Regional Municipality of Waterloo
Planning and Works Committee

Agenda

Tuesday, August 11, 2015

Approx. 12:30 p.m. (Immediately following L&H)

Regional Council Chamber

150 Frederick Street, Kitchener

1. Declarations of Pecuniary Interest under The Municipal Conflict Of Interest Act

2. Delegations

2.1 John Armstrong, Armstrong Strategy Group and Peter Menary, Len’s Mill Stores re: Waterloo’s Spur Line Multi-Use Trail

2.2 TES-TRP-15-13, Fountain Street (Regional Road 17) Truck Prohibition Review Between King Street (Regional Road 8) and Cherry Blossom Road, City of Cambridge (For Information)

    i. Matthew Donau

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.

3. Request to Remove Items from Consent Agenda
4. **Motion to Approve Items or Receive for Information**

4.1 **PDL-LEG-15-54**, Authorization to Expropriate Lands (2nd Report) for Sawmill Road (Regional Road 17) Road Improvements, Conestogo, Township of Woolwich

See pages 29-31 for recommendation

4.2 **PDL-LEG-15-55**, Authorization To Expropriate Lands (2nd Report) For The Reconstruction Of Fountain Street (Regional Road 17) From Shantz Hill Road To King Street West And King Street (Regional Road 8) From Fountain Street To Eagle Street, in The City of Cambridge

See pages 38-42 for recommendation

4.3 **PDL-LEG-15-59**, Authorization To Expropriate Lands (1st Report) for improvements to Ira Needles Blvd (Regional Road 70) at Erb Street West, City of Waterloo

**Recommendation:**

That The Regional Municipality of Waterloo direct and authorize the Regional Solicitor to take the following actions with respect to the expropriation of lands for the reconstruction of Ira Needles Blvd at Erb Street West, City of Waterloo, in the Region of Waterloo as detailed in report PDL-LEG-15-59 dated August 11, 2015:

1. Complete application(s) to the Council of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, as may be required from time to time, for approval to expropriate land, which is required for the improvements to Ira Needles Blvd and described as follows:

**Fee Simple Partial Taking:**

a) Part of Lot 41, German Company Tract, being Parts 2, 3 and 4 on 58R-18609 (650 Erb Street West, Waterloo);

**Hydro Easement:**

The right and easement, being an easement in gross, for itself, its successors and assigns and anyone authorized by it, in perpetuity to, at any time enter upon the following properties for purposes of constructing, laying down, installing, inspecting, repairing, altering, enlarging, replacing, correcting, operating,
and maintaining hydro installations and infrastructure, both under ground and overhead, including cables, pipes, conduits of all kinds, all necessary poles, supporting wires and braces and other equipment and appurtenances thereto, herein referred to as the utility plant, which may be determined necessary from time to time through, over, upon, along and across the lands, and for all such purposes together with the free, unimpeded and unobstructed access for itself, its successors and assigns, servants, agents, contractors, workmen and anyone authorized by it, and vehicles, supplies and equipment at all times and for all purposes and things necessary for or incidental to the exercise and enjoyment of the right and easement:

a) Part Block 91, Plan 1708 being Part 1 on 58R-18611 (636 Erb Street West, Waterloo);
b) Part of Lot 41, German Company Tract being Part 1 on 58R-18612 (651 Erb Street West, Waterloo);
c) Part of Lot 41, German Company Tract being Parts 1, 5 and 6 on 58R-18609 (650 Erb Street West, Waterloo);

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

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

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

5. Discontinue expropriation proceedings or any part thereof, in respect of the above described lands, or any part thereof, upon the registration on title of the required documentation to complete a transaction whereby the required interests in the lands are conveyed or if determined by the Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services that such lands, or any part or interest thereof, are not required for the subject project; and

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


**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into an
Agreement for Professional Consulting Services with GHD Limited, to provide engineering services during the preliminary and detailed design and services during construction for the Waterloo Landfill South Boundary Well Pumphouse and Stormwater Management Pond 3 Modifications, City of Kitchener, at an upset fee limit of $323,242.58 plus applicable taxes.

4.5 **TES-TRP-15-17**, 2014 Traffic Signal Corridor and Signal Timing Review (For Information)

4.6 **TES-WMS-15-09**, Waste Management Services Education Program Update (For Information)


**Recommendation:**

That Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into a Consulting Services Agreement with BluMetric Environmental Inc. of Kitchener, Ontario, to provide consulting services for undertaking the G5 Salt Assessment, Pinebush Well Field, in the City of Cambridge, at an upset limit of $342,336.00 plus applicable taxes.


**Recommendation:**


4.9 **PDL-CPL-15-40**, Mid-Year 2014 Waterloo Region Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory (for Information)

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

**Design and Construction**

5.1 **TES-DCS-15-17**, University Avenue Reconstruction and...
Widening (Keats Way to Erb Street) City of Waterloo
Recommended Design Concept

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to the Environmental Assessment and Preliminary Design Study for the reconstruction and widening of University Avenue between Keats Way and Erb Street in the City of Waterloo:

a) Approve the Recommended Design Concept for the proposed reconstruction and widening of University Avenue from Keats Way to Erb Street as described in Report TES-DCS-15-17 dated August 11, 2015.

b) Direct staff to file a Notice of Completion as required by the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment and place the project file on the public record for review for a period of 30 days.

5.2 TES-DCS-15-18, Consultant Selection – Detailed Design and Services During Construction for the Ayr Sewage Pumping Station and Forcemain, Village of Ayr

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into an Agreement for Professional Consulting Services with GM BluePlan Engineering Limited, to provide engineering services for detailed design and services during construction for the Ayr Sewage Pumping Station and Forcemain in Ayr, at an upset fee limit of $613,768 plus applicable taxes.

5.3 TES-DCS-15-19, Consultant Selection – Class Environmental Assessment, Detailed Design and Services During Construction, Weber Street from Albert Street to Northfield Drive, City of Waterloo

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into a Consultant Services Agreement with Stantec Consulting Ltd. to provide consulting engineering services for a Class Environmental Assessment, detailed design, contract administration and construction inspection for improvements to
Weber Street from Albert Street to Northfield Drive in the City of Waterloo at an upset fee of $527,527.00 plus applicable taxes for the Class Environmental Assessment and detailed design phases, with contract administration and construction inspection services to be paid on a time basis in an estimated amount of $315,000.00 as described in Report TES-DCS-15-19 dated August 11, 2015.

**5.4 TES-DCS-15-20**, Recommended Intersection Improvements at Ira Needles Boulevard and Thorndale Drive and Update on the Widening of Ira Needles Boulevard, City of Waterloo

**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the implementation of a roundabout on Ira Needles Boulevard at Thorndale Drive, in the City of Waterloo, all as presented in Report TES-DCS-15-20 and subject to Regional Council approval of funding as part of the 2016 Transportation Capital Program budget process and subject to lands for the roundabout being dedicated by developers once the Consent Application for the lands is approved by the City of Waterloo and Thorndale Drive Extension is designated a municipal road.

**Transit Services**

**5.5 TES-TRS-15-12**, Grand River Transit Real-Time Data Availability (For Information) 178

**5.6 TES-TRS-15-13**, Cambridge GO Train Service Update (For Information) 185

**5.7 TES-TRS-15-14**, Integration of Grand River Transit Automatic Vehicle Location System and Electronic Fare Management System 201

**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the acquisition and installation of software upgrades, enhancements and new modules from INIT Innovations in Transportation, Inc. to support the integration of Grand River Transit’s computer-aided dispatch and the automatic vehicle location (CAD/AVL) system with the Electronic Fare Management System (EFMS) at a cost of
up to $206,885.75 plus all applicable taxes

Transportation

5.8 TES-TRP-15-18, Proposed Speed Limit on Gerber Road (Regional Road 12) between Nafziger Road (Regional Road 5) and 100 meters east of Greenwood Hill Road, in the Township of Wellesley

Recommendation:

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

a) Remove from Schedule 18, posted 70 km/h on Gerber Road (Regional Road 12) between Nafziger Road (Regional Road 5) and 400 metres east of Nafziger Road;

b) Remove from Schedule 18, posted 80 km/h on Gerber Road (Regional Road 12) between 400 metres east of Nafziger Road and Moser-Young Road (Regional Road 14);

c) Add to Schedule 18, posted 60 km/h on Gerber Road between Nafziger Road and 100 metres east of Greenwood Hill Road;

d) Add to Schedule 18, posted 80 km/h on Gerber Road between 100 metres east of Greenwood Hill Road and Moser-Young Road;


Waste Management

5.9 TES-WMS-15-10, Curbside Collection Contract – Recommended Bid Option Structure

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve a single bid option, referred to as Bid Option 1, for residential curbside collection in the Tri-cities (Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo) and the Townships (North Dumfries, Wellesley, Wilmot and Woolwich) for the next waste collection contract, commencing March 6, 2017.
Water Services

5.10 TES-WAS-15-22, Update on East Side Lands Wastewater Servicing Environmental Assessment (For Information)


Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo accept the proposal of Bartels Environmental Services Inc. for Aerobic Biosolids Management Contract for a five (5) year term at unit rates of $4.10 /m$^3$, $6.98 /m^3$ and $26.30 /m^3$ (excluding all applicable taxes) for biosolids haulage, biosolids land application or disposal and septage lagoon clean out respectively, all as detailed in Report TES-WAS-15-23 dated August 11, 2015.

Inter-Departmental Reports


Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo endorse the findings and recommendations of the report entitled “Implementing the Growth Plan: Seeking Provincial and Municipal Alignment to Support a Prosperous Ontario”, as it pertains to the Region of Waterloo, and as described in Report No. PDL-15-05/TES-15-02/COR-15-01, dated August 11, 2015;

And that this report be forwarded to the Ontario Growth Secretariat as further endorsement of the above-noted report.

Reports – Planning, Development and Legislative Services

Community Services

5.13 PDL-CPL-15-41, Statutory Public Meeting on a Proposed Amendment to the Regional Official Plan - Transportation Policy Update

Recommendation:
That Regional Council authorize staff to schedule a public meeting in 2015 under the Planning Act to obtain input from the community on a proposed amendment to the Regional Official Plan that would propose to update Regional transportation policies, as outlined in Report No. PDL-CPL-15-41, dated August 11, 2015.

6. Information/Correspondence

6.1 MWA – Municipal Waste Association - 2014 Silver Promotion and Education Award for Digital Tool (over 30,000 households)

6.2 Council Enquiries and Requests for Information Tracking List

7. Other Business

8. Next Meeting – September 15, 2015

9. Adjourn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 15, 2015</td>
<td>1:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Planning and Works Committee</td>
<td>Council Chamber 2nd Floor, Regional Administration Building 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 6, 2015</td>
<td>1:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Planning and Works Committee</td>
<td>Council Chamber 2nd Floor, Regional Administration Building 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Transportation

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: August 11, 2015
File Code: T01-20/17 Fountain Street

Subject: Fountain Street (Regional Road 17) Truck Prohibition Review Between King Street (Regional Road 8) and Cherry Blossom Road, City of Cambridge

Recommendation:
For information.

Summary:
At the November 4, 2014 Planning and Works Committee meeting, staff were requested to consider restricting heavy trucks along Fountain Street (Regional Road 17) between King Street (Regional Road 8) and Cherry Blossom Road, in the City of Cambridge. Accordingly, staff have assessed the restriction of heavy trucks along Fountain Street between King Street and Cherry Blossom Road in accordance with the Region’s Truck Route Policy.

After a review of Fountain Street between King Street and Cherry Blossom Road, staff recommends that this roadway remain permissive to heavy trucks for the following reasons:

- There is no alternative truck route meeting the conditions of the Region’s Truck Route Policy; and

- A Fountain Street truck restriction/prohibition would shift truck traffic to other roads with fronting residential properties and would result in impacts to more residential properties than those on Fountain Street.

Staff also reviewed a number of other locations where staff frequently receive requests
from the public to prohibit trucks. All locations reviewed are similar to the 
Fountain Street location in that they had no effective alternate route available to 
adequately re-route truck traffic. Staff also reviewed the criteria of the Truck Route 
policy and concluded that the current policy provides a balanced approach to consider 
truck prohibitions while providing clear direction to staff.

Report:

1.0 Background

At the November 4, 2014 Planning and Works Committee meeting, as part of 
Regional Council’s approval of the Fountain Street Improvement Project (King Street to 
Cherry Blossom Road, Report E-14-120), staff were directed by Council to review the 
possibility of restricting heavy trucks along that portion of Fountain Street in light of the 
Region’s Truck Route Policy.

Staff has assessed a heavy truck restriction on Fountain Street between King Street 
and Cherry Blossom Road in the City of Cambridge in accordance with the Region’s 
Truck Route Policy. In addition, in light of several recent requests for truck restrictions 
in other locations of the Region, staff also briefly assessed truck restrictions at four 
other locations in the Region in Settlement areas. This additional assessment also 
provided staff an opportunity to review and confirm the need for the Region’s Truck 
Route Policy.

2.0 Current Regional Truck Route Policy

Regional Council approved the Truck Route Policy contained in the final report of the 
Kitchener Waterloo Traffic Operations Study on June 13, 1991. This policy states that 
all Regional roads should be truck routes unless there are valid reasons for imposing 
prohibitions or time restrictions on a particular section of road. The policy 
specifically states that a heavy truck prohibition should be considered when the section 
of road was not designed or constructed for heavy truck traffic or long vehicles and that 
once road improvements have been completed that eliminate the deficiencies the 
prohibition/restriction should be removed. The policy also states that time restrictions 
should be considered when the section of road is primarily front-lotted urban residential 
with numerous driveways and a suitable alternate route (less than 50% longer, and not 
more than 4 kilometres longer) is available.

In the event a roadway is restricted for heavy trucks, those trucks that have a bona fide 
destination are legally permissible to travel the roadway. A bona fide destination 
applies to a delivery to or collection from a premise that cannot be reached by any route 
other than the roadway where heavy trucks are prohibited.

The Truck Route Policy is a reflection of the generally accepted principles of providing a 
network of truck routes that permits the safe and efficient movement of goods while
trying to restrict the impact of trucking on unsuitable roadways. The policy reflects the needs of the Region and local municipalities as well as the trucking industry. More importantly, it serves to help maintain economic sustainability and the attractiveness of the Region of Waterloo to businesses seeking to relocate here.

3.0 Existing Conditions on Fountain Street

Fountain Street between King Street and Cherry Blossom Road has a two-lane cross section with a posted speed of 50km/h hour. Fountain Street carries an Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) volume of approximately 32,000 vehicles. The percentage of heavy vehicles that make up the total traffic volume is approximately 1%. Fountain Street between King Street and Cherry Blossom Road is approximately 1.5 kilometres in length.

Fountain Street is comprised of residential properties from south of Highway 401 to King Street and commercial/industrial properties north of Highway 401. There are approximately 15 residential driveways fronting Fountain Street and 9 industrial/commercial properties between King Street and Cherry Blossom Road. It’s important to note that there are an additional 13 industrial/commercial properties fronting Fountain Street between Cherry Blossom Road and Maple Grove Road.

The land use north of Cherry Blossom Road is a key industrial/commercial area. Fountain Street provides an important transportation link between the City of Cambridge, the City of Kitchener and the Township of Woolwich. It further provides access to the Region of Waterloo International Airport, numerous commercial/businesses properties, public institutions and residential properties. In the future, it will be one of the main transportation corridors servicing the area known as the East Side Lands. The East Side Lands encompass approximately 300 net hectares which is designated in the Regional Official Plan for employment use.

Figure 1 illustrates the section of Fountain Street under review and the surrounding area.
4.0 Review of a Truck Prohibition on Fountain Street

Regional staff reviewed the potential for a full time prohibition and a time of day restriction to heavy trucks along Fountain Street between King Street and Cherry Blossom Road in accordance with the Region’s Truck Route Policy.

4.1 Full Time Prohibition

Valid reasons for a prohibition of heavy trucks along a Regional road include:

- The section of roadway was not designed or constructed for heavy truck traffic; or
- There are critical height or weight restrictions on the section of roadway.
Fountain Street between King Street and Cherry Blossom Road currently does not have any critical height or weight restrictions and was designed and constructed for use of heavy trucks.

4.2 Time of Day Restrictions

Valid reasons for time of day restrictions of heavy trucks along a Regional road include:

- When the section of road is primarily front-lotted urban residential with numerous driveways; and
- A suitable alternate route (less than 50% longer, and not more than 4 kilometres longer) is available.

As previously noted, Fountain Street is comprised of residential properties from south of Highway 401 to King Street and commercial/industrial properties north of Highway 401. The adjacent land use along the section of Fountain Street between King Street and Cherry Blossom Road is considered primarily front-lotted urban residential with numerous driveways. It is staff’s practice to consider a section of road as primarily front-lotted when at least 51% of the properties are considered residential.

A prohibition or restriction for heavy trucks along Fountain Street between King Street and Cherry Blossom Road would result in the redistribution of approximately 312 heavy trucks (1% of AADT). It’s important to note that when reviewing an alternate route for heavy trucks, the Region is obligated to find a route using Regional roads and not local municipal or provincial roadways because Regional roads are constructed and maintained to carry heavy trucks and because the other road authorities have advised us not to use their roads to accommodate detours and alternate routes.

Depending on direction of travel, the following routes illustrated in Figure 2 would likely be utilized to travel to and from the industrial area.
As shown in the above figure, Route 1 to access the industrial lands to the north would be approximately 407% (6.1 kilometres) longer and Route 2 would be approximately 320% (4.8 kilometres) longer compared to using Fountain Street. As per the Region’s Truck Route Policy, a suitable alternate route should be less than 50% longer (and not more than 4 kilometres longer).

When reviewing alternate truck routes it’s also important to be mindful of the residents along the adjacent roadways under consideration that may be affected as they will likely experience an increase in heavy truck traffic. In this case, restricting heavy trucks along Fountain Street between King Street and Cherry Blossom Road would likely increase heavy truck volume along Eagle Street, Speedsville Road, Cherry Blossom Road and
Shantz Hill Road. There are approximately 72 front-lotted residential properties along these roadways that would incur an increase in truck volume. Staff has not consulted with these property owners to date as it is not a current practice to consult with the public when staff recommend to maintain existing conditions. Therefore if Council directs staff to prohibit truck traffic on Fountain Street it is recommended that this report be deferred so that staff can consult with affected residents and provide them an opportunity to respond to the proposed changes.

4.3 Existing Operating Speed and Collisions along Fountain Street

Staff was not able to obtain the average travel speed of heavy trucks along Fountain Street between King Street and Cherry Blossom Road because this section of Fountain Street is currently closed to through traffic due to the removal of the Highway 401 overpass by the Ministry of Transportation.

A review of the collision history (2009 to 2013) does not indicate any unusual collisions involving heavy trucks along Fountain Street between King Street and Cherry Blossom Road. The review shows that there have been 2 collisions involving heavy trucks during this 5-year period. Both of the collisions were minor in nature and occurred at the intersection of King Street and Fountain Street. One of the collisions was caused by a westbound truck driver on King Street turning left onto Fountain Street from the incorrect lane. The other collision was caused by a truck driver making a left turn from Fountain Street onto King Street and colliding with a northbound motorist.

5.0 Truck Restriction Requests on Other Regional Roads

Staff receives numerous requests to restrict heavy trucks along Regional roads. Typically, requests are often received to restrict heavy trucks along Regional roads within the Region’s Settlement areas because of concerns including noise, speed and safety. The following locations are often requested for truck restrictions, but are not limited to:

- Village of New Dundee (Bridge Street and Queen Street);
- Village of Ayr (Northumberland Street and Swan Street);
- Village of Conestogo (Sawmill Road); and
- Town of Elmira (Arthur Street).

5.1 Village of New Dundee

In April 2015, staff received a letter from a concerned resident noting that drivers of heavy trucks who pass through New Dundee to access Highway 7/8 and Highway 401 should be provided an alternate route. A copy of the correspondence received from the resident is also included in Appendix A.
Staff also received a petition with 321 signatures from residents in New Dundee supporting a truck restriction on both Queen Street and Bridge Street. A copy of the petition is available upon request.

On April 16, 2015 staff received a letter from a resident of New Dundee regarding report TES-TRP-15-03, Reduced Speed Limits in School Zones. In summary, the resident noted that he was a truck advocate representing residents and does not feel speed is a concern through the Village and cited his dismay to restrict trucks in New Dundee. The resident noted that a ban on truck traffic through New Dundee would be precedent setting for all small communities in Ontario. A copy of the resident’s letter is provided in Appendix A.

5.2 Village of Ayr

Through reviewing the proposed design along Northumberland Street and Swan Street in 2014, staff received numerous concerns regarding heavy truck traffic within the Village of Ayr. Some residents of Ayr were requesting that trucks be prohibited and that a truck by-pass around the Village of Ayr be considered.

5.3 Village of Conestogo

In October 2011, staff arranged a Public Consultation Centre (PCC) for residents within the Village of Conestogo. The purpose of the PCC was to provide proposed design options for Sawmill Road. Through the PCC, staff received concerns from residents regarding the heavy truck traffic and was requested to consider a truck prohibition or a truck by-pass. More recently, Township Council has raised concerns regarding heavy trucks along Sawmill Road and has requested a truck prohibition along Sawmill Road through the Village of Conestogo.

5.4 Town of Elmira

Recently, the Township of Woolwich has also requested the Region consider a by-pass around Elmira. A by-pass around Elmira could potentially reduce heavy truck volumes past residential properties on Arthur Street between Listowel Road and Church Street. To address this request from the Township, staff will be considering an “Elmira By-pass” as part of the upcoming update to the Region’s Transportation Master Plan, commencing in late 2015.

5.5 Assessment of Potential Truck Prohibition and Other Issues in Settlement Areas

As with the Fountain Street review, staff also reviewed the potential for heavy truck prohibitions on Regional roads within the above noted Settlement areas. In all cases, an alternate truck route circumnavigating the above Settlement areas using alternative Regional roads would result in a route for drivers of heavy trucks that would be more
than 50% longer than the existing route.

Another main concern often cited is noise likely due to the use of engine brakes. Currently, there are no provincial regulations (Highway Traffic Act) to effectively discourage noise as a result of motorists using their engine brakes due to risk implications.

In an effort to minimize the use of engine brakes, staff currently has a practice of using signs (Please Avoid Use of Engine Brakes) to discourage their use. Because engine braking is typically used to slow down a vehicle on grades, “Please Avoid Use of Engine Brake” signs are considered, upon request, on Regional Roads where the grade of the road exceeds 4% for a road length of 100 metres and there are residential properties within 200 metres. The use of “Please Avoid Use of Engine Brake” signs have no legal authority but are used to discourage use of engine brakes and to remind truck drivers to be mindful of impacts to residents.

6.0 Operating Speeds and Collision History in Settlement Areas

To further address the main concerns about heavy trucks in the aforementioned Settlement areas, staff reviewed the average travel speeds of heavy trucks along Regional roads within the above Settlement areas. Table 1 summarizes the results of the speed surveys.

Table 1 – Summary of Heavy Truck Speed Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Posted Speed</th>
<th>Heavy Trucks Surveyed</th>
<th>Average Speed of Heavy Trucks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queen Street between North Street and Kurt Place, New Dundee</td>
<td>50km/h</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45 km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Street between Cedar Crescent and Meadowbrook Court New Dundee</td>
<td>50km/h</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41 km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland Street between Hall Street and Bute Street, Ayr</td>
<td>50km/h</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39 km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan Street between Fowler Street and Mitchell Street, Ayr</td>
<td>50km/h</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30 km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawmill Road between Flax Mill Drive and Evening Star, Conestogo</td>
<td>40km/h</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>48 km/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Street between Park Street and Wyatt Street, Elmira</td>
<td>50km/h</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33 km/h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the speed studies clearly indicate that in all but one case, truck drivers on
average are travelling well below the current posted speed limit on Regional roads through settlement areas.

A review of the collisions along the Regional roads within the above Settlement areas does not show any unusual collision patterns related to heavy trucks. Table 2 summarizes the 5-year collision history along Regional Roads within the above Settlement areas. It should be noted that of the total collisions involving heavy trucks (10) only 1 collision included an injury which was noted as minor, the remaining collisions were noted as property damage only. The 6 collisions on Arthur Street may be attributed to the higher truck volumes along this stretch of road in comparison with the other locations.

Table 2 – Summary of 5-year Collision History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queen Street between Bridge Street and Water Street, New Dundee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Street between Queen Street and Trussler Road, New Dundee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland Street between Stanley Street and Greenfield Road, Ayr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley Street between Northumberland Street and Swan Street, Ayr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan Street, between Stanley Street and Hilltop Drive, Ayr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawmill Road between Misty River and Musselman Crescent Conestogo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Street between Listowel Road and Church Street, Elmira</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.0 Recommendations

7.1 Fountain Street Recommendations

After a review of Fountain Street between King Street and Cherry Blossom Road, staff recommends that this roadway remain permissive to heavy trucks for the following reasons:

- A restriction of heavy trucks on Fountain Street between Cherry Blossom Road and King Street would not adhere to the Region’s Truck Route Policy given that:
  - a) The section of roadway was designed and constructed for heavy truck or long vehicles;
  - b) There are no critical height or weight restrictions on the section of roadway;
  - c) There is no suitable alternate route less than 50% longer;
• Imposing a restriction could result in driver confusion and inconvenience;

• Permitting heavy trucks will better serve the industrial properties in the area and provides a logical truck route; and

• A restriction along Fountain Street will likely increase heavy truck traffic on adjacent roadways affecting approximately 72 residential properties versus 15 properties on Fountain Street.

7.2 Recommendations Regarding Other Settlement Areas

Similar to Fountain Street, a restriction of heavy trucks along the Regional roads within the settlement area’s would not adhere to the Region’s Truck Route Policy given that:

• The sections of roadway were designed and constructed for heavy truck or long vehicles;

• There are no critical height or weight restrictions on the sections of roadway;

• There are no suitable alternate routes less than 50% longer;

• Imposing a restriction could result in driver confusion and inconvenience; and

• Permitting heavy trucks will better serve the industrial properties in the area and provides a logical truck route.

Those residents and parties with an interest in heavy truck traffic through the Village of New Dundee, including the proponent of the petition, have been notified of this report.

Through Public Consultation Centres, those residents concerned with heavy truck traffic through the Village of Ayr and Conestogo have been informed of the Region’s Truck Policy and that a prohibition or restriction through these Settlement areas does not meet the Regions Truck Route Policy.

Through the Region’s update to the Transportation Master Plan, commencing in late 2015, the Region will be considering an Elmira Bypass. Through this review, residents of Elmira will have an opportunity to provide comments regarding heavy truck traffic through Elmira.

7.3 Current Truck Route Policy

Staff supports the current Truck Route Policy because it provides a balanced approach to considering truck prohibitions/restrictions on Regional roads. The Region needs to maintain an efficient network of roads for the movement of goods in order to maintain economic stability and to help attract new businesses to the area. Keeping trucks on Regional roads in also essential to move goods in a safe manner and to help prevent heavy trucks from using local roads.
Corporate Strategic Plan:

This report addresses the Region’s goal to optimize existing road capacity to safely manage traffic throughout Waterloo Region (Strategic Objective 3.2).

Financial Implications:

Nil

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Appendix A – Copy of Correspondences

Prepared By: Patricia Heft, Engineering Technologist (Traffic)

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
April 16, 2015

From: Grant & Heather Poll

Pages - 4 including cover sheet

Please distribute a copy of the following sheets to The Regional Chair, and to each Regional Council Member

With Thanks!!

[Name redacted]

Grant Poll
April 16, 2015

From: Grant & Heather Poll

To: Regional Chair and Regional Council Members

Re: Reduced speed limits in school zones

I am sending this by fax as unfortunately I cannot attend Regional Council meetings to present this in person.

At the Township of Wilmot Council meeting on February 9, 2015, I represented the Pro Truck residents in and around New Dundee in regards to safety and truck traffic going through New Dundee. This representation is not only people involved in trucking business, but were local residents, some who live only doors away from the school.

It is our opinion that no matter what the speed limit is posted in school zones, there will always be those drivers who speed. We feel this movement in regards to safety in New Dundee is more about traffic noise past some residents front door then safety. Indeed, we wonder how many of these same people have received a speeding ticket in our own village?

We fully support and appreciate Bob Henderson and the Regional Staff who have studied traffic through the school zones and agree that no changes need to be made.

The following pages is my presentation to Township of Wilmot Council.

Thanks! Grant and Heather Poll
Good evening Mayor Las Armstrong and Wilmot Township Council. My name is Grant Poll, owner of Poll Transport Inc. located north of the village of New Dundee. I am here tonight representing the Pro Truck residents of New Dundee and surrounding area, so our voice will be heard.

I have lived in or north of New Dundee most of my 57 years. The Poll family has had trucks leaving this property north of New Dundee since 1947, and to my knowledge there has never been a truck at fault accident in New Dundee during this time.

Back when I was a child the New Dundee Creamery had trucks coming & going 7 days a week, the local Feed Mill had tractors and trucks coming and going during harvest season through the down town, and our Community grew up around it. We called this progress - people were finding jobs and making a better life for themselves and their families. Before the expressway was built, Regional Rd. 12, or Queen and Bridge St. was the main route for all traffic coming from Goderich, Exeter, Stratford, and St Mary's and beyond to get to the 401 corridor. All children from grades 1-8 who lived in New Dundee, walked or rode their bike to school, with very few poorly built sidewalks. Parents or Grandparents driving their children to school was unheard of. We were taught to look both ways and stay off the roads. What a concept!

We are all concerned about the safety of our children and all residents of New Dundee. We thank the Township of Wilmot and Region of Waterloo for the huge improvements on Bridge St. with widening of the road, full bike lanes, curbs and sidewalks on both sides of Bridge St. out past the old park. With these improvements, Queen and Bridge St. have never been safer. We don’t see any safety issue with trucks travelling through the village, in fact, it has been observed by Town Folk, that they think trucks slow traffic down through the village. Statistics would show, cars and pickup trucks are the ones speeding past through town.

If a truck ban would be implemented, how would the Region of Waterloo want me to get from my yard to the 401 corridor? Alternate routes would have me travelling on Township roads which are not designed for big truck volume traffic. They are too narrow, not designed for any significant weight volumes, plus turning onto Trussler Rd. is too tight and would not be safe at busy times of the day. Also, the town of Mannheim does not need to see more trucks in their village as Ottawa St. and Trussler Rd is already congested! If a full truck ban in New Dundee would be implemented, this will set a precedent for all communities across Ontario. With just in time delivery, how will trucks efficiently deliver their goods. We should be so thankful that we live in a province that has jobs to go to, manufacturing etc. taking place and that there are products to move.

We are not convinced the 5 way stop has made our town safer. However, with traffic having to stop, I'm sure it is noisier. If you buy a home on any main street in any village, you should expect some noise associated with living on a main road. As a trucking community we do not see trucks as being a safety issue, and are asking the Twp. of Wilmot and Region of Waterloo to reconsider the No Truck signs on Hallman Rd. and Queen St South in New Dundee and replacing the stop sign back to a yield sign.

I own a small trucking company. In 2013 between my fuel tax and licenses I paid approx. $108,000 to travel the roads of Ontario. I do not believe it is warranted for the Township or the Region to spend
millions of dollars to upgrade other existing roads, when we already have the best, most efficient and safest thoroughfare. If you have it – a truck brought it! Thanks.
First, a few

Getting the Truck Counts. From the past 72 hours.

When the Region of Waterloo asked for input into the proposed all-way stop, 320 residents in the New Dundee area signed the petition and this was submitted to the Region. The petition said that the undersigned were:
- in favour of the all-way stop on Bridge and Queen
- asked for the Region of Waterloo to Restrict Transient trucks from going through New Dundee.

Again, 320 people signed this petition, that is a major representation of New Dundee.

There was no mention of BANNING trucks on RR12 as Local trucks are not the problem, but that the Transient Trucks going from the 401 to the 7/8 expressway could use alternate routes.

Lowering the speed zone in front of the school and in front of the library like our Counsellor Al Junker suggested in his election campaign is a good start.

There are alternate routes that the township and the Region could look at to solve the truck problem outlined here.

Redirect down Trussler. Huron Road (there are 18 houses on Huron), where as there are 75-90 through New Dundee, a School, A Public Library, Ice Rink, Public Parks, etc.

I think that further discussion on this is needed and I look forward to it.

Thank you
Saturday, February 7, 2015 from 3:39am-3:53am

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Who?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-11</td>
<td>3:39am-3:53am</td>
<td>? (11 Total in this 14 minute period)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Saturday, February 7, 2015 from 3:53am-5:06am

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Who?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-34</td>
<td>3:54am-5:06am</td>
<td>? (23 Total in this 72 minute period)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEW DUNDEE (Queen/Bridge)

TRUCK TRAFFIC Stats/Info/Count

Monday, February 9, 2015 from 8:45am-9:45am

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Who?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8:46</td>
<td>Unknown/Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8:46</td>
<td>Unknown/Unclear &gt; “OVERSIZED LOAD”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8:47</td>
<td>Erb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8:50</td>
<td>Atlantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8:51</td>
<td>Unknown/Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8:55</td>
<td>Western Logistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9:01</td>
<td>Unknown/Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9:08</td>
<td>Unknown/Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9:17</td>
<td>Cargill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9:18</td>
<td>OMEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>9:22</td>
<td>Dawn Lee Trucking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9:22</td>
<td>Unknown/Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>9:27</td>
<td>Unknown/Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9:27</td>
<td>Progressive Recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>9:29</td>
<td>Client Transport Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>9:36</td>
<td>K-Dac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>9:38</td>
<td>Essroc Ready Mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>9:39</td>
<td>Essroc Ready Mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>9:45</td>
<td>Day &amp; Ross</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Restrict trucks that are not local
- stop sign/2way stop
- restricting transit trucks.
Region of Waterloo

Planning Development and Legislative Services

Legal Services

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

Date: August 11, 2015   File Code: L07-90

Subject: Authorization to Expropriate Lands (2nd Report) for Sawmill Road (Regional Road 17) Road Improvements, Conestogo, Township of Woolwich

Recommendation:

That Council of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the expropriation of lands for the purpose of reconstruction of Sawmill Road from the Conestogo Bridge to Musselman Crescent in the Township of Woolwich, in the Region of Waterloo as detailed in report PDL-LEG-15-54 dated August 11, 2015, described as follows:

Fee Simple Partial Taking:

1. Part of Lots 13 and 14, North of King Street and East of Water Street, Registered Plan 601, Township of Woolwich, being Part 2 on 58R-18001; Part of PIN 22240-0207(LT) (1778 Sawmill Road, Conestogo);

2. Part of Lots 12 and 13, North of King Street and East of Water Street, Registered Plan 601, Township of Woolwich, being Part 1 on 58R-18001; Part of PIN 22240-0206(LT) (1786 Sawmill Road, Conestogo);

3. Part of Lot 6, Registered Plan 600, Township of Woolwich, being Part 3 on 58R-18199; Part of PIN 22705-0407(LT) (1959 Sawmill Road, Conestogo);

4. Part of Lot 4, Registered Plan 602, Township of Woolwich, being Part 2 on 58R-18199; Part of PIN 22240-0098(LT) (1966 Sawmill Road, Conestogo);
5 Part of Lots 7 and 8, Registered Plan 600, Township of Woolwich, being Part 5 on 58R-18199; Part of PIN 22705-0007(LT) (1015 Northfield Drive East, Conestogo);

6 Part of Lot 27, Registered Plan 600, Township of Woolwich, being Part 1 on 58R-18199; Part of PIN 22705-0037(LT) (1030 Northfield Drive East, Conestogo).

Permanent Easement – Utility Pole Anchor:
The right and easement, being an easement in gross, for itself, its successors and assigns and anyone authorized by it, in perpetuity to, at any time enter upon the following properties for purposes of constructing, laying down, installing, inspecting, repairing, altering, enlarging, replacing, correcting, operating, and maintaining hydro installations and infrastructure, both under ground and overhead, including cables, pipes, conduits of all kinds, all necessary poles, supporting wires and braces and other equipment and appurtenances thereto, herein referred to as the utility plant, which may be determined necessary from time to time through, over, upon, along and across the lands, and for all such purposes together with the free, unimpeded and unobstructed access for itself, its successors and assigns, servants, agents, contractors, workmen and anyone authorized by it, and vehicles, supplies and equipment at all times and for all purposes and things necessary for or incidental to the exercise and enjoyment of the right and easement:

1 Part of Lot 6, Registered Plan 600, Township of Woolwich, being Part 4 on 58R-18199; Part of PIN 22705-0407(LT) (1959 Sawmill Road, Conestogo);

And that staff be instructed to register a Plan of Expropriation for the property within three months of the granting of the approval to expropriate the property, as required by the “Expropriations Act”;

And that the registered owners be served with a Notice of Expropriation and a Notice of Possession for the property after the registration of the Plan of Expropriation and the Regional Solicitor is authorized to take any and all actions required to enforce such Notices including but not limited to any application pursuant to Section 40 of the “Expropriations Act”;

And that all above-referenced fee simple partial takings situated adjacent to an existing Regional public highway be acquired for road widening purposes and therefore be deemed to form part of the adjacent public highway in accordance with subsection 31(6) of the Municipal Act, 2001, S. O. 2001, c.25;
And that if no agreement as to compensation is made with an owner, the statutory Offer of Compensation and payment be served upon the registered owners of the property in the amount of the market value of the interests in the land as estimated by the Region’s appraiser in accordance with the Expropriations Act;

And Further That the Regional Solicitor be authorized to discontinue expropriation proceedings or any part thereof, in respect of the above described lands, or any part thereof, upon the registration on title of the required documentation to complete the transaction or if determined by the Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services that such lands, or any part or interest thereof, are not required for the subject Project.

Summary:

NIL

Report:

Regional Council approved the Recommended Design Alternative for improvements to Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive in the Village of Conestogo as described in Report No. E-13-038. (Please refer to Appendix “A” for a Key Plan.) These road improvements are currently scheduled for construction in 2017 in the Region’s approved 2015 Transportation Capital Program. The Recommended Design Alternative for the improvements to Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive includes construction of a new sidewalk on the east side of Northfield Drive between Sawmill Road and Elgin Street and a new sidewalk on the north side of Sawmill Road from Harriet Street to Golf Course Road in order to provide a continuous pedestrian link for residents located within the Village of Conestogo east of the Grand River.

Council approved the commencement of expropriation proceedings of the subject properties and easement on February 24, 2015 as detailed in report PDL-LEG-15-14. The appropriate forms under the Expropriations Act were served in order to initiate formal proceedings under the Act for these properties and easement. All of the affected property owners were previously contacted by Legal Services staff and informed of the project as well as the Region’s intention to commence the expropriation process and the Region’s Expropriation Information Sheet was provided to each of them. The affected property owners or their representatives have also been provided with appraisal reports and/or offers to purchase. To date, negotiations are on-going with all affected owners. An agreement of purchase and sale has been completed with one affected property owner for the acquisition of a partial taking and therefore expropriation proceedings have been discontinued in respect of that property.
Land acquisitions as outlined in the Recommendation will be required from six (6) property owners. The acquisitions are fee simple partial takings for road widening purposes. A permanent utility pole anchor easement for Hydro is also required over one of the properties.

The owners and representatives for all of the subject properties have been contacted to discuss the Region’s property requirements. As well, they have been advised of the Region’s intention to continue the expropriations process in order to undertake utility relocations and ensure that the construction timeline is maintained, including this report being presented to Council, as detailed in the Region’s Expropriation Information Sheet. Communications included the assurance that, notwithstanding the commencement of the expropriation process, Regional staff and Regional representatives will make every effort to complete negotiated agreements of purchase and sale by summer 2015, and thereafter, continue to negotiate amicable settlement agreements for all interests acquired through expropriation. Previous written correspondence to the owners and their representatives has included information sheets on the Region’s property acquisition process and the expropriation.

The Region did not receive a notice for a Hearing of Necessity within the statutory time frame established by the Expropriations Act from any of the affected property owners which has allowed for the Region to proceed with the expropriation process.

Upon Council approval of the expropriation of the properties and easement, such approval will be endorsed upon on a certificate of approval on the Plan of Expropriation for those properties not acquired under agreement. The Plan will then be registered within three months of the approval. Ownership of the property vests with the Region upon the registration of the Plan. Notices of Expropriation and Notices of Possession are then served upon all registered owners, including tenants as shown on the assessment roll. The Region will take possession of the required lands at least 3 months after service of the Notice of Possession.

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

The expropriation of the lands is on an “as is” basis and upon closing the Region assumes all responsibility for the lands.
A list of the corporate owners of the fee simple interest in the subject lands is attached as Appendix “B”. Regional staff has conducted corporate profile searches of affected corporate property owners and the directors and officers are listed for each. This list does not include tenants, easement holders or holders of security interests in the subject lands.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

One of the focus areas of the Corporate Strategic Plan is to develop greater, more sustainable and safe transportation choices.

**Financial Implications:**

Transportation and Environmental Services staff advises that the Region’s approved 2015 Transportation Capital Program includes funds of $5,080,000 in years 2015 to 2018 inclusive in order to complete construction of improvements to Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive in the Village of Conestogo to be funded from the Roads Rehabilitation Reserve Fund. Sufficient funding for the acquisitions outlined within this report is available in the project budget.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Transportation and Environmental Services staff has been consulted in the preparation of this Report.

**Attachments**

Appendix “A”

- Key Plan
- Partial Takings at Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive
- Partial Takings at Sawmill Road and Harriet Street

Appendix “B”

- Corporate Profile of Corporate Owner of 1959 Sawmill Road, Conestogo

**Prepared By:**  Brian Timm, Property Agent

**Approved By:**  Debra Arnold, Regional Solicitor, Director of Legal Services
Appendix “A”

REGIONAL ROAD No. 17 (SAWMILL ROAD) AND REGIONAL ROAD No. 22 (NORTHFIELD DRIVE) IMPROVEMENTS VILLAGE OF CONESTOGO, TOWNSHIP OF WOOLWICH
Appendix “A” - Continued

Partial Takings at Sawmill Road and Northfield Drive
Appendix “A” - Continued

Partial Takings at Sawmill Road and Harriet Street
Appendix “B”

Address: 1959 Sawmill Road, Conestogo
Owner: 2088879 Ontario Ltd.
Annual Return: July 5, 2014
Directors/Officers: Raymond Kuntz, Bonnie Kuntz
Region of Waterloo
Planning Development and Legislative Services
Legal Services

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

Date: August 11, 2015 File Code: L07-90

Subject: Authorization To Expropriate Lands (2nd Report) For The Reconstruction Of Fountain Street (Regional Road 17) From Shantz Hill Road To King Street West And King Street (Regional Road 8) From Fountain Street To Eagle Street, In The City of Cambridge

Recommendation:

That Council of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the expropriation of lands for the purpose of reconstruction of Fountain Street (Regional Road 17) from Shantz Hill Road to King Street West and King Street West (Regional Road 8) from Fountain Street to Eagle Street, in the City of Cambridge in the Region of Waterloo as detailed in Report PDL-LEG-15-55 dated August 11, 2015, described as follows:

Fee Simple Partial Taking:

1. Part of Lot 13 and Lot 14, Municipal Compiled Plan 731, being Part 1 on Plan 58R-18361, Part of PIN 03769-0131(LT) (340 Shantz Hill Road)
2. Part of Lot 7, Municipal Compiled Plan 731, being Part 1 on Plan 58R-18360, Part of PIN 22651-1027(LT) (311 Shantz Hill Road)
3. Part of Lots 8 and 9 West Side of Fountain Street, Registered Plan 522, being Part 3 on Plan 58R-18325, Part of PIN 22651-0509(LT) (328 Fountain Street South)
4. Part of Lot 16 East of Fountain Street, Registered Plan 522, being Part 1 on Plan 58R-18359, Part of PIN 03774-0494 (LT) (329 Fountain Street South)
5. Part of Lot 15 East of Fountain Street, Registered Plan 522, being Part 4 on Plan 58R-18359, Part of PIN 03774-0492(LT) (309 Fountain Street South)
6. Part of Lots 14 and 15 East of Fountain Street, Registered Plan 522, being Part 6 on Plan 58R-18359, Part of PIN 03774-0491(LT) (299 Fountain Street South)
7. Part of Lots 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 East of Fountain Street, Registered Plan 522, being Part 1 on Plan 58R-18364, Part of PIN 03774-0489(LT) (239-255 Fountain Street South)

8. Part of Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 East of Fountain Street, Registered Plan 522, Part of Lot 21, Municipal Compiled Plan 730, being Part 1 on Plan 58R-18324, Part of PIN 03774-0486(LT) (115 Fountain Street South)

9. Part of Lot 21, Municipal Compiled Plan 730, being Part 8 on Plan 58R-18324, Part of PIN 03774-0530(LT) (250 King Street West)

10. Part of Lot 23, Municipal Compiled Plan 730, Part of Lots 25 and 26, Municipal Compiled Plan 730, being Parts 1, 2 and 5 on Plan 58R-18369, being Part of PIN 03774-1129(LT) (140 King Street West)

11. Part of Lot 14, Municipal Compiled Plan 730, being Parts 11 and 12 on Plan 58R-18369, Part of PIN 03768-0083(LT) (149 King Street West)

12. Part of Lots 10, 11, 12, and 13, Municipal Compiled Plan 730, being Parts 13, 14, and 15 on Plan 58R-18369, Part of PIN 03768-0258(LT) (157 King Street West)

13. Part of Lot 2, Municipal Compiled Plan 730, being Part 1 on Plan 58R-18329, Part of PIN 03769-0213(LT) (144 Fountain Street North)

14. Part of Lots 1 and 2, Registered Plan 87, being Part 1 on Plan 58R-18367, Part of PIN 03777-0210(LT) (361 King Street East)

15. Part of Lot 9, Registered Plan 87, being Part 3 on Plan 58R-18367, Part of PIN 03777-0103(LT) (329 King Street East)

16. Part of Lots 8 and 9, Registered Plan 87, Part of Lot 63, Municipal Compiled Plan 729, being Part 5 on Plan 58R-18367, Part of PIN 03777-0003(LT) (303 King Street East)

17. Part of Lot 6, Registered Plan 522, being Part 1 on Plan 58R-18368, Part of PIN 03776-0029(LT) (246 King Street East)

**Temporary Easement:**

The right and easement, being a temporary easement in gross, for the free and unobstructed, right, interest and easement terminating on the 31st day of December, 2019, for itself, its successors and assigns, and anyone authorized by it, on over, under and through the following properties for the purposes of excavation, construction, installation, replacement, alteration, grading, and landscaping as required in connection with the reconstruction and improvements to Fountain Street (Regional Road 17) and King Street (Regional Road 8) and Shantz Hill Road, and all works ancillary thereto and for such purposes, the free, unimpeded and unobstructed access to the lands at all times by employees, agents, contractors, workers and anyone authorized by it, and vehicles, supplies and equipment at all times and for all purposes and things necessary for or incidental to the exercise and enjoyment of the right and easement.

1. Part of Lot 13 and Lot 14, Municipal Compiled Plan 731, being Part 2, 3, and 4 on Plan 58R-18361, Part of PIN 03769-0131(LT) (340 Shantz Hill Road)

2. Part of Lot 7, Municipal Compiled Plan 731, being Part 2 on Plan 58R-18360, Part of PIN 22651-1027(LT) (311 Shantz Hill Road)
3. Part of Lot 8, West Side of Fountain Street, Registered Plan 522, being Part 1 on Plan 58R-18325, Part of PIN 22651-0509(LT) (328 Fountain Street South)
4. Part of Lot 16 East of Fountain Street, Registered Plan 522, being Part 2 on Plan 58R-18359, Part of PIN 03774-0494 (LT) (329 Fountain Street South)
5. Part of Lot 15 East of Fountain Street, Registered Plan 522, being Part 5 on Plan 58R-18359, Part of PIN 03774-0492(LT) (309 Fountain Street South)
6. Part of Lots 14 and 15, East of Fountain Street, Registered Plan 522, being Part 7 on Plan 58R-18359, Part of PIN 03774-0491(LT) (299 Fountain Street South)
7. Part of Lots 13 and 14, East of Fountain Street, Registered Plan 522, being Part 8 on Plan 58R-18359, Part of PIN 03774-0490 (LT) (285 Fountain Street South)
8. Part of Lots 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 East of Fountain Street, Registered Plan 522, being Part 2 on Plan 58R-18364, Part of PIN 03774-0489(LT) (239-255 Fountain Street South)
9. Part of Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 East of Fountain Street, Registered Plan 522, Part of Lot 21, Municipal Compiled Plan 730, being Parts 2, 4 and 5 on Plan 58R-18324, Part of PIN 03774-0486(LT) (115 Fountain Street South)
10. Part of Lot 21 and 22, Municipal Compiled Plan 730, being Parts 6, 7, 9, and 10 on Plan 58R-18324, being Part of PIN S 03774-0530(LT) and 03774-0485(LT) (250 King Street West)
11. Part of Lots 23 and 24, Municipal Compiled Plan 730, Part of Lots 24, 25 and 26, Municipal Compiled Plan 730, being Parts 3 and 4 on Plan 58R-18369, Part of PIN 03774-1129(LT) (140 King Street West)
12. Part of Lot 14, Municipal Compiled Plan 730, being Parts 7 and 8 on Plan 58R-18369, Part of PIN 03768-0083(LT) (149 King Street West)
13. Part of Lots 10, 11, 12, and 13, Municipal Compiled Plan 730, Part of Lot 2 North of Main, Registered Plan 522, Being Parts 9 and 10 on Plan 58R-18369, Part of PIN 03768-0258(LT) (157 King Street West)
14. Part of Lot 4 East of Woolwich Street, Registered Plan 522, being Part 6 on Plan 58R-18330, Part of PIN 03768-0080(LT) (153 Fountain Street North)
15. Part of Lot 4 and 5 East of Woolwich Street, Registered Plan 522, being Part 7 on Plan 58R-18330, being Part of PIN 03768-0079(LT) (155 Fountain Street North)
16. Part of Lot 5 East of Woolwich Street, Registered Plan 522, being Part 8 on Plan 58R-18330, Part of PIN 03768-0078(LT) (163 Fountain Street North)
17. Part of Lot 6, East of Woolwich Street, Registered Plan 522, being Part 9 on Plan 58R-18330, Part of PIN 03768-0077(LT) (169 Fountain Street North)
18. Part of Lots 8 and 9, Registered Plan 87, Part of Lot 63, Municipal Compiled Plan 729, being Part 6 on Plan 58R-18367, Part of PIN 03777-0003(LT) (303 King Street East)
19. Part of Lots 5 and 6, Registered Plan 522, being Part 2 on Plan 58R-18368, Part of PIN 03776-0029(LT) (246 King Street East)
20. Part of Lot A, Registered Plan 91, being Part 1 on Plan 58R-18366, Part of PIN 03776-0049(LT) (310-328 King Street East)
Permanent Easement:

The right and easement, being an easement in gross, for itself, its successors and assigns and anyone authorized by it, in perpetuity to, at any time enter upon the following properties for purposes of constructing, installing, inspecting, repairing, altering, enlarging, correcting, operating, maintaining, replacing, and reconstructing the adjacent highway, above ground and underground municipal services including without limitation paving, curbs and gutters, retaining wall structures, sidewalks, multi-use trails, boulevard landscaping, street lighting, traffic signals, sanitary sewers, storm sewers, water mains, culverts, catch basins, drains, drainage works, together with all pipes, wires, conduits, poles, markers and other works and appurtenances thereto, which may be determined necessary from time to time through, under, over, upon, along and across the lands, and for all such purposes together with the free, unimpeded and unobstructed access for itself, its successors and assigns, servants, agents, contractors, workers and anyone authorized by it, and vehicles, supplies and equipment at all times and for all purposes and things necessary for or incidental to the exercise and enjoyment of the right and easement.

1. Part of Lots 8 and 9, Registered Plan 522, being Part 2 on Plan 58R-18325, Part of PIN 22651-0509(LT) (328 Fountain Street South)
2. Part of Lots 1 and 2 East of Fountain Street, Registered Plan 522, Part of Lot 21, Municipal Compiled Plan 730, being Part 3 on Plan 58R-18324, Part of PIN 03774-0486(LT) (115 Fountain Street South)
3. Part of Lot 22, Municipal Compiled Plan 730, being Parts 11 and 12 on Plan 58R-18324 and Part 5 on Plan 58R-18365, Part of PIN 03774-0485(LT) (250 King Street West)
4. Part of Lots 25 and 26, Municipal Compiled Plan 730, being Part 6 on Plan 58R-18369, Part of PIN 03774-1129(LT) (140 King Street West)
5. Part of Lot 2, Registered Plan 87, being Part 2 on Plan 58R-18367, Part of PIN 03777-0210(LT) (361 King Street East)
6. Part of Lot 9, Registered Plan 87, being Part 4 on Plan 58R-18367, Part of PIN 03777-0103(LT) (329 King Street East)

And That staff be instructed to register a Plan of Expropriation for the property within three months of the granting of the approval to expropriate the property, as required by the “Expropriations Act”;

And That the registered owners be served with a Notice of Expropriation and a Notice of Possession for the property after the registration of the Plan of Expropriation and the Regional Solicitor is authorized to take any and all actions required to enforce such Notices including but not limited to any application pursuant to Section 40 of the “Expropriations Act”;
And that all above-referenced fee simple partial takings situated adjacent to an existing Regional public highway be acquired for road widening purposes and therefore be deemed to form part of the adjacent public highway in accordance with subsection 31(6) of the Municipal Act, 2001, S. O. 2001, c.25;

And That if no agreement as to compensation is made with an owner, the statutory Offer of Compensation and payment be served upon the registered owners of the property in the amount of the market value of the interests in the land as estimated by the Region’s appraiser in accordance with the Expropriations Act;

And Further That the Regional Solicitor be authorized to discontinue expropriation proceedings or any part thereof, in respect of the above described lands, or any part thereof, upon the registration on title of the required documentation to complete the transaction or if determined by the Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services that such lands, or any part or interest thereof, are not required for the subject Project.

Summary:

NIL

Report:

Regional Council approved the reconstruction of Fountain Street (Regional Road 17) from Shantz Hill Road to King Street West and King Street (Regional Road 8) from Fountain Street to Eagle Street, in the City of Cambridge (the “Project”) in October 2012. The Environmental Assessment (EA) was approved by the Ministry of the Environment in August 2013. The Project EA investigated the need to address roadway and traffic operational improvements on the Fountain Street and King Street corridor and approved intersection improvements including transit queue-jump lanes along with other intersection improvements at the three intersections within the corridor: Fountain Street and King Street; King Street and Eagle Street; and the Fountain Street and Shantz Hill Road intersection. The Fountain Street and Shantz Hill Road intersection will also be realigned. The detailed design of the project is presently underway with construction planned for 2016.

The property interests required to undertake the project include fee simple partial takings and both permanent and temporary easements. Fee simple partial takings will generally be incorporated into the road fabric. The permanent easements are generally required for the construction and ongoing operation and maintenance of Region owned and installed infrastructure such as retaining walls, bridge, culverts. Temporary easements are generally required to accommodate the construction of the road and facilitate grading along the fronting properties in connection with the road improvements.
Expropriation was approved by Council for two primary properties known municipally as 278 Fountain Street South, 255 King Street West at the February 24th, 2015 meeting of the Planning and Works Committee and Council as detailed in report PDL-LEG-15-12. The process was initiated for these two properties, in advance of the interests required from the remaining properties for the project, in order to meet the project time line for utility relocations and grading works associated with those relocations in Fall 2015 or early 2016, which is to take place prior to overall project construction in spring of 2016.

Council approved the commencement of expropriation of the subject properties and easements on November 4, 2014 as detailed in report CR-RS-14-095. The appropriate forms under the Expropriations Act were served in order to initiate formal proceedings under the Act for these properties and easements. All of the affected property owners were previously contacted by Legal Services staff and informed of the project as well as the Region’s intention to commence the expropriation process and the Region’s Expropriation Information Sheet was provided to each of them. The affected property owners have also met with Regional representatives, and been provided with appraisals and/or offers to purchase.

Land acquisitions as set out in the Recommendation are required from 25 property owners and include 17 partial takings, 20 temporary easements for construction, grading and landscaping, and 6 permanent easements required for the construction and ongoing operation and maintenance of Region owned and installed infrastructure such as retaining walls, bridge, culverts. The Region has entered into agreements with 5 owners to acquire 2 partial takings and 4 temporary easements. If these purchase transactions cannot be completed and registered before the registration of the Plan of Expropriation, the agreements will be considered settlement agreements.

The owners or their representatives for all properties have been contacted to discuss the Region’s property requirements. As well, they have been advised, both verbally and in writing, of the necessity of continuing the expropriations process in order to meet project construction timelines with the assurance that, notwithstanding the commencement of the expropriation process, Regional staff and Regional representatives will make every effort to complete negotiated agreements of purchase and sale by the end of 2015, and thereafter continue to negotiate amicable settlement agreements for all interests acquired through expropriation. Written correspondence to the owners and their representatives included information sheets on the Region’s property acquisition process and the expropriation process. Affected property owners have been advised of this report being brought to Planning and Works Committee and Council for approval.
It is noted that lands and interests required from the City of Cambridge for this project are excluded from the expropriation process and are therefore not included in this report. It is anticipated that negotiated agreements can be concluded for these lands and interests in order for the project to proceed.

For reference, the subject lands are shown on attached Appendix ‘A’. A list of the individual and corporate owners of the fee simple interest in the subject lands is attached as Appendix “B”. Regional staff has conducted corporate profile searches of affected corporate property owners and the directors and officers are listed for each. This list does not include tenants, easement holders or holders of security interests in the subject lands.

The Region did not receive a notice for a Hearing of Necessity within the statutory time frame established by the Expropriations Act from any of the affected property owners which has allowed for the Region to proceed with the expropriation process.

Upon Council approval of the expropriation of the properties and easements, such approval will be endorsed upon on a certificate of approval on the Plan of Expropriation for those properties not acquired under agreement. The Plan will then be registered within three months of the approval. Ownership of the property vests with the Region upon the registration of the Plan. Notices of Expropriation and Notices of Possession are then served upon all registered owners, including tenants as shown on the assessment roll. The Region will take possession of the required lands at least 3 months after service of the Notice of Possession.

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

The expropriation of the lands is on an “as is” basis and upon closing the Region assumes all responsibility for the lands.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

One of the focus areas of the Corporate Strategic Plan is to develop greater, more sustainable and safe transportation choices.
Financial Implications:

Transportation and Environmental Services staff advises that the 2015 Ten Year Transportation Capital Program includes $17,340,000 over the years 2015 to 2017 for this project to be funded from the Regional Development Charges Reserve Fund.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Transportation and Environmental Services staff has been consulted in the preparation of this Report.

Attachments

Appendix “A” - Sketches of Subject Properties
Appendix “B” - Corporate Profiles

Prepared By: Brian Timm, Property Agent, Real Estate Services
Approved By: Debra Arnold, Regional Solicitor, Director of Legal Services
Appendix “A”

PROJECT AREA
Address: 115 Fountain Street South  
Owner: Montclair Food Services Inc.  
Annual Return: June 29, 2013  
Directors/ Officers: Lynn St. Clair

Address: 149 King Street West  
Owner: Cole Psychology Professional Corporation  
Annual Return: March 20, 2014  
Directors/ Officers: John David Cole

Address: 328 King Street  
Owner: J-4 Enterprises Limited  
Annual Return: August 2, 2014  
Directors/ Officers: Herbert Johnson, Margaret Johnson, Brian Johnson, and Scott Johnson

Address: 250 King Street West  
Owner: 2106432 Ontario Inc.  
Annual Return: September 6, 2014  
Directors/ Officers: Mohamad Khoramshahi

Address: 285 Fountain Street South  
Owner: T-3 Travel Ltd.  
Annual Return: February 1, 2014  
Directors/ Officers: Robert G. Titcomb, Jerry Van Dyke and Anneka Van Dyke

Address: 328 Fountain Street South  
Owner: 2350022 Ontario Inc.  
Annual Return: November 15, 2012  
Directors/ Officers: Bill Griffin

Address: 144 Fountain Street South  
Owner: Haastown Holdings (Preston) Inc.  
Annual Return: March 3, 2014  
Directors/ Officers: Paul De Haas
Address: 303 King Street East  
Owner: 616101 Ontario Limited  
Annual Return: May 3, 2014  
Directors/ Officers: Jill E. Aebker, Cynthia J. Devine, and William A. Moir

Address: 157 King Street West  
Owner: Atrush Properties Inc.  
Annual Return: April 18, 2009  
Directors/ Officers: Amin Atrach and Camille Atrache

Address: 239-255 Fountain Street South  
Owner: Suncor Energy Inc.  
Annual Return: 2014  

Address: 140 King Street East  
Owner: Parrish & Heimbecker, Limited  
Annual Return: n/a  
Directors/ Officers: James W. Astwood, Alan R. Heimbecker, Robert J. Heimbecker, Kevin L. Klippenstein, William S. Parrish, Robert J. Bryson and William B. Parrish
Region of Waterloo
Corporate Resources
Legal Services

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

Date: August 11, 2015    File Code: L07-90

Subject: Authorization To Expropriate Lands (1st Report) for improvements to Ira Needles Blvd (Regional Road 70) at Erb Street West, City of Waterloo

Recommendation:

That The Regional Municipality of Waterloo direct and authorize the Regional Solicitor to take the following actions with respect to the expropriation of lands for the reconstruction of Ira Needles Blvd at Erb Street West, City of Waterloo, in the Region of Waterloo as detailed in report PDL-LEG-15-59 dated August 11, 2015:

1. Complete application(s) to the Council of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, as may be required from time to time, for approval to expropriate land, which is required for the improvements to Ira Needles Blvd and described as follows:

Fee Simple Partial Taking:

a) Part of Lot 41, German Company Tract, being Parts 2, 3 and 4 on 58R-18609 (650 Erb Street West, Waterloo);

Hydro Easement:

The right and easement, being an easement in gross, for itself, its successors and assigns and anyone authorized by it, in perpetuity to, at any time enter upon the following properties for purposes of constructing, laying down, installing, inspecting, repairing, altering, enlarging, replacing, correcting, operating, and maintaining hydro installations and infrastructure, both under ground and overhead, including cables, pipes, conduits of all kinds, all necessary poles, supporting wires and braces and other equipment and appurtenances thereto, herein referred to as the utility plant, which may be determined necessary from time to time through, over, upon, along and across the lands, and for all such purposes together with the free, unimpeded and unobstructed access for itself, its successors and assigns, servants, agents, contractors, workmen
and anyone authorized by it, and vehicles, supplies and equipment at all times and for all purposes and things necessary for or incidental to the exercise and enjoyment of the right and easement:

a) Part Block 91, Plan 1708 being Part 1 on 58R-18611 (636 Erb Street West, Waterloo);

b) Part of Lot 41, German Company Tract being Part 1 on 58R-18612 (651 Erb Street West, Waterloo);

c) Part of Lot 41, German Company Tract being Parts 1, 5 and 6 on 58R-18609 (650 Erb Street West, Waterloo);

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

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

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

5. Discontinue expropriation proceedings or any part thereof, in respect of the above described lands, or any part thereof, upon the registration on title of the required documentation to complete a transaction whereby the required interests in the lands are conveyed or if determined by the Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services that such lands, or any part or interest thereof, are not required for the subject project; and

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

Summary:

NIL

Report:

The Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Study for Ira Needles Boulevard was originally completed in 1988, recognizing the need for a west side arterial extending from Highway 7/8 to Erb Street to serve the westerly expansion of the Cities of Kitchener and Waterloo. The Class EA Study was updated in 2002 and a Preliminary Design Study was completed in 2004. The Preliminary Design Study identified the preferred ultimate design for Ira Needles Boulevard as a 4-lane urban arterial with cycling lanes, to be constructed initially with two through traffic lanes and cycling lanes. The initial two-lane construction of Ira Needles Boulevard was completed in 2007.

In 2014 the Region completed the first phase of widening Ira Needles Blvd from Highview Drive to the north entrance of the Boardwalk development. The second phase of the widening, scheduled for 2016, from the north entrance of the Boardwalk to Chablis Drive requires some additional property at the Erb Street roundabout to accommodate growth of future developments in the west Waterloo area. These road
improvements include the addition of northbound and southbound by-pass lanes at the roundabout and relocation of a number of hydro poles.

Land acquisitions as outlined in the Recommendation will be required from three (3) property owners. The acquisitions are one fee simple partial taking for road widening purposes and three permanent easements in favour of Waterloo North Hydro Inc. for the relocation of hydro facilities. All of the affected property owners, or their representatives, have been contacted by Legal Services Real Estate staff by one or more of the following means: in-person meeting, telephone, written correspondence and/or e-mail, to discuss the required acquisitions and have been informed of the Region’s intention to commence the expropriation process, including this Report going forward, to ensure project time lines are met. All property owners have been provided with the Region’s Expropriation Information Sheet explaining the expropriation process. A copy of the Expropriation Information Sheet is attached as Appendix “C”. The owners have further been advised it is the Region’s intent to seek a negotiated settlement prior to completion of the expropriation process and that the process has been commenced only to ensure possession of the required lands by the date set by Project staff in order to keep the project timeline in place. To date a negotiated settlement to obtain a permanent easement in favour of Waterloo North Hydro Inc. has been reached with one property owner. As at the writing of this report this transaction has not been completed and the lands are included in this report. Expropriation proceedings will be discontinued in respect of those properties where a negotiated settlement is reached and a conveyance of the required acquisition registered before the expropriation process is complete.

The expropriation of the lands is on an “as is” basis and upon acquisition the Region assumes all responsibility for the lands.

The Project Area is shown attached as Appendix “A”.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

One of the focus areas of the Corporate Strategic Plan is to develop greater, more sustainable and safe transportation choices.

**Financial Implications:**

Transportation and Environmental Services staff advises that the 2015 Ten-year Transportation Capital Program includes funds of $ 5.72 million in the years 2015 to 2017 for this project to be funded from the Regional Development Charges fund. Sufficient funding for the acquisitions outlined within this report is available in the project budget.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Transportation and Environmental Services staff have been consulted in the preparation of this Report.
Attachments

Appendix “A” – Sketch of Subject Lands
Appendix “B” – Corporate Profiles
Appendix “C” – Copy of Expropriation Information Sheet

Prepared By:  Fiona McCrea, Solicitor, Property

Approved By:  Debra Arnold, Regional Solicitor, Director of Legal Services
Appendix “A”
Appendix “B”

1. 636 Erb Street West, Waterloo  
   Owner: Needlewood Glen Housing Co-Operative Inc.  
   Annual Return: August 13, 2014  
   Directors/Officers: Valerie Brady, Diane Carroll, Phillip Cicchirillo, Ruthie Dickson, Sarah Harrison, Richard Lah, Mary Ann Roberts, Belma Rosic, Carrie Waekens  
   Permanent Hydro Easement

2. 651 Erb Street West, Waterloo  
   Owner: Waterloo Commons Shopping Centre Inc.  
   Annual Return: June 21, 2014  
   Directors/Officers: Robyn Collver, Craig Gregory, Eleni Damianakakis, Brian McCammond, Robert Mongeau  
   Permanent Hydro Easement

3. 650 Erb Street West, Waterloo  
   Owner: Canadian Tire Properties Inc.  
   Annual Return: April 5, 2014  
   Directors/Officers: Shawn Goldenberg, Howard Walton  
   Fee Simple Partial Taking and Permanent Hydro Easement
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.
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Design and Construction

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

Date: August 11, 2015  File Code: 01082-H

Subject: Waterloo Landfill South Boundary Well Pumphouse and Stormwater Management Pond 3 Modifications – Consultant Selection

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into an Agreement for Professional Consulting Services with GHD Limited, to provide engineering services during the preliminary and detailed design and services during construction for the Waterloo Landfill South Boundary Well Pumphouse and Stormwater Management Pond 3 Modifications, City of Kitchener, at an upset fee limit of $323,242.58 plus applicable taxes.

Summary:

A Request for Consulting Engineering Services for the Waterloo Landfill South Boundary Well Pumphouse and Stormwater Management Pond 3 Modifications was advertised in the Waterloo Region Record and on the Region’s Purchasing website. A single stage consultant selection process was followed in accordance with the Region’s Purchasing By-Law for assignments of this nature. Following a review and assessment of the detailed submissions, the project evaluation team recommends that GHD Limited (formerly Conestoga-Rovers and Associates Ltd.) of Waterloo, Ontario, be retained to undertake this assignment for a total upset fee of $323,242.58 plus applicable taxes.

Report:

Background

The Region’s Waterloo Landfill is comprised of three separate areas: the original landfill area (OLA), the north expansion area (NEA) and the south expansion area (SEA). The OLA was developed without a liner or leachate containment system, which has resulted
in groundwater contamination. However, the OLA has been retrofitted over time and is now surrounded by perimeter toe and finger drains, and vertical and horizontal extraction wells for leachate collection. All north and south expansion area cells, including four cells in the NEA and seven cells in the SEA, have been or will be constructed with a minimum 2.2 m re-compacted clay liner and leachate collection system overlying the entire base of the cell.

Historical groundwater monitoring has identified vinyl chloride impacts in the groundwater attributable to the OLA. A groundwater extraction system comprised of a number of pumping wells has been in operation since 2001 and has been expanded as necessary to address and remediate the vinyl chloride impacts, specifically in the southeastern portion of the site.

At this time, the Waterloo Landfill requires the design and construction of a new south boundary well pumphouse to improve the existing groundwater extraction system at the south boundary of the landfill that is currently pumping groundwater to Stormwater Management Pond 3 (SWP3). These improvements are required in order to address the vinyl chloride groundwater impacts originating from the OLA. As a result of future increased groundwater extraction requirements, SWP3 modifications are also necessary to receive an increased volume of groundwater. As part of this project, the Region requires construction of a permanent underground discharge from the south extraction wells (that currently discharge to SWP3 via above ground lay flat hosing) to the new well pumphouse and to SWP3.

**Consultant Selection:**

In order to meet the scheduled 2016 construction start date for the proposed work, a multi-disciplinary engineering consultant must be retained now to undertake the design, approvals, tendering, and contract administration for this work. On June 11, 2015, the Region of Waterloo placed advertisements on its website and in the Waterloo Region Record inviting submissions from consultants for preliminary and detailed design and services during construction for the Waterloo Landfill South Boundary Well Pumphouse and Stormwater Management Pond 3 Modifications. The following two proponents submitted a Proposal (detailed Workplan and Upset Fee):

- GHD Limited; and,
- Sco-Terra Consulting Group Limited.

Each detailed Workplan was reviewed by the consultant evaluation team consisting of: Tracy Annett, Senior Environmental Engineer (Waste Management Division), Donna Serrati, Manager of Engineering & Programs (Waste Management Division), and Nancy Corbett, Senior Project Manager, Environmental Engineering (Design and Construction Division). The consultant selection process was carried out in accordance with the
Region of Waterloo's Purchasing Bylaw 04-093 for the procurement of goods and services, and included price as a factor. The evaluation criteria were subdivided into Quality, Equity, and Price factors as follows:

**Quality factors**

- Project Approach and Understanding: 25%
- Experience of the Project Manager: 20%
- Experience of the Project Support Staff: 20%
- Experience on Similar Projects: 15%

**Equity Factors**

- Current Workload for Region: 3%
- Local Office: 2%

**Price Factor**

- Upset Price: 15%

Quality factors assigned during review of the detailed Workplans were reviewed and finalized and then the Upset Fee Envelopes from the two proponents were opened and evaluated.

When considering all Quality, Equity, and Price Factors, the consultant selection team gave the submission from GHD Limited the highest score. GHD's upset fee of $323,242.58 plus applicable taxes was 9.9% below the average of the submissions. GHD’s upset fee represents approximately 26% of the estimated project cost of $1,250,000 and is considered competitive for a capital project of this magnitude, complexity and specific project requirements, which includes preliminary design work and environmental studies to support approvals. Therefore, the project evaluation team recommends that GHD Limited be awarded this assignment for an Upset Fee of $323,242.58 plus applicable taxes.

**Scope of Work**

The scope of work for the consulting assignment for the preliminary and detailed design and services during construction for the Waterloo Landfill South Boundary Well Pumphouse and Stormwater Management Pond 3 Modifications includes the following tasks:

- Task 1: Project initiation, including information gathering and site conditions survey;
- Task 2: Preliminary and detailed design;
• Task 3: Approvals, including pre-consultation review meetings with the Ministry of the Environment and Climate change (MOECC) and the Grand River Conservation Area (GRCA), environmental studies and submission of approval and permit applications;

• Task 4: Tender administration and support;

• Task 5: Contract administration and on-site construction inspection services; and,

• Task 6: Post-construction services.

Schedule

Subject to Council's approval of this assignment, it is anticipated that a project initiation meeting will be held in August of 2015. Preliminary and detailed design will commence in August 2015, approvals applications will be submitted in December 2015, and construction is planned to take place from July to December, 2016, assuming approvals are granted before July 2016.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

Implementation of this project at the Waterloo Landfill is consistent with the Corporate Strategic Plan Objective 1.4, Protect the quality and the quantity of our drinking water sources and Objective 2.2, Develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs.

Financial Implications:

The Region’s approved 2015 Waste Management Capital Forecast provides a total budget of $2,036,000 in projects #01058 (Waterloo Stormwater Management) and #01082 (Waterloo Groundwater Management) in 2015 and 2016 to be funded from debentures. Of this total amount, $1,250,000 has been allocated for the Waterloo Landfill South Boundary Well Pumphouse and Stormwater Management Pond 3 Modifications project. The consultant’s upset fee of $323,242.58 plus applicable taxes is within the budget allowance for engineering work for this project.
Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

NIL

Attachments:

Appendix A: Breakdown of Consultant’s Upset Fees

Prepared By: Nancy Corbett, Senior Project Manager, Design and Construction

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
## Appendix A: Breakdown of Consultant’s Upset Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td>Project initiation</td>
<td>$8,638.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>Preliminary and detailed design</td>
<td>$91,470.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3</td>
<td>Approvals and environmental studies</td>
<td>$65,413.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4</td>
<td>Tender administration and support</td>
<td>$22,246.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5</td>
<td>Contract administration and on-site construction inspection</td>
<td>$124,076.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 6</td>
<td>Post-construction</td>
<td>$11,398.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Upset Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$323,242.58</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region of Waterloo
Transportation And Environmental Services
Transportation

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: August 11, 2015  File Code: T08-50/GEN
Subject: 2014 Traffic Signal Corridor and Signal Timing Review

Recommendation:
For information

Summary:

The Region currently operates 480 traffic control signals. Each year staff review the operation of approximately 90 traffic control signals, with a goal to have all locations reviewed within a five year cycle. Priorities are also set for areas that are currently experiencing operational problems. In reviewing the operation at each location, staff collect data regarding corridor travel time, stops and delays and use this data to implement traffic signal timing changes to reduce delay and improve operational efficiency.

In 2014, 85 traffic control signals were reviewed in four key areas. The areas include East Galt, Maple Grove, Fairway/Weber and some Township locations. Signal timing changes that were done as part of this review resulted in an average travel time reduction of 11% with a reduction as high as 30% on some corridors.

Report:

1.0 Background

Traffic signal progression or coordination of traffic signals within a network is one of the most effective methods of improving the traffic flow. Improvements to traffic flow can provide:

- Improved traffic capacity on roads with closely spaced traffic signals;
- Reduction in overall network travel time and delay;
- Reduction in the overall network number of stops;
- Reduction in collisions; and
- Reduction in noise levels, air pollution and fuel consumption.

The Region currently operates 480 traffic control signals, of which 445 are on a traffic control system and 35 operate independently. The signals that operate independently are generally in the rural areas.

Staff review the operation of approximately 90 traffic control signals each year. Priorities are set for areas that have not had a recent review, have operational problems and or have experienced changes in traffic patterns. Changes can occur due to new developments or the construction of new roads.

Field studies use a Global Positioning System Unit to track repeated staff vehicle movements along arterial roadways and to determine the location, types and extent of traffic delays. Collected data included:

- Travel time - The time it takes to travel from one end of the corridor to the other;
- Stops - The number of stops throughout the corridor;
- Delay - The time that is spent stopped; and
- Speed - The speed that vehicles travel along the corridor.

Staff analyzed the data and implemented traffic signal timing changes to reduce delay and improve operational efficiency. Perfect synchronization for one direction of traffic on a street may result in frequent stops and delays to the other direction. Staff attempts to balance travel times in each direction of all corridors. If balance cannot be achieved, then staff favours the arterial direction with heavier traffic flow by time of day.

2.0 2014 Traffic Signal Corridor Control Areas

In 2014, Traffic Systems staff as part of its annual signals review, reviewed traffic signal coordination and traffic flows for 85 signals in 4 control areas. Figure 1 identifies the 4 signal control areas and Table 1 summarizes the arterials within each signal control area.
Figure 1: 2014 Signal Control Areas
Table 1 – 2014 Signal Control Areas and Arterials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Area Name</th>
<th>Number of Intersections</th>
<th>Corridor Name and Section of Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Galt</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Franklin Boulevard from Clyde Road to Champlain Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Main Street/Concession from Christopher Drive to Dundas Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Grove</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Fountain Street from Allendale Road to Shantz Hill Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maple Grove Road from Hwy 8 to Speedsville Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King Street from Deer Ridge Drive to Fountain Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sportsworld Drive from King Street to Sportsworld Crossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairway/Weber</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Fairway Road from River Road to Manitou Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Courtland Avenue from Carwood Avenue to Manitou Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weber Street from Delroy Avenue to King Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King Street from Weber Street to River Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>River Road from Old Chicopee Drive to Fairway Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township Signals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Arthur Street from Listowel Road to Church Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cedar Creek Road from Edworthy Sideroad to Northumberland Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Galt CBD was identified in the 2013 Traffic Signal Corridor and Signal Timing Review to be completed in 2014. Report TES-TRP-15-07 was recently approved permitting the removal of the four parking spaces on the west side of Ainslie Street to allow the Region to increase the northbound lanes of Ainslie Street to two lanes which is anticipated to improve traffic flow in this area. Signal timing changes and speed and delay studies will be completed once the pavement marking changes have been implemented. Staff plan to provide the results in the 2015 report.
3.0 Results

Travel time and delay studies were conducted for arterial roadways containing 3 or more coordinated signals in close proximity. On average, travel times were reduced by 10.8% as a result of staff reviews and timing adjustments.

Below is a summary of all the control areas, travel time studies that have been completed and additional signals reviewed.

3.1 East Galt Control Area

This control area experienced an average travel time reduction of 16.3% on Franklin Boulevard and Main Street following timing adjustments to the traffic signals. A detailed analysis of the Control Area is provided in Appendix A-1.

Signal timings were also reviewed and optimized for the following intersections:

- Myers Road and Water Street;
- Myers Road and Christopher Drive;
- Myers Road and Monsignor Doyle/Christian School (IPS);
- Myers Road and Elgin Street/Cheese Factory Road;
- Main Street and Bruce Street/Oak Street; and
- Samuelson Street and Beverly Street.

3.2 Maple Grove Control Area

This control area is reviewed on an ongoing basis to accommodate shift schedules of major manufactures in the area (e.g. Toyota). Travel time and delay studies were not conducted in this area as traffic signals are operated to optimize specific movements entering and exiting major manufacturers. Staff however determined that the travel time between Speedsville Road and Highway 8 along Maple Grove Road on average takes 4 minutes and 39 seconds.

3.3 Fairway/Weber Control Area

This control area experienced an average travel time reduction of 6.0% on the major corridors of Fairway Road/Courtland Avenue and Weber Street following timing adjustments to the traffic signals. A detailed analysis of the Control Area is provided in Appendix A-2.
Signal timings were also reviewed and optimized for the following intersections:

- Wilson Avenue and Kingsway Drive;
- Wilson Avenue and Kingsway Drive;
- Franklin Street and Kingsway Drive; and
- River Road and Old Chicopee.

3.4 Township Control Area

Arthur Street in the Township of Woolwich experienced an average travel time reduction of 16.9% following timing adjustments to the traffic signals. A detailed analysis of the Control Area is provided in Appendix A-3.

Signal timings were also reviewed and optimized for the following intersections:

- Erb’s Road and Notre Dame Drive;
- Fischer-Hallman Road and New Dundee Road;
- Snyder's Road and Foundry Street;
- Snyder's Road and Notre Dame Drive;
- Northfield Drive at Sawmill Road;
- Lobsinger Line at Kressler Road;
- Line 86 and Katherine Street;
- Line 86 and Northfield Drive;

4.0 2015 Control Areas

Table 3 identifies the traffic signal control areas that are currently under review for 2015.
### Table 3: 2015 Signal Control Areas and Arterials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Area Name</th>
<th>Number of Intersections</th>
<th>Corridor Name and Section of Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Bridge/University         | 8                       | Bridge Street from Bridle Trail to Chesapeake Drive  
Lexington Road from Davenport Road to University Avenue  
University Avenue from Bridge Street to Lexington |
| Homer Watson Boulevard    | 29                      | Ottawa Street from Strasburg Road to Kehl Street  
Homer Watson Boulevard from Trillium Drive to Century Hill Drive  
Bleams Road from Trillium Drive to Century Hill Drive  
Block Line Road from Strasburg Road to Homer Watson Boulevard  
Manitou Drive from Homer Watson Boulevard to Bleams Road  
Ottawa Street from Strasburg Road to Kehl Street |
| North Galt                | 29                      | Hespeler Road from Avenue Road to Pinebush Road  
Conestoga Boulevard from Dunbar Road to Pinebush Road |
| Sunrise                   | 20                      | Fischer-Hallman Road from Bleams Road to FHCI Ped  
Westmount Road from Fischer-Hallman Road to Greenbrook Drive  
Ottawa Street from Trussler Road to Howland Drive  
Westmount Road from Queen Street to Stoke Drive |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Area Name</th>
<th>Number of Intersections</th>
<th>Corridor Name and Section of Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highland/Victoria</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Fischer-Hallman Road from Queen Street to Glasgow Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highland Road from Westforest Trail to Stirling Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria Street from Westforest Trail to Belmont Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galt CBD</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Cedar Street from Southwood Drive to Ainslie Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Park Hill Road from George Street to Ainslie Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Main Street from Water Street to Wellington Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Water Street from Park Hill Road to Ainslie Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ainslie Street from Simcoe Street to Cedar Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

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

**Financial Implications:**

Nil

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Nil

**Attachments**

Appendix A - Average Results of Signal Control Area Review for Traffic Flows

**Prepared By:** Jennifer Bertelsen, Analyst (Traffic Systems Management)

**Approved By:** Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
## East Galt Average Results of Signal Control Area Review for Traffic Flows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor Name</th>
<th>Section of Road</th>
<th># of intersections</th>
<th>Average Travel Time Before (minutes : seconds)</th>
<th>Average Travel Time After (minutes : seconds)</th>
<th>Average Travel Time Change (minutes : seconds)</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Franklin Boulevard</strong></td>
<td>Clyde Road to Champlain Boulevard</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Northbound: 4:53</td>
<td>Northbound: 4:20</td>
<td>Northbound: -0:33</td>
<td>Northbound: -11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Southbound: 4:48</td>
<td>Southbound: 4:54</td>
<td>Southbound: +0:06</td>
<td>Southbound: +2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Street/Concession</strong></td>
<td>Christopher Drive to Dundas Street</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Eastbound: 1:30</td>
<td>Eastbound: 1:06</td>
<td>Eastbound: -0:24</td>
<td>Eastbound: -26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Westbound: 1:40</td>
<td>Westbound: 1:10</td>
<td>Westbound: -0:30</td>
<td>Westbound: -29.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Fairway/Weber Average Results of Signal Control Area Review for Traffic Flows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor Name</th>
<th>Section of Road</th>
<th># of intersections</th>
<th>Average Travel Time Before (minutes : seconds)</th>
<th>Average Travel Time After (minutes : seconds)</th>
<th>Average Travel Time Change (minutes : seconds)</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fairway Road</strong></td>
<td>River Road to Manitou Drive</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Eastbound: 2:28</td>
<td>Eastbound: 2:18</td>
<td>Eastbound: -0.10</td>
<td>Eastbound: -6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Westbound: 2:55</td>
<td>Westbound: 2:41</td>
<td>Westbound: -0.14</td>
<td>Westbound: -8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Courtland Avenue</strong></td>
<td>Carwood Avenue to Manitou Drive</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Eastbound: 1:05</td>
<td>Eastbound: 1:07</td>
<td>Eastbound: +0.02</td>
<td>Eastbound: +3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Westbound: 1:05</td>
<td>Westbound: 0:56</td>
<td>Westbound: -0.09</td>
<td>Westbound: -13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weber Street</strong></td>
<td>Delroy Avenue to King Street</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Northbound: 1:55</td>
<td>Northbound: 2:03</td>
<td>Northbound: +0:08</td>
<td>Northbound: +6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Southbound: 2:23</td>
<td>Southbound: 1:59</td>
<td>Southbound: -0:24</td>
<td>Southbound: -16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor Name</td>
<td>Section of Road</td>
<td># of Intersections</td>
<td>Average Travel Time Before (minutes : seconds)</td>
<td>Average Travel Time After (minutes : seconds)</td>
<td>Average Travel Time Change (minutes : seconds)</td>
<td>% Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region of Waterloo
Transportation & Environmental Services
Waste Management

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

Date: August 11, 2015

Subject: Waste Management Services Education Program Update

Recommendation:

For information.

Summary: Nil

Report:

This report provides a summary of the Waste Management Division’s Environmental Education Program, which supports and encourages residents to participate in curbside waste diversion programs, such as blue box recycling and green bin organics.

Waste management education is a key component of the Region’s long term waste strategy. Beginning in 2002, the Waste Management Division introduced an education program to encourage participation in residential waste diversion programs and to educate residents on the importance of reducing, reusing and recycling. In 2004, in response to increasing interest in waste education, the decision was made to advance the program to a full on-site, permanent education facility. With Council support, staff began to offer tours of the Waterloo landfill site. In 2006, a small, unused building at the Waterloo landfill was converted into a permanent education facility for hands-on learning. The first full season of educational programming took place in 2007.

Between September and June each year, more than 5,000 school aged children, adults, and teachers participate in the program and see first-hand the impacts of their waste choices. The Program supports the elementary and high school Science and Technology Curriculum and is very popular with local teachers. No admission is charged; schools are only required to organize a school bus.
The two hour program begins at the Education Centre where a Waste Management Coordinator delivers a grade appropriate discussion on waste issues such as the environmental effects of consumption, the benefits of recycling, and composting, and landfill design. Practical reminders and tips to reduce waste by using the green bin, blue box and other diversion programs are also included. Visitors then proceed through four themed rooms. Each room in the centre has a different theme that follows the waste cycle from natural resource to end of life, whether it is landfills or recycling. There are over 100 displays, both static and interactive. The rooms are organized around the following topics:

- **The Science of Waste** – Landfill operations; green bin organics; household hazardous waste (HHW);
- **Consumption of Natural Resources versus Recycling** – the life cycle of natural resources to consumer product; the connection between recycling and reduced consumption of natural resources;
- **The Learning Kitchen** – litterless lunches; water usage in the home; and
- **The Ecology Room** – presentation room, threats to our earth, ecological footprint, and reuse centre.

All of the furniture and almost all of the displays in the centre have been made from recycled and/or reused materials. These furnishings and displays serve as concrete examples of the abstract concepts of reduce and reuse and encourage visitors to participate more actively in sustainable waste behaviours.

After the in-class presentation, visitors board a school bus for continued discussion of environmental issues and an escorted tour of the site. The site tour typically includes visits to the Nyle Ludolph Recycling Centre, the waste diversion areas, the compost pad, a closed landfill cell and the active landfill tipping face.

The Environmental Education Program supports the development of environmentally sustainable behaviours both in the home and at school. Each teacher who attends the program is provided with a package of printed resources to continue learning back in the classroom and in the home. Resources include age appropriate activity sheets, recycling facts, and recycling guides. A letter to parents encourages conversations in the home about the importance of proper sorting of waste and the resulting benefits to the community and the environment.

The Program also supports schools that receive the Region’s green bin organics collection service. “Green teams” made up of students and teachers attend the Environmental Education Program to learn about what happens to the recycling and organics they collect. A number of printed resources are available for these teams to encourage sustainable waste choices back at their schools. Schools that receive green bin organics collection can also access presentations by Waste Management staff.
Presenters attend school assemblies to review proper waste sorting and preparation, and the environmental benefits of reducing, reusing and recycling.

In addition to the school-focused programs, Waste Management Services also hosts a popular Public Tour Day each spring (in April, around Earth Day) and fall (during Waste Reduction Week). The event is very well attended and offers any resident of Waterloo Region the opportunity to tour the site and learn more about diversion programs and the landfill. Approximately 800 residents (about 500 in the spring, and 300 in the fall) attend Public Tour Day each year.

Feedback on the Program

An opportunity to provide feedback is provided to each teacher following their visit. Local teachers express great support of the program because content is closely aligned with the elementary and secondary school curriculum and the learning is long lasting. Students talk enthusiastically about their visit for many days afterwards and apply lessons learned at home and at school. They inspire friends and family members to put waste in the right place. Adult volunteers who attend enjoy the opportunity to learn what happens to their waste and ask questions about how to properly prepare material for collection. Below are some of the comments received:

“A really good intro to our community’s needs – a must for all citizens!” Grade five Teacher

“This really is a superior program and I learn so much every time I go.” Grade six Teacher

“After yesterday’s tour, I absolutely understand why it is important to recycle and how to recycle.” Parent volunteer

“It is amazing how often the kids have referred back to the landfill experience since our trip!” Grade two Teacher

“I think all the adults who attended left re-thinking their own practises!” Kindergarten teacher

The Environmental Education Program has won a number of awards, including Best Promotion and Education Tool from the Association of Municipal Recycling Coordinators in 2006, and staff received a letter of congratulations on the opening from the provincial Minister of Education. Since its inception in 2007, the permanent education program has hosted more than 30,000 students, teachers, and adult volunteers. This highly successful and popular program will continue to be part of the Waste Management Division’s waste reduction strategy for years to come.
Corporate Strategic Plan:

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

Financial Implications:

The annual cost of this program is approximately $34,000 and is provided from the Waste Management operating budget.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Nil

Attachments:

Photos related to the Environmental Education Centre and programs.

Prepared By: Shelley Conrad, Coordinator, Waste Management

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
LEADING THE WAY

Waterloo Regional Councillors together with the students from the Environmental Club at Elizabeth Zeigler Public School officially opened the new Children's Environmental Education Centre at the Waterloo Landfill site.
Plastics closer to home

Scientists are now discovering plastic debris in not just the world’s oceans. Plastics are now present in all five of the Great Lakes. Lake Erie shows the highest concentration of plastics because all other lakes drain into it. Biologists have found a wide variety of items including toys, food wrappers, water bottles and cigarette butts (which are made from plastic fibre).

Production of plastics has increased significantly since the 1950s because they are light and long-lasting. Slowly plastic lasts for decades or centuries, it’s piling up somewhere.

Small and dangerous

Plastics do not biodegrade; they photo degrade. When these plastics are added to the plastic and the plastic breaks into tiny pieces called “microplastics” or “nurdles”.

Because nurdles are so small, they move easily from habitat to habitat and are the hardest to clean up.

See life sees the tiny pieces of floating plastic and thinks they are food, but eating plastic is dangerous. Plastics block the respiratory and digestive systems of birds, fish, turtles and other marine life. Other species suffer injuries or death when they become caught in larger pieces of plastic.

Plastics contain toxins that can be released into the water and harm habitats. The toxins can also make their way up the food chain when plastics get consumed by smaller organisms that are eaten by larger species.

Traveling with ocean currents

Garbage collects where ocean currents meet. These swirling vortices of ocean water are called gyres. The gyres rotate clockwise in the northern hemisphere and counter-clockwise in the southern hemisphere.

There are five gyres in the world and all are collecting garbage. The two in the Pacific Ocean are the largest. The largest is known as the Great Pacific Garbage Patch.

Areas of the Great Pacific Garbage Patch have been described as a “pest of plastic” and some as a plastic soup.

Trash can float on top of the ocean or sink to the sea floor. Scientists have found garbage 2,000 km from shore and as deep as 1,000 meters below the surface. They believe 70% of the garbage will end up on the ocean floor.

Plastics in the gyres has been identified from all over the world. Garbage enters the water systems through rivers, lakes, tributaries and boats. Once in the water system, garbage makes its way to the Arctic because all water on earth is connected.
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Water Services

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: August 11, 2015
File Code: E06-70/4125
Subject: Consultant Selection for G5 Salt Assessment, Pinebush Well Field, City of Cambridge

Recommendation:

That Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into a Consulting Services Agreement with BluMetric Environmental Inc. of Kitchener, Ontario, to provide consulting services for undertaking the G5 Salt Assessment, Pinebush Well Field, in the City of Cambridge, at an upset limit of $342,336.00 plus applicable taxes.

Summary:

The Region is experiencing increasing sodium and chloride concentrations at municipal well G5 in the Pinebush Well Field. As such, the Region is conducting a new study at municipal wells G5 and G5A to determine the best course of action to manage sodium and chloride concentrations within the study area and develop an operational strategy for these wells going forward.

The Region has carried out a public procurement process, Request for Consultant Services C2015-17, to procure professional consulting services for the G5 Salt Assessment, Pinebush Well Field. Seven consultant proposals were received and evaluated. The evaluation committee found that the submission by BluMetric Environmental Inc. of Kitchener, Ontario provides the best overall value to the Region. It is recommended that the Region award the consulting contract C2015-17 to BluMetric Environmental Inc. at a cost of $342,336.00 plus applicable taxes.
Report:

The Region is experiencing increasing sodium and chloride concentrations at municipal well G5 in the Pinebush Well Field. These increasing concentrations are coincident with new development in the vicinity of G5. The Region chose to commission this new study at G5/G5A to determine the best course of action to manage sodium and chloride concentrations within the study area.

The primary objectives of this study are as follows:

1. Identify sources of salt loading to the drinking water supply within the study area;
2. Identify data gaps regarding the distribution of sodium and chloride concentrations in overburden and bedrock hydrogeologic units beneath the study area;
3. Refine and update the area conceptual model for the study area;
4. Identify and evaluate road and parking lot stormwater design and construction practices to identify potential opportunities to change design criteria for these structures to reduce infiltration of salt-laden runoff from pervious areas within the study area; and
5. Prepare recommendations regarding future operation of wells G5 and G5A, implementing changes in design criteria and/or implementation of Beneficial Management Practices (BMPs) for winter de-icing operations on road and parking lots.

Project Primary Tasks

A number of tasks have been identified to achieve the project objectives as follows:

1. Review historical information;
2. Identify gaps in the existing groundwater monitoring well network for the study area, and where there are knowledge gaps in the area conceptual model for the study area. Prepare a final work plan for implementing a field investigation and monitoring program to fill in data gaps previously identified;
3. Implement the field investigation and monitoring program;
4. Complete a land use inventory;
5. Complete a salt management / salt use assessment;
6. Use the Region’s existing mass balance model to determine the necessary reduction in salt loading to the study area required to reduce sodium and chloride concentrations.
concentrations at G5, including an estimate of the timeline required for these goals to be realized;

7. Reporting;

8. Project management, including data management and recommendations for conceptual / hydrogeological model updates.

Consultant Selection

A Request for Consultant Services for the G5 Salt Assessment, Pinebush Well Field was advertised in the Kitchener-Waterloo Record and on the Region’s website on June 22, 2015. The Region received bids from seven consulting firms. They were:

- AECOM Canada Ltd.
- BluMetric Environmental Inc.
- Golder Associates Ltd.
- Matrix Solutions Inc.
- MTE Consultants Inc.
- R.J. Burnside and Associates Limited
- Stantec Consulting Ltd.

The individuals on the Project Team involved in the consultant selection were:

- Eric Hodgins, Manager, Hydrogeology and Source Water, Water Services
- Don Corbett, Senior Hydrogeologist, Hydrogeology and Source Water, Water Services
- Geoff Moroz, Project Hydrogeologist, Hydrogeology and Source Water, Water Services

The evaluation criteria used for selecting the successful consultant was consistent with the Region’s Purchasing By-law and consultant selection policies. The evaluation criteria and their respective weightings are:

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

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

Price Factor (15%)
- Upset Price (15%)
After reviewing the Detailed Work Plans, schedules, and upset budget, BluMetric Environmental Inc. had the highest overall score. BluMetric cost estimate was the highest of the submitted proposals, but the approach proposed by this Consultant was superior than the others.

Based on this evaluation, the project team recommends that BluMetric Environmental Inc. be retained to undertake this assignment at an upset fee limit of $342,336.00 plus applicable taxes. The project will is scheduled to be completed in 2017.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

The G5 Salt Assessment project supports the Corporate Strategic Plan Focus Area 1: Protect and Enhance the Environment; protect the quality and the quantity of our water sources.

**Financial Implications:**

The total cost of the work including net HST is $348,361. The Council approved 2015 Water Services Capital Budget and Ten-Year Forecast contains a total of $2,107,000 in 2015, $1,475,000 in 2016, and $1,100,000 in 2017 for Source Water Protection Assessment (project #04125), which includes the total costs of this project. This project is funded by the Water Reserve Fund ($257,787) and Regional Development Charges ($90,574).

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Procurement Services staff were consulted regarding the financial implications of this project and proposed process.

**Attachments**

Appendix A: Breakdown of consultant’s upset fee

**Prepared By:** Geoff Moroz, Project Hydrogeologist, Water Services

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

## Breakdown of Consultant’s Upset Fee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Review of Historical Information</td>
<td>$4,488.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gap Analysis and Field Investigation Work Plan</td>
<td>$11,075.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Field Investigation and Monitoring Program</td>
<td>$93,596.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Land Use Inventory</td>
<td>$23,083.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Salt Management / Use Assessment</td>
<td>$19,430.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mass Balance Modeling</td>
<td>$8,850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Deliverables and Reporting</td>
<td>$76,357.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>$27,305.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Provisional Task 1 – Specialized Site Characterization</td>
<td>$28,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Provisional Task 2 – Continuous WQ Monitoring Using Data Loggers</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Contingency – 15% of total project value including Provisional Tasks 1 and 2</td>
<td>$44,652.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Upset Fee</strong></td>
<td><strong>$342,336.00</strong></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: August 11, 2015       File Code: D18-01

Recommendation:


Summary:

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

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

Report:

City of Cambridge
Draft Approval of Plan of Subdivision 30T-14103
Applicant: Intermarket CAM Limited (Creekside Lands)
Location: 245 Riverbank Drive
Proposal: To permit the development of an industrial business
Draft Approval of Plan of Subdivision 30T-14103

Park consisting of 9 business park blocks, 3 future development blocks, 5 open space blocks and a sanitary pumping station.

Regional Processing Fee: Paid May 28, 2015
Commissioner’s Approval: June 11, 2015
Came Into Effect: July 3, 2015

Official Plan Amendment Number 4

Applicant: City of Cambridge
Location: Maple Grove Road, Speedsville Road, Royal Oak Drive and Boxwood Drive
Proposal: To amend the Prestige Industrial and Business Industrial land use designations by adding a Site Specific Policy 8.10.29 Boxwood Business Campus (Boxwood subdivision) in order to permit standalone data centres and courier and delivery services, to prohibit hotels, conference centres and banquet facilities, and to prohibit licensed childcare establishments in a specific location; as well as, to amend Figure 33 of the City’s Official Plan by removing certain lands and outlining the areas subject to Site Specific Policy 8.10.29 Boxwood Business Campus. The amendment will also address housekeeping matters affecting these lands such as resolving part of Deferral No. 8 to the City of Cambridge Official Plan, and amending Map 2A of the City’s Official Plan to remove certain lands from Site Specific Policy Area 33.

Commissioner’s Approval: June 22, 2015
Regional Processing Fee: Not applicable.
Came Into Effect: July 13, 2015

City of Kitchener

Plan of Condominium Application 30CDM-15205

Date Accepted: June 10, 2015
Applicant: Reid’s Heritage Homes Ltd.
Plan of Condominium Application 30CDM-15205
Location: 50 Bryan Court
Proposal: To permit the development of 56 residential condominium apartment units.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid June 8, 2015

Plan of Condominium Application 30CDM-15206
Date Accepted: June 22, 2015
Applicant: Williamsburg Homes Inc.
Location: 155, 175 and 195 Commonwealth Street
Proposal: To permit the development of 46 multiple residential condominium units and 1 non-residential roof unit.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid June 18, 2015

Plan of Condominium Application 30CDM-15207
Date Accepted: June 26, 2015
Applicant: 2247846 Ontario Ltd.
Location: 806 to 816 Doon Village Road
Proposal: To permit the conversion of 18 residential stacked cluster townhouse units to condominium ownership.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid June 26, 2015

Registration of Draft Plan of Subdivision 30T-08203
Draft Approval Date: March 9, 2009
Phase: Stage 1
Applicant: Activa Holdings Inc.
Location: New Dundee Road
Proposal: To permit the development of 50 single detached residential units and 24 residential townhouse units.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid June 1, 2015
Commissioner’s Release: June 23, 2015

Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-13204
Draft Approval Date: July 30, 2013
Phase: Stages 7 and 9
Plan of Condominium Application 30CDM-15205
Applicant: Deerfield Homes Ltd.
Location: 1650, 1670, 1680, 1690 and 1720 Fisher-Hallman Road
Proposal: To permit the development of 2 semi-detached residential units and 24 stacked townhouse residential units.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid June 2, 2015
Commissioner’s Release: June 25, 2015

City of Waterloo
Plan of Condominium Application 30CDM-15402
Date Accepted: June 12, 2015
Applicant: Fir Village Inc.
Location: 201 Lester Street
Proposal: To permit the conversion of a 12 storey residential apartment building to condominium ownership.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid May 29, 2015

Plan of Condominium Application 30CDM-15403
Date Accepted: June 12, 2015
Applicant: Fir Village Inc.
Location: 202 Lester Street
Proposal: To permit the conversion of a 12 storey residential apartment building to condominium ownership.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid May 29, 2015

Plan of Condominium Application 30CDM-15404
Date Accepted: June 23, 2015
Applicant: Silver Lakes Developments
Location: 110 Erb Street West
Proposal: To permit the creation of parking units for the entire Barrel Yards Development, including the hotel, existing and proposed residential towers, and commercial office space that is to be constructed.
Plan of Condominium Application 30CDM-15402
Regional Processing Fee: Paid June 4, 2015

Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-14406
Draft Approval Date: March 18, 2015
Phase: Entire Plan
Applicant: IN8 (Sage III) Developments Inc.
Location: 62 Balsam Street
Proposal: To permit the development of 70 residential apartment units, 28 residential townhouse units and 14 commercial units.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid March 27, 2015
Commissioner's Release: June 25, 2015

Township of North Dumfries
Draft Approval of Plan of Condominium 30CDM-14301
Applicant: Guatam Growth Properties Inc.
Location: 1126 Swan Street, Ayr
Proposal: To permit the development of 19 residential townhouse units, each with a built-in garage and exclusive use private area.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid June 11, 2015
Commissioner's Approval: June 25, 2015
Came Into Effect: July 16, 2015

Township of Wilmot
Official Plan Amendment Number 7
Applicant: David and Lena Caputo
Location: 12-1228 Bertlett’s Road
Proposal: To re-designate a specific area of land in order to permit a year-round residence to be established, similar to several other properties within the Sunfish Lake Settlement Area.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid May 5, 2015
Commissioner's Approval: June 9, 2015
Came Into Effect; June 29, 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.

**Attachments:**

Nil.

**Prepared By:** Andrea Banks, Program Assistant

**Approved By:** Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Development and Legislative Services
Region of Waterloo
Planning, Development and Legislative Services
Community Planning

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: August 11, 2015 File Code: D07-40(A)
Subject: Mid-Year 2014 Waterloo Region Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory

Recommendation:
For information.

Summary:
A robust and stable supply of vacant industrial and business park lands is integral to attracting and retaining investment in manufacturing and related businesses. The Region of Waterloo, in collaboration with the Area Municipalities, Canada’s Technology Triangle Inc., Communitech and the Greater Kitchener-Waterloo and the Cambridge Chambers of Commerce, prepared an Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory in 2005 and 2008. In 2013 this inventory was updated to mid-year with the assistance of staff in the Area Municipalities. It has now been updated as of mid-year 2014 to provide accurate information about the amount and type of vacant industrial and business park land in Waterloo Region. The inventory is focused on vacant land that is designated for industrial and business park uses.

The inventory also reports on the availability of land as described in two broad categories, ‘shovel ready’ and ‘in the pipeline’. Shovel ready lands can be developed immediately for industrial and business park uses based on approved land use designations and zoning, and the availability of the appropriate servicing. ‘In the pipeline’ refers to lands appropriately designated for industrial and business park use, but which require a zoning by-law amendment or servicing improvements before they are ‘shovel ready’, with the lands presumed to be available in 1-10 years.

The inventory indicates that the supply of vacant industrial and business park land
remains stable. There are currently 2,650 net developable acres in the inventory, down slightly from 2,771 acres in 2013. This includes 745 acres of shovel-ready lands, an increase of 133 acres. In addition 607 acres of lands are available ‘in the pipeline’. In the 2014 inventory, almost 93 per cent of the ‘shovel-ready’ land supply is fully municipally serviced, compared to 90 per cent in the 2013 inventory.

There remains a very small inventory of large lot parcels – those that are over 25 acres – particularly in the shovel-ready category. Of the 150 shovel-ready parcels, only three are larger than 25 acres. This is similar to the conditions that existed in previous inventories. Of the three ‘shovel-ready’ large lots, only one is larger than fifty acres. In 2013, there were no parcels available that were larger than fifty acres. Development of the East Side Lands is proceeding to meet the need for large lots on the market and to attract new investment and will consequently provide an important addition to supply.

A current, complete inventory of employment lands was identified as a key resource in the region-wide Waterloo Region Economic Development Strategy (WREDS) as developed by the Region of Waterloo, Area Municipalities, Canada’s Technology Triangle Inc. and a variety of economic development stakeholders. It is an important component of the strategy to ensure that a full range of employment land are available on the market in Waterloo Region. Accordingly, the maintenance of this inventory is a specific initiative of the strategy for 2015.

The mid-year 2014 inventory will be used by the Region of Waterloo for planning needs and made widely available to economic development stakeholders within the region.

Report:

Manufacturing is a cornerstone of our diverse economy, employing 54,500 people in the Kitchener-Cambridge-Waterloo Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) at year end 2014. This represents 19.3 per cent of the CMA's labour force, making it third only to Guelph and Windsor as the most manufacturing-intensive economy in Canada. Manufacturing employment exceeds employment in other key sectors the CMA's economy including: trade (40,300 employees), health care and social services (26,100 employees), and educational services (23,800 employees).

A robust and stable supply of vacant industrial and business park lands is integral to attracting and retaining investment in manufacturing and related businesses. The Region of Waterloo, in collaboration with the Area Municipalities, Canada’s Technology Triangle Inc., Communitech and the Greater Kitchener-Waterloo and the Cambridge Chambers of Commerce, prepared an Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory in 2005, 2008, 2013 and has now updated it for 2014, to provide accurate, consolidated information about the amount and type of vacant industrial and business park land in Waterloo Region.
For the purposes of this inventory, land has been placed in nine categories (see Figure 1). The inventory is focused on vacant land that is designated for industrial and business park uses. It does not include lands with designations that primarily provide for other types of employment such as commercial office, mixed use nodes or downtown designations. The inventory does not include land containing vacant buildings.

### Figure 1 Vacant Parcels Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vacant parcels available immediately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Vacant parcels available immediately as design build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Vacant parcels available immediately in the University of Waterloo R&amp;T Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Vacant parcels no longer on the market that are expected to be developed by the current owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Vacant parcels without significant constraints, not on the market and not expected to be developed by the current owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vacant parcels available in one to two years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Vacant parcels with the expectation of availability in over two years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Vacant parcels with constraints other than timing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Vacant parcels without significant constraints, where development applications have been submitted for conversion to other uses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ongoing update of the inventory allows trends to be identified and tracked in industrial and business park land. This mid-year 2014 inventory provides an update on activities in this market since the last inventory was completed in 2013. Sources used in the update include: information provided by Area Municipalities; listings on ICX, a website subsidiary of the Multiple Listing Service (MLS); building permit data; aerial photography and site visits. Parcels were removed from the inventory if a building permit was issued on a parcel.

The inventory also reports on the availability of land as described in two broad categories: ‘shovel ready’ and ‘in the pipeline’. Shovel ready lands can be developed immediately for industrial and business park uses based on approved land use designations and zoning, and the availability of the appropriate servicing (Categories 1, 2 and 3). ‘In the pipeline’ refers to lands appropriately designated for industrial and business park use, but which require a zoning by-law amendment or servicing improvements before they are ‘shovel ready’, with the lands presumed to be available in 1-10 years (Categories 6 and 7).

### Key Findings

The supply of vacant industrial and business park land remains stable. There are currently 2,650 net developable acres in the inventory, down slightly from 2,771 acres in 2013 (see Figure 2).
Six properties were added to the inventory, contributing 58 new developable acres in three municipalities - Kitchener (one acre), Waterloo (36 acres) and Woolwich (22 acres). Of these six new properties, three are considered shovel-ready and the other three are ‘in the pipeline.’ An example of a property added to the inventory was through the demolition of the Manulife building on Columbia Street in Waterloo.

Examples of properties removed from the inventory in 2014 include the Heroux Devtek site in the Boxwood Business Campus. A building permit was issued in 2014 to build a 116,000 square foot aerospace manufacturing plant on this site. Horst Industries in Elmira (100,000 square feet) and Fastenal in Kitchener (150,000 square foot distribution centre) also acquired building permits for new industrial buildings.

The inventory includes 745 acres of shovel-ready lands, an increase of 133 acres since 2013. The term ‘shovel-ready’ refers to parcels that have appropriate land use designations and zoning to accommodate industrial and business park development and that are on the market, either for sale or as a build-to-suit/land lease opportunity. These lands are divided among 150 properties, an increase from the 114 parcels considered ‘shovel-ready’ in 2013. The increase in the number of ‘shovel-ready’ parcels is primarily due to the division of large properties into lots in the Boxwood Business Campus as well as in St Clements. Almost 93 per cent of the ‘shovel-ready’ land supply is fully municipally serviced, compared to 90 per cent in the 2013 mid-year inventory.

Of the ‘shovel-ready’ parcels, only three are larger than 25 acres. This is similar to the situation in previous inventories. Of the three shovel-ready large lots, one is larger than fifty acres. In 2013, there were no parcels available that were larger than fifty acres. The new large lot is located at 300 Bridge Street, in Kitchener, which was previously a ‘pipeline’ site. Development of the East Side Lands is progressing to meet the need for large lots on the market and to attract new investment.

Additionally, 607 acres of pipeline lands are available. The pipeline refers to lands that
are appropriately designated for industrial and business park uses, but may require a zoning by-law amendment or servicing improvements before they are shovel-ready. Lands in the pipeline are expected to be shovel-ready in one to ten years. Some lands that were in the pipeline in 2013 became shovel-ready in 2014.

Opportunities for Employment Growth in Addition to the Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land

The scope of this inventory was to focus on the subset of employment land associated with manufacturing and related uses. Beyond this, there are many opportunities to accommodate employment growth in Waterloo Region. These include:

1. Re-urbanization of underutilized parcels on land designated for industrial and business park uses
2. Redevelopment or the reuse/repurpose of vacant industrial buildings
3. Vacant lands found in other employment land designations such as arterial commercial corridors, commercial campuses or ‘power centres’, service commercial areas and institutional designations
4. Vacant lands found in other land use designations (not exclusively designated for employment) such as mixed use corridors, mixed use nodes, neighbourhood centres, downtowns, Rapid Transit Station Areas, agricultural lands and residential areas (home based businesses)
5. Vacant lands found at the Region of Waterloo International Airport that are zoned and available for airport related uses
6. The 958 acres of developable land in North Cambridge designated as Prime Industrial / Strategic Reserve following the approval of Regional Official Policies Plan Amendment 28 and subsequently through the new Regional Official Plan. Much work has been done through the East Side Lands (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan to bring this land to market including approximately 200 acres referred to as the “Quick Start Lands”. However, the lands are not included in the Inventory as they have not yet been designated for industrial and business park uses in the City of Cambridge Official Plan
7. Vacant lands to be designated for industrial and business park uses

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

Since the initiation of the first Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory in 2005, Regional staff has held numerous meetings with Area Municipal staff (i.e. planners and economic development officers), as well as interested parties and the Prosperity Council of Waterloo Region’s Regional Growth Management Strategy Liaison Task Force. Area Municipal staff provided and verified data used to update to the Mid-year 2014 Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory, and their efforts to complete this inventory are greatly appreciated.
Corporate Strategic Plan:

The comprehensive review of the Region’s vacant industrial and business park lands within the Mid-year 2014 Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory is consistent with Strategic Objective 2.3 of the Corporate Strategic Plan to support a diverse, innovative and globally competitive economy.

Financial Implications:

The inventory could be used to support new investment in employment growth which could increase assessment in Waterloo Region.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Nil.

Attachments:

Attachment 1: Region of Waterloo Mid-year 2014 Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory Report

Prepared By: Margaret Parkin, Manager, Planning Research and Analytics
Rehan Waheed, Planning Technician

Approved By: Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Development and Legislative Services
Attachment 1

Region of Waterloo

Mid-year 2014 Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory
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1.0 Introduction

Manufacturing is a cornerstone of our diverse economy, employing 54,500 people in the Kitchener-Cambridge-Waterloo CMA at year end 2014. This represents 19.3 per cent of the CMA's labour force, making it third only to Guelph and Windsor as the most manufacturing-intensive economy in Canada. Manufacturing employment exceeds employment in other key sectors the CMA's economy including: trade (40,300 employees), health care and social services (26,100 employees), and educational services (23,800 employees).

A robust and stable supply of vacant industrial and business park lands is integral to attracting and retaining investment in manufacturing and related businesses. The Region of Waterloo, in collaboration with the Area Municipalities, Canada's Technology Triangle Inc., Communitech and the Greater Kitchener-Waterloo and the Cambridge Chambers of Commerce, prepared an Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory in 2005, 2008, 2013 and has now updated it for 2014, to provide accurate, consolidated information about the amount and type of vacant industrial and business park land in Waterloo Region.

2.0 Background

In 2005, the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, together with local stakeholders, undertook an inventory of industrial and business park vacant land. The scope of this inventory was to focus on land that is associated with manufacturing and related uses. The continued availability of this type of land remains very important both to accommodate growth, and to market Waterloo Region as a community that is “open for business”.

The industrial and business park land use designations as defined within Area Municipal Official Plans provide flexibility to accommodate a wide variety of manufacturing and related uses. This is important in order to accommodate industrial manufacturers who often have unique building and land requirements. However, the land use flexibility, combined with proximity of these lands to major transportation corridors, also make them very attractive for conversion to non-manufacturing uses – uses that generally do not have the same compatibility constraints and that could locate outside of industrial and business park lands. Both the demand for industrial and business park land, as well as the pressures for its conversion to uses other than manufacturing, underscore the need to monitor the availability of this relatively small subset of vacant land.

3.0 Methodology

3.1 Participants

The Regional Economic Development Liaison Committee, which included representatives from each Area Municipality, Canada's Technology Triangle Inc., Communitech and the Greater Kitchener-Waterloo and Cambridge Chambers of Commerce, together...
Commerce, worked with Regional staff to develop the methodology used in the inaugural 2005 inventory. These stakeholders then helped to refine the methodology and update the information for the 2008 inventory, which is considered to be the baseline inventory. Subsequent updates were undertaken in 2013 and 2014 by the Region together with economic development officers and other representatives from each local municipality.

3.2 Type of Land Included within the Inventory

Only vacant lands within established industrial areas and business parks, which were designated in Area Municipal Official Plans for industrial and business park uses are included within the inventory. This inventory does not include lands available or potentially available to accommodate future employment growth through infill, intensification, adaptive re-use or redevelopment, lands in urban core areas or lands within what are traditionally considered residential areas. Specifically, the inventory does not include land containing vacant buildings. The inventory also does not include any vacant lands which are designated and zoned principally for commercial uses, institutional development, or are currently designated for agricultural uses within the Area Municipal Official Plans. Further, the inventory does not include any of the Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve.

3.3 Process for Identifying Land for Inclusion in the Inventory

The inventory has evolved through the updates, with parcels having been added, moved between categories and removed based on the established criteria. Information was provided by the Area Municipalities, and updated with listings on ICX (a website subsidiary of MLS), building permit data and recent aerial photography. Parcels were removed from the inventory based on the issuance of a building permit. Parcels were also removed if it was determined through consultation with the Area Municipalities that a specific parcel was designated for uses other than industrial and business park uses.

During the development of this inventory, Area Municipal staff evaluated each parcel, assigning the appropriate category to the parcel. The mapping of parcels in the initial years of the inventory was provided to the Economic Development Liaison Committee to assist in identifying parcels within the inventory. Each parcel was assigned an identification number, with other information about the parcel being documented as follows:

- the municipal address and/or legal description;
- the physical size of each parcel;
- ownership information;
- the physical extent of any constraints to development located within the parcel;
- zoning category applicable to the parcel;
- whether the parcel is designated for serviced or unserviced development; and
- any additional comments, such as proximity to major arterials, Hwy 401.
exposure, whether it is located on a rail line, or the topography of the parcel, ownership and potential uses etc.

In 2013 and 2014, having a solid methodology and understanding of the inventory process, parcels were provided to economic development officers, or appropriate staff from each Area Municipality, for review, update and comment.

3.4 Calculation of ‘Developable’, ‘Designated Serviced’ and ‘Publically/Privately Owned’

Provincially significant constraints such as Provincially Significant Wetlands and Environmentally Sensitive Policy Areas were removed from the area of land available for development identified for each inventory parcel. Where applicable, other features such as steep slopes or locally significant woodlands were also removed. The remaining area is referred to as ‘developable.’ All figures in this inventory are reported as developable acres.

The term ‘designated serviced’ in this report refers to all inventory parcels in the City or Township Urban Areas as designated by the Regional Official Policies Plan, where municipal services are provided. It may also refer to some Rural Industrial/Commercial Areas such as the Mercedes/Stockyards Area, if the industrial commercial area has access to full municipal services. ‘Designated Serviced’ does not necessarily mean that the services are currently located at the lot line of a parcel, but rather that the land either is, or will be serviced within an appropriate planning horizon. If a parcel is categorized as 'Unserviced', the parcel is located outside of either the City or Township Urban Areas and is to be developed utilizing private services (septic systems and private wells).

The term ‘publically owned’ refers to lands owned by public entities such as Area Municipalities, the Region of Waterloo, public utilities and Provincial Ministries. By converse, the term ‘privately owned’ in this report refers to all other forms of ownership other than by a public entity.

3.5 Categories of Vacant Parcels

A system to classify the vacant parcels was developed and initial categories were assigned by the Region of Waterloo Economic Development Liaison Committee based on the ability of the parcel to accommodate employment based on anticipated timing to market and ownership characteristics. During the update to the 2008 inventory, refinements were made to the category labels as a part of establishing a benchmark inventory. The 2013 and 2014 inventories were updated using the refined categories. The 2013 inventory included a new denotation of the “shovel readiness” of each category. Please see Table 1 for the summary descriptions of each category.
# Table 1: Categories of Vacant Parcels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND AVAILABLE IMMEDIATELY FOR SALE OR FOR LONG TERM LEASE (SHOVEL-READY)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Available immediately</td>
<td>These parcels are currently on the market, appropriately zoned, with no known restrictions to development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Available immediately as 'build to suit'</td>
<td>These parcels are no longer available for sale but are still immediately available to accommodate new or expanding businesses as design-build or land lease opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Available immediately in the University of Waterloo Research and Technology Park</td>
<td>This land is owned by the University of Waterloo and available only to University associated firms on long term lease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANDS AVAILABLE FOR USE BY OWNER / OR AVAILABLE BUT TIMING UNKNOWN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>No longer on the market, are anticipated to be utilized by the current owner</td>
<td>These parcels were purchased after December 31, 2004 for the specific purpose of expansion or development by the current owner. Although no longer on the market, these parcels will accommodate employment growth through new development. These lands remain within the inventory until a building permit is issued on the parcel. Issuance of a building permit is the trigger for parcel removal as it has been found that parcels in this category may become available on the market more than once, and by different owners, prior to a building being erected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>No significant restrictions to development, not on the market and not expected to be developed by the current owner</td>
<td>Many of these parcels have the potential to be placed on the market at any time, but are not currently available for sale and no knowledge exists as to when they may come on to the market. For example, parcels in this category include parcels where the owner is known to be holding a parcel as a longer term investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND THAT IS ANTICIPATED TO COME ON THE MARKET IN THE FUTURE (IN THE PIPELINE)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Available in one to two years</td>
<td>These parcels, with no known restrictions to development, are anticipated to be on the market, with appropriate planning approvals, in 2014 or 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Expect availability in over two years</td>
<td>These parcels, with no known restrictions to development, are anticipated to be on the market after 2015. All parcels within this category have the potential to be available within 10 years based on demand.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.0 Key Findings

The supply of vacant industrial and business park land remains stable. There are currently 2,650 acres in the inventory, down slightly from 2,771 acres in 2013. Table 2 provides a summary of the mid-year 2014 inventory by category, with 2013 for comparison.
Key findings include:

- Six properties were added to the inventory, contributing 58 new developable acres in three municipalities: Kitchener (1 acre), Waterloo (36 acres) and Woolwich (22 acres). Of these six new properties, three are considered ‘shovel-ready’ and the other three are ‘in the pipeline.’ An example of a property added to the inventory was through the demolition of the Manulife building on Columbia Avenue in Waterloo.

- Examples of properties removed from the inventory in 2014 include the Heroux Devtek site in the Boxwood Business Campus. A building permit was issued in 2014 to build a 116,000 square foot aerospace manufacturing plant on this site. Horst Industries in Elmira (100,000 square feet) and Fastenal in Kitchener (150,000 square foot distribution centre) also acquired building permits for new industrial buildings.

- There remains a small supply of large lot parcels. In 2014, there were 26 parcels that were larger than 25 acres. In 2013, there were 28 lots that were larger than 25 acres, 8 of which were larger than fifty acres.

- The 2014 inventory includes parcels totalling 745 acres of ‘shovel-ready’ lands, an increase of 133 acres since 2013. These lands are divided among 150 properties, an increase from the 114 parcels considered ‘shovel-ready’ in 2013.
The increase in the number of ‘shovel-ready’ parcels is primarily due to the division from one property into lots in the Boxwood Business Campus as well as in St Clements. The term ‘shovel-ready’ refers to parcels that have appropriate land use designations and zoning to accommodate industrial and business park development and that are on the market, either for sale or as a build-to-suit/land lease opportunity (see Map 1.)

- Almost 93 per cent of the ‘shovel-ready’ land supply is fully municipally serviced, compared to 90 per cent in the 2013 mid-year inventory.

- Of the 157 ‘shovel-ready’ parcels, only three are larger than 25 acres. This is similar to the conditions that existed in previous inventories. Of the three ‘shovel-ready’ large lots, one is larger than 50 acres. In 2013, there were no parcels available that were larger than fifty acres. The new large site is located at 300 Bridge Street also in Kitchener which was previously a “category 7” site. Development of the East Side Lands is progressing to meet the potential need for large lots on the market and to attract new investment.

- An additional 607 acres of ‘pipeline lands’ are available. The ‘pipeline’ refers to lands that are appropriately designated for industrial and business park uses, but may require a zoning by-law amendment or servicing improvements before they are ‘shovel-ready’. Lands ‘in the pipeline’ are expected to be ‘shovel-ready’ in the next 1-10 years (see Map 1.)

- Some lands that were considered to be ‘in the pipeline’ at mid-year 2013 (e.g. approximately 150 acres in Boxwood Business Campus, Cambridge) are now considered ‘shovel-ready’.
Map 1: Location of ‘Shovel-ready’ and ‘Pipeline’ Lands
### Table 3: Summary of the Mid-Year 2014 Region of Waterloo Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory & Detailed Summaries by Municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat.</th>
<th>Region of Waterloo</th>
<th>Cambridge</th>
<th>Kitchener</th>
<th>Waterloo</th>
<th>Woolwich</th>
<th>North Dumfries</th>
<th>Wilmot</th>
<th>Wellesley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developable Acres</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Designated Serviced Total</td>
<td>Developable Acres</td>
<td>Designated Serviced</td>
<td>Developable Acres</td>
<td>Designated Serviced</td>
<td>Developable Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>504.9</td>
<td>19.06%</td>
<td>448.23</td>
<td>118.98</td>
<td>118.98</td>
<td>174.77</td>
<td>174.77</td>
<td>40.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>209.5</td>
<td>7.91%</td>
<td>209.5</td>
<td>100.12</td>
<td>100.12</td>
<td>49.45</td>
<td>49.45</td>
<td>56.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.69</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
<td>30.69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>339.54</td>
<td>12.81%</td>
<td>252.05</td>
<td>150.27</td>
<td>150.27</td>
<td>57.94</td>
<td>57.94</td>
<td>26.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>168.85</td>
<td>6.37%</td>
<td>149.13</td>
<td>64.61</td>
<td>64.61</td>
<td>34.41</td>
<td>34.41</td>
<td>22.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>229.52</td>
<td>8.66%</td>
<td>229.52</td>
<td>54.09</td>
<td>54.09</td>
<td>37.55</td>
<td>37.55</td>
<td>26.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>377.71</td>
<td>14.25%</td>
<td>238.77</td>
<td>60.27</td>
<td>60.27</td>
<td>35.86</td>
<td>35.86</td>
<td>142.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>582.64</td>
<td>21.99%</td>
<td>406.52</td>
<td>151.39</td>
<td>151.39</td>
<td>90.03</td>
<td>90.03</td>
<td>10.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>206.32</td>
<td>7.79%</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2649.67</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>1969.45</td>
<td>699.73</td>
<td>699.73</td>
<td>480.01</td>
<td>480.01</td>
<td>355.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Available for use by owner**

**Anticipated to come on to the market in the future**

**Constrained land**

**Potentially in transition to other uses**

**Total**
5.0 Detailed Findings and Analysis

The following summarizes the characteristics of the lands contained in the inventory of vacant industrial and business park land as of June 30, 2014. Refer to Table 2 (previous page) for a summary of the inventory by municipality. For parcel-level detail, including maps, please refer to the report appendices.

Overall, there are 2,650 net developable acres of vacant industrial and business park land as of mid-year 2014. This is down four per cent from the amount of land that was available in 2013 (2,771 acres.)

5.1 Lands on the Market (‘shovel-ready’)

Category 1, 2 and 3 lands represent the Region’s capacity to meet immediate industrial and business park land needs, as they are already designated for industrial and business park uses and are currently on the market for sale or lease. Parcels of land within these categories are considered ‘shovel-ready’.

As of mid-year 2014, there were 157 parcels in these categories. This represented 745 net developable acres, or 28 per cent of the total inventory. This was an increase from 611 acres that were available in 2013.

By area, 571 acres (77 per cent) of land in categories 1, 2 and 3 was located within the cities, with the City of Kitchener having the most at 224 acres (30 per cent). Of the 150 properties in these categories, the greatest number was located in Cambridge (58 parcels). The townships accounted for another 174 acres or 23 per cent of the inventory.

Specifically, parcels included in category 1 are vacant, and currently on the market. Over 500 developable acres of category 1 lands were available in 2014, accounting for almost 20 per cent of the total inventory. Most of this land (87 per cent) had servicing.

Although the next two categories of land are not available for purchase, these lands still represent immediate opportunities to accommodate new or expanding businesses.

Category 2 parcels are on the market but only available for ‘build to suit’ and ‘land lease’ opportunities. Approximately 210 developable acres of serviced land were available in this category, stable from the previous year.

Category 3 lands are located within the University of Waterloo Research and Technology Park. Just over 30 acres of serviced land were available for long term lease to firms which are associated with the university.
5.2 Lands Anticipated to Come on to the Market (including lands ‘in the pipeline’)

Lands in categories 5, 6, and 7 were not on the market at the time of the inventory, but they are anticipated to become available in the future.

At mid-year 2014, land within these categories amounted almost 30 per cent of the total inventory. There were 776 acres of land within these categories, down from 1,086 acres in the previous year. Over 60 per cent was located in the cities.

Of this land, 617 acres (80 per cent) were designated for serviced development, while an additional 159 acres were designated for private servicing. Most land was held in private ownership (571 acres or 74 per cent), an increase from 2013 when 53 per cent was privately-owned.

Specifically, categories 6 and 7 represent vacant parcels without significant constraints to development, where there is an expectation the land will be brought to market within one to ten years. These lands, referred to as ‘in the pipeline,’ are all appropriately designated for industrial and business park uses, but may require a zone change or servicing upgrades before they are considered ‘shovel-ready’. Category 6 lands are expected to be brought to market within two years, while lands within category 7 are expected to be available for development between two to ten years.

There were 607 acres of lands considered to be ‘in the pipeline’, almost a quarter (23 per cent) of the total inventory. However, it is a drop of over a third (35 per cent) from the previous year, when there were 937 acres. Lands that have moved from the pipeline to ‘shovel-ready’ in the past year include Boxwood Business Campus (152 developable hectares), 300 Bridge Street, Kitchener (52 acres), and two sites west of New Hamburg, north of highway 7/8 (32 acres). Additionally, a site on Main Street, Cambridge (43 acres) moved to category 5, and a property on Greenfield Road in North Dumfries (36 acres) came out of the inventory.

The timeframe associated with development of category 5 lands is less predictable. While there are no apparent constraints to the immediate use of the lands, they have not been on the market for at least ten years. In many instances they could be considered a source for ‘shovel-ready’ land, should the owner decide to build, or for the immediate sale of the lands, should the owner decide to bring them to market. However, they can not be marketed as such because these lands may be held as longer-term investments or for the future expansions of existing businesses. This is a relatively small category: there were 169 acres of land in this category, representing six per cent of the total inventory. Of this land, 149 acres are designated serviced.
5.3 Available for Use by Owner

Category 4 contains parcels which typically have been purchased by businesses to provide for future expansion or development. Since these parcels are no longer on the market, they are immediately available for development by the owner. Category 4 is meant to hold parcels for a year or two after being sold and prior to a building permit being issued. There are, however, some parcels that have been placed in this category and remain there for several years, or are put back on the market – moving from category 4 back into a ‘shovel-ready’ category.

At mid-year 2014, there were 340 acres of land within category 4, or 13 per cent of the total inventory. Of these lands, 252 acres (74 per cent) were designated for serviced development, while 88 acres (26 per cent) were for private servicing.

There were 65 parcels of land in this category. By municipality, Kitchener had 25 parcels available, covering 58 acres. Cambridge had fewer parcels in this category (15) but accounted for more land (150 acres).

5.4 Lands with Constraints or Potentially in Transition to Other Uses

Lands in categories 8 and 9 may potentially not be developed for employment land uses. At mid-year 2014, land within these categories accounted for 30 per cent of the total inventory. Almost half of these lands (359 acres) were located in Woolwich Township. Of the land in Categories 8 and 9, a total of 412 acres, or just over half, were designated for serviced development.

Parcels in category 8 are subject to significant constraints to development such as contamination, topographical challenges, servicing restrictions or transportation limitations. There were 583 acres of land in category 8 at mid-year 2014, an increase of 76 acres from 2013.

Category 9 lands, although designated, zoned and potentially well suited for industrial and business park uses, were subject to planning applications to convert the lands to other uses at the time of the inventory. There were 206 acres of land in category 9, almost entirely in Woolwich Township. This is down from 235 acres in 2013.

6.0 Other Lands Accommodating Employment Growth

The scope of this inventory addresses a subset of employment land (i.e. vacant industrial and business park lands) associated with manufacturing and related uses (vacant industrial and business park lands). Outside of this subset there are many opportunities to accommodate employment growth in Waterloo Region. These opportunities include:

1) Re-urbanization of underutilized parcels on land designated for industrial and business park uses
2) Redevelopment or the reuse/repurpose of vacant industrial buildings
3) Vacant lands found in other employment land designations such as arterial commercial corridors, commercial campuses or ‘power centres’, service commercial areas and in institutional designations

4) Vacant lands found in other land use designations (not exclusively designated for employment) such as mixed use corridors, mixed use nodes, neighbourhood centres, downtowns, Rapid Transit Station Areas, agricultural lands and residential areas (home based businesses)

5) Vacant lands found at the Region of Waterloo International Airport that are zoned and available for airport related uses

6) The 958 acres of developable land in North Cambridge designated as Prime Industrial / Strategic Reserve following the approval of Regional Official Policies Plan Amendment 28. Much work has been done through the East Side Lands (Stage 1) Master Environmental Servicing Plan to bring this land to market including approximately 200 acres referred to as the “Quick Start Lands”. However, the lands are not included in the Inventory as they have not yet been designated for industrial and business park uses in the City of Cambridge Official Plan

7) Vacant lands soon to be designated for industrial and business park uses
Appendix 1 - Map of City of Cambridge Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land
### Appendix 2 - City of Cambridge Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory

#### City of Cambridge Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Man</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Cat</th>
<th>Legal Description</th>
<th>Privately Owned</th>
<th>Designated Serviced</th>
<th>Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Area Available for Development</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Pinebush Road, Lot 422, Concept 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 58M467 PT BLK 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>31.22</td>
<td>31.22</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>M1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>45 Highridge Ct</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1382 PT LOT 21 RP 58R17341 PT 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Purchased for business expansion, but is a stand-alone parcel, entire site is 7.63 acres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>129 Pinebush Rd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RCP 1382 PT LOT 26 RP 58R12913 PTS 2, 3, 5 AND 6 PT 1 AND 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Parcel potentially available as build to lease, MTO Intersection improvements and Regional Road improvements may affect this property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>350 Pinebush Rd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>REG COMP PLAN 1384 LOT 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>13.99</td>
<td>13.99</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>340 Holiday Inn Dr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 907 PT LOT 12 RP 58R15577 PT 1 RP 58R16283 PT 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>M1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>350 Industrial Rd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 1427 LOT 5 PT BLK 24 AND RP 58R13404 PTS 3 AND 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Build to suit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>464 Dobble Dr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1135 PT LOT 56 RP 58R11417 PTS 2,3,4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Eastern Industrial Park - Rail access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>540 Jamieson Pky</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>REG COMP PLAN 1843 LOT 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>9.99</td>
<td>9.99</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Restricted servicing - build to suit lease only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>700 Jamieson Pky</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 58M223 PT BLK 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>M1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>120 Saltsman Dr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 58M302 BLK 1 INCLUDES 50 BARNES RD</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>12.43</td>
<td>12.43</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Build to suit lease only, two buildings are proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>54 Saltsman Dr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASILS BP PT LOT 21 RP 58R15720 PTS 13 AND 14</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Build to suit for sale, vacant land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>507 Franklin Blvd Corner of Franklin Blvd And Savage Dr Lot 467</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1135 PT LOT 46 RP 58R18709 PARTS 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>20.77</td>
<td>20.77</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Eastern Industrial Park, continues to be vacant with no building permits, not listed for sale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Mun</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>Legal Description</td>
<td>Privately Owned</td>
<td>Designated Serviced</td>
<td>Area (Acres)</td>
<td>Area Available for Development</td>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Detailed Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>111 Savage Dr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1135 PT LOT 52 RP 58R14105 PT 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>M4</td>
<td>Stand-alone parcel. Access to Dobie Drive - purchased by nearby business for expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>1140 Main St</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>CON 115 PT LOT 5 RP 67R8810 PT 1 RP 67R3579 PT 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>43.92</td>
<td>43.02</td>
<td>(H)M4</td>
<td>Access to Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>467</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>340 Franklin Blvd</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>REG COMP PLAN 1135 PT LOT 28</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Franklin Blvd</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>CON 11 PT LOT 5 REG COMP PLAN 1135 PT 27 PT LOT 28 RP67R3772 PT 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>469</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>500 Main St</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>CON 11 PT LOT 5 RP67R3772 PT 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Franklin Blvd</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>CON 11 PT LOT 5 REG COMP PLAN 1135 PT LOT 28 RP67R3772 PT 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>471</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Farmkin Blvd</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>CON 11 PT LOT 5 REG COMP PLAN 1135 PT LOT 28 RP67R3772 PT 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Eagle St N</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PLAN 1364 LOT 22</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11.39</td>
<td>11.39</td>
<td>M4</td>
<td>Rail access, hwy 401 exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>478</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>475 Wittner St</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PLAN 1364 LOT 21 RP 58R14440 PTS 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>36.41</td>
<td>19.60</td>
<td>M4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Bishop at Canamera Pky</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RCP 1383 PT LOT 25 RP 58R14644 PT PT; RCP 1380 PT LOT 1 RP 1383 PT LOTS 24 &amp; 25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>24.06</td>
<td>23.57</td>
<td>(H)M2 &amp; (H)M3</td>
<td>Parcel is proposed to be subdivided for design build opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>487</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>230 Pinebush Rd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1384 PT LOT 3 RP 67R15356 PT 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>MTO road improvements may affect this property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>499</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Boxwood Dr. Lot 810</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLD CON BEASLEYS BROKEN FRONT PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP 58R14147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>770 Boxwood Dr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CON BEASLEYS BROKEN FRONT PT LOT 30 RP 58R12550 PT 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Access to Boxwood Dr and Vondrau Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>800 Maplegrove Rd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CON BEASLEYS BROKEN FRONT PT LOT 30 RP67R2727 PT 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>25.08</td>
<td>25.08</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Access to Boxwood Dr. and Maple Grove. Owner will use for their own purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>140 Old Mill Rd</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>SVY BEASLEYS OLD PT LOT 6 PT PART 1 RP 58R12575</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>63.20</td>
<td>54.09</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>ZCA and Plan of Subdivision in process, proposing 14 industrial lots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Riverbank Dr / Maple Grve Rd</td>
<td>CON BEASLEYS BROKEN FRONT PT LOTS 8.9.13 &amp; 14</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>87.13</td>
<td>84.22</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Land locked - this parcel is smaller than represented on the map - the area reflects this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>534</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>609 Sheldon Dr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>RCP 1386 PT LOT 6 RP 58R15732 PT 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>M2 &amp; M3</td>
<td>Used for outdoor storage, unavailable for development at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>810 Clyde Rd</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>CON 12 PT LOT 1 RP67R2834 PTS 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>25.23</td>
<td>23.55</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Holding - No Servicing. Requires a pumping station and forcemain. Listed for Sale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>300 Jamieson Pky</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 58M181 LOT 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>On the market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>579</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>320 Jamieson Pky</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 58M181 LOT 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Design Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>306 Jamieson Pky</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 58M181 LOT 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>On the market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>581</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>45 Commerce Crt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 58M181 LOT 6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Site plan approved, building permit is pending.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>584</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>899 Langs Dr</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>PLAN 1375 PT LOT 13 RP67R3440 PT 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>806 Clyde Rd</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NORTH DUMFRIES CON 12 PT LOTS 1 AND 2 RP 58R14888 PTS 2 AND 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Holding - Municipal water only. Requires other services. For sale woodlot is not netted out of area (not prov sign!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Mun</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>Legal Description</td>
<td>Privately Owned</td>
<td>Designated Serviced</td>
<td>Area (Acres)</td>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Detailed Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>2310 Townline Rd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RCP 1386 PT LT 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>M1 (H) This property is back on the market in a prime location.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 610| Cam | 840 Main St              | 8   | CON 11 PT LOT 4 PT LOT 5 PLAN 1135  
 PT LOT 28 PT LOT 49 | Y              | Y                   | 54.29       | 36.18   |                                                                   |
| 617| Cam | Townline Rd              | 4   | REG COMP PLAN 1386 PT LOT 6 CON 4  
 PT LT 3 RPS8113030 PT 2 | Y              | Y                   | 2.92        | 2.92    | M1 (H) Lands to be used by current owner.                                      |
| 624| Cam | Industrial Rd            | 5   | REG COMP PLAN 1374 PT LOT 42  
 RP67R2458 PTS 1&2 | Y              | Y                   | 3.20        | 3.20    | M3 If brought to market, may be developed in conjunction with id no. 625         |
| 625| Cam | Industrial Rd            | 5   | REG COMP PLAN 1374 PT LOT 42  
 RP67R2458 PTS 3&4 | Y              | Y                   | 3.42        | 3.42    | M3 If brought to market, may be developed in conjunction with id no. 624         |
| 702| Cam | 600 Fountain St          | 2   | CON BEASLEYS BROKEN FRONT PT LOT  
 24 | Y              | Y                   | 3.01        | 3.01    | M1 Parcel is listed as build to suit for sale.                                |
| 703| Cam | 292 Shepherd Ave         | 4   | PLAN 908 PT LOT 15         | Y              | Y                   | 1.15        | 1.15    | M1 Sold in 2012, future home to a trucking business                              |
| 704| Cam | 240 Pinebusen Rd         | 2   | PLAN 1384 PT LOT 3 RP 67R1536 PT 2  
 19 RP S88942 PTS 2 TO 11 14 & 15 AND  
 17 | Y              | Y                   | 2.91        | 2.91    | M1 Same Owner as ID99 and #487. MTO road improvements may affect this property  |
| 737| Cam | Fountain St at Allendale  | 7   | CON BEASLEYS BROKEN FRONT PT LOT  
 27 RP S88942 PTS 1 TO 10  
 17 | Y              | Y                   | 28.45       | 28.45   | Is subject to a plan of subdivision and zone change application                |
| 750| Cam | 210 Royal Oak Rd         | 4   | WATERLOO CON BEASLEYS BROKEN FRONT PT LOT  
 27 RP S88942 PTS 1 TO 10  
 17 | Y              | Y                   | 9.10        | 9.10    | (H) CM2 Not for sale, to be used by current owner. A residential use still remains on this property |
| 762| Cam | Heroux Devtek Dr          | 1   | WATERLOO CON BEASLEYS BF PT LOTS  
 27 TO 29 AND RP S88184 PT 1 TO 6  
 11 TO 49 | N              | Y                   | 3.43        | 3.43    | M3 City owned - Available in 2014                                              |
| 766| Cam | 65 Heroux Devtek Dr       | 1   | WATERLOO CON BEASLEYS BF PT LOTS  
 27 TO 29 AND RP S88184 PT 1 TO 6  
 11 TO 49 | N              | Y                   | 3.66        | 3.66    | M3 City owned - Available in 2014                                              |
| 767| Cam | 75 Heroux Devtek Dr       | 1   | WATERLOO CON BEASLEYS BF PT LOTS  
 27 TO 29 AND RP S88184 PT 1 TO 6  
 11 TO 49 | N              | Y                   | 2.51        | 2.51    | M3 City owned - Available in 2014                                              |
| 768| Cam | 85 Heroux Devtek Dr       | 1   | WATERLOO CON BEASLEYS BF PT LOTS  
 27 TO 29 AND RP S88184 PT 1 TO 6  
 11 TO 49 | N              | Y                   | 1.28        | 1.28    | M3 City owned - Available in 2014                                              |
| 769| Cam | 95 Heroux Devtek Dr       | 1   | WATERLOO CON BEASLEYS BF PT LOTS  
 27 TO 29 AND RP S88184 PT 1 TO 6  
 11 TO 49 | N              | Y                   | 1.62        | 1.62    | M3 City owned - Available in 2014                                              |
| 770| Cam | Heroux Devtek Dr          | 1   | WATERLOO CON BEASLEYS BF PT LOTS  
 27 TO 29 AND RP S88184 PT 1 TO 6  
 11 TO 49 | N              | Y                   | 4.03        | 4.03    | (H) M2 s4.1.255 City owned - Available in 2014                                |
| 771| Cam | Heroux Devtek Dr and Goddard Cres  | 1   | WATERLOO CON BEASLEYS BF PT LOTS  
 27 TO 29 AND RP S88184 PT 1 TO 6  
 11 TO 49 | N              | Y                   | 1.43        | 1.43    | (H) M2 s4.1.255 City owned - Available in 2014                                |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Mun</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Cat</th>
<th>Legal Description</th>
<th>Privately Owned</th>
<th>Designated Serviced</th>
<th>Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Area Available for Development</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Detailed Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>772</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Heroux Devtek Dr and Goddard Cres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP S8R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>(H) M2</td>
<td>s.4.1.255 City owned - Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>150 Goddard Cres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP S8R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>(H) M2</td>
<td>s.4.1.255 City owned - Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>774</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>140 Goddard Cres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP S8R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>s.4.1.255 City owned - Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>775</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>130 Goddard Cres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP S8R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>s.4.1.255 City owned - Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>776</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>120 Goddard Cres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP S8R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>s.4.1.255 City owned - Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>777</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>110 Goddard Cres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP S8R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>s.4.1.255 City owned - Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>778</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>100 Goddard Cres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP S8R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>s.4.1.255 City owned - Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>782</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Boxwood Dr. Lot 810</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP S8R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>City Owned. On the market in 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>783</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>80 Goddard Cres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP S8R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>City owned - Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>786</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>60 Goddard Cres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP S8R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>City owned - Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>787</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>50 Goddard Cres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP S8R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>City owned - Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>788</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>40 Goddard Cres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP S8R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>City owned - Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>789</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>30 Goddard Cres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP S8R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>City owned - Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>790</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>20 Goddard Cres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP S8R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>City owned - Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Mun</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>Legal Description</td>
<td>Privately Owned</td>
<td>Designated Serviced</td>
<td>Area (Acres)</td>
<td>Area Available for Development</td>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Detailed Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>791</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Heroux Devtek Dr and Goddard Cres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP S8R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>City owned -Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>792</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>70 Heroux Devtek Dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP S8R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>City owned -Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>793</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>60 Heroux Devtek Dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP S8R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>City owned -Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>794</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>50 Heroux Devtek Dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP S8R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>City owned -Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>795</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>40 Heroux Devtek Dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP S8R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>City owned -Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>796</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>30 Heroux Devtek Dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP S8R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>City owned -Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>797</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>20 Heroux Devtek Dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP S8R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>City owned -Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>798</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>10 Heroux Devtek Dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP S8R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>City owned -Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Heroux Devtek Dr and Goddard Cres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP S8R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>City owned -Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>15 to 155 Goddard Cres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP S8R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>City owned -Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>803</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>15 to 155 Goddard Cres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP S8R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>City owned -Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>804</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>15 to 155 Goddard Cres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP S8R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>City owned -Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>805</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>15 to 155 Goddard Cres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP S8R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>City owned -Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>806</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>15 to 155 Goddard Cres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP S8R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>City owned -Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Mun</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>Legal Description</td>
<td>Privately Owned</td>
<td>Designated Serviced</td>
<td>Area (Acres)</td>
<td>Area Available for Development</td>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Detailed Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>807</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>15 to 155 Goddard Cres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP 59R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>City owned -Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>808</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>15 to 155 Goddard Cres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP 59R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>City owned -Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>809</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>15 to 155 Goddard Cres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP 59R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>City owned -Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>810</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>15 to 155 Goddard Cres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP 59R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>City owned -Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>811</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>15 to 155 Goddard Cres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP 59R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>City owned -Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>812</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>15 to 155 Goddard Cres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP 59R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>City owned -Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>813</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>15 to 155 Goddard Cres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP 59R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>City owned -Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>814</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>Heroux Devtek Dr and Goddard Cres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WATERLOO CON BEASLEY'S BF PT LOTS 27 TO 29 AND RP 59R18147 PTS 1 TO 6 11 TO 49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>City owned -Available in 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3 - Map of City of Kitchener Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land
# Appendix 4 – City of Kitchener Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory

City of Kitchener Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Mun</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Cat</th>
<th>Legal Description</th>
<th>Privately Owned</th>
<th>Designated Serviced</th>
<th>Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Area Available for Development</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Detailed Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>McIntyre Dr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1471 PT LOT 14 RPS8R10560 PT 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Stand-alone parcel purchased for owner's expansion, currently used for storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>40 Adam Ferrie Pl</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN RCP1478 LOT 26 RP SBR1111 PT 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Stand alone parcel not available - future expansion of parcel adjacent to left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Strasburg Rd</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>PLAN 1471 PT LOT 17 RPS86642 PT 1 &amp; 2 SUBJ TO ROW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>37.66</td>
<td>37.55</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Mun. Draft Apprvd - Req for upgrading of Battler Rd to full mun stdrs across the entire frontage. Subject to conditions of the Strasburg Crk Master Watershed Plan - merged with ID#519, Central Maintenance Facility Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>1655 Strasburg Rd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RC PLAN 1471 PT LOT 17 RP SBR15163 PT 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Requirement for upgrading of Battler Rd to full municipal standards across the entire frontage. Subject to conditions of the Strasburg Creek Master Watershed Plan. Used to be a part of a 12.5 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>74 Bleams Rd</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PLAN 1490 PT LOT 5 PTS 2 &amp; 3 RPS8R2505</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>This site is impaired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Sereda Rd</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>GCT SUB LT 39 PT LT 10 PT L 40 PT L T F RPS8R6980 PT 1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>City owned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>36 Crestview Pl</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 20</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Lands sold in 2005 but no building permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>88 Centennial Rd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1698 LOT 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>Lands sold in 05 but no building permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>120 Centennial Rd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1698 LOT 6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>Lands sold in 2005 but no building permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>112 Centennial Rd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1698 LOT 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>Sold in 2005 approved site plan building permit under review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>201 Centennial Crt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1698 LOT 7</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>Sold in 2005 approved site plan building permit under review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>New Dundee Rd</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>SURVEY BEASLEYS OLD PT LOT 7</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Unservicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>1800 Strasburg Rd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 1382 PT LOT 1 RP SBR17260 PTS 1 AND 3 RPS8R6568 PT 36</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Weber Supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>211 McIntyre Dr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1471 PT LOT 14 RPS8R3568 PT 36</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Owned by business on adjoining property to the left for future growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>15 Riverview Pl</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 27</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>21 Riverview Pl</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 28</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Sold in 05 building permit is pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Mun</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>Legal Description</td>
<td>Privately Owned</td>
<td>Designated Serviced</td>
<td>Area (Acres)</td>
<td>Area Available for Development</td>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Detailed Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>44 Crestview Pl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 19</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>To be sold with lots 6, 7 and 18, 13 acres in total at $205,000 per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>40 Cedarview Pl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 7</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>To be sold with Parts 6, 18 and 19, 13 acres in total at $205,000 per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>38 Cedarview</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 8</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Parcel sold in 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>41 Crestview Pl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 18</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>To be sold with Lots 6, 7 and 19, 13 acres in total at $205,000 per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>2260 Shirley Dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 11</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Parcel sold in 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>22 Cedarview Pl</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 10</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Parcel sold in 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>28 Cedarview Pl</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 9</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Subdivision approved as 12 Lots Can be developed as 1-3 larger lots without the Cedarview Pl cul-de-sac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>27 Cedarview Pl</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Parcel sold in 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>2216 Shirley Dr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Parcel sold in 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>31 Cedarview</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Parcel sold in 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>33 Cedarview Pl</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Parcel sold in 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>39 Cedarview Pl</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Land sold in 05 but no building permit. Truck trailers on property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>2295 Shirley Dr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 36</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Land sold in 05, small office Building Permit issued. Truck trailers being stored on property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>2315 Shirley Dr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 37</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Land sold in 05, small office Building Permit issued. Truck trailers being stored on property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>27 Riverview Pl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 29</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Land sold in 05, small office Building Permit issued. Truck trailers being stored on property.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

334 Kit 8 21 and 22 RP S5814741 Pts 4 and 5 CON BEASLEYS BROKEN FRONT PT LOTS Extension N Y 4.23 4.23 B3 Constrained

335 Kit 8 FRONT PT LOTS 21 AND 22 WATERLOO BEASLEYS BROKEN EXTENSION N Y 7.60 5.09 B3 / P2 partially treed constrained

345 Kit 2 RCP 1524 PT LOT 10 RP S5812376 PT PT 3 3 Access to Wilson and to Goodrich - severed. Former Michelin Tire Plant

349 Kit 4 PLAN 1420 LOT 3 Y Y 0.98 0.83 M2 This is a stand-alone assessment parcel, purchased for expansion by the owner

350 Kit 4 PLAN 1420 LOT 4 Y Y 0.98 0.85 M2 This is a stand-alone assessment parcel purchased for expansion by the owner

359 Kit 4 RCP 1489 PT LOT 5 RP S5815681 PT 1 Y Y 3.61 3.61 M4 Frontage on Manitou and access to Sasage

362 Kit 1 PLAN 1471 PT LOT 12 RP S5814393 PT 2 2 2 Recentely purchased awaiting building permit.

380 Kit 4 2 PLAN 1471 PT LOT 12 RP S5814393 PT 2 2 2 Recentely purchased awaiting building permit.

401 Kit 8 LOT 37 38 N Y 69.29 44.25 M4 Access to Riverbend Dr and Shirley Ave. Severe grading issues - rolling hills and treed. Owned by MTO.

402 Kit 8 PLAN 763 PT LOT 38 PLAN 970 PT LOT 3 Y Y 0.93 0.92 M4 No frontage

406 Kit 8 GCT PT LT 59 MCP OF SUB OF LT 59 GCT PT 1 AND 10 RP S587331 Pts 5 23 Y Y 1.06 1.06 M2 Constrained, slope stability review

409 Kit 8 PLAN 666 PT LOT 116 Y Y 0.98 0.98 M2 Access to both Maple and Birch - a complete parcel
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Mun</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Cat</th>
<th>Legal Description</th>
<th>Privately Owned</th>
<th>Designated Serviced</th>
<th>Area [Acres]</th>
<th>Area Available for Development</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Detailed Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>211 Spring Valley Rd</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PLAN 40 PT LOT 8 PT LOT 5 TRACT GERMAN COMPANY SUB LOT 58 LOT 16 PT LOT 17</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>Partial constrained by future Hwy 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Guzelh St</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PLAN 40 PT LOT 10</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>Most or all of parcel is part of future Hwy 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>32 Forwell Rd</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 121 RPSR4526 PT 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>34.41</td>
<td>34.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gravel pit, potentially servicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>5 Forwell Rd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 123 RP SRRB8242 PT 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>On the market for $275,000/acre. Can be developed as one parcel of 47.96 acres, or individually as four lots. Please note that total developable is slightly larger than the net developable land offered for sale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>300 Bridge St E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 112 RP SRR8724 PTS 1 TO 5 PT LOT 1 AND 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>116.39</td>
<td>52.22</td>
<td>P3 / B2</td>
<td>Priority post 2006 this parcel may be larger than is represented req access from River Rd ext w/hwy 8 interchange &amp; a pumping station EA Pending. On the market for $291,005/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>280 Hidden Valley Rd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RIGHT OF WAY PLAN 986 LOT 36, 38 &amp; 39 PLAN 961 LOT 13</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>16.12</td>
<td>16.12</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Priority post 2006 parcel may be larger than is represented requires access from River Rd ext w/hwy 8 interchange &amp; a pumping station EA Pending.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Hidden Valley Rd</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>PLAN 1523 PT LOT 3 AND PT LOT 1 RP SRR9582 PTS 2 TO 7</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>38.58</td>
<td>35.86</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Priority post 2006 parcel may be larger than is represented requires access from River Rd ext w/hwy 8 interchange &amp; a pumping station EA Pending.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>593</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Hesh Cres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 5BM424 PT BLK 4 RP SBR16128 PT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Was previously part of a 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>594</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Hesh Cres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 5BM424 BLKS 2 AND 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Was previously part of a 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Bingemans Centre Dr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 122 RP SBR13418 PTS 11 AND 20</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>This is a completely separate parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>2085 Shirley Dr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 5BM424 PT BLK 1 RP SBR16128 PT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Shirley Dr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 5BM424 PT BLK 1 RP SBR16128 PT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Shirley Dr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 5BM424 PT BLK 1 RP SBR16128 PT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Shirley Dr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 5BM424 PT BLK 1 RP SBR16128 PT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>633</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Shirley Dr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 5BM424 PT BLK 1 RP SBR16128 PT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Shirley Dr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 5BM424 PT BLK 1 RP SBR16128 PT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>635</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Shirley Dr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 5BM424 PT BLK 1 RP SBR16128 PT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Shirley Dr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 5BM424 PT BLK 1 RP SBR16128 PT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>637</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>2215 Shirley Dr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 32</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>638</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>2235 Shirley Dr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 1677 LOT 33</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>639</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Courtland Ave E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>KITCHNER PLAN 1206 PT BLK 3 PLAN 1221 PT BLK 6 PLAN SBR12301 PT 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Parcel has severe slope constraints that will make it difficult to develop for industrial, parcel will likely receive an application for redesignation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>1585 Battler Rd</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PLAN 1478 PT LOT 5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>13.67</td>
<td>13.67</td>
<td>&lt;Null&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Mun</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Cat</th>
<th>Legal Description</th>
<th>Privately Owned</th>
<th>Designated Serviced</th>
<th>Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Area Available for Development</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Detailed Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>711</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Wilson Ave</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>RCP 1524 PT LOT 10 RP 58R16376 PT 6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>&lt;Null&gt;</td>
<td>This site is subject to a development application, however, it is currently designated for Industrial and Business Park Uses. Budd Park will be held as a Strategic Reserve for large lot users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>1011 Homer Watson Blvd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RCP 1489 PT LOT 31 RP 58R15576 PTS 1 TO 6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>63.81</td>
<td>63.81</td>
<td>&lt;Null&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>718</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Hesh Cres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 58M424 PT BLK 4 RP 58R16128 PT 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Was previously part of a 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>719</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Hesh Cres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 58M424 PT BLK 6 RP 58R16128 PT 16</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Used to be part of a 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Hesh Cres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 58M424 PT BLK 6 RP 58R16128 PT 17</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Used to be part of a 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>721</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Hesh Cres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 58M424 PT BLK 6 RP 58R16128 PT 18</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Used to be part of a 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>722</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Hesh Cres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 58M424 PT BLK 6 RP 58R16128 PT 19</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Used to be part of a 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>723</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Shirley Ave</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 58M424 PT BLK 6 RP 58R16128 PT 15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Used to be part of a 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>724</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Shirley Ave</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 58M424 PT BLK 6 RP 58R16128 PT 14</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Used to be part of a 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Shirley Ave</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 58M424 PT BLK 6 RP 58R16128 PT 13</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Used to be part of a 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>726</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Hesh Cres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 58M424 PT BLK 6 RP 58R16128 PT 12</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Used to be part of a 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>727</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Hesh Cres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 58M424 PT BLK 5 RP 58R16128 PT 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Used to be part of a 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>728</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Hesh Cres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 58M424 PT BLK 5 RP 58R16128 PT 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Used to be part of a 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>729</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Hesh Cres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 58M424 PT BLK 5 RP 58R16128 PT 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Used to be part of a 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Hesh Cres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 58M424 PT BLK 5 RP 58R16128 PT 6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Used to be part of a 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>731</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Hesh Cres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 58M424 PT BLK 5 RP 58R16128 PT 7</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Used to be part of a 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>732</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Hesh Cres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 58M424 PT BLK 5 RP 58R16128 PT 8</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Used to be part of a 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>733</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Hesh Cres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 58M424 PT BLK 5 RP 58R16128 PT 9</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Used to be part of a 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>734</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Hesh Cres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 58M424 PT BLK 5 RP 58R16128 PT 10</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Used to be part of a 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>735</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Hesh Cres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLAN 58M424 PT BLK 5 RP 58R16128 PT 11</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Used to be part of a 51 acre parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>3s Trillium Dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 1478 PT LOT 5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>&lt;Null&gt;</td>
<td>Used to be a portion of IDP710. On the market for $500,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Mun</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>Legal Description</td>
<td>Privately Owned</td>
<td>Designated Serviced</td>
<td>Area Available for Development (Acres)</td>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Detailed Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>1241 Strasburg Rd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,4,6,8,9</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>Currently on the market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 6 – City of Waterloo Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory

City of Waterloo Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Run</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Cat</th>
<th>Legal Description</th>
<th>Privately Owned</th>
<th>Designated Serviced</th>
<th>Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Area Available for Development</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Detailed Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>100 Wilmot Line</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 41 RPSR8685 PT 10 AND 11 SUBJ TO &amp; TOG WITH ROW</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>78.88</td>
<td>78.88</td>
<td>OP-IND Z -</td>
<td>Currently unserviced, owned by the City of Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>50 Wilmot Line</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 41 RPSR8685 PT 13</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>OP-IND Z -</td>
<td>Currently unserviced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>930 Erb St W</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 41 SUBJ TO ROW TOG WITH ROW RPSR8685 PT 1 2 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>25.56</td>
<td>25.56</td>
<td>OP-IND AC</td>
<td>Currently unserviced, owned by the City of Waterloo. West Waterloo Commercial Centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>65 Ira Needles Blvd</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 40</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>'A'</td>
<td>Unserviced - sanitary servicing constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>87 Ira Needles Blvd</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 40</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>'A'</td>
<td>Unserviced - sanitary servicing constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>73 Ira Needles Blvd</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 40</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>'A'</td>
<td>Unserviced - sanitary servicing constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>101 Ira Needles Blvd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GERMAN COMPANY TRACT PT LOT 63 RPSR12717 PT 1 TO 4 RPSR127168 2 PTS 1 TO 6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>'A'</td>
<td>Sanitary servicing available via The Boardwalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>350 Northfield Dr E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>RPSR12717 PT 1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>'A'</td>
<td>Sold, pending due diligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>617 Colby Dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 1405 LOT 16</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>12-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>41 Ira Needles Blvd</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>GERMAN COMPANY TRACT PT LOT 40 RPSR6478 PART 7</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>17.53</td>
<td>17.53</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Not serviced - Sanitary servicing constraints. Occupied by West Hill Meadows Golf Course. Front portion of property is not included as it is designated Arterial Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>450-460 Weber St N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GERMAN COMPANY TRACT PT LOTS 7 AND 12 PLAN 1155 PT RESERVE ERP RPSR137497 PT 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11.58</td>
<td>11.58</td>
<td>I-6</td>
<td>Remains on the market, up to 300,000 sq ft available, E-Lane Systems Business Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>340 University Ave E</td>
<td>8 &amp; 60 PLAN 1531 BLK 4 &amp; BLK 5</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOTS 6 7</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>I-6</td>
<td>Separate parcel with access issues - exposure to Hwy 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Mtn</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>Legal Description</td>
<td>Privately Owned</td>
<td>Designated Serviced</td>
<td>Area (Acres)</td>
<td>Area Available for Development</td>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Detailed Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>580 Weber St N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOTS 9 AND 10 AND RP SBR14706 PTS 2 TO 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>II-6</td>
<td>Severed from NCR, may be a part of whole NCR land sale. Waterloo Corporate Campus, loft offices, adjacent to LRT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>640 Colby Dr</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PLAN 1406 LOT 61</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>II-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>325 Northfield Dr E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 58M228 BLK 1 RP SBR15871 PTS 1 TO 17</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>18.62</td>
<td>18.62</td>
<td>II-6</td>
<td>Blackberry Campus, unavailable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>2415 University Ave E</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>PLAN 58M228 BLK 2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>II-6</td>
<td>Owned by the City of Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>2025 University Ave E</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>GERMAN COMPANY TRACT PT LOTS 03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>24.58</td>
<td>24.58</td>
<td>II-6</td>
<td>Owned by the City of Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>465 Wes Graham Way</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PLAN 58M350 BLK 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>sB-1</td>
<td>UW R&amp;T Park - some restrictions apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>380 Hagey Blvd And 420 Wes Graham Way</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PLAN 58M272 BLK 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>sB-1</td>
<td>UW R&amp;T Park - some restrictions apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>925 Erb St W</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 41</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Currently unserviced, owned by the City of Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>2305 University Ave E</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PLAN 58M228 BLK 5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>I-25</td>
<td>Owned by City of Waterloo. Topographic challenge to site, 7.5 metre change across site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>441 Albert Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 12</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>I-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>Country Squire Rd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 58M506 BLK 50</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>37.21</td>
<td>37.21</td>
<td>I-8</td>
<td>Activia lands limited generally to business park uses with some light manufacturing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>10 Northland Rd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LT 9 AND 1569 PT LT 12 RP SR84536 PT 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>II-6</td>
<td>Owner is not interested in selling the property at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>75 Columbia St E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>MCP SUB LOT 6 TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 1 RP SBR16677 PT 8</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>I-6</td>
<td>Build to lease / Office / R&amp;D / Medical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>630 Weber St N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 10</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>14.99</td>
<td>14.99</td>
<td>I-6</td>
<td>Rear pads are currently on the market for design build/lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>703</td>
<td>Wat</td>
<td>380 Weber St N</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 7 RP</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>14.47</td>
<td>14.47</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A complete demolition permit was issued for this property in early 2014. It is unknown if this property will be used by its current owner or if it will be brought to market.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Appendix 8 – Township of Woolwich Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory

### Township of Woolwich Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory

**Categories**

1. Vacant parcels available immediately
2. Vacant parcels available immediately as design build
3. Vacant parcels available immediately in the University of Waterloo R&T Park
4. Vacant parcels no longer on the market that are expected to be developed by the current owner
5. Vacant parcels without significant constraints, not on the market and not expected to be developed by the current owner
6. Vacant parcels available in one to two years
7. Vacant parcels with the expectation of availability in over two years
8. Vacant parcels with constraints other than timing
9. Vacant parcels without significant constraints, where development applications have been submitted for conversion to other uses

### Vacant Parcels Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Mn</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Cat</th>
<th>Legal Description</th>
<th>Privately Owned</th>
<th>Designated Serviced</th>
<th>Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Area Available for Development</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Detailed Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>33 Henry St</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PLAN 15-44 PT LOT 10 RPS8R6795 PT 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>16.85</td>
<td>16.76</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>St. Jacobs Serviced on rail line, access issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>3015 Sawmill Rd</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 7 PT LOT 35 PT LOT 36</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>39.98</td>
<td>34.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Jacobs. Farmstead, owned by MTO. Servicing constraints exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>1623 King St N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 15-47 LOT 10 RPS8R 398 PART 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>St. Jacobs Serviced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>1623 King St N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY LOTS 18 AND 19 RP SBR15634 PT 1 AND RP SBR3830 PT 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stockyards - Commercial power centre - Private services. On market for $400,000 per acre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>713 King St N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 5 RP SBR7105 PT 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stockyards - services from Waterloo, commercial. Owner intends to retain and develop property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>Reitzel Pl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LT10 RPS8R 5190 PT 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Bast Place - Regional Rd 15 Industrial Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>Three Bridges Rd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PL 1546 PT BLK 6 RPS8R9564 PT 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Bast Place - Regional Rd 15 Industrial Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>Three Bridges Rd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PL 1546 PT BLK 6 RPS8R 5984 PT 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Bast Place - Regional Rd 15 Industrial Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>5179 Fountain St N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN SBR1279 LOT 1 SUBJ TO ROW</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11.08</td>
<td>11.08</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>South Breslau Industrial Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>5158 Fountain St N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 116 WATERLOO TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 115 RP SBR158100 PT 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>South Breslau Industrial Area. Building Permit received on parcel after Mid-year 2014, this parcel will be removed in subsequent updates to the Inventory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>256 Woolwich St S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PT LOT 115 RP SBR15814 PTS 3 TO 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>South Breslau Industrial Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>1748 Greenhouse Rd</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 107 PT LOT 108 RPS8R6829 PART 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>226.37</td>
<td>197.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>This parcel is subject to a planning application to redesignate from industrial land uses to other uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>2699 Victoria St N</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 105 PT LOT 106</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>108.58</td>
<td>76.99</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Breslau East - 53 Industrial lots - Dry industrial. Likely to be subdivided. Servicing Issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>1033 Kenning Pl</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>WOOLWICH GERMAN COMPANY TRACT PT LOT 89 RP SBR16763 PTS 3 TO 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>25.28</td>
<td>25.28</td>
<td>M6(F)</td>
<td>Elmira - Servicing constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Mnr.</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>Legal Description</td>
<td>Privately Owned</td>
<td>Designated Serviced</td>
<td>Area (Acres)</td>
<td>Area Available for Development</td>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Detailed Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>65 Oriole Pky E</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>GCT PT LOT 35 RP 58R397 PT 2 RP</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>Building permit was issued after mid-year 2014. This parcel will be removed from subsequent updated to the inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>Greenhouse Rd</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 1B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>71.22</td>
<td>14.20</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Breslau East - disincentives to development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>45 Benjamin Rd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 1B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Stockyards serviced commercial. Site Plan is approved for a hotel and a building permit is pending in mid 2013. On the market for $425,000 per acre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>61 First St E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 1330 PT LOT 92 RPS811688 PT 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>Elmira - 3 acres in size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>401 Arthur St S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GERMAN COMPANY TRACT PT LOT 85</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>M5</td>
<td>Elmira - no parcel data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>Earl Martin Dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 58M191 LOT 2 PT LOT 3 RP</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>M5</td>
<td>Elmira - recent purchase (05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>45 Earl Martin Dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 58M216 LOT 1 RP 58R14190</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>M5</td>
<td>This represents two separate parcels to be split in 06 inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>371 Arthur St S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 1330 LOT 90 TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 87</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>20.99</td>
<td>20.99</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>A long narrow parcel which would be difficult to develop - serviced in future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>17 First St E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 1330 LOT 121</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Zoning only permits development on rear portion of the lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>2615 Victoria St N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 106</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Stand alone parcel for current owner's expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>Woolwich St S / Fountain St N</td>
<td>PLAN 58M179 PT LOT 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Parcel is a large island of land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>307 Woolwich St S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 58M179 PT LOT 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>238 Woolwich St</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 115</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>Henry St</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PLAN 1330 PT LOTS 1,2,5,56 86 &amp; 89</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>Rail Access - complete parcel same owner as 116 - Frontage Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>538</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>25 Erb St</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PLAN 570 PT LOT 52</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>27.68</td>
<td>27.68</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>Unroyal lands long term constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>383 Arthur St S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 58M216 LOT 1 PT LOT 58R14190 PT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>M5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>599</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>98 Union St</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 58M164 LOT 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>Vacant parcel but with some small buildings on it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>310 Union St</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 58M358 LOT 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Used to be a part of a 31 acre parcel, separated. Located in south Elmira. Lots are fully serviced, including cable and fibre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>19 Denway Crt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 58M469 LOT 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>M6</td>
<td>Located in south Elmira, 5 minutes from Waterloo. Lots are fully serviced, including cable and fibre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>270 Union St</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 58M469 LOT 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>M6</td>
<td>Located in south Elmira, 5 minutes from Waterloo. Lots are fully serviced, including cable and fibre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>705</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>463 Arthur St S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>WOOLWICH TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 85 RP 58R9643 PT 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>M2(F)</td>
<td>Limited access to site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>100 Oriole Pky E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>PLAN 1330 PT LOT 91 TOS WITH ROW</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>M2(F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>South Field Dr</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 86</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>M2(F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Mun</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>Legal Description</td>
<td>Privately Owned</td>
<td>Designated Serviced</td>
<td>Area (Acres)</td>
<td>Area Available for Development</td>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Detailed Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>Arthur St S / Earl Martin Dr</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>PLAN 58M191 LOT 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>M5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>709</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>23 Union St</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>REG COMP PLAN 1330 LOT 77 PT LOT 78</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>All structures have been removed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>736</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>18 Donway Crt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PTS 3 AND 4 PLAN 58M469 PT BLK 5 RP 58R17516</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>755</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>90 Union St</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>PLAN 1330 PT LOT 102 RP 58R16607 PT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>M6</td>
<td>Not on the market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>756</td>
<td>Woo</td>
<td>5111 Fountain St N</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOTS 110 AND 116 RP 58R11182 PTS 4 TO 6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>20.28</td>
<td>19.72</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Not on the market.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 9 – Map of Township of North Dumfries Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land
### Appendix 10 – Township of North Dumfries Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory

**Township of North Dumfries Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory**

**Categories:**
1. Vacant parcels available immediately
2. Vacant parcels available immediately as design build
3. Vacant parcels available immediately in the University of Waterloo R&T Park
4. Vacant parcels no longer on the market that are expected to be developed by the current owner
5. Vacant parcels without significant constraints, not on the market and not expected to be developed by the current owner
6. Vacant parcels available in one to two years
7. Vacant parcels with the expectation of availability in over two years
8. Vacant parcels with constraints other than timing
9. Vacant parcels without significant constraints, where development applications have been submitted for conversion to other uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Mun</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Cat</th>
<th>Legal Description</th>
<th>Privately Owned</th>
<th>Designated Serviced</th>
<th>Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Area Available for Development</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Detailed Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>170 Greenfield Rd</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>CON 9 PT LOT 36 RP589336 PTS 1 &amp; 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Ayr - no swm outlet determined yet, consideration for redesignation to commercial uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>Regional Rd 50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>CON 9 PT LOT 36 RP589336 PTS 2 &amp; 6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Ayr - no swm outlet determined yet, consideration for redesignation to commercial uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>Greenfield Rd</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>NORTH DUMFRIES CON 8 PT LOTS 35 AND 36 RP 589383 PT 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Ayr - full municipal services available. Official Plan Amendment in process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>2855 Greenfield Rd</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>CON 8 PT LOT 34 PT LOT 35</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>92.33</td>
<td>92.33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Ayr - There is a flood plain that divides this lot - amount of undevelopable local constraints totals over 21 acres - used for agriculture no interest in development, stated desire to continue agricultural use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>3 Township Rd W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CON 8 PT LOT 32</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>8.98</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>Z11</td>
<td>Ayr, used for fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>226 Boida Ave</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SBR162480 PT 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>Z11</td>
<td>This parcel has been severed into two smaller parcels - still available for development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>317 Darrell Dr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1479 LOT 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Z11</td>
<td>H401/R97 - could be subdivided, but owner has stated intent is to hold for future options and no intent to sell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>Darrell Dr / Harmony Rd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NORTH DUMFRIES CON 10 PT LOT 30 RP 67R2936 PT 1 AND 67R2936 PT 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>22.67</td>
<td>22.67</td>
<td>Z11</td>
<td>H401/R97 Stand-alone parcel purchased for owner's expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>435 Waydom Dr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1408 LOT 22</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>Z11</td>
<td>H401/R97 Stand-alone parcel purchased for owner's expansion, used by owner adjacent to the south, currently used to park business vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>Township Rd B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1407 LOT 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>Z11</td>
<td>H401/R97 road access to future subdivision to west. This site is being utilized for storage of heavy machinery, it is unavailable for development at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>Wanless Ct</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1462 PT BLK 16 RP67R3713 PT 6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>Z11</td>
<td>Parcel is part of a larger aggregate extraction operation. Parcel and old residential home on the dwelling is being utilized by a business, unavailable for development at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>2852 Cedar Creek Rd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CON 11 PT LOT 32 RP 58114574 PT 2 AND RP 67R3012 PT 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>16.27</td>
<td>16.27</td>
<td>Z11</td>
<td>H401/R97 - No access (MTO proximity to on ramp), owned by MTO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>2788 Cedar Creek Rd</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PLAN 1407 LOT 2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>Z11</td>
<td>H401/R97 - No access (MTO proximity to on ramp), owned by MTO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Mn</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>Legal Description</td>
<td>Priority Owned</td>
<td>Designated Serviced</td>
<td>Area (Acres)</td>
<td>Area Available for Development</td>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Detailed Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>60 Wanless Crt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1462 PT BLK 16 RPS8R3713 PTS 2 TO 5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>Complete separate parcel being used for trailer parking. Parcel is fully utilized for storage purposes and is unavailable for development at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>360-380 Waydon Dr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1408 LOTS 45 AND 46 AND CON</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>401/97 owned by area business for parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>2396 Cedar Creek Rd</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NORTH DUMFRIES CON 11 PT LOT 28 RP</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>34.81</td>
<td>34.81</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>401 exposure and Cochran Dr Access. Pregrading complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>Cedar Creek Rd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TOG WITH ROW</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>On the market for $1,600,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>1011 Northumberland St</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>N DUMFRIES CON 9 PT LOTS 35 AND 36</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Building permit was issued after mid-year 2014. This parcel will be removed from subsequent updated to the inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>2509 Cedar Creek Rd</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>CON 10 PT LOT 29</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>45.01</td>
<td>45.01</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>Site specific zoning / OP designation permits trucking / transportation use only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>40 Wanless Crt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1462 LOT 15</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>To be utilized by current owner (60 Wanless Court)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>715</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>Cedar Creek Rd</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>CON 10 N PT LOT 32 RP S8R11984 PT 1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surplus lands from MTO Interchange – great 401 visibility. Constrained because of MTO requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>716</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>2588-2616 Cedar Creek Rd</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>CON 11 PT LOT 30</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>Previous location of Tu Lane Service Centre, all buildings have been removed. Excellent location and visibility to 401. Constrained because of MTO requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>717</td>
<td>NDu</td>
<td>Cedar Creek Rd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>S8R15460 PT 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 11 – Map of Township of Wellesley Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land
Appendix 12 – Township of Wellesley Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory

Township of Wellesley Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory

Categories

1. Vacant parcels available immediately
2. Vacant parcels available immediately as design build
3. Vacant parcels available immediately in the University of Waterloo R&I Park
4. Vacant parcels no longer on the market that are expected to be developed by the current owner
5. Vacant parcels without significant constraints, not on the market and not expected to be developed by the current owner
6. Vacant parcels available in one to two years
7. Vacant parcels with the expectation of availability in over two years
8. Vacant parcels with constraints other than timing
9. Vacant parcels without significant constraints, where development applications have been submitted for conversion to other uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Mun</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Cat</th>
<th>Legal Description</th>
<th>Privately Owned</th>
<th>Designated Serviced</th>
<th>Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Area Available for Development</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Detailed Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Wel</td>
<td>Herrgott Rd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CON 12 ES PT LOT 2 RP S8R14275 PTS 2 AND 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>Dry Industrial (Di)</td>
<td>Stand-alone parcel expansion purposes only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Wel</td>
<td>1039 Industrial Cres</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1667 LOT 25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Dry Industrial (Di-5)</td>
<td>St. Clements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Wel</td>
<td>1023 Industrial Cres</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1667 LOT 21</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Dry Industrial (Di-5)</td>
<td>St. Clements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>Wel</td>
<td>Herrgott Rd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WELLESLEY CON 7 ES PT LOT 2 RP S8R18037 PTS 1 TO 10</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>Dry Industrial (Di-h2)</td>
<td>Vacant, H2 - environmental impact analysis required from GRCA. Constraint area is approx. until more is known. Entire 9.72 acre parcel on the market for $2,138,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>Wel</td>
<td>1390 Hutchison Rd</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>SECTION WEST CON 2 PT LOT 12 RP S8R12390 PT 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>27.29</td>
<td>27.14</td>
<td>Dry Industrial (Di-4)</td>
<td>West of Wellesley, Storm water management required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640</td>
<td>Wel</td>
<td>2593 Herrgott Rd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1667 LOT 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>641</td>
<td>Wel</td>
<td>1045 Industrial Cres</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAN 1667 LOT 26</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>738</td>
<td>Wel</td>
<td>2411 Gerber Rd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SECTION EAST CON 12 PT LOT 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>Dry Industrial</td>
<td>Land purchased and merged with abutting property after Mid-year 2014, this parcel will be removed in the subsequent updates to the inventory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>739</td>
<td>Wel</td>
<td>2411 Gerber Rd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CON 1 EAST SEC PT LOT 14</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>Dry Industrial</td>
<td>Future development of Veterinary Clinic after Mid-year 2014, this parcel will be removed in the subsequent updates to the inventory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>757</td>
<td>Wel</td>
<td>Herrgott Rd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WELLESLEY CON 7 ES PT LOT 2 RP S8R18037 PTS 1 TO 10</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>Vacant, H2 - environmental impact analysis required from GRCA. Constraint area is approx. until more is known. Entire 9.72 acre parcel on the market for $2,138,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>758</td>
<td>Wel</td>
<td>Herrgott Rd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WELLESLEY CON 7 ES PT LOT 2 RP S8R18037 PTS 1 TO 10</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>Vacant, H2 - environmental impact analysis required from GRCA. Constraint area is approx. until more is known. Entire 9.72 acre parcel on the market for $2,138,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Mun</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Legal Description</td>
<td>Privately Owned</td>
<td>Designated Serviced</td>
<td>Area Available for Development</td>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Detailed Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>759</td>
<td>Wel</td>
<td>Hergott Rd</td>
<td>WELLESLEY CON 7 ES PT LOT 2 RP</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>Vacant. H2 - environmental impact analysis required from GRCA. Constraint area is approx. until more is known. Entire 9.72 acre parcel on the market for $2,138,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760</td>
<td>Wel</td>
<td>Hergott Rd</td>
<td>WELLESLEY CON 7 ES PT LOT 2 RP</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>Vacant. H2 - environmental impact analysis required from GRCA. Constraint area is approx. until more is known. Entire 9.72 acre parcel on the market for $2,138,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Township of Wilmot Industrial and Business Park Vacant Land Inventory

### Categories

1. Vacant parcels available immediately
2. Vacant parcels available immediately as design build
3. Vacant parcels available immediately in the University of Waterloo R&T Park
4. Vacant parcels no longer on the market that are expected to be developed by the current owner
5. Vacant parcels without significant constraints, not on the market and not expected to be developed by the current owner
6. Vacant parcels available in one to two years
7. Vacant parcels with the expectation of availability in over two years
8. Vacant parcels with constraints other than timing
9. Vacant parcels without significant constraints, where development applications have been submitted for conversion to other uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Mnr</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Cat</th>
<th>Legal Description</th>
<th>Privately Owned</th>
<th>Designated Serviced</th>
<th>Area (Acre)</th>
<th>Area Available for Development</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Detailed Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Hamilton Rd/Hafziger Rd</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>CON 12 ES PT LOT 2 RP $8R1427S PLS 2 AND 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>109.04</td>
<td>108.71</td>
<td>Ind/Ag</td>
<td>Locally significant woodlot included as constrained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Hafziger Rd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WILMOT CON N OF BLEAMS RD PT LOT 19</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>10.49</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>New Hamburg. Locally Significant Woodlot is not included in the developable area. On the Market with Parcel ID#607 (Same owner) for $1,950,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Bergy Crt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 88S PT LOT 10 RP$8R707S PLS 3 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>New Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Victoria St / Riverside Dr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SMITHS PLAN PT BLK 12 MUN COMP</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>New Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>100 Bergy Crt</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>PLAN 1048 LOTS 1 TO 6 8 PT LOTS 7 9 TO 14 PLAN 273 PT LOT 1 DAVID ST PT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>New Hamburg. Sold in 2006, owner to build one building to accommodate his business, remainder of property is built to suit. Building and Land Use permits will not be issued by MTO for the remainder of the property until Corridor Study is completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Foundry St and Gingrich Rd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>WILMOT CON SOUTH OF SNYDERS RD PT LOT 15 AND RP $8R1249 PT 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>Lands have been purchased and are presently being marketed for tenants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>1609 Gingrich Rd</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>WILMOT CON NORTH OF BLEAMS RD PT LOTS 16 AND 17 RP $8R12417 PT 8</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>Baden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>144 to 148 Foundry St</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>23.26</td>
<td>23.26</td>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>Lands in estate presently being settled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Arnold St</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 532A LOT 302 PT LOTS 303,308 PT SCOTT ST $8R1848 PT 7</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>Only northern portion of the parcel can be developed due to grade at rear (only developable portion identified in the inventory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Arnold St</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 12 PT LOTS 23,24 RP$8R1848 PT 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>Only northern portion of the parcel can be developed due to grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>320 Bleams Rd E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLAN 1450 BLK 9 PLAN 88S PT LOT 9 AND RP $8R075 PT 1 AND 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Mun</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Cat</th>
<th>Legal Description</th>
<th>Privately Owned</th>
<th>Designated Serviced</th>
<th>Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Area Available for Development</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Detailed Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>592</td>
<td>Wil</td>
<td>Gingerich Rd</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PLAN 1512 LOTS 13-18 PT LOTS 11, 19, 20, 21 &amp; PT DECKER DR &amp; PT RESERVE 21</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>Adjacent to 1439 Gingerich. Large amount of top soil is stock piled on this site (property owned by 1439 Gingerich - Erb Transport)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607</td>
<td>Wil</td>
<td>Nafziger Rd</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>WILMOT CONN OF BLEAMS RD PT LOT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>21.52</td>
<td>21.52</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>On the Market with Parcel DHP95 (same owner) for $2,950,000. Locally Significant Woodlot is not included in the developable area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609</td>
<td>Wil</td>
<td>1439 Gingerich Rd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Plan 1512 Lots 10-11, Pt Lots 4-9, 12, Pt Reserve Blk 24 &amp; PT Decker Csl. RPS8R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>3.58 acres already developed, 1 acre environmentally contained, 3.69 acres build to suit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental services
Design and Construction

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: August 11, 2015  File Code: C04-30, 07259
Subject: University Avenue Reconstruction and Widening (Keats Way to Erb Street) City of Waterloo Recommended Design Concept

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to the Environmental Assessment and Preliminary Design Study for the reconstruction and widening of University Avenue between Keats Way and Erb Street in the City of Waterloo:

a) Approve the Recommended Design Concept for the proposed reconstruction and widening of University Avenue from Keats Way to Erb Street as described in Report TES-DCS-15-17 dated August 11, 2015.

b) Direct staff to file a Notice of Completion as required by the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment and place the project file on the public record for review for a period of 30 days.

Summary:

The Region of Waterloo is undertaking an Environmental Assessment and Preliminary Design Study for the reconstruction and widening of University Avenue between Keats Way and Erb Street in the City of Waterloo. The limits of the study area are shown on the Key Plan included in Appendix A to this report. The study is being guided by a Project Team consisting of staff and Councillors from the Region of Waterloo and the City of Waterloo.
This Study is being undertaken as a Schedule “B” project in accordance with the requirements of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment. The segment of University Avenue within the study area currently consists of two traffic lanes with paved shoulders and left-turn lanes at the Keats Way and Erb Street intersections. A concrete sidewalk is present on the east side of the road. Reconstruction of the road is required in order to address poor pavement conditions. The reconstruction of the road also offers an opportunity for widening to accommodate increasing traffic volumes, the addition of new bike lanes for cyclists and new sidewalks for pedestrians.

Widening of the road to four lanes with cycling facilities is required in order to provide for expected traffic growth and the accommodation of cyclists.

Based on the existing conditions and needs within the study area, the Project Team assessed alternatives and developed a Recommended Design Concept for Council approval consisting of the following elements (see Appendix B for cross-section);

- Reconstruction of the existing road structure and widening to a standard four lane cross-section complete with concrete curb and gutters
- Construction of new concrete sidewalk on the west side of the road where none currently exists and reconstruction of the existing sidewalk on the east side of the road
- Construction of buffered bike lanes
- Construction of a centre median and extended left-turn lane at the Erb Street intersection to help guide traffic through the widened intersection

The Recommended Design Concept was presented at a Public Consultation Centre held on November 5, 2014. Public comments received are supportive of the Recommended Design Concept. No property acquisition is required to implement the Recommended Design Concept. Staff are now presenting the Recommended Design Concept for Council approval. Subject to approval of the Recommended Design Concept by Council and satisfactory review of the project file by the public and agencies, detailed design of the proposed works is planned to begin in the fall of 2015. Construction is currently scheduled in 2018.

Report:

1. Project Background

University Avenue, within the project area currently consists of a two lane cross-section with paved shoulders. No residential properties front the project area. A concrete sidewalk is present on the east side of the road. The study limits are shown on the Key Plan in Appendix A of this report.
Due to the age and condition of the pavement structure of University Avenue within the study limits, it is necessary to completely reconstruct the existing road including the asphalt surface and granular base.

The reconstruction of the road also offers an opportunity for widening to accommodate increasing traffic volumes, the addition of new bike lanes for cyclists and concrete sidewalks where none currently exist for pedestrians.

The proposed University Avenue Widening and Reconstruction Project is classified as a Schedule B undertaking in accordance with the planning process outlined in the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment. Approval of the project is subject to a screening process whereby potentially impacted members of the public and approval agencies have an opportunity to review and comment on the solutions being considered.

The planning and design of the University Avenue Widening and Reconstruction project is being directed by a Project Team consisting of staff from the Regional Municipality of Waterloo and the City Waterloo, and Councillors Jeff Henry (City of Waterloo) and Jane Mitchell (Region of Waterloo).

2. Transportation Requirements

University Avenue provides an important east-west transportation link within the City of Waterloo connecting the Universities of Waterloo and Wilfrid Laurier with residential areas east and west of the Uptown core. Based on traffic projections to the year 2031, the Region of Waterloo’s Transportation Master Plan (RTMP) identifies the need to widen University Avenue between Keats Way and Erb Street to four lanes by 2021. Analysis of 2014 peak hour vehicular traffic volumes indicates that the operation of the road is generally acceptable except for the northbound and southbound through movements at the Erb Street intersection where these movements are experiencing congestion and delay. Traffic volumes in the University Avenue corridor are expected to increase by approximately 20% in the future resulting in an increase in congestion and delay at the Erb Street intersection and also at the Keats Way intersection. Measured pedestrian volumes on University Avenue within the project limits are moderate to high. The RTMP, through its vision of sustainability, also supports measures that will improve the cycling and pedestrian networks in the project area.

The Regional Cycling Master Plan and the Regional Active Transportation Master Plan identify University Avenue as a core on-road cycling route. The University Avenue corridor provides an important linkage to the University’s of Waterloo and Wilfrid Laurier and indirectly to Waterloo Park and the Waterloo Recreation Centre.

According to the Regions Context Sensitive Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines (CDG), University Avenue is classified as a Neighbourhood Connector –
Avenue (NAV). As a fundamental part of this classification, University Avenue should be designed to support active transportation modes including walking and cycling.

The implementation of the features identified in the Transportation Master Plan, Cycling Master Plan and the Corridor Design Guidelines will enable all road users, including cyclists and pedestrians, an opportunity to travel without obstructions within this community and beyond.

In addition to improvements to accommodate active transportation, analysis of existing vehicular traffic patterns in the area suggests that improvements can also be made in order to improve traffic operations.

The Region of Waterloo monitors traffic collisions on all of the roads under its jurisdiction to determine where improvements are required to improve public safety. An analysis of the collision history within the project area between 2008 and 2012 does not indicate that a significant concern regarding vehicular safety exists. Approximately 6% of the reported collisions involved cyclists possibly due to the lack of designated cycling facilities.

A centre median is being considered at the Erb Street intersection. Such a median would extend north and south of Erb Street and provide a physical separation between north-bound and south-bound vehicles as they pass through the intersection. Secondary traffic signals would be located on these medians to improve sight-lines for drivers.

3. Recommended Design Concept and Potential Impacts

The Project Team assessed alternatives and developed a Recommended Design Concept which addresses the identified pavement condition and transportation needs within the study area. The Concept includes reconstruction of the existing road structure, widening of the road to a four lane urban standard with cycling facilities and concrete curbs, the construction of concrete sidewalks where none currently exist and the construction of a centre median at the Erb Street intersection. A cross-section diagram of the Recommended Design Concept can be found in Appendix B of this report.

3.1 Reconstruction of road structure

Due to the deteriorating condition of the existing road structure, the existing granular base and asphalt must be removed and replaced. Widening of the road to four lanes will require the excavation and removal of the existing shoulders and the construction of new granular base and asphalt complete with standard concrete curb and gutter. Drainage of surface runoff from the widened road surface will be accommodated in the existing storm sewers which may require adjustment to conform to the road’s new geometry.
3.2 Sidewalk construction

The installation of a new sidewalk on the western side of the road would require the re-grading of the existing boulevard and may require the removal of several mature trees.

Maple Hill Creek flows in a northerly direction, west of and roughly parallel to University Avenue. The creek flows through a concrete culvert under University Avenue south of Keats Way where it joins with Clair Creek. Maple Hill Creek has a pronounced meander pattern and alternatively crosses privately owned lands and lands owned by the City of Waterloo and the University Avenue right-of-way. Several areas of the creek bank are severely eroded and further erosion into the University Avenue right-of-way may occur in the future. In order to protect the structural integrity of a new sidewalk installed within the University Avenue right-of-way, erosion control measures are being considered to prevent further encroachment of the creek into the road right-of-way.

3.3 Bike Lanes

On-road bike lanes would provide an important connection to the existing on-road bike lanes on University Avenue both north of Keats Way and south of Erb Street. Bike lanes are also present on Erb Street east and west of University Avenue.

The alternative being recommended by the Project Team is a buffered bike lane.

The buffered bike lane would be built as an extension of the asphalt roadway surface but would be separated from vehicles by a buffer (double painted line) and possible “rumble strips” ground into the asphalt surface between the double painted lines.

A cycle track was also considered is not recommended for this location because University Ave. both north and south of the project currently has on road bike lanes and it makes the most sense for this portion of University Ave to maintain an on-road bike lane for continuity with the adjoining sections.

4. Public Consultation

The Recommended Design Concept was presented to area residents at a Public Consultation Centre (PCC) held on November 4, 2014. Notices for this meeting were mailed out to property and business owners within the project limits. Notices were also placed in the local newspaper and on road-side signs. Staff from the Region of Waterloo and City of Waterloo were available at the Centre to discuss the Recommended Design Concept.
The PCC was attended by three local property owners and residents. Public comments received by the Project Team were supportive of the Recommended Design Concept including the need for cycling facilities.

5. Estimated Project Cost:

The estimated cost to construct the Recommended Design Concept including road reconstruction and widening, buffered bike lanes, new concrete curbs and sidewalks and a centre median and extended left-turn lane at the Erb Street intersection is approximately $2,200,000.

6. Next Steps

Staff is now presenting the Recommended Design Concept for Council approval. Subject to approval of the Recommended Design Concept by Council, a Notice of Completion will be prepared. This Notice will be circulated to potentially impacted property owners and agencies. The project file including all information made available to the public and the assessment of the alternatives considered will be made available for public review. If no unresolved concerns are brought forward within the 30 day review period, preparation of the detailed design for the proposed works will be initiated. Construction is currently scheduled to be undertaken in 2018.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

The recommended improvements to University Ave support Focus Area #3 (Sustainable Transportation) by integrating active forms of transportation and optimizing road capacity to improve safety.

Financial Implications:

The estimated cost of the improvements proposed in the Recommended Design Concept is approximately $2,200,000 to be funded from the Regional Development Charges Reserve Fund. The approved 2015 Ten Year Transportation Capital Program includes sufficient funding for the construction of this project in 2018. The estimate and budget will be further refined during the detailed design phase of this project.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Nil.
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REGIONAL ROAD No. 57
UNIVERSITY AVENUE
KEATS WAY TO ERB STREET
City of Waterloo

Region of Waterloo
Appendix B – Recommended Design Concept
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Design and Construction

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: August 11, 2015
File Code: 08324
Subject: Consultant Selection – Detailed Design and Services During Construction for the Ayr Sewage Pumping Station and Forcemain, Village of Ayr

Recommendation:
That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into an Agreement for Professional Consulting Services with GM BluePlan Engineering Limited, to provide engineering services for detailed design and services during construction for the Ayr Sewage Pumping Station and Forcemain in Ayr, at an upset fee limit of $613,768 plus applicable taxes.

Summary:
In 2005, the Region of Waterloo assumed ownership and responsibility for the operation of Ayr’s wastewater collection system. A Wastewater Master Plan and Class Environmental Assessment approved by the Region recommended a new pumping station and forcemain in the south end of Ayr to service future settlement lands in the south end of Ayr.

In order to construct the Ayr Sewage Pumping Station and Forcemain by 2017, a multi-disciplinary engineering consultant must be retained now to undertake the detailed design and construction administration for this project. A consultant selection process was carried out in accordance with the Region of Waterloo’s Purchasing By-law 04-093 for the procurement of goods and services and included price as a factor.
Letters of Interest were received from ten consultants. When considering all Quality, Equity, and Price Factors, the submission from GM BluePlan Engineering Limited scored the highest and staff recommends that GM BluePlan Engineering Limited be retained to undertake this assignment at an upset fee of $613,768 plus applicable taxes.

Subject to Council approval of this consultant assignment, it is anticipated that final design will be completed in 2016 and construction will be completed in 2017. The capital budget in the 2015 Ten Year Waste Water Capital Forecast for this project is $4,200,000.

Report:

1. Background

In 2005, the Region of Waterloo (Region) assumed ownership and responsibility for operating Ayr’s wastewater collection system. In 2012 the Region initiated a Wastewater Master Plan for Ayr to develop short and long term wastewater servicing strategies for Ayr. Following completion of the Wastewater Master Plan, the Region initiated a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) as recommended in the Wastewater Master Plan, to determine the location of a future sewage pumping station and forcemain, as well as trunk sewer alignments required for sanitary servicing of the future settlement lands in the south end of Ayr.

The Ayr Pumping Station and Forcemain Routing Municipal Class EA was completed and approved in 2014. The approved EA recommended the phased construction of a pumping station with the ability to accommodate the capacity required at future project development. Phase 1 will be equipped for flows of 18 L/s average, and 46 L/s peak, while future Phase 2 will have equipment added for an ultimate average flow of 35.28 L/s and an ultimate peak flow of 84.34L/s.

The proposed 200mm diameter forcemain will run from the proposed new pump station site at Swan Street for approximately 2.85km to the Ayr WWTP, and will generally follow the existing ground profile along Swan Street, Brant-Waterloo Road, and Nith Road.

In order to meet a scheduled 2016 construction start date for the proposed works, a multi-disciplinary engineering consultant must be retained now to undertake the detailed design and construction administration for this upgrade.

2. Consultant Selection

On June 5, 2015, the Region of Waterloo placed advertisements on its website and in The Kitchener-Waterloo Record and Daily Commercial News inviting submissions from consultants for detailed design and services during construction for the Ayr Sewage Pumping Station and Forcemain.
Ten proponents submitted a proposal for consulting services.

- AECOM
- CIMA+ Canada Inc.
- Cole Engineering
- Conestoga-Rovers & Associates
- GM BluePlan Engineering
- J.L. Richards & Associates
- MMM Group
- MTE Consultants Inc.
- R.V. Anderson Associates Ltd.
- Stantec Consulting Ltd.

Each proposal was reviewed by the consultant selection team consisting of: Jeff Medd, Project Manager (Design and Construction); Kevin Dolishny, Sr. Project Engineer, (Water Services), Dominika Celmer-Repín, Project Engineer (Water Services) and Tina Lumgair, (Finance).

The consultant selection process was carried out in accordance with the Region of Waterloo’s Purchasing By-law 04-093 for the procurement of goods and services, and included price as a factor. The evaluation criteria were subdivided into Quality, Equity, and Price factors as follows:

Quality factors

- Project Approach and Understanding: 25%
- Experience of the Project Manager: 20%
- Experience of the Project Support Staff: 20%
- Experience on Similar Projects: 15%

Equity Factors

- Current Workload for Region: 3%
- Local Office: 2%

Price Factor

- Upset Price: 15%
When considering all Quality, Equity, and Price Factors, the submission from GM BluePlan Engineering Limited scored highest overall. GM BluePlan Engineering Limited had a competitive price (equal to the average price) and the highest technical score which resulted in the highest overall score. Staff therefore recommends that GM BluePlan Engineering Limited be awarded this assignment for an upset fee of $613,768 plus applicable taxes.

3. Scope of Work

For this assignment, the Consultant will provide professional consulting services during the detailed design, tender, construction, and post-construction phases of the capital project. The Consultant will submit all required documentation in order to obtain the required Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA). The consultant will prepare issued-for-tender, issued-for-construction, and record versions of the Contract Drawings and Contract Specifications for one general construction contract. The consultant will also provide services related to construction cost estimates and cash flow projections, approvals and permits, third party hydrogeological and geotechnical investigation, third party materials testing and quality control, health and safety reviews, site inspection, contract administration, equipment acceptance tests, commissioning of new works, a custom operation and maintenance manual, custom training sessions and administration of equipment warranties.

Appendix A provides a breakdown of the Consultant’s upset fee.

4. Schedule

Subject to Council’s approval of this assignment for professional consulting services, detailed design will commence in September 2015 to allow for design completion by spring 2016 and MOECC approvals and a general contract tender and award by summer 2016. Construction is scheduled to commence following receipt of the required approvals, with the project being completed and commissioned in 2017.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

This project meets the Region’s Corporate Strategic Plan objective to “develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs” under Focus Area 2 “Growth Management and Prosperity”.
Financial Implications

The Region’s 2015 Ten Year Waste Water Capital Forecast includes a budget of $4,200,000 for the period 2015 to 2017 for the Ayr Sewage Pumping Station and Forcemain Project. The consultant’s upset fee of $613,768 is within the budget allowance for engineering work and represents approximately 15% of the total project budget. The upset fee is considered reasonable for the scope of services to be provided and for a capital project of this magnitude. The Ayr Sewage Pumping Station and Forcemain Project will be funded 100% by Regional Development Charges.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Nil

Attachments

Appendix A – Breakdown of Consultant’s Upset Fee

Prepared By: Jeff Medd, Project Manager, Design and Construction

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

Ayr Sewage Pumping Station and Forcemain

Breakdown of Consultant’s Upset Fee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Detailed Design Phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate Third-Party Consultants</td>
<td>$1,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable Reports</td>
<td>$14,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Design</td>
<td>$123,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings during Detailed Design</td>
<td>$27,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation Centre</td>
<td>$7,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approvals</td>
<td>$3,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tender Phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tender</td>
<td>$9,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Administration &amp; Construction Technical Support</td>
<td>$101,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings during Construction</td>
<td>$36,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Inspection Services</td>
<td>$212,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Safety</td>
<td>$3,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAT, SAT, Start-up and Commissioning</td>
<td>$13,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuals and Training</td>
<td>$20,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-Construction Phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record Drawings, Warranty Period Assistance and Meetings</td>
<td>$38,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Upset Fee (plus applicable taxes)</strong></td>
<td>$613,768</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region of Waterloo

Transportation and Environmental Services

Design and Construction

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

Date: August 11, 2015

Subject: Consultant Selection – Class Environmental Assessment, Detailed Design and Services During Construction, Weber Street From Albert Street To Northfield Drive, City of Waterloo

Recommendation:
That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into a Consultant Services Agreement with Stantec Consulting Ltd. to provide consulting engineering services for a Class Environmental Assessment, detailed design, contract administration and construction inspection for improvements to Weber Street from Albert Street to Northfield Drive in the City of Waterloo at an upset fee of $527,527.00 plus applicable taxes for the Class Environmental Assessment and detailed design phases, with contract administration and construction inspection services to be paid on a time basis in an estimated amount of $315,000.00 as described in Report TES-DCS-15-19 dated August 11, 2015.

Summary:
The Region of Waterloo is planning for the reconstruction of Weber Street from Albert Street to Northfield Drive in the City of Waterloo in 2019. In order to meet this timeline, an engineering consultant must be hired now to undertake the Class Environmental Assessment, detailed design and construction administration in order to obtain all necessary approvals in advance of construction.

An invitation to submit Letters-of-Interest to provide engineering services for this assignment was advertised in the Waterloo Region Record and on the Region’s website. Nine (9) letters of interest were received. Three (3) firms were short-listed and invited to submit detailed work plans and fee estimates.
Based on the evaluation criteria, review of the detailed work plans, schedules and upset fees provided, the Evaluation Team recommends that Stantec Consulting Ltd. be retained to undertake this consultant assignment at an upset fee limit of $527,527 plus applicable taxes for the Class Environmental Assessment and detailed design phases, with contract administration and construction inspection to be paid on a time basis in an estimated amount of $315,000. Stantec Consulting Ltd.’s fees of $527,527 plus applicable taxes for the Class Environmental Assessment and detailed design phases are within the consulting fee allowance provided for in the total project budget of $3,445,000.

Report:

1. Background

The Weber Street project limits are from Albert Street to Northfield Drive as shown on the Key Plan in Appendix “A”. Weber Street within the project limits consists of a 4 lane urban cross section. The posted speed limit throughout the entire 1.13 kilometre project length is 60 km/hr.

Improvements to Weber Street from Albert Street to Northfield Drive in the City of Waterloo are identified in the Region’s 2015 Ten-Year Transportation Capital Program for construction in 2019 in order to address the deteriorated pavement condition. Other improvements to be considered as part of the planning for this project include upgrades to the street lighting, the need for a new left turn lane at Glen Forrest Boulevard, rehabilitation of the existing bridge over the rail tracks, and dedicated cycling facilities. The existing bridge over the rail track is not wide enough to accommodate the addition of new cycling lanes. Through this assignment, the consultant will consider an option to reduce the number of travel lanes along this section of Weber Street to provide additional space for new cycling lanes.

Planning of these improvements will be completed in accordance with the Schedule “B” requirements of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) document.

The Project Team includes staff representatives from the Region and the City of Waterloo as well as City of Waterloo Councillor Angela Vieth.

The Region’s 2015 Ten-Year Transportation Capital Program includes funding in the amount of $3,445,000 in 2015-2020 inclusive for the Class Environmental Assessment, detailed design and construction of this project. Regional staff is fully committed to other capital projects and therefore staff recommends that an external consultant be hired to complete this project. Staff has determined that it is necessary to commence the engineering for this project now in order to provide sufficient time to complete the Class Environmental Assessment Study, detailed design, obtain any required property, undertake utility relocations and obtain required approvals in advance of construction in
2. Consultant Selection

An invitation to submit Letters-of-Interest to provide engineering services for this assignment was advertised in the Waterloo Region Record and on the Region’s website. Nine (9) consultant firms submitted Letters-of-Interest. From a review of the submissions, three (3) firms were shortlisted based on their qualifications and these consultants were asked to submit a detailed work plan and upset fee for the Class Environmental Assessment and detailed design phases. The short-listed consultants were also requested to submit an estimate of fees for contract administration and construction inspection services.

The three (3) short-listed consultants were:
- IBI Group;
- Parsons Inc.; and,
- Stantec Consulting Ltd.

The Evaluation Team involved with the consultant selection consisted of:
Dave Brown, Project Manager, Design and Construction Division;
Dave Weiler, Head, Transportation Capital Projects, Design and Construction Division;
Ruba Al Assar, Project Manager, Transportation Division; and,
Mike Lupsa, Project Manager, Design and Construction, City of Waterloo.

The evaluation criteria used for selecting the successful consultant were consistent with the Region’s Purchasing Bylaw which includes price as a factor in the selection process.

These evaluation criteria and their respective weightings were as follows:

**Quality Factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Approach and Understanding</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of the Project Manager</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of the Project Support Staff</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience on Similar Projects</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Equity Factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Workload for Region</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Office</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Price Factor
Upset Fee Limit 15%

The Letters-of-Interest submitted by all three (3) short-listed consultants demonstrated a good understanding of the project with capable project teams and experience on numerous similar projects. When considering the combination of quality, equity and price factors described above, Stantec Consulting Ltd. scored the highest of the three short-listed consultants. Stantec Consulting Ltd.’s upset fee of $527,527.00 plus applicable taxes for the Class Environmental Assessment and detailed design components was the second lowest price submitted and was 7.0% below the mean of the three (3) submitted prices.

Based on the above evaluation criteria, including review of the detailed work plans, schedules and upset fees provided, the Evaluation Team recommends that Stantec Consulting Ltd. be retained to undertake the Class Environmental Assessment, detailed design, contract administration and construction inspection of this project.

3. Scope of Work

For this engineering assignment, the consultant will complete the following tasks: review all background information; conduct a Schedule “B” Class Environmental Assessment Study; conduct a public consultation program; complete a full Transportation Study; complete a full assessment of the existing bridge over the rail tracks; develop and present design alternatives at Public Consultation Centres; complete final design of the road improvements; complete final design of the bridge rehabilitation and/or improvements; prepare contract drawings, specifications and tender documents; develop traffic staging plans; obtain all necessary agency approvals; assist during the tendering period; provide contract administration and site inspection services during construction; prepare record drawings; and provide post-construction services during the warranty period. A breakdown of the successful consultant’s upset fee is included in Appendix “B” attached to this report.

4. Schedule

Subject to Council’s approval of this consultant assignment, the proposed project schedule is outlined below. The construction schedule is dependent upon the extent and timing of any property acquisitions necessary to implement the proposed improvements.
5. Consultant’s Upset Fee

The short-listed consultants were each requested to submit an upset fee for consulting engineering services to complete the Class Environmental Assessment and detailed design, and were also requested to submit an estimate for contract administration and construction inspection fees. For road and drainage projects, the time required for contract administration and construction inspection can vary significantly depending on weather conditions, the actual contractor hired for construction and other unknown variables. Because an upset fee does not lend itself well to these types of services, it has been the Region’s practice for road and drainage projects to pay for contract administration and construction inspection fees on a time basis. It is recommended that this same practice be followed for this project. For budgetary purposes, staff has estimated the cost of contract administration and construction inspection services to be $315,000.00 plus applicable taxes, which is based on the preliminary estimate of fees submitted by Stantec Consulting Ltd. and a review of costs on similar projects. The upset fee limit for Stantec Consulting Ltd. to undertake the Class Environmental Assessment and detailed design for this assignment is $527,527.00 plus applicable taxes for consultant fees and disbursements.

The Region’s total budget for the Weber Street Improvements Project from Albert Street to Northfield Drive is $3,445,000. Based on this total value of $3,445,000, the consultant’s upset fee limit for the Class Environmental Assessment and detailed design services of $527,527.00 plus applicable taxes represents approximately 15.3% of the estimated total cost for this project which is within the normal fee range for a project of this type, size and complexity.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

The Weber Street Improvements Project from Albert Street to Northfield Drive, when complete, will support “Focus Area 2 – Growth Management and Prosperity” and meets strategic objective number 2.2 to develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs.
Financial Implications

Based on the upset fee schedule received from Stantec Consulting Ltd., the total costs for the Class Environmental Assessment and detailed design phases are as follows:

Upset Consulting Fee $527,527.00
HST (13%) $68,578.51
Sub-Total $596,105.51
Less Municipal HST Rebate of 86.46% $59,292.98
Net Cost of Consulting Assignment $536,812.53

The Region’s 2015 Ten-Year Transportation Capital Program includes $3,445,000 in 2015-2020 inclusive for this project to be funded from the Roads Rehabilitation Reserve Fund ($2,875,000, 83%) and the Cycling Facility Capital Reserve Fund ($570,000, 17%).

Stantec Consulting Ltd.’s fees for the Class Environmental Assessment and detailed design phases of this consulting assignment in the amount of $527,527.00 plus applicable taxes are within the consulting fee allowance provided for in the total budget of $3,445,000 for this project.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Nil

Attachments

Appendix “A” – Project Key Plan
Appendix “B” – Breakdown of Consultant’s Upset Fee Estimate

Prepared By: Dave Brown, Project Manager, Design and Construction

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

Stantec Consulting Ltd. – Upset Fee Breakdown
Weber Street (Albert Street to Northfield Drive)
City of Waterloo

1. Project initiation, Data Collection/Review & Base Plans $12,932.00
2. Class EA and Preliminary Design $274,656.50
3. Detailed Design $175,701.50
4. Project Management $25,110.60
5. Tendering & Contract Documents/Specifications $17,339.40
6. Disbursements $21,787.00

Total Upset Fee Limit and Disbursements (excluding HST) $527,527.00
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Design and Construction

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: August 11, 2015    File Code: 07282
Subject: Recommended Intersection Improvements at Ira Needles Boulevard and Thorndale Drive and Update on the Widening of Ira Needles Boulevard, City of Waterloo

Recommendation:
That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the implementation of a roundabout on Ira Needles Boulevard at Thorndale Drive, in the City of Waterloo, all as presented in Report TES-DCS-15-20 and subject to Regional Council approval of funding as part of the 2016 Transportation Capital Program budget process and subject to lands for the roundabout being dedicated by developers once the Consent Application for the lands is approved by the City of Waterloo and Thorndale Drive Extension is designated a municipal road.

Summary:
Road improvements to the existing intersection on Ira Needles Boulevard and Thorndale Drive (Please see key plan in Appendix A), are necessary to address expected increases in traffic from ongoing development in the area. Lands to the west of Ira Needles and in the vicinity of Thorndale Drive Extension have pending development plans that will require access to Ira Needles Boulevard. A roundabout is recommended at this location because it will result in less delays and fewer injury collisions and has a lower life cycle cost than a signalized intersection.

Ideally, construction of this new roundabout would coincide with the proposed widening of Ira Needles Boulevard from the north Boardwalk entrance to Chablis Drive in 2016. The Region is working with the City of Waterloo and the developers who are making best efforts to dedicate the required lands to the Region and designate Thorndale Drive...
extension as a municipal road by November 2015 in order to be ready for 2016 construction. If the property dedication at Thorndale Drive is not completed by November 2015 then the Region could proceed with four lane widening of Ira Needles in 2016 without a roundabout at Thorndale Drive. The roundabout could then be built at a later date. The cost to construct both the road widening of Ira Needles Boulevard and the roundabout at Thorndale Drive in 2016 at the same time is estimated at $5.7 million. Construction of a roundabout at a later date would cost approximately $500,000.00 more than the cost to construct the roundabout in 2016 at the same time as the widening to 4 lanes.

In addition to this new roundabout and the remaining widening of Ira Needles Boulevard from the north Boardwalk entrance to Chablis Drive, Region and City staff have identified a number of other road network improvements in the Erb Street area of west Waterloo to service development and the increase in traffic. These transportation system improvements include (please see key plan in Appendix A):

- Planned construction of a new north-south collector road by the City of Waterloo (City Employment Collector) between Erb Street and Columbia Street, opposite Gate 2 of the Waste Management Centre;
- Construction of two roundabouts at Gates 1 and 2 of the Waste Management Centre to service the proposed Costco site planned for 2016 (pending utility relocation);
- Widening and improvements on Erb Street from Fischer-Hallman Road to Wilmot Line (subject to a Class Environmental Assessment Study currently being initiated by the Region), with construction planned for 2018; and
- Improvements to the intersection of Ira Needles Boulevard and Erb Street, with construction in 2016 (pending land acquisition and utility relocation).

Report:

1. Background

Road improvements to the existing intersection on Ira Needles Boulevard and Thorndale Drive (please see key plan in Appendix A), are necessary to address expected increases in traffic from ongoing development in the area. Lands to the west of Ira Needles and in the vicinity of Thorndale Drive Extension have pending development plans. These future development lands will require access to Ira Needles Boulevard and both a roundabout and a signalized intersection were considered for this location as described in Section 2.

A Consent Application for the lands west of Ira Needles Boulevard for proposed development is currently being processed by the City of Waterloo. If the Consent Application is approved then the City of Waterloo will be designating Thorndale Drive
Extension west of Ira Needles as a municipal road. This process is expected to be complete before the end of October 2015.

2. Comparison of Roundabout and Conventional Road Improvements

In reviewing the need for intersection improvements at Ira Needles Boulevard and Thorndale Drive, Regional staff assessed the feasibility of constructing a roundabout in lieu of conventional road improvements in accordance with Regional Policy (adopted in 2003 and updated on September 15, 2010). Conventional road improvements would include a signalized intersection with additional turn and through lanes on Ira Needles Boulevard.

The conventional road improvements required to address the capacity needs at Thorndale Drive would include:

- Four through lanes on Ira Needles Boulevard; and
- Left turn lanes on all four approaches.

The roundabout option (as shown in Appendix ‘B’) includes:

- Four through lanes on Ira Needles Boulevard;
- A roundabout with two-lane approaches on Ira Needles Blvd (both north and south and the west leg of Thorndale Drive; and
- Single lane approach from the east leg of Thorndale Drive.

An Intersection Control Study (ICS) was completed to compare the advantages and disadvantages of the roundabout versus the conventional traffic signals alternative for this intersection. In addition to assessing the safety performance of each alternative and the user delays associated with accommodating the anticipated traffic, a key component of the ICS assessment is to determine the total Life Cycle Cost (LCC) of each alternative. The LCC includes all costs associated with the implementation and maintenance of the alternatives over a 20-year period. The LCC also includes for each alternative an estimate of the injury crash costs based on the expected injury crashes over the 20-year period. Based on this assessment of total costs, it has been determined the total LCC of the roundabout option would be approximately $4.7 million lower than the LCC of the conventional road improvements option. The roundabout option’s lower LCC is due mostly to the expectation of fewer injury collisions at the roundabout than would be expected at the traffic signal.

Based on consideration of safety performance, traffic capacity and total life-cycle costing, staff are recommending the implementation of a roundabout because a roundabout would result in fewer injury collisions and less delays to motorists and pedestrians than conventional road improvements. This intersection is also in a
preferred roundabout corridor.

3. **Public Consultation**

Prior to presenting a recommended option for this project, staff sought public input on the roundabout alternative. Letters were hand delivered to business owners/residents within the immediate vicinity of the intersection on July 14, 2015.

4. **Main Issue Raised by the Public**

Prior to the recent mail-outs staff were contacted by residents with concerns regarding noise from the widening of Ira Needles Boulevard. The existing homes backing onto Ira Needles in the vicinity of Thorndale Drive all currently have either a noise wall or earth berm to attenuate noise levels. These noise attenuation measures were implemented during the plan of subdivision and were based on future traffic projections at the time of approval of the subdivision. Region staff have met with these residents and will be re-evaluating the noise based on actual traffic levels in accordance with the Region’s Noise Policy. This noise analysis is expected to be complete early this fall and the findings will be shared with the concerned residents. If the noise evaluation identifies that further action is required in accordance with the Region’s Noise Policy, then staff will prepare a future report for council consideration.

No further responses were received after the letters to the business owners/residents were delivered.

5. **Recommended Alternative**

Based on the technical study, the current experience with the Region’s existing roundabouts and input received from the public regarding this project, a roundabout is a better option for this intersection because:

- A roundabout would result in fewer injury collisions than the signalized intersections;
- A roundabout would result in fewer delays to all users;
- A roundabout would result in the lowest total Life Cycle Cost; and
- This intersection is in a preferred roundabout corridor.

In addition to the benefits of reduced injury collisions, reduced delays and lower life-cycle costs, the roundabout would also reduce idling times resulting in fuel savings and reduced vehicle emissions. The roundabout would also provide an opportunity for aesthetic streetscape enhancements.

Given the benefits of a roundabout when compared to traffic signals, staff is recommending the implementation of a roundabout at the intersection of Ira Needles
Boulevard and Thorndale Drive.

6. Construction Timing

The widening of Ira Needles Boulevard from the north Boardwalk entrance to Chablis Drive is planned for 2016. Ideally, the new roundabout at Thorndale Drive (if approved by Council) would be constructed in 2016 to coincide with the proposed widening of Ira Needles Boulevard. Construction of the roundabout in 2016 would be more cost effective and less disruptive to motorists then construction at a later date.

A number of steps must be completed this year in order to be ready for roundabout construction in 2016. A Consent Application currently being processed by the City of Waterloo must be approved and Thorndale Drive Extension must be designated as a municipal road. The lands required to construct the roundabout must be dedicated by the developers to the Region. The Region, the City of Waterloo and the Developers are making best efforts to complete all of these tasks by November 2015 in order to be ready for 2016 construction should council approve this roundabout.

If these tasks cannot be completed in time for 2016 roundabout construction, then the Region could still proceed with four-lane widening of Ira Needles Boulevard without a roundabout at Thorndale Drive. The roundabout could then be built at a later date recognizing that there would be additional cost and disruptions to motorists.

7. Estimated Costs

The roundabout at Ira Needles Boulevard and Thorndale Drive and associated road improvements on Ira Needles Boulevard, would be the responsibility of the Region with Thorndale Drive Extension opened as a municipal road by the City of Waterloo. Regional staff are working with the City of Waterloo and the developers on the detailed design for the road and intersection improvements. The cost of the roundabout is being further developed as part of the detailed design for the road improvements and will be updated and included in the upcoming draft 2016 Transportation Capital Program. Land for the roundabout is being dedicated by the developers. The project cost for road widening is estimated at approximately $5.7 million including the cost for the roundabout at Thorndale Drive, if it can be constructed in 2016 at the same time as the four-lane widening. If the roundabout is constructed separately after 2016, then the estimated cost would be increased by approximately $500,000.00.

8. Other West Waterloo Road Network Improvements

In addition to the proposed roundabout at Thorndale Drive and the widening of Ira Needles Boulevard from the north Boardwalk entrance to Chablis Drive a number of other road network improvements in the area of west Waterloo have also been identified to service development and the increase in traffic.

- Planned construction of a new north-south collector road by the City of Waterloo
(City Employment Collector) between Erb Street and Columbia Street, opposite Gate 2 of the Waste Management Centre;

- Construction of two roundabouts at Gates 1 and 2 of the Waste Management Centre to service the proposed Costco site planned for 2016 (pending utility relocations);
- Widening and improvements on Erb Street from Fischer-Hallman Road to Wilmot Line (subject to a Class Environmental Assessment Study currently being initiated by the Region), with construction planned for 2018; and
- Improvements to the intersection of Ira Needles Boulevard and Erb Street, with construction in 2016 (pending land acquisition and utility relocation).

The above noted projects are already planned or under way. Under any scenario, these projects will require more than one construction season to complete. Staff are making best efforts to schedule all the regional road work for two construction seasons while meeting timing needs and other constraints. Region staff have requested the City advance construction of the new north-south collector from Erb Street to Columbia Street as an alternative route in assisting to accommodate the expected traffic within the west Waterloo area.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

This project supports Focus Area 2 – Growth Management and Prosperity and meets the strategic objective to develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs.

**Financial Implications:**

The Region’s 2015 Ten Year Transportation Capital Program includes a total budget of $5.72 million for the widening of Ira Needles Boulevard from the north entrance of the Boardwalk to Chablis Drive in 2016 to be funded from the Regional Development Charges Reserve Fund. The current funding for the widening of Ira Needles Boulevard is sufficient to cover the estimated cost for the widening of Ira Needles Boulevard plus the additional improvements for the roundabout at Thorndale Drive if constructed in 2016.

The 2015 Ten-Year Transportation Capital Program also includes a budget of $11.7 million for Erb Street widening (from Fischer-Hallman Road to Wilmot Line) which includes the Region’s cost of the Costco roundabouts in 2016 and the remaining widening in 2018. This work will be funded by Regional Development Charges Reserve fund ($9.39 million) and Road Rehabilitation Reserve fund ($2.29 million).

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Nil.
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To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: August 11, 2015 File Code: D28-20
Subject: Grand River Transit Real-Time Data Availability

Recommendation:
For Information

Summary:

Grand River Transit (GRT) has automatic vehicle location (AVL) systems on all of the buses. This allows staff to track where buses are and to monitor bus service schedule adherence. This real time bus location information has recently been used to help the public in planning trips with more accuracy through a number of in-house applications.

GRT has launched a number of real time applications including GRT easyGO mobile app, SMS text messaging of real time bus departures, real time displays at key locations, and Google trip planner. Staff are looking to expand upon this by releasing this real-time data via the Region's Open Data Portal later in August.

Currently open data only provides scheduled bus times to software developers to create various trip planning apps. There have been requests to allow access to the real time data from buses to allow developers to expand trip planning apps to include real time information. Staff wants to accommodate these requests and generate more opportunity to create new apps that can encourage transit ridership.

GRT also plans to start putting the schedule adherence summary onto the GRT website. Schedule adherence data is used by staff to help adjust schedules and to identify locations where changes to the road network could assist transit vehicles to improve speed and reliability.
Report:

Background

Grand River Transit buses are all equipped with automatic vehicle location (AVL) and automatic passenger counter (APC) systems. These systems allow transit staff to monitor the buses, adjust service levels, gather data on schedule adherence and ridership and provide traveller information to the public. The data in the system can be used both in real time and be collected in order to do analysis and make necessary service adjustments in the future.

One of the key pieces of data is the identification of the location of buses in real time. For staff, this is quite valuable in evaluating where the bus is at any given time. For the public, the great value of this is that riders can know what time their bus will arrive with greater certainty, even if something such as bad weather or detours have affected the normal arrival time.

Distribution of Data

Currently real time bus location information is shared with the public through several applications including:

- LED digital displays at iXpress stations that tell what time the next buses are departing from that stop
- Flat panel displays at a number of locations that provide both real-time and scheduled information for buses; these are currently located at the Charles Street and Ainslie Street terminals, Conestoga Mall, Wilfrid Laurier University, the University of Waterloo and Conestoga College
- SMS text messaging of real time bus departures
- easyGO Mobile app for smart phones on all 4 major mobile operating systems and a web-based Real Time Transit Map developed by eSolutions for GRT
- an app for the UW Student Portal – this is exclusive to students at UW and was developed by staff in their Information Systems & Technology group as a way of testing the data for the Region
- Google trip planner – Region staff are presently working with Google staff in order to enable customers to see the actual departure times for buses in the Google trip planner in addition to the scheduled information currently provided.

The real time uses of the data have proven very popular with transit customers and have supplemented the scheduled information very well. The easyGO Mobile app has been downloaded nearly 19,000 times. Over time, real time information will replace much of the scheduled information as it provides more confidence to transit customers.
Open Data

The Region of Waterloo is committed to accountability and transparency. As a result, an Open Data Portal has been set up on the Region’s website. This allows any member of the public to download data to be used to solve unique problems, create mobile/web-based applications or promote community collaboration and greater citizen engagement. One of the first sets of data provided was the schedule data for transit. As is typical in any open data system, transit data is very popular and is used by developers to create various trip planning applications.

With the schedule data now regularly used, developers have been asking for access to the real time data to provide even more trip planning tools. While staff have long planned to release this data, there were a number of advantages to working with specific vendors first. In developing their applications in close collaboration with Regional staff, data issues could be resolved and tested. Staff could concentrate on working with a few people to resolve issues. Through the development of those apps we were able to correct data issues that were preventing proper integration with the Google real time specifications.

Schedule Adherence Analysis

Along with using the data for trip planning purposes, knowing where the buses actually are allows a comparison to the planned schedule for the buses. Knowing this information allows a determination of how often buses are early, late or on time. By knowing this, staff can review the bus schedules and determine what adjustments can be made to ensure the most efficient and effective system possible. Operations staff has the ability to do service monitoring and make adjustments to headway, if required.

Schedule adherence has long been a standard measure of transit performance and the on-time performance is identified in GRT’s Business Plan as a significant measure. As shown in Appendix A, the goal is to be on time 90% or 95% of the time, depending on the route category and time period.

On-time means that a bus has departed from a timepoint at the scheduled time or no less than 3 minutes late. Any bus departing more than 3 minutes after the scheduled time is considered late while anything departing any time before the scheduled time is considered early. To assist the drivers, on board the bus a display shows them how close to the time point based schedule they are.

To measure schedule adherence in the past, this information had to be obtained via manual random samples with surveyors on board buses. As a result most bus routes were only sampled once or twice every year. The AVL systems have allowed far more information to be gathered and now we can measure schedule adherence for every trip.
Along with the analysis tools from the AVL vendor, GRT has worked with researchers from the University of Waterloo and a local software vendor to create a Transit Data Reporting System (TDRS). One function of this system is to gather schedule adherence data on a regular basis and create standardized reports. It processes the data to exclude any outliers – data that is invalid for any reason – and thus provide more accurate results. In previous manual processes, staff would rely on several hundred or thousand samples collected every couple of years, whereas now enough data is collected that we have over 1.6 million samples to rely on from the fall of 2014 alone. This means staff can be more accurate and precise in looking at the information and thus improve decision making related to future routing schedules to improve schedule adherence.

Table 1 shows the schedule adherence for the entire transit system by each schedule period (the five times a year that service and driver’s schedules are adjusted). The table shows that GRT is on-time roughly 80% of the time system-wide.

Factors affecting schedule adherence include changes in route ridership, traffic and road conditions, detours and weather. One current example is the decrease in adherence this spring and fall – a direct result of the significant number of road closures and detours currently in effect.

Table 1: Schedule Adherence for 2014 & 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On-Time</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>Late</td>
<td>On-Time</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>Late</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>Summer*</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas 14/15</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>Christmas 15/16</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly Average</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>Yearly Average</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The standards currently in place were developed in the 1970’s based on processes, conditions and tools available at the time. These standards reflect manual data collection that was not as accurate as today where data is collected on every trip. As part of the GRT Business Plan review that has just begun, the validity of these current standards will be evaluated and adjusted, if necessary. A recent review of schedule adherence standards used by other transit agencies, found that while many still had a target around 90%, many did not meet that target. In addition, many had a much wider on-time target (often one minute early to 5 minutes late).
Public Release of Real Time Data

Staff plan to do two things related to the real time data. First, staff will start posting the schedule adherence summary data onto the GRT website as an accountability tool. It would be displayed in a form similar to Table 1. Related to this release will be an FAQ section on the website to explain how the data is collected, what it means, how staff use it and limitations on the data.

Second, the real time data will be released via the Region's Open Data Portal so developers can use it to develop more trip planning tools. A number of developers have indicated they are ready to launch an app shortly after the data becomes available. It should be noted that GRT and the Region do not provide any support to the apps and it will be up to the developers to ensure accuracy and to understand the limitations of the data and how best to use it.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

The provision of real time bus information and an on-going review of schedule adherence data meet the strategic plan priority of improving public transportation. Specifically it meets Strategic Objective Action of 3.1.3 - Develop and implement programs to improve access to and awareness of public transit.

Financial Implications:

NIL

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Staff from the Information Technology Services division of Corporate Services have been involved in providing the data currently available on open data as well as creating the approach and access for vendors to use.
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Appendix A: GRT Business Plan On-Time Performance Service Standard

Performance Measures

Performance measures are used primarily to set desired and achievable goals for the performance of the transit system and permit evaluation and feedback on how well these goals are met. The following section provides guidance on overall performance of the system, both in terms of the effectiveness of the level of service and its financial performance. Where applicable, a Decision Process is also included to identify corrective actions to be taken if service is not meeting overall performance measures.

8. On-time Performance

Background

Schedule reliability is a significant service quality factor influencing ridership. Reliable on-time performance will improve customer satisfaction and promote a positive image of the system. This standard is used to measure the reliability of the transit service (the time a bus arrives at a scheduled stop relative to the indicated schedule). For customers, this could be the difference between waiting for the next bus, if their bus leaves early (and is missed), or waiting for the next transfer opportunity at the terminal if a bus is late. Route timing points are established to guide the bus driver and should be monitored regularly. Buses should never leave a stop before the time indicated on the posted schedule.

To accommodate for the variability of weekday peak period driving conditions, the performance standard is adjusted based on the time of day. The exception is on Express Routes, where transit priority features will help mitigate delays due to congestion.

GRT has recently added Automatic Vehicle Location (AVL) systems to its fleet. These systems aid in determining accurate on-time performance statistics and will be used to reliability determine on-time performance at each stop. The newly available schedule data will allow schedule adherence to be improved by adjusting posted schedules or adjusting route timing.

Standard

1. Express Routes should adhere to published schedules 95% of the time during all service periods. All other routes should adhere to published schedules 90% of the time during weekday peak periods and 95% of the time during all other service periods, as detailed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Express Routes</th>
<th>All other Routes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekday peak periods (6:00am-9:00am and 4:00pm to 7:00pm)</td>
<td>0-3 minutes late, 95% of the time</td>
<td>0-3 minutes late, 90% of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other periods</td>
<td>0-3 minutes late, 95% of the time</td>
<td>0-3 minutes late, 95% of the time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Timed transfers at transit terminals/stations to be achieved 95 percent
of the time during weekday peak periods and 98 percent of the time during off peak periods and weekends.

3. GRT will aim to achieve a 3 percent improvement in on-time performance each year until the targets are reached.

4. At no point should buses leave early at key timing points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Process</th>
<th>The following will guide any actions taken by GRT to ensure compliance to the above standards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Consider adjusting posted schedules, route timing or adding transit priority features if the on-time performance standard is not met on a consistent basis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attainment of Goal</th>
<th>Goal 1.2: Service Reliability</th>
<th>Goal 1.3: Image</th>
<th>Goal 1.7: Travel Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Plan</td>
<td>Goal 2.1: Operations Productivity</td>
<td>Goal 4.1: Environmental Protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Monitor using onboard Automatic Vehicle Location (AVL) systems. Schedule reliability contributes to an improved customer experience by providing certainty that travel expectations will be met.

Measurements will be taken on a sign-up by sign-up basis. The system allows for parameters to be set, to report routes/runs not meeting the standard. Routes/runs consistently not achieving standards will be reviewed from both a scheduling and operations perspective to determine the problem and take corrective action.
Region of Waterloo  
Transportation and Environmental Services  
Transit Services

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee  
Date: August 11, 2015  
File Code: D10-40(A)  
Subject: Cambridge GO Train Service Update

Recommendation:
For information.

Summary:
The “Cambridge on the GO: A Business Case for the Extension of GO Train from Cambridge to Milton” study re-confirms the feasibility of an extension of GO train service from Milton to Cambridge. The new Business Case develops three additional scenarios for the implementation of GO rail service to Cambridge which involve lower initial capital investment and a quicker start than the original proposal.

The fastest possible implementation option with the lowest initial capital investment involves starting GO rail service with two conventional 12-car trains. Alternatively, rail service could be provided by self-propelled diesel multiple units (DMUs). The final rail infrastructure cost requirements would be determined through negotiation with CP, but could range from $21 million to $107 million. Overall, the cost of the alternative scenarios could be significantly less than the $110 million originally estimated in the 2009 study for the conventional introduction of GO rail service.

The expansion of GO rail service to Cambridge would provide access to a wider regional labour force and continue the significant economic contributions of Cambridge to the provincial and national economy.

In addition, the relocation of CP freight under the “Missing Link” proposal would facilitate the provision of two-way all-day service on the Milton line and make it easier to extend
GO rail service to Cambridge. Regional staff will continue to collaborate with area municipal staff to help influence the inclusion of an extension of GO rail service to Cambridge in the delivery of the Metrolinx Regional Express Rail (RER) strategy. In parallel to the Missing Link initiative, Metrolinx is engaged in negotiations with CN and CP over the rationalization of the regional rail network surrounding the Greater Toronto Area. This would represent a major step towards the implementation of the RER vision.

**Report:**

In 2009 Regional Council endorsed the “Cambridge to Greater Toronto Area GO Transit Rail Passenger Feasibility Study” which considered the extension of GO train service to Cambridge using the Canadian Pacific (CP) mainline from Milton (Galt subdivision). The study recommended starting service with four peak-period 12-car GO trains and increasing the number of trains as demand grows. It also recommended four new stations, a storage facility in Cambridge and double tracking the rail corridor at a cost of approximately $110 million.

In 2013, Regional Council included funding for an extension of the 2009 Cambridge GO train study in the approved Implementation Plan of the Transit Supportive Strategy in the City of Cambridge, as described in Report P-13-070. The purpose of the study approved in 2013 was to evaluate lower cost alternatives for initial passenger rail service to Cambridge.

This new study, titled “Cambridge on the GO: A Business Case for the Extension of GO Train from Cambridge to Milton”, re-confirms the feasibility of an extension of GO train service from Milton to Cambridge. The executive summary of this new Business Case is attached as Appendix 1 of this report. The study incorporates the technical analysis completed as part of the “Cambridge to Milton Passenger Rail Business Case and Implementation Strategy (October 2014)” and further outlines the broader benefits that extending GO train service to Cambridge would provide. This report, TES-TRS-15-13, provides an update on the technical recommendations and other conclusions of the Business Case study.

**Technical Conclusions of Business Case**

Building on the 2009 study, the new Business Case develops three additional scenarios for the implementation of GO rail service to Cambridge which involve lower initial capital investment and a quicker start than the original proposal. The fastest possible implementation option with the lowest initial capital investment involves starting GO rail service with two conventional 12-car trains, no storage yard in Cambridge and three (rather than four) stations between Milton and Cambridge of minimal design (Scenario 1). GO train trips to Cambridge would operate as an extension of existing 12-car train trips which terminate at Milton.
Alternatively, rail service could be provided by self-propelled diesel multiple units (DMUs) such as the Sumitomo vehicles now in service on the Union Pearson Express (Scenario 2). Although CP expressed some concern, the Business Case argues that DMUs can be compatible with mixed operation on a freight rail corridor. DMUs can be operated as self-propelled single vehicles or in multiple car train sets, and present some significant opportunities for application on a Cambridge extension and in other parts of the overall GO rail network. Additionally, Scenario 3 is a combination of DMUs and conventional 12-car GO trains. DMU train trips would run from Cambridge to Milton and require passengers to transfer where 12-car trains terminate at Milton.

The Business Case argues that DMUs can provide significant advantages over conventional 12-car GO trains. This includes lower operating costs (reduced energy demand and crewing), improved acceleration/deceleration reducing travel times, lower capital costs (smaller stations and shorter passing sidings), reduced physical impacts in an urban environment (due to shorter delays at grade level crossings), a greater ability to be integrated with bus and LRT service in multimodal stations (due to smaller train size), and improved reliability of the total corridor (delays on the outer DMU portion of the corridor would not affect 12-car train service on the inner portion of the corridor).

The capital cost of implementing each rail service scenario, as described in the Business Case, is shown below in Table 1. The capital cost of Scenarios 1-3 are generated from the baseline of the original 2009 cost estimate. The final capital cost of Scenarios 1-3 depend on whether all required trackwork, signals, and structures identified in the 2009 study are included. The final rail infrastructure cost requirements would be determined through negotiation with CP.

Table 1: Capital Cost of Rail Service Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Train Type</th>
<th>Capital Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009 Feasibility Study</td>
<td>4 conventional 12-car GO trains</td>
<td>$110 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Business Case Scenario 1</td>
<td>2 conventional 12-car GO trains</td>
<td>$32 million - $85 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Business Case Scenario 2</td>
<td>4 DMU trains</td>
<td>$21 million - $101 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Business Case Scenario 3</td>
<td>2 DMU trains and 2 conventional 12-car GO trains</td>
<td>$36 million - $107 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No additional GO trains are required to be purchased for Scenario 1, as it assumes two existing train trips are extended from Milton to Cambridge. Scenarios 2 and 3 involve
the purchase of 4-6 Sumitomo DMU vehicles at a cost of approximately $4,500,000 each. These are the same vehicles used for the Union Pearson Express. The future electrification of the Union Pearson Express corridor represents an opportunity to reduce the cost of Scenarios 2 and 3. If the vehicles in use on the Union Pearson Express were replaced by electric trains then they could be available for other applications in the GO rail network, such as an extension of service to Cambridge. Overall, the cost of implementing scenarios 1-3 could be significantly less than the $110 million originally estimated in the 2009 study for the conventional introduction of GO rail service.

**Key Benefits of GO Rail Expansion to Cambridge**

A high quality transportation network is essential to provide access to a wider regional labour force and to continue the significant economic contributions of Cambridge to the provincial and national economy. The expansion of GO rail service to Cambridge would:

- Connect two of the fastest growing communities in Ontario (Milton and Cambridge) with a rail transit option and provide the infrastructure necessary to foster redevelopment and intensification opportunities at existing and planned mobility hubs in these communities;
- Create more high paying jobs across all sectors including advanced manufacturing and high tech. This includes support for the creation of approximately 7,300 new jobs within walking distance of the proposed Cambridge and Milton GO Rail stations creating integrated mobility hubs;
- Provide support for the expansion and connection of world class, post-secondary institutions between the GTA and Waterloo Region by providing an affordable transit option for over 275,000 students enrolled in eight post-secondary campuses along the corridor;
- Enhance the movement of goods and services by providing an effective transit travel alternative to the private car and by reducing highway congestion along the Continental Gateway through the provision of more park and ride opportunities;
- Supply local businesses with better access to a region-wide labour force and reduce costs for their supply chain and export markets;
- Provide a cost effective opportunity to expand the Metrolinx RER network more broadly; and
- Support Federal and Provincial objectives to address national, provincial and local infrastructure priorities, policy and plans.

**Other Initiatives to Support Extension of Rail Service to Cambridge**

**Potential Freight Traffic Rationalization**

The municipalities of Toronto, Mississauga, Milton, Cambridge, Kitchener and Region of Waterloo have had on-going discussions on a proposal to rationalize the movement of
freight by creating a new rail link branded the Missing Link. This new link would reduce passenger train and freight movement conflicts, and would facilitate the provision of two-way all-day GO rail service on the Milton Line and the extension of service to Cambridge.

A consultant has been engaged to undertake a feasibility study and high level business case for the Missing Link. The intent would be to submit the feasibility study/business case to the federal government and position the project as a having national significance and major benefits for the Continental Gateway. The consultant study is expected to be completed by the end of August 2015.

Description and Benefits of the Missing Link (Figure 1)

The proposal would be to construct a new freight rail between the CP line west of Trafalgar Road in Milton and the CN line in Bramalea. All through-routed CP and CN freight traffic would travel on this route from Milton to Bramalea and continue along the CN line to the east. The new rail route would be located adjacent to Highway 407 and would require several bridges, new rail connections between CN and CP, and would have to be double tracked.

Relocation of CP freight onto the Missing Link would remove freight-passenger rail conflicts on the Milton line between Milton and Toronto. This would facilitate the provision of two-way all-day service on the Milton line and make it easier to extend GO rail service to Cambridge.

Next Steps

The Business Case study recommends that the Region request that the Province of Ontario and Metrolinx:

- Identify two-way, all-day GO Rail service to Milton as a Next Wave project to be implemented through the RER strategy within 10 years, and re-prioritized accordingly through The Big Move (2008) legislated update.
- Initiate the extension of GO Train service between Milton and Cambridge by the early testing of Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU) technology for commuter rail service as part of a pilot project.
- Include GO Train service from Milton to Cambridge as part of the RER Strategy.
- Include Waterloo Region as part of the Metrolinx planning area and as part of The Big Move.
- Immediately commence an Environmental Assessment (EA) study for the extension of GO Train service to Cambridge in order to identify and protect for new station locations, crossings and other corridor requirements.
- Include representatives from Waterloo Region, the City of Cambridge, Halton Region and the Town of Milton on any applicable Stakeholders Committees.
• Engage the Federal Government in discussions to establish the extension of GO Train service to Cambridge as an approved project under the Building Canada Fund.

Regional staff will continue to collaborate with area municipal staff to help influence the inclusion of an extension of GO rail service to Cambridge in the delivery of the Metrolinx RER strategy.

On July 28th, a delegation of municipal officials from along the Milton and Kitchener lines, including Mayor Craig, Mayor Vrbanovic and Regional Chair Seiling met with the Honourable Steven Del Duca, Provincial Minister of Transportation to reiterate the case for key infrastructure improvements including the Cambridge GO pilot and the Missing Link rail initiative. The Minister is supportive in principle to rationalize freight operations so that better passenger rail service can be provided on the Kitchener line and service can be extended to Cambridge on the Milton line.

Regional staff will continue to participate on the Missing Link Feasibility and Business Case study, and will provide a more complete update report to Committee and Council in September or October 2015.

In parallel to the Missing Link initiative, Metrolinx is engaged in negotiations with CN and CP over the rationalization of the regional rail network surrounding the Greater Toronto Area. The rationalization of the regional rail network would represent a major step towards the implementation of the RER vision. Metrolinx hopes to conclude technical negotiations with CN and CP this summer and come to an agreement over opportunities to build new connections, reduce bottlenecks and increase capacity for passenger rail service.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

The “Cambridge on the GO: A Business Case for the Extension of GO Train from Cambridge to Milton” study supports **Strategic Objective 3.4.3:** “Advocate for improved Rail service to Kitchener and Cambridge” under **Strategic Plan Focus Area 3:** “Sustainable Transportation”.

**Financial Implications:**

Funding for “Cambridge on the GO: A Business Case for the Extension of GO Train from Cambridge to Milton” was included in the Transit Supportive Strategy for the City of Cambridge. The Region has agreed to contribute approximately $5,250 from the existing Transit Services Operating Budget to the $84,000 cost of the “Missing Link” study which is being coordinated by the City of Mississauga.
Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

This report has been prepared in consultation with City of Cambridge staff as well as staff from Finance and Community Planning.
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Appendix 1: Cambridge on the GO: A Business Case for the Extension of GO Train from Cambridge to Milton (Executive Summary)

Figure 1: Missing Link
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Appendix 1: Cambridge on the GO: A Business Case for the Extension of GO Train from Cambridge to Milton (Executive Summary)
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The partnering communities of Waterloo Region, the City of Cambridge, Halton Region and the Town of Milton have come together in this request for increased GO Rail service. This includes two-way, all-day GO Rail service to Milton and, as a concurrent and complementary phase, the extension of GO Rail services further west to Cambridge. The extension to Cambridge represents an innovative opportunity to pilot new technologies that could have benefits for the entire commuter rail network in southern Ontario.

These communities respectfully request that the Province of Ontario and Metrolinx:

- Identify two-way, all-day GO Rail service to Milton as a Next Wave project to be implemented through the Regional Express Rail (RER) strategy within (10) years, and re-prioritized accordingly through The Big Move (adopted in 2008 by Metrolinx) legislated update.
- Initiate the extension of GO Train service between Milton and Cambridge –by the early testing of Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU) technology for commuter rail service as part of a pilot project.
- Include GO Train service from Milton to Cambridge as part of the Regional Express Rail (RER) Strategy.
- Include Waterloo Region as part of the Metrolinx planning area and as part of the Big Move.
- Immediately commence an Environmental Assessment (EA) study for the extension of GO Train service to Cambridge in order to identify and protect for new station locations, crossings and other corridor requirements.
- Include representatives from Waterloo Region, the City of Cambridge, Halton Region and the Town of Milton on any applicable Stakeholders Committees.
Key Benefits of GO Rail Expansion to Cambridge

The City of Cambridge is a significant contributor to the provincial and national economy – both as a unique and vibrant community in its own right, as well as being part of the broader Waterloo Region economic engine. A high quality transportation network is essential to provide access to a wider regional labour force and continue this community’s economic contribution. The extension of GO Train service to Cambridge is a vital component of the regional, provincial and federal transportation networks. All Canadians will benefit from expanded and extended GO Rail services from downtown Toronto to Cambridge (passing through the urban growth centres of Etobicoke, Mississauga and Milton) through the enhanced mobility and economic activity that comes with the creation of a comprehensive transportation network in one of Canada’s busiest economic corridors. GO Rail expansion to Cambridge will:

- Support sustainable development by connecting two of the fastest growing communities in Ontario with two-way, all-day GO rail service to Milton and a lower cost and more flexible rail transit option between Milton and Cambridge.
- Provide a cost effective opportunity to expand the Regional Express Rail network more broadly, while also supporting Provincial objectives to:
  - Promote economic prosperity;
  - Enhance quality of life; and
  - Improve the natural environment, including reduction in greenhouse gases;
- Support Federal objectives to address national, regional and local infrastructure priorities that move towards a:
  - Stronger economy;
  - Cleaner environment; and
  - Strong and prosperous communities¹.
- The downtown Cambridge to Toronto Union Station route would cover over 90km within the Continental Gateway, an integrated transportation network connecting Ontario to Quebec that encompasses ports, airports, intermodal facilities, and border crossings, as well as essential road, rail, and marine infrastructure across a 1,000km radius.
- Align policy, strategic objectives and resources outlined in local, provincial, and federal plans including the Province’s Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe to develop complete communities that are affordable, accessible and attractive.
- Leverage over 6.5 billion dollars of existing and future transportation infrastructure investments (Waterloo Region Ion Rapid Transit corridor, Highway 401 expansion, two GO Rail corridors and the GTA West highway).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Provide the infrastructure necessary to foster redevelopment and intensification opportunities for existing and planned mobility hubs in communities along the corridor (including the urban growth areas of downtown Milton and Cambridge).

- Complement and leverage the investment in two-way GO rail service on the Kitchener line to Kitchener/Waterloo, creating dynamic travel options between the GTA and Waterloo Region – our fastest growing communities and most heavily travelled transportation corridor.

- Create more high paying jobs across all sectors including advanced manufacturing and high tech. This includes support for the creation of approximately 7,300 new jobs within walking distance of the proposed Cambridge and Milton GO Rail stations creating integrated mobility hubs.

- Supply local businesses with better access to a region-wide labour force and reduce costs for their supply chain and export markets.

- Provide support for the expansion and connection of world class, post-secondary institutions between the GTA and Waterloo Region by providing an affordable transit option for over 275,000 students enrolled in eight post-secondary campuses along the corridor.

- Enhance the movement of goods and services by providing an effective transit travel alternative to the private car and by reducing highway congestion on critical links through the provision of more park and ride opportunities.

Supporting Economic Development

Cambridge is located in Waterloo Region or “Canada’s Technology Triangle”, which is known for the significant number of science, technology and advanced manufacturing companies that are located in this geographic region. Waterloo Region also includes the Cities of Kitchener and Waterloo, and the Townships of Wellesley, Wilmot, Woolwich and North Dumfries. A consumer market of over 525,000 people live in Waterloo Region, with a labour pool of over 259,000. The City of Cambridge alone is expected to grow to by approximately 40 percent to a population of 178,000 people by 2031, with a total employment forecast of approximately 102,000 jobs (79 percent growth). Its companies are well situated to access major markets in Southern Ontario and to export manufactured goods to the north eastern and central United States through the Michigan and Niagara gateways. Over the past five years, the establishment of business in Cambridge has increased 3.4 percent annually. Cambridge’s economic base is diversified with strengths in advanced manufacturing, automotive, textiles, plastics, agrifood and the technology sectors. The City has been rated the Top Ontario Investment Town (2014) by the Real Estate Investment Network (REID).

Currently, the only direct connection between Cambridge and the Greater Toronto Area (GTA) is the often congested Highway 401. Delays within this corridor impact economic growth opportunities by discouraging labour force mobility, trades and goods movement to and from the GTA. Cambridge’s location on Highway 401 is beneficial and is outside the congestion zone of the GTA. As such, the City attracts advanced manufacturing and other industries that have supply chains throughout southwest Ontario and export markets through the Michigan and Niagara gateways.
The City is strategically located on the Quebec-Ontario Continental Gateway. The Continental Gateway initiative is focused on developing a sustainable, secure and efficient multi-modal transportation system that keeps Canada’s economic heartland competitive, attractive for investment and essential for trade. Ontario, Quebec and the federal government have been working with the private sector and other key public sector stakeholders to develop a comprehensive infrastructure, policy, and regulatory strategy with recommendations for the short, medium and long term to support international trade through the Continental Gateway. The extension of passenger rail to Cambridge enhances over 90km of rail between Cambridge and downtown Toronto on the Continental Gateway, supporting improved international passenger traffic between the financial centre of Canada (downtown Toronto) and Canada’s Technology Triangle (Region of Waterloo).

Cambridge’s current and future businesses need access to regional labour and high quality transit is a key stimulant. Business travellers and post-secondary students need fast and reliable transit access to GTA growth centres. Without being part of the Regional Express Rail (RER) strategy, Cambridge will not achieve its potential to create economic growth, particularly in the advanced manufacturing sector that is heavily dependent on an efficient supply chain and access to export markets.

**Strategic Fit with Provincial and Federal Plans and Policies**

An evaluation was undertaken that demonstrates how the GO Rail extension supports broader policy directions in various provincial and federal policy documents, plans and studies. The following conclusions were made:

- The extension of GO Rail to Cambridge supports the three lenses of *The Big Move*: a high quality of life, a protected environment and a prosperous and competitive economy.
- The provision of passenger rail service to Cambridge is consistent with Provincial and Metrolinx policy including the *Provincial Policy Statement and the Provincial Growth Plan*.
- The *GTA West Corridor Environmental Assessment* identified the extension of full-day, two-way GO Trains to Cambridge (Regional Rail) as part of the solution in the Transportation Development Strategy.
- The federal and provincial governments support the *Continental Gateway* initiative which will benefit from the extension of GO Rail service to Cambridge.

The proposed GO Rail extension would also support federal, provincial and municipal objectives for sustainable growth, economic development and the reduction of environmental impacts from transportation by providing a public transit alternative in close proximity to the congested Highway 401 corridor.

The innovative use of smaller, self-propelled rail cars for commuter markets will generate significant environmental benefits including a reduction in GHG emissions per passenger kilometre. There may also be the opportunity for a Canadian car builder to supply DMU/EMU’s for the broader Metrolinx market.

A 2009 Cambridge to GTA Rail Passenger Feasibility Study concluded that the extension of GO Rail service from Milton to Cambridge is feasible. The feasibility was reconfirmed in this 2014 Cambridge to Milton Passenger Rail Business Case and Implementation Strategy. The detailed technical report is included in Appendix A.
Project Scorecard

The Metrolinx project prioritization process uses a comprehensive and innovative methodology consisting of two key stages. The primary evaluation establishes core criteria against which the projects are scored and respond to the three lenses of "The Big Move": a high quality of life, a protected environment and a prosperous and competitive economy. Then an implementation screen is considered which addresses issues of deliverability and constructability. These two stages create a project scorecard.

This project scorecard then enables the Metrolinx Board to assess the project’s Strategic Fit, which allows for consideration of broader elements, such as leveraging of other projects and initiatives, project readiness and funding.

Chapter 6 highlights the key scorecard indicators for the extension of GO Train service from Milton to Cambridge. The outcome of the project scorecard is summarized below:

1. **Prosperous Economy** – All Ontarians and Canadians will benefit from this expansion due to the enhanced mobility and economic activity that comes from the creation of a broader regional transportation network and improved goods movement.

2. **High Quality of Life** – Expansion of GO Rail will provide the necessary infrastructure to intensify, create high paying jobs and develop complete communities that are affordable, accessible and attractive.

3. **Sustainable Environment** – The extension of two-way GO Train service will provide a sustainable travel alternative to and from a rapidly growing region and reduce greenhouse gas emissions from Canada’s busiest highway corridor. A public transit alternative will contribute to the effectiveness of the Quebec-Ontario Continental Gateway.

4. **Strategic Fit** – Piloting the use of new Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU) technology to connect two of the fastest growing communities in Ontario will provide an opportunity to expand the Regional Express Rail network more broadly and cost effectively while supporting local, provincial, and federal plans and leveraging investment in transportation infrastructure.

Proposed GO Rail Extension Scenario

The City of Cambridge, along with the Region of Waterloo, is one of the most proactive communities in Ontario in supporting the provincial sustainability objectives of building strong healthy communities, the efficient use and management of land and infrastructure and the protection of the environment and resources. These objectives are entrenched in the Official Plans of both the City and the Region, the Regional Growth Plan, Regional Transportation Master Plan and Active Transportation Master Plan. The community has implemented policy and invested in infrastructure to make this vision a reality. The provision of inter-regional passenger rail service is the one component of this vision that is not within the community’s control but is a significant element required to ensure the total success of implementing this vision.

The federal and provincial commitment to the Milton and Kitchener GO Rail corridors and the Region’s commitment to ION (the local rapid transit system) provide the key elements of the transit rail network...
for GTA West. The inclusion of the Cambridge-Milton GO Rail link completes this transit network and complements the freeway network and the Continental Gateway.

A market entry scenario is proposed that connects Cambridge to Milton with four Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU) trains and one interim station (initially) in downtown Cambridge (Cambridge Central) to facilitate fast implementation. This scenario requires users travelling beyond Milton to transfer between the DMU and a 12-car GO Train at Milton station. This service would include four eastbound AM peak trips and four westbound PM peak period trips for consistency with the traditional Metrolinx approach to minimum market entry for rail service start-up.

Since the DMUs are not required for service east of Milton, this scenario allows for two-way travel in the AM and PM peak periods to accommodate Milton residents working in Cambridge. The DMUs can also be used to test mid-day return trips and evening service between Milton and Cambridge. Potentially these new service strategies could be tested on even longer sections of the corridor depending on track availability between Milton and Union Station.

The overall benefits of using DMUs over 12-car GO Trains for the extension of passenger rail service to Cambridge are as follows:

- Infrastructure costs as station platform lengths, passing sidings and storage tracks could be greatly reduced;
- Provides the opportunity to cost effectively provide two-way and off-peak service between Cambridge and Milton;
- More easily integrated with multi-modal station designs (in Cambridge there would be the potential opportunity to fully integrate the DMU with the future LRT station as both vehicles have the same track gauge);
- Improve overall reliability of service in the total corridor between Cambridge and Toronto as an incident or delay on the DMU between Cambridge and Milton would not delay the 12-car GO Train service between Milton and Toronto;
- Provides a second fleet standard for GO Transit that may be available to serve other transit markets to efficiently address other regional employment destinations.

For the Cambridge Central station, the final location would support the “Urban Growth Centre” designation for downtown Cambridge specified in the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe by providing a rapid transit connection in an area planned for higher density population and employment growth. Intensification is planned within an 800m radius of the proposed Cambridge Mobility Hub (integrated GO Train and ION light rail transit station) and other intensification/ regeneration areas. With GO Train service, the population around the station is projected to grow from 13,500 to 18,900 and employment to grow from 6,500 to approximately 10,000 by 2031.

Extension of the GO Train service westerly to Cambridge would also be a catalyst for the designated Milton Urban Growth Centre. Intensification is planned within an 800m radius of the Milton station and population around the station is projected to grow from 2,200 to approximately 14,400 with employment growth from 2,200 to approximately 6,000 by 2031.

Capital cost for this scenario ranges from $20 to $73 million, depending on the final inclusion requirements of rail corridor infrastructure costs. This does not include the costs of rail equipment as
the DMUs may become surplus when the airport service is electrified. With the costs of six DMUs included, the range is from $47 to $100 million.

It is anticipated that DMU operational costs will be significantly less than the costs for a traditional GO Train as they will operate with much smaller diesel engines (lower energy costs and emissions) and fewer train operating crew will be required. Exact cost savings will be identified once the Union Pearson Express is operational. Annual ridership for the DMU pilot project is anticipated to be in the range of 192,000 to 376,000 passengers by 2031.

A cost effective and innovative service strategy is proposed which can be quickly implemented and easily expanded as ridership develops. The success of DMU’s in this corridor will provide opportunities for other applications within the Metrolinx network and accelerate implementation of the Regional Express Rail strategy. Federal objectives to implement a Continental Gateway and reduce GHG emissions from transportation will also be achieved.
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Transit Services

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

Date: August 11, 2015

File Code: D28-60(A)

Subject: Integration of Grand River Transit Automatic Vehicle Location System and Electronic Fare Management System

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the acquisition and installation of software upgrades, enhancements and new modules from INIT Innovations in Transportation, Inc. to support the integration of Grand River Transit’s computer-aided dispatch and the automatic vehicle location (CAD/AVL) system with the Electronic Fare Management System (EFMS) at a cost of up to $206,885.75 plus all applicable taxes.

Summary:

Regional Council approved the acquisition of an Electronic Fare Management System (EFMS) to be supplied by Scheidt & Bachmann on June 25, 2014, as described in Report F-14-085. The EFMS is an electronic transit fare solution for fare payment on GRT buses, MobilityPLUS and ION LRT and aBRT service.

Integration with existing computer-aided dispatch and automatic vehicle location (CAD/AVL) provided by INIT Innovations in Transportation, Inc. was included in the EFMS design specifications because integration of the two systems will:

- Improve the accuracy and reliability of transit route performance and fare data, and;
- Simplify transit operator duties by eliminating the need to enter information into both systems separately.

While work to integrate the fare system is within the scope of the EFMS contract with Scheidt & Bachmann, modifications to the existing CAD/AVL equipment are not.
& Bachmann provided a detailed technology integration specification, based upon which, INIT provided a quote for the necessary integration work and support hardware.

Report:

INIT’s intelligent transportation control system is in operation on the entire GRT bus fleet. INIT’s integrated central system includes functions for analyzing, planning, implementing and improving on street transit vehicle operations through continuous tracking and communications with transit buses. The performance of the INIT system has been effective and reliable, providing considerable benefits to customers and service delivery.

The Request for Proposals for the Electronic Fare Management System (EFMS) identified the need to integrate new farebox systems with existing INIT on-bus equipment by:

- Adding the bus stop location to each on-bus fare transaction recorded in the EFMS database, and;
- Passing operator log-in information from the INIT on-vehicle equipment to the farebox, eliminating the need for the operator to enter information into both systems separately.

Integration of the fare and vehicle location systems will allow more reliable analysis of route performance. Revenue data would include the stop, route, time, payment method and fare paid for each boarding. Currently, most of this information is manually entered into the farebox by transit operators.

Operator duties would also be modified by eliminating a requirement to log into two systems manually with the same information. When a bus changes to a different route during a shift, that information would also be passed to the EFMS without operator intervention. The proposed integration would also provide a platform that could be extended through a future project to include automated log-in to the bus using Employee ID cards and automatic wireless transmission of shift and log-in information to each bus.

The EFMS RFP requested that bidders include support for this level of integration in their proposed project scope. Because INIT was a potential EFMS bidder, the RFP was structured to exclude any modification of the INIT system from proposals. The successful EFMS vendor, Scheidt & Bachmann has provided an Interface Control Document that guides the technical approach to integration. INIT then proposed a price for modification of the existing system to achieve the desired level of integration.
Corporate Strategic Plan:

Implementation of the EFMS project, integrated with existing CAD/AVL systems, supports the implementation of Council’s Strategic Focus, identified under Focus Area 3: Sustainable Transportation: Develop greater, more sustainable and safe transportation choices, and specifically Action 3.1.2: Expand the bus network (Conventional Transit) and begin to integrate it with the future Light Rail Transit System.

Financial Implications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INIT System Integration Proposal</td>
<td>$206,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus: Applicable Net HST of 1.76%</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$210,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The approved 2015 GRT 10 Year Capital Program includes $7,436,000 (Project 66059) from 2014–2016 to complete the EFMS project for conventional transit, MobilityPLUS, Bus Plus and ION services. The project costs are budgeted to be funded from development charges (approximately $1.35 million) and debentures (approximately $6.09 million with debt service funded from the RTMP Reserve Fund). The approved 2015 Rapid Transit 10 year Capital Program includes $3,798,000 for EFMS implementation in 2016.

This overall project budget includes $730,000 for project management and consulting costs during the system implementation phase along with a community awareness program. To date, including this INIT system integration, $440,000 of this amount has been committed.

The Purchasing By-Law provides that a “Purchase by Negotiation” is appropriate when it is “the extension of an existing or previous contract which would prove more cost effective or beneficial for the Region” and “the acquisition is required or is beneficial in regard to the standardization of goods or services for the Region”. Such negotiated acquisitions still require Council approval when the contract value exceeds $100,000.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

This report was prepared with staff from Transit Services, Transportation and Environmental Services, Financial Services and Treasury Services.

Prepared By: Gethyn Beniston, Project Manager, Transit Services

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: August 11, 2015
File Code: T01-20/12 Gerber Road
Subject: Proposed Speed Limit on Gerber Road (Regional Road 12) between Nafziger Road (Regional Road 5) and 100 metres east of Greenwood Hill Road, in the Township of Wellesley

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

a) Remove from Schedule 18, posted 70 km/h on Gerber Road (Regional Road 12) between Nafziger Road (Regional Road 5) and 400 metres east of Nafziger Road;

b) Remove from Schedule 18, posted 80 km/h on Gerber Road (Regional Road 12) between 400 metres east of Nafziger Road and Moser-Young Road (Regional Road 14);

c) Add to Schedule 18, posted 60 km/h on Gerber Road between Nafziger Road and 100 metres east of Greenwood Hill Road;

d) Add to Schedule 18, posted 80 km/h on Gerber Road between 100 metres east of Greenwood Hill Road and Moser-Young Road;


Summary:
Transportation Engineering staff reviewed the current posted speed limit along Gerber Road east of Nafziger Road. Based on this review, it is recommended that the posted speed limit be reduced to 60 km/h between Nafziger Road and 100 metres east
of Greenwood Hill Road. This will extend the existing 60 km/h speed limit zone along Gerber Road to encompass the settlement area of the Town of Wellesley.

Report:

1.0 Background

Regional staff received a request from Township of Wellesley to review the posted speed limit on Gerber Road between Nafziger Road and Greenwood Hill Road due to the recent development of residential homes further east towards Greenwood Hill Road.

2.0 Existing Conditions

Gerber Road is an east/west roadway with one lane in each direction. Gerber Road has a posted speed limit of 70 km/h from Nafziger Road to 400 metres east of Nafziger Road where it changes to 80 km/h. Gerber Road west of Nafziger Road (under Township of Wellesley jurisdiction) has a posted speed limit of 60 km/h. The Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) along Gerber Road, east of Nafziger Road is 2518 vehicles per day.

Recently the Township of Wellesley, in conjunction with the Region of Waterloo, approved residential development in the easterly portion of the settlement area of Wellesley, towards Greenwood Hill Road. A multi-use trail was constructed between Parkview Drive and Greenwood Hill Road.

Figure 1 shows the existing posted speed limit and the location of the new residential development.
Figure 1: Existing Speed Limit Zones on Gerber Road
3.0 Regional Practice for Establishing Speed Limits

Generally, staff recommends that speed limits be set at or about the average speed because this is most likely to produce a uniformly moving traffic stream. Traffic moving at a uniform speed results in increased safety and fewer collisions. With uniform speed, drivers are less impatient, pass less often, and are less likely to tailgate, which reduces both head-on and rear-end collisions.

The posting of an appropriate speed limit also simplifies the work of enforcement officers because most of the traffic is moving at or near the posted speed. With an appropriate speed limit, blatant speeders are easily spotted, safe drivers are not penalized, and police officers are not asked to enforce and defend unrealistic and arbitrary speed limits.

3.1 Speed Study Results

On August 20, 2014, a speed study was undertaken along Gerber Road within the 70 km/h speed zone between Nafziger Road and Parkview Drive. The results of the study indicated that of the 2450 vehicles surveyed, motorists on average were travelling at 62 km/h.

4.0 Public and Area Municipality Consultation

Information signs were installed on July 7, 2015 along Gerber Road for two weeks requesting comments about the proposed speed limit reduction through the Region’s website or via telephone. An Internet questionnaire was also setup to receive comments and a phone number was provided.

The questionnaire asked interested parties whether they were in support of, or in opposition to, the proposal to reduce the posted speed limit to 60 km/h. Of the 64 respondents, 40 are in favour of the posted speed reduction and 24 are opposed. The majority of those that oppose the posted speed reduction noted the following:

- Properties do not front Gerber Road with driveways but are backlotted; and
- Motorists are already travelling 62 km/h, so there should be no reason to change the speed limit as the existing speed limit is adequate.

Those interested in the speed limit along Gerber Road have been notified. Township of Wellesley staff are in agreement with the proposed changes.

5.0 Recommendations

Based on staff’s assessment, feedback received through the public survey, and the Regional practice of setting speed limits, it is recommended that the posted speed limit be reduced to 60 km/h between Nafziger Road and 100 metres east of Greenwood Hill Road. Revising the speed limit as recommended will result in one less speed zone and
is expected to yield:

- A speed zone that better reflects the changing environment;
- More uniform traffic speeds; and
- Fewer collisions.

Figure 2 shows the recommended speed limit zones.

**Figure 2: Recommended Speed Limit Zones on Gerber Road**

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 change the posted speed limit signs is approximately $800, and funding is provided in the Transportation Operations budget.
Other Department Consultations / Concurrence:

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

Attachments:

Nil

Prepared By: Satinderjit Bahia, Engineering Technologist (Traffic)

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

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

Date: August 11, 2015  

File Code: E20-40

Subject: Curbside Collection Contract – Recommended Bid Option Structure

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve a single bid option, referred to as Bid Option 1, for residential curbside collection in the Tri-cities (Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo) and the Townships (North Dumfries, Wellesley, Wilmot and Woolwich) for the next waste collection contract, commencing March 6, 2017.

Summary: Nil

Report:

Under the existing residential waste collection contract, curbside service is provided by two (2) separate private waste management contractors. In the Tri-cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo, service is provided by Waste Management of Canada Inc. and in the Townships of North Dumfries, Wellesley, Wilmot and Woolwich, service is provided by Plein Disposal Inc. The historic rationale for two separate contracts has been based primarily on differing curbside service levels between the Tri-Cities and the Townships, and that both large and small contractors could effectively compete for the work. Annual collection costs are in the range of $16 million/year in the tri-cities for service to approximately 120,000 households and $4 million/year in the townships for service to approximately 20,000 households. Combined, the two contracts make up about 42% of the Waste Management Division’s operating budget.

With the recent Council approval of standardized curbside collection services across the entire Region, staff are in the process of developing the bid documents for the next seven year waste collection contract. There is a robust pool of potential bidders for this contract, as several waste management firms provide similar services across Ontario.
The intent is to advertise the contract in late August/early September with award of contract anticipated in November/December of this year. This schedule allows sufficient time for the successful contractor to obtain the necessary resources, approvals and finalize collection routes prior to commencement of the new contract in March 2017. As part of the development of bid documents staff conducted a review of potential bid options for procurement of services and developed the following bid options for consideration as presented below.

**Bid Option 1: Single Region Wide Collection Contract**

The provision of curbside collection services would be provided under one contract for the entire Region (Tri-cities and Townships combined) by a single contractor.

Or the combined bid options of:

**Bid Option 2a: Separate Tri-Cities Collection Contract**

The provision of curbside collection services would be provided under one contract for the Tri-cities only (Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo) by a single contractor; and

**Bid Option 2b: Separate Township Collection Contract**

The provision of curbside collection services would be provided under one contract for the Townships only (North Dumfries, Wellesley, Wilmot and Woolwich) by a single contractor.

**Discussion:**

It is anticipated that Bid Option 1 would likely be the most beneficial and simplest to present/evaluate for the following reasons:

- **Economies of Scale:** better pricing is anticipated as the standardized level of service across the entire Region would allow potential bidders an opportunity to optimize collection routes across urban/rural boundaries that previously hasn’t occurred while maintaining balanced daily collection routes, Monday to Friday.

- **Simpler Contract Administration:** the administration of a single contract versus multiple contracts would be more efficient as there would be only one point of contact, one set of invoices, simpler reporting of data to the Province for the annual data-call (impacts blue box funding), etc.

- **Industry Standard:** the majority of upper tier municipally administered collection contracts of a similar size/scope in Ontario are bid as single bid contract and do not require differentiation between lower tier and upper tier or urban and rural geographical boundaries.
- Simpler Bid Evaluation/Complexity: the provision of a single bid option is less complex for potential bidders (only required to provide 1 bid versus possibly 3 separate bids) and simpler to evaluate/compare and award.

It is also recognized that Bid Option 1 could result in smaller collection contractors not being able to bid as they may not have the necessary resources given the size and scope of a single Region-wide collection contract. To address this issue, appropriate language would be included in the bid documents that would allow smaller collection contractors to act as sub-contractors. While not common practice, bidders would have the option to subcontract a portion of the work to another contractor as part of their bid package.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

To ensure Regional programs and services are efficient and effective and demonstrate accountability to the public.

**Financial Implications:**

The cost of waste collection is provided for in the annual Waste Management Services operating budget.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Staff from the Corporate Services were consulted and provided input toward the preparation of this report.

**Attachments:**

**Prepared By:** Jon Arsenault, Director, Waste Management Division

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

Transportation and Environmental Services

Water Services Division

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

Date: August 11, 2015

File Code: C06-60; E13-20/08302

Subject: Update on East Side Lands Wastewater Servicing Environmental Assessment

Recommendation:

For information only.

Summary:

The “East Side Lands” have been identified as an area to accommodate future greenfield growth in the Region. The 2007 Wastewater Treatment Master Plan identified the need for a new Regional pumping station and forcemain to convey wastewater from the new development areas to the Kitchener Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP).

In 2013, Regional Council awarded consulting contract C2012-29 to Associated Engineering Ltd. for completion of a Class Environmental Assessment (EA) and preliminary design for the proposed wastewater infrastructure (Report E-13-021). The objective of the EA was to establish the preferred design concept for the initial and ultimate pump station and forcemain infrastructure, including pump station location and forcemain route through Kitchener.

As the EA study has evolved and new information has been gathered, the need for changes to the project scope has been recognized. The following summarizes the changes in circumstances and scope for the project:
• The originally planned pumping station and forcemain solution has greater construction, operations, and capital cost challenges than anticipated at the Master Planning stage, primarily related to the operational issues of forcemain and pumping station, and the need for large air relief and odour control structures along the route;

• New information suggests that viable gravity sewer solutions exist (potentially reducing or even eliminating the need for pump station and forcemain infrastructure);

• In the short- to medium-term (up to 20 years, depending on the rate of development), servicing of the East Side Lands (including Stage 1) can likely be provided more cost-effectively by the Preston WWTP. The infrastructure for conveyance of wastewater from the East Side Lands to the Kitchener WWTP would still be the ultimate long-term solution, but construction can likely be deferred until a much later date than originally anticipated;

• The study work completed to-date is still relevant and necessary to establish the preferred long-term solution for conveyance of wastewater from the East Side Lands to the Kitchener WWTP; and

• Therefore, considering the above, the current project has been re-scoped to:
  
  o Revise the Class EA scope to consider the additional solutions (building upon previous work) and focus on long-term servicing,
  o Shift the infrastructure planning for short-term servicing (including Stage 1 of the East Side Lands) to the scope of the concurrent Wastewater Treatment Master Plan update project (C2015-06);
  o Defer the Preliminary Design component of the project (recognizing that construction may be 10 to 20 years away).

The above approach will allow a more efficient short and long-term wastewater servicing of the East Side lands. Servicing of East Side Lands Stage 1 (short-term) can be achieved through the Preston WWTP, and will allow easier and prompt servicing of development without the need for implementing the long term solution. Long-term wastewater servicing of the East Side Lands will still be through Kitchener WWTP. The timing for implementing the long-term solution will be continuously evaluated through future updates of the Wastewater Treatment Master Plan.

The consultant has recently begun the additional work needed to address the revised scope of the EA. The portion of the C2012-29 budget originally intended for preliminary design has been reallocated to the Class EA budget. This amount is sufficient to allow the consultant team to complete the Class EA within the limit of the original budget for the consultant assignment. As explained above, the implementation of the long-term wastewater servicing of the East Side Lands will likely be delayed by several years, and the preliminary design will be combined with the detailed design.
Consultation with the public and other stakeholders, and incorporation of their input into the decision-making process for the preferred solution, is a critical component of this project. Notices of project commencement were published in 2013, and in September 2014 an update was mailed to approximately 1000 property owners within the study area. Another update notice, explaining the changes in the scope and schedule of the Class EA, will be published later in August 2015 and mailed to the same property owners. Public Consultation Centres for the project, advertised in advance, are anticipated to be held by December 2015. The information to be presented at the Public Consultation Centres will be circulated to Regional Council in advance of the public meetings.

Report:

Background

The “East Side Lands” refers to an area of land located in the eastern portion of Waterloo Region (Region) surrounding the Waterloo Regional Airport. These lands have been identified as an area to accommodate future greenfield growth in the Region. New infrastructure will be required to service development in the area.

The East Side Lands Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MESP) was approved by Regional Council on April 9, 2014 (Report P-14-043) and will advance the development of approximately 300 net hectares (741 net acres) of land for employment uses (Stage 1 lands). The MESP identified construction of a new pumping station (in the vicinity of the East Side Lands) and a forcemain to convey wastewater to the Kitchener Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) as the preferred servicing solution for the entire East Side Lands (consistent with the Region’s Wastewater Treatment Master Plan [WWTMP], 2007).

As the East Side Lands is expected to be gradually developed in stages over a long period of time, the implementation concept involves constructing initial infrastructure to service a portion of the East Side Lands (mainly the Stage 1 lands), and expanding the capacity of this infrastructure in one or more stages over time until the mature build-out state of the broader East Side Lands is reached.

Regional Council awarded consulting contract C2012-29 to Associated Engineering Ltd. (the consultant) for completion of a Class Environmental Assessment (EA) and preliminary design for the proposed East Side Lands Wastewater Pumping Station and Forcemain (Report E-13-021). A Steering Committee including staff members from the Region, the Cities of Kitchener and Cambridge and the Township of Woolwich was formed to participate in the project. The objective of the EA was to establish the preferred design concept for the initial and ultimate pump station and forcemain infrastructure, including:

- The preferred location for the pump station,
- The preferred route for the forcemain connecting the pump station to the...
Kitchener WWTP, and

- The infrastructure requirements for servicing both the first stage and ultimate built-out state of the East Side Lands development.

**Class EA Progress Update**

The consultants conducted extensive investigation including ecological field studies and land surveying, carried out extensive consultation with stakeholders, established the recommended initial and ultimate size (capacity) for the infrastructure, and developed numerous alternative solutions (potential pump station locations and forcemain routes). These alternatives were comparatively evaluated based on environmental, social and technical criteria to obtain a short list of most promising alternatives. Conceptual designs of the short-listed alternatives were developed in more detail, for further analysis and comparison.

As more detailed information became available during the development of the short-listed conceptual design alternatives, the consultant identified potentially feasible options for conveying wastewater to the Kitchener WWTP by gravity sewer most of the way or all of the way to the WWTP. This approach could potentially avoid the need for a Regional pump station, or perhaps allow the pump station to be located closer to the existing Kitchener WWTP property, which would minimize the extent of forcemain required and reduce construction and operation challenges.

The consultant has provided a preliminary opinion that these alternatives have the potential to be less expensive and easier to operate than the pumping station and forcemain alternatives already evaluated, and that the scope of the Environmental Assessment should be revised to consider these additional alternative solutions. Based on the preliminary analysis presented to staff by the engineering consultant, Water Services Division concurred with the recommended change in project scope.

There is another relevant change in circumstances since the concept was developed for East Side Lands servicing in the last WWTMP update (2007). At that time, wastewater projections suggested that Preston WWTP would not be a good option for servicing the whole of Stage 1 of the East Side Lands, due to lack of spare capacity. However, the diversion of flows from the industrial area in the Preston community to the Galt WWTP in 2011 increased the spare capacity at Preston WWTP sufficiently to service Stage 1 for a decade or more, before there would be a need to divert East Side Lands wastewater to Kitchener WWTP.

In June 2015, the Region initiated a project to update the WWTMP, which will include revisiting the short/medium term servicing concept above for the East Side Lands. Therefore, Regional staff have recommended that the Consultant adjust the scope of this project to establish only the preferred long-term solution for wastewater conveyance to the Kitchener WWTP, and defer decision-making on the construction timing and initial
size (capacity) of the long term infrastructure to the WWTMP update.

The Region and the consultant have worked together over the last few months to develop a new work plan, schedule, and budget estimate for expanding the EA to allow development and evaluation of the wider range of alternative concepts, and to supplement and revise the project reports completed to-date accordingly. The portion of original consultant assignment budget intended for preliminary design task will be reallocated to the Class EA task budget to include the revised scope above. This amount is sufficient to allow the consultant team to complete the Class EA within the limit of the original budget for the consultant assignment. The preliminary design for the long term solution can be deferred and completed at a later date to be determined by the WWTMP.

The Region has recently directed the consultant to proceed with the new work plan, and additional field investigation and stakeholder consultation has been scheduled to take place over the next several months.

Public Consultation

Consultation with the public and other stakeholders, and incorporation of their input into the decision-making process for the preferred solution, is a critical component of this project. The project directly impacts the Cities of Cambridge and Kitchener, and the Township of Woolwich. The wastewater system will initially service portions of the East Side Lands that lie in the City of Cambridge, and ultimately in the future will also service portions of the Township of Woolwich. However, much of the Regional wastewater infrastructure will be built within the City of Kitchener between Highway 8 and the Grand River. Residents in this area are the most likely to be impacted by construction and operation of the proposed facilities.

The development of the East Side Lands is a multi-municipality initiative that is expected to bring economic benefits and better employment opportunities to the whole Region. The decision to use the Kitchener WWTP to provide wastewater treatment for the East Side Lands was determined though the Master Planning process to be the best alternative for the Region as a whole, considering financial, environmental, social and technical factors.

In 2014, the Region mailed out an informational notice about the East Side Lands EA to the owners of all addresses located in the vicinity of alternative pump station locations and forcemain routes being considered. This mail-out (appended to this report) was sent to about 1000 homes, businesses and institutions, mainly in the Deer Ridge, Pioneer Tower, Grand Hill, and Sportsworld Crossing areas of Kitchener. The notice explained the purpose of the EA and the proposed works, and advised the public about the plan for future public consultation meetings to obtain community feedback and address any concerns the public may have.
At the time the notice was mailed, it had been anticipated that Public Consultation Centres would have occurred in early 2015. With the revised EA scope and work plan, it is now anticipated that Public Consultation Centres will be held by approximately December 2015. The information to be presented at the Public Consultation Centres will be circulated to Regional Council in advance of the public meetings.

A notice will be mailed out later in August to the same list of local property owners as used for the 2014 notice, providing an update on the change in scope and schedule for the study. A similar notice will concurrently be advertised in local newspapers and posted to the Region’s web site.

**Updated Schedule**

As a result of the revised project scope, the revised anticipated schedule is as follows:

- Publication of project update notices: August 2015
- Public Consultation Meetings: early December 2015
- Recommendation report to Planning & Works Committee: early 2016
- Publication of Environmental Study Report for public and stakeholder comments: Spring 2016

Appropriate timing of preliminary design, detailed design, and construction of the recommended long-term solution will be established through the Wastewater Treatment Master Plan update, scheduled to commence in July 2015.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

The East Side Lands Pumping Station and Forcemain Class EA and Preliminary Design support 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.”

**Financial Implications:**

The 2015 Ten Year Wastewater Capital Program includes a total combined budget of $24,750,000 for the implementation of the East Side Lands wastewater servicing infrastructure, including $650,000 allocated over the years 2015 – 2016 funded from the Water Development Charges Fund. This budget is sufficient to fund the remaining work for the Class EA.

Preliminary design of the preferred design solution after completion of the Class EA was originally included in the consultant assignment and the 2015-2016 Capital Program, but will be deferred to a later year (to be determined by the WWTMP update).
The total C2012-29 total budget remains unchanged, but task budgets within the contract have been adjusted, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Previous C2012-29 Budget</th>
<th>Revised C2012-29 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EA Phase</td>
<td>$484,992</td>
<td>$605,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Design Phase</td>
<td>$120,698</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$605,690</td>
<td>$605,690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As explained in this report, the implementation of the long-term wastewater servicing of the East Side Lands will likely be delayed by several years, and the preliminary design will be combined with the detailed design. Award of the combined preliminary and detailed design for the long-term alternative will be part of a future Planning & Works Committee Report.

In the proposed 2016 Ten Year Wastewater Capital Program currently in development, the recommended funding allocation for East Side Lands wastewater servicing will be adjusted to reflect the change in project schedule.

All figures in this section are exclusive of applicable taxes.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**
Nil

**Attachment**

Attachment A: Information for Residents & Property Owners (September 4, 2014)

**Prepared By:** Dave Arsenault, Senior Project Engineer, Water Services

**Approved By:** Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
INFORMATION FOR RESIDENTS & PROPERTY OWNERS
September 4, 2014

RE: EAST SIDE LANDS PUMPING STATION AND FORCEMAIN CLASS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (CLASS EA)

In April 2013, the Region of Waterloo began a Class Environmental Assessment study for a new wastewater pumping station and forcemain (wastewater pipeline) that will service properties in the area known as the “East Side Lands”. This study is one step in the process to implement strategies developed through the East Side Lands Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MESP) completed earlier in 2014, and the Region’s Wastewater Treatment Master Plan (WWTMP) completed in 2007.

It is expected that the East Side Lands will be developed in the coming decades, primarily as “employment lands” (industrial, commercial, and institutional). New municipal service infrastructure, including wastewater servicing, will need to be constructed to allow for these new developments. Wastewater from most of the East Side Lands is planned to be treated at the Kitchener Wastewater Treatment Plant (KWWTP), located in the City of Kitchener, across the Grand River in the Doon area. A new Regional wastewater pump station also needs to be constructed, along with a new underground pipeline through portions of Kitchener, to transport the wastewater from the East Side Lands to the KWWTP.

The current study will help to determine the best location for the new pump station, and the best route for the new pipeline. The Region is studying the area (see map below) which includes field work to survey and categorize existing ecological conditions in areas that could potentially be affected by the project. The Region will consult with City of Kitchener and Cambridge staff, residents, and other government agencies to ensure the needs and concerns of all stakeholders are considered, including the potential impacts of construction and operation on residents and businesses.

In the fall of 2014, the project team and key stakeholders including City of Kitchener and Cambridge staff will review the information gathered, and develop a preliminary recommendation for the preferred pump station site and pipeline route.

A Public Consultation Centre will be held in early 2015, where the preliminary recommendation and other study findings will be presented and public feedback gathered. The draft study report will also be made public for review and comment. The Region of Waterloo welcomes comments from the public at any time up to completion of the study in 2015.

For further clarification, please review the following questions and answers:

Q: Why do we need to build a new pumping station and pipeline?
A: The proposed pumping station and pipeline is necessary infrastructure needed to service new development on the east side of the region, and is part of the Region’s strategy for economic growth and attracting new employers to the area.
Q: Why is this Study needed?
A: The Region wants to find a solution that minimizes the impacts on residents and the surrounding natural environment. A Class EA study is a Province of Ontario requirement for this type of project, that helps ensure all relevant input and stakeholders are considered in the decision-making process.

Q: Where will this new pump station and pipeline be built?
A: No decisions have been made on a location. A number of locations and routes are being considered as possible options. Key stakeholders including City of Kitchener and Cambridge staff will review the information gathered, and develop a preliminary recommendation for the preferred pump station site and pipeline route. Before any decisions are made, a Public Consultation Centre will be held in early 2015, where the preliminary recommendation and other study findings will be presented and public feedback gathered. The draft study report will also be made public for review and comment. The Region of Waterloo welcomes comments from the public at any time up to completion of the study in 2015.

Q: What areas could be impacted by construction? Will traffic flow be affected in my area?
A: The areas potentially impacted will depend on the final recommendations of the study. Once the final selection is made, plans will be developed to minimize the impacts of the project on the areas affected. However, we do know that most of the potential pipeline routes cross the King Street and Highway 8 corridors. Options being considered for pump station options are all located to the north-east of Highway 8, in the area roughly bounded by Highway 8, Aliendale Road, Fountain Street, and Maple Grove Road. (See also the map provided below.)

Q: Is the decision of where to construct the pumping station and pipeline going to be made solely by the Region?
A: No. The Region is working closely with City of Kitchener and Cambridge staff as well as other stakeholders in developing the preferred solution. Once the relevant information is gathered and assessed by the project team, the public will also have formal opportunities to give their input before the final decision is made.

Q: Will Regional staff be on my property during this study?
A: There are only a few private properties in the study area, none of them are residential. If project staff need to access a property, the owner will be contacted in advance to arrange access.

Q: When is the construction going to take place?
A: The timing is dependent on a number of factors. Currently we anticipate construction of the pump station and pipeline to begin in 2017.
Q: How can I get more information, or give input on this project?
A: We encourage you to provide us with any suggestions or comments that you may have about this study. All comments will be posted as part of public record with the exception of personal information. To provide comment or request additional information, please contact either of the Project Team members below:

Mr. Dave Arsenault, M.Sc., P.Eng.
Senior Project Engineer
Region of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street,
Kitchener ON N2G 4J3
Phone: 519-575-4757 ext. 3682
Email: darsenault@regionofwaterloo.ca

Mr. Duane Lindner, P.Eng.
Manager of Infrastructure
Associated Engineering (Ont.) Ltd.
Suite 302, 508 Riverbend Drive,
Kitchener, ON N2K 3S2
Phone: 226-214-3187 ext. 5301
Email: lindnerd@ae.ca

Key Map – East Side Lands
Pumping Station and Forcemain

FUTURE PUMPING STATION (PS)

KITCHENER WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT (WWTP)
Region of Waterloo

Transportation and Environmental Services

Water Services

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

Date: August 11, 2015  File Code: E13-40

Subject: P2015-21 Aerobic Biosolids Management Contract

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo accept the proposal of Bartels Environmental Services Inc. for Aerobic Biosolids Management Contract for a five (5) year term at unit rates of $4.10 /m³, $6.98 /m³ and $26.30 /m³ (excluding all applicable taxes) for biosolids haulage, biosolids land application or disposal and septage lagoon clean out respectively, all as detailed in Report TES-WAS-15-23 dated August 11,2015.

Summary:

The current Aerobic Biosolids Management Program includes haulage, land application and/ or disposal of aerobic biosolids generated at Hespeler, Conestoga, St. Jacobs, Wellesley, Heidelberg, Foxboro, New Hamburg and Ayr Wastewater Treatment Plants (WWTPS).

This program is essential as services provided through this contract are critical for the continuous and efficient operation of the Region’s smaller and rural wastewater treatment facilities. The new aerobic biosolids management program will optimize the haulage, reprocessing, and disposal of aerobic biosolids. Management of septage received at the New Hamburg WWTP is also included in the scope of this contract.

The Request for Proposals (P2015-21) for Aerobic Biosolids Management Program was advertised in the Record and on the Region’s Purchasing website on Monday June 15, 2015. The selection process was completed in accordance with the Region’s selection policy and Purchasing By-law. Upon a review of the contractor’s proposal and upset fee cost, the project team recommends that Bartels Environmental Services Inc. be retained to undertake this assignment at unit rates of $4.10 /m³, $6.98 /m³ and $26.30 /m³ (excluding all applicable taxes) for biosolids haulage, biosolids land application or
disposal and septage lagoon clean out respectively. It is normal practice to base the biosolids management contracts on unit rates ($/m^3) as the volumes of handled aerobic biosolids vary due to fluctuating flows, environmental and seasonal conditions. The actual annual cost of this contract will be based on the actual volume of biosolids processed.

Report:

Background

The Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Region) is responsible for providing wastewater treatment services to the seven municipalities within its boundaries. The wastewater facilities are owned by the Region and are currently operated and maintained by the Ontario Clean Water Agency (OCWA).

Kitchener, Galt, Waterloo and Preston Wastewater Treatment Plans (WWTPs) process approximately 80% of the Region’s total wastewater flow. Remaining 20% of the wastewater flow is treated at number smaller and rural wastewater treatment plants. Sludge, a by-product of the wastewater treatment process is stabilized either through anaerobic or aerobic digestion.

Currently sludge generated at Kitchener, Waterloo, Galt and Preston WWTPs is anaerobically digested, dewatered and disposed at an approved landfill or land applied during spreading season. The anaerobic biosolids is managed by the Region through a contract with Terratec Environmental.

Sludge generated at the remaining Regional WWTPs is currently either aerobically digested and land applied on agricultural land or hauled to other plants for further processing and disposed through the anaerobic program. The current Aerobic Biosolids contract was awarded by council in 2005 with an extension clause exercised in 2010. The current contract is to expire December 31, 2015.

This new aerobic biosolids management program will include Hespeler, Conestoga, St. Jacobs, Wellesley, Heidelberg, Foxboro, New Hamburg and Ayr WWTPS. The services provided through this program include biosolids haulage, land application (and/or disposal), and periodic cleanout of the septage lagoon at the New Hamburg WWTP. These services are critical for continuous and efficient operation of our wastewater treatment facilities.

Scope of work

The scope of this contract is to implement an Aerobic Biosolids Management Program which includes:

1) haulage of aerobic biosolids from Hespeler, Conestoga, St. Jacobs, Foxboro, Wellesley and Heidelberg WWTPs to either New Hamburg WWTP, Waterloo WWTP, Galt WWTP, Manitou Wastewater Residual Management Centre or combination of thereof for further processing:
2) management of biosolids from New Hamburg and Ayr WWTPs through haulage and either disposal or application to agricultural land during spreading season;

3) clean out of the septage lagoon at New Hamburg WWTP and septage material processing and disposal as required to meet WWTPs performance and operational requirements.

Contractor selection

The Request for Proposals (P2015-21) for Aerobic Biosolids Management Program was advertised in the Record and on the Region’s Purchasing website on Monday June 15, 2015.

Proposals were opened in the presence of J. Markovic, C. Bogusat and D. Celmer-Repin.

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

- T. Brown, Manager, Engineering and Wastewater Programs, Water Services
- T. Bellamy, Senior Project Engineer, Engineering and Wastewater Programs, Water Services
- D. Celmer – Repin, Project Engineer, Engineering and Wastewater Programs, Water Services

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

Quality Factors (70%)

- Description of proposed aerobic biosolids and septage management program (35%)
- Equipment & Infrastructure Availability (15%)
- Company and Team Profile (20%)

Price Factor (30%)

- Estimated Annual Cost (30%)

The Region received five (5) proposals which were evaluated by the Project Team according to above Quality Factors.
All submitted proposals demonstrated good understanding of the program, capable project teams and experience with similar projects. After the project team finalized the evaluation of the Proposals, the price envelopes were opened and overall scores, including the Price Factor, were calculated. The Bartels Environmental Services Inc. submission received the highest overall score, with the lowest estimated annual cost. Based on the evaluation, the project team recommends that Bartels Environmental Services Inc. be retained to undertake this assignment.

**Schedule**

Subject to Council’s approval of this report, the proposed schedule is for 5 years, commencing on January 1, 2016 and ending December 31, 2020, with an option to renew the contract on an annual basis, for two (2) additional twelve (12) month terms, under the terms and conditions of this original contract.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

The Aerobic Biosolids Management Program supports the Corporate Strategic Plan Focus Area 1: Environmental Sustainability; and Strategic Objectives to protect the quality and quantity of our drinking water sources.

**Financial Implications:**

| Estimated Annual Cost | $657,700 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| Less: Municipal Rebate of 86.48% of HST (11.24%) | $65,421 |
| Contingency (due to fluctuation volumes) | $100,000 |
| Total | $692,279 |

It is normal practice to base the biosolids management contracts on unit rates ($/m\(^3\)) as...
the volumes of handled aerobic biosolids vary due to fluctuating flows, environmental and seasonal conditions. At the unit rates of $4.10 /m³, $6.98 /m³ and $26.30 /m³ for biosolids haulage, biosolids land application or disposal and septage lagoon clean out respectively, the estimated annual cost for the contract is $657,700. The actual annual cost associated with this operating contract will reflect the actual biosolids volumes produced and managed throughout the duration of this contract. Due to the variability in flows and corresponding biosolids produced a $100,000 contingency has been added. This contract is subject to an annual Consumer Price Index adjustment to the unit rates in years 2019 and 2020.

The approach for this operational contract was approved under the 2011 Biosolids Master Plan. The aerobic biosolids budget in the proposed 2016 Wastewater Operating Budget will include $700,000 to cover the expenditures associated with this contract. Previous year’s expenditures for this service under the existing contract varied from approximately $800,000 to $1,000,000. Therefore, savings of approximately $100,000 to $300,000 are expected with the new contract. Future operating budgets will be prepared accordingly to reflect Consumer Price Index increases as included in the contract.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Corporate Services, Treasury Services (Procurement)

Attachments

Nil

Prepared By: Dominika Celmer-Repin, Project Engineer, Engineering and Wastewater Programs, Water Services

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee  
Date: August 11, 2015  
File Code: D06-40  
Subject: Final Report of Regional Planning Commissioners, Regional Public Works Commissioners and Regional Treasurers on the Provincial Growth Plan Review

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo endorse the findings and recommendations of the report entitled “Implementing the Growth Plan: Seeking Provincial and Municipal Alignment to Support a Prosperous Ontario”, as it pertains to the Region of Waterloo, and as described in Report No. PDL-15-05/TES-15-02/COR-15-01, dated August 11, 2015;  
And that this report be forwarded to the Ontario Growth Secretariat as further endorsement of the above-noted report.

Summary:

June of 2016 will mark the tenth anniversary of the Provincial Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (P2G). It has also been a remarkable decade of global change.  
In 2008, major economic shifts in the United States and declines in Europe profoundly
affected the Canadian and Ontario economies. Unemployment rates rose and then tapered, manufacturing was reinvented, and the “knowledge economy” began to gain a greater foothold in Ontario communities. The result has been a greater understanding that the Province and its communities must be competitive players in the global economy, where success requires a high quality of life and nimble responses to investment opportunities. Implementation of P2G is a critical public policy tool in supporting that greater prosperity.

Since 2006, Municipalities in the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH) have worked diligently to implement the Growth Plan, and over the last decade, new and substantial investment in public transit has occurred. Metrolinx was created to drive investment in public transit. Communities like Ottawa, York and Waterloo have developed their own intra-regional rapid transit systems. Greater public reliance on transit has become a foundational element of supporting a variety of other “shifts” throughout the GGH, including higher densities, more compact growth, and a great focus on design excellence. However, there have also been challenges, and in some cases, impediments in realizing the objectives of the Growth Plan.

In support of the Province’s planned comprehensive review of the Growth Plan in 2016, the Regional Planning Commissioners of Ontario (RPCO), the Regional Public Works Commissioners of Ontario (RPWCO) and the Ontario Regional and Single Tier Treasurers (ORSTT) came together to lend their expertise and prepare a comprehensive report. These organizations have also been reporting to the Regional and Single Tier Chief Administrative Officers of Ontario, who share the view that this is important work for all. It should also be noted that the Provincial Government assisted by funding a part of this work through the Ontario Growth Plan Implementation Fund.

The barriers and opportunities described in this report have been identified through a collaborative and informed process, bringing together subject matter experts from municipalities, the Province, and academia/research. The approach has been one of proactively identifying means of mutual gain in critical matters like better forecasting approaches, a more efficient development review and appeal process, and enhancements to financing tools that are much better aligned with our shared goals. While some of the recommendations are specific to the Growth Plan, there are also recommendations that are relevant to all municipalities in Ontario (and are noted accordingly).

The Growth Plan is a key influencer of community and Provincial prosperity. Consequently, it is recommended that Regional Council formally endorse the findings and recommendations of this work, as outlined in this report, in order to further promote the importance of effecting change. The joint study has already been formally submitted to the Province by the three authoring organizations, and with the support of the Ontario Regional and Single Tier Chief Administrative Officers.
Overview

In 2006, the Provincial government brought a significant new policy into effect, namely the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (P2G). In 2016, the Provincial government will undertake its first comprehensive review of P2G. As a means of assisting the Province, three municipal “umbrella” organizations came together to undertake a joint review of P2G. These three groups are the Regional Planning Commissioners of Ontario (Rob Horne current Chair), the Regional Public Works Commissioners of Ontario (Thomas Schmidt current Chair) and the Ontario Regional and Single Tier Treasurers (represented by Bill Hughes, Regional Treasurer for York Region). From the outset, these groups agreed that such a report must focus both on the issues and recommend actions the Province could take to better align P2G with the actual implementation of this important policy by municipalities.

The implementation of P2G by the Province did not constitute a major shift by the Region of Waterloo in matters of planning policy. This is largely attributed to the fact that Regional Council approved its own Regional Growth Management Strategy (RGMS) in 2003, which possessed a very similar policy framework (e.g. more compact and contained growth, higher densities of development, greater transit reliance).

However, like municipalities across Ontario, the Region of Waterloo continues to be challenged by the “misalignment” of key implementation considerations. As a result, this joint initiative is equally important as a means of achieving the vision of P2G in this Region, as reflected in the vision of RGMS (now anchored in the Regional Official Plan and recently approved by the Ontario Municipal Board in June of 2015).

Key Issues

The Executive Summary of this joint initiative is appended to this report as Attachment 1. A full copy of the report is located in the Regional Councillors’ library or from the Commissioners’ Offices. However, the following key themes are especially important to the Region of Waterloo:

a) **Growth Plan Projections and Targets**

   In 2006, the Provincial Growth Plan was issued containing schedules of population and employment growth forecasts to the year 2031. In 2013, these forecasts were updated, and the time horizon extended to the year 2041. P2G expects municipalities to plan to these forecasts. Accordingly, the ROP was based on P2G forecasts.

   With nearly a ten year history of growth (since 2006, when P2G came into effect), municipalities are able to track actual growth against these forecasts. Despite the fact that growth rates are variable from year to year, there appears to be the
beginning of some sustained divergence between forecast and actual growth in the short term. Furthermore, the Provincial Ministry of Finance published its own updated growth forecasts in 2014, which are considerably lower than the expected P2G growth. A comparison of variable forecasts in other municipalities is appended as Attachment 2 of this report. While longer term forecasts may prove to be fairly accurate, this situation presents some significant considerations, including the timing of new infrastructure (particularly relating to water supply, wastewater treatment capacity and roadways) and the amount and timing of development charge collections needed to fund such infrastructure.

There are two other related issues relative to the forecasts. The first relates to the planning and appeals process, where official plans are rewritten in their entirety or amended to implement P2G. The Region of Waterloo was used as a case study, as the new ROP was not approved until 6 years after its adoption by Regional Council in 2009. The second issue pertains to “land budgeting”, an exercise to determine whether sufficient land exists to support forecast growth. There is no uniform methodology, leaving municipalities and appellants to devise and present their own methodologies, which have been highly variable. Associated decisions of the Ontario Municipal Board have been highly variable as well.

b) Financing Growth

The report concludes that “growth is not paying for growth”. Two examples are the inadequacy of development charges to pay for growth in intensified urban developments, and the need for municipalities to be able to collect development charge revenue for transit (i.e. removing current limitations for municipal collection under the Development Charges Act). Municipal responses to this situation have included debt financing, the deferral of capital projects, and front-ending agreements.

c) Infrastructure Efficiency

Land use and infrastructure decisions must be better integrated. This includes more efficient Environmental Assessment and Planning Act processes and approvals, as well as major reforms relating to the Ontario Municipal Board.

d) Employment Lands Protection

One of the greatest challenges facing municipalities is anticipating and planning for employment land needs. Activity in the industrial-commercial-institutional (ICI) sector is highly variable from year to year, and can be extremely specific in its requirements (e.g. parcel size and configuration, distance from potentially
incompatible uses, access to 400 series highways and border crossings, proximity to rail and public transit). Compounding the challenges of creating employment lands are the pressures of conversion for residential uses. Particularly concerning is the general language contained in P2G, and interpretations made by the Ontario Municipal Board. An ongoing issue has been employment lands being broadly defined, from power centres providing significant part time employment, to uses that provide full time employment with benefits for “higher value-added” business (e.g. manufacturing, technology).

Key Recommendations Affecting the Region of Waterloo

A total of fifteen recommendations were made to the Province. Some of these recommendations, if implemented, would also benefit municipalities outside the Greater Golden Horseshoe, and are asterisked accordingly in Attachment 1 of this report. However, the following recommendations could significantly benefit the Region of Waterloo in implementing P2G (and are further described in Attachment 1):

- A long term Provincial Infrastructure Plan that conforms to P2G;
- A long term commitment by the Federal Government for transit funding;
- Greater flexibility in applying growth projections;
- Uniform framework or methodology for land budgets;
- Further limits to appeals of official plans and amendments that implement P2G;
- Ontario Municipal Board reform;
- Amendments to the Development Charges Act to ensure growth pays for growth and to expand the entitlement for municipal collection for transit infrastructure;
- Further strengthening municipal abilities to create and protect strategic employment lands;
- More refined definition of employment lands, particularly strategic employment lands; and
- Training by the Province for all who use and apply P2G.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

This report has been distributed to all Area Municipalities for information.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

This study supports a variety of aspects of the Corporate Strategic Plan, particularly four focus areas: Environmentally Sustainability, Growth Management and Prosperity, Sustainable Transportation and Healthy and Inclusive Communities.

Financial Implications:

The costs for preparing this report (funds and in-kind) were provided by the Regional
Planning Commissioners of Ontario, the Regional Public Works Commissioners of Ontario, the Ontario Regional and Single Tier Treasurers and the Provincial Government through the Ontario Growth Plan Implementation Fund.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

This report was circulated to all Departments.

Attachments:

Attachment 1 – Executive Summary, Implementing the Growth Plan: Seeking Provincial and Municipal Alignment to Support a Prosperous Ontario

Attachment 2 – Population and Employment Forecasts

Prepared and Approved By:

Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Development and Legislative Services

Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services

Craig Dyer, Commissioner, Corporate Services and Chief Financial Officer
Attachment 1 - Executive Summary

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Implementing the Growth Plan:
Seeking Provincial and Municipal Alignment to Support a Prosperous Ontario

Prepared for the RPWCO, RPCO, and ORSTT

By Nicola Crawhall and Associates

MAY 2015
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report identifies key challenges and opportunities for the Province of Ontario and the municipalities in the Greater Golden Horseshoe to implement the Greater Golden Horseshoe Growth Plan (Growth Plan) in a way that is financially sustainable, uses infrastructure efficiently, creates livable communities and supports economic prosperity across the region. Findings reflect consensus positions developed amongst the Regional Planning Commissioners of Ontario, the Regional Public Works Commissioners of Ontario, and the Ontario Regional and Single Tier Treasurers. The analysis in the report draws upon the experience of eight of the largest municipalities included in the Growth Plan, the six inner ring regional and single tier municipalities (York Region, Durham Region, City of Toronto, Peel Region, Halton Region, and the City of Hamilton) and two outer ring municipalities, the Regions of Waterloo and Niagara.

While this report is focused on the experience of municipalities in implementing the Growth Plan in the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH), a number of the issues identified and recommendations in relation to financing growth, implementing efficient infrastructure and planning for employment are equally relevant to municipalities outside of the GGH.

Looking at challenges and opportunities in implementing the Growth Plan from the perspective of three disciplines—planning, public works and finance, allowed Commissioners to identify issues and their interlinkages. This provides a more complete picture of the landscape that municipalities are navigating as they manage growth in the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

Analysis and conclusions are presented in five sections: i) the policy and economic context within which the Growth Plan is being implemented on the ground; ii) conforming with Growth Plan projections and targets; iii) financing growth; iv) encouraging the efficient planning and deployment of growth-related infrastructure; and v) protecting employment lands.

The Policy and Economic Context

Misalignment of federal, provincial and municipal infrastructure investments

The 2008 recession and its aftermath accelerated an economic transformation that was already underway in Southern Ontario, resulting in a dramatic loss of manufacturing jobs and their replacement with jobs in the services sector, health and education institutions and logistics firms. These changes have had a significant impact on meeting Growth Plan projections and targets and financing growth, due to changes in employment, spatial demands for employment, and a decline in revenues from non-residential development charges (DCs) and property assessment in some areas of the GGH. While dips in business cycles are to be expected, the concern is that this structural change to the southern Ontario economy will not result in a cyclical rebounding of the manufacturing sector, despite a drop in oil prices and a decline in the value of Canadian currency.

This economic uncertainty reinforces the need for a coordinated federal-provincial and municipal economic strategy for the region, coupled with a commitment to strategic infrastructure investments to support this shared economic vision.

Instead, there is concern over what is seen as a misalignment in the timing and quantum of provincial and federal investments with municipal growth-related planning and infrastructure implementation. For example, at the provincial level, the Growth Plan requires that municipalities make detailed plans using a longer time horizon than provincial infrastructure plans or plans managed by Metrolinx.

At the federal level, Canadian cities are at a disadvantage compared to their OECD competitors, because Canada remains one of the only OECD countries without a long-term, predictable federal transit-investment strategy. This lack of a federal transit investment strategy puts municipalities at great risk and financial exposure when introducing or expanding transit. The announcement in the 2015 Federal Budget of a permanent transit fund beginning in 2017, albeit at a relatively low investment level, is a step in the right direction.
Growth Plan Projections and Targets
Lack of Confidence in Growth Plan projections

By 2041, it is projected that the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH) area in Ontario will be home to 13.5 million people and 6.3 million jobs. The pattern of development to accommodate this growth is being influenced by provincial policy contained in the Greater Golden Horseshoe Growth Plan, 2006, that encourages intensified, mixed use development.

The achievement of the Growth Plan is heavily dependent on the ability of municipalities to realize provincially assigned population forecasts and intensification and density targets. However, there is great concern that the Growth Plan jobs and employment projections and targets are too high or anticipate growth too soon in most areas of the GGH, outside of the City of Toronto. This is not to suggest that any one set of projections would be perfectly accurate. Economic conditions that shape growth temporally and spatially are inherently uncertain over a 30-year period. However, as municipalities are mandated to integrate Growth Plan projections and targets into their Official Plans (O.Ps), misalignment in the location and timing of population and jobs projections risks creating a systemic imbalance in municipal balance sheets, creating a risk of overbuilding or underbuilding critical, cost-effective, growth-related infrastructure. Greater flexibility in meeting projections and targets could save municipalities tens, even hundreds of millions of dollars.

There is slow progress in attracting jobs to greenfield development, particularly at higher densities. While there is value in a combined density target, a change in the way employment is defined under the target may be a more practical method of encouraging employment density in greenfield development.

Some progress is being made in inner ring and select outer ring municipalities to meet the Growth Plan's 40% residential intensification target. While this is good news, once achieved, the target still permits 60% greenfield development to continue. As municipalities in the inner ring with more mature economic activity reach the intensification target, there should be consideration of a review to raise the target, in consultation with the municipality.

Bringing O.Ps into conformity with the Growth Plan has proven to be a difficult and drawn out process. Every one of the eight municipalities surveyed for this study had their O.P. amendments appealed. Five of them continue to work through their appeals, five years after the 2009 adoption date.

Likewise, differences in the assumptions used by municipalities to determine their land budgets has made it difficult to defend the municipal comprehensive review at the Ontario Municipal Board, with appellants challenging the methodology for determining them. A uniform methodology, from the Province, for determining land budgets would help defend municipal land budgets at the time of municipal comprehensive reviews and avoid costly delays.

Financing Growth
Insufficient development charge revenue to pay for growth

Ultimately the successful implementation of the Growth Plan must be supported by a sustainable financial model whereby growth pays for growth. The inadequacy of development charge revenues, the risk inherent in paying in advance for large scale infrastructure, and the lag in payback for these major investments, are all contributing to the financial burden that municipalities are bearing in paying for growth. Simply put, growth is not paying for growth, leaving the remainder to be paid for by property tax and user rate payers.

As development charges are proving to be insufficient to pay for growth in intensified urban developments, many municipalities are using an increasing share of their debt capacity to finance growth-related infrastructure. Some municipalities are deferring growth related capital projects, and some are turning to front-ending agreements to reduce the risk associated with carrying considerable debt to fill the gap.

New transit systems to support intensification are proving to be the greatest financial burden and the most difficult to finance under the current Development Charges Act limitations.
Bringing the quantum and timing of growth revenues in line with growth costs through amendments to the Development Charges Act is essential to support the implementation of the Growth Plan, and to meet growth demands more generally. Proposed amendments to the Development Charges Act under Bill 73 go some way in addressing these concerns. Timely commitments from the federal and provincial governments with respect to transit funding and other strategic investments are also needed.

**Infrastructure Efficiency**

**Better Integration of Land use and Infrastructure decisions**

Infrastructure is the primary driver of growth costs. If it is deployed efficiently and appropriately, it can not only save municipalities money, it can be a public revenue generator by driving growth and other forms of value to the community. If it is deployed inefficiently, it can add to costs and become a drag on both growth and public revenues.

Building in an assessment of costs, benefits, and risk exposure to infrastructure planning and decision making can make the difference between the former vs the latter outcome.

Some municipalities and other public agencies are undertaking more sophisticated analysis to determine how to deploy infrastructure more efficiently to reduce costs, minimize risk and promote value, in balance with other operational, environmental and societal objectives. Better integration of land use and infrastructure decisions can also support planning for infrastructure efficiency.

External influences, like lengthy and complex provincial approvals and OMB decisions that go against Official Plans also contribute to infrastructure costs.

**Employment Lands Protection**

**Stronger Provincial support for employment lands protection**

Some GGH municipalities are under intense pressure to convert employment lands, leaving some areas with insufficient employment lands for the next twenty year period, particularly larger parcels of land.

Notwithstanding a strengthened provincial policy framework for protecting employment lands, municipalities have found that support for this strengthened provincial policy does not always extend across some provincial ministries and agencies, in the implementation of provincial plans, and in OMB hearings.

Greater support is needed from the Province to support the protection of employment lands, especially strategic employment lands that are essential to move people and goods, along 400 series highways, at border crossings, and around active ports and harbours.

In this shifting employment landscape, some developers are challenging municipal assumptions on which their employment land DC calculations are based, calling into question whether the currently accepted methodology to calculate employment DCs needs to be reconsidered.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

Municipalities are still on a learning curve in planning for and servicing more intensified and dense growth in the GGH. They are adapting and improving their strategies along the way. This study explores the added challenges and opportunities posed by federal and provincial governments in supporting growth in the GGH. The compounding effect of the issues raised in this study stands in the way of the successful implementation of the Growth Plan, and is contributing to the strain of financing this growth.

To address these issues, the following recommendations were agreed to by the RPWCO, RPOCO, and ORSTT Commissioners at a March 2 workshop. As noted above, while this report and its findings are focused on the Greater Golden Horseshoe and the Growth Plan, much of the analysis and many of the conclusions are relevant to municipalities outside of the GGH. In order to highlight these, recommendations with broader geographic relevance have been identified with an asterisk (*).
Policy and Economic Context

Recommendation #1
The Province’s long term infrastructure plan should be required to conform with the Growth Plan over a planning horizon that is compatible with municipal planning horizons, that is, 15 + years, through an amendment to the proposed Infrastructure for Jobs and Prosperity Act (Bill 6) currently before the Legislature. The Infrastructure Plan should provide enough detail in terms of timing and specific projects so as to enable coordination with complementary municipal infrastructure investments.

*Recommendation #2
The Federal Government should make a long term commitment (15 + years) to stable funding for transit, amounting to a minimum of 30% of capital costs.

Conforming with Growth Projections and Targets

Recommendation #3
In light of Ministry of Finance projections, Growth Plan population and employment projections should be reviewed and revisited. Consideration should be given to building flexibility into the projections, providing a numeric and timing range within which the projected growth is expected to occur.

Recommendation #4
The Province should continue to prescribe the 40% minimum intensification target for inner ring municipalities but, once the target is achieved, based on the progress towards intensification in more ‘mature’ regions and cities over time, the Province should, in consultation with municipalities, raise the intensification target.

Recommendation #5
The Province should amend the combined employment and residential density target for greenfield development to distinguish among the types of employment that are included so that industrial and knowledge-based jobs would be excluded and only population-related jobs would be combined with the residential target.

*Recommendation #6
The Provincial Government should provide a uniform methodology for determining land budgets, developed in consultation with municipalities.

Paying for growth

*Recommendation #7
To ensure that growth pays for growth, the Province should amend the Development Charges Act (DCA) as follows:
• removal of the 10% discount (Sec. 5.1) 8)
• removal of service level cap based on 10-year historical average (Sec. 5.1) 4.)
• removal of all other service exemptions such as waste facilities, parks
• removal of 50% industrial expansion exemption (4.2)
• removal of clause in the DCA that prohibits municipalities from gaining, or developers from losing financially as a result of an OMB appeal, (16. (4))
• Metrolinx should not be given authority to charge DCs for growth related infrastructure and should no longer be permitted to invoice municipalities for costs associated with Metrolinx assets.

Infrastructure efficiency

Recommendation #8
The Province should limit appeals of Growth Plan-related OPs with significant infrastructure cost implications through amendments to the Planning Act and/or the Places to Grow Act.

*Recommendation #9
The Province should introduce reasonable fixed timeframes for provincial decision points in the environmental assessment process, including Part II bump-up requests.

Recommendation #10
Relevant provincial legislation (Places to Grow Act, Planning Act, proposed Infrastructure for Jobs and Prosperity Act (Bill 6) and policies (Provincial Policy Statement) should be amended to facilitate and encourage municipalities to:
a) further integrate land use planning, infrastructure and financing considerations at the beginning of the land use planning process;
b) standardize the practice of making all lifecycle costs (ongoing operations and maintenance, replacement costs) transparent when considering costs of new growth related infrastructure;
c) undertake comprehensive business case assessments of major infrastructure works like transit, large water and wastewater treatment facility expansions, that includes consideration of costs, benefits and return on investment.
Employment lands

Recommendation #11a
The province should articulate criteria in the Growth Plan for identifying strategic employment lands, including but not limited to land adjacent to 400 series highways corridors, airport lands, border crossing areas, active ports and harbours, and strategic transit corridors, and allow for "generational" protection of these lands, either with no time horizon, or a minimum 30 year horizon.

Recommendation #11b
The Province should limit appeals related to strategic employment lands through amendments to the Places to Grow Act and/or the Planning Act.

*Recommendation #12
The Ministry of Municipal Affairs should launch Growth Plan training and specific implementation guidance for provincial ministries, boards and agencies whose policies may infringe or conflict with a municipality's efforts to protect employment lands.

Recommendation #13
The Growth Plan should establish a process to negotiate "land swaps" between municipalities and the Province to allow for the protection of consolidated employment lands where provincial policy, e.g. provincially significant wetlands, has the effect of severing employment lands; where this involves the Greenbelt or Oak Ridges Moraine plans, the swap of equivalent land parcels to protect employment lands should result in "no net loss" to the territory delineated in those Provincial plans.

Recommendation #14
Where designated employment lands are consistent with the Growth Plan, the Province should make these non-appealable to the OMB through amendments to the Planning Act or Places to Grow Act. When a municipality has planned for various categories of employment lands in a conformity exercise, appeals should be prohibited OR the scope of the appeal should be limited to population-based employment only.

*Recommendation #15
TheProvince should support other measures of determining employment land DCAs used in other jurisdictions that better reflect actual servicing costs, such as lot size, trip generation (people and distribution).
### Attachment 2 - Population and Employment Forecasts

#### Table 1: MOF population projections compared to GP projections expressed as difference in % growth from 2011 historical population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(’000)</th>
<th>Historical</th>
<th>GP</th>
<th>MoF</th>
<th>% difference in growth from 2011</th>
<th>GP</th>
<th>MoF</th>
<th>% difference in growth from 2011</th>
<th>GP</th>
<th>MoF</th>
<th>% difference in growth from 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td></td>
<td>2041</td>
<td>2041</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>2704.6</td>
<td>2,975</td>
<td>3,030.90</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3,193</td>
<td>3,354.40</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>3,639.30</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>626.8</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>716.8</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>830.8</td>
<td>-22%</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>956.3</td>
<td>-37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton</td>
<td>517.2</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>634.3</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>775.7</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>931.5</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel</td>
<td>1340.5</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>1,586.10</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1,786</td>
<td>1,855.60</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1,970</td>
<td>2,112.10</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>1065.5</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>1,265.40</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>1,585</td>
<td>1,529.30</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>1,763.90</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>535.6</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>581.6</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>631.5</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>677.6</td>
<td>-19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara</td>
<td>442.8</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>457.9</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>478.2</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>495.2</td>
<td>-26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>523.8</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>584.7</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>650.9</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>712.7</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(MOF, 2014; Davenport, 2013)
Region of Waterloo
Planning, Development and Legislative Services
Community Planning

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: August 11, 2015
File Code: D16-20

Subject: Statutory Public Meeting on a Proposed Amendment to the Regional Official Plan - Transportation Policy Update

Recommendation:

That Regional Council authorize staff to schedule a public meeting in 2015 under the Planning Act to obtain input from the community on a proposed amendment to the Regional Official Plan that would propose to update Regional transportation policies, as outlined in Report No. PDL-CPL-15-41, dated August 11, 2015.

Summary:

On June 18, 2015 the Ontario Municipal Board approved the new Regional Official Plan (ROP). This approval occurred almost six years to the day after the adoption of the ROP by Regional Council on June 16, 2009. Over this period of time, a number of updates to the transportation policies of the ROP have been proposed through various processes including the 2010 update to the Regional Transportation Master Plan.

These updates would normally have been addressed two or three years ago as part of a periodic amendment to the ROP. However, given that the ROP was still under appeal before the Ontario Municipal Board, staff could not initiate the required policy updates at that time. Now that the Board has approved the ROP, staff is seeking Council’s authorization to schedule a statutory public meeting (tentatively scheduled early this fall) to obtain input from the community on a proposed ROP amendment that would implement a number of the required updates to the ROP’s transportation policies and mapping (see below for additional details).

Subject to Council’s approval, this public meeting would be held at a regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning and Works Committee. Copies of the proposed ROP
amendment would be made available to Council, the Area Municipalities and members of the public prior to the issuance of the notice for the public meeting. Any comments received at the public meeting would be used to inform the final draft of the proposed amendment presented to Council later this year.

The Area Municipalities have been actively involved in the Region’s transportation initiatives leading up to this proposed ROP amendment. Staff will ensure that each of the Area Municipalities is consulted during the preparation of the draft amendment.

Report:

Staff is proposing to initiate an amendment to the Regional Official Plan (ROP) to update some of the Region’s current transportation policies. The proposed amendment would introduce new and updated transportation policies to:

1. Revise Schedule ‘A’ (Designated Road Allowances) to update the planned road allowances of various Regional roads consistent with the 2010 Regional Transportation Master Plan and other recent transportation initiatives;

2. Revise Map 3a (Urban Area) to delete the boundary of the “Central Transit Corridor Environmental Study Area”, and to replace it with a new boundary that identifies conceptually the location of the “Central Transit Corridor” and its associated Major Transit Station Areas;

3. Revise Map 5a (Regional Transit Network) to update the Region’s existing and proposed transit corridor network, including the ION rapid transit system;

4. Revise Map 5b (Existing, Planned and Proposed Roads and Corridors) to include any local municipal roads that were assumed by the Region of Waterloo since the adoption of the ROP in 2009;

5. Add new policies to Chapter 2 (Shaping Waterloo Region’s Urban Communities) to introduce new policies to guide development along the Central Transit Corridor and within Major Transit Station Areas; and

6. Revise Chapter 5 (Addressing Waterloo Region’s Infrastructure Needs) to introduce new access management principles to improve the way in which the Region currently manages vehicular access onto Regional roads.

The Region’s transportation policies were last updated in 2009 as part of the background work completed for the new ROP, which Council adopted on June 16, 2009. Since then, the Region has continued to advance its transportation planning program and has completed several initiatives to support a more balanced and sustainable transportation system. Examples include the 2010 Regional Transportation Master Plan, the Context Sensitive Regional Transportation Corridor Design Guidelines,
the Rapid Transit Project Assessment and the Active Transportation Master Plan. As a result of these initiatives, there is now a need to amend the ROP to update the transportation policies noted above.

The Region would normally have initiated these updates two or three years ago as part of a periodic update of the ROP. However, given the longer than anticipated approval process for the ROP, which remained under appeal for over six years until it was approved by the Ontario Municipal Board on June 18, 2015, staff could not initiate this amendment until now.

As a result of this delay, the proposed ROP amendment is intended to serve as a temporary measure or short-term fix until the Region updates its Regional Transportation Master Plan in late 2017. Work on this project is currently underway and is anticipated to be completed over a two-year period. Following the update of the Regional Transportation Master Plan, staff will initiate a more comprehensive review of the ROP’s transportation policies.

The proposed amendment is required now so the Region can continue to move forward with its transportation planning program. For example, a key part of the proposed amendment would be to revise Schedule ‘A’ in the ROP. This schedule sets out the designated road allowance (i.e. road width) of every road under the Region’s jurisdiction. Since the adoption of the ROP in 2009, five local roads have been transferred to the Region from the Cities of Kitchener and Waterloo to facilitate the ION project. As a result of these transfers, the Region must now add the newly assumed roads to Schedule ‘A’ of the ROP to ensure the roads form part of the Region’s transportation planning program.

Proposed Next Steps

If Council authorizes this public meeting, the meeting would be held at a regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning and Works Committee. Copies of the proposed ROP amendment would be made available to Council, the Area Municipalities and members of the public prior to the issuance of the notice for the public meeting. Any comments received at the public meeting would be used to inform the final draft of the proposed amendment presented to Council later this year.

This amendment would be the first in a series of future ROP amendments that staff will be presenting to Council over the new two years. These future amendments are required to update other parts of the ROP (e.g., mapping of environmental areas), and to propose the various policies changes that Council agreed to initiate as part of the comprehensive settlement to the ROP appeals. Staff will prepare a follow-up report for Council’s consideration later this year that describes the other required amendments to the ROP.
Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

The Area Municipalities were extensively consulted on the 2010 Regional Transportation Master Plan and the other Regional transportation initiatives leading up to this proposed ROP amendment. Staff will ensure that each of the Area Municipalities is consulted on the proposed amendment and that they also receive copy of this report. Each Area Municipality will also have an opportunity to provide additional input as part of the formal review and circulation process for the amendment.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

The proposed ROP amendment is intended to support the Region’s priorities with respect to Focus Area 2 (Growth Management and Prosperity) and Focus Area 3 (Sustainable Transportation) of the Corporate Strategic Plan.

Financial Implications

Nil.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Staff in Transportation and Environmental Services will be involved in the preparation of the proposed ROP amendment.

Prepared By: John Lubczynski, Principal Planner

Approved By: Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning, Development and Legislative Services
2014
Silver Promotion & Education Award
for Digital Tool (Over 30,000 households)
presented to
Region of Waterloo

Shirley McLean
Chair, Municipal Waste Association
May 2015
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting date</th>
<th>Requestor</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Assigned Department</th>
<th>Anticipated Response Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>