be improved. We encourage the Province to maintain the overall policy directions of the four plans to address the challenges of planning for growth in the Greater Golden Horseshoe and the Region of Waterloo.

Despite our continued support for the Growth Plan and the Greenbelt Plan, we recommend that the Province refine the two plans in the policy areas noted above. In addition to these refinements, the Province needs to better co-ordinate and provide stronger oversight on how the two plans will be implemented moving forward. The Province’s implementation framework to date has often been fragmented on key policy matters and, unfortunately has resulted in a range of inconsistent approaches on how the Growth Plan should be implemented.

Proposed Next Steps

If approved by Regional Council, this report would be forwarded to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing to help inform draft potential amendments to the Growth Plan and the Greenbelt Plan. Any such amendments would be brought back to Regional Council for consideration as part of a second stage of public consultation, likely in the fall of 2015. Ultimately, any revisions to the Province’s Growth Plan and the Greenbelt Plan would need to be reflected in the Regional Official Plan and each of the seven Area Municipal Official Plans. This work would typically be completed as part of the next scheduled five-year official plan review required under the Planning Act.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

Regional staff has consulted with all of the Area Municipalities in the preparation of this
report. The Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo are submitting individual comments on this review directly to the Province.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

The Region’s participation in this review supports Strategic Focus Area 2: Managing Growth to Foster Thriving and Productive Urban and Rural Communities.

**Financial Implications:**

Nil.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Staff from Legal Services and Transportation and Environmental Services has been consulted in the course of preparing this report.

**Attachments:**

Attachment 1 - Map of Greater Golden Horseshoe Growth Plan Area
Attachment 2 - Map of the Greenbelt Plan Area
Attachment 3 - Map of Previously Proposed Westward Extension of Greenbelt (2005)
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To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: May 26, 2015 File Code: L04-20

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

Recommendation:


Summary:

On March 5, 2015, the Province of Ontario’s introduced proposed amendments to the Planning Act to respond to issues and recommendations made during the review and consultation process undertaken by the Province in 2014 and 2015, including more effective public involvement, more stability in municipal planning documents and strengthening Provincial interests. This report provides a more detailed review of the proposed amendment, implementation matters, potential financial impacts and recommendations on Bill 73.

Regional staff previously reported to Council on the proposed amendments to the Planning Act set out in Bill 73 through Report No. PDL-LEG-15-28 (copy attached as Attachment A). Generally, Regional staff is supportive of the changes to the Planning Act proposed under Bill 73, although in certain instances the changes do not go far
enough to resolve some of the issues relating to the ability of municipalities to bring their official plans into conformity with evolving Provincial policy. Accordingly, it is recommended that conformity updates to official plans approved by the Province be exempt from appeals in their entirety.

Bill 73 is not intended to address Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) reform. Regional staff recommends that the Province commence its review of the role of the OMB now in order to properly address the full range of issues faced by municipalities in responding to the requirements of a changing Provincial policy environment. A formal submission on OMB reform was previously sent to the Province.

Report:

On March 24, 2015, Region staff reported to Council in Report No. PDL-LEG-15-28 (copy attached as Attachment A) on the proposed amendments to the Planning Act set out in Bill 73, Smart Growth for Our Communities Act, 2015. Regional staff has completed a detailed review of the provisions that relate directly to the Region’s role in the land use planning process.

As part of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing’s formal consultation on Land Use Planning and Appeal Review Regional Council made several recommendations to the Province as set out in Report No. P-13-122. Bill 73 addresses several of the recommendations and key planning considerations as follows. It does not address Regional Council’s recommendation to review the operations, practices, procedures and reporting requirements of the Ontario Municipal Board. The Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing has indicated the government’s intent to undertake this review, however, no further information on this intended review has been made available. Regional staff recommends that the Province commence a review of the role of the OMB now in order to properly address the full range of issues faced by municipalities in responding to the requirements of a changing Provincial policy environment.

Regional Council recommended that the Province be encouraged to make broad systemic changes, and not simply minor adjustments, to achieve substantially greater accountability in addition to greater efficiency, accessibility and transparency for land use planning in Ontario. Region staff are of the opinion that the amendments proposed by Bill 73 that provide increased opportunities for public input in the planning process and additional opportunities for dispute resolution at the municipal level (as outlined in Report No. PDL-LEG-15-28) address Regional Council’s recommendation for achieving greater accountability, accessibility and transparency for land use planning in Ontario.

The proposed amendments that provide increased stability with respect to the appeals process (as outlined in Report No. PDL-LEG-15-28) partially address Regional Council’s recommendation that the Province further clarify and deem key policies and
their implementation in municipal planning documents unappealable, particularly with respect to the Provincial Growth Plan, and more broadly preclude the ability for entire municipal planning documents to be appealed and held in abeyance for extended periods of time. The amendments prohibit global appeals of an entire official plan, as well as appeals of official plans 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. Further, no person or public body can request an amendment to a new official plan, a new comprehensive zoning by-law or a minor variance to the new comprehensive zoning by-law for a two year period following its approval (however a municipality may initiate its own amendment). While the proposed changes move in the right direction, Regional staff continues to recommend that conformity updates to official plans approved by the Province be exempt from appeals in their entirety.


In terms of implementation of Bill 73 amendments to the Planning Act, Region staff will be reviewing the Region’s official plan policies and other policies relating to procedures for informing and obtaining the views of the public of various matters. Further to this review, Regional staff will provide recommendations to Regional Council for any needed amendments to the Regional Official Plan to comply with the new requirement for official plans to provide policies to describe the measures and procedures for informing and obtaining the views of the public in respect of revisions of amendments to the official plan, proposed zoning by-laws, plans of subdivision, proposed consents to sever and any other prescribed matter. Region staff will also work with their colleagues in the local municipalities to conduct a similar policy review and develop recommendations for new or revised policies in the local official plans.

The Region already complies with the new requirement for every upper tier municipality to appoint a planning advisory committee through its appointment of the Region’s Ecological and Environmental Advisory Committee. Regional Council may wish to consider expanding the scope of EEAC in the future to include a broader range of planning matters and/or consider a joint planning advisory committee with one or more of the Area Municipalities.
Bill 73 also provides for the use of dispute resolution techniques such as mediation and conciliation to attempt to resolve a dispute set out in a notice of appeal prior to formal proceedings before the Ontario Municipal Board. Participation in such dispute resolution process is voluntary by the persons and public bodies invited to participate. Regional staff will confer with their colleagues in the local municipalities regarding the implementation of dispute resolution techniques for appeals of the various planning matters. Voluntary participation in such dispute resolution would have the potential benefit of resolving disputes without the need for costly and lengthy OMB proceedings. Such dispute resolution would still require staff time to prepare and participate and financial contribution towards cost of external mediators or facilitators as may be agreed upon. Region staff will report back to Regional Council with any recommendations in this regard.

**Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination:**

A draft copy of this report was circulated to all Area Municipal planning staff for comment.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

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

**Financial Implications:**

Any potential financial implications associated with the implementation of the proposed legislation cannot be quantified at this time.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Nil.

**Attachments:**


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

Brenna MacKinnon, Manager, Greenfield Planning

**Approved By:** Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Development and Legislative Services
Region of Waterloo
Planning Development and Legislative Services
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
Transportation and Environmental Services
Rapid Transit

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

Date: May 26, 2015     File Code: A02-30/PW

Subject: Recommended ION LRT Stop Names

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the ION LRT stop names as outlined in Report TES-RTS-15-06, dated May 26, 2015.

Summary: Nil

Report:

The selection of the ION LRT stop names is an important decision that will be a prominent feature of the rapid transit service for decades to come. The ION LRT stop names will be used for stop signage, mapping, vehicle audio announcements and more. Through research of existing naming conventions in other transit systems around the world, as well as Grand River Transit (GRT), it was determined that the best stop names are recognizable, short and descriptive. Therefore, in generating the recommended ION LRT stop names the following guidelines were considered and used where applicable.

- Stop names should be short and descriptive.
- Stop names should be consistent with existing GRT naming conventions.
- Typical naming conventions for transit systems, including GRT, do not use “Street” or “Avenue” suffixes. This should be consistent for ION LRT stop names.
- Stop names should be identifiable by both local/frequent users of the system as well as visitors.
- Stops can be named after established institutions and key landmarks if the stop is primarily serving a specific institution/landmark that currently exists and is known to exist long-term.
Stops should be named after the closest cross street where no primary institution is present. If there are multiple institutions, the cross street name should also be used.

Stop names should be unique and distinct from each other avoiding duplication of names.

Stops should not be named for private enterprises as it generates free advertising, they are not guaranteed to exist long-term, and for many stops there are numerous enterprises which are being served. ION LRT is a public service.

Central transit hubs and stations worldwide often have distinct names.

Based on the above naming criteria the following stop names are recommended.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended for Approval</th>
<th>Name used during the Planning Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conestoga</td>
<td>Conestoga Mall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northfield</td>
<td>Northfield Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Technology</td>
<td>R&amp;T Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Waterloo</td>
<td>University of Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurier - Waterloo Park</td>
<td>Seagram Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willis Way</td>
<td>Willis Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Public Square</td>
<td>Waterloo Town Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Allen Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand River Hospital</td>
<td>Grand River Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Central</td>
<td>Transit Hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Park</td>
<td>Gaukel Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen</td>
<td>Benton Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener City Hall</td>
<td>Young Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>Frederick Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener Market</td>
<td>Cedar Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borden</td>
<td>Borden Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill</td>
<td>Mill Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block Line</td>
<td>Blockline Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairway</td>
<td>Fairview Park Mall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Rapid Transit Steering Committee which includes Chair Ken Seiling and Councillors Tom Galloway, Sean Strickland, Geoff Lorentz and Karl Kiefer have reviewed and are in support of the proposed names.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

This report supports Focus Area 3 Sustainable Transportation of the Region’s Corporate Strategic Plan to implement a light rail transit system in the central transit corridor, fully integrated with an expanded conventional transit system.
Financial Implications:

Nil

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Nil

Attachments

Nil

Prepared By: Danielle Bury, Rapid Transit Planner

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

Transportation and Environmental Services

Transportation

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

Date: May 26, 2015

File Code: T01-20/10 Herrgott, T01-20/15 Lobsinger

Subject: Consideration of Traffic Control Signals at the Intersection of Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10) and Lobsinger Line (Regional Road 15), in the Township of Wellesley

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo maintain the current 2-way stop control at the Herrgott Road (Regional Road 10)/Lobsinger Line (Regional Road 15) intersection, in the Township of Wellesley, as outlined in Report TES-TRP-15-05, dated May 26, 2015.

Summary:

At the Planning and Works Committee meeting on April 1, 2014, staff recommended (Report E-14-028) the removal of four parking spaces on Lobsinger Line at the Herrgott Road intersection to improve sightlines at this location. The Committee approved the parking removal and further directed staff to assess the need for traffic signals at this location based on concerns raised by delegations at the April 1, 2014 meeting and concerns raised by the citizens in the St. Clements Community.

Staff undertook a comprehensive review of existing traffic volumes and the collision history at the Herrgott Road/Lobsinger Line intersection and has concluded that the installation of traffic control signals is not warranted at this time.

Staff do not recommend the installation of traffic signals because the installation of traffic signals would likely result in an increased number of collisions at this intersection. In reviewing the existing intersection geometry and the collision reports, staff discovered that a significant number of collisions that are occurring at this location are the result of insufficient space for large trucks to turn left from Lobsinger Line when vehicles are stopped at the stop bars on Herrgott Road. In order to address the existing geometric conditions, staff is recommending the construction in 2015 of a “roll-over” curb in the...
north east corner of the intersection as well as further intersection modifications in 2022 to make more room for trucks as part of an upcoming reconstruction project at this location. In addition, staff is recommending the installation of an oversize stop sign on the northbound approach to the intersection.

Report:

1.0  Background

Herrgott Road intersects Lobsinger Line at a 90 degree angle creating a 4-leg intersection. Both Herrgott Road and Lobsinger Line have a two-lane cross section, with a stop control on Herrgott Road in the northbound and southbound directions, and a dedicated left-turn lane on Lobsinger Line in the eastbound and westbound directions. The Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) at this intersection is 7118 vehicles per day. Figure 1 shows the intersection geometry.

Figure 1 - Herrgott Road and Lobsinger Line
In response to concerns from citizens regarding the sightlines for motorists turning from Herrgott Road onto Lobsinger Line due to parked vehicles on Lobsinger Line, Regional staff undertook a questionnaire between January 13, 2014 and January 27, 2014 to obtain feedback from citizens to potentially remove parking spaces on both sides of Lobsinger Line, east and west of Herrgott Road. The majority of responses to the questionnaire were in support of the proposed traffic restrictions. A significant number of responses requested the installation of traffic signals.

As part of the responses received for the parking questionnaire conducted in January 2014, 17 citizens indicated that they would like a traffic signal at the Herrgott Road/Lobsinger Line intersection. The reasons stated for the traffic signals included the safety of both motorists and pedestrians utilizing the intersection, visibility concerns due to nearby buildings, the speed of motorists travelling through the intersection, and the delay encountered by those waiting to turn at the intersection.

At the Planning and Works Committee meeting on April 1, 2014, staff presented Report E-14-028 recommending the removal of four parking spaces on Lobsinger Line at Herrgott Road to improve sightlines for motorist entering the intersection from Herrgott Road. At this meeting, a presentation was made by delegate Birk Donsig. The presentation noted that an increased number of children are crossing at the intersection, and that the sightlines are compromised. The presentation also stated that installing “No Parking” signs would not solve the issue of poor sightlines, as enforcement is difficult to provide on a constant basis to comply with the new parking restrictions, and that due to increased traffic volumes including trucks, traffic lights would be a better solution to address the visibility concerns. As a result of the feedback received, Planning and Works Committee members further directed staff to assess the need for traffic control signals at the Herrgott Road/Lobsinger Line intersection, in the Township of Wellesley.

On April 9, 2014 Regional Council approved the staff recommendation to restrict parking on the south side of Lobsinger Line east and west of Herrgott Road and to further investigate the need for traffic signals.

On Monday, May 26, 2014, signs restricting parking along Lobsinger Line east and west of Herrgott Road were revised according to the Council approved recommendation. Shortly after, staff confirmed that the sightlines have been improved at the intersection. It is anticipated that restricting parking on Lobsinger Line may reduce both angle and turning movement collisions at the intersection, as motorists turning from Herrgott Road onto Lobsinger Line now have better sightlines.
2.0 Collision History

A review of the collision history between 2009 and 2013 inclusive shows that there were 13 collisions, where 6 to 7 would be expected based on the Region’s collision prediction model. Of the 13 collisions, 10 are noted as angle type collisions, 2 turning movement type collisions, and 1 was a rear-end collision. The majority of angle collisions (7 of 10) involved a motorist who first stopped at the stop sign on Herrgott Road and then proceeded. Typically, this type of collision can be attributed to poor sight distance from the stop location or difficulty judging acceptable gaps.

Upon further review of the collision reports, staff has determined that the intersection was experiencing more collisions than expected primarily as a result of difficult turning conditions for motorists of larger vehicles (primarily transport truck drivers). These conditions restrict motorists of larger vehicles from turning left from Lobsinger Line when vehicles are present on Herrgott Road at the stop bar. The collision reports indicate that truck drivers waved to motorists on Herrgott Road to proceed through the intersection resulting in a collision (6 of 13 collisions between 2009 and 2013).

Since the removal of the four parking spaces in May 2014, staff has not received any reports of collisions at this location, but are aware of one recent collision in February 2015 involving 3 vehicles. Staff has not yet received this report from Waterloo Regional Police Services.

3.0 Regional Practice for Establishing the Need for Traffic Control

The need for additional traffic control in including traffic signals and an all-way stop was investigated for the intersection of Herrgott Road and Lobsinger Line.

3.1 Regional Practice for Establishing the Need for Traffic Control Signals

Regional staff applies provincial traffic signal warrant guidelines to help determine the need for traffic signals. Based on these guidelines traffic signals are considered when one or more of the following warrants are met or exceeded:

- Justification 1 - Minimum Vehicular Volume ≥ 100%
- Justification 2 - Delay to Cross Traffic ≥ 100%
- Justification 3 – Both Justification 1 or 2 ≥ 80%
- Justification 4 – 4-Hour Warrant ≥ 100%
- Justification 5 – Collision Warrant ≥ 100%
• Justification 6 – Pedestrian Volume and Delay
  a) \( \geq 200 \) pedestrians
  b) \( \geq 75 \) pedestrians delayed > 10 seconds

Signal warrants are used to set standards and benchmarks for the installation of new signals, such as vehicle and pedestrian volumes and delay and the collision history. In considering whether signals are the most appropriate form of traffic control for an intersection, there is a need to balance the benefits to side-street traffic against the “costs” of increased collisions and main-street delay. Signals can reduce delay for side-street traffic and can be effective in reducing angle and turning collisions on rare occasions. However, this is accomplished at the cost of increased delay to main-street traffic and generally increased overall collisions. Collision prediction models help in the intersection control decision-making process by providing context. It is important to follow signal warrants to:

• Ensure that signals are installed on a fair and equitable basis;
• Maintain public belief in the process of deciding which intersections get signals and which don’t;
• Apply consistent practice with respect to the installation of new signals;
• Promote an efficient and environmentally-friendly Regional transportation network; and
• Be consistent with other jurisdictions.

Traffic signals are not a safety device, and the installation of unwarranted signals can have many negative impacts. Many of these negative impacts may be contrary to common expectations, but are proven by observations and studies. On average, at least twice as many collisions occur at a signalized intersection compared to a stop-controlled intersection with similar traffic volumes.

3.2 Regional Practice for Establishing the Need for All-Way Stop Control

Generally, an all-way stop is considered when:

• Traffic volume entering the intersection exceeds 500 vehicles per hour over eight hours; and
• Combined vehicle and pedestrian volume on the minor street exceeds 200 units for the same eight hours; or
• There is an average of 4 collisions per year for a three year period susceptible to correction with the installation of an all-way stop.
4.0 Traffic Control Warrants for the Herrgott Road/Lobsinger Line Intersection

The initial results presented to the Planning and Works Committee on April 1, 2014 indicated that neither traffic signals nor an all-way stop are warranted at this intersection. A follow-up count undertaken on Tuesday, April 29, 2014 confirms these results.

Below is a summary of the warrant results for the installation of traffic signals and an all-way stop at the intersection of Herrgott Road and Lobsinger Line, based on the latest count undertaken at this intersection.

4.1 Traffic Signal Warrants

Analysis of traffic and pedestrian volume demand along with the collision history at this intersection indicates that traffic signals are not required to minimize excessive delays or to improve collision history, including the turning deficiency associated with trucks turning.

Table 1 summarizes the results of the traffic signal warrant analysis for the intersection of Herrgott Road and Lobsinger Line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Warrant Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justification 1</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>Not Satisfied Min 100% required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification 2</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>Not Satisfied Min 100% required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification 3</td>
<td>71% and 49%</td>
<td>Not Satisfied 1 or 2 min 80% required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification 4</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>Not Satisfied Min 100% required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification 5</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>Not Satisfied Min 100% required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification 6</td>
<td>13 pedestrians</td>
<td>Not Satisfied Min 200 pedestrians required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traffic signals would not address the current geometric conditions adequately as vehicles will continue to obstruct turning trucks regardless if a traffic signal is present or not. It is anticipated, based on the Region’s collision prediction method that the installation of traffic signals would result in an expected 5-year collision frequency of 10 collisions (under ideal conditions) versus 6.5 collisions (under ideal conditions) with the current control. It is further anticipated that the collisions will continue to be higher than...
expected due to the geometric conditions of the intersection for larger trucks.

4.2 All-way Stop Warrant

Analysis of traffic volume demand along with the collision history indicates that an all-way stop is not justified at this time. It is also generally not recommended to install all-way-stop controls at intersections with multi-lane approaches to minimize driver confusion. Additionally stop signs on Lobsinger Line could be missed by drivers creating another safety issue due to stop signs potentially being blocked or obscured by roadside parking activity. As noted with the installation of traffic control signals, an all-way stop at the Herrgott Road/Lobsinger Line intersection would not address the turning deficiency associated with trucks turning.

Table 2 summarizes the results of the all-way stop warrant analysis for the intersection of Herrgott Road and Lobsinger Line.

Table 2 – All-way Stop Warrant Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Warrant Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Volume on All Approaches &gt; 500 vehicles per hour (vph)</td>
<td>4 of 8 Hours Fulfilled</td>
<td>Not Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Volume on Minor Street &gt; 200 vph</td>
<td>2 of 8 Hours Fulfilled</td>
<td>Not Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Collisions Susceptible to Correction Over 3 Years</td>
<td>7 (Minimum 12 Required)</td>
<td>Not Satisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.0 Consideration of Other Options to Address Collisions and Citizen Concerns

Staff has reviewed the existing geometric conditions and has developed a preliminary revised intersection layout that would provide adequate space for large trucks to turn left onto Herrgott Road from Lobsinger Line. These geometric improvements would reduce the occurrences of truck operators “waving out” motorists from Herrgott Road.

These geometric improvements are planned for construction in 2022 as part of the programmed reconstruction of Herrgott Road in St. Clements. As part of the 2016 Transportation Capital Budget process, staff will assess the possibility of advancing this reconstruction rehabilitation. In the interim, however, in 2015 the Region will be completing minor intersection improvements this year to replace the existing raised curb in the northeast corner of the intersection with “roll-over” curb. It is anticipated that the “roll-over” curb will allow motorists of larger vehicles to make the left turn from Lobsinger
Line easier as additional pavement will be available. Staff does not anticipate large trucks to encroach onto the sidewalk as a result of the roll over curb.

Staff also reviewed the merits of relocating the southbound and northbound stop bars on Herrgott Road. However, in the absence of any geometric improvements and in order to allow ample distance for a truck to turn left, the stop bars would have to be located approximately 20 metres prior to the intersection. Relocating the stop bars this far from the intersection would likely lead to additional confusion for all road users and would significantly impede sight lines due to existing buildings. Motorists would still be forced to “creep up” to Lobsinger Line (secondary stop) in order to safely see oncoming vehicles. As a result, the turning conflicts with larger vehicles would continue.

Given the history of disobey-stop collisions northbound approaching Lobsinger Line, a special oversize stop sign has been requested for installation for the northbound approach on Herrgott Road approaching Lobsinger Line. Currently there are special oversize stop-ahead signs northbound and southbound on Herrgott Road approaching Lobsinger Line, and a special oversize stop sign for southbound motorists on Herrgott Road approaching Lobsinger Line.

6.0 Public and Area Municipality Consultation

Staff have hosted public meetings regarding the operation of this intersection in the past and presented detailed assessments of the intersection in 2013 to Township of Wellesley Council where interested parties were invited to attend and ask questions. In January 2013, staff also contacted a concerned citizen, listened to her concerns, and followed-up with the details of traffic signal warrants and noted the negative impacts of installing unwarranted traffic signals at intersections. Despite several attempts, staff were unable to contact Birk Donsig (April 1, 2014 delegate) who also had concerns regarding the traffic control at this intersection.

Those interested in the control at the intersection including the delegation from the April 1, 2014 Planning and Works Committee meeting have been notified. Staff at the Township of Wellesley supports the recommendation to maintain the current traffic control.

7.0 Recommendations

Based on a review of the existing collision history, geometric conditions and traffic control warrants and discussions with interested citizens, staff is recommending that the Region of Waterloo maintain the existing two-way stop control at this intersection. Staff does not recommend the installation of traffic control signals at this time as traffic signals are not warranted and would likely result in an increase in collisions should they be installed. Staff also believe that the improvements in the existing sightlines though the removal of four parking spaces is already providing benefits in the form of a reduced
likelihood of turning and angle collisions at this location. And further, staff also plan to undertake the following additional measures at this location to reduce the likelihood of collisions:

- In 2015, construct a “roll-over” curb in the northeast corner;
- In 2015, install a special oversize stop sign on the northbound approach on Herrgott Road; and
- In 2022, undertake further improvements to the intersection geometry to address truck turns as part of the intersection reconstruction.

Staff will also review the opportunity to advance the reconstruction of the intersection as part of 2016 budget process. Staff will continue to monitor this intersection to assess the performance of the measures noted in this report (TES-TRP-15-05) and will reassess the warrants for traffic signals in advance of the programmed reconstruction.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

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

Financial Implications:

The cost to install the special oversize stop sign is approximately $500 and funding is provided in the maintenance budget. The cost to convert the barrier curb to roll-over curb in the northeast corner of the intersection is approximately $1000 for which sufficient funding is provided in the 2015 Transportation Capital Budget, funded 100% from the Roads Rehabilitation Capital Reserve Fund.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Nil

Attachments:

Nil

Prepared By: Satinderjit Bahia, Engineering Technologist (Traffic)

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

Transportation and Environmental Services

Transportation

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

Date: May 26, 2015  File Code: T04-10/28

Subject: Homer Watson Boulevard (Regional Road 28) and Block Line Road Roundabout Operational Review

Recommendation:

For information.

Summary:

Collisions at the Homer Watson Boulevard and Block Line Road roundabout continue to exceed expectations despite all the collision countermeasures implemented to date. In response to this, staff retained the services of a professional engineering consultant who specializes in Human Factors assessments to obtain an additional perspective on the causes and possible countermeasures of the fail-to-yield collisions. Staff has developed a revised approach to identifying potential countermeasures for this roundabout. The revised list of potential countermeasures includes additional warning signs and continued and focussed driver education.

Report:

1.0 Background

In August 2011, the Region completed construction of a roundabout at the intersection of Homer Watson Boulevard (Regional Road 28) and Block Line Road. Soon after the roundabout opened staff recognized that the roundabout was experiencing more collisions than expected and that the fail-to-yield collisions were of particular concern.

A number of collision countermeasures were implemented incrementally between September 2011 and January 30, 2012 to address the overrepresented fail-to-yield collisions. The countermeasures recommended and installed included:
• Moving yield signs;
• Increasing the size of yield signs;
• Adding “yield” tabs to the yield signs;
• Removing lead-in dots on the pavement;
• Increasing the width of yield lines;
• Replacing “yield” tabs with “To Oncoming Traffic” tabs;
• Replacing “To Oncoming Traffic” tabs with “To All Traffic in All Lanes” tab;
• Reducing the posted speed limit from 70 km/h to 50 km/h on the Homer Watson Boulevard approaches to the roundabout;
• Adding 30 km/h advisory speed signs;
• Using electronic signs reminding drivers to yield; and
• Continuing roundabout education programs.

On March 28, 2012, Regional Council members approved changes to the roundabout to help reduce fail-to-yield collisions that included:

• Reconfiguring the southbound approach lane configuration from three through lanes to two through lanes and dedicating the curb lane as a right-turn only lane;
• Implementing “shark teeth” (triangular-shaped pavement markings) near yield lines;
• Implementing circulatory lane pavement markings;
• Implementing approach lane designation symbols on the pavement; and
• Implementing circulatory lane designation symbols on the pavement.

The March 28 approved countermeasures were installed on May 13, 2012.

On June 18, 2013 staff presented Report E-13-064 to the Region’s Planning and Works Committee recommending the use of raised crosswalks at the intersection of Homer Watson Boulevard and Block Line Road as a means to help reduce the overrepresentation of fail-to-yield collisions that continued to occur at this roundabout.

At the June 18, 2013 Planning and Works Committee meeting staff and members of Council received concerns from the City of Kitchener Fire Chief regarding possible increases to emergency response times and additional “wear and tear” to emergency response vehicles that could result from the raised crosswalks on Homer Watson Boulevard. At that time, Regional Council did not approve the raised crosswalks and directed staff to further review the potential impacts that raised crosswalks could have on emergency response times and vehicles.

2.0 Collision Analysis

Staff has been continually monitoring collisions at this roundabout and note that collisions are increasing in frequency and continue to exceed the number of collisions expected according to the Region’s collision prediction model. Figure 1 below illustrates...
the monthly collision frequency over time between September of 2011 and October 2014.

Figure 1 – Monthly Collisions at Roundabout

![Homer Watson Boulevard and Block Line Road Monthly Collisions](image)

The increase in collisions may be partially attributable to the traffic patterns at the roundabout changing due to the opening of Block Line Road to Courtland Avenue (November, 2013). Traffic counts completed at the intersection indicate that overall traffic volumes have stayed relatively the same however turning movement patterns at the roundabout appear to have changed as a result of the Block Line Road extension to Courtland Avenue.

Staff uses turning movement counts to estimate total daily conflicts at roundabouts which in turn is used to predict collisions. The Region’s roundabout collision prediction model has been verified by Ryerson University to be a statistically reliable model for predicting collisions at roundabouts. The estimated total daily conflicts has increased from 51,300 to 66,500 potential conflicts per day due to the opening of Block Line Road.
An increase in collisions would therefore be expected as estimated total daily conflicts have increased. Based on the current estimated conflicts per day, staff expects the roundabout to operate with approximately 28 collisions per year. To date staff has received 81 collision reports in 2014 (up to the end of October 2014) and anticipate that this roundabout will experience approximately 100 collisions in 2014 or 3.6 times more collisions than expected.

It is important to note that the vast majority of those collisions are minor in terms of severity, with only 10% resulting in injuries. And further, the majority of injuries sustained at this intersection were considered minimal by Waterloo Regional Police Services Officers. These observations are in line with injury statistics at all roundabouts in the Region of Waterloo.

Based on the collision analysis, it is apparent that the countermeasures applied to date at this roundabout have had little to no positive effect on reducing collisions. As such it is evident that there is still an outstanding need to address collisions at this location through other means.

### 3.0 Evaluation of Operational Impacts of Raised Crosswalks

In the summer of 2014, the Region and City of Kitchener installed two prototype raised pedestrian crosswalks at the Waterloo Region Emergency Services Training and Research Complex (WRESTRC). Staff collaborated with Area Municipal Fire Departments, Waterloo Regional Police Services and Grand River Transit to review operational impacts on applicable vehicles. Two different crosswalks were tested, each raised crosswalk was 80 mm high. One prototype utilized an 8% approach ramp while the other prototype utilized a less-steep 4% approach ramp. The findings concluded that:

- The raised crosswalk with the steeper approach grade (e.g. 8% grade versus 4% grade) was more effective at slowing down passenger cars;
- Passenger cars could generally negotiate the 8% ramp design at 30 km/h or less;
- Ambulance drivers need to slow down their vehicle to less than 30 km/h to maintain adequate patient comfort;
- Most bus types could negotiate the ramp at approximately 30 km/h - 40 km/h to maintain reasonable passenger comfort;
- Motorcycle drivers need to negotiate the ramp at approximately 30 km/h or less to maintain adequate control of their vehicle; and
- Fire trucks can negotiate the raised crosswalk reasonably at 50 km/h.

In general, the findings from the prototype assessments found that a raised crosswalk has a greater impact on smaller vehicles (e.g. passenger cars and motorcycles) versus larger vehicles (e.g. buses and fire trucks). Since fire department vehicles have been observed and recorded negotiating the roundabout at Homer Watson Boulevard and
Block Line Road on average at 40 km/h when responding to an emergency, it is anticipated that there would be little to no impact on emergency response times based on observations completed as part of the prototype assessments.

The prototype assessments done at WRESTRC during the summer of 2014 did not include an empirical assessment of the “wear and tear” on vehicles tested. Staff would like to note that the 8% ramp tested as part of these assessments would be no greater a displacement to vehicles than any of the “speed bumps” currently existing on many local and collector roads in the three cities.

4.0 Additional Investigation into the Causes of Collisions

Regional staff through detailed collision analysis and video sources identified that the majority of fail-to-yield collisions at this roundabout involved motorists entering from the curb lane and colliding with motorists exiting the roundabout from the inner lane. In general, staff found that leading up to a collision, drivers generally slowed down or stopped at the entry points to the roundabout however they opted to enter the roundabout when drivers in the inner lane of the roundabout were exiting. The collisions appeared to occur at slow speeds. The majority of drivers failing to yield properly generally entered the roundabout from the curb lane. The following diagram depicts the typical pattern of a fail-to-yield collision observed.

Figure 2 – Typical Fail-to-Yield Collision Pattern
In light of increasing collisions and the ineffectiveness of countermeasures installed to date, staff retained the services of a professional engineering consultant who specializes in Human Factors assessments to obtain an additional perspective on the causes and possible countermeasures of the fail-to-yield collisions. The purpose of this new assessment was to review the roundabout from another perspective rather than the traditional engineering peer review perspective that was previously done. The focus of this particular assignment concentrated on human cognitive ability. The human factors expert was tasked with reviewing various roundabout components including geometry, signage and pavement markings to identify if there were any conditions present at the roundabout that would violate a driver’s general ability to perceive the roundabout and to make decisions in order to negotiate the roundabout safely.

The results of this assessment concluded that there were no geometric, signage, and or pavement marking elements that were contributing to a driver's ability to observe, perceive and or to react to the yield conditions present at the roundabout. Rather it concluded that the overrepresentation of fail-to-yield collisions occurring at the roundabout was generally caused by motorists entering the roundabout from the right-most lane and their inability to adequately understand the need to yield to motorists circulating and or exiting the roundabout from the inner lane. The expert also suggested that traditional intersection design in North America may be pre-conditioning drivers at roundabouts to only concentrate on motorists circulating in the outermost curb lane. For example at traditional intersections, right-turning drivers generally look left for gaps in traffic, but predominantly look for gaps in the right-most lane only. Ontario driving laws generally state that when turning you must leave from and enter corresponding lanes (e.g. when turning right, turn right from the right-most lane and enter the right-most lane on the leaving side).

The human factors assignment also concluded that speed was not a contributing factor in the existing fail-to-yield collisions at the roundabout.

5.0 Countermeasures to Reduce Collisions

The human factors assessment has given staff a better understanding of why fail-to-yield collisions are occurring at the Homer Watson Boulevard and Block Line Road roundabout. Based on the human factors assessment, it can now be concluded that entry speed is not a factor in most of the fail-to-yield collisions. Therefore, given this new assessment, staff do not recommend the installation of raised crosswalks at the roundabout because it is not expected that the raised crosswalk would result in a significant decrease in the fail-to-yield collisions. Raised pedestrian crosswalks may potentially result in other benefits at this or another roundabout, such as increased yielding to pedestrians. Staff do not want to completely discount the potential benefits of a raised pedestrian crosswalk at a roundabout; however; at this time, the raised crosswalks are not viewed as a significant countermeasure for fail-to-yield collisions at
Based on the conclusions that the main cause of the excessive fail-to-yield collisions is that drivers are simply making a wrong decision about whether they need to yield, staff has developed a revised approach to identifying potential countermeasures for this roundabout. The revised list of potential countermeasures includes additional warning signs and continued and focussed driver education.

5.1 Warning Signs

Several months ago staff surveyed road-safety professionals including the human factors safety specialist retained, and a large network of non road-safety Regional staff to help identify potential warning signs to mitigate the identified fail-to-yield collision type. Staff’s goal in developing a new warning sign was to make the new sign easy to read, easy to comprehend, and simple in order to be effective. Warning signs also need to be strategically placed so that drivers have enough time to read and react to them accordingly while focussing on the driving task. New signs should not take away time required to read and react to other key signs that a driver requires (e.g. green street-name guide signs, lane designation signs, and yield signs, etc.) in order to negotiate a roundabout safely. The survey identified two text-based warning signs that have been installed at the Homer Watson roundabout to reduce collisions. Figure 3 illustrates the two warning signs currently in use at the roundabout. These warning signs have been strategically placed above the one-way arrow boards in the central island, well within a driver’s cone of vision and more importantly in the general direction where a motorist should be looking when entering a roundabout. Please refer to Appendix A for a photograph of one of the signs in place at the Homer Watson Boulevard and Block Line Road roundabout.

Figure 3 – Roundabout Pilot Warning Signs
Staff has completed a preliminary assessment of the effectiveness of these signs through video observation and has noted a 25% reduction in fail-to-yield conflicts following the installation of these warning signs. Determining the efficacy of all countermeasures, however, should be measured though more reliable evidence (e.g. collisions) which will take more time to document. Staff is contemplating other graphic-based signs and may consider them on other approaches to the roundabout as well.

5.2 Driver Education

As summarized and detailed in Report TES-TRP-15-06, dated April 14, 2015, Regional staff has been educating the public about roundabouts since 2004. The education provided by Regional staff has included proper roundabout driving etiquette and techniques over the years.

The Region’s new educational campaign includes education targeting several undesirable driver behaviours including non-yielding behaviour. The new video also highlights this particular issue of concern and the need to yield to “all motorists in all lanes” of a roundabout when entering.

Staff is already developing additional educational material for the public to specifically address the particular cognitive issue identified in the human factors assessment; that you need to ensure that the inner lane is clear too in order to safely enter a roundabout. Pamphlets are planned to be delivered to all households in the Region and an animated simulation of this collision type is planned to be highlighted on the Region’s website. This issue is likely to also be a focal point of future educational campaigns.

6.0 Recommendations

Based on recent detailed video observations and a human factors assessment by a specialist in the field, staff is recommending a two-fold approach to addressing the problem of fail-to-yield collisions at this roundabout. The first part of this approach is the installation of additional warning signs, which has already been initiated by Transportation staff. Staff is further recommending to evaluate the effectiveness of these measures over a one and two year period prior to any other measures being considered. Staff is also recommending a revised driver education campaign that specifically targets the driver error that is causing the excessive fail-to-yield collisions.

Staff is planning to bring reports on the effectiveness of the warning signs and the education campaign to Regional Council for consideration in May of 2016 and 2017. These reports will inform members of Regional Council about the effectiveness of the education and warning signs initiated to date and if deemed required, provides Regional Council the ability to consider further remedial countermeasures as necessary in year one or two of the evaluation of current measures.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

This report addresses the Region’s goal to optimize existing road capacity to safely manage traffic throughout Waterloo Region (Strategic Objective 3.3) and to implement
proven roadway safety strategies and education to enhance the safety of our roadways (Strategic Objective 3.3.2)

Financial Implications:

The 2015 Transportation Capital Program includes $80,000 for roundabout education funded from the Development Charge Reserve Fund ($40,000, 50%) and the Road Capital Levy Reserve Fund ($40,000, 50%). The cost to manufacture and install the two roundabout warning signs is approximately $2000 and the costs to produce 180,000 brochures and deliver them to all households in the Region is approximately $40,000.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Nil

Attachments

Appendix A – Photo of New Warning Sign

Prepared By: Steve van De Keere, Director, Transportation

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

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

Date: May 26, 2015  File Code: T13-01

Subject: Installation Criteria for Bike-box Facilities at Signalized Intersections on Regional Roads

Recommendation:

That the Region of Waterloo adopts the recommended bike-box installation criteria as outlined in Report TES-TRP-15-11, dated May 26, 2015.

Summary:

A bike-box is a new facility that can be provided at traffic control signals to help cyclists to turn left at intersections. Staff considered several bike-box program alternatives and recommends that the Region approve a bike-box installation program that considers a bike-box on approaches to traffic signals that have a designated cycling facility on both the approach and left-turn receiving leg at an intersection and that each bike-box include bicycle symbols, detection and skid-resistant green paint.

1.0 Background

A bike-box is a relatively new cycling facility that assists in facilitating left-turn movements for cyclists at busy signalized intersections. This facility provides cyclists the ability to ride alongside stopped traffic waiting at a red traffic signal and to merge back into an optimal left-turning position in front of the stopped traffic. Please refer to Appendix A and B that illustrate two different bike-box concepts (1-stage bike-box and a 2-stage bike-box).
A 1-stage bike box is generally intended to permit cyclists to turn left in one stage. Cyclists will be permitted to position their bicycles in front of left-turning traffic which will permit them to turn left on a path similar to left-turning motorists. A 2-stage bike-box, is generally considered for wider roadways, and permits cyclists to complete a left-turn over 2-stages. Staff anticipates that in general 1-stage bike boxes will be applicable in the majority of cases given that the majority of Regional and local roadways have four-lane lane cross-sections or less, however there will be instances where 2-stage bike-boxes will need to be considered. The pathways of a cyclist at both a 1 and 2-stage bike-box are illustrated in Appendix A and B respectively.

The Region’s Transportation Division is now receiving more requests to consider bike-boxes at signalized intersections from the public, local municipalities and active transportation advisory committees. The need to establish a consistent and logical bike-box installation program is therefore becoming increasingly important.

In 2011 the Region of Waterloo and City of Waterloo retained a qualified engineering consultant to provide guidelines for the installation of bike-boxes at signalized intersections. Region and City staff used this information to develop bike-box installation criteria for signalized intersections in the Region of Waterloo. The following criteria are currently considered when assessing the feasibility of bike-boxes at signalized intersections on a case by case basis:

- Posted Speed limit;
- Presence of a designated cycling lane;
- Level of Service (delay);
- History of Cycling Collisions;
- Number of lanes on approach to an intersection (to determine whether 1 or 2-stage bike-box is preferred);
- Impacts on traffic signal operations;
  - Advanced signal phases for cyclists;
  - Motorist Right-turn on-red restrictions;
- Right-turn on red prohibition and impact on intersection operations; and
- Need for bike-box advance signal phase and impact on operations

Ontario Traffic Manual (OTM) Book 18, Cycling Facilities, published in December 2013 suggests that practitioners should consider bike-boxes at signalized intersections when:

- Motor vehicle volumes are high (especially right turns);
- Where large numbers of cyclists may be expected;
- Where bicycle routes turn left or connect with another designated facility; or
- Where there are a high number of left-turn cyclist movements.
The guidance provided by the engineering consultant and OTM Book 18 is very good and provides practitioners with sound rationale to address individual intersection needs but does not address methods for establishing network-wide bike-box programs. Regional staff therefore believes it is critical to plan a network-wide program to fully understand upfront capital and perpetual operational budget implications.

2.0 General Benefits of Bike-boxes

Bike-boxes help cyclists to turn left at intersections by providing a more convenient way to transition over to the left-turn lane versus having to negotiate though traffic into general purpose left-turn lanes. They provide cyclists priority at intersections by allowing them to negotiate past stopped traffic into a position in front of left-turning motorists. Currently cyclists are forced to maneuver through traffic into a left-turn lane on the approach to a traffic signal. Less experienced cyclists may find this to be a daunting task and will often complete a left-turn by way of two straight through movements on two separate green light indications. In most literature about bike-boxes, cyclists in general have stated that they prefer bike-boxes because of the added convenience and comfort level and they feel that bike-boxes are safer for them.

Complementing the Region’s current cycling network with supporting bike-boxes will help develop, promote and integrate cycling into the Region’s transportation network. The Region is continually striving to increase cycling numbers in an effort to manage congestion on roadways.

3.0 Safety Effectiveness of Bike-box Facilities

Although literature often suggests bike-boxes make cyclists feel safer (subjective safety), the actual safety effects (objective safety) is not fully understood at this time. A study assessing the effectiveness of bike-boxes in the City of Portland, Oregon indicated that collisions involving cyclists at 11 bike-box locations doubled from 16 to 32 collisions over a 4-year period after bike-boxes were installed. Of the 32 collisions occurring in the after period, 26 or 81% of crashes occurred at four locations. The information provided indicated that bicycle use and volumes increased significantly which complicated the assessment, but officials also stated “We believe that the crash data trend suggests that right-hook crashes are increasing at some of the treatment locations.” Details of the collisions suggested that the primary cause of collisions related to cyclists attempting to pass right-turning vehicles on the right side of the turning vehicle during permissive green traffic signal indications and where grades were affecting cyclist speeds. In one instance a cyclists was fatally injured. Figure 1 below illustrates the common type of collision seen in Portland also known as a “right-hook” collision.
The City of Portland has suggested that to mitigate the increase in collisions, it is considering the following countermeasures at the four intersections considered problematic:

- Installing right-turn lanes;
- Prohibiting right-turns all together;
- Adding exclusive through movement signal phases for cyclists; and
- Active warning signs to provide motorists a warning that cyclists are approaching from behind.

Regional staff notes that this type of collision is not an uncommon collision as there have been a total of 51 similar collisions on Regional roads between right-turning motorists and cyclists riding in a bike-lane, on the road or on a sidewalk between 2009 and 2014. Therefore it cannot be concluded that the increase in collisions seen in the City of Portland is solely attributable to the bike-box only.
To date the Region and local municipalities have implemented 3 bike-boxes at traffic signals on Regional or local municipal roads as follows:

1. Bridge Street and Lexington Road (2014);
2. King Street and Water Street (2014); and
3. Davenport Road and Lexington Road (2011).

There have been no reported collisions involving cyclists at these locations since bike-boxes were implemented at these locations.

4.0 Bike-box Elements and Related Costs

A bike-box can incorporate many elements including bicycle symbols, bicycle detection, and skid-resistant coloured pavement markings. At minimum, a bike-box needs to provide a dedicated space with bicycle symbols, and may be further supplemented with detectors so that the traffic signal can identify the presence of a cyclist and modify operations, and can further be supplemented with skid-resistant green pavement marking to emphasize the area for cyclists. The following table summarizes expected costs of these optional elements for a 1-stage bike-box at a standard semi-actuated 4-legged signalized intersection.

Table 1 – Bike-box Elements and Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bicycle Symbols</th>
<th>Bicycle Detection</th>
<th>Skid-resistant Green Pavement Markings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost per Bike-box Element</td>
<td>$4000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost per Intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost per Intersection Approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.0 Bike-box Program Alternatives

In keeping with the guidance provided by the engineering consultant and OTM Book 18, bike-boxes should only be considered on lower speed roadways with posted speed limits of 60 km/h or less. It is estimated that there are approximately 1300 to 1400 approaches to signalized intersections in the Region with a posted speed limit of 60 km/h or less that could potentially qualify for a bike-box. Staff considered several bike-box program alternatives and narrowed down the list of potential programs to two feasible alternatives including:

1. All traffic signal approaches that have a designated cycling facility; and
2. All traffic signal approaches that have a designated cycling facility on approach and left-turn departure.

As mentioned previously there are optional bike-box elements that can include bicycle symbols, bicycle detection, and skid-resistant coloured pavement markings. At a minimum, bike symbols must be used to define a bike-box location. Therefore the two program alternatives were further sub-categorized by the optional bike-box elements, ranging from bike symbols only to incorporating all bike-box elements (e.g. symbols, detectors and green pavement marking).

Table 2 summarizes the total estimated capital costs of the two bike-box installation program alternatives.
Table 2 – Estimated Capital Cost of Optional Bike-box Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bike-box Program Alternatives</th>
<th>Estimated Number of Potential Approaches</th>
<th>A Bicycle Symbols Only</th>
<th>B Bicycle Symbols and Bicycle Detection</th>
<th>C Bicycle Symbols, Bicycle Detection and Skid-resistant Green Pavement Markings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. All traffic signal approaches ≤ 60 km/h that have a designated cycling facility</strong></td>
<td>430</td>
<td>$430,000</td>
<td>$1,505,000</td>
<td>$4,192,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. All traffic signal approaches ≤ 60 km/h that have a designated cycling facility on approach and LT departure</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$1,950,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The summary of capital installation costs do not account for future maintenance costs. Pavement marking elements will require maintenance every 3-5 years and detection devices will require maintenance every 6-10 years. The following table summarizes estimated annual maintenance costs assuming a 5-year maintenance period for pavement markings and a 10-year replacement period for detection.
Table 3 – Estimated Annual Maintenance Costs of Optional Bike-box Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bike-box Program Alternatives</th>
<th>Estimated Number of Potential Approaches</th>
<th>A Bicycle Symbols Only</th>
<th>B Bicycle Symbols and Bicycle Detection</th>
<th>C Bicycle Symbols, Bicycle Detection and Skid-resistant Green Pavement Markings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. All traffic signal approaches ≤ 60 km/h that have a designated cycling facility</strong></td>
<td>430</td>
<td>$86,000</td>
<td>$193,500</td>
<td>$731,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. All traffic signal approaches ≤ 60 km/h that have a designated cycling facility on approach and LT departure</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$340,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.0 Area Municipal Staff and Active Transportation Advisory Committee Consultation

In general, staff from the Cities of Kitchener, Cambridge and Waterloo support the idea of a consistent bike-box installation program in Waterloo Region. Local municipal staff have suggested that bike-boxes should be considered in more locations, not just where designated cycling lanes on the approaches to intersections connect with other designated cycling lanes on the left-turn departure leg. Staff from the area municipalities would like to see bike-boxes considered on approaches to intersection with designated lanes, but that may connect with a bike route rather than just with designated cycling facilities only. It is estimated that this would potentially qualify up to an additional 230 approaches.
Regional staff has also consulted with the Region’s Active Transportation Advisory Committee (ATAC) on this issue. ATAC advised staff that it supports a Regional bike-box program but suggested the Region take a cautious approach to the implementation due to the relative unknown safety performance of bike-boxes. ATAC also advised staff to consider a pilot program at a few select locations with high volumes of cycling traffic before implementing bike-boxes on a larger scale. Information was also shared with local municipal active transportation advisory committees and to date similar feedback has been received.

6.0 Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Region consider a bike-box installation program as outlined in Alternative 2C of Table 2. If supported by Regional Council, Alternative 2C will provide staff direction to consider a bike-box on approaches to traffic signals that have a designated cycling facility on both the approach and left-turn receiving leg at an intersection. Each bike-box would include bicycle symbols, detection and skid-resistant green paint. When considering the installation of a bike-box, staff in the Region’s Traffic Engineering and Traffic Systems Management group shall be consulted with and satisfied that the bike-box can be designed and operated adequately and that traffic signal operation can be maintained to a satisfactory level of service. Staff believes that Alternative 2C is the most ideal program for the following reasons:

- Bike-box installations will logically connect present-day designated cycling facilities;
- Bike-box locations will make practical sense;
- The program will provide clear direction to engineering project teams at both the Regional and local municipal level;
- Detection of cyclists is integral to the effectiveness of bike-box;
- Green skid-resistant pavement markings will emphasize locations to both cyclists and motorists; and
- This less aggressive installation program is very similar to a pilot project approach and allows staff to monitor the safety effectiveness of the program more effectively and to modify the program as needed should a collision concern arise with cyclists.

Rather than a full-scale implementation of Alternative 1 bike-box program, staff is recommending the gradual implementation of bike-boxes as part of future construction projects or traffic signal major modification works that are scheduled in the Transportation Capital Program. Measures to mitigate the right-turn collision at bike-boxes would be considered for all installations. Funding necessary to facilitate bike-boxes at signalized intersections situated on a Regional road falls under the responsibility of the Region of Waterloo however funds to facilitate bike-boxes at the signalized intersection of two local municipal roadways would fall under the
responsibility of the local municipality (excluding funds for bicycle detection) based on the Region’s Roadway Jurisdiction Policy.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

This initiative meets the Region’s goal to develop, promote and integrate active forms of transportation (cycling and walking) Strategic Objective 3.2.

**Financial Implications:**

The cost to install bike-boxes as part of future construction projects would add an additional $9,750 for each intersection approach. Based on the current 2015 Transportation Capital Program, staff estimates the gradual implementation of bike-boxes would cost approximately $50,000 to $100,000 per year, funded from the Regional Development Charge Reserve Fund.

The Region’s Transportation Operations budget would need to be increased by $1,700 per year per intersection approach with a bike-box to cover the annual maintenance requirements of the Alternative 2C bike-box program and would eventually need to be increased to $340,000 annually in perpetuity when the program is fully implemented. Based on the projects scheduled in the Transportation Capital Program for 2015, an additional 5-10 locations would be considered for construction resulting in a $17,000 budget adjustment to the Transportation Operations budget in 2016.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Nil

**Attachments**

Appendix A – 1-Stage Bike-Box

Appendix B – 2-Stage Bike-Box

**Prepared By:** Bob Henderson, Manager, Transportation Engineering

**Approved By:** Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Appendix A – 1 Stage Bike-box
Appendix B – 2 Stage Bike-box

The queue box may be positioned laterally and aligned with the parking lane rather than in front of the cross street travel lane.

The queue box should be positioned laterally in the cross street to promote visibility of cyclists.

Green surface treatment inside of the queueing areas should be used to further define the bicycle space.

The queue box must be placed in a protected area. Typically this is aligned with an on-street parking lane or between the bicycle lane and the pedestrian crossings.

This area is designated to hold queuing cyclists and formalize two-stage left turns. Pavement markings include a bicycle stencil and a turn arrow to clearly indicate the proper direction and positioning for cyclists.
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Water Services

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: May 26, 2015
File Code: E03-20/4173
Subject: Conestogo Plains Water Supply Class Environmental Assessment: Notice of Completion

Recommendation:


And that the Regional Municipality of Waterloo publish the Notice of Completion for the EA and provide the Environmental Study Report for public review and comment for a 30-day period, in accordance with the Municipal Engineers Association’s Class Environmental Assessment process.

Summary:

The West Montrose Water Supply Class Environmental Assessment (EA) completed in 2012 recommended the connection to the Conestogo Plains Water Supply System as the preferred strategy for long term water supply to the Village of West Montrose. The Conestogo Plains System was not investigated in detail as part of the West Montrose Class EA and a recommendation was made to undertake a Class EA for this water system, which is part of the scope of this report.

The Schedule B, Class EA study has now been completed, including the required Project File Report. This report includes the preferred strategy for long-term water supply to the communities of West Montrose and Conestogo.

The project was guided by a Steering Committee which included representation from
Regional (former Mayor Todd Cowan) and Township Councils (former councillor Bonnie Bryant). The public, applicable regulatory authorities and other stakeholders have been consulted during the study. Public Consultation Centres were held at two milestone points in the project.

The preferred water supply strategy for the communities of West Montrose and Conestogo includes the provision of water from the Region’s Integrated Urban System. This will be achieved through the installation of a water main from St. Jacobs to the Conestogo Plains System, and two subsequent watermains connecting West Montrose and Conestogo Golf Course to Conestogo Plains. The construction is anticipated to be completed in multiple phases between 2017-2020.

The Municipal Class Environmental Assessment requires public advertisement of a Notice of Completion for the EA, and public release of the Project File Report for review and comment for a period of at least 30 days following issue of the notice. Water Services recommends that the Region approve the publication of the Notice of Completion, and placement of the Project File Report for public review at the Regional Clerk’s office, on the Region’s web site, and at the Township of Woolwich’s Clerk’s office, tentatively from June 15, 2015 to July 16, 2015.

**Report:**

The West Montrose Water Supply System consists of four infiltration wells located within the floodplain of the Grand River and services approximately 60 homes. In recent years, the water supply source has not been able to meet community demands due to declining performance of the existing wells. In order to supplement the well supply, water from another Regional source has been transported to the reservoir via water trucks. In 2012 the Region completed a Class EA for West Montrose that recommended a connection to the Conestogo Plains Water Supply System as the preferred strategy for long term water supply to the Village of West Montrose (Report E-12-124 dated Dec.11, 2012). This study recommended a more detailed investigation of the Conestogo Plains System to confirm this strategy, which is part of the scope of this report.

In April 2013, the Region retained CIMA to complete a Schedule B Class EA for the Conestogo Plains Water System, as outlined in Report E-13-052, dated April 30, 2013. The Conestogo Plains Water System is located on the west side of the community of Conestogo and consists of two groundwater wells with iron sequestration, disinfection and associated storage and pumping. The system currently has approximately 115 service connections. The water supply to the remainder of the community of Conestogo is provided by private wells and another Regional water system servicing the Conestogo Golf Course subdivision. The scope of the Class EA was to confirm whether the existing system can sustain water supply to Conestogo Plains, West Montrose and potential...
connection of properties on private wells within the settlement boundaries of these communities. The study also evaluated the alternative of potentially connecting the whole community of Conestogo (Plains, Golf Course and properties on private wells within the settlement boundary) and West Montrose to another larger water system, such as the City of Waterloo, located approximately 1.2 km from the community of Conestogo.

A Project Steering Committee provided review and guidance throughout the project. This committee included representation from Regional Council (former Mayor Todd Cowan), Township of Woolwich Council (former Councillor Bonnie Bryant), and Region and Township staff. The public, regulatory authorities and other stakeholders have been consulted in the development of the preferred concept. Public Consultation Centres were held in Conestogo in March and November 2014.

The EA phase of the consulting assignment has now been completed by CIMA, including the required Project File Report. This report includes the preferred long term water strategy for the communities of West Montrose and Conestogo.

The preferred water supply strategy includes the provision of water from the Region’s Integrated Urban System (IUS). This will be achieved through the installation of a water main from St. Jacobs to the Conestogo Plains System and two subsequent water mains connecting West Montrose and Conestogo Golf Course to Conestogo Plains. The preferred approach is shown in Figure 1, attached. This alternative provides a long-term sustainable supply that will provide sufficient water for current service connections and accommodate future connections within the settlement boundaries. This alternative will also increase the operational efficiency of these systems by eliminating the operation of six wells and eliminating the need for frequent water trucking to the West Montrose system.

The Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process requires public advertisement of a Notice of Completion for the EA, and public release of the Project File Report for review and comment for a period of at least 30 days following issue of the notice. Water Services recommends that the Region approve the publication of the Notice of Completion, and placement of the Project File Report for public review at the Regional Clerk’s office, on the Region’s web site, and at the Township of Woolwich’s Clerk’s office, tentatively from June 15, 2015 to July 16, 2015.

After the public comment period has expired and any comments received on the report are addressed, CIMA will continue with the preliminary design phase of the proposed works. Detailed design of this project will be initiated by 2016. It is expected that construction of the works will take place in four phases between 2017-2020 and includes integration of construction with the planned road reconstruction on Sawmill
Road in Conestogo in 2017. The timing of each of the anticipated construction projects is included in Table 1, attached.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

The Conestogo Plains Water Supply System Class EA and Preliminary Design supports the Corporate Strategic Focus Area 2: “Growth Management and Prosperity,” Strategic Objective 2.2: “Develop, Optimize and Maintain Infrastructure to Meet Current and Projected Needs,” and specifically, Strategic Action 2.2.1: “Continue to prioritize and implement capital program projects required to meet community needs and ensure sustainability.”

Financial Implications:

The 2015 Ten Year Water Capital Forecast includes projected spending of $8.25 million between 2015 and 2024 for upgrades to the Conestogo Plains and West Montrose Water Supply Systems. The estimated cost of construction from the EA is $8.1 million. More detailed cost estimates will be developed during the preliminary and detailed design phases of the project, and will be used for updating future Water Capital Forecasts.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

NIL

Attachments

Figure 1 – Map of Preferred Water Supply Strategy
Table 1 – Timing of Construction Phases

Prepared By: Pam Law, Senior Project Engineer, Water Services

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Figure 1: Map of Preferred Water Supply Strategy
Table 1: Timing of Construction Phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase</th>
<th>Work Included</th>
<th>Anticipated Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Construction of watermain along Sawmill Road, within the Village of Conestogo. To be completed in conjunction with road reconstruction.</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Construction of watermain from St. Jacobs to Conestogo Plains and upgrades to Conestogo Plain treatment plant.</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Construction of watermain from Conestogo Plains to West Montrose and upgrades to West Montrose treatment plant.</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Construction of watermain from Conestogo Plains to Conestogo Golf Course and decommissioning of Conestogo Golf treatment plant.</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region of Waterloo
Planning, Development and Legislative Services
Community Planning

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

Date: May 26, 2015  File Code: T15-40/58 Kit.

Subject: Regional Road #58 (Fischer-Hallman Road) Traffic Operations at Proposed West Oak Trail Drive North of Huron Road, City of Kitchener

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve right-in, right-out only traffic movements from West Oak Trail Drive onto Regional Road #58 (Fischer-Hallman Road) North of Huron Road, City of Kitchener as described in Report No. PDL-CPL-15-30, dated May 26, 2015.

Summary:

Regional Road #58 (Fischer-Hallman Road) from Regional Road #4 (Ottawa Street) to Regional Road #12 (New Dundee Road) is a two-lane roadway, and identified as a Controlled Access – Prohibited road in the Region’s Controlled Access By-law #58-87. An ongoing Class “C” Environmental Assessment (EA) considering the widening of Fischer-Hallman Road is proposing the addition of a raised centre median as recommended by Region staff. This access control measure will preserve the traffic carrying capacity of this strategic Regional corridor and will reduce collisions involving left turning vehicles. Construction of this project is currently scheduled for 2019.

1271395 Ontario Limited and Schlegel Urban Developments Incorporated (the Developer) is proposing a mixed-use development on the northwest corner of Regional Road #58 (Fischer-Hallman Road) and Huron Road in the City of Kitchener (please see Attachment 1). The site is ultimately proposed to be developed with 448 apartment/townhouse units and 251,900 square feet of office/commercial/retail space. The site is initially proposed to be developed with a 70,000 square foot furniture store, 76,400 square feet of office/commercial space and 204 apartment/townhouse units (please see Attachment 2).
The Developer is proposing a municipal street to be known as West Oak Trail Drive to intersect with Fischer-Hallman Road on the west side of the road between the two existing roundabouts on Fischer-Hallman Road at the Huron Road and Seabrook Drive intersections. The Developer is requesting that the proposed intersection of Fischer-Hallman Road and West Oak Trail Drive permit left-in traffic movements in addition to right-in, right-out, traffic movements. Three accesses are proposed on Huron Road to the site as well, for a total of four independent points of access.

To preserve the traffic carrying capacity of Fischer-Hallman Road and reduce collisions involving left turning vehicles, Region staff is recommending that the West Oak Trail Drive intersection with Fischer-Hallman Road operate with right-in, right-out only traffic movements. Fischer-Hallman Road is one of only three major north/south Regional Roads in Kitchener/Waterloo with limited ability for the Region to widen this road to more than four lanes if capacity issues arise in the future. Permitting left turns into the development would require a break in the raised centre median which will result in high-speed “T-bone” type collisions involving personal injuries, and introduce the possibility of high risk improper left turns outbound from West Oak Trail Drive. While the raised centre median would restrict West Oak Trail Drive to right-in, right-out only traffic movements from Fischer-Hallman Road, the roundabouts at Huron Road and Seabrook Drive are within sight and can be accessed for left turns entering and exiting (please see Attachment 3). This development is also well serviced by the three proposed accesses on Huron Road.

City of Kitchener staff support the Region of Waterloo staff recommendation that the intersection of Fischer-Hallman Road and West Oak Trail Drive operate with right-in, right-out only traffic movements. Kitchener staff has also noted that if left-in traffic movements are permitted from Fischer-Hallman Road, they will need to reconsider the three accesses to Huron road as well as the design and location of the proposed angled parking along West Oak Trail Drive (please see Attachment 4).

This report is presented as a result of Planning and Works Committee direction to Regional staff to present a report at this meeting relative to a delegation (Mr. Chris Pidgeon), that appeared at the May 5, 2015 Planning and Works Committee.

Report:

Regional Road #58 (Fischer-Hallman Road) from Regional Road #4 (Ottawa Street) to Regional Road #12 (New Dundee Road) is a two-lane roadway, and identified as a Controlled Access – Prohibited road in the Region’s Controlled Access By-law #58-87. A Schedule “C” Class Environmental Assessment (EA) is underway to consider the widening of Fischer-Hallman Road from two to four lanes, as well as other improvements between Regional Road #56 (Bleams Road) and Plains Road, and is currently scheduled for construction in 2019. Fischer-Hallman Road is one of only three major north/south Regional Roads in Kitchener/Waterloo, with limited ability for the
Region to widen this road to more than four lanes if capacity issues arise in the future. As a result, the EA includes a raised centre median on Fischer-Hallman Road as recommended by Region staff, to preserve its traffic carrying capacity and to reduce collisions involving left turning vehicles. Staff has consistently communicated to all potential developers along this portion of Fischer-Hallman Road that any additional access will be restricted to right-in, right-out only movements if not located at a roundabout.

This report is presented as a result of Planning and Works Committee direction to Regional staff to present a report at this meeting relative to a delegation (Mr. Chris Pidgeon), that appeared at the May 5, 2015 Planning and Works Committee.

1271395 Ontario Limited and Schlegel Urban Developments Incorporated (the Developer) is proposing a mixed use development on the northwest corner of Regional Road #58 (Fischer-Hallman Road) and Huron Road in the City of Kitchener (please see Attachment 1). The site is ultimately proposed to be developed with 448 apartment/townhouse units and 251,900 square feet of office/commercial/retail space. The site is initially proposed to be developed with a 70,000 square foot furniture store, 76,400 square feet of office/commercial space and 204 apartment/townhouse units (please see Attachment 2).

The Developer is proposing a municipal street to be known as West Oak Trail Drive to intersect with Fischer-Hallman Road on the west side of the road. This intersection will be located approximately 170 metres north of the existing roundabout at the intersection of Fischer-Hallman Road and Huron Road, and approximately 380 metres south of the existing roundabout at Fischer-Hallman Road and Seabrook Drive. Both existing roundabouts will be within sight of West Oak Trail Drive (please see Attachment 3). The Developer is requesting that the proposed intersection of Fischer-Hallman Road and West Oak Trail Drive permit left-in traffic movements in addition to right-in, right-out movements. Three accesses are proposed to Huron Road as well, for a total of four independent points of access.

The Developer submitted a transportation impact study (TIS) in support of the proposed development. Regional staff reviewed the TIS and issued comments in January 2015. As there were no technical issues with the TIS, staff advised the Developer that a resubmission would not be necessary. However, staff also advised the Developer that only right-in, right-out traffic movements would be considered at Fischer-Hallman Road and West Oak Trail Drive.

City of Kitchener staff reviewed the transportation impact study and support the findings on a technical level, however, Kitchener staff do not support the left-in movement from Fischer-Hallman Road at West Oak Trail Drive based on the Regional staff recommendation. Three full movement accesses to Huron Road were supported by Kitchener staff based on right-in, right-out only traffic movements at Fischer-Hallman Road at West Oak Trail Drive. Kitchener staff acknowledge that the Huron Road
access closest to the Fischer-Hallman Road and Huron Road roundabout may be restricted to right-in, right-out only traffic movements through the future widening of Huron Road to four lanes and the associated modifications to the design of the roundabout (please see Attachment 4).

In addition, the proposed design and location of the angled parking along West Oak Trail Drive west of Fischer-Hallman Road was supported by the City of Kitchener based on the Fischer-Hallman Road and West Oak Trail Drive intersection operating with right-in, right-out only traffic movements. Kitchener staff has also noted that if left-in traffic movements are permitted from Fischer-Hallman Road, they will need to reconsider support of the three accesses to Huron road as well as the design and location of the angled parking along West Oak Trail Drive.

City of Kitchener staff support the Region of Waterloo staff recommendation that the intersection of Fischer-Hallman Road and West Oak Trail Drive operate with right-in, right-out only traffic movements.

Left-in access from Fischer-Hallman Road provides very limited benefit to access the site because of the multiple proposed accesses from Huron Road, and the proximity of the two roundabouts on Fischer-Hallman Road at the Huron Road and Seabrook Drive intersections. These two roundabouts on Fischer-Hallman Road effectively allow left turning vehicles both inbound and outbound at West Oak Trail Drive to make U-turns at the roundabouts thereby facilitating right-in movements as an alternative to the proposed left-in movement. This is a proven measure to reduce left-turn collisions that has been successfully implemented on other roundabout corridors in the United States, and has also been approved on Franklin Boulevard in Cambridge.

Permitting left-in traffic movements at the Fischer-Hallman Road and West Oak Trail Drive intersection would require a break in the existing and proposed centre median. There will be three significant negative effects on Fischer-Hallman Road:

1. Creation of additional potential collision conflict points: Left turning entering vehicles would need to cross both southbound high volume lanes on Fischer-Hallman Road after it is widened, which will result in high-speed “T-bone” type collisions involving personal injuries. There are fewer large gaps in traffic to allow left turn movements within roundabout corridors than would be found in corridors with traffic control signals.

2. Potential for higher risk, non-compliant left turns from West Oak Trail Drive: Regional experience at similarly designed driveways is that some motorists will attempt to make improper left-out movements from West Oak Trail Drive, regardless of how the median opening is designed.

3. Inconsistent application of access control in the area: All other developments along this corridor south of Bleams Road have been informed they will only be permitted right-in, right-out access movements when not located directly at a roundabout.
In order to preserve the traffic carrying capacity of Fischer-Hallman Road and reduce collisions involving left-turning vehicles, Region staff is recommending that the West Oak Trail Drive intersection with Fischer-Hallman Road operate with right-in, right-out only traffic movements. With the close proximity of the existing roundabouts on Fischer-Hallman Road at the Huron Road and Seabrook Drive intersections, in addition to the three accesses proposed to Huron Road, this development will be well serviced from an access perspective.

**Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination**

City of Kitchener staff support the Region of Waterloo staff recommendation that the intersection of Fischer-Hallman Road and West Oak Trail Drive operate with right-in, right-out only traffic movements. Approval of three proposed accesses to Huron Road as well as the design and location of the angled parking along West Oak Trail Drive west of Fischer-Hallman Road was supported based on right-in, right-out only traffic movements at this intersection.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

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

**Financial Implications:**

If left-in traffic movements from Fischer-Hallman Road to West Oak Trail Drive are permitted, the cost of the median opening, including construction of the associated northbound left turn lane on Fischer-Hallman Road would be eligible for funding through Regional Development Charges.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Community Planning staff have consulted with Transportation and Environmental Services staff in the preparation of this report.

**Attachments:**

Attachment 1 - Key Plan
Attachment 2 - Master Site Plan
Attachment 3 - Photos showing roundabouts at Seabrook Drive and Huron Road
Attachment 4 – Email from City of Kitchener staff

**Prepared By:** Bruce Erb, Supervisor, Corridor Management

**Approved By:** Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Development and Legislative Services
Attachment 1 – Key Plan
Attachment 2 – Master Site Plan
Attachment 3 – Photos showing roundabouts at Seabrook Drive and Huron Road

FH Road at future West Oak Trail Drive looking North at Seabrook Drive Roundabout

FH Road at future West Oak Trail Drive looking South at Huron Road Roundabout
Attachment 4 – Email from City of Kitchener staff

Bruce

The City of Kitchener Transportation Services has reviewed the Traffic Impact Study for the Bromberg/Pumpkin Patch Lands and provides the following comments.

1. Transportation Services has reviewed the Traffic Impact Study and supports the findings on a technical level. However, Transportation Services takes the position not to support the proposed “Left Turn Lane” northbound Fischer Hallman Road at West Oak Trail.

   I. Transportation Services initially was not in support of the 3 accesses granted along Huron Road, the decision to allow the accesses was based on a number of factors of which the Regions Decision to only support a “Right in/Right out” at West Oak Trail and Fischer Hallman Road. Additionally the design elements of West Oak Trail were considered based on the “Right in/Right out” access. If the provision for a left turn lane along Fischer Hallman Road at West Oak Trail is granted, The City of Kitchener will need to re-address the three (3) accesses along Huron Road and the need to redesign West Oak Trail will have to be conducted.

   II. The City of Kitchener, has approved three (3) full moves access points to the development lands along Huron Road, based on the Regions “Right in Right out” at Fischer Hallman Road and West Oak Trail, and acknowledges the spacing of the roundabouts at Seabrook Drive and Huron Road are within a reasonable distance of the access at West Oak Trail to accommodate any need for a left turn movement at this location.

   III. The central Access along Huron Road is the primary access for Heavy Truck Traffic to and from this development. Additionally, the main access and drive aisle through the development on the northwest corner of Fischer Hallman Road and Huron Road has an mutual access agreement in place for the other adjacent developments along West Oak Trail.

   IV. The design and location of the angle parking along West Oak Trail was supported based on the Right In – Right Out access control at Fischer Hallman Road and West Oak Trail. If the left turn lane is granted the design and location of the angled parking be need to be addressed and a full redesign of the West Oak Trail right of way will need to be conducted.

   V. The City of Kitchener supports the Region of Waterloo and its position regarding this proposed left turn lane, as Fischer Hallman Road is under the Jurisdiction of the Region and its Policies and Technical Staff decisions.
2. Transportation Services reviewed the three (3) proposed access locations along Huron Road and will support the full moves access at each location. However, Huron Road will be widened to an Ultimate width of 30m and a four lane cross section, which may impact design features of the roundabout at Huron Road (extension of the centre median along Huron Road) which may restrict the access nearest the roundabout at Fischer Hallman Road and Huron Road to a “Right in – Right out”, and it is unlikely to have any impact on the remaining two (2) access points along Huron Road based on the distance from the roundabout. The central Access to the development lands has been identified as the primary heavy truck access for the large scale commercial development at the North west corner of Fischer Hallman Road and Huron Road.

The City of Kitchener is providing the above comments with regards to the access and proposed “Left Turn Lane” at west Oak Trail only, and any other development along Fischer Hallman Road seeking changes in access will be addressed on a case by case basis.

Regards

Jeramie Lewis, Dipl.T.
Traffic Planning Analyst
Transportation Services
City of Kitchener
ph: (519) 741-2200 ext: 7665
f: (519)741-2747
tty: 1-866-969-9994
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