Regional Municipality of Waterloo

Planning and Works Committee

Agenda

Tuesday, September 15, 2015

12:30 p.m. – Note Time Change

Regional Council Chamber

150 Frederick Street, Kitchener

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

2. Delegations

2.1 Benjamin Revoy re: Safety Concerns During Road Construction

2.2 Bryan Smith Re: Traction Power Sub-Station at the Corner of Breithaupt Street and Waterloo Street

2.3 Andrew Elliot re: Request Changes to GRT Route 15

2.4 TES-WMS-15-11, Rural Waste Transfer Station Update

(For Direction)

   i. Frank Arttasid

2.5 TES-TRP-15-20, Pedestrian Access Improvements for the Hanson/Hayward Industrial and Alpine Village Area, Kitchener, Class Environmental Assessment – Project Update

(For Information)

   i. Fauzia Mazhar
   ii. George Doerr
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-15-17, Authorization to Expropriate Lands (2\textsuperscript{nd} Report) for Phase 2 of Manitou Drive Improvements (Homer Watson Boulevard to Bleams Road), in the City of Kitchener

See Recommendation on pages 48-49

4.2 PDL-LEG-15-65, Authorization to Expropriate Lands (1\textsuperscript{st} Report) For Ottawa Street (Regional Road 4) Improvements Project (Dreger Avenue to Midland Road), in the City of Kitchener

See Recommendation on pages 54-55

4.3 TES-DCS-15-24, Amend Traffic and Parking By-Law 06-728 – Designated Cycling Lanes, 2-Way Centre Left-Turn Lanes and Lane Designation on Manitou Drive between Fairway Road and Bleams Road

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo amend Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended upon completion of construction to accommodate the road improvements, to:

a) Add to Schedule 16, Lane Designation:
   
a. Manitou Drive (Regional Road 69) southbound, through and through/right turn movements at Bleams Road, (Regional Road 56)

   b. Manitou Drive (Regional Road 69) northbound, through/left turn and through movements at Bleams Road (Regional Road 56)

   c. Bleams Road (Regional Road 56) eastbound, left turn and left turn/right turn movements at Manitou Drive
b) Add to Schedule 20, Centre Lane: Two-Way Left-Turns on Manitou Drive (Regional Road 69) from 100 m south of Fairway Road (Regional Road 53) to 740 m south of Fairway Road

c) Add to Schedule 24, Reserved Lanes for Bicycles on Both Sides of Manitou Drive (Regional Road 69) from Fairway Road (Regional Road 53) to Bleams Road (Regional Road 56)

4.4 **TES-RTS-15-09**, Lane Designations and Reserved Lanes on Hespeler Road (Regional Road #24) at Various Intersections, City of Cambridge

**Recommendation:**

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

a) Remove from Schedule 16, Southbound Right-turn Lane Designation on Hespeler Road (Regional Road 24) at Dunbar Road;

b) Remove from Schedule 16, Northbound Left-turn, Right-turn on Hespeler Road (Regional Road 24) at Pinebush Road/Eagle Street (Regional Road 39);

c) Add to Schedule 16, Northbound Left-turn, Left-turn, Right-turn on Hespeler Road (Regional Road 24) at Pinebush Road/Eagle Street (Regional Road 39);

d) Add to Schedule 16, Northbound Right-turn on Hespeler Road (Regional Road 24) at Munch Avenue/Isherwood Avenue;

e) Add to Schedule 24, Reserved Bus Lane, Southbound Hespeler Road (Regional Road 24) from Coronation Boulevard/Dundas Street (Regional Road 8) to 20 Metres North of Coronation Boulevard/Dundas Street (Regional Road 8);

f) Add to Schedule 24, Reserved Bus Lane, Southbound Water Street (Regional Road 24) from Coronation Boulevard/Dundas Street (Regional Road 8) to 25 Metres South of Coronation
Boulevard/Dundas Street (Regional Road 8);
in the City of Cambridge, as outlined in Report TES-RTS-15-09, dated September 15, 2015.

4.5 **PDL-LEG-15-63**, Surplus Declaration and Conveyance of Easement Interest in Favour of Cambridge and North Dumfries Hydro Inc. - Preston Waste Water Treatment Plant 358 Montrose Street South, Cambridge

**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo:

a) declare an easement interest in the lands described as Part Lot 230, Plan 716, part of PIN 03861-0119 and Part Lot 241, Plan 716, part of PINs 03774-0350 and 03774-0351, as shown as Parts 1, 2 and 3, on attached draft Reference Plan, in the City of Cambridge surplus to the needs of the Region, as detailed in Report No. PDL-LEG-15-63 dated September 15, 2015, and provide the standard public notification as required by the Region’s property disposition by-law; and

b) approve, enter into an Agreement for, and execute all documentation related to, the conveyance of a permanent easement to Cambridge and North Dumfries Hydro Inc., for the sum of $1.00, for the installation and maintenance of hydro equipment on, over and under the lands described as Part Lot 230, Plan 716, part of PIN 03861-0119 and Part Lot 241, Plan 716, part of PINs 03774-0350 and 03774-0351, as shown as Parts 1, 2 and 3, on attached draft Reference Plan, in the City of Cambridge as detailed in Report No. PDL-LEG-15-63 dated September 15, 2015 pursuant to the Region’s property disposition by-law and the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor.


**Recommendation:**

4.7 **PDL-CPL-15-44**, Amendment of Terms of Reference of the Kissing Bridge Trailway Advisory Board and Authorization to Sign Agreements with Kissing Bridge Trailway Steward Groups

**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, in concert with the Corporation of the County of Wellington, take the following actions with respect to the Kissing Bridge Trailway, as described in Report No. PDL-CPL-15-44, dated September 15, 2015:

a) Amend sub-section 2.1(c) of the Terms of Reference to delete the reference to the Village of Millbank Association, as requested by this group, and add two representatives of the Guelph Trail Club, one for each segment of the Trailway stewarded by the Guelph Trail Club, and make other editorial amendments as shown in Attachment 1; and

b) Authorize the Commissioner of Planning, Development, and Legislative Services to execute agreements to the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor with the following Kissing Bridge Trailway Steward Groups to outline the roles and responsibilities of each Trailway Steward Group for its respective segment of the Kissing Bridge Trailway, as well as role and responsibilities of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo and the Corporation County of Wellington:

- Guelph Trail Club,
- The Lions Club of Elmira
- Linwood & District Lions Club,
- Golden Triangle Snowmobile Association.

4.8 **PDL-CPL-15-45**, Seventeenth Annual Report of the Kissing Bridge Trailway Advisory Committee for 2014 (For Information)

4.9 **PDL-CPL-15-46**, Amendment to Regional Municipality of Waterloo Controlled Access By-Law #58-87 for Access to Regional Road #58 (Fischer-Hallman Road), City of Kitchener

**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo Controlled Access By-law #58-87 be amended to include a permanent emergency access on the west side of Regional Road #58 (Fischer-Hallman Road).
Road) approximately 240 metres north of the Seabrook Drive/Fischer-Hallman Road roundabout, in the City of Kitchener as described in Report No. PDL-CPL-15-46, dated September 15, 2015.

4.10 **PDL-CPL-15-47**, Building Permit Activity – January to June 2015 (For Information)

### Regular Agenda Resumes

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

**Commissioner’s Office**

5.1 **TES-15-03/COR-15-02**, Corporate Asset Management Strategy Project Update (For Information)

5.2 **TES-15-04**, Moving Ontario Forward – Outside the GTHA

**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo endorse Report TES-15-04 as the Region’s submission to the “Moving Ontario Forward – Outside the GTHA” consultation process.

**Design and Construction**

5.3 **TES-DCS-15-23**, Consultant Selection – Detailed Design and Services during Construction for the Waterloo Landfill Leachate Forcemain City of Kitchener

**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into a Consulting Services Agreement with MTE Consultants Inc. (MTE) to provide engineering services for detailed design and services during construction for the Waterloo Landfill Leachate Forcemain in the City of Kitchener, at an upset fee limit of $403,793.00 plus applicable taxes.

**Rapid Transit**

5.4 **TES-RTS-15-08**, Highway 401- Highway 8 to Hespeler Road, Bus Bypass Shoulders
Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into an agreement and operating protocol with Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario (by its Ministry of Transportation) to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services, and the Regional Solicitor to allow for the use of the bus bypass shoulders by Grand River Transit on Highway 401 between Highway 8 and Hespeler Road, as described in Report No. TES-TRP-15-16, dated September 15, 2015.

Transit Services

5.5 TES-TRS-15-15, Go Train Update

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo endorse in principle the findings of the “Feasibility Study and Business Case of Constructing the Missing Link” as described in report TES-TRS-15-15, dated September 15, 2015;

And that the Regional Municipality of Waterloo continue to encourage the provincial and Federal governments to take all necessary steps as quickly as possible to implement two-way GO train service to Kitchener (especially morning inbound and afternoon outbound trips) and to initiate GO train service between Milton and Cambridge”.

Transportation

5.6 TES-TRP-15-16, Standardization of Traffic Signal Controllers

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo authorize the Manager, Procurement to enter into negotiations with Econolite Canada Incorporated for the supply of traffic signal controllers and related control equipment at an annual cost not to exceed $400,000 as outlined in report TES-TRP-15-16.

5.7 TES-TRP-15-19, Proposed Lane Configuration Changes on Westmount Road (Regional Road 50) at Glasgow Street, in the City of Kitchener
Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo amend the Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended, to remove from Schedule 16, Southbound Left-turn, Through Lane Designation on Westmount Road (Regional Road 50) at Glasgow Street; in the City of Kitchener, as outlined in Report TES-TRP-15-19, dated September 15, 2015.

Water Services

5.8 TES-WAS-15-26, License Agreement with Kitchener-Wilmot Hydro for the Sole Purpose of Installation, Maintenance and Operation of Radio Repeater Equipment on Top of Sportsworld Tower in the City of Kitchener

Recommendation:

That The Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into a License Agreement with Kitchener-Wilmot Hydro Inc. effective the 1st day of October 2015 to the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor, for the purpose of the installation, maintenance, and operation of radio repeater equipment on the Sportsworld Tower (the “Tower”), in the City of Kitchener, as per Report TES-WAS-15-26, dated September 15, 2015, and the Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services be authorized to execute the same.


Recommendation:


Reports – Planning, Development and Legislative Services

5.10 PDL-CPL-15-48, Greenlands Network Implementation Guideline

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to the Greenlands Network Implementation Guideline, as described in Report PDL-CPL-15-48, dated
September 15, 2015:

a) Direct staff to circulate a draft of the Greenlands Network Implementation Guideline to the Area Municipalities, Grand River Conservation Authority, Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry, and local consulting firms for a period of at least sixty days for final review and comment; and

b) Direct staff to provide public notification as required by Regional Official Plan policies 10.B.11 through 10.B.13 prior to consideration of the Greenlands Network Implementation Guideline by the Planning and Works Committee at a future date.

6. Information/Correspondence

6.1 Council Enquiries and Requests for Information Tracking List 184

7. Other Business

8. Next Meeting – October 6, 2015

9. Adjourn
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 6, 2015</td>
<td>1:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Planning and Works Committee</td>
<td>Council Chamber 2\textsuperscript{nd} Floor, Regional Administration Building 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 27, 2015</td>
<td>1:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Planning and Works Committee</td>
<td>Council Chamber 2\textsuperscript{nd} Floor, Regional Administration Building 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Waste Management

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: September 15, 2015 File Code: E20-40
Subject: Rural Waste Transfer Station Update

Recommendation: For direction

Summary:

The rural transfer stations have been operating for over 25 years and since the introduction of enhanced curbside collection in 2009 as well as implementation of a minimum fee in 2013, less usage of the sites has been observed while curbside collection has increased. Based on the first eight (8) months of operation in 2015, these trends continue to be observed with the transfer stations operating on a 20% to 30% cost recovery basis, with the estimated cost (net of revenue) to maintain operation of the four sites as per the existing operational schedule, estimated to be in the range of $208,000/year. In addition, there are currently no provisions for capital budget allowances for future maintenance/upgrades at any of the sites.

Private sector interest to purchase and maintain waste transfer operations at the sites (and specifically the Woolwich transfer station) does exist. However, additional details with respect to the terms and conditions of a property transaction and Regional policy considerations would be required for a private sector firm to develop a full business plan. It is also noted that at a minimum, a private sector firm would likely require additional tonnage/volume from the small business/IC&I sector and possibly from outside the Region as well as an increased fee structure in order to make site operations feasible.

At this time, staff continue to recommend the full closure of the four (4) rural transfer stations as per previous Council direction. However, further Council direction is required to determine the final disposition/use of the properties with the following options presented:
1. Closure of all four (4) rural transfer stations at the end of 2015 and take no further action with respect to making the sites available to a private operator.

2. Closure of all four (4) rural transfer stations at the end of 2015 and commence the process to initiate transfer of one or a number of the properties to a third party for the purposes of maintaining waste transfer operations by a private sector waste management firm.

With either option above and in those instances where property deed conditions explicitly identify a requirement to transfer ownership back to the Township(s), further discussion with the Township(s) is necessary to determine terms and conditions of property transfer or willingness to release the covenant so that the Region can direct future use of the property(s).

Report:

At the March 4, 2015 budget committee meeting, the following actions with respect to the 2015 operating budget for the Waste Management Division were approved:

1. Continued operation of the four (4) rural waste transfer stations at the existing every other Saturday operating schedule to the end of 2015 resulting in an operating cost increase of $131,656 (funded from reserves) and the addition of 1.5 FTEs;

2. Amendment of the Fees and Charges by-law for the four (4) rural transfer stations to increase the minimum fee from $2 to $5 per visit (up to three bags/items), to delete the existing $10 half-load fee and to maintain the $15 vehicle flat rate fee for anything more than 3 bags/items up to 200kg/vehicle, effective July 1st, 2015; and,

3. Direct staff to continue to monitor site usage, cost/revenue implications, alternative operating scenarios (including private sector ownership and operations) and report back to Council in August 2015 to allow any action that Regional Council takes be reflected in the 2016 budget process.

This report presents an update of site usage/statistics as well as a discussion on issues for consideration and potential alternative operating scenarios.

Site usage/statistics

A breakdown of vehicle transactions, tonnes of waste materials received, revenue generated and operating costs by rural waste transfer site for the first 8 months (January – August) of 2015 is presented below. All four sites continue to operate on an every other Saturday schedule.
The number of transactions and revenue received are trending at or below what was projected as part of the February 2015 budget information paper (see Appendix A) for all four sites. The majority of users of the sites are residential and repeat customers with a significant portion of the material handled being yard waste. Curbside collection data for the first eight months of 2015 also suggests that tonnage is projected to increase by approximately 300 tonnes across the Townships by the end of 2015. This is consistent with a trend of more waste being placed curbside for collection versus use of the transfer stations.

With respect to cost/revenue implications, the rural transfer stations continue to operate on a 20% to 30% cost recovery basis, with the estimated cost (net of revenue) to maintain operation of the four sites as per the existing operational schedule, estimated to be in the range of $208,000/year. It is noted that the user fee structure was revised as of July 1st (minimum fee increase from $2 to $5) and only two months of data pertaining to the revised fee structure is included in the above. Regardless, it is not expected that a substantive increase in cost recovery will be realized at the rural transfer stations with the new fee structure in place and based on the transaction/tonnage trends noted above.

Based on the above and given continuing budgetary pressures, the closure of the transfer stations at the end of 2015 as per existing Council direction is still considered warranted.

**Private Sector Waste Operator Interest**

As directed by Council, staff has had discussions with both Plein Disposal Inc. (Plein) and Waste Management Inc. (WMI), the two firms that are currently under contract with the Region to provide curbside collection service, about their possible interest in purchasing the Woolwich Transfer station (and potentially the other rural transfer stations as well) for the purposes of maintaining waste transfer operations. Although both firms indicated that they are interested, additional details such as the potential environmental liability associated with the site(s) and the terms and conditions of a property transaction would be required in order for a detailed business plan to be

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Transactions</th>
<th>Tonnes Received</th>
<th>Operating Costs</th>
<th>Revenue Generated</th>
<th>Net Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Dumfries</td>
<td>1,298</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$41,464</td>
<td>$8,670</td>
<td>$32,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>$35,064</td>
<td>$8,199</td>
<td>$26,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>$17,736</td>
<td>$4,349</td>
<td>$13,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>4,161</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>$91,000</td>
<td>$28,253</td>
<td>$62,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,070</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>$185,264</td>
<td>$49,471</td>
<td>$135,793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
developed. However, both firms did identify that, at a minimum, they would likely require additional tonnage/volume from the industrial, commercial and institutional (IC&I) sector and possibly from outside the Region as well as an increased fee structure in order to make site operations feasible.

Transfer Restrictions

Of particular note and as a result of the records review component of the environmental assessment process, it was determined that the Woolwich transfer station property was transferred to the Region from the Township of Woolwich in 1991 and a copy of the deed of transfer states that the Township reserves the right to require the Region to transfer the property back to the Township, without compensation, if the Region terminates its operations of the waste transfer station. In this regard, staff have commenced a search of the property deeds for the other three (3) rural transfer stations to see what, if any, conditions exist for those sites. Further, it is staff’s intention to initiate Phase 1 ESAs for the remaining three rural transfer stations within the next year on the premise that the potential for future property transactions may occur.

Policy Considerations

Operations of the sites by a private sector waste management firm could conflict with the Region’s residential waste management policies/programs and would likely lead to further waste export outside the Region. This could negatively impact residential diversion programs and revenue from commercial tipping fees.

Potential Alternative Operating Scenario

Based on the above, ownership and operation of the site(s) by a third party does present a potential alternative operating scenario. Under this scenario, the following options exist:

- specific to the Woolwich transfer station, the Region transfers ownership of the property back to the Township of Woolwich as per the existing deed of transfer conditions and the Township undertakes the process of property sale/transfer to a private sector operator for the purposes of waste transfer operations; or

- the Region maintains ownership of the property(s) and undertakes the process of sale/transfer to a private sector operator for waste transfer operations.

In any event, the potential impacts and issues identified above would need to be taken under advisement prior to consideration of any type of transaction.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

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

Financial Implications:

The 2016 Waste Management Division operating budget does not currently provide for the continued operation of the four (4) rural waste transfer stations beyond the end of December, 2015. The estimated cost (net of revenue) to maintain operation of the four sites as per the existing operational schedule is estimated to be in the range of $208,000/year. In addition, if the sites remain open beyond December 2015, there is currently no capital budget provision for any of the rural transfer stations. The table below outlines the previous 2014 10-year projected capital budget for the four rural transfer stations which is still considered valid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RURAL TRANSFER STATIONS</td>
<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>North Dumfries (Ayr)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>1,405</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley (Crosshill)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>1,667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmot (New Dundee)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>1,699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich (Elmira)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>2,285</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>3,359</td>
<td>7,056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Short Term (1-2 years) and Medium Term (2-5 years) work includes: Pedestrian barricades, perimeter precast wall, bin walls, fencing at bin walls, asphalt and concrete surfaces and loading ramps
Longer Term (5-10 years) work includes: New buildings, septic systems and bin walls
Note: 1) Short-term upgrades required due to unsafe or very poor condition of infrastructure.

Financial implications associated with a sale of the property are not known at this time and would be dependent on direction provided by Council. In the case of the Woolwich Transfer Station, it is assumed that if the property were transferred back to the Township as per the original deed of transfer, minimal legal/transaction costs would be incurred. Any other property transfer/sale process directed by the Region would require appropriate property appraisals, terms and conditions and would be expected to take upwards of a year to finalize.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Staff from the Corporate Resources and Planning, Development and Legislative Services Departments were consulted and provided input toward the preparation of this report.
Attachments:

Appendix A – 2015 Budget Information Paper (Rural Small Vehicle Transfer Stations)

Prepared By: Jon Arsenault, Director, Waste Management Division

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

2015 Budget

2015 Budget Information

Information: Waste Management

1. Rural Small Vehicle Transfer Stations

In April 2014, Regional Council approved the closure of all four rural waste transfer stations as of March 31, 2015 and as such, the preliminary 2015 budget includes a provision to continue operation of these sites until that time but not beyond. The following additional budget information, as requested at the February 3, 2015 Planning and Works committee meeting, is provided for Council consideration.

A breakdown of vehicle transactions, tonnes of waste materials received, revenue generated and operating costs by rural waste transfer site are presented below for 2013 and 2014. In each of the past couple of years, a number of factors including varied operational schedules and weather events, as noted, have impacted the usage, revenue and operating costs.

2013 Statistics

In 2013, all four rural transfer stations were open 8 hours/day as follows:

- North Dumfries and Wilmot: open one day per week (Saturdays)
- Wellesley: open two days per week (Thursdays and Saturdays)
- Woolwich: open five days per week (Tuesday to Saturday)

The $2 minimum fee was introduced in April of 2013.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Transactions</th>
<th>Tonnes Received</th>
<th>Operating Costs</th>
<th>Revenue Generated</th>
<th>Net Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Dumfries</td>
<td>4,736</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>$ 71,149</td>
<td>$ 26,035</td>
<td>$45,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley</td>
<td>4,814</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>$ 68,839</td>
<td>$ 24,681</td>
<td>$44,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td>2,699</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>$ 31,879</td>
<td>$ 13,830</td>
<td>$18,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>29,383</td>
<td>3,074</td>
<td>$290,133</td>
<td>$128,106</td>
<td>$162,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>41,632</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,507</strong></td>
<td><strong>462,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>192,652</strong></td>
<td><strong>269,348</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2014 Statistics

In 2014, the four rural transfer stations were open 8 hours per day as follows:

- January 1\(^{st}\) to March 31\(^{st}\): all four sites operated as per the 2013 operating schedule
- April 1\(^{st}\) to May 24\(^{th}\): North Dumfries open one day/week; Wellesley and Woolwich open two days/week; Wilmot closed
- May 24\(^{th}\) – present: all four sites operated every other Saturday

Vehicle transactions and tonnage were also higher for the first 4 to 5 months of 2014 due to the December 2013 ice storm and revenue was lower due to waived tipping fees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Transactions</th>
<th>Tonnes Received</th>
<th>Operating Costs</th>
<th>Revenue Generated</th>
<th>Net Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Dumfries</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>$66,140</td>
<td>$20,184</td>
<td>$45,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley</td>
<td>2,243</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>$52,133</td>
<td>$14,574</td>
<td>$37,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>$23,240</td>
<td>$5,913</td>
<td>$17,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>11,351</td>
<td>1,082</td>
<td>$160,235</td>
<td>$53,692</td>
<td>$106,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17,847</td>
<td>1,874</td>
<td>$301,748</td>
<td>$94,363</td>
<td>$207,385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2015 Projections

As a result of the 2014 Budget deliberations, 2 FTEs, some part time staffing hours and a roll-off truck (and associated fuel and maintenance costs) were removed from the 2014 Waste Management Division budget. The sites remain open while being staffed on a voluntary overtime basis. Given the approved closure of the rural transfer stations after March 2015, the preliminary 2015 operating budget includes a provision of $75,884 to operate the sites for the first three (3) months of 2015. Operation of these sites beyond March 31\(^{st}\), 2015 would require reinstatement of operating and capital budgets, as well as some of the previous staffing reductions, dependent on the days/hours of operation approved.

Using data collected over the last 6 months of 2014 (i.e. after implementation of the every other Saturday operating schedule), the following table presents "projected" numbers for 2015 assuming normal operating practices (i.e. no changes to existing user fee schedule, operational schedule or operational upsets such as ice storms).
Based on the current hours of operation and assuming the projected activity levels at the sites as per the above table, the annual gross operating costs to maintain the existing every other Saturday schedule is estimated at $278,000 and would require the reinstatement of 1.5 to 2.0 FTEs. Under the existing user fee structure, revenue on the order of $70,000/year is projected with the net annual cost to operate all four (4) rural waste transfer stations anticipated to be approximately $208,000/year. Should Council wish to keep the sites open for the balance of 2015, a tax levy increase of $131,656 would be required. This has a tax rate impact of 0.03%.

**User Fee Analysis**

The user fee structure at the rural transfer stations is based on material (3 bags or less) and vehicle rates (half-load/full load) with a 200 kg/vehicle limit in place in accordance with Regional By-Law 98-87 as the sites are not designed to accommodate larger commercial and industrial loads. It has also been observed that most loads typically come in at the minimum fee or the full vehicle rate and much less half loads. However, in the absence of weigh scales, this user fee and weight basis structure can be subjective in nature. Nonetheless, the amount of waste dropped at the rural waste transfer stations has typically ranged from a low of about 100 kg/vehicle to a high of about 140 kg/vehicle. If these loads were based on scaled weights at the current industrial, commercial and institutional (IC&I) tipping fee of $74/tonne, fees in the range of $7.40/vehicle to $10.36/vehicle would be applied. By comparison, since the implementation of the current rural waste transfer station user fee schedule ($2 minimum fee, $10 half load and $15 full load), the cost recovery per vehicle transaction generally ranges between $4.75/vehicle to $6.90/vehicle, well below what would be charged at the Cambridge and Waterloo sites where scales are present. This suggests a discrepancy in the current fee structure exists between the rural transfer stations and the Cambridge and Waterloo sites and that an adjustment to the rural waste transfer station user fee schedule is warranted should continued operation of the sites be considered.
Based on the above, staff has reviewed potential user fee structures for consideration that would be expected to result in improved cost recovery per vehicle (as compared to the Cambridge and Waterloo sites) as well as assist with some of the existing subjective nature of applying the existing fee structure as follows:

1. Minimum fee of $5/vehicle (up to three bags/items) and $15 vehicle flat rate for anything above 3 bags/items and up to 200 kg/vehicle (no more half-load fees)
   - Under this scenario, revenue would be anticipated to range between $85,000 (assuming 25% drop in transactions) to $112,500 per year assuming no change to current transaction levels. This equates to an average fee of about $9/vehicle and would be anticipated to result in 30% to 40% cost recovery
   - The $5 minimum fee would be consistent with the proposed minimum fee for the Cambridge and Waterloo sites

2. Minimum fee of $10/vehicle (up to three bags/items) and $15 vehicle flat rate for anything above 3 bags/items and up to 200 kg (no more half-load fees)
   - Under this scenario, revenue would be anticipated to range between $90,000 (assuming 40% drop in transactions) to $150,000 per year assuming no change in current transaction levels. This equates to an average fee of about $12/vehicle and would be anticipated to result in 30% to 50% cost recovery
   - The $10 minimum fee is higher than the $5 minimum fee currently proposed for the Cambridge and Waterloo sites

Although some reduction in tonnage would be expected under either of the revised fee structures above, it is assumed that the implications on operating costs would still remain the same as currently projected for 2015 (approximately $280,000). It is also noted that a provision for future capital costs estimated at about $7 million over the next 10 years for the four rural transfer stations would need to be reinstated should the sites remain operational for an extended period of time. These capital costs provide for the replacement or upgrade of aging transfer buildings/site infrastructure which are over 25 years old.

As set out in Report COR-FSD-15-03 on this Budget Committee agenda, staff recommend implementation of the minimum fee of $5 per vehicle. It would be appropriate for Budget Committee and Council to determine, during the 2015 Budget process, whether it wishes to keep the rural transfer stations open beyond March 31, 2015, for how long, and the days/hours of operation. Should Council determine that the rural transfer stations remain open, staff would then recommend that the user fee structure also include a $15 vehicle flat rate for anything above 3 bags/items and up to 200 kg/vehicle (i.e. the half-load fee would be eliminated).
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Transportation

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: September 15, 2015 File Code: D28-20/Alpine Trail
Subject: Pedestrian Access Improvements for the Hanson/Hayward Industrial and Alpine Village Area, Kitchener, Class Environmental Assessment – Project Update

Recommendation: For information.

Summary:

In January 2014, the Region initiated the Pedestrian Access Improvements Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Study to consider options to improve pedestrian access to transit for the Family Centre and Family and Children Services in the Hanson/Hayward area in the City of Kitchener. The study area is shown in Appendix “A”. The isolated location of the Hanson/Hayward area is considered a challenge for Grand River Transit (GRT) to service in an effective manner. This report serves to provide an update on the work that has been completed to date and what will be done before the EA is completed and a recommendation is brought to Council.

The Region’s Active Transportation Master Plan recognizes the “Alpine to Hanson Connection” as a special area for further study, and it became clear through this study that it was also important to improve connectivity to the Alpine Village residential area west of Homer Watson Boulevard. There is no pedestrian access between Alpine Village, a residential neighbourhood with elementary schools, a park and trails, and the Hanson/Hayward industrial area that contains a variety of businesses, social services, a high school, and public sport fields, for 1,300 metres of Homer Watson Boulevard between Ottawa Street and Block Line Road. A pedestrian access between the two areas and an improved access to transit would benefit the residents and employees who need to access these locations.
As part of this study two public meetings were held to gain public and stakeholder feedback. The first Public Consultation Centre (PCC) was held on June 17, 2014 and the second on June 18, 2015. Various pedestrian connection and transit route alternatives were presented at the PCCs, including a preferred alternative (identified as Alternative 2 in Appendix “C”) that involved a pedestrian walkway between Alpine Road and Homer Watson Boulevard. Many concerns were raised by the residents and property owners who abut the proposed walkway, including concerns about safety, trespassing, noise and property impacts. Regional staff also consulted with the Regional Active Transportation Advisory Committee (ATAC) and the Kitchener Trails and Cycling Advisory Committee (KTCAC). Both committees were supportive of Alternative 2.

The project team has reviewed these concerns and re-examined the potential impacts associated with the proposed connection. The project team believes that a pedestrian connection between the Alpine Village area and the Hanson/Hayward industrial area will benefit both sides of Homer Watson Boulevard. In addition, GRT routes in the area will be reviewed because of the new planned ION station at Courtland Avenue and Block Line Road. This may include shifting routes away from local roads like Kingswood Drive to Regional roads like Homer Watson Boulevard to enable shorter and more direct routes with higher frequencies. With these potential GRT route changes a pedestrian connection between the Alpine neighbourhood and Homer Watson Boulevard will become important for the residents to access transit services. Therefore, the potential for removing transit service on Kingswood Drive is an additional key “driver” in the need and justification for the proposed pedestrian walkway.

The following initiatives are occurring outside of this EA:

- The pedestrian connection identified as Alternative 6 will be constructed by GrandLinq as part of ION, and also by the City of Kitchener as part of planned improvements, by 2017. This involves providing improved sidewalk and multi-use-trail along Hayward Avenue between the Family Centre and Family and Children Services and the existing GRT Route 8 transit stop on Walton Avenue east of Courtland Avenue.

- To take advantage of the planned ION station at Courtland Avenue and Block Line Road, GRT routes will be examined to determine new or changed transit routes to access both the Alpine Village area and Hanson/Hayward industrial area. This study is to be completed by 2016.

Completion of these two initiatives will enable the project team to identify the Recommended Alternative for this Environmental Assessment Study. The anticipated date of completion for this study is 2017.
Report:

Background

The Region of Waterloo is undertaking a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Study to evaluate pedestrian and transit access improvements for the Hanson/Hayward Industrial and Alpine Village Area in the City of Kitchener. The study limits as shown in Appendix “A” include an area bounded by Ottawa Street to the north, Block Line Road to the south, Courtland Avenue to the east and Strasburg Road to the west.

The project team includes staff from the Region of Waterloo and the City of Kitchener. IBI Group has been retained to assist the Region in conducting the EA.

Many requests and petitions have been received during the last few years for an improved access to transit to the Family Centre (FC) and Family and Children’s Services (FACS) located within the Hanson/Hayward industrial area adjacent to Homer Watson Boulevard. The isolated location of the Hanson industrial area is challenging for Grand River Transit (GRT) to service in a cost-effective and efficient manner. The closest GRT stops to the FC and FACS are approximately 725 metres and 845 metres, respectively, and some roads do not have sidewalks. For comparison, GRT’s target for the maximum walking distance to bus stops is 450 metres.

In 2007, an Engineering Feasibility study was conducted to investigate and design a pedestrian connection between Homer Watson Boulevard and Alpine Court. The proposed connection would have provided pedestrian access between the Hanson/Hayward industrial area and GRT Route 11 on Kingswood Drive. This connection would have improved the access to transit and shortened the walking distance between the closest GRT stops and the FC and FACS to 645 metres and 520 metres, respectively. The feasibility study concluded that the connection is feasible and required property acquisition.

The Region’s Active Transportation Master Plan, approved by Regional Council in 2014, recognizes the “Alpine to Hanson Connection” as a special area for further study, and it became clear through this current study that it was also important to improve connectivity to the Alpine Village residential area west of Homer Watson Boulevard. There is no pedestrian access between Alpine Village, a residential neighbourhood with elementary schools, a park, and trails, and the Hanson/Hayward industrial area that contains a variety of businesses, social services (including the Family Centre and Family and Children Services), a high school, and public sport fields, for 1,300 metres of Homer Watson Boulevard between Ottawa Street and Block Line Road. A pedestrian access between the two areas and an improved access to transit would benefit the residents and employees who need to access these locations.
This EA is considering alternatives to improve pedestrian and transit access to the FC, FACS and other destinations in the Hanson/Hayward area, and to address the gap in pedestrian access across Homer Watson Boulevard between Ottawa Street and Block Line Road. Three groups of alternatives were considered in the EA:

- Do Nothing
- Pedestrian Connection Alternatives
- Transit Route Alternatives.

The “Do Nothing” alternative was evaluated and screened out from further consideration as it will not address the problem of pedestrian and transit access to and from the FC and FACS.

Pedestrian Connection Alternatives

The following pedestrian access alternatives were developed and evaluated for this EA as shown in Appendix “B”

1. Through the Alpine Court industrial area along Alpine Court and Homer Watson, to and from GRT Route 11 on Kingswood Drive;

2. The previously planned walkway (in 2007) between 190/192 Alpine Road and the Alpine Court industrial area, to and from GRT Route 11;

3. Through the driveway within the 190/192 Alpine Road condominium development along Homer Watson Boulevard; to and from GRT Route 11;

4. To and from GRT Route 11 via the woodlot behind 190/192 Alpine Road along Homer Watson Boulevard; and

5. To and from GRT Route 11 via the driveway within the Autumn Woods condo project at 220-236 Kingswood Drive; and

6. To and from GRT Route 8 along Hayward Avenue.

Each of these alternatives was evaluated in terms of its ability to minimize the walking distance to the FC and FACS, to avoid property acquisition, and to reduce negative impacts on private and natural features. Based on these criteria, alternatives 1, 3, 4, and 5 were screened out from further consideration, and alternatives 2 and 6 were carried forward. Alternatives 2 and 6 are shown in Appendix “C”.

Alternative 2:

This alternative involves a new walkway beside the grassed berm between the 190/192 Alpine Road condominium development and the Alpine Court industrial area. It extends from Alpine Road to Homer Watson Boulevard creating a new pedestrian link between the Hanson/Hayward Industrial and Alpine Village areas. The proposed connection will
improve pedestrian access between the Alpine Village residential neighbourhood and employment area and recreational facilities in the Hanson/Hayward area. The new walkway would also reduce the walking distance between the GRT Route 11 transit stop at the Kingswood Drive/Alpine Road intersection and the FACS and FC to 520 metres and 645 metres, respectively.

Alternative 2 would address the access to transit and the connectivity problem within the Study Area.

Alternative 6:

This alternative involves improving an existing pedestrian connection along Hayward Avenue between the FC and the FACS and the existing GRT Route 8 transit stop on Walton Avenue east of Courtland Avenue.

A concrete sidewalk is currently located on the south side of Hayward Avenue between Hanson and Courtland, but there is no sidewalk in place at the CN Huron Park rail spur crossing. As part of the Region’s ION rapid transit project, pedestrian improvements are planned between the CN Huron Park rail spur and Courtland Avenue. The improvements include construction of a new 3.0 metre wide multi-use trail on the north side, and a new 1.5 metre wide sidewalk on the south side of the Hayward Avenue section. Pedestrian improvements along Hayward Avenue to the west between the CN Huron Park rail spur and Hanson Avenue are planned by the City of Kitchener as a separate project. These improvements will be done outside of this study and will be available when ION opens in 2017.

This alternative will provide an improved access to transit, but will not reduce the walking distance (725 metres to the FC and 845 meters to FACS) or address the connectivity problem along Homer Watson Boulevard within the Study Area.

Transit Route Alternatives:

The following transit route alternatives were developed and evaluated for this EA:

1. Modifications to existing conventional transit routes
2. ION-related route modifications
3. New transit service route

1. Modifications to existing conventional transit routes:

Modifications to three existing GRT Routes (Routes 8, 11 and 22) in the Study Area were evaluated as potential ways of providing nearby transit access to serve many destinations in Hanson/Hayward area, including the FC and FACS. The evaluation indicates that these alternatives cannot be supported for the following reasons:
The existing routes do not have extra time in their schedules to divert to the Hanson/Hayward area.

Changes to existing routes would involve significant impacts to large numbers of existing riders, potential revenue loss and increased operating costs. On average, for each of the three potential transit route alternatives evaluated in the study, between 110,000 and 120,000 passenger trips yearly would be negatively affected as the new routes would have significant out-of-direction deviations on them, extending the trip lengths considerably.

Each of these major route changes would also require the purchase of at least one additional bus costing approximately $500,000. Operating expenses of the additional bus would be between $430,000 and $585,000 annually.

The net operating costs would be a challenge since the FC and FACS area is physically isolated within an industrial park that generates low transit ridership and eventually low revenue.

Therefore, these three alternative transit route changes have been screened out from further consideration.

2. **ION-Related Route Modifications:**

This alternative involves possible route changes associated with the new ION station at Courtland Avenue and Block Line Road. These changes may provide future transit service on Homer Watson Boulevard and could introduce new transit service opportunities to the Study Area, including better access to the FC and FACS. The redesign of routes to integrate with planned ION stations is ongoing and anticipated to be finalized by 2016. This alternative was carried forward for further consideration.

3. **New Transit Service Route:**

This alternative involves providing a new route serving the FC and FACS. The bus would operate for at least 12 hours per day (8 a.m. to 8 p.m.) on weekdays, and service would be provided every 15-30 minutes, depending on the final route length. In order to provide a conventional 40' bus for this service, there would be a capital cost of approximately $500,000 (i.e. one new bus) plus estimated annual operating costs of $270,000. The net operating cost, considering an estimated $20,000 annual revenue, would be $250,000 ($270,000-$20,000) per year.

This service could also be operated using the contracted BusPLUS service at a lower cost and a smaller 19-passenger bus. Annual operating costs for this service would be approximately $188,000. The net annual operating cost, considering $20,000 annual revenue, is $166,000 ($188,000-$20,000).
Although a BusPLUS service is possible, providing a new transit route is not recommended for the following reasons:

- The revenue relative to potential cost is very low. The anticipated revenue/cost ratio for the conventional service would be 7%, and for the BusPLUS service would be 11%, while the minimum target is 25%.

- To make it viable for the contractor to purchase the required vehicle, the contract would have to be in place for a minimum of 5 years. While the vehicle could be reallocated, currently there are no other locations to re-deploy the vehicle. Normally BusPLUS is used to develop service in an area in order to justify conversion to a full-size bus, and this would be a different approach.

- The new GRT Business Plan will be developing policies related to potential other uses, such as community buses, but this is not yet adopted and no policies supporting this type of use are in place.

- Capacity at the closest logical point to connect to (Forest Glen Terminal) is limited and space may not be available for an additional bus.

- Longer term plans for route realignment will provide a better solution.

Therefore this alternative was screened out from further consideration.

**Public Consultation**

Two Public Consultation Centres (PCC) have been held for this project. The first PCC took place on June 17, 2014, and the second on June 18, 2015. Public comments received from PCC #1 helped the project team to introduce some mitigation measures and investigate a new Alternative to address some of the raised concerns. The comments received from PCC #2 were grouped into three main categories as follows:

1. The walking distance exceeds the standard
2. Safety, trespassing, and noise
3. Property impacts

1. The walking distance exceeds the 450 metre standard:

The main concern raised by the FC and FACS stakeholders is that many users of the facilities are low income, have mobility issues or other impairments, and Alternatives 2 and 6 will continue to involve excessive walking distances for them.
Project Team Response

The project team acknowledges that the FC and FACS need an improved access to transit and the proposed Alternative 2 will shorten the walking distance, but will not meet the 450 metre standard. The project team investigated multiple transit alternatives, including a BusPLUS option, and concluded that these alternatives cannot be implemented at this time. GRT plans for transit route modifications in the Study Area may result in route changes that would meet the 450 metre criterion.

2. Safety, Trespassing, and Noise:

The residents of 190/192 Alpine Road are opposed to Alternative 2 because of concerns about maintenance, trespassing, aesthetics/appearance and other safety/security issues.

Project Team Response

The project team acknowledges these concerns and redesigned the walkway with some features that will improve the safety (lighting) and limit trespassing (fencing). Many of the other concerns can be addressed through the detailed design, construction and maintenance of the walkway.

3. Property Impacts

The owner of the industrial business at 30 Alpine Court also raised concerns regarding Alternative 2 and its impact on his property (i.e. partial land acquisition, reduction in the snow storage area, potential impact on the truck turning movements to the rear of the building).

Project Team Response

The project team acknowledges that construction of the walkway would require some property and reduces the available snow storage area at 30 Alpine Court. The project team modified the design of the walkway to minimize these impacts. The revised design maintains the paved area and provides access, loading and circulation space for all trucks except for tractor-trailers.

The project team’s responses to all comments received from PCC #2 are included in Appendix “D”.

Regional staff also consulted with the Regional Active Transportation Advisory Committee (ATAC) and the Kitchener Trails and Cycling Advisory Committee (KTCAC). Both committees were supportive of the Alternative 2 proposed walkway connection.
Project Team Conclusion

The project team has carefully reviewed all the comments received from the public and has re-examined the potential impacts associated with the proposed walkway (Alternative 2). Based on this assessment, and despite the fact that the proposed walkway would only moderately improve direct access to the FC and FACS, the project team believes that a new pedestrian walkway at this location addresses a much broader issue in this community. A new walkway would promote transportation choice for the residents of this neighbourhood as it would provide a feasible and convenient alternative to the automobile to access the various destinations on the other side of Homer Watson Boulevard.

As noted above, GRT routes in this area will be examined to take advantage of the planned ION station at Courtland Avenue and Block Line Road. Shifting transit away from local roads like Kingswood Drive to Regional roads like Homer Watson Boulevard would enable shorter, more direct routes with higher frequencies that could provide more efficient service for the majority of passengers. However, such a shift would make it difficult for residents of the Alpine Village neighbourhood to access transit unless supportive pedestrian connections are provided. Therefore, the potential for removing transit service on Kingswood Drive is an additional key “driver” in the need and justification for the proposed pedestrian walkway.

Based on the project team evaluation and all comments from the public, stakeholders, and involved agencies, the project team concluded that more information regarding plans for transit route modifications in the Study Area is required to identify the final Recommended Alternative for this project.

Next Steps

The following initiatives are occurring outside of this EA:

- The pedestrian connection identified as Alternative 6 will be constructed by GrandLinq as part of ION, and also by the City of Kitchener as part of planned improvements, by 2017.

- To take advantage of the planned ION station at Courtland Avenue and Block Line Road, GRT routes will be examined to determine new or changed transit routes to access both the Alpine Village area and Hanson/Hayward industrial area. This study is to be completed by 2016.

Completion of these two initiatives will enable the project team to identify the Recommended Alternative for this EA. The anticipated date of completion is 2017.
Corporate Strategic Plan:

The Pedestrian Access Improvements Environmental Assessment between the Hanson/Hayward Industrial and Alpine Village Areas supports the Region’s Strategic Focus Area 2 (Growth Management and Prosperity), that relates to developing, optimizing and maintaining infrastructure to meet current and projected needs. Strategic Focus Area 3 (Sustainable Transportation) is also supported by this project. This focus area relates to developing, promoting and integrating active forms of transportation (walking).

Financial Implications:

The 2015 Transportation Capital program includes funding allocation of $150,000 for growth related studies, to be funded from Regional Development Charge Reserve fund, including the Pedestrian Access Improvements Environmental Assessment between Hanson/Hayward industrial and Alpine Village Areas. Sufficient funds exist in the ION project budget to fund the Region’s portion of Alternative 6 and the City of Kitchener has sufficient funds to address its portion of Alternative 6.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Transit Services and Design and Construction divisions participated on the project team.

Attachments

Appendix A - Study Area
Appendix B - Pedestrian Connection Alternatives
Appendix C - Alternatives 2 and 6
Appendix D - Comment/Response Table

Prepared By: Hanan Wahib, Transportation Planning Engineer
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Alternatives 2 and 6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cameron Dearlove</td>
<td>For reasons of access, equity and inclusion it needs a bus option plus pedestrian improvements on Hayward. Even a bus plus option until a route on Homer Watson becomes a reality. The region has unnecessarily dragged out this process for 2 years now and owes it to the community that has clearly said that a bus is a necessity for this neighbourhood. There is no clear route to influence transit services and so we have gone through this process. This process has shown that this community prefers a bus option, so it is time to make a decision. I urge you to listen to the people who have been engaged in this process.</td>
<td>A new transit route or route modifications, cannot be implemented at this time. Previous studies have shown low ridership potential in the area, potential revenue loss and increased operating costs. Changing an existing route is not an option as the existing routes do not have time in their schedules to service the Hanson/Hayward Industrial Park. Changing a route would also inconvenience current riders by extending routes and displacing bus stops. Routes will be redesigned in southwest Kitchener to integrate transit with the ION LRT station at Courtland Avenue and Block Line Road. The redesigned network may provide more direct access to transit service for Family and Children’s Services and The Family Centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Nunnikhoven</td>
<td>A bus option is very much needed for the community to have access to The Family Centre. Improved pedestrian walk way on Hayward is also needed ASAP.</td>
<td>A new transit route or route modifications, cannot be implemented at this time. Previous studies have shown low ridership potential in the area, potential revenue loss and increased operating costs. Changing an existing route is not an option as the existing routes do not have time in their schedules to service the Hanson/Hayward Industrial Park. Changing a route would also inconvenience current riders by extending routes and displacing bus stops. Routes will be redesigned in southwest Kitchener to integrate transit with the ION LRT station at Courtland Avenue and Block Line Road. The redesigned network may provide more direct access to transit service for Family and Children’s Services and The Family Centre. The sidewalk along Hayward Avenue has been approved as part of the ION project. There will be a 1.5 m wide sidewalk on the south side of Hayward and a 3 m multi use trail on the north side. This undertaking is expected to be completed and open for use during the Fall of 2017, when the ION commences operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fadhwe Yusuf</td>
<td>We are advocating for a bus route to come to the facility centre. Through my own experience, I have spent a lot of money on taxis during the winter months. It was difficult to push the stroller from Haywood and Courtland to the facility centre. We also have clients who have mobility concerns, as well as parents with young kids in</td>
<td>A new transit route or route modifications, cannot be implemented at this time. Previous studies have shown low ridership potential in the area, potential revenue loss and increased operating costs. Changing an existing route is not an option as the existing routes do not have time in their schedules to service the Hanson/Hayward Industrial Park. Changing a route would also inconvenience current riders by extending routes and displacing bus stops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Mona Loffelmann</td>
<td>Some of our clients stop coming to The Family Centre because of not having public transportation. Some of our clients have little children on strollers and are walking with their parents and it's too much especially when the weather is bad. Some on wheelchairs, very difficult to come to The Family Centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Michelle Smith</td>
<td>While I would still like to see a bus serving the Family Centre directly, from the option presented I support #3 with service from Forest Glen to the Family centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>No Name Provided</td>
<td>This option would better meet the access needs for all citizens to The Family Centre. The new transit route option presented on Thursday night. This new route will operate from the Glen Forest terminal. It would be a 12 hours service (8am to 8pm to match the family centre schedule) with a bus every 15-30 minutes. This new route can also be offered as Bus Plus (19 passenger accessible vehicles) as pilot project in a much lower budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>No Name Provided</td>
<td>On behalf of the children and families who attend all the programs at the Family Visiting Centre, please support bus plus and help us to attend our parenting programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>David Vanderwindt</td>
<td>Cool, looks interesting. I guess that allowing people to safely cross Homer-Watson will be a challenge, but a rep said that Kitchener would do that. Thanks for doing this!! I thought the renderings look like a sidewalk which is awkward for cyclists and pedestrians to share. Could it be widened, or even two lanes like on Blockline?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Mike Walters</td>
<td>Has the use of Alpine Court for a pathway really been given proper consideration? It seems to me it has not. Volume of heavy truck traffic in the area of Alpine Court??? At what speed? Not 50km/h as on any other city sidewalk beside a road Hill to steep? Engineering??? Less snow clearing problems, using Alpine Court Bus could be re-routed to include a stop in Alpine Court. Less invasive to existing business and home owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Fauzia Mazhar – Coordinator Family Centre</td>
<td>Staff recommended option (walkway between Kingsway and Block Line), although significantly improved from last time, is still not a great option for our families and children for the following reasons. 1. The proposed walkway is still longer (700m) than the recommended walking distance for bus service users (400m) 2. For our clients – families with children on strollers and individuals using wheelchair and other mobility devices, walking about 700m particularly in adverse weather and night time does not seem to be an option. 3. This option seems to be more of a benefit to the residents of Alpine and Block Line than our clients who happen to come from all over KW. Therefore, we strongly recommend adding a new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bus route. (From Forest Glen) This bus route with stops closer to the places like The Family Centre and Family and Children Services and Activa Sportsplex will eliminate the longer walk. We think there is a good case for running at least a Bus Plus on this route.</td>
<td>A potential BusPLUS service to serve The Family Centre and Family and Children’s Services has been added as a transit service option for the Hanson/Hayward area. However, it has not been approved by the Region and would require Council approval to implement. Routes will be redesigned in southwest Kitchener to integrate transit with the ION LRT station at Courtland Avenue and Block Line Road. The redesigned network may provide more direct access to transit service for Family and Children’s Services and The Family Centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Krista McCann</td>
<td>Staff from The Family Centre still feel the proposed walkway does not address accessibility concerns. The stop and walkway would still be 546-645 meter walkway. People coming with mobility issues as well as people with strollers and children would still find this walk too long. It is proposed that a Bus Plus option is used to service the Lennox Lewis/Hanson area if need on a shortened schedule (i.e., Running at rush hour peaks) this system would be implemented quicker than any of the proposed solutions. Also, if an ION stop was issued on Homer Watson, the BusPlus can be re-evaluated and removed if deemed appropriate. By adding a bus plus there would be a reduced cost of infrastructure and concern would be addressed quicker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Shelly Taylor</td>
<td>I work at FACs, and have worked there for over 20 years. On many occasions, I have seen staff and clients struggle with the use of bus service due to the distance of the nearest stop. This becomes most evident in poor weather when rain and snow make it almost impossible to walk, particularly with the lack of sidewalk from almost every direction (down Ardel to School Board stop at Ottawa, Hayward from Courtland, through what is currently proposed as a walkway.) Many times I have watched Moms with small children and babies in strollers trying to make their way to FACs and The Family Centre. The walkway option appears pleasant, but it’s not likely to encourage a lot of visitors as the distance from the bus stop is still very lengthy. Closer transit service to our facilities would be much appreciated by staff, volunteers and the users of the Family Centre. The sooner this would be available, the better. An eventual link to the ION with a transit stop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Sheri Tease

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheri Tease</td>
<td>Need a plan to address snow removal at the Alpine Court properties. Very little space is there now. Would make more sense to wait until ION is completed and address bussing concerns along with that project. This project has already been in the planning phases for 8 years, a couple more shouldn’t matter. Will the walkway really provide the access that The Family Centre customers require? For anyone with limited mobility, it’s still a long distance. A bus stop outside their facility would be meet their needs better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Snow removal arrangements at the Alpine Court properties will be made as part of the detailed design of the walkway.

Routes will be redesigned in southwest Kitchener to integrate transit with the ION LRT station at Courtland Avenue and Block Line Road. The redesigned network may provide more direct access to transit service for Family and Children’s Services and The Family Centre.

The 645 metre walking distance to The Family Centre in Option 2 is a shorter distance for anyone accessing the Centre from the west, including from Transit Route 11 west of Homer Watson Blvd. |

14. Diane Lowater

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diane Lowater</td>
<td>I am deeply concerned with the plan of the proposed walkway. We have lived in our condo for 30 years and have always felt extremely safe. It concerns me that the walkway will draw the wrong types of people who might litter or even worse. I truly believe that the paths using Alpine Court would be cheaper to build and safer for all concerned. The snow removal of the walkway is a concern. We have trees that could be affected if the snow is blown our way. I just think that the Region is more concerned about the revenue on the LRT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of Alpine Court (i.e. The Food Bank) was considered as an alternative. We have concluded that owing to the topography and external parking, storage and truck movement space, a public walkway in this location is not feasible.

Maintenance of this walkway would be the responsibility of the City of Kitchener. |

15. David Lowater

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Lowater</td>
<td>I do not believe you have given serious enough consideration to running the path along the side of The Food Bank. To say the grade is too steep is a cop out. A simple switchback would provide the necessary grade. While there is traffic in that area, none of it can move at any speed, so any chance of accidents is remote.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of Alpine Court (i.e. The Food Bank) was considered as an alternative. We have concluded that owing to the topography and external parking, storage and truck movement space, a public walkway in this location is not feasible. |
|   |   | Furthermore this option would be a lot less costly and easier to maintain.  
|   |   | The other option is to do nothing, so people would have to walk further. What is so wrong with that?  
|   |   | My final comment is that the Region is more concerned about the revenue on the LRT.  
| 16. | S.M. Sweeney | If my understanding of the problem is correct, this is to address bus access for clients of family and children's services. I honestly don't believe this will address the problem. Expecting clients especially vulnerable ones already dealing with obstacles to walk across two busy roads and 1300 meters especially in bad weather?  
|   |   | It's discriminatory and a band aid at best. You have a school, a sports facility, FACS and 4 huge apartment buildings. Reroute the buses and pick these people up at the door.  
|   |   | I think the cost is justified in light of the fact these are people who don't have the means to buy a car or use cabs. That is not a reason to give them inaccessible services. Think winter. Single mom, 2 kids, 1300 meters, two busy roads.  
|   |   | Sorry, this isn't the answer. Spend the 500k on affordable housing.  
| 17. | George K Doerr | As you know, I strongly disagree with the contents of the handout presented at the most recent meeting. I have made it abundantly clear that this project will have serious effect on my business and property at the previous meetings and discussions if the project proceeds. Yet, paragraph #4 of the Region’s handout wrongly states that the impacts to 30 Alpine Court have been avoided.  
|   |   | I have been candid regarding the disastrous effect on my business with regards to the loss of snow removal and snow dumping area, restricted access to the rear by commercial vehicles and the loss of numerous parking spaces. In addition to preventing me from adding a second shift to  
|   |   | The purpose of this Class EA is to consider options to improve pedestrian access across Homer Watson Boulevard between the industrial and Alpine Village areas between Ottawa Street and Block Line Road, including transit access to The Family Centre and Family and Children's Services on Hanson Avenue for staff, clients and visitors.  
|   |   | Changing an existing route is not an option as the existing routes do not have time in their schedules to service the Hanson/Hayward Industrial Park. Changing a route would also inconvenience current riders by extending routes and displacing bus stops.  
|   |   | Paragraph #4 of the Region’s handout refers to adjustments that have been made to the walkway alignment so as to avoid any impact on the paved parking and circulation areas around 30 Alpine Court, and access to the loading area by commercial vehicles.  
|   |   | The Region of Waterloo's property acquisition process will require further information and justification from the property owner on business impacts to 30 Alpine Court. Subsequent to Council's approval of any solution that requires the acquisition of private property, staff will work with the property owners as part of the property acquisition process to ensure the normal practices are followed with respect to the reasonable assessment of impacts to properties associated with any acquisitions.
my business, the increase likelihood of trespassing and vandalism are further factors that have been disregarded. There is no necessity of proceeding with project at least in its present form and the necessity to proceed has not been established. There is also no substantial evidence that any alternative routes have been considered. If this project proceeds, it will effectively put me out of business at this location and destroy the reasonable saleability of the property. In its current state, the premises have many advantages that will be very expensive to reproduce in any replacement premises. It is not possible to move to a new business location with disrupting the business. If the project proceeds I will no alternative but to pursue compensation to the fullest extent required by law. That pursuit unnecessarily take more valuable time away from my business.

It is estimated that about 35% of the snow storage space located immediately east of 30 Alpine Court could be lost to a walkway switch-back alignment to Homer Watson Blvd. The City and owner will have to come to agreement on alternative snow storage arrangements.

The need for a new pedestrian connection to Homer Watson Blvd. between Ottawa Street and Block Line Road has been identified in the Region’s Active Transportation Master Plan.

| 18. | Marg and Bernie White | We would prefer to have a vehicular road access as well. The road was removed when the Autumn Hills condominium was developed. Is it wise to do this now instead of in another 40 years? | A road connection to Homer Watson Boulevard is beyond the scope of this EA. This would be under the City of Kitchener jurisdiction. |

| 19. | Graham Jeffery | I do not see a sufficient need for the walkway based on the needs of our neighborhood, so the expected walkway usage by the clients of the family buildings is key to determining the viability of the project. The social behavior/crime concerns expressed by the residents on Alpine Road are important to consider, but I don’t think that will be as much a problem as they expect, as I don’t feel that the walkway will be an attractive place for people to hang out. It might be useful for you to discuss this with a criminologist or someone at the Waterloo Region Police who understands crime and social behavior patterns. I would use the walkway probably about a couple of times a month. | The Region of Waterloo’s Active Transportation Master Plan has an “Alpine to Hanson connection” as one of the special areas for further study to provide improved pedestrian and cycling access across Homer Watson Blvd between Ottawa Street and Block Line Rd. to serve the Alpine neighborhood to the west and Hanson employment/recreation area to the east.

We recognize the concerns you and others have raised regarding the overall safety of the walkway, and its need to take into account existing policy. If the Alpine-Hanson walkway is the preferred solution from the Environmental Assessment process, then Crime Prevention Though Environmental Design principles will be applied to the detailed design of the walkway. This can require mitigation of concerns though other design elements including fencing (currently planned only on the south side of the walkway to avoid entrapment), pedestrian illumination, maintenance and landscaping. The Study Team has requested information from the WRPS but has not received any feedback at this time. |
20. Andrew Head

Represent the owner of 10 Alpine Court. Do not support Alternative 2 and will not accommodate any requests to sell land.

Removal of any lands from 10 Alpine Court for the proposed walkway will have the following negative impacts:
- A walkway block located adjacent to the subject lands will decrease property value and potential buyers.
- Reduced land mass for future building or parking expansion.
- Non-compliance with current and proposed zoning by-law.
- Additional variances will be required further limited potential issues.
- Snow storage areas will be removed requiring snow to be taken offsite at the additional expense of the owner.
- Increase potential for litter and vandalism.
- Decrease in natural/landscape area.
- Drainage concerns and potential for additional maintenance.

We have further concerns over security a pedestrian safety. Locating a 2116.1 ft long walkway at the rear of industrial buildings and abutting full grown landscape berm will create a natural area for loitering, vandalism and potential for criminal behaviour.

This letter is a formal objection to Alternative 2.

The stated negative effects on 10 Alpine Court will be reviewed and confirmed as part of the Region’s property acquisition process. All property and business impacts will have to be substantiated by the property owner. Subsequent to Council’s approval of any solution that requires the acquisition of private property, staff will work with the property owners as part of the property acquisition process to ensure the normal practices are followed with respect to the reasonable assessment of impacts to properties associated with any acquisitions.

According to the City of Kitchener, property taken for public works is deemed to be in zoning compliance. If taking property from 10 Alpine Court creates any zoning non-compliance, the City would arrange to provide whatever site plan, minor variance or other application that would be required.

The Project Team recognize the concerns you and others have raised regarding the overall safety of the walkway, and its need to take into account existing policy. If the Alpine-Hanson walkway is the preferred solution from the Environmental Assessment process, then Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design principles will be applied to the detailed design of the walkway. This can require mitigation of concerns through other design elements including fencing (currently planned only on the south side of the walkway to avoid entrapment), pedestrian illumination, maintenance and landscaping.

22. Judith Lodi

- Need bus service to The Family Centre.
- Implement BusPLUS.

There has been no costing of lighting, storm or winter maintenance for the pathway. This should have been available during public and Regional consultations to confirm that safety measures will be addressed.

A new transit route or route modifications, cannot be implemented at this time. Previous studies have shown low ridership potential in the area, potential revenue loss and increased operating costs. Changing an existing route is not an option as the existing routes do not have time in their schedules to service the Hanson/Hayward Industrial Park. Changing a route would also inconvenience current riders by extending routes and displacing bus stops. Routes will be redesigned in southwest Kitchener to integrate transit with the ION LRT station at Courtland Avenue and Block Line Road. The redesigned network may provide more direct access to transit service for Family and Children’s Services and The Family Centre.
A potential BusPLUS service to serve The Family Centre and Family and Children’s Services has been added as a transit service option for the Hanson/Hayward area. However, it has not been approved by the Region and would require Council approval to implement.

Provision of lighting and stormwater management is included in the walkway cost estimate. Maintenance costs will be calculated based on a final walkway design if the Environmental Assessment is endorsed.

23. Lorna Aberdien
I wish to express my thoughts on the necessity of providing transit services to The Family Centre, 65 Hanson Ave. As a centre that serves children and adults of all abilities and income levels, safe and affordable access to the centre is needed. Without a bus stop close to the building, some people are prevented from accessing the services available there. For people who need to use wheelchairs for mobility, there is no safe way to get to The Family Centre from existing bus stops. For people with developmental challenges, safety is also a concern. Having a bus that brings them to the building is the safest option in my opinion.

I work for an organization, Planned Lifetime Networks that is located in The Family Centre’s Community Hub space. We serve people who are isolated due to disability or circumstance and safety is a key concern.

There are other non-profit organizations housed at The Family Centre who serve folks with developmental and/or mental health challenges, where safety and ease of finding their way are critical.

24. Heather Bagg
1. Use BusPLUS to service the area.
2. Proposed route from Conestoga College up to Homer Watson and the proposed stop will be on the Homer Watson-Hanson intersection.
3. Route changes with the LRT.
4. Unjustifiable tax cost.
5. There is a dangerous, high collision corner.
6. Emergency vehicles will not have quick

1. A potential BusPLUS service to serve The Family Centre and Family and Children’s Services has been added as a transit service option for the Hanson/Hayward area. However, it has not been approved by the Region and would require Council approval to implement.

2. Route modifications, cannot be implemented at this time. Previous studies have shown low ridership potential in the area, potential revenue loss and increased operating costs. Changing an existing route is not an option as the existing routes do not have time in their schedules to service the
access to the walkway.
7. Walkway doesn’t have multiple points of entry to prevent entrapment.
8. Natural beauty and aesthetics will be destroyed by path and its fence and other man-made structures, as well as the addition of litter and noise and light pollution.
9. Environment (including threatened species) and the prolific wildlife within the pathway area and adjacent woodlot close by will be negatively impacted and disturbed by the construction and very existence of the path and its users.
10. No costs have been disclosed on how the area intended for use as a drainage ditch will be effectively changed into a pathway and whether it will be problem free.
11. Cost of annual maintenance.
12. Design drawings omitted key features necessary for the path (waste, drainage and stormwater management, and snow removal tactics), and no diagrams were provided of nearby bus routes with their stops (and future routes/stops) to help assess whether a path is even needed.


Hanson/Hayward Industrial Park. Changing a route would also inconvenience current riders by extending routes and displacing bus stops.

3. Routes will be redesigned in southwest Kitchener to integrate transit with the ION LRT station at Courtland Avenue and Block Line Road. The redesigned network may provide more direct access to transit service for Family and Children’s Services and The Family Centre.

4. The purpose of this Class EA is to consider options to improve pedestrian access across Homer Watson Boulevard between the industrial and Alpine Village areas between Ottawa Street and Block Line Road, including transit access to The Family Centre and Family and Children’s Services on Hanson Avenue for staff, clients and visitors. The Region of Waterloo’s Active Transportation Master Plan has an “Alpine to Hanson connection” as one of the special areas for further study to provide improved pedestrian and cycling access across Homer Watson Blvd between Ottawa Street and Block Line Rd. to serve the Alpine neighborhood to the west and Hanson employment/recreation area to the east.

5. The City of Kitchener will review the Alpine Road corner which would connect with a walkway, and advise on any traffic/speed management improvements that may be included in the final walkway design.

6. Emergency vehicles do not typically access 1.8m wide walkways. Any emergency response would be provided from either Alpine Road or Homer Watson Blvd.

7. We recognize the concerns you and others have raised regarding the overall safety of the walkway. If the Alpine-Hanson walkway is the preferred solution from the Environmental Assessment process, then Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design principles will be applied to the detailed design of the walkway. This can require mitigation of concerns though other design elements including fencing (currently planned only on the south side of the walkway to avoid entrapment), pedestrian illumination, maintenance and landscaping.

8. The existing landscaped berm and its vegetation between 190-192 Alpine Road and the Alpine Court lots will not be directly impacted by a walkway. The walkway would be located all on the Alpine Court side of the berm.

9. The preceding statement, and the separation of the woodlot south of 190-192 Alpine Road by the condo development have led the Region’s environmental planner to conclude that the planned walkway will not adversely impact any natural
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments Received Before the PCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25. George Doerr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Charlie Tease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alpine-Hanson walkway (Alternative #2) is the preferred solution from the Environmental Assessment process now underway, then CPTED principles will be applied to the detailed design of the walkway. This can require mitigation of concerns though other design elements including fencing (currently planned only on the south side of the walkway to avoid entrapment), pedestrian illumination, maintenance and landscaping.

Regarding your concerns about traffic and pedestrian safety issues at the Alpine Road trail link, this too will be addressed in the detailed design if Alternative #2 is selected as the preferred walkway alignment. In that case, the City of Kitchener can consider traffic calming applications along this section of Alpine Road to help slow motorist traffic near the trail end.

The objective of the Region and City is to find a solution to the active transportation limitations in the Alpine/Hanson area that ensures that the walkway design is safe. Once this is completed, the design will be available to the public for further comment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>29. Andrew Head Dryden Smith and Head</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In our meeting at 20 Alpine Court, you had agreed to provide the detailed designs of the walkway in digital format for our review. Please advise when we will have these to review the total impacts to 10 Alpine Court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still working on the requested drawing and will email it to you soon. Regarding adding your name to the contact list, it has been added and you will be notified of any future event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please add my name to the mailing list for correspondence and if possible provide any presentation notes in pdf to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It should be noted that you can access all the information related to this project including the information package of June 18, 2015 PCC through the following link: <a href="http://www.regionofwaterloo.ca/en/discoveringthereregion/parkstrails.asp">http://www.regionofwaterloo.ca/en/discoveringthereregion/parkstrails.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does this public meeting mean that other walkway locations are under review again?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With respect to June 18, 2015 PCC, we are not going to show new locations for the proposed walkway. Since our meeting on May 28th, we have investigated the area around the Kitchener Food Bank warehouse at 50 Alpine Court as suggested by some residents. We have concluded that owing to the topography and external parking, storage and truck movement space, a public walkway in this location is not feasible. During the June 18, 2015 we will show only the shortlisted pedestrian connection Alternatives: Alternative Walkway and Alternative #6 (sidewalk improvements on Hayward Ave).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I may not be able to attend the public meeting as am triple booked. If time allows I may make an appearance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30. Ron Esch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am enclosing my remarks from a year ago, which have not changed in the ensuing year. The more I think about this, the more I wonder who is asking for this - residents of Alpine Village area or the City of Kitchener. I have a funny feeling that there are a lot more residents opposed to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The scope of this project has expanded to include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide improved pedestrian and cycling access across Homer Watson Blvd between Ottawa Street and Block Line Rd. to serve the Alpine neighborhood to the west and Hanson employment/recreation area to the east.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve access to transit for many destinations in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | this plan than people that have asked for this change.  
I will also be copying you in a second e-mail, correspondence to and from City of K staff as well as our ward councillor Paul Singh that point out the safety problems at the 90 degree bend in Alpine Rd, a terminus of the proposed walkway. This is a very dangerous corner. It was pointed out by Don at our last meeting that safety was a primary concern in not putting sidewalks into Alpine Court to the Food Bank and having the walkway continue from the Food Bank to Homer Watson. Well, safety is also a concern at this 90 degree bend in Alpine.  
| | Hanson/Hayward area including The Family Centre and Family and Children’s Services.  
Alternative #6 to improve sidewalks along Hayward between Lennox Lewis Way and Courtland is now an approved project as part of the ION construction. This alternative provides an improved access to transit, but does not address the lack of connectivity across Homer Watson between Ottawa and Block Line. All other Alternatives to cross Homer Watson Blvd between the Alpine and Hanson areas have been evaluated and screened out as not being feasible owing to local conditions (i.e. truck traffic, loading/unloading, insufficient property, excessive walking distances).  
If Alternative #2 approved by the Regional Council as a preferred alignment, the study would explore options to mitigate resident concerns about the impacts of this alternative. |
Region of Waterloo
Planning Development and Legislative Services
Legal Services

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

Date: September 15, 2015
File Code: L07-90

Subject: Authorization to Expropriate Lands (2nd Report) for Phase 2 of Manitou Drive Improvements (Homer Watson Boulevard to Bleams Road), in the City of Kitchener

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the expropriation of lands for the purpose of construction of road improvements to Manitou Drive (Regional Road 69), in the City of Kitchener, in the Region of Waterloo as detailed in Report PDL-LEG-15-17 dated September 15, 2015 described as follows:

Fee Simple Partial Taking:

Part Lot 1, Registrar’s Compiled Plan 1521, being Part 1 on 58R-18262, being part of PIN 22731-0020 (LT), in the City of Kitchener (262 Manitou Drive, Kitchener)

And that staff be instructed to register a Plan of Expropriation for the property, or such lesser portions of any of the said properties as may be determined through the design process, 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 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 otherwise deemed expedient by the Commissioner or Transportation and Environmental Services and the Regional Solicitor.

**Summary:** NIL

**Report:**

Regional Council approved roadway improvements to Manitou Drive (Regional Road 69) from Homer Watson Boulevard to Bleams Road on August 20, 2014 as detailed in report E-14-092. The project improvements include replacement of deteriorated pavement surface, replacing existing paved shoulders with curb and gutter, installing storm sewer and installing sidewalk and segregated cycling lanes. Construction is scheduled for the summer of 2016.

Land acquisitions are required from two (2) property owners. The acquisitions are fee simple partial takings for road widening purposes. The Region has entered into an agreement with one of the two property owners to obtain the required fee simple partial takings and this agreement has been completed by registration of the Transfer on title conveying interest in the lands to the Region.

Council approved the commencement of expropriation of the subject property on April 22, 2015 as detailed in report PDL-LEG-15-36. The appropriate forms under the Expropriations Act were served in order to initiate formal proceedings under the Act. 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 been provided with offers to purchase. Legal Services staff also contacted all property owners and informed them of the Region’s intention to continue with the expropriation process in order to ensure that the construction timeline is maintained, including this report going forward, as detailed in the Region’s Expropriation Information Sheet.

Should a negotiated settlement be reached with the one outstanding property and a conveyance of the required acquisition be completed before the Expropriation process is complete, the Expropriation process will be discontinued by the Regional Solicitor.

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. The next step in the proceedings is for Council to approve the expropriation of the property. This approval will ultimately be endorsed upon a certificate of approval on the Plan of Expropriation for those properties not acquired under agreement. The Plan is then registered within 3 months of the approval. Ownership of the property vests with
the Region upon the registration of the Plan. Notices of Expropriation are then served upon all registered owners, including tenants as shown on the assessment roll.

Once ownership by the Region is secured through the registration of the Plan, it is possible to serve the Notice of Possession. The date for possession can be no sooner than 3 months following the date of service of the Notice of Possession. The Notices of Expropriation and Notices of Possession may be served at the same time.

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 process is proceeding to ensure that the Region has possession of the land for construction in the summer of 2016.

Transportation and Environmental Services staff advises that they are not aware of any environmental concerns with respect to the subject lands. The expropriation of the lands is on an “as is” basis and upon closing the Region assumes all responsibility for the lands.

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 have 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:**

The Manitou Drive Improvements, when complete, will support the following 2 strategic objectives of the Corporate Strategic Plan:

- To develop, promote and integrate active forms of transportation (cycling and walking); and
- To optimize existing road capacity to safely manage traffic throughout Waterloo Region.
Financial Implications:

The 2015 Ten-year Transportation Capital Program includes funds of $4,200,000 (Project #5579) in the years 2015 to 2017 for this project to be funded from the Roads Rehabilitation Reserve ($3,350,000; 80%) and Regional Development Charges ($850,000; 20%) fund. Sufficient funding for the acquisitions outlined within this report is available in the project budget.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

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

Attachments

Appendix “A” – Sketch of Project Area

Appendix “B” – Corporate Profiles

Prepared By: Fiona McCrea, Solicitor, Property

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

1. 262 Manitou Drive, Kitchener
   Owner: Newo Holdings Limited
   Annual Return: June 28, 2014
   Directors/Officers: Jeffrey Michael Owen, Douglas Edward Owen
Please note report PDL-LEG-15-65, pages 54-65, has been removed from the Agenda.
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental services
Design and Construction

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: September 15, 2015
File Code: T04-20, 5340

Subject: Amend Traffic and Parking By-Law 06-728 - Designated Cycling Lanes, 2-Way Centre Left-Turn Lanes and Lane Designation on Manitou Drive between Fairway Road and Bleams Road.

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo amend Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended upon completion of construction to accommodate the road improvements, to:

a) Add to Schedule 16, Lane Designation:

   a. Manitou Drive (Regional Road 69) southbound, through and through/right turn movements at Bleams Road, (Regional Road 56)

   b. Manitou Drive (Regional Road 69) northbound, through/left turn and through movements at Bleams Road (Regional Road 56)

   c. Bleams Road (Regional Road 56) eastbound, left turn and left turn/right turn movements at Manitou Drive (Regional Road 69)

b) Add to Schedule 20, Centre Lane: Two-Way Left-Turns on Manitou Drive (Regional Road 69) from 100 m south of Fairway Road (Regional Road 53) to 740 m south of Fairway Road

c) Add to Schedule 24, Reserved Lanes for Bicycles on Both Sides of Manitou Drive (Regional Road 69) from Fairway Road (Regional Road 53) to Bleams Road (Regional Road 56)
Summary:
Nil

Report:
At the regular meeting November 21, 2012 Regional Council approved the following Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to the Class Environmental Assessment for Manitou Drive Widening, Bleams Road to Fairway Road, in the City of Kitchener:

a) Approve the improvements to Manitou Drive from Fairway Road to Bleams Road in the City of Kitchener including a roundabout at the intersection of Manitou Drive and Bleams Road and replacement of the bridge at Schneider's Creek, all presented as Recommended Design Concept 1 in Report E-12-086 dated September 11, 2012; and

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

The project limits are shown in Appendix A. The approved design includes the following:

- Designated on-road Cycling Lanes on both sides of Manitou Drive
- Designated two-way centre left-turn lane on Manitou Drive
- Designated through/turn lanes at all three entries to the proposed roundabout at Manitou Drive and Bleams Road.

Contract T2015-133 to construct the Manitou Drive Widening, Bleams Road to Fairway Road was award by Regional Council on April 22, 2015 and construction is currently underway. In order to allow for construction of the new bridge and roundabout, Manitou Drive is currently closed at Bleams Road with local access to Manitou Drive north of Bleams Road provided via Fairway Road and Webster Road. Bleams Road is also closed at Manitou Drive. Detour routes are posted via Homer Watson Boulevard and Block Line and via Wabanaki Drive and Wilson Ave.

Subject to weather conditions and construction progress, most of the construction work is scheduled to be completed and the intersection of Manitou Drive and Bleams Road is scheduled to be re-opened to traffic by the end of this year. It is planned that some construction work such as some surface asphalt and landscaping will be completed in 2016.
The recommended Traffic and Parking By-law amendment will enable the approved changes under the Highway Traffic Act to come into effect in time for the opening and operation of the newly constructed lanes.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

This report addresses the objective to optimize existing road capacity and safety throughout the Region (Strategic Objective 3.3).

**Financial Implications:**
Nil

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**
Nil

**Attachments**

Appendix A – Key Plan

**Prepared By:** Wayne Cheater, Senior Project Manager

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

[Map showing a project limits area within a city, with the text 'Regional Road No. 69 Manitou Drive Widening Bleams Road to Fairway Road City of Kitchener'.]
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Rapid Transit

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: September 15, 2015        File Code: A02-30/PW
Subject: Lane designations and reserved lanes on Hespeler Road (Regional Road #24) at various intersections, City of Cambridge

Recommendation:

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

a) Remove from Schedule 16, Southbound Right-turn Lane Designation on Hespeler Road (Regional Road 24) at Dunbar Road;

b) Remove from Schedule 16, Northbound Left-turn, Right-turn on Hespeler Road (Regional Road 24) at Pinebush Road/Eagle Street (Regional Road 39);

c) Add to Schedule 16, Northbound Left-turn, Left-turn, Right-turn on Hespeler Road (Regional Road 24) at Pinebush Road/Eagle Street (Regional Road 39);

d) Add to Schedule 16, Northbound Right-turn on Hespeler Road (Regional Road 24) at Munch Avenue/Isherwood Avenue;

e) Add to Schedule 24, Reserved Bus Lane, Southbound Hespeler Road (Regional Road 24) from Coronation Boulevard/Dundas Street (Regional Road 8) to 20 Metres North of Coronation Boulevard/Dundas Street (Regional Road 8);

f) Add to Schedule 24, Reserved Bus Lane, Southbound Water Street (Regional Road 24) from Coronation Boulevard/Dundas Street (Regional Road 8) to 25 Metres South of Coronation Boulevard/Dundas Street (Regional Road 8);

in the City of Cambridge, as outlined in Report TES-RTS-15-09, dated September 15, 2015.
Summary:

NIL

Report:

ION Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) construction has been completed and service began on September 7, 2015 allowing more convenient access to Cambridge’s shopping, employment and recreational facilities. ION BRT links the Ainslie Street transit terminal in Cambridge with the Fairview Park Mall transit terminal in Kitchener through a 17 kilometre route. Stops are located at the Ainslie Street transit terminal, Sportsworld Crossing, Fairview Park Mall (with a connection to ION LRT in 2017) and various locations along Hespeler Road as follows:

- Hespeler Road/Water Street at Dundas Street/Coronation Boulevard (the Delta);
- Hespeler Road at Can-Amera Parkway;
- Cambridge Centre Mall;
- Hespeler Road at Pinebush Road/Eagle Street;

ION BRT will help build transit ridership along Cambridge’s busiest corridor by providing an efficient and reliable transit option. To achieve this goal, ION BRT vehicles will take advantage of special service features such as limited stops, transit signal priority and queue jumps (to provide preference to buses at signalized intersections) along Hespeler Road, and bus bypass shoulders along Highway 401 and Highway 8.

In order to improve travel times for transit riders, queue jump lanes and a reserved transit only lane has been constructed along Hespeler Road. Queue jumps will be accommodated via right-turn only lanes at the intersections of Hespeler Road and Munch Avenue/Isherwood Avenue (northbound and southbound) as well as Hespeler Road at Pinebush Road/Eagle Street (northbound only). However, the queue jump process will involve a combination of exclusive transit signal timing, lane designation and buses excepted signage. The lane designation with buses excepted signage will officially make the lanes a right-turn only movement lane and buses will be exempted from having to make a right-turn so that they can continue with the rest of their route north or south along Hespeler Road. In addition, a traffic signal head at these locations with a vertical white bar and right-turn signal indication will advise when bus drivers and right-turning motorists in the designated right-turn lane may proceed in advance of regular traffic.

Similarly, at the intersection of Hespeler Road and Dundas Street/Coronation Boulevard a southbound transit only lane has been constructed. This reserved lane will allow exclusive phasing for transit vehicles moving southbound through the intersection. A
traffic signal head displaying a vertical white bar will advise when bus drivers can proceed through the intersection in advance of regular traffic.

To accommodate the queue jump lanes and the transit only lane, the following lane designation changes are required along Hespeler Road at the noted intersections:

- Add the second left-turn lane for the new northbound left-turn from Hespeler Road onto Eagle Street;
- Add a northbound right-turn lane on Hespeler Road at Munch Avenue/Isherwood Avenue;
- Add reserved bus lane designation on Hespeler Road southbound crossing Coronation Boulevard/Dundas Street; and
- In addition to the above, it is also recommending to remove the southbound right-turn lane designation on Hespeler Road at Dunbar Road. This change is required because the southbound curb lane was previously constructed as a shared right-turn/through lane and the traffic and Parking By-law was not updated to reflect the new configuration.

See Appendix A for illustrations.

Recognizing that these required changes are for regulatory signs, an amendment to the Regional Municipality of Waterloo Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072 is required and being recommended by staff.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

This report addresses the Region’s goal to expand the bus network (Conventional Transit) and begin to integrate it with the future Light Rail Transit System (Strategic Action 3.1.2).

**Financial Implications:**

The estimated cost to install the proposed signage inclusive of pavement marking is $2,500.00 plus HST and is included in the Council approved ION budget.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

This report was prepared with input from Transportation and Environmental Services.

**Attachments**

Appendix A – Intersection Figures
Prepared By:  Andrew Doman, P.Eng., Project Engineer Intern, Rapid Transit

Mike Jones, C.E.T., Supervisor Traffic Engineering

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

Figure 1 – Recommended Southbound Right-turn Lane Designation Removal at Hespeler Road and Dunbar Road
Figure 2 – Recommended Lane Designation Changes at Hespeler Road/Eagle Street/Pinebush Road
Figure 3 – Recommended Lane Designation Changes at Hespeler Road and Isherwood Avenue/Munch Avenue

Figure 4 – Recommended Transit Only Lanes on Hespeler Road at Dundas
Street/Coronation Boulevard
Region of Waterloo
Corporate Resources
Legal Services

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

Date: September 15, 2015    File Code: L07-90

Subject: Surplus declaration and conveyance of easement interest in favour of Cambridge and North Dumfries Hydro Inc. - Preston Waste Water Treatment Plant, 395 Montrose Street South, Cambridge

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo:

a) declare an easement interest in the lands described as Part Lot 230, Plan 716, part of PIN 03861-0119 and Part Lot 241, Plan 716, part of PINs 03774-0350 and 03774-0351, as shown as Parts 1, 2 and 3, on attached draft Reference Plan, in the City of Cambridge surplus to the needs of the Region, as detailed in Report No. PDL-LEG-15-63 dated September 15, 2015, and provide the standard public notification as required by the Region’s property disposition by-law; and

b) approve, enter into an Agreement for, and execute all documentation related to, the conveyance of a permanent easement to Cambridge and North Dumfries Hydro Inc., for the sum of $1.00, for the installation and maintenance of hydro equipment on, over and under the lands described as Part Lot 230, Plan 716, part of PIN 03861-0119 and Part Lot 241, Plan 716, part of PINs 03774-0350 and 03774-0351, as shown as Parts 1, 2 and 3, on attached draft Reference Plan, in the City of Cambridge as detailed in Report No. PDL-LEG-15-63 dated September 15, 2015 pursuant to the Region’s property disposition by-law and the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor.

Summary: NIL

Report:

Water Services staff advise that the driveway entrance at the Preston Wastewater Treatment Plant (“WWTP”), located at 395 Montrose Street South, is scheduled to be widened under contract T2015-124 – Preston WWTP Odour Control Upgrades. The
driveway widening is required to improve vehicle access to the site. The 23.5 metre driveway widening will necessitate the relocation of the existing hydro poles and guy wires and Cambridge North Dumfries Hydro Inc. (“Cambridge Hydro”) requires a permanent easement for their relocated utilities, plant and equipment on WWTP lands. The total easement area will be approximately 1,315.39 square feet. The permanent easement will give Cambridge Hydro the right to enter on the easement area to construct, install, operate, maintain, repair and replace all of their underground and/or overhead lines, pipes, conduits and all necessary poles, supporting wires and braces and related equipment. The Region cannot erect any buildings or structures or otherwise obstruct access to the easement area. Water Services staff has no concern with this requirement as the subject lands are not required for any Regional purpose. Cambridge Hydro will be responsible to restore the easement area to the same condition, as nearly as possible, as they were at the time any of their work is commenced on the lands.

The Region’s property disposition by-law requires advertising of any proposed conveyance of an interest in Regional land in a local newspaper. When the requirements of the Region’s property disposition by-law have been met, the subject easement will be conveyed to Cambridge Hydro. The Region will be responsible for the associated costs of the easement such as preparation of the Reference Plan, advertising and registration of all documentation.

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

Corporate Strategic Plan:

This project meets the 2011-2014 Corporate Strategic Plan Objective to protect the quality and quantity of our water sources under Strategic Focus Area 1 Protect and Enhance the Environment.

Financial Implications:

Water Services staff advise that the Region of Waterloo’s approved 2015 Ten Year Capital Forecast includes a total budget of $1,900,000 for the Cambridge Infrastructure Upgrades Project (Project # 08308) in 2015; funded by the Wastewater Reserve Fund (73.7%) and the Development Charges Reserve Fund (26.3%). The Cambridge Infrastructure Upgrades Project includes sufficient funding for the associated costs for this transaction, which are estimated to be approximately $2,000.00.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Water Services staff have been consulted in the preparation of this Report.

Attachments

Appendix “A” – Sketch of Subject Lands

Prepared By: Joan Moore, Property Agent

Approved By: Debra Arnold, Regional Solicitor, Director of Legal Services
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Region of Waterloo
Planning, Development and Legislative Services
Community Planning

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

Date: September 15, 2015   File Code: D18-01


Recommendation:


Summary:

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

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

Report:

City of Cambridge

Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-12102

Draft Approval Date: December 20, 2012

Phase: Phase 6

Applicant: Deerfield Homes Limited

Location: 750 Lawrence Street

Proposal: To permit the development of 12 townhouse condominium units
Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-12102

Regional Processing Fee: Paid May 5, 2015
Commissioner’s Release: July 16, 2015

Official Plan Amendment Number 1

Applicant: AMA Investments Inc. and Benninger Holdings Inc.
Location: 245 Riverbank Drive
Proposal: To re-designate the Creekside lands from Future Urban Reserve with Drive and Putt Special District to Employment Corridor with site-specific policy to allow additional ancillary commercial uses including the sales, repair and service of motor and recreational vehicles and Natural Open Space System.

The approval of OPA 1 as proposed and modified would resolve Deferral No. 9 to the City of Cambridge Official Plan as referenced in the Region’s Notice of Decision dated November 30, 2012.

The lands subject to OPA 1 and Deferral No. 9 are designated “Urban Area” and “Urban Designated Greenfield Area” in the Regional Official Plan (ROP). These ROP designations permit the full range of urban uses, including industrial business park uses.

Regional Processing Fee: Paid at time of 2012 original application.
Commissioner’s Approval: July 21, 2015
Came Into Effect: August 11, 2015

Official Plan Amendment Number 8

Applicant: CAM K Holdings Inc.
Location: 6 Jaffray Street
Proposal: The purpose of OPA No. 8 is to redesignate the subject property from Low/Medium Density Residential to Class 4 (Hespeler Road) Commercial with site specific policies to allow for the redevelopment of the site as a mixed use or for non-residential uses with a minimum building height of two storeys.
Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-12102
Commissioner’s Approval: July 20, 2015
Regional Processing Fee: Paid July 28, 2015
Came Into Effect: August 18, 2015

City of Kitchener

Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-15201
Draft Approval Date: July 13, 2015
Phase: Phase 1
Applicant: 2280644 Ontario Inc.
Location: 70 Willowrun Drive
Proposal: To permit the development of 14 townhouse condominium units.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid July 13, 2015
Commissioner’s Release: July 9, 2015

Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-12204
Draft Approval Date: November 23, 2012
Phase: Phase 4
Applicant: Deerfield Homes Ltd.
Location: Isaiah Drive, Eliza Avenue and Nyles Drive
Proposal: To permit the development of 11 street-fronting townhouse condominium units.
Regional Processing Fee: Paid July 21, 2015
Commissioner’s Release: July 21, 2015

Township of Wilmot

Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-14601
Draft Approval Date: December 2, 2014
Phase: Phase 2 (Final)
Applicant: Will-O Homes
Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-14601

Location: 192-208 Brewery Street, Baden

Proposal: To permit the development of 17 townhouse condominium units.

Regional Processing Fee: Paid December 22, 2014

Commissioner’s Release: July 17, 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: September 15, 2015  File Code: D12-40

Subject: Amendment of Terms of Reference of the Kissing Bridge Trailway Advisory Board and Authorization to Sign Agreements with Kissing Bridge Trailway Steward Groups

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, in concert with the Corporation of the County of Wellington, take the following actions with respect to the Kissing Bridge Trailway, as described in Report No. PDL-CPL-15-44, dated September 15, 2015:

a) Amend sub-section 2.1(c) of the Terms of Reference to delete the reference to the Village of Millbank Association, as requested by this group, and add two representatives of the Guelph Trail Club, one for each segment of the Trailway stewarded by the Guelph Trail Club, and make other editorial amendments as shown in Attachment 1; and

b) Authorize the Commissioner of Planning, Development, and Legislative Services to execute agreements to the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor with the following Kissing Bridge Trailway Steward Groups to outline the roles and responsibilities of each Trailway Steward Group for its respective segment of the Kissing Bridge Trailway, as well as role and responsibilities of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo and the Corporation County of Wellington:

- Guelph Trail Club,
- The Lions Club of Elmira
- Linwood & District Lions Club,
- Golden Triangle Snowmobile Association.
Summary:

The Regional Municipality of Waterloo and The Corporation of the County of Wellington jointly leased the 44.5 kilometre abandoned railway right-of-way between Guelph and Millbank from the Province in 1997 to pave the way for the development of the Kissing Bridge Trailway. The original lease was for a term of 15 years, with renewals every five years. At each renewal, the municipalities signed a series of agreements, known as Trailway Steward Group agreements, with five community groups each of which took on the responsibility for developing and stewarding specified segments of the Trailway. This was carried out under the auspices of the Kissing Bridge Trailway Advisory Board established by the County and Region with the approval of Terms of Reference in 1998.

Recently, the Village of Millbank Association has requested to relinquish its segment at the western end of the Trailway. The Guelph Trail Club has agreed to assume that segment of the Trailway in addition to its segment between Guelph and the Grand River that it has developed and stewarded since 1998. It is accordingly recommended that the Terms of Reference in Attachment 1 be amended to reflect this change. The Guelph Trail Club will have two members on the Board to ensure that each of its widely-separated segments is represented at Board discussions, but only the principal representative of this Steward Group shall be a voting member and the Terms of Reference in Attachment 1 shall be amended accordingly to reflect this voting structure.

The Trailway Steward Group agreements stipulate the responsibilities of each group as well as those of the Region and the County of Wellington. When Council authorized renewal of the lease in 2002 and 2007, the execution of new agreements with the respective Trailway Steward Groups was also approved. The original 15 year lease was further extended as of September 1, 2012, and will expire on August 31, 2017 pursuant to a Lease Extension and Amending Agreement dated June 25, 2012.

As Community Planning staff worked with the Trailway Steward Groups after 2012 to prepare the next series of Trailway Steward Group agreements, it became apparent that some changes would be required. One group relinquished its section of the Trailway in 2014, and part of its segment was assigned to The Lions Club of Elmira and part to a new steward group, the West Montrose Residents’ Association Inc. The Trailway Advisory Board Terms of Reference were amended and authorization was given to execute a Trailway Steward Group agreement with the Association (PDL-CPL-15-02, dated January 13, 2015). More recently, as noted above, the Guelph Trail Club assumed an additional Trailway segment in Millbank. As Legal Services staff prepared the revised agreements for execution, it became apparent that there was no specific Council authorization for the execution of the agreements. Accordingly, staff now recommend that Council authorize the Regional Chair and Regional Clerk to execute Trailway Steward Group agreements with the Guelph Trail Club, The Lions Club of Elmira, Linwood & District Lions Club, and Golden Triangle Snowmobile Association.
Report:

The Region of Waterloo and County of Wellington jointly leased the 44.5 kilometre abandoned rail right-of-way between Guelph and Millbank from the Province in 1997 to pave the way for the development of the Kissing Bridge Trailway. Shortly thereafter, the municipalities signed a series of agreements with five community groups each of which took on development and stewardship of specified segments of the Trailway.

Stewardship of the Trailway has been carried out under the auspices of the Kissing Bridge Trailway Advisory Board which was established by the County and Region with the approval of Terms of Reference in 1998. The Trailway Steward Groups are all represented on the Board. The Terms of Reference were amended in 2009 with the addition of the Village of Millbank Association, and again in January 2015 when the Conestogo-Winterbourne Optimist Club was replaced by the West Montrose Residents’ Association Inc. Recently, the Village of Millbank Association has requested to relinquish its segment of the Trailway between Perth County Roads 116 and 121 at the western end of the Trailway. The Guelph Trail Club has agreed to assume that segment of the Trailway in addition to the segment between Guelph and the Grand River that it has developed and stewarded since the inception of the Trailway in 1998. It is accordingly recommended that the Terms of Reference in Attachment 1 be amended to reflect this change. The Guelph Trail Club will have two members on the Board to ensure that each of its widely-separated segments is represented at Board discussions, but only the principal representative of this Steward Group shall be a voting member and the Terms of Reference in Attachment 1 shall be amended accordingly to reflect this voting structure.

The Trailway Steward Group agreements stipulate the responsibilities of each group as well as those of the Region and the County of Wellington. When Council approved the extension of the lease in 2002 and 2007, it also authorized the execution of new agreements with the respective Trailway Steward Groups. When the Village of Millbank Association became a Trailway Steward Group in 2009, an additional agreement was subsequently signed.

The original 15 year lease (1997-2012), with renewals at five-year intervals, had to be extended in 2012. At that time, the Province was only prepared to extend the lease for a further five years, and specified that all future extensions would only be for five years at a time. As result, the original 15 year lease was further extended as of September 1, 2012 and will expire on August 31, 2017 pursuant to a Lease Extension and Amending Agreement dated June 25, 2012.

As Community Planning staff worked with the Trailway Steward Groups after 2012 to prepare the next series of agreements, it became apparent that some changes would be required as responsibility for the respective Trailway segments underwent some change. When the West Montrose Residents’ Association was added as a new steward group in
January 2015, authorization was given to execute a Trailway Steward Group agreement with the Association (PDL-CPL-15-02, dated January 13, 2015). As Legal Services staff prepared the revised agreements for execution, it became apparent that there was no Council authorization for the Regional Chair and Regional Clerk to sign the other four agreements. Accordingly, staff now recommend that Council authorize the Regional Chair and Regional Clerk to execute the Trailway Steward Group agreements with the Guelph Trail Club, the Lions Club of Elmira, Linwood & District Lions Club and the Golden Triangle Snowmobile Association.

**Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination**

The Trails Co-ordinator for the Township of Woolwich usually attends the meetings of the Kissing Bridge Trailway Advisory Board in addition to Regional and Wellington staff. Regional Councillor Sandy Shantz, Mayor of Woolwich is the Region’s appointee to the Board.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

Strategic Objective 3.2 of the Region of Waterloo's Strategic Focus 2011-2014 speaks to developing active forms of transportation, and specifically to work with community stakeholders to develop an integrated and safe network of regional, local, and off-road cycling routes. The Kissing Bridge Trailway provides 44.5 kilometres of readily accessible walking and cycling trail through Woolwich and Wellesley Townships as well as Centre Wellington and Perth East Townships. The Trailway has been identified as a major bicycle route in the Regional Cycling Master Plan and as the key cycling “spine” through RTO4 (Regional Tourism Organization 4).

**Financial Implications:**

Nil.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Legal Services staff has assisted with the preparation of this report and are working with Community Planning staff to prepare the Trailway Steward Group agreements.

**Attachments:**

Attachment 1 – Kissing Bridge Trailway Advisory Board Terms of Reference

**Prepared By:** Chris Gosselin, Manager of Environmental Planning and Stewardship

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

KISSING BRIDGE TRAILWAY

Trailway Advisory Board

1. Terms of Reference

1.1 As a representative of the various stakeholders in the Trailway - local residents, Trailway Steward groups, the business community, and the County of Wellington and Regional Municipality of Waterloo - the Trailway Advisory Board will provide ongoing supervision of the Trailway, and coordinate the work of the various Trailway Steward groups having regard to the report presented to County and Regional Councils in 1997.

1.2 The Trailway Advisory Board is an advisory board to the County and Regional Councils and will provide the ongoing liaison between the Councils, the Trailway Steward Groups and local residents. It will strive to ensure that the interests of the various stakeholders are appropriately addressed, and seek to balance potentially competing interests.

1.3 Staff will address concerns, complaints, and suggestions from local residents and Trailway users, and, where appropriate, refer them to the Trailway Advisory Board for further discussion. Where issues cannot be satisfactorily resolved, the Board will request County and Regional staff to refer the matter to County and Regional Councils for resolution.

1.4 The Trailway Advisory Board will consult with stakeholder groups to determine standards for fencing, signage, parking facilities, other capital improvements, and ongoing maintenance.

1.5 The Trailway Advisory Board will receive, evaluate, and prioritize requests for fencing according to the following priorities:

Priority 1

a. Adjacent property used for livestock, or potentially hazardous activities;
b. Areas experiencing recurrent problems with trespass and vandalism;
c. Residences and barns located in proximity to the Trailway;

Priority 2

d. Commercial and recreational establishments adjacent to the Trailway;
e. Agricultural cropland; and
f. Other areas deemed appropriate by the Trailway Advisory Board.
1.6 The Trailway Advisory Board will make recommendations to the Councils through their respective planning committees concerning such matters as policy issues, issues which have significant Regional or County implications, the expenditure of contributions to a tax creditable Trailway Fund (which will be jointly administered by the County and Region), and any matters that may be referred to the Trailway Advisory Board by either Council.

1.7 The Trailway Advisory Board will participate in fund-raising for capital improvements and other ongoing expenses.

1.8 The Trailway Advisory Board will prepare an annual report to the Councils of the County of Wellington and Regional Municipality of Waterloo on its activities, initiatives, and proposals for the coming year.

2. Membership

2.1 The Trailway Advisory Board will consist of the following voting members:

   a) One local farm landowner to represent each local municipality in which the Trailway is located (i.e., the Townships of Guelph/Eramosa, Mapleton, Woolwich, and Wellesley), to be nominated by the respective Federation of Agriculture (if for any reason no representative is available, a farm landowner from another municipality may be nominated) [Total 4 voting members];

   b) Three representative local non-farming landowners from any of the municipalities in which the Trailway is located, to be selected from applicants responding to public advertisements [Total 3 voting members];

   c) One representative nominated by the following Trailway Steward groups:

      West Montrose Residents’ Association Inc. [1 voting member]
      The Lions Club of Elmira [1 voting member]
      Linwood & District Lions Club [1 voting member]
      Golden Triangle Snowmobile Club [1 voting member]

      Two representatives nominated by the Guelph Trail Club, one for each Trailway segment it stewards, but only the principal representative designated by the Club shall be a voting member, and the other shall be a non-voting member. [1 voting member, 1 non-voting member]

      (Alternates may be designated by each group to attend when the principal representative is unavailable. For clarity, any non-voting member cannot have an alternate designated for it.)

      [Total for all Trailway Steward groups: 5 voting members, 1 non-voting member, and 5 Alternatives];

   d) One nominee of the local Chambers of Commerce or Business Associations in
communities along the Trailway, on a rotating basis, or failing nomination, a member of the business community who applies to serve [Total 1 voting member];

e) One person appointed by the Council of the County of Wellington [Total 1 voting member]; and

f) One person appointed by the Council of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo [Total 1 voting member].

2.2 In the event the County of Perth or the Township of Perth East elects to participate in the Trailway at a future date, the membership shall be increased to include one voting local farm landowner and one voting appointee of the respective Council.

2.3 All members of the Trailway Advisory Board shall be jointly appointed by the Councils of the County of Wellington and the Regional Municipality of Waterloo.

2.4 The members of the Board shall be appointed for three year terms. The two Council appointees will be appointed by their respective Councils for a four-year term coinciding with the term of Council.

2.5 A member of the Board may be reappointed for a subsequent term at the conclusion of the initial term.

3. Operation of the Committee

3.1 The Chair and Vice-Chair of the Trailway Advisory Board will be elected from among the voting members at the Board’s first meeting of each calendar year. The Chair should be able to devote some time between meetings to working informally with Trailway Steward Groups, County and Regional staff, and to attending meetings of the County and Regional Planning Committees when circumstances warrant.

3.2 The quorum for a meeting shall be half the total voting membership of the Board.

3.3 Meetings of the Trailway Advisory Board will be held at least twice a year. Meetings may also be held at the call of the Chair to consider urgent matters.

3.4 When an issue must be resolved expeditiously and it is not feasible to convene a quorum, draft motions or resolutions may be circulated to all voting members of the Board. If a majority of be resolutions are signed and returned to the Chair, the motion shall be considered adopted.

3.5 Any member missing three consecutive meetings without a valid reason will be replaced at the earliest opportunity.

3.6 Meetings will normally be open to the public. In camera discussions will only be held in compliance with the County and Regional Procedural By-laws.

3.7 Members may from time to time be requested to serve on a sub-committee to investigate particular issues.
3.8 The Trailway Advisory Board will advise Trailway Steward groups, adjoining residents, or County and Regional Councils on matters referred to them.

3.9 The Trailway Advisory Board will discuss and resolve issues identified by local residents, Trailway Steward Groups, Trailway users, or County and Regional staff. Where issues cannot be satisfactorily resolved, the Board may request County and Regional staff to refer the matter to County and Regional Councils for resolution. Subject to the terms of the leasing arrangements, the final decision in such cases will rest jointly with County and Regional Councils.

3.10 The Board shall engage volunteers from the community to prepare agendas, minutes, and correspondence. If necessary, staff support to perform these functions may be provided by the County of Wellington and/or Regional Municipality of Waterloo on an interim basis.

3.11 Staff support will be provided by the County of Wellington and the Regional Municipality of Waterloo to collect and disburse moneys other than those contributed directly to Trailway Steward Groups, and to provide other advice.

3.12 The Trailway Advisory Board may, from time to time, invite other persons to address the Board and participate in discussions on subjects before the Board or to be briefed on Trail-related initiatives by other agencies or organizations.

3.13 The Trailway Advisory Board may review these Terms of Reference from time to time as required. With support from two-thirds of the voting members, the Board may request County and Regional Councils to make necessary amendments thereto.

3.14 The Trailway Advisory Board shall report to the County and Regional Councils on a regular basis.

4.0 Conflict of Interest Policy

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

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

Approved by Regional Council, April 29, 1998
Amended by Regional Council, August 19, 2009
Amended by Regional Council, January 21, 2015
Region of Waterloo
Planning, Development and Legislative Services
Community Planning

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

Date: September 15, 2015 File Code: D12-40/KBT/ANN RPT

Subject: Seventeenth Annual Report of the Kissing Bridge Trailway Advisory Committee for 2014

Recommendation:
For information.

Summary:
When the County of Wellington and Regional Municipality of Waterloo jointly created the Kissing Bridge Trailway Advisory Board in May 1998, the Terms of Reference required the Board to report to both Councils each year on its activities. The Board adopted the attached report as its Seventeenth Annual Report for the year 2014 (Attachment 1) at its May 7, 2015 meeting.

Some notable highlights from 2014 include:

- The Conestogo-Winterbourne Optimist Club decided to relinquish stewardship of the Trailway segment from Elmira to the Grand River which they had developed and maintained since 1998. The Lions Club of Elmira extended its segment from the eastern edge of Elmira to Northfield Drive. A new Trailway Steward Group, the West Montrose Residents’ Association Inc. (BridgeKeepers), took over stewardship of the segment from Northfield Drive to the Grand River.
- A bridge was installed across a tributary creek of the Nith River just east of the village of Millbank. This is the last of the smaller bridges on the Trailway to be replaced. It will help to move pedestrian and cyclist traffic off local roads and facilitate access to the Guelph to Goderich (G2G) Rail Trail to Goderich as it becomes operational in 2015.
• **Spring on the Trail** was held for the fourth year with organized activities occurring at various locations along the trailway. Spring on the Trail is intended to promote activities along the length of the trail and to help to raise the local profile of the Trailway.

• For the second year, the Steaming Nostril Cycling Race was a success with over 300 competitors participating on an ice-packed section of the Trailway and muddy rural roads. The event was well received by participants and the community and it is expected that it will continue to grow in future years.

• Several ice- and windstorms in 2014 resulted in many trees and shrubs being broken and damaged along the entire length of the Trailway. All steward groups undertook clean-up and pruning of damaged trees and shrubs to ensure user safety and maintain the aesthetic qualities of the Trailway.

• Regional and County staff have addressed significant encroachments by neighbouring landowners onto the Trailway right-of-way in the Ariss and Elmira areas. The Board and staff are working with the Trailway Steward Groups and landowners to find effective solutions to maintain the Trailway in a safe and attractive state consistent with the terms of the Lease from the Province.

**Report:**

When the County of Wellington and Regional Municipality of Waterloo jointly created the Kissing Bridge Trailway Advisory Board in May 1998, the Terms of Reference required the Board to report to both Councils each year on its activities. The Board adopted the attached report as its Seventeenth Annual Report for the year 2014 (Attachment 1) at its May 7, 2015 meeting.

The Kissing Bridge Trailway runs through parts of the County of Wellington and the Region of Waterloo from Guelph to the village of Millbank. The Trailway Advisory Board met three times in 2014. For the most part, the meetings focused on activities involving development of infrastructure, promotion of trail use, and maintenance required to ensure that Trailway users are provided with a safe and enjoyable experience.

Mike Curtis, representative of the Guelph Hiking Trail Club was re-elected Chair of the Advisory Board for 2014 and Doug Cerson, a community business representative, was elected as Vice-chair.

Included in the business conducted by the Advisory Board and the Stewardship Groups during 2014, were the following:

**New Steward Group and Section Realignment** - After developing and stewarding the segment of the Trailway from the eastern edge of Elmira to the Grand River since 1998, the Conestogo-Winterbourne Optimist Club decided to relinquish stewardship segment. The Lions Club of Elmira agreed to extend is section eastward as far as Northfield.
Drive. A new Trailway Steward Group, the West Montrose Residents’ Association Inc. known as the BridgeKeepers, volunteered to serve as the new Trailway Steward Group of the segment from Northfield Drive to the Grand River.

**Installation of Millbank Bridge** – In the fall of 2014, a bridge was installed across the tributary creek to the Nith River on the east side of the village of Millbank. This is the last of the smaller bridge replacements on the Trailway, and was the result of several years of planning and fundraising activities. This new bridge will divert pedestrian and cyclist traffic off local roads and facilitate access to the Guelph to Goderich (G2G) Rail Trail running west from Millbank to Goderich as it becomes operational in 2015.

**Spring on the Trail** - This annual event was held for the fourth year in 2014 with organized activities occurring at various locations along the trailway. Spring on the Trail is intended to promote activities along the length of the trail and to help to raise the local profile of the Trailway. The priority for the event is to raise funds for the two major bridges required across the Conestogo River (near Wallenstein) and the Grand River (near West Montrose).

**Steaming Nostrils Cycling Race** - For the second year, the Steaming Nostril Race was a success with more than 300 competitors participating. The event was well received by participants and the community and it is expected that it will continue to grow in future years.

**Trans Canada Trail** - A major gap in the Kissing Bridge Trailway continues to be the Grand River near West Montrose in Woolwich Township. The missing bridge results in a significant detour for trail users travelling between Guelph and Elmira and has been identified as a major gap in the Trans Canada Trail in Southern Ontario. Regional Transportation and Environmental Services staff are providing technical advice on potential design solutions which address the configuration of the century-old abutments and piers which remain from the original bridge.

**Trail Maintenance and Enhancement** - Several ice- and windstorms in late 2013 and 2014 resulted in significant damage to many trees and shrubs along the entire length of the Trailway. All steward groups were kept busy removing or pruning damaged trees to maintain user safety and the overall aesthetic qualities of the trail.

Trailway Encroachment - Regional and County staff have addressed significant encroachments by neighbouring landowners onto the Trailway right-of-way in the Ariss and Elmira areas. The Board and staff are working with the Trailway Steward Groups and landowners to find effective solutions to maintain the Trailway in a safe and attractive state consistent with the terms of the Lease from the Province.
Activities Planned for 2015

During 2015, Trail Condition Reports will be completed by each of the steward groups. Trailway inspections cover all aspects of the Trailway infrastructure including trail surface, bridges, gates, signage, fencing and vegetation.

Due to significant encroachments, parts of the Trailway east of Elmira will have to be surveyed and marked clearly in order to delineate the Trailway right-of-way. Ongoing discussions with the landowners, responsible Trailway Steward Groups, and Regional staff are expected to help define required farm crossings and determine how best to maintain the lands within the right-of-way in this location.

Also during 2015, the Trailway Advisory Board plans to continue its participation in Guelph to Goderich Rail Trail effort by having one or two representatives sit on the G2G advisory group. This participation will enable the linkage and cooperative functioning across all sections of what promises to become one of the major off-road trail systems in southwestern Ontario.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

Staff liaise with the Townships of Wellesley and Woolwich staff as required. The Township of Woolwich trails coordinator attends Trailway Advisory Board meetings on a regular basis, and the Mayor of Woolwich is the Regional representative on the Board. A copy of this report will be circulated to Wilmot and Wellesley Township staff.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

The Kissing Bridge Trailway is helping to achieve Action 3.2.1 of the Region of Waterloo's Strategic Focus 2011-2014 which speaks to working with Area Municipalities and other stakeholders “to develop an integrated and safe network of regional, local and off-road cycling and walking routes.” The Trailway has been identified as a major bicycle route in the Regional Cycling Master Plan. In addition to coordinating with trails in Woolwich and Wellesley Townships, the Kissing Bridge Trailway is a collaboration with six community groups, the County of Wellington, the Ontario Realty Corporation, the Trans Canada Trail Foundation and the Ontario Trails Foundation.

Financial Implications:

There is no Regional Budget allocation to the development and operation of the Kissing Bridge Trailway. The Region provides in-kind staff support to the Kissing Bridge Trailway Advisory Board. The survey of the lands affected by encroachments east of Elmira was paid from funds within the approved Planning, Development, and Legislative Services budget.
Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Structural engineers in the Transportation and Environmental Services Department provide invaluable technical advice on bridges along the Trailway. Legal Services also advises on legal matters pertaining to the operation of the Trailway, renewing the Trailway Steward Group agreements, and dealing with encroachments. Finance staff has sent municipal receipts to those who made donations to the Spring on the Trailway event and manage the accounts of the Trailway.

Attachments:

Attachment 1 - Seventeenth Annual Report of the Kissing Bridge Trailway Advisory Board for the Year 2014 (Docs 1862284)

Prepared By: Albert Hovingh, Principal Planner, Environmental and Stewardship

Approved By: Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Development and Legislative Services
Seventeenth Annual Report
of the Kissing Bridge Trailway Advisory Board
for the Year 2014

Submitted to the Councils of

The County of Wellington
and
The Regional Municipality of Waterloo

Spring 2015
Introduction

In September 1997, the County of Wellington and Region of Waterloo jointly leased a 44.5 kilometre stretch of abandoned rail right-of-way from the Province for development as a multi-use recreational trail between the outskirts of the City of Guelph and the Village of Millbank. During the winter and spring of 1998, the County and Region concluded Trailway Steward agreements with five community groups to develop and operate sections of the Trailway.

In May 1998, the County and Region jointly approved Terms of Reference for the Trailway Advisory Board, and appointed fifteen persons and four alternate representatives to the Board. Section 1.8 of the Terms of Reference states that the Board “will prepare an annual report to the Councils of the County of Wellington and Regional Municipality of Waterloo on its activities, initiatives, and proposals for the coming year.” The seventeenth annual report covers the year 2014.

In 2009, the Village of Millbank Association signed a co-stewardship agreement with the Golden Triangle Snowmobile Association and the County and Region to become steward of the segment between the Perth Waterloo boundary (Perth Road 116) and Perth Road 121 in Millbank. The Association now has a representative and alternate on the Board like the other Trailway Steward Groups.

In 2014, the Conestogo-Winterbourne Optimist regretfully relinquished stewardship of...
their Trailway segment from Elmira to the Grand River due to diminished manpower to ensure trail maintenance and board contribution. The West Montrose Residents’ Association Inc., known as the BridgeKeepers, agreed to take on the stewardship of the segment west of the Grand River and up to Northfield Drive. At the same time, the Elmira Lions Club agreed to extend their section from the east limit of Elmira to Northfield Drive.

The current steward groups and their respective segments are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Trailway Steward Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guelph to Grand River</td>
<td>→ Guelph Hiking Trail Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand River to Northfield Drive</td>
<td>→ Bridgekeepers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northfield Drive to Wallenstein</td>
<td>→ Lions Club of Elmira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallenstein to Linwood (Ament Line)</td>
<td>→ Linwood Lions Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linwood to Perth Road 116</td>
<td>→ Golden Triangle Snowmobile Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth Road 116 to Perth Road 121</td>
<td>→ Village of Millbank Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During 2014 the steward groups carried out a range of activities including routine trail maintenance, completion of the information kiosk in Linwood and generally improving the overall appearance of the Trailway. The Spring on the Trail Event was held for the fourth year and has been successful in promoting the Trailway and raising funds for the trail. These activities have had a positive impact on the profile and use of the trail, particularly among local residents.

**Trailway Advisory Board Activities**

The Trailway Advisory Board met three times in 2014. For the most part, the meetings focused on activities involving development of infrastructure, promotion of trail use and maintenance required to ensure that trail users are provided with a safe and enjoyable experience.

Mike Curtis, representative of the Guelph Hiking Trail Club was re-elected Chair of the Advisory Board for 2014 and Doug Cerson, a community business representative, was elected as vice-chair.

**New Steward Group and Section Realignment**

During the past few years, the Conestogo-Winterbourne Optimists group was finding it ever more difficult to keep up with the maintenance activities required on their section of
the Trailway from the eastern edge of Elmira to the Grand River due to declining numbers of volunteers. At the same time, the West Montrose Residents’ Association Inc. known as the BridgeKeepers, expressed an interest in developing a closer working relationship with the Trailway. After lengthy discussions, the Optimist Club decided to terminate their stewardship of the segment. The BridgeKeepers subsequently agreed to take over stewardship activities of the Trailway section from the west bank of the Grand River to Northfield Drive. The remainder of the former section from Northfield Drive to the eastern limits of Elmira was added to the Elmira Lions Club stewardship agreement as a natural extension of the section.

**Installation of Millbank Bridge**

After several years of planning and fundraising activities, a bridge was installed across the tributary creek of the Nith River located east of the village of Millbank. The bridge was manufactured by Iron Bridge Fabrication in Brunner, Ontario and is sufficient to support a snowmobile trail groomer, should it ever be decided to re-route the Golden Triangle Snowmobile trails into Millbank. It is anticipated that this new bridge will help to move pedestrian and cyclist traffic off local roads and facilitate access on to the G2G trail section toward Goderich as it becomes operational in 2015.

---

**You Are Invited!**

Bring your family, friends and any outdoor enthusiast! Building Bridges | Connecting Communities

After many hours of planning, fundraising and hard work the Kissling Bridge Trailway will be officially "Bridged" into Perth County at Millbank, Ontario!

**Bike, Hike, Run or Walk the Trail!**

Join us for the "Ribbon Cutting" starting in Anna Mae’s Parking lot where we will gather to celebrate the installation of the new Trailway Bridge.

Join us on **SATURDAY October 11th**

**11:30 AM**

---

Invitation to opening of new Millbank Bridge showing view to east after installation
Spring on the Trail

In 2010, a proposal was put forward by Doug Cerson, the business community representative, to organize an annual trail event. A subcommittee was formed to explore possibilities for such an event. The resulting event has become known as Spring on the Trail and is intended to promote activities along the length of the trail and to help to raise the local profile of the Trailway. The priority for the event is to raise funds for the two major bridges required across the Conestogo River (near Wallenstein) and the Grand River (near West Montrose).

Spring on the Trail gains momentum each year and as a result people are starting to recognize the Kissing Bridge Trailway, but it requires participation by all stakeholders. Money is being raised from the general public and is helping to make improvement to the Trail. Currently plans are underway to develop an online system for making contributions to Kissing Bridge Trailway. The Regional Tourism Organization from Zone 4 (RTO4) is providing assistance in this endeavour along with the County of Wellington and the Region of Waterloo. In addition, Spring on the Trail has resulted in participation and interest from other community groups who want to make the event a success in their respective communities. Local steward groups are considering identifying “local heroes” who contribute to the further development of the Trailway in their community or elsewhere.

Steaming Nostrils Cycling Race

For the second year, the Steaming Nostril Race was a success with more than 300 competitors. The trail was snow covered and groomed by Jeff Mitchell Property Management several days prior to event resulting in a hard-packed icy surface that held up well. The event was well received by participants and the community and it is expected that it will continue to grow in future years.

Trans Canada Trail

A major gap in the Kissing Bridge Trailway continues to be the Grand River near West Montrose in Woolwich Township. The missing bridge results in a significant detour for trail users travelling between Guelph and Elmira and has been identified as a major gap in the Trans Canada Trail in Southern Ontario. Regional Transportation and Environmental Services staff are providing technical advice on potential design solutions which address the configuration of the century-old abutments and piers which remain from the original bridge.
Trail Maintenance and Enhancement

Several ice- and windstorms in late 2013 and 2014 resulted in damage to many trees and shrubs along the entire length of the Trailway. All steward groups were busy with removing and pruning damaged trees to ensure that trail users could use the Trailway safely and to maintain the overall aesthetic appearance of the trail.

The Township of Woolwich Environmental Enhancement Committee’s (TWEEC) Trees for Woolwich group made a proposal to initiate a tree planting project along the Middlebrook Rd. to Grand River section. The adjacent landowner, G. Bauman, currently crops part of the right-of-way and has offered to help with preparation of the site and watering of the planted trees. The Advisory Board approved the project which is to take place early in 2015. As part of the maintenance work necessary along this section, controlling an infestation of Dog-strangling Vine (Vincetoxicum rossicum) will also be undertaken. Dog strangling vine is listed on Ontario’s Noxious Weed List and due to its proximity to agricultural fields, must be controlled. The Advisory Board will submit an application for funding to the Region of Waterloo’s Community Environmental Fund to cover the costs of herbicide and its application for a period of at least three years.

Trailway Encroachment

Over the past years there have been a number of encroachments onto the Trailway right-of-way by neighbouring landowners in the Ariss and Elmira areas. Region and County staff continue to work with the local steward groups to find effective solutions to these situations, including installation of fencing and or planting trees to clearly demarcate the boundary lines. Surveys of the property line will be undertaken where and when appropriate and necessary.
Finances and funding

The cost of developing recreational trails can be high. When the Kissing Bridge Trailway was established, it was intended that most of the cost would be borne by the community groups who are jointly developing the Trailway. To date, the majority of the funds expended on the Trailway have come from the Trailway Steward Groups or private donations. In the past three years, private donations have increased, largely in part due to the Spring on the Trail event.

The Region of Waterloo contributed $38,000 to the Kissing Bridge Trailway in 1999, and a further $20,000 in 2000. The Board has developed a formula to allocate this money among Trailway Steward Groups based on infrastructure development costs within Regional boundaries. In addition, Wellington County provided $10,000 in 2001 to assist the Guelph Hiking Trail Club install barrier gates at intersections along its section. The County provided $25,000 in each of 2004, 2005 and 2006 to grade and apply stonedust to the Trailway. The County continues to fund ongoing maintenance (mowing and weed control) in Guelph/Eramosa.

Regional and County staff provide assistance in a variety of ways to the steward groups including brochure and signage development, clerical support and technical expertise.

Activities Planned for 2015

During 2015, Trail Condition Reports will be completed by each of the steward groups. Trailway inspections cover all aspects of the Trailway infrastructure including trail surface, bridges, gates, signage, fencing and vegetation. Conducting the inspection and report regularly enables the steward groups to take the required actions in a timely fashion in order that all trail users will be able to enjoy themselves safely.

One of the necessary activities of 2015 will be the demarcation of property lines and rights-of-way where farmers are farming or pasturing onto Trailway property. Due to increased pressure by a few neighbours, parts of the Trailway will have to be surveyed and marked clearly in order to reduce encroachment onto Trailway right-of-way. Planting trees and shrubs and possibly some fence installations will help to maintain a clearly marked property line. Farm crossings (where farm equipment is permitted to cross the right-of-way to gain access to fields separated by the Trailway need to be clearly marked as a precautionary measure to inform Trailway users of the potential presence of machinery on or near the trail.

During 2015, the Trailway Advisory Board plans to continue its participation in Guelph to Goderich Rail Trail effort by having one or two representatives sit on the G2G advisory group. The representatives will bring the many years of experience in trail steward activity to new steward group representatives in Perth and Huron Counties as the
process unfolds. The participation will enable the linkage and cooperative functioning across all sections of what promises to become one of the major off-road trail systems in southwestern Ontario.

**Conclusion**

The Trailway Advisory Board anticipates that 2015 will continue as another busy year along the entire length of the Trailway. The Advisory Board is confident that the enthusiasm generated by the activities of the various steward groups will result in increased overall support for the Kissing Bridge Trailway. The Advisory Board also looks forward to the development of the G2G initiative and the realization of an approximately 124 km, off-road trail connecting a network of communities across a significant portion of the southern Ontario landscape from Goderich to Guelph.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Curtis, Chair (2014)
Trailway Advisory Board
May, 2015
Region of Waterloo
Planning, Development and Legislative Services
Community Planning

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: September 15, 2015
File Code: T 15-40/58, Mattamy Homes

Subject: Amendment to Regional Municipality of Waterloo Controlled Access By-Law #58-87 for Access to Regional Road #58 (Fischer-Hallman Road), City of Kitchener

Recommendation:
That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo Controlled Access By-law #58-87 be amended to include a permanent emergency access on the west side of Regional Road #58 (Fischer-Hallman Road) approximately 240 metres north of the Seabrook Drive/Fischer-Hallman Road roundabout, in the City of Kitchener as described in Report No. PDL-CPL-15-46, dated September 15, 2015.

Summary:
Tru-Villa Incorporated is developing a 180-unit cluster multiple dwelling townhouse development at 220 Apple Hill Crescent on the northwest corner of the intersection of Regional Road #58 (Fischer-Hallman Road) and Seabrook Drive (please see Attachment A). The proposed development falls within the Trillium Community Subdivision. The site plan application SP 15/013/A/GS for the proposed multiple dwelling has been approved in principle by the City of Kitchener. Construction is expected to start in October 2015.

The multiple dwelling development would be accessed through Apple Hill Crescent branching off from Seabrook Drive on the west side of Fischer-Hallman Road. In order to comply with the City of Kitchener emergency service policy requirements, a permanent emergency access to Fischer-Hallman Road approximately 240 metres north of Seabrook Drive is required to accommodate the proposed development (please see Attachment B). The permanent access would be used by emergency vehicles only
and would be maintained and secured with a gate on the developers’ lands.

City of Kitchener Planning staff and the developer support the location of the proposed permanent emergency access from Fischer-Hallman Road.

Fischer-Hallman Road is designated as a Controlled Access-Prohibited Road from Regional Road #4 (Ottawa Street) to Regional Road #12 (New Dundee Road) under the Region’s Controlled Access By-Law #58-87. An amendment to this By-Law is required prior to the issuance of an Access Permit by Regional staff for the permanent emergency access.

Report:

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

Tru-Villa Incorporated is developing a 180-unit cluster multiple dwelling townhouse development at 220 Apple Hill Crescent on the northwest corner of the intersection of Regional Road #58 (Fischer-Hallman Road) and Seabrook Drive (please see Attachment A). The proposed development falls within the Trillium Community Subdivision. The site plan application SP 15/013/A/GS for the proposed multiple dwelling has been approved in principle by the City of Kitchener. Construction is expected to start in October 2015.

The multiple-dwelling development would be accessed through Apple Hill Crescent branching off from Seabrook Drive on the west side of Fischer-Hallman Road. In order to comply with the City of Kitchener emergency service policy requirements, a permanent emergency access to Fischer-Hallman Road approximately 240 metres north of Seabrook Drive is required to accommodate the proposed development (please see Attachment B). The permanent emergency access would be used by emergency vehicles only and would be maintained and secured with a gate on the developers’ lands.

City of Kitchener Planning staff and the developer support the location of the proposed permanent emergency access from Fischer-Hallman Road.
Fischer-Hallman Road is designated as a Controlled Access – Prohibited Road from Regional Road #4 (Ottawa Street) to Regional Road #12 (New Dundee Road) under the Region’s Controlled Access By-law #58-87. Approval of the By-law amendment to permit the permanent emergency access from Fischer-Hallman Road would be required by Regional Council prior to the issuance of an Access Permit by staff.

Staff has confirmed that the permanent emergency access meets minimum standards and recommends the approval of the proposed By-law amendment.

**Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination**

City of Kitchener Planning staff support the location of the proposed permanent emergency access from Fischer-Hallman Road.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

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

**Financial Implications:**

The developer would be responsible for the cost to construct the permanent emergency access including the installation and maintenance of a gate on the developers’ lands and any other associated works.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

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

**Attachments:**

Attachment A - Key Map showing the location of the Proposed Multiple Dwelling Development

Attachment B - Location of The Proposed Permanent Emergency Access and the proposed Amendment to Controlled Access By-law #58-87

**Prepared By:** Joginder Bhatia, Transportation Planner

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

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: September 15, 2015  File Code: D07-40(A)
Subject: Building Permit Activity – January to June 2015

Recommendation:
For information.

Summary:
This report on building permit activity in Waterloo Region covers the first half of 2015. It reflects building permit data related to new construction (as provided by the Area Municipalities) for the period of January to June 2015. A subsequent year-end report on building permit activity will be compiled in early 2016, providing a summary of 2015 with comparisons to previous years, and more detailed analysis. Based on the information provided in this report, building activity has tapered but remained strong across the Region.

Residential building permit activity across the Region in the first half of 2015 increased over the level of activity seen in the first half of 2014. Residential permits were issued for 2,069 units in the first half of 2015, up 28% from the 1,616 units in the first half of 2014. The value of these permits increased 9% to $380.9 million from $349 million. While the number of singles remained stable, an increase in the number of apartment units in the first half of the year led to a mix of 25 per cent single-detached units, 2 per cent semi-detached, 12 per cent townhouse units, and 62 per cent apartment units.

Non-residential floor space decreased nominally to 959,387 square feet from 1,089,687 square feet in the first half of 2014. The value of non-residential permits issued in the first half of 2015 decreased 41% to $168.5 million from $287 million in the same period in 2014. Notable non-residential projects in the first half of 2015 include an institutional permit for the Applied Health Science building at the University of Waterloo, a
commercial interior finish project for Google at the Breithaupt Block in Kitchener, and an industrial shell permit for Westco Inc. in Cambridge.

Overall, the first half of 2015 showed slight tapering in the total value of new construction. The total value of new building permits issued across Waterloo Region was $549.4 million, comprised of $380.9 million in the non-residential sector and $168.5 million in the residential sector. This represents a decrease of 13% from the first half of 2014.

Report:

Building permit activity is an indicator of the strength of the economy. This report summarizes building activity in both the residential and non-residential sectors in Waterloo Region, for the first half of 2015 (January to June). Building activity data for the same period in previous years is provided for comparison. These figures are compiled by Planning, Development and Legislative Services staff, based on data supplied by the Area Municipalities.

Total Value of New Construction

The first half of 2015 showed slight tapering in the overall value of new construction. The total value of new building permits issued across Waterloo Region was $549.4 million, comprised of $380.9 million in the residential sector, and $168.5 million in the non-residential sector. This represents a decrease of 14% from the first half of 2014. The change in residential and non-residential activity by type is summarized in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Summary of Building Permit Activity (January – June)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Half 2014</th>
<th>First Half 2015</th>
<th>Change from First Half 2014</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value (in millions)</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Value (in millions)</td>
<td>Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>$349.0</td>
<td>1,616</td>
<td>$380.9</td>
<td>2,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singles</td>
<td>$153.6</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>$179.5</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-detached</td>
<td>$7.1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$4.8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouses</td>
<td>$55.5</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>$45.1</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>$132.9</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>$152.0</td>
<td>1283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value (in millions)</th>
<th>Area (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Value (in millions)</th>
<th>Area (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Value (in millions)</th>
<th>Area (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Value (in millions)</th>
<th>Area (Sq. Ft.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>$237.0</td>
<td>1,089,687</td>
<td>$168.5</td>
<td>959,387</td>
<td>$-118.5</td>
<td>-300,300</td>
<td>-41%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>$44.6</td>
<td>339,474</td>
<td>$55.0</td>
<td>339,404</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td>-7.7</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$29.7</td>
<td>364,854</td>
<td>$28.80</td>
<td>309,260</td>
<td>-$0.9</td>
<td>-55,594</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>$212.7</td>
<td>385,359</td>
<td>$84.60</td>
<td>310,723</td>
<td>-$128.1</td>
<td>-74,636</td>
<td>-60%</td>
<td>-19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the total value of new construction in the first half of 2015 is down compared to the first half of 2014, it is generally consistent with construction activity seen in recent years, as shown in Figure 2.
Building Activity in the Non-Residential Sector

The overall value of the non-residential building permits declined in the first half of 2015 compared to the same period in 2014. The 2015 permit value of institutional building was $84.6 million, commercial was $55 million and industrial was $28.8 million.

Figure 3: Non-Residential Building Permit Activity (January – June)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>First Half 2014</th>
<th>First Half 2015</th>
<th>Change from First Half 2014</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td>$287.0</td>
<td>$168.5</td>
<td>-$118.6</td>
<td>-41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>$44.6</td>
<td>$55.0</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$29.7</td>
<td>$28.8</td>
<td>-$0.9</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>$212.7</td>
<td>$84.6</td>
<td>-$128.1</td>
<td>-60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest construction values for a project in the first half of 2015 by type were:

- **Institutional** $16 million for an addition to the Applied Health Science building located at the University of Waterloo
- **Commercial** $15 million for the interior finish of the Breithaupt Block (Google) located at 51 Breithaupt Street in Kitchener
- **Industrial** $5.4 million for a shell only to Westco Cambridge Inc. (FedEx) located at 80 Goddard Crescent in Cambridge

Non-residential floor space was slightly down compared to the same period in 2014 in all sectors as shown in Figure 4. Overall, total floor space decreased by 12% from 1,089,687 square feet in the first half of 2014 to 959,387 square feet in the first half of 2015. Although the non-residential floor space construction was 14 per cent below the
10 year average, it was 22 per cent higher than the 5 year average.

**Figure 4: New Square Feet by Structure Type by First Half of Years**

Figure 5 provides a summary of new non-residential floor space by type and by Area Municipality. In the cities, the non-residential construction was highest in Waterloo (407,106 square feet), followed by Kitchener (253,888 square feet), and Cambridge (190,551 square feet). In the townships the highest was Woolwich (47,116 square feet) followed by North Dumfries (34,563 square feet), Wilmot (13,747 square feet) and Wellesley (12,416 square feet).

**Figure 5: Total New Non-Residential Floor Space (square feet) by Type, January – June**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>129,905</td>
<td>82,484</td>
<td>155,023</td>
<td>47,417</td>
<td>274,215</td>
<td>60,650</td>
<td>559,143</td>
<td>190,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>149,059</td>
<td>61,900</td>
<td>23,407</td>
<td>140,373</td>
<td>48,278</td>
<td>51,615</td>
<td>220,754</td>
<td>253,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>1,485</td>
<td>119,961</td>
<td>60,196</td>
<td>111,127</td>
<td>59,422</td>
<td>176,018</td>
<td>121,103</td>
<td>407,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dumfries</td>
<td>61,592</td>
<td>3,143</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31,420</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61,592</td>
<td>34,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>12,416</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>12,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,067</td>
<td>2,669</td>
<td>4,680</td>
<td>5,069</td>
<td>13,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>16,403</td>
<td>29,356</td>
<td>100,848</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>17,760</td>
<td>113,026</td>
<td>47,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Waterloo</td>
<td>364,854</td>
<td>509,260</td>
<td>339,474</td>
<td>339,404</td>
<td>585,359</td>
<td>510,723</td>
<td>1,089,687</td>
<td>959,587</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building Activity in the Residential Sector**

2015 was off to a strong start for residential construction in Waterloo Region. The total value of new residential construction in the first half of 2015 ($380.9 million) was $32 million higher than 2014 ($349 million). Overall, the residential value increased 9% as shown in Figure 6.
The high value of the residential building permits in the first half of 2015 was comprised of $179.5 million of single-detached, $4.8 million of semi-detached, $45.1 million of townhouse and $151.5 million of apartment construction activity. Compared to first half of 2014, the construction value of single-detached and apartments increased 17% and 14% respectively, while the value of semi-detached and townhouse declined 33% and 19%.

**Figure 6: Residential Building Permit Activity (January – June)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Half 2014</th>
<th>First Half 2015</th>
<th>Change from First Half 2014</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singles</td>
<td>$153.6</td>
<td>$179.5</td>
<td>$25.9</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-detached</td>
<td>$7.1</td>
<td>$4.8</td>
<td>-$2.3</td>
<td>-33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouses</td>
<td>$55.5</td>
<td>$45.1</td>
<td>-$10.0</td>
<td>-19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>$132.9</td>
<td>$152.0</td>
<td>$18.7</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were five residential projects within the Region with the construction value over $20 million in the first half of 2015. The highest value ones by municipality were:

- **Waterloo** $56 million for the 25-storey *ICON330* – a mixed-use building with 624 units located at 330 Phillip Street
- **Kitchener** $23.9 million for the 14-storey *Trio on Belmont* located at 460 Belmont Ave West
- **Cambridge** $6.2 million for a women’s shelter and administration offices

There was a 28% increase in the number of units in the first half of 2015, compared to same period in 2014. This represents a year-to-date increase of 453 residential units. While the number of single-detached units was stable (14 units higher than June, 2014) the number of new apartments almost doubled with 600 units more than in 2014. In the first half of 2015, 25% of new residential units were single-detached, 2% were semi-detached, 12% were townhouse units, and 62% were apartment units.
Figure 8 provides a summary of new residential units by type and by Area Municipality. In the cities, the residential construction was highest in Waterloo (1,118 units), followed by Kitchener (772 units), and Cambridge (103 units). In the townships, the highest was Wilmot (30 units) followed by Woolwich (21 units), North Dumfries (13 units), and Wellesley (12 units). While there was greater activity in the City of Waterloo, new residential units declined in most Area Municipalities in the first half of 2015.

Figure 8: Total New Residential Units by Type, January - June

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single Detached</th>
<th>Semi Detached</th>
<th>Townhouse</th>
<th>Apartment</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dumfries</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmot</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMW</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students and Seniors

Residential building permits were issued for six student-oriented apartment buildings in the first half of 2015, totalling 1,261 bedrooms in 882 units. This is up from 334 bedrooms in five student-oriented buildings in the first half of 2014. In addition, a student residence at the University of Waterloo was issued a permit for 539 beds and 11 units. While some student-oriented permits were identified as such on the permit itself, Regional staff identified additional student-oriented permits by their location and built form.
A building permit was issued for an 11-storey addition to the Westhill Retirement Residence at 7 Westhill Drive in Waterloo, containing 100 units with 178 bedrooms. Seniors-oriented buildings are typically identified as such on the permit itself.

**Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination**

Building permit data are collected by Area Municipal staff and submitted either electronically or in hardcopy. They are compiled by Regional staff for use in Regional development charge calculations, development tracking, forecasts, and reporting. Municipal staff is consulted for verification and insight into the data. Copies of this report have been circulated to the Area Municipalities.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

Tracking and reporting building permit activity contributes to Strategic Focus Area 2: Growth Management and Prosperity

**Financial Implications:**

Nil.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Nil.

**Attachments:**

Nil.

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

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

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

Date: September 15, 2015  File Code: C06-60

Subject: Corporate Asset Management Strategy Project Update

Recommendation:

For Information

Summary:

This report is to update Council on the Corporate Asset Management Strategy Project accomplishments and progress achieved to date. This report provides information relating to the Corporate Asset Management Governance Structure, Asset Management Plan, and the procurement and implementation of a Corporate Asset Management System (this includes a Work Management System, Decision Support System(s) and Professional Services support).

The objective of the Corporate Asset Management Strategy Project was to work with Transportation and Environmental Services and Corporate Services towards the further development and implementation of asset management (AM) best practices. Although the Region of Waterloo (Region) has always practiced AM, the methodologies were not always applied consistently throughout each Department and Division. The AM Strategy project has allowed staff to understand and implement industry best practices, and develop processes and policies for managing the Region’s physical assets. Implementation of these processes and policies has resulted in better collaboration between departments and divisions, improved project planning, repeatable decision making and overall cost savings. This report describes these benefits in greater detail and outlines the next steps to further the implementation of best Asset Management practices at the Region.
Report:

Asset Management is an integrated set of processes and best practices that minimize the lifecycle costs of owning, operating, and maintaining assets, at an acceptable level of risk, while continuously delivering established levels of service. Two main tools to assist in AM include a Work Management System (WMS) and a Decision Support System (DSS). The WMS is used to plan, generate, track and monitor the day-to-day activities that are required to operate and maintain Region assets. The DSS is used to assist the development of capital programs by prioritizing and managing projects, and tracking the overall performance and condition of the assets. In its simplest form, asset management answers the following questions:

1. What is the current state of our assets?
   a. What do we own and what is it worth?
   b. What condition is it in?
   c. What is the remaining useful life?

2. What is the required Level of Service?
   a. What is the demand?
   b. What is required by regulations and legislation?
   c. What is my performance?
   d. What will the Level of Service cost?

3. Which assets are critical to performance?
   a. How do they fail?
   b. How can they fail?
   c. What is the cost to repair or replace?
   d. What are the consequences of failure?

4. What is the best minimum lifecycle cost based on Capital Improvement Plan, and Operation and Maintenance strategies?
   a. What alternate options are there?
   b. Which options are most feasible for the Region?
5. Given the above, what is the best long-term funding strategy?

   a. Is there an infrastructure deficit or gap and how much is it?

By answering these questions the Region can ensure that the right projects are being done at the right cost, at the right time and for the right reasons.

In 2011, Transportation and Environmental Services (TES) Department and Facilities Management and Fleet Services (FFM) worked together on the Corporate Asset Management Strategy Project. The objective of this project was to work collectively with all affected business units and operating areas towards the development of asset management (AM) best practices.

A Corporate Asset Management Policy that defines the AM strategy is currently under review and will be presented to Regional Council for endorsement later this year.

The Region owns assets with a total replacement value of approximately $5.5 billion covering a wide range of different asset types. In 2015, we will spend approximately $600 million maintaining and operating these assets to meet expected service levels. The breakdown of asset valuation, as well as, the capital and operating budget for each division is outlined in the table below. Appendix A shows a more detailed list of assets within the Region.
### Division or Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division or Section</th>
<th>2014 Historical Asset Cost ($000’s)</th>
<th>2014 Asset Replacement Cost ($000’s)</th>
<th>2015 Capital Budget ($000’s) (excludes RDC funded projects)</th>
<th>2015 Operating Budget ($000’s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Services</td>
<td>$911,000</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
<td>$60,896</td>
<td>$80,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>$910,000</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td>$68,395</td>
<td>$65,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td>$74,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$18,131</td>
<td>$50,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$2,140</td>
<td>$9,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>$341,000</td>
<td>$1,344,000</td>
<td>$43,660</td>
<td>$51,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td>$941</td>
<td>$4,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand River Transit</td>
<td>$174,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$26,667</td>
<td>$108,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$62,000</td>
<td>$132,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$2,522,000</td>
<td>$5,493,000</td>
<td>$220,830</td>
<td>$370,601</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of Progress and Benefits to Date

The AM strategy has allowed staff to implement industry best practices, policies and available processes for managing the Region’s assets. Progress to date is summarized below:

1. Prepared Initial Asset Management Plans for each participating division

2. Defined Level of Service (LOS), Failure Modes and Risk Analysis and processes to apply these to each asset. Defined Maintenance, Renewal and Capital Planning Framework and Processes

3. Developed processes to prioritize and optimize capital and maintenance activities to achieve best value to the community
4. Prepared maintenance and capital improvement plans based on risk and life cycle analysis

5. Improved benchmarking processes to measure infrastructure performance over time

6. Forecasted needs to develop comprehensive long range financial plans

7. Improved data collection and information systems to support asset management decisions

8. Enhanced staff asset management knowledge, skills and corporate memory.

The Region has enhanced its asset management knowledge and is moving to a more advanced program by implementing the above best practices and processes. While progress has been made, there are still opportunities to make further changes and improvements. Some of the benefits achieved to date are as follows:

- A number of divisions have made significant improvements to their asset inventory and maintenance management system. By tracking and categorizing assets, those divisions are able to better understand and forecast failures, repair and replacement costs, and schedules. Maintenance work can now be better predicted and planned, reducing costly failures

- Many divisions have started to assess the risk of asset failure, allowing staff to prioritize both maintenance and capital work so that both critical and non-critical assets are maintained and replaced appropriately. A significant amount of work is required to expand these processes to all Region-owned assets

- The Transportation Division has deferred over $8M in the 10 year Capital Program in road projects through a more proactive maintenance program without impacting the level of service or road quality

- Further performance and condition assessment of watermains resulted in a deferral of over $8M in replacement projects in the Water Services Division 10 year Capital Program without impacting the level of service

- Incorporating AM best practices has resulted in the optimization of the 10 year Water Capital Program in all areas

**Corporate Asset Management Next Steps**

As part of the asset management strategy, the Region will continue to develop a formal Corporate Asset Management Program. Representatives from each division will work
together to further implement AM processes, practices and procedures to ensure the Region is managing its assets effectively and consistently providing best value to the community. The following are some of the key next steps of the Corporate Asset Management Program.

**Corporate Asset Management Governance Structure**

A Corporate Asset Management Governance Structure was implemented to build on the structure used during the Corporate Asset Management Strategy Project to ensure that there is a single consistent corporate direction and ensures consistent processes are applied among the various program areas.

A Steering Committee consisting of the Commissioners and two Directors each from Corporate Services (CS) and Transportation & Environmental Services (TES) has been created. The Steering Committee will provide overall direction to the program. An AM Implementation Group has been formed to support the governance structure which includes representation from the operating divisions, Finance (procurement and corporate finance), Human Resources and Information Technology (IT). This structure provides input, general project direction, ensures acceptance and buy-in to asset management principles and coordinates the work across departments and divisions. Staff within each division gathers information, provides comments, tests concepts and strategies and completes the actual asset management activities.

**Updated Corporate Asset Management Plan**

The Asset Management Plan (AM Plan) is a long range planning document that is used to provide a rational framework for managing the Region’s assets. The AM Plan is intended to improve the Region’s ability to meet its corporate goals and objectives in a way that best services its customers.

The AM Plan presents a Corporate Framework and provides systematic and repeatable processes to manage costs, risks and levels of service for the Region’s assets. The AM Plan identifies medium to long term cost forecasts and assists in predicting future problems that may hinder service delivery. This creates opportunities for the asset managers and operators to remove physical and financial barriers before they negatively impact customer levels of service. The AM Plan is required by the Province and Federal Government for municipalities to apply for infrastructure funding. The Region currently meets the provincial and federal requirements.

Initial AM Plans were completed by both TES and FFM in 2012. Staff is currently working on an updated Corporate AM Plan which will be presented to Regional Council in early 2016.
Asset Management System Implementation

The AM System Implementation Project will include a centralized, Corporate WMS and DSS(s). Implementation of an AM System will ensure the Region has a complete and consistent asset inventory, data definition and business process integration for all phases of asset lifecycles (from procurement to decommissioning) and related operational activities.

The Region currently has a number of WMS’s in use. Many of these systems are at or nearing the end of their useful life and generally no longer supported by their vendors. These systems require either upgrading or replacement to meet current business needs and requirements. The Region is targeting to replace the various WMSs with a common system that will be used throughout the Region to be more efficient and effective. Having a common WMS will allow easy sharing of information and expertise, and greatly simplify the support required from IT.

As part of the AM Systems implementation, the DSS(s) will assist in capital program planning, prioritizing and managing projects, and tracking the overall performance and condition of the assets.

The AM System purchase will consist of a two stage Request for Proposal process.

- Request for Proposal 1 – Includes the selection and purchase of a corporate Work Management System (includes software, modules and licenses). This Request for Proposal is currently being prepared and a report outlining staff recommendation will be presented to Regional Council in early 2016.

- Request for Proposal 2 – Includes the Professional Support Services to implement the Work Management System as well as the purchase and implementation of one or more software products to meet necessary requirements for a Decision Support System(s). Staff anticipate a report to Regional Council with a recommendation on the preferred Professional Support Services in the summer of 2016.

The Region will gain productivity advantage by efficient sharing of asset information between area municipalities and other partners such as Ontario Clean Water Agency (OCWA). Transportation and water assets, in particular, are part of an integrated network where services are optimized and shared between the various local area municipalities.

The Asset Management Steering Committee and Implementation Group will jointly develop the evaluation criteria to be used in this process. These criteria will include efficient sharing of information among municipalities and stakeholders, vendor
experience and references, price, integration with existing systems as well as other considerations.

**Departmental Implementation Next Steps**

Changes will be required within TES and CS to fully implement the Corporate Asset Management Strategy Project. TES will, through a minor reorganization process, create a small group that will be responsible for the overall implementation of asset management in the department. This group will be created using existing Full Time Equivalents and will be funded from the capital program (similar to Design and Construction funding). It is anticipated that the group will consist of one management position reporting to the Commissioner of TES and up to three additional redeployed existing positions.

Corporate Services has already created a position of Manager, Planning and Performance Management and the project will be further supported by the Director, Financial Services and Development Financing as well as the Manager, Infrastructure Financing.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

The project meets the Corporate Strategic Plan objective to develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs under Strategic Focus Area 2 - Growth Management and Prosperity.

**Actions:**

2.2.1 Continue to prioritize and implement capital program projects required to meet community needs and ensure sustainability.

2.2.2 Develop and implement a comprehensive asset management strategy to achieve optimal long-term value from regional infrastructure.

**Financial Implications:**

The approved 2015 capital budget and forecast includes $10.4 million from 2015 to 2018 to implement an Asset Management System. These expenditures will be funded from Regional Development Charges ($1,560,000; 15%), Water and Wastewater User Rates ($4,440,000; 43%), the Roads Rehabilitation Reserve ($3,350,000; 32%) and Debentures ($1,070,000; 10%). Staff are currently reviewing the requirements for this project and updates will be included in the 2016 budget process.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Staff from Corporate Services have been involved in the Corporate Asset Management
Program and consulted in the preparation of this report.

**Attachments:**

Appendix A – Region of Waterloo Current Asset List

**Prepared By:** Richard Pinder, Senior Project Engineer - Asset Management

Charles Allen, Manager, Planning and Performance Management

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

Craig Dyer, Commissioner of Corporate Services/Chief Financial Officer
APPENDIX A

Region of Waterloo Current Asset List

Airport

- 360,000 square metres of asphalt which consists of 2 runways, 5 taxiways, 5 Aircraft parking aprons and a series of groundside roads and vehicle parking lots
- 49,000 metres of storm sewer
- 500 edge lights, 40 guidance signs, 4 precision approach path indicator (PAPI) systems, 2 approach lighting systems, 8 constant current regulators including approximately 28,392 metre of underground cabling
- 2 emergency generators and a computerized control system located in a dedicated field electric centre
- 2,233 metres of overhead and 442 metres of underground 3 phase hydro distribution including 13 pole mount transformers, 5 pad mount transformers, 3 load break switches and 46 hydro consumption meters
- 32 street lights and light standards including underground cabling 2,258 meters of underground fibre optic telecommunication cabling.
- 5 administration and maintenance operations buildings
- 32 camera CCTV security system including cabling and digital video recording system
- 24,000 metres security / wildlife fencing network including 50 security gates
- 2,600 metres water pipeline network including 22 gate valves, 8 curb stops and 13 fire hydrants.
- 1,700 metres sanitary pipeline including 21 sanitary manholes and 1 pumping station

Facilities

- 714 building totaling an area of 6,081,415 square feet. These buildings include:
  - 3 ambulance stations
  - 5 child care centres
  - 3 gas generation facilities
- 5 high rise housing facilities
- 30 mid rise housing facilities
- 194 townhouses
- 124 detached and semi housing facilities
- 1 library
- 2 long term care facilities
- 28 museum buildings
- 22 offices
- 14 maintenance/office/storage facilities
- 61 out buildings (sheds, salt domes etc)
- 4 training facilities
- 4 transit terminals
- 8 waste transfer stations
- 77 waste water buildings
- 129 water buildings

**Fleet**

- 956 total vehicles which include:
  - 761 light vehicles
  - 105 medium vehicles
  - 90 heavy vehicles

**Grand River Transit**

- 238 conventional buses
- 30 MobilityPLUS buses
- 2 forklift
- 2 sweeper
- 3 service vehicles
- 11 supervisor vans
- 1 MP supervisor van with wheelchair lift

**Transportation**

- 1,726 lane kms of roadways
- 170 bridges and major culverts
- 484 signalized intersections
- 17,265 linear meters of noise walls
- 72,428 linear meters of guiderails
- 13,338 square meters of retaining walls
- 330 linear kms of storm pipes
- 1,036 storm water culverts
- 4,449 storm man holes
- 6,000 storm catch basins
- 11 storm water management ponds

**Waste Management**

- 1 engineered landfill
- 1 bulk transfer station
- 6 small vehicle transfer stations
- 1 Material Recycling Centre
- 2 household hazardous waste facilities
- 1 composting facility
- 2 administration buildings
- 2 heavy equipment maintenance shops
• 7 scales and scale houses
• 3 landfill gas Collection systems with over 150 gas wells and 50 km of collection piping
• 13 groundwater extraction wells
• 2 extraction well houses
• 6 leachate pump stations with over 10 km of discharge piping
• 7 storm water management ponds
• Over 10 km of haul roads

**Water Services**
• 111 wells
• 1 surface water treatment plant
• 25 groundwater treatment systems
• 1 raw water storage facility
• 17 treated water storage facilities
• 14 water pumping stations
• Approximately 400 km of watermains
• 13 waste water treatment plants
• 6 sewage pumping stations
• 1 biosolids storage lagoon
• 1 biosolids transfer facility
Region of Waterloo
Commissioner’s Office
Transportation and Environmental Services

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: September 15, 2015       File Code: A16-70
Subject: Moving Ontario Forward – Outside the GTHA

Recommendation:
That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo endorse Report TES-15-04 as the Region’s submission to the “Moving Ontario Forward – Outside the GTHA” consultation process.

Summary: Nil.

Report:

Earlier this year, the Province announced that it was allocating $31.5 billion in funding for the “Moving Ontario Forward” program to improve public transit, transportation and other priority infrastructure projects across the province over the next 10 years. The program allocates approximately $16 billion to projects within the Greater Toronto and Hamilton area (GTHA) and approximately $15 billion for projects outside the GTHA. Some of the “Outside the GTHA” funding has already been allocated, leaving approximately $11.5 billion yet to be allocated.

Over the summer the Province has been undertaking consultations to inform the design of new infrastructure programs, and a framework to prioritize needs for this infrastructure funding for communities outside the GTHA. The Province is seeking input on questions such as:

- What should they consider when making decisions around the new infrastructure program design and prioritizing future investments
• What is the long-term future of your transportation network, and how can “Moving Ontario Forward” support that?

Appendix A to this report provides staff’s response to these questions, and recommends that the Province use this new infrastructure funding to make significant investments in the transit and transportation network within and around Waterloo Region. Staff are recommending that Council endorse Appendix A as the Region’s input to the consultation process. The Province is requesting that feedback be provided by September 18, 2015.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

This submission is consistent with the Region’s 2011-2014 Strategic Plan objective to “develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs”.

Financial Implications:

The Region’s capital forecast projects spending of more than $3.5 billion over the next 10 years. This planned level of spending is not adequate to address the Region’s infrastructure deficit. Financial support from the Federal and Provincial governments will be essential to meeting the Region’s infrastructure needs.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Staff from Corporate Services (Finance), Transportation and Environmental Services, and Planning, Development and Legislative Services provided input to this report.

Attachments:

Appendix A: Region of Waterloo Submission – Moving Ontario Forward – Outside the GTHA (DOCS #1915675).

Prepared and Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Input to:

“Moving Ontario Forward – Outside the GTHA”

By

Region of Waterloo

September 2015
1.0 INTRODUCTION

Waterloo Region is the second largest metropolitan area in Ontario outside the Greater Toronto and Hamilton area (GTHA). The Region’s current population of 570,000 represents almost 10% of Ontario’s population outside the GTHA, and is forecast to grow by an additional 200,000 people in the next 20 years; greater than all other outer ring municipalities in the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

The diverse economy of Waterloo Region makes a significant contribution to both the provincial and national economies. Its estimated 2014 Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of $25.6 billion equates to more than $50,000 per person, which is 15 per cent higher than the provincial average. According to the Conference Board of Canada, Waterloo Region’s economy grew by 3.8% in 2014, and is forecast to grow by 3.4% in 2015 – the highest forecast growth in Canada!

With an employed labour force of 283,100 workers, employment in this area is forecast to grow by 1.7 per cent in 2015, higher than both the provincial and national forecast growth rate. Over the past 10 years, from 2004 to 2013, the Kitchener-Cambridge-Waterloo CMA experienced the highest employment growth of any CMA in Ontario across all sectors (see Figure 1).

Figure 1 – Employment Growth in All Sectors 2004-2013 for Canadian CMAs
The Region has a growing and diversified economy with over 1,000 technology firms, including Canada's largest software, hardware, e-learning, and satellite companies, while maintaining a strong and stable manufacturing sector supplying jobs for 20 per cent of the region’s employed population. There is also significant representation in food processing and agri-business, and insurance and financial services. Emerging sectors in the region include health sciences, environmental, nanotechnology, pharmaceutical and renewable energy.

Waterloo Region has an impressive entrepreneurial culture with 15.36 patents created per 10,000 people, 11.3 times higher than the Canadian average. The Region of Waterloo, the Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo and the Townships of North Dumfries, Wellesley, Wilmot and Woolwich are working together to promote economic opportunity and attract investment to the region through the creation of the new Waterloo Region Economic Development Corporation, which will be operational in 2016.

In short, the economy in Waterloo Region is of provincial and national significance, and the Provincial and Federal governments should do everything possible to invest in the necessary infrastructure to support the success of the Region’s economy, which will contribute to provincial and national economic growth.

The Region of Waterloo is very supportive of the Province’s significant plan for investing in infrastructure over the next 10 years, and is particularly interested in the implementation of the $15 billion fund for infrastructure outside of the GTHA. As noted in Figure 2, the Region of Waterloo's ten year capital forecast projects spending of more than $3.5 billion. Of this, more than $3.2 billion in spending is projected for core infrastructure including transit, rapid transit, roads, the airport, water, wastewater, waste management and community housing. It is important to note that the planned level of spending on road rehabilitation ($428 million over the next 10 years) is not adequate to address the Region’s infrastructure deficit. Support from the Provincial and Federal government will be essential to meeting the Region’s infrastructure needs.
The Region is particularly encouraged to note several of the “Outside the GTHA” program objectives and features described in the “Discussion Guide for Moving Ontario Forward – Outside the GTHA”, including the following:

- The program is targeted “to meet local needs and support economic development….”
- The Province is “committed to building infrastructure and supporting economic development in a way that is fair and addresses critical needs in every part of the Province”.
- Priority will be given to “projects that address critical infrastructure needs and deliver the best economic, social and environmental returns.”
- “Every region has unique needs… there is no one size fits all solution for every region across the Province.”

We have structured our input to respond directly to two of the three questions posed in the Discussion Guide.
2.0 “WHAT SHOULD WE CONSIDER WHEN MAKING DECISIONS AROUND NEW INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM DESIGN AND PRIORITIZING FUTURE INVESTMENTS?”

The following are key principles that the Province should consider when deciding how to allocate the “Outside the GTHA” infrastructure funding:

- Funding fairness – for municipalities outside the GTHA compared with those inside the GTHA, and for both large and small municipalities.
- A significant portion of the funding should be distributed directly to municipalities based on an appropriate allocation formula. This should recognize the distinct infrastructure needs of upper-tier and lower-tier municipalities.
- Any application-based program should prioritize projects that will provide the greatest return on investment and that recognize/reward municipal performance and alignment with Provincial priorities.

Each of these principles is discussed further in the following sections.

2.1 Funding Fairness

Any infrastructure funding allocation should treat municipalities outside the GTHA fairly relative to those within the GTHA, and should treat large Regions/municipalities fairly, relative to small municipalities.

Over the past several months, the Province has announced that it will fully fund rapid transit projects in Toronto, Brampton, Mississauga and Hamilton. In contrast, the Region of Waterloo is funding almost one-third of the capital cost, and 100% of the ongoing operating, maintenance and lifecycle costs of a similar light rail transit (LRT) system through incremental annual property tax increases. Businesses and residents in Waterloo Region will pay higher property taxes to cover the local share of the capital costs and ongoing operating, maintenance and lifecycle costs of the ION rapid transit project under the current Provincial funding arrangement. This contrasts with little or no rapid transit related increase in property taxes for businesses and residents in the GTHA. Effectively, these communities – their residents and businesses – have been given a property tax subsidy at the expense of taxpayers in Waterloo Region.

The Province should use the “Outside the GTHA” infrastructure fund as an opportunity to correct this imbalance and to fund Waterloo Region’s rapid transit system to the same level as similar systems within the GTHA. If the Province chooses not to do that, it should ensure that the Region of Waterloo receives an equivalent level of funding for other transportation-related initiatives through this infrastructure fund. (See Sections 3.1 and 3.2).
Prior to starting the consultations regarding the “Outside the GTHA” Infrastructure Fund, the Province decided to commit over $1 billion of the $15 billion fund to small, rural and northern communities (which does not include the Region of Waterloo). Approximately half of this funding is allocated annually based on a formula; the other half is allocated through an application-based process. There is no question that these small communities have significant infrastructure needs. **However, the Province should ensure that large municipalities, such as the Region of Waterloo, have access to appropriate levels of funding from this program, also based on an appropriate allocation formula.** (See Section 2.2).

### 2.2 Formula Based Allocation

The discussion document notes in several places that infrastructure needs and priorities are different in every community, and that each community best knows their own infrastructure needs and priorities.

Presumably in recognition of this, the Ontario Community Infrastructure Fund (OCIF) (for small, northern and rural communities) was established with 50% of its $100 million annual funding allocated to eligible municipalities based on an allocation formula. The municipalities are then able to use this funding on their highest priority infrastructure projects as long as those projects meet certain criteria.

The Province should allocate a significant portion of the remaining “Outside the GTHA” funding to Regions/large municipalities based on an appropriate allocation formula. The allocation formula should consider factors such as population, economic activity (GDP), transit ridership, and the value of the municipalities’ installed infrastructure. It should also consider the distinct infrastructure needs of upper-tier and lower-tier municipalities in Regional Municipalities. Each municipality would be able to use this funding for its highest priority projects, as long as those projects met certain eligibility criteria. This approach would treat large municipalities fairly relative to smaller municipalities outside the GTHA.

### 2.3 Funding Criteria

If any portion of the infrastructure fund is allocated based on an application process, the process itself should be simple and transparent, and the selection criteria should be carefully chosen and clear. Potential evaluation criteria could include the following:

- Return on investment – prioritize projects that support and encourage economic development and job creation;
- Alignment with Provincial priorities – prioritize projects that support municipalities, and municipal initiatives that are aligned with Provincial policies such as
encouraging intensification, encouraging transit use, etc.

- Recognize/reward good municipal performance – prioritize projects in municipalities that are well managed (e.g. asset management plans in place; Official Plans in place, etc.).

3.0 **“WHAT IS THE LONG-TERM FUTURE OF YOUR TRANSPORTATION NETWORK, AND HOW CAN ‘MOVING ONTARIO FORWARD’ SUPPORT THAT?”**

The key issues and trends regarding the transportation network in Waterloo Region include the following:

1) Promoting greater transit use, including expanding conventional transit, and building rapid transit.
2) Aging road network which contributes to a growing infrastructure deficit, and the need to invest more in the repair/rehabilitation/replacement of roads and bridges.
3) The need for a better inter-regional transportation/transit network; including improvements to GO Transit and to highways.

Each of these issues, and how the Province can help address them, are described further in the following sections.

3.1 **Promoting Greater Transit Use**

The Region of Waterloo assumed responsibility for public transit from the local municipalities in 2000. Since that time the Region has invested significantly in expanding the conventional transit system (Grand River Transit-GRT), and more recently in the construction of a rapid transit system (ION). The Region’s 2010 Transportation Master Plan set a goal of increasing the modal share of trips using transit from 4% to 15% by 2031. The Region has two primary goals for its significant investment in transit (especially rapid transit): namely moving people and encouraging intensification. This focus on increased transit use and urban intensification are driven by, and are entirely consistent with, the Province’s policy directions in the “Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe”.

As shown in Figure 3, since 2000, the amount of Grand River Transit service has increased by 85 percent, and annual transit ridership has increased by 122 percent, from 9.9 million to 22.0 million riders per year.
As shown in Figure 4, this has contributed to a doubling of per capita transit ridership over that same period. The per capita transit ridership in Waterloo Region is now the fourth highest in the Province, and is higher than Mississauga, Brampton and Hamilton.
Figure 4 – 2013 Ridership per Capita

The Region plans to continue to expand the conventional transit network, and to fully integrate conventional transit and rapid transit. Key elements of this transit expansion plan over the next five years include the following:

- Additional buses (possibly including articulated buses).
- Additional transit station development, including key nodes at the University of Waterloo and Fairview Park Mall.
- Enhanced transit technology to improve efficiency and customer experience.
- New bus storage and maintenance facility.
- Multi-modal transit hub connecting conventional transit, LRT, GO, VIA and inter-city buses.

The total cost of these system expansions and enhancements is approximately $130 million over the next 5 years.

**The Province should make the Region of Waterloo’s transit system expansion/enhancement a high priority for funding through the “Outside the GTHA” Infrastructure Fund.**

The next stage in the growth of the transit network in Waterloo Region is the
construction of our ION rapid transit system. Stage 1 of ION includes a 19 kilometre Light Rail Transit (LRT) line from north Waterloo to south Kitchener, and a 17 kilometre adapted Bus Rapid Transit (aBRT) line from South Kitchener to downtown Cambridge (Galt). The capital cost of ION Stage 1 is estimated to be $818 million and the Region is pleased to have Provincial ($300 million) and Federal ($265 million) contributions towards this cost. The Region’s share of the capital cost ($253 million) and all of the operating, maintenance and lifecycle costs will be financed through transit fares, and through incremental property tax increases phased in over a 7 to 8 year period. Businesses and residents in Waterloo Region will pay increased property taxes to cover the local share of capital, operating, maintenance and lifecycle costs under the current funding arrangement.

In contrast, the Province recently announced that it will fully fund rapid transit projects in Toronto, Brampton, Mississauga and Hamilton. Since these municipalities will not need to contribute anything to the capital costs of these transit projects, there will be little or no rapid transit related increase in property taxes for residents or businesses in the GTHA. Effectively, the residents and businesses in these communities have been given a property tax subsidy at the expense of taxpayers in Waterloo Region.

Accordingly, the Province should use the “Outside the GTHA” Infrastructure Fund (or other appropriate funding mechanisms) to fund the capital, operating, maintenance and lifecycle costs of Stage 1 of the Region of Waterloo’s ION rapid transit project to the same level as it is funding similar projects inside the GTHA.

While construction of ION Stage 1 is underway, the Region is initiating an Environmental Assessment/Transit Project Assessment (TPAP) for ION Stage 2. Stage 2 would involve the construction of 18 kilometres of LRT from South Kitchener to downtown Cambridge (Galt). This process will update the capital and operating and maintenance cost estimates, ridership projections and will update the Business Case for the project. Pending the completion of the TPAP/Business Case, the Province should consider including funding for ION Stage 2 in the “Outside the GTHA” Infrastructure Fund.

3.2 Repairing and Replacing Existing Roads and Bridges

Currently the Region’s road network is comprised of 708 kilometres of road, 170 bridges and 481 traffic signals. A well-maintained road network is essential for the effective movement of goods and people, and hence, is essential to the economic well-being of the Region and the Province. In order to maintain the Region’s road network in its current condition, the Region needs to be spending approximately $50 million per year. In addition to this, the Region has a road infrastructure deficit totalling $456 million. The current funding for road, bridge and other road network assets is approximately $40
million per year, which is not sufficient to maintain the current condition of the road network and will result in the road infrastructure deficit to increase.

**Accordingly, the Province should make the Region of Waterloo’s road repair, rehabilitation and replacement needs a high priority for funding through the “Outside the GTHA” Infrastructure Fund.**

### 3.3 Improving the Inter-Regional Transportation Network

Recent transportation surveys indicate that approximately 31,000 people commute into Waterloo Region, and approximately 33,000 people commute out of Waterloo Region for work each day. Almost all of these trips are made by car, many of them on increasingly congested Highway 401, because of the lack of viable inter-regional transit options.

GO Transit currently operates 2 trains each morning from Kitchener to Toronto and 2 trains each afternoon from Toronto to Kitchener. The travel time is approximately 2 hours in each direction. GO has plans to increase the service to 4 morning and afternoon trains daily starting in 2016.

Local employers, particularly in the technology and financial services sector have repeatedly stressed the importance of a morning train from Toronto to Kitchener. Several of these companies are currently operating daily buses to transport their employees from the GTA to Waterloo Region. Improved morning train service would enhance their ability to attract and retain employees, grow their companies and create jobs.

A Business case recently developed by the City of Kitchener in partnership with several other municipalities highlighted the significant benefits associated with improved GO Train service, including:

- Improving the ability of people in the GTA to access employment in Waterloo Region and vice versa;
- Facilitating economic development and job creation in Guelph, downtown Kitchener, and along the ION Rapid Transit corridor;
- Saving time and money for commuters, and easing congestion on the extremely busy highway 401 corridor; and
- Supporting planning policy (especially Places to Grow), reusing existing infrastructure, revitalizing urban centres, greenhouse gas reduction and protecting green space.

The Region of Waterloo and the City of Cambridge recently completed a feasibility study regarding the extension of GO Train service from Milton to Cambridge. The study
demonstrated that GO service between Milton and Cambridge could be implemented in a cost-effective way by initially using Diesel Multiple Units (DMUs) operating between Cambridge and Milton, and connecting with larger, regular GO Trains in Milton. This service expansion is supported by several other municipalities including the Town of Milton, and Halton Region, because it is seen as providing many benefits, including:

- Connecting two of the fastest growing communities in Ontario (Milton and Cambridge) with a lower cost and more flexible rail transit option.
- Creating more high paying jobs across all sectors including advanced manufacturing and high tech.
- Providing 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.
- Enhancing the movement of goods and services by providing an effective transit travel alternative to the private car and by reducing highway congestion along Highway 401 through the provision of more park and ride opportunities.
- Supplying local businesses with better access to a region-wide labour force and reduced costs for their supply chain and export markets.
- Supporting Federal and Provincial objectives to address national, provincial and local infrastructure priorities, policy and plans.

The recently announced Metrolinx Regional Express Rail (RER) Strategy includes significant enhancements to the GO Train network, but does NOT include the provision of two-way service to Kitchener or the extension of GO rail service from Milton to Cambridge. It is understood that freight operations and infrastructure constraints along the CN line (to Kitchener) and CP (to Milton) make it difficult to enhance and extend passenger rail service on these corridors.

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

The proposal would be to construct a new freight rail line – the “missing link” between the CP main line west of Trafalgar Road in Milton and the CN Freight Line in Bramalea. All through CP and CN freight traffic would travel on this route from Milton to Bramalea and continue along the CN line going east. The new rail route is located adjacent to
Highway 407 and would require several bridges, new rail connections between CN and CP and would have to be double track.

While the “missing link” is a significant investment, a large share of these costs could be offset by eliminating the need to undertake infrastructure improvements in the RER program to the Kitchener and Milton lines. Metrolinx is also discussing this issue with CN and CP and hopes to identify a recommended option for resolving the passenger/freight conflicts later this year.

**The Province should make funding the infrastructure improvements necessary for 2-way all-day GO Train service to Kitchener and extending GO Train service from Milton to Cambridge a priority for funding through the “Moving Ontario Forward” funds. Infrastructure improvements located within the GTHA should be funded from the portion of the “Moving Ontario Forward” fund dedicated to the GTHA, and those located outside the GTHA should be funded from the “Outside the GTHA” portion of the fund.**

Local residents and businesses also depend on an efficient Provincial highway system for travel and to support goods movement. The Region is encouraged to see the Province proceeding with the planned expansion of Highway 7 between Kitchener and Guelph, and with the widening of Highway 401 through Waterloo Region. The Province should also proceed with the planned ramp from southbound Highway 8 to westbound Highway 401 as quickly as possible.
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Design and Construction

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

Date: September 15, 2015

Subject: Consultant Selection – Detailed Design and Services during Construction for the Waterloo Landfill Leachate Forcemain, City of Kitchener

Recommendation:
That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into a Consulting Services Agreement with MTE Consultants Inc. (MTE) to provide engineering services for detailed design and services during construction for the Waterloo Landfill Leachate Forcemain in the City of Kitchener, at an upset fee limit of $403,793.00 plus applicable taxes.

Summary:
In 2014, the Regional Municipality of Waterloo (Region) completed the preliminary design for the construction of a second Waterloo Landfill leachate forcemain. The existing leachate forcemain conveys leachate from the Waterloo Landfill to the Waterloo Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) via the City of Waterloo sanitary sewer system. The leachate flow from the landfill has nearly reached the City of Waterloo maximum allowable flow rate of 15.2 litres/second and will exceed this allowable flow rate in the near future. Therefore, a second forcemain, that will direct some of the leachate from the Waterloo Landfill to the Kitchener WWTP via the City of Kitchener sanitary sewer system, is required to service the ongoing expansion of the landfill. (Please see Appendix B)

A consultant selection process was carried out in accordance with the Region’s Purchasing By-law 04-093 for the procurement of goods and services and included
price as a factor. Two proponents submitted a Proposal and Detailed Work Plan and Upset Fee. When considering all Quality, Equity and Price Factors, the submission from MTE Consultants Inc. scored the highest and had the lowest price. Therefore staff recommends that MTE Consultants Inc. be retained to undertake this assignment for an upset fee of $403,793.00 plus applicable taxes.

Subject to Council approval of this assignment, it is anticipated that detailed design will commence in fall of 2015 and the construction will commence in early 2017 with completion in late 2017.

Report:

1. Background

The Waterloo Landfill is located at 925 Erb Street West, Waterloo, and straddles the boundary between the City of Kitchener to the south and the City of Waterloo to the north.

Environmental controls at the Waterloo Landfill include a landfill gas collection system and a leachate collection system. In the present configuration, leachate collected from the landfill is pumped to the City of Waterloo sanitary sewer system on Erb Street, which directs flow to the Waterloo Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP). The maximum allowable flow rate to the City of Waterloo sanitary sewer is 15.2 litres/second.

As a result of on-going expansion of the Waterloo Landfill, the leachate flow from the landfill has almost reached 15.2 litres/second and will increase above this allowable City of Waterloo flow in the near future. The Region completed a preliminary design in 2014 for a second leachate forcemain that will be required to discharge some of the leachate flow from the landfill to the Kitchener WWTP via the City of Kitchener sanitary sewer system. (Please see Appendix B)

The proposed scope of work includes the design and construction of approximately 1.6 km of leachate forcemain from the landfill along Glasgow Street and across Ira Needles Boulevard to the existing City of Kitchener trunk sanitary sewer located in the Henry Sturm Greenway. (Please see Appendix B) The project is pre-approved under Schedule A+ of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment because the forcemain will be located entirely within existing municipal road allowances and right-of-ways. Pre-construction notices will be sent in advance of construction to nearby property owners and occupants to inform them of the upcoming construction.

2. Consultant Selection

On June 30, 2015, the Region placed advertisements on its website and in The Record and Daily Commercial News inviting submissions from consultants for detailed design and services during construction for the Waterloo Landfill leachate forcemain. Two
proponents submitted a proposal and detailed work plan (Envelope #1) and upset fee (Envelope #2). The specialized nature of this project likely contributed to the low number of proposals received. Each proposal was reviewed by the Region’s selection team consisting of: Jerry Borovicka (Design and Construction Division), Donna Serrati (Waste Management Division) and Kevin Dolishny (Water Services Division). The consultant selection process was carried out in accordance with the Region’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%

The Region’s selection team reviewed the two proposals for quality and equity factors. The upset fee envelopes of the following two proponents were then opened in the presence of Tina Lumgair (Procurement and Supply Services):

- MTE Consulting Inc.
- GHD Limited

When considering all Quality, Equity, and Price Factors, the submission from MTE Consultants Inc. scored the highest overall. MTE Consultants Inc. received the highest technical score for understanding of the project and significant experience on similar projects. MTE’s price was also the lowest. Staff recommends that MTE Consultants Inc. be awarded this assignment for an upset fee of $403,793.

3. **Scope of Work**

For this assignment, the Consultant will provide consulting engineering services during the detailed design, tender, construction, and post-construction phases of this capital
project. The Consultant will complete the design for the second leachate forcemain including two valve chambers, connection to the existing City of Kitchener Henry Sturm Trunk Sewer, replacement of two submersible pumps in one of the landfill’s pumping stations, associated process and electrical equipment, and SCADA programming. The Consultant will also assist the Region in obtaining a permanent easement on City of Kitchener lands for the forcemain. The Consultant will prepare issued-for-tender, issued-for-construction, and record versions of the Contract Drawings as well as Contract Specifications for the construction contract. The Consultant will also provide services related to construction cost estimates, approvals and permits, third-party materials testing and quality control, health and safety reviews, site inspection, equipment acceptance tests, commissioning of new works, a custom operation and maintenance manual, custom training sessions, contract administration and administration of equipment warranties.

4. Schedule

Subject to Council’s approval of this assignment, detailed design will commence in November 2015 followed by a general contract tender planned for January 2017 with completion of all work planned for November 2017.

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 2015 Ten Year Waste Management Capital Forecast includes a budget provision of $6,266,000 for the period 2015 to 2018 for leachate control (project 01156) at the Waterloo Landfill Site to be funded by debentures. Of the total amount, $2,311,000 has been allocated for the second Waterloo Landfill leachate forcemain. The consultant’s upset fee of $403,793 is within the budget allowance for engineering work for this project and is considered reasonable for the scope of services to be provided and for a capital project of this magnitude. The remainder of the budget will be utilized for work related to other leachate control projects on the site.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Nil
Attachments

Appendix A – Breakdown of Consultant’s Upset Fee

Prepared By: Jerry Borovicka, Project Manager, Environmental Projects

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

## Waterloo Landfill Leachate Forcemain

### Breakdown of Consultant’s Upset Fee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background Review</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Class EA Requirements</td>
<td>$1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topographic Survey</td>
<td>$4,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Plan Preparation</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Detailed Design Phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% design tasks</td>
<td>$42,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% design tasks</td>
<td>$44,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% design tasks</td>
<td>$48,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% design tasks</td>
<td>$44,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tender Phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Tender Documents</td>
<td>$11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Administration</td>
<td>$26,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction inspection</td>
<td>$141,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance of Factory and Site Acceptance Testing</td>
<td>$2,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of contractor’s submittals</td>
<td>$6,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Safety</td>
<td>$1,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start-up and Commissioning</td>
<td>$6,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of deficiency list</td>
<td>$3,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-Construction Phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record Drawings, O &amp; M Manuals, Warranty Period Assistance and Meetings</td>
<td>$9,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Upset Fee (plus applicable taxes)</strong></td>
<td>$403,793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Region of Waterloo

Transportation and Environmental Services

Rapid Transit

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

Date: September 15, 2015

File Code: D09-00(A)

Subject: Highway 401- Highway 8 to Hespeler Road, Bus Bypass Shoulders

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into an agreement and operating protocol with Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario (by its Ministry of Transportation) to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services, and the Regional Solicitor to allow for the use of the bus bypass shoulders by Grand River Transit on Highway 401 between Highway 8 and Hespeler Road, as described in Report No. TES-TRP-15-16, dated September 15, 2015.

Summary:

The widening on Highway 401, from Highway 8 to Hespeler Road (currently underway) will accommodate an additional 1.25 metres along the shoulders and bridge structures to accommodate 4.25 m bus bypass shoulders (BBS). The Region agreed to provide additional capital funds to the MTO for the widening required to allow for bus bypass shoulders as part of the Rapid Transit budget. The BBS were approved as part of the Rapid Transit Environmental Assessment.

The BBS on this area of Highway 401 will keep Grand River Transit (including ion BRT) on a consistent schedule so congestion from highway incidents can be avoided. Transit buses will be allowed to use the shoulders for traveling if the main stream of vehicles is moving at less than 60 km/hr. The BBS on Highway 401 between Highway 8 and Hespeler Road are currently being constructed and will be ready for use in 2019.

The use of the BBS is planned to begin in 2019 subject to approval and signing of the agreement for the construction of the BBS and the operating protocol. The BBS along
Highway 401 are similar to the existing bus bypass shoulders currently in operation along Highway 8 between Sportsworld Drive and north of the Grand River.

**Report:**

Schedule reliability and travel time competitiveness are both key factors that attract “choice riders” to public transportation. In many urban areas, traffic congestion regularly delays bus service and adversely affects schedule reliability. Many communities, including Waterloo Region, are adopting various measures such as bus signal priority to improve speed and reliability of bus service. Another effective measure is the implementation of bus bypass shoulders (BBS) in areas of heavy congestion. (Please see Attachment 1). BBS allow transit vehicles to use the shoulders of the road to “bypass” regular congestion and queues caused by highway incidents.

Bus-Bypass Shoulders are defined as the area adjacent to the general purpose lane used by police, emergency services and for disabled vehicles. According to the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) guidelines, authorized transit buses will be allowed to use the shoulders for traveling if the main stream of vehicles is moving at less than 60 km/hr. Transit vehicle operators require special training and licensing to be authorized to operate a bus on a bus bypass shoulder.

An area of poor reliability for GRT, both today and expected in the future, is on the stretch of Highway 401 between Highway 8 and Hespeler Road. Any incident in this corridor causes significant delays for buses. In order to mitigate this impact on GRT operations, BBS were proposed. In most cases these BBS would be available for transit use should any delays or incidents affect traffic flow on Highway 401.

The Ministry of Transportation is currently widening Highway 401 between Highway 8 and Hespeler Road that will include Bus Bypass Shoulders (see Attachment 2 for a map of the limits).

Due to the longevity of the MTO works on Highway 401, there was no further opportunity to complete BBS as part of another project. As such, there is significant cost savings involved in constructing the bus bypass shoulders as part of this Highway 401 widening project instead of as a stand alone project in the future. Therefore, the Region agreed to provide additional capital funds to the MTO to cover the widening required to accommodate bus bypass shoulders. This was approved by Regional Council in 2011 as part of the final Rapid Transit Plan.

The widening on Highway 401, (to be completed by 2019) will provide for an additional 1.25 metres along the shoulders and bridge structures to accommodate 4.25 m bus bypass shoulders. The cost estimate provided by MTO (based on tendered costs) is $2.7 million.

Even with the widening on Highway 401, peak hour congestion may still occur and congested conditions are forecast to reoccur within 10 - 12 years. Also, if a vehicle
incident occurs during the peak periods, traveled lanes will be blocked. This ongoing risk of operational problems along Highway 401 means that the BBS will contribute to the long term speed and reliability of GRT services that use this stretch of Highway 401.

**Bus Bypass Shoulders Operation**

In order to start using the Highway 401 bus by-pass shoulders, the Region of Waterloo must meet certain eligibility criteria (Please see Attachment 3 for details), including the training of operators to review key operating parameters such as the purpose, design and layout of the BBS, signs and markings, operating speed restrictions, safe merging, BBS access and egress, and emergency procedures.

The construction agreement and operating protocol for the construction and use of the Highway 8 BBS have been finalized. While Region staff have not yet received the proposed agreements for the Highway 401 bus by-pass shoulders it is anticipated they will be on substantially the same terms and conditions which include the following: The design, specification and construction of the BBS would be completed by MTO;

- The Region would reimburse MTO in the amount of $2,700,000 for the final costs to construct the BBS, as previously agreed upon;
- The BBS form part of Highway 8 and as such are owned by MTO;
- MTO is responsible for all maintenance of the BBS including signage, pavement, pavement markings and snow removal;
- The Region and MTO agree to the use of the BBS by Grand River Transit in accordance with operational protocols;
- Other operators may be permitted to use the BBS by MTO by amendment to the Regulation with notice to the Region;
- MTO has requested that the maintenance of the BBS continue to be negotiated. At this time, staff are recommending that MTO cover the maintenance of the BBS (MTO covers maintenance with for the BBS on Highway 403 where the City of Mississauga Transit operate). Any amendment to the agreements to provide for maintenance cost sharing will be brought back to Regional Council for consideration.
- MTO may suspend or terminate the Region’s use of the BBS in the event there are continued violations of the operating protocol or if continued use of the BBS causes a significant traffic safety or operational concern, upon 90 days’ notice or less in the case of an emergency.
- MTO is not liable for any consequences that may result from termination of the operation of the BBS; and
• By using the BBS and entering into the Operating Protocol, the Region acknowledges and accepts the more limited operating conditions of the BBS compared to the highway general purpose lanes.

The BBS on Highway 401 between Highway 8 and Hespeler Road are under construction as part of the Highway 401 widening and will be operational in 2019.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

The construction of the Highway 8 bus bypass shoulders supports the Strategic Focus Area 5: Provide High Quality, Integrated Multi-Modal Regional Transportation Network (Automobile, Rapid Transit, and Conventional Transit).

Financial Implications:

In June 2011, Council approved the implementation of the RT project, including LRT and aBRT, with estimated capital costs of $818 million, in 2014 dollars, with capital funding to be provided by the Province (up to $300 million), the federal government (one third of eligible project costs to a maximum of $265 million) and the Region ($253 million). The capital cost estimate was confirmed by Council on March 19, 2014. The RT project and improvements to conventional transit are financed through annual tax rate increases.

As indicated above, the capital cost for the BBS on Highway 401 ($2.7 million) have been incorporated into the LRT project as part of the early works estimate previously presented to Council. The overall costs will be funded from the approved Rapid Transit project budget.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Staff from Grand River Transit and Transportation Planning were consulted during the planning of the bus bypass shoulders on Highway 401 and will provide input into the final agreement.

Attachments

Attachment 1 – Example of a Bus Bypass Shoulder Lane
Attachment 2 - Map – Limits of Highway 401 Bus Bypass Shoulders
Attachment 3 – Eligibility Criteria for Use of BBS

Prepared By: Paula Sawicki, Manager Coordination, Rapid Transit

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Attachment 1 – Example of a Bus Bypass Shoulder Lane
Attachment 2 - Map – Limits of Highway 401 Bus Bypass Shoulders
Attachment 3 – Eligibility Criteria for Use of BBS

Region of Waterloo - Grand River Transit must provide regular, scheduled service available to the public. Transit vehicles that are permitted to use the BBS are as follows:

- Buses & articulated buses (40’ – 60’ in length)
- MobilityPLUS buses (25’ – 30’ in length)

Buses must have radio or telephone contact with the Region of Waterloo - Grand River Transit’s central dispatcher, in order to report blocked shoulders or other emergency situations involving the shoulder.

Region of Waterloo - Grand River Transit must have a Commercial Vehicle Operator’s Registration (CVOR) Certificate, and must have a Carrier Safety Rating (CSR) of either excellent or satisfactory. The Ministry’s West Region designated contact must be provided with proof of this rate.

Region of Waterloo - Grand River Transit supervisory and driver staff must complete Manager and Driver Training as Provided by Region of Waterloo - Grand River Transit, before commencing operations. The curriculum will include:

- Purpose of BBS
- Review of BBS layout, signs and markings
- Operating Speed Restrictions
- Safe Merging
- BBS Access and Egress
- Emergency Procedures

After completion of training, each supervisor and bus driver must sign an acknowledgement form indicating that they have been trained and will abide by the rules of this Operating Protocol. Region of Waterloo - Grand River Transit must retain a copy of each signed form for MTO’s review.
Region of Waterloo

Transportation and Environmental Services

Transit Services

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

Date: September 15, 2015

File Code: D10-40(A)

Subject: GO Train Update

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo endorse in principle the findings of the “Feasibility Study and Business Case of Constructing the Missing Link” as described in report TES-TRS-15-15, dated September 15, 2015;

And that the Regional Municipality of Waterloo continue to encourage the provincial and Federal governments to take all necessary steps as quickly as possible to implement two-way GO train service to Kitchener (especially morning inbound and afternoon outbound trips) and to initiate GO train service between Milton and Cambridge”.

Summary:

The Region of Waterloo continues to collaborate with area municipalities and municipalities along the Kitchener and Milton GO Rail lines to advance the implementation of two-way all day rail service to Kitchener and extension of GO train service to Cambridge.

Recently, the Region and area municipalities collaborated with the municipalities of Toronto, Mississauga and Milton, on a study that evaluated the technical feasibility and business case to rationalize the movement of freight by creating a new rail link branded the “missing link”. By separating freight traffic from passenger rail service, the new rail link would free up capacity on both the Milton GO line so that GO service could be more easily extended to Cambridge and on the Kitchener GO line so that two-way all day GO rail service could be provided to Kitchener. The study concluded that the “missing link” proposal including a new rail link, new rail connections, upgraded signalling systems, additional tracks and new rail/road and rail/rail grade separations, is constructible and
would provide numerous benefits as described in the main report.

In addition to initiatives like the “missing link” which would facilitate the long-term implementation of the province’s Regional Express Rail strategy, staff will continue to encourage Metrolinx/GO to pursue the necessary steps as quickly as possible to implement two-way GO train service to Kitchener during peak periods and the extension of initial GO train service to Cambridge.

Report:

Introduction

The Region of Waterloo and its area municipalities recognize the importance of improved GO passenger rail service between the GTA and Waterloo Region. By connecting employees, business travellers and post-secondary students between the GTA/Guelph and Waterloo Region, passenger rail would help sustain and enhance a vibrant southern Ontario economy and support strong and thriving urban growth centres.

Earlier this summer, staff advised Council on the on-going technical and advocacy efforts of Regional and area municipal staff and elected officials to create awareness among provincial and federal representatives of the importance of passenger rail service connecting Waterloo Region with the GTA.

One initiative noted was that the municipalities of Toronto, Mississauga, Milton, Cambridge, Kitchener, Waterloo and Region of Waterloo were going to engage a consultant to evaluate the technical feasibility and business case to rationalize the movement of freight by creating a new rail link branded the “missing link”. The new rail link would free up capacity on both the Milton GO line so that GO service could be more easily extended to Cambridge and on the Kitchener GO line so that two-way all day GO rail service could be provided to Kitchener.

This report provides an update on the key findings of the “Feasibility Study and Business Case of Constructing the Missing Link”, and of recent GO Train service improvements on the Kitchener GO line.

Background

The key challenges to providing two-way all day GO rail service to Kitchener and to extending GO rail service to Cambridge are extensive freight operations and corridor ownership by CN between Georgetown and Bramalea on the Kitchener GO line and by CP on the Milton GO line.

The “Feasibility Study and Business Case of Constructing the Missing Link” evaluates the potential construction of a new rail link that would connect the CP mainline near the
Milton/Mississauga border to the CN bypass line in Bramalea (Figure 1). This new rail connection would considerably reduce passenger train and freight movement conflicts, thereby facilitating the provision of two-way all day GO rail service on the Kitchener line and on the Milton line including extension of service to Cambridge. In addition to the new rail link other infrastructure improvements required include several rail connections, upgraded signalling systems, additional tracks and new rail/road and rail/rail grade separations.

The “missing link” is one potential option that would facilitate the provision of provision of two-way all-day GO rail service on the Kitchener line and extension of GO rail service to Cambridge. Another option Metrolinx has been exploring is the provision of additional tracks along the Kitchener and Milton lines so that passenger and freight traffic could better co-exist. Additional tracks would be challenging to provide in constrained locations such as downtown Brampton and Streetsville. Metrolinx continues to discuss and negotiate with CN and CP different strategies and options that could facilitate implementation of their Regional Express Rail vision of two-way all day GO rail service on all GO lines.

For example, Metrolinx was able to negotiate with CN the recent provision of more passenger rail service on the CN line. On September 8, 2015, an additional 14 weekday trips (7 per direction) were added during the midday on the Kitchener line between Union Station and Mount Pleasant station on the west side of Brampton. This additional two-way train service was made possible because Metrolinx completed the construction of the $1 billion plus “Georgetown South” project between Milton and Union station which included providing two additional tracks, elimination of level crossings and a rail to rail grade separation. This work was foundational to enable future GO service improvements on the Kitchener GO line.

**Key Findings of “Missing Link” Study**

The “Feasibility Study and Business Case of Constructing the Missing Link” was recently completed. Constructing the “missing link” and related rail improvements has significant benefits as summarized below:

- It eliminates the impacts of widening the Milton line in Streetsville and the Kitchener line in downtown Brampton where the rail corridors are space constrained.

- By relocating existing CN through freight movements to the “missing link”, conflict between passenger rail and freight traffic would be removed between Georgetown and Bramalea. This would facilitate the provision of two-way all day GO rail service between Kitchener and Union Station on the Kitchener GO line.

- By relocating existing CP through freight movements to the “missing link”, conflict
between passenger and freight traffic would be removed between Milton and Toronto. This would facilitate the provision of two-way all day service between on the Milton GO line and make it easier to extend GO rail service to Cambridge.

- The relocation of heavy freight movements would allow the future electrification of the Kitchener and Milton GO lines. Metrolinx has the long term intention to electrify all seven GO lines and has already identified the electrification of the Kitchener line as far as Bramalea.

- The “missing link” would remove heavy through traffic and related nuisance impacts from the central areas of Toronto, Mississauga, Brampton and Georgetown.

- Relocating heavy freight movements would facilitate other new GO rail services envisioned by Metrolinx’s “Big Move” regional transportation plan such as services to Bolton, Agincourt/North Pickering and Midtown Toronto, and improved service on the Richmond Hill line.

- Separating freight rail traffic from passenger rail movements and reduced track mileage for CN would result in more reliable and efficient freight movements.

- More reliable and efficient freight movements contribute to the objectives of the Continental Gateway strategy of the Federal government and Provincial governments of Ontario and Quebec by facilitating through freight traffic to and from the US border.

**Short-Term Improvements**

Full implementation of the Regional Express Rail strategy has a long-term horizon given requirements to fund numerous large infrastructure components and lengthy approval and negotiating processes between government agencies and CN and CP freight operators. Staff encourage Metrolinx/GO to continue to consider short-term improvements given the latent demand for improved GO rail service to Waterloo Region and the immediate benefits this would provide.

In particular, a reverse commute morning train trip from Union Station to Kitchener and an afternoon train trip from Kitchener to Union Station would enable employees residing in the GTA to access employment in Waterloo Region. Several technology companies now bus employees from the GTA to workplace locations in Kitchener and Waterloo. These and other employers located in Waterloo Region continue to request a more reliable and convenient public transit option for their employees that reside in the GTA. A train service would provide more reliable transportation than a bus operating in mixed traffic and impacted by weather conditions.

In Fall 2016, Metrolinx/GO is planning to add two additional morning train trips from
Kitchener to Union Station and two afternoon train trips from Union Station to Kitchener. Staff encourage that as part of this service improvement Metrolinx/GO negotiate track time availability with CN so that a morning train trip can be provided from Union Station to Kitchener and afternoon trip from Kitchener to Union Station.

Regional Council was recently provided an update on the “Cambridge on the GO: A Business Case for the Extension of GO Train from Cambridge to Milton” (PW Report TES-TRS-15-13, August 11, 2015). This study re-confirms the feasibility of an extension of GO train service to Cambridge on the Milton GO line and noted the economic benefits of connecting two of the fastest growing communities in Ontario (Milton and Cambridge).

One option evaluated was the extension of GO Trains from the Milton GO station. Another option evaluated was a shuttle service between Cambridge and the Milton GO station using self-propelled Diesel Multiple Units (DMU’s). DMU’s are now in operation on the Union-Pearson Express line and provide numerous advantages over the conventional 12-car GO train including lower operating costs, improved acceleration/deceleration reducing travel times and more appropriate train size for interregional service. Staff encourage that Metrolinx/GO negotiate track time availability with CP to either extend a couple of existing GO train trips from Milton or pilot a DMU shuttle.

**Next Steps**

Staff will continue to collaborate with area municipal staff and staff from the GTA and surrounding municipalities on initiatives like the “missing link”. Staff will also continue to advocate with the Province, Metrolinx/GO and the federal government that two-way all day GO rail service to Kitchener and extension of GO train service to Cambridge be included in the Regional Express Rail strategy and that short-term improvements including a reverse commute train trip between Kitchener and Union Station, extension of existing GO train trips from Milton to Cambridge or a pilot Diesel Multiple Unit shuttle service between Cambridge and the Milton GO station be given priority consideration.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

Achieving two-way all day GO rail service to Kitchener and provision of GO train service to Cambridge supports the Corporate Strategic Plan focus areas of Sustainable Transportation, Growth Management and Prosperity and Environmentally Sustainability.

**Financial Implications:**

The Region shared equally with the City of Cambridge, City of Kitchener and City of Waterloo, one quarter of the $84,000 study cost or $21,000. The Region’s share amounts to $5,250.
Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

This report has been circulated to area municipal staff.

Attachments:

Figure 1: GO Transit Service and Missing Link

Prepared By: John Cicuttin, Manager Transit Development

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Figure 1: GO Transit Service and Missing Link
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Transportation

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

Date: September 15, 2015    File Code: T08-50

Subject: Standardization of Traffic Signal Controllers

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo authorize the Manager, Procurement to enter into negotiations with Econolite Canada Incorporated for the supply of traffic signal controllers and related control equipment at an annual cost not to exceed $400,000 as outlined in report TES-TRP-15-16.

Summary:

Nil

Report:

1. Background

The Region currently operates 480 traffic signals, all of which are controlled by traffic signal controllers (TSC). The life expectancy of TSC is approximately 10–15 years. Staff must regularly replace TSC because of age and damage caused by lightning and traffic collisions. Currently the Region has a yearly replacement program to upgrade approximately 15 TSC. Approximately 5 TSC are also replaced through the traffic signal modernization program. The Region also installs approximately 5 new TSC annually due to intersections warranting new traffic signals.

The Region has previously purchased Econolite TSC under Part VII, Section 21-I of the Region’s Purchasing By-law which allows the Chief Purchasing Officer to acquire goods or services through negotiation where the acquisition is beneficial in regard to the standardization of goods or services for the Region. The previous term with Econolite
Canada has recently expired and staff wish to re-establish the “sole-source” arrangement with Econolite Canada.

As the cost to supply TSC is expected to exceed $100,000 the Chief Purchasing Officer is required to obtain Regional Council approval to enter into negotiations with Econolite Canada for the supply of TSC.

2. **Benefits of Standardization**

TSC components are not easily interchangeable and fully compatible between different manufacturers. The use of various TSC supplied by different manufacturers has a negative impact on operating functionality, documentation, training, staff proficiency, material stock, maintenance and operating cost.

Over the years the Region has confirmed that standardization of traffic signal equipment has many operational benefits. Standardization ensures consistent methods of programming and spare part inventories. It also simplifies the technical knowledge required for operating, maintaining and troubleshooting TSC thereby reducing training requirements, operational risk and service cost.

Currently, all of the TSC operated by the Region have been supplied by Econolite. In maintaining uniformity throughout the traffic signal network, fewer hardware failures and lower operating cost have been realized.

3. **Justification for Sole-Sourcing to Econolite Canada**

Regional staff has conducted bench testing and functional analysis of various TSC. The Econolite TSC scored the best in terms of functionality, ease of operating and best matched the Region specifications.

Over the past years the TSC supplied by Econolite has undergone considerable enhancements to improve its operational compatibility and integration with the Region’s traffic signal control system.

The Region and Econolite have spent considerable effort over the past 20 plus years to improve TSC functionality and reliability through hardware and software upgrades to meet changing industry requirements. The Econolite product line offers easy “plug and play” migration with newer TSC versions allowing for retention of current investments in software development.

Econolite has offered the Region access to proprietary firmware and software information. This has reduced the need for additional peripheral equipment and unconventional rewiring of electrical paneling and systems.

Econolite offers free support for products that are no longer being sold. Downward compatibility and conformance to industry standards of Econolite’s TSC avoids early
obsolescence of existing equipment and increases the expected equipment service life.

Econolite provides excellent delivery, response time for equipment repair, free-of-charge certification courses, seminars and 24/7 support.

In 2010, Regional Council approved funds for the upgrade of the Region’s traffic signal control system, scheduled to be operational by early 2016. Econolite was the selected product line to meet key functional data upload, download and real-time monitoring specifications of the new traffic signal control system.

In addition, Grandlinq is preparing to purchase an Econolite Centracs Traffic Management System for the new light rail transit system, including Econolite TSC, which the Region will operate and maintain.

Econolite TSC are cost competitive with TSC from other suppliers and staff believe the Econolite product provides best value to the Region when considering its cost and the quality of the product.

Given the high quality and competitive price of the Econolite TSC and the benefits of continuing to use Econolite to ensure the standardization of the Region’s control system, staff is recommending that Council authorize the Manager, Procurement to enter into negotiations with Econolite Canada Incorporated to supply TSC and related control equipment. The annual cost of this sole-source arrangement is not expected to exceed $400,000. The term of this arrangement is not to exceed five (5) years.

Staff will continue to monitor and evaluate the performance and value provided by Econolite in comparison with other vendors to ensure the Region continues to receive best value for TSC.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

This report addresses the Region’s Strategic Objective 2.2 - Develop, optimize and maintain infrastructure to meet current and projected needs.

**Financial Implications:**

The Transportation Capital Program includes $200,000 annually for traffic signal controller replacements and $275,000 annually for minor traffic signal modernizations funded from the Roads Rehabilitation Reserve Fund.

All new warranted traffic signals are added to the Transportation Capital Program as need arises and are funded from the Development Charge Reserve Fund.
Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Corporate Services, Procurement

Attachments

Nil

Prepared By: Egerton Heath, Supervisor Traffic Systems Management

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: September 15, 2015

Subject: Proposed Lane Configuration Changes on Westmount Road (Regional Road 50) at Glasgow Street, in the City of Kitchener

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo amend the Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended, to remove from Schedule 16, Southbound Left-turn, Through Lane Designation on Westmount Road (Regional Road 50) at Glasgow Street; in the City of Kitchener, as outlined in Report TES-TRP-15-19, dated September 15, 2015.

Summary:

Staff has identified that traffic control signals are warranted at the Westmount Road and Union Boulevard intersection. In order to consider new traffic control signals at the Westmount Road and Union Boulevard intersection, traffic flow along Westmount Road between Union Boulevard and Glasgow Street must be improved as currently southbound traffic on Westmount Road routinely “backs up” through the Union Boulevard intersection during peak periods. To improve southbound traffic flow through the Glasgow Street intersection, staff reviewed a number of options, including road widening on Westmount Road, and is recommending the reconfiguration of lanes on Westmount Road to include four through lanes without dedicated left-turn lanes.

The recommended lane modifications would not require any road widening and are anticipated to reduce southbound congestion currently being experienced along Westmount Road between Glasgow Street and Union Boulevard. The proposed lane modifications would allow acceptable traffic operations at the Westmount Road and Union Boulevard intersection.
Please refer to Appendix F for a plan view of the recommended lane configuration at the Westmount Road and Glasgow Street intersection.

Report:

1.0 Background

In 1999, prior to a planned reconstruction in 2001, Regional staff undertook a traffic study to address a collision problem on Westmount Road at Glasgow Street. A summary of the collisions prior to 2001 is provided in Appendix A. The existing lane configuration on Westmount Road at that time included four through lanes without dedicated left-turn lanes on Westmount Road. Appendix B shows the lane configuration prior to 2001. To address a high number of left-turn collisions, staff recommended the widening of Westmount Road at this location to include dedicated left-turn lanes in addition to the four through lanes. Regional Council did not approve the road widening because of concerns raised by residents about the impacts of the widening on trees and front yards. Instead, Regional Council approved a revised lane configuration that included dedicated left-turn lanes on Westmount Road but with only one lane southbound on Westmount Road. Please refer to Appendix C for a plan view of the approved lane configuration that was constructed in 2001.

Currently, the Westmount Road and Glasgow Street intersection is experiencing significant southbound congestion. Site visits and analysis have shown that during the p.m. period, southbound vehicular queuing extends from the Glasgow Street intersection for an average distance of approximately 230 metres. Frequently however, the southbound queues extend through and beyond the Union Boulevard intersection.

Staff has determined that the Westmount Road and Union Boulevard intersection now requires traffic control signals. However, given the current queuing of southbound traffic from Glasgow Street, traffic control signals at the Westmount Road and Union Boulevard intersection would likely experience operational problems. In order to consider traffic control signals, traffic flow along Westmount Road between Union Boulevard and Glasgow Street must be improved. To accomplish this, operational improvements are required at the Westmount Road and Glasgow Street intersection.

2.0 Existing Conditions

Westmount Road is a north/south roadway with two lanes in each direction. Where Westmount Road intersects Glasgow Street there is a southbound shared through/right-turn lane and an exclusive left-turn lane. In the northbound direction there is a shared through/right-turn lane, a through lane and an exclusive left-turn lane. The intersection is controlled by traffic control signals. The Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) entering the Westmount Road and Glasgow Street intersection is 28,825 vehicles per day.
Westmount Road where it intersects Union Boulevard also has two lanes in both the northbound and southbound directions. There is a shared though/right-turn lane and a shared through/left-turn lane in both the northbound and southbound directions. Westmount Road is free flow and Union Boulevard is stop controlled. The AADT entering the Westmount Road/Union Boulevard intersection is 21,719 vehicles per day.

The posted speed limit along this section of Westmount Road is 50 km/h.

Appendix D shows a map of the general area and the subject intersections. Appendix E shows the existing lane configuration at the Westmount Road and Union Boulevard intersection.

3.0 Potential Options Considered to Address Southbound Congestion at Glasgow Street

3.1 Do Nothing

Staff has determined a need for traffic control signals at the Westmount Road and Union Boulevard intersection. As previously noted, the Westmount Road and Glasgow Street intersection is experiencing excessive southbound queuing; frequently the queues extend though and beyond the Union Boulevard intersection. Regional staff routinely receive complaints regarding travel times through this area. Without improving the southbound congestion, traffic signals at Westmount Road and Union Boulevard would not function effectively and it is anticipated that the intersection would experience more collisions than expected as a result. Staff do not prefer this option and would not recommend creating such a scenario.

3.2 Widen Westmount Road at Glasgow Street to Include Two Southbound Through lanes

This alternative would require widening of the intersection resulting in impacts to trees and boulevards. Given the anticipated boulevard and the tree impacts and the heavy neighbourhood opposition to the widening of the intersection that occurred during the 1999 study, staff does not feel that the widening of the intersection is the best solution at this time.

3.3 Revise Existing Lane Designations on Westmount Road

The existing northbound and southbound pavement width allows for two lanes in each direction approaching Glasgow Street. Removing the dedicated left-turn lanes in both the northbound and southbound directions and reconfiguring the intersection to allow for four shared through lanes would significantly improve the southbound congestion along Westmount Road.
It is anticipated that the southbound queuing would be approximately 122 metres if lane
designations are revised which will avoid queues through and beyond the Union
Boulevard intersection. However, reconfiguring the northbound and southbound lanes
to include two shared through lanes converts the geometry of the intersection to a
condition preceding the road works in 2001. At that time, the Westmount Road and
Glasgow Street intersection was consistently ranked high according to the Region’s
Collision Severity Ranking. It was identified that approximately 50% of the total
collisions (56) in a three-year period involved a northbound left-turning motorist.

Recognizing the conversion of the lanes to a condition that experienced a high number
of left-turn collisions, staff considered a time of day restriction for the northbound
left-turn movement between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., Monday to Friday. The proposed
restriction would be integral to this solution including the proposed lane modifications.

Staff identified the modification of the existing lanes and turn-prohibition as the preferred
option and this option was recently presented to the public for consideration and
feedback.

4.0 Public and Area Municipality Consultation

Information signs were installed on June 24, 2015 on all approaches to the Westmount
Road and Glasgow Street intersection for two weeks requesting comments on the staff
preferred option through the Region’s website or via telephone. An Internet
questionnaire was also setup to receive comments and a phone number was provided.
In addition, 262 letters were mailed to local residents also requesting comments on the
proposed changes.

The questionnaire asked interested parties whether they were in support of, or in
opposition to the options being considered by Regional staff. Of the 142 respondents,
63 were in favour of the proposed restriction and 68 were opposed. The majority of
those that were opposed indicated opposition to the proposed left-turn restriction and
cited cut through traffic along local roadways would result. There were very few parties
concerned with the proposed lane modifications. City of Kitchener staff did not support
the proposed northbound left-turn prohibition but were in agreement with the proposed
lane modifications.

5.0 Recommendations

Based on staff’s assessment and feedback received through the public survey, it is
recommended that the lane configuration on Westmount Road at its intersection with
Glasgow Street be revised (in the Fall of 2015) as follows to provide:

- A southbound shared through/right-turn and a southbound shared
  through/left-turn lane; and
• A northbound shared through/right-turn and a northbound shared through/left-turn lane.

Please refer to Appendix F for a plan view of the recommended lane configuration.

Due to the comments received through our survey, staff is not recommending that northbound left-turns be restricted from Westmount Road onto Glasgow Street at this time. Should a left-turn collision pattern appear after the lanes are re-configured, staff may have to request Regional Council to consider a left-turn prohibition or another option such as road widening at that time.

It is anticipated that the lane changes on Westmount Road at Glasgow Street will significantly reduce the southbound queuing along Westmount Road and will allow the acceptable operation of traffic control signals at the Westmount Road and Union Boulevard intersection.

Once the changes have been made at Glasgow Street, staff will monitor the operation of southbound queuing on Westmount Road and proceed with traffic control signal installation at the Westmount Road and Union Boulevard intersection when staff has confirmed that the southbound queuing has been reduced.

Those interested in this issue have been notified of the planned report to Planning and Works Committee recommending a revised lane configuration with no turning prohibition.

**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 implement the recommended lane changes at the Westmount/Glasgow intersection is approximately $4000, 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:

Appendix A - Summary of Collisions Prior to Road Works in 2001
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Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Water Services

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

Date: September 15, 2015  File Code: L04-20/01

Subject: License Agreement with Kitchener-Wilmot Hydro for the Sole Purpose of Installation, Maintenance and Operation of Radio Repeater Equipment on Top of Sportsworld Tower in the City of Kitchener

Recommendation:

That The Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into a License Agreement with Kitchener-Wilmot Hydro Inc. effective the 1st day of October 2015 to the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor, for the purpose of the installation, maintenance, and operation of radio repeater equipment on the Sportsworld Tower (the “Tower”), in the City of Kitchener, as per Report TES-WAS-15-26, dated September 15, 2015, and the Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services be authorized to execute the same.

Summary:

Nil

Report:

Kitchener-Wilmot Hydro will be installing remote operable switching devices around the KWWTP as part of the system expansion to facilitate the load growth at the plant. These remote operable switches utilise 900 MHz radio to communicate with their control room at 301 Victoria St. S. A RF study was conducted and determined that a repeater placed on the Region’s water tower at 180 Sportsworld Drive will significantly aid communication between the switches and the control room.

The repeater is housed in a weather proof box that can be mounted outside or in an electrical room and connected to a 120V power supply. There is also an antenna which will require mounting on top of the tank via a section of 2” galvanise pipe.
The Region has been approached by Kitchener-Wilmot Hydro Inc. with a request for installation of the radio repeater equipment on the tower effective the 1st day of October 2015. Regional staff recommend entering into a License Agreement effective the 1st day of October 2015, whereby: (i) the term of the License Agreement will be ten (10) years, with one optional renewal term of five (5) years; (ii) Kitchener-Wilmot Hydro Inc. will have the right to install, operate and maintain radio repeater equipment at the tower as approved by the Region; and (iii) Kitchener-Wilmot Hydro Inc. will pay two ($2.00) dollars per year, plus all applicable taxes throughout the term of the License Agreement and any renewal(s) thereof.

Should additional equipment be required to be added, Kitchener-Wilmot Hydro Inc. will formally submit a request. If approved by the Region, Kitchener-Wilmot Hydro Inc. is required to have a pre- and post-inspection done by a Region approved contractor on the tower to ensure that damage does not occur during the installation of the new equipment. Should damage occur to the tower or to Region equipment, Kitchener-Wilmot Hydro Inc. is responsible for all associated repairs.

Kitchener-Wilmot Hydro Inc. acknowledges that the efficient, unimpaired and uninterrupted functioning of the Region’s operational systems, including, but not limited to its waterworks system and emergency services communication equipment, is of paramount importance to the health, welfare, and safety of the public. Kitchener-Wilmot Hydro Inc. would therefore be required pursuant to the License Agreement to covenant and agree to immediately, upon request of the Region, cease any or all activities and transmissions at or from the tower where the activities and transmissions have interfered with or disrupted, or may interfere with or disrupt the Region’s operational systems or emergency services communications equipment.

Security of the site is maintained as per the signed License Agreement. Water staff is notified any time the site is accessed.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

In maintaining Agreements with the local business community, the Region supports Strategic Priority of Service Excellence.

**Financial Implications:**

The Region’s WWTP will be the main user of this communication equipment and the device uses very low energy (maximum 88kwh per year), this cost will be covered under the operations of the tank. The Region will not be responsible for any costs related to the proposed License. The licensing fee of two ($2.00) dollars per year plus all applicable taxes will be applied to the operating budget. This fee and the coverage of the energy cost reflect utility cooperation. The Region has equipment on hydro’s...
distribution systems that are not billed, such as streetlight controllers. Kitchener-Wilmot Hydro Inc. will be responsible for pre- and post-inspections as maintenance is required.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Legal Services and Facilities Management were consulted in the negotiation of the terms of the new Agreement and they are in concurrence with the recommended direction.

**Attachments**

Nil

**Prepared By:** Olga Vrentzos, Manager, Water Operations and Maintenance

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

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: September 15, 2015
File Code: E-14-01

Subject: Water Services Energy Management Plan

Recommendation:

Summary: Nil

Report:

Background

The Region operates five large wastewater treatment plants (WWTP) in the Cities of Cambridge (Hespeler, Galt and Preston WWTPs), Kitchener (Kitchener WWTP) and Waterloo (Waterloo WWTP). The Region also operates eight other smaller plants in the Townships of North Dumfries (Ayr WWTP), Wellesley (Wellesley WWTP), Wilmot (Foxboro Green and New Hamburg WWTPs) and Woolwich (Conestoga Golf Course, Elmira, Heidelberg, and St. Jacobs WWTPs).

In 2014, the Region’s wastewater system consumed approximately 38 million kilowatt-hours (kWh) of electricity at a cost of $5 million. This accounted for approximately 26% of the Region’s total annual electricity consumption.

Major treatment upgrades and system expansions, which are necessary to improve the river quality, meet new legislation, address biosolids issues, and service future growth have contributed to a 30% increase in electricity consumption over the past five years. As the Region continues to implement the recommendations outlined in the Wastewater Treatment Master Plan, it is anticipated that energy consumption will continue to
increase. In addition, the cost of purchasing electricity has risen dramatically over the past five years.

An energy management plan has been developed to monitor and reduce the overall electricity consumption at the Region’s wastewater treatment facilities. The proposed projects and associated energy savings outlined in this plan align with our commitment under the Region’s Corporate Energy Plan that was approved by Council on June 25, 2014 (CR-FM-14-005).

Approach to Energy Management

The approach used for the development and implementation of the Region’s energy management plan consists of three stages. Stage 1, Power Monitoring, identifies processes of higher energy consumption at the Region’s WWTPs. Stage 2, Energy Studies, identifies opportunities for improving energy efficiency in the processes and plants identified in Stage 1. Stage 3, Energy Projects, is the final stage in the process and would confirm the feasibility and timing for each project identified in Stage 2. Stages 1 and 2 have been completed and a preliminary list of potential projects has been prepared for confirmation of their feasibility in Stage 3 (see Appendix A: Table 1), which is expected to be completed in the next 6 months.

More details about each of the Stages above is provided below:

1. Power Monitoring - A power monitoring standard was developed; power meters have been installed at each treatment plant on high energy processes, such as raw sewage pumping, aeration, and biosolids dewatering. These power meters have allowed staff to monitor real-time electricity consumption and identify processes where energy reduction could be achieved.

2. Energy Studies - Engineering studies focusing on high energy processes were conducted in collaboration with local electrical distribution companies funded under the Provincial saveONenergy Program. Through site visits, data collection and analysis, these studies identified opportunities to reduce and/or conserve electricity consumption. The feasibility of each opportunity was evaluated based on energy savings, implementation costs, potential for project incentives and simple payback period.

3. Energy Projects - Potential energy reduction projects identified in Stage 2 will be evaluated based on the project’s operational feasibility and alignment with the asset management program. If approved, the projects are recommended for inclusion in the 10-year capital forecast. Once the project details/design have been established, the local electrical distribution company will become involved
and financial incentives are determined through the Provincial saveONenergy Program. A verification of actual energy savings is completed following project implementation.

Next section gives an example of the findings of Stages 1 and 2 above for the Hespeler WWTP in the City of Cambridge.

Energy Project at the Hespeler Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP)

In recent years, flows in the Hespeler WWTP watershed have dropped. For this reason, staff has recommended that the proposed expansion of this plant be delayed and that short term upgrades to enhance the treatment process be completed. These changes will be reflected in the 2016 Capital Program deliberations late in 2015. A project to identify the short term upgrades above is ongoing and one of the recommendations is to replace the existing aging blowers with newer and more efficient ones.

The Stage 2 Energy Study for the Hespeler WWTP has confirmed an energy saving opportunity associated with the plant’s aeration blowers, which is the plant’s highest energy consuming process. Through on-site power monitoring, the study confirmed that two (2) blowers servicing the aeration system and aerobic digester system run continuously with no control or modulating ability to match treatment or process needs. This method of operation may result in periods with excess air supply and an over consumption of electricity. Considering the age and design limitations of the existing blowers, the study recommended replacing the blowers with high efficiency units. Two benefits of the new blowers are high efficiency operation and having the ability to modulate operation therefore reducing electricity consumption. From this study, the potential annual savings are estimated at 456,400 kWh and savings of $62,500 based on 2014 hydro rates.

Replacement of the blowers identified in the Energy Study above cannot be done in isolation as it will require changes to the existing electrical and instrumentation systems, and other mechanical components of the plant. Therefore, this project will be completed in conjunction with other upgrades to be done at the plant in the next two to three years.

**Next Steps:**

Other projects identified in Stage 2, Energy Studies, and shown in Table 1 in Appendix A need to follow similar analysis to be done in Stage 3 of the energy plan. This will confirm the feasibility of each project and the best approach for their implementation, as some changes for achieving energy efficiencies may require other ancillary works, which may be part of other ongoing or upcoming projects.

The proposed energy projects above have a potential pay back ranging from 2 to 8
years. The implementation of these energy projects will be phased in based on the complexity of the project and operational constraints; projects with minimal engineering will be completed within 2 years and projects requiring more complex engineering will be completed in the next 2 to 3 years.

The total potential energy savings with the implementation of the projects identified in Table 1 in Appendix A is estimated at 1,690,512 kWh per year, which represents approximately 4.5% of the total annual wastewater energy consumption and will contribute to reducing the Region’s Green House Gas Emissions (GHG).

Corporate Strategic Plan:

The implementation of this energy management plan contributes to Focus Area 1: Environmental Sustainability and Strategic Objective 1.2.3: Develop an Energy Reduction Plan for Water and Wastewater facilities.

Financial Implications:

The two largest projects identified in the Water Services Energy Management Plan, replacement of the blowers at Preston and Hespeler WWTPs, have been included in the proposed 2016 Wastewater Capital Program, to be submitted to Council for deliberations and approval late in 2015. The other smaller projects are currently undergoing assessment under Stage 3 of the plan, and will be included in upcoming Wastewater Capital Programs, as required.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Planning, Development and Legislative Services were consulted regarding the Plan.

Attachment A:

Table 1: Potential Energy Projects identified in Stages 1 and 2 of the Water Services Energy Management Plan

Prepared By: Tammy Bellamy, Senior Project Engineer, Water Services

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

### Table 1: Potential Energy Projects identified in Stages 1 and 2 of the Water Services Energy Management Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ayr WWTP</td>
<td>Aerobic Digester Install variable speed drives (VFD) on blowers and a mass flow meter on the sludge line.</td>
<td>$28,380</td>
<td>$3,267</td>
<td>32,675</td>
<td>$4,901</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UV System Modify operation of UV system to turn off lamps during low flow conditions.</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$876</td>
<td>8,760</td>
<td>$1,314</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmira WWTP</td>
<td>Raw Sewage Pumps Replace main duty pump (operated continuously) with new, higher efficiency unit.</td>
<td>$44,380</td>
<td>$9,844</td>
<td>98,447</td>
<td>$10,829</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aeration Blowers Replace main duty blower (operates continuously) with a new, higher efficiency unit.</td>
<td>$57,030</td>
<td>$16,491</td>
<td>164,910</td>
<td>$18,140</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hespeler WWTP</td>
<td>Aeration Blowers Replace fixed speed blowers with one larger high efficiency, variable speed blower and implement a DO control system.</td>
<td>$470,000</td>
<td>$45,635</td>
<td>456,400</td>
<td>$62,527</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hamburg WWTP</td>
<td>Aeration Blowers Install VFDs on blowers; and implement a DO control system.</td>
<td>$87,300</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>65,350</td>
<td>$9,802</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aerobic Digester Install VFDs on blowers and a mass flow meter on the sludge line.</td>
<td>$40,500</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>65,350</td>
<td>$9,802</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston WWTP</td>
<td>Aeration Blowers Replace aged fixed speed blowers with one larger high efficiency, variable speed blower; and implement a DO control system.</td>
<td>$567,600</td>
<td>$65,350</td>
<td>653,496</td>
<td>$98,024</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effluent Install VFDs with level control on existing</td>
<td>$50,700</td>
<td>$3,921</td>
<td>39,210</td>
<td>$5,881</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumps</td>
<td>effluent pumps.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAS Pumps</td>
<td>Modify RAS pump operation to flow pace based on the SOR of the secondary clarifiers.</td>
<td>$18,360</td>
<td>$1,470</td>
<td>14,704</td>
<td>$2,206</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Jacob’s WWTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxidation Ditch Rotors</td>
<td>Install VFDs on motors.</td>
<td>$24,660</td>
<td>$3,921</td>
<td>39,210</td>
<td>$5,881</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley WWTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeration Blowers</td>
<td>Replace aged fixed speed blowers with updated units with VFDs; and implement a DO control system.</td>
<td>$55,500</td>
<td>$5,200</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>$7,800</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,451,910</td>
<td>$169,245</td>
<td>$1,690,512</td>
<td>$237,107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. The payback period was calculated based on a simple payback method.
2. The Total Estimate Project Cost includes 15% for Engineering and 35% for Ancillary Works such as Electrical, Instrumentation, Mechanical, and other required works.

Region of Waterloo
Planning, Development and Legislative Services
Community Planning

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

Date: September 15, 2015          File Code: D23-40/GNIG

Subject: Greenlands Network Implementation Guideline

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to the Greenlands Network Implementation Guideline, as described in Report PDL-CPL-15-48, dated September 15, 2015:

a) Direct staff to circulate a draft of the Greenlands Network Implementation Guideline to the Area Municipalities, Grand River Conservation Authority, Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry, and local consulting firms for a period of at least sixty days for final review and comment; and

b) Direct staff to provide public notification as required by Regional Official Plan policies 10.B.11 through 10.B.13 prior to consideration of the Greenlands Network Implementation Guideline by the Planning and Works Committee at a future date.

Summary:

The Regional Official Plan (ROP) is now in force and effect with the exception of specific deferrals, and has now replaced the 1995 Regional Official Policies Plan. The ROP relies on a variety of Implementation Guidelines to detail the manner in which specific policies are to be implemented by staff and development applicants. ROP Policy 7.A.4 commits the Region to develop a Greenlands Network Implementation Guideline. This Implementation Guideline is proposed to serve as a guide for the preparation of Environmental Impact Statements affecting Core Environmental Features. It also provides technical guidance for delineating the buffers of Regionally-significant environmental features, and natural linkages as required by policies in the
ROP and Area Municipal Official Plans.

The First Draft of the Greenlands Network Implementation Guideline was prepared by staff with substantial input from the Ecological and Environmental Advisory Committee (EEAC) and circulated to the Area Municipalities, the Grand River Conservation Authority and Ministry of Natural Resources, as well as environmental consulting firms active in the Region. Comments and suggestions received were incorporated in a Second Draft which was the subject of a Public Meeting of the Planning and Works Committee on March 8, 2011. It was intended that that draft, once additional comments were incorporated, would be submitted for Council’s consideration shortly thereafter. Because the ROP was appealed in its entirety in early 2011, however, further action on the Implementation Guideline was deferred until the ROP would come into force and effect. Following approval of the ROP by the Ontario Municipal Board on June 18, 2015, Policy 7.A.4 is now in force and effect. Staff have accordingly updated the draft as necessary, and are now proposing to circulate it for at least 60 days until November 30, 2015 for any additional comments. This will inform preparation of a final draft which is expected to be submitted for Council’s consideration early in 2016.

Report:


Policies 10.B.9 and 10.B.10 set the legal context for Implementation Guidelines. The policies recognize:

Regional Implementation Guidelines as. . . statements adopted by resolution of Regional Council which detail the manner in which policies established in this Plan will be implemented. The content and scope of these Implementation Guidelines will be determined by the Region, in consultation with the Area Municipalities and the Grand River Conservation Authority as appropriate, will be updated from time-to-time and will be in conformity with the policies in this Plan. (ROP policy 10.B.9).

Implementation Guidelines elaborate upon ROP policy, but may not be used as a means of introducing “new policy provisions that could be the basis for denying development applications . . . or for interfering with the natural justice rights of landowners and the public” (ROP 10.B.10). As legally binding elaborations of Regional policy, proposed Implementation Guidelines must also be publicized in newspapers and
circulated to public agencies and affected organizations in order to provide interested parties an opportunity to comment upon them. They must also be the subject of a formal public meeting where Council or its standing committee may receive comments (10.B.14).

The Need for a Greenlands Network Implementation Guideline

The ROP defines a Greenlands Network comprising significant environmental features such as Environmentally Sensitive Landscapes (ESLs), Environmentally Sensitive Policy Areas (ESPAs), significant woodlands, wetlands, and other valuable or rare habitats and the linkages among them. The overall goal of the Greenlands Network policies in Chapter 7 is to "maintain, enhance, and restore" the Greenlands Network by requiring development proponents to carry out appropriate studies called Environmental Impact Statements (EISs) to evaluate potential impacts to the features. The Greenlands Network Implementation Guideline identified in ROP Policy 7.A.4 will provide technical guidance to development applicants and approval agencies on the implementation of the policies at a higher level of technical detail than is appropriate in Official Plan policies.

Community Planning staff and the Ecological and Environmental Advisory Committee (EEAC) routinely review EISs in support of development applications. Environmental policy and the science of conducting EISs have evolved considerably since Council adopted the Guideline for the Preparation of Environmental Impact Statements in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo in 2002. It has become apparent that additional matters need to be addressed in the Implementation Guideline in order to guide applicants, EEAC and staff in the preparation and review of development applications. These include:

- providing guidance on the preparation of scoped Environmental Impact Statements;
- formalizing principles for the delineation of boundaries of significant natural features;
- delineating buffers and linkages; and
- defining terms used in the guideline which may not be in the ROP Glossary.

Preparation of the Greenlands Network Implementation Guideline

EEAC and staff began working on an initial draft of the Greenlands Network Implementation Guideline at the time the ROP was adopted by Regional Council in 2009. On December 15, 2009, EEAC completed the First Draft, which was presented to the Planning and Works Committee on January 26, 2010 with the recommendation that it be circulated to agencies and the environmental consulting community for review and comment (Report P-10-007). At the time, staff suggested that Area Municipal
environmental committees consider the Implementation Guideline as a potential common document that all municipalities in the Region could use when EISs are required pursuant to their respective policies. This has the potential to streamline the environmental component of the development review process for agency staff and applicants alike.

Circulation of the draft to agencies and environmental consultants resulted in many insightful and detailed comments from the City of Cambridge, City of Kitchener, City of Waterloo and Grand River Conservation Authority as well as environmental consultants. Staff are very appreciative of the time and effort that Area Municipal staff and environmental advisory committee members devoted to it. The great majority of the comments and suggestions were incorporated into the Second Draft of the Implementation Guideline. This draft was submitted to Planning and Works Committee on November 16, 2010 and circulated for further comment (Report P-10-076). As required by ROP Policy 10.B.14, an advertised Public Meeting of Planning and Works Committee was held at the March 8, 2011 Planning and Works Committee to receive input from interested members of the public (Report P-11-022).

Shortly before the Public Meeting, the ROP was appealed in its entirety including Policy 7.A.4, which mandates the Greenlands Network Implementation Guideline. This put the adoption of Guideline on hold until after the ROP appeals could be resolved. In the interim, the Second Draft has been used by environmental consultants and Area Municipalities for guidance. Staff edited the draft to incorporate comments received at the time of the March 8, 2011 Public Meeting to produce a Third Draft which was not circulated at the time. A copy of the Third Draft is available in the Council Library or from Planning, Development and Legislative Services. Following the approval of the ROP by the Ontario Municipal Board on June 18, 2015, staff updated references in the draft which had become obsolete over the 2011-15 period with the aim of bringing it forward for Council’s consideration.

As 4 ½ years have elapsed since the Public Meeting, staff propose to circulate the Third Draft for any final comments to public agencies and environmental consultants practising in the Region. Comments received over a roughly 60 day period ending November 30, 2015 will be considered in a final draft which will be submitted for Council’s consideration early in 2016.

ROP Policies 10.B.11 through 10.B.13 require at least 20 days’ advance public and agency notification prior to Council’s consideration of a new or revised Implementation Guideline. Staff seek Council’s direction to provide appropriate notification prior to the Planning and Works Committee meeting at which the final draft will be considered.
Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

ROP Policy 10.C.9 requires that the content and scope of Implementation Guidelines be determined by the Region in consultation with Area Municipalities and other appropriate agencies. The First and Second Drafts were circulated to the Area Municipalities, and the great majority of comments returned by Area Municipal staff and their environmental advisory committee members have been incorporated in the Third Draft. This latest draft would now be circulated to the Area Municipalities for any further comments they may have.

The text of the Third Draft is available in the Council Library or directly from Planning, Development and Legislative Services.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

The development of the Greenlands Network Implementation Guideline is identified as Action Item 1.5.1 in the Region of Waterloo Strategic Focus 2011-2014.

Financial Implications:

The cost of placing public notices would be paid from funds in the approved Planning, Development and Legislative Services budget.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Council and Administrative Services staff would place the public notice advertisements in local newspapers. Notice and the text of the Third Draft would also be placed on the Regional website as required by ROP policy 10.B.12.

Attachments:

Nil.

Prepared By:  Chris Gosselin, Manager, Environmental Planning and Stewardship

Approved By:  Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Development and Legislative Services
<table>
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<th>Meeting date</th>
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<th>Assigned Department</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
</table>