Regional Municipality of Waterloo

Planning and Works Committee

Agenda

Tuesday, May 3, 2016

9:00 A.M.

Regional Council Chambers

150 Frederick Street

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

2. Presentations

Dr. Stephanie Sobek-Swant and Keith Ainsworth - rare Charitable Research Reserve re: Research and conservation opportunities at rare

3. Delegations

Consent Agenda Items

Items on the Consent Agenda can be approved in one motion of Committee to save time. Prior to the motion being voted on, any member of Committee may request that one or more of the items be removed from the Consent Agenda and voted on separately.

4. Request to Remove Items from Consent Agenda

5. Motion to Approve Items or Receive for Information

5.1 PDL-CPL-16-26, East Side Lands Master Environmental Servicing Plan (Stage 2) (Information)

**Recommendation:**


5.3 **PDL-LEG-16-34**, Authorization to Expropriate Lands (2nd Report) for Ottawa Street South (Regional Road 4) Improvements Project (Dreger Avenue to Midland Road), In the City of Kitchener

**Recommendation:** 22-23

5.4 **William Street and Strange Street Water** Supply Systems Class Environmental Assessment Public Consultation Centre No. 3 (Information)

### Regular Agenda Resumes

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

**Transit Services**

6.1 **TES-TRS-16-06**, End User Maintenance Agreement for INIT services - Grand River Transit

**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into the End User Maintenance Agreement (EUMA) for the on-going support of software services provided by INIT Innovations in Transportation, Inc. at a total cost of $608,137.88 for a three year term, plus applicable taxes, on terms and conditions satisfactory to the Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services and the Regional Solicitor;

And that the Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services be authorized to execute the agreement as described in Report TES-TRS-16-06, dated May 3, 2016.

6.2. **TES-TRS-16-12**, Change to Grand River Transit (GRT) Route 34 Bingemans at Lancaster Street West Railway Crossing (Information)

**Water Services**

6.3. **TES-WAS-16-12**, C2016-06 Consulting Services - Creation of
Cambridge Pressure Zone 1 West Environmental Assessment

**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into an Agreement for Professional Consulting Services with GM BluePlan Engineering Ltd. to provide engineering services for a Class Environmental Assessment and conceptual design for the Creation of Cambridge Zone 1 West Pressure, at an upset fee limit of $217,072 plus applicable taxes.

6.4. **TES-WAS-16-14,** Source Protection Incentive Program Details

**Recommendation:**

That The Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the Source Water Protection Incentive Program project categories, funding rates and maximum grants as outlined in report TES-WAS-16-14 dated May 3, 2016;

And That The Regional Municipality of Waterloo delegate to the Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services the authority to approve the detailed program guidelines and innovative projects submitted as part of the Source Protection Incentive Program as outlined in report TES-WAS-16-14 dated May 3, 2016;

And That The Regional Municipality of Waterloo extend the Preliminary Incentives for Septic Systems first year grant rate to Baden residents as outlined in report TES-WAS-16-14 dated May 3, 2016.

6.5. **TES-WAS-16-15,** Clean Water Act Risk Management By-law and Fees

**Recommendation:**

That the proposed Clean Water Act Risk Management By-law, substantially in the form attached as Attachment A to Report TES-WAS-16-15 dated May 3, 2016 be placed on an upcoming agenda of Regional Council for its consideration;

And That The Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the Clean Water Act Risk Management Fee Schedule as described in Report TES-WAS-16-15 dated May 3, 2016; and amend the Regional Fees
and Charges By-law 16-001 to include these new fees.

7. Information/Correspondence

7.1 Council Enquiries and Requests for Information 87

8. Other Business


10. Adjourn
### Next Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning and Works Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 24, 2016</td>
<td>9:00 A.M.</td>
<td>Planning and Works Committee</td>
<td>Council Chamber 2nd Floor, Regional Administration Building 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 14, 2016</td>
<td>9:00 A.M.</td>
<td>Planning and Works Committee</td>
<td>Council Chamber 2nd Floor, Regional Administration Building 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation and Environmental Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, May 17, 2016</td>
<td>5:00 P.M. – 7:00 P.M.</td>
<td>William Street and Strange Street Water Supply Systems Class Environmental Assessment Public Consultation Centre No. 3</td>
<td>Public Health and Social Services Building Region of Waterloo 99 Regina Street South 5th Floor Waterloo, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu., May 19, 2016</td>
<td>5:00 P.M. – 7:00 P.M.</td>
<td>William Street and Strange Street Water Supply Systems Class Environmental Assessment Public Consultation Centre No. 3</td>
<td>St. John Catholic Elementary School 99 Strange Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning, Development and Legislative Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu., May 19, 2016</td>
<td>4:00 P.M. – 8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>King Victoria Transit Hub Open House</td>
<td>Kitchener City Hall Rotunda 200 King Street West Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region of Waterloo
Planning, Development and Legislative Services
Community Planning

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: May 3, 2016  File Code: D07-30
Subject: East Side Lands Master Environmental Servicing Plan (Stage 2)

Recommendation:

For information.

Summary:

The Region of Waterloo, together with the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA), the City of Cambridge and the Township of Woolwich and in consultation with the City of Kitchener, is undertaking the East Side Lands Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MESP Stage 2), a Subwatershed Study for the Randall and Breslau Drains, and a Secondary Plan. The MESP Stage 2 will provide the necessary environmental, stormwater management, transportation, water and waste-water servicing, utility and fiscal impact analysis to facilitate the development of approximately 170 net hectares of greenfield land within the City of Cambridge and the Township of Woolwich.

The MESP Stage 2 lands are part of an overall plan to accommodate growth over the next twenty years in the form of new employment and limited new residential development as prescribed in the (approved) Regional Official Plan. The MESP Stage 2 will provide the framework to guide development and provide specific implementation recommendations and associated servicing cost estimates and timing. The study process recognizes that there are benefits to using a comprehensive approach for studies where it is expected that a series of projects will be distributed throughout the study area and ongoing work will be prioritized and implemented at different stages of development. This approach was previously used to work toward creating the new strategic employment lands in North Cambridge (MESP Stage 1).

On January 20, 2016, Council accepted the proposal of MMM Group Limited to complete the Master Environmental Servicing Plan and Secondary Plan for the East Side Lands...
By the end of 2016 as required by the Regional Official Plan (ROP) (COR-TRY-16-07). This report provides additional information regarding the ongoing study.

**Report:**

In June 2003 Regional Council approved the Region of Waterloo’s Growth Management Strategy (RGMS), which sets out a long term strategic framework and identifies where, when and how future residential and employment growth will be accommodated. Goal 5, “foster a strong economy”, included an action to form the necessary partnerships to develop the east side employment lands, as it identified the east side of the Grand River as representing a significant opportunity for employment development. It noted that the range and complexity of planning, development and servicing issues calls for a coordinated, partnership-based arrangement. It recommended the Region take the lead in order to create the necessary partnership to facilitate the development of key infrastructure and to establish cost-sharing arrangements. In adopting the RGMS, Regional Council endorsed the consideration of expansion of the urban area into the East Side Lands.

From the direction set forward in the RGMS, a variety of processes were undertaken to advance the development of the East Side Lands. The following background reports were prepared.

**East Side Community Scoping Study, 2004**

Building on the recommendations of the RGMS, the East Side Community Scoping Study was undertaken in 2004 to assist in scoping the tasks and timing required to resolve the complex planning, development and servicing issues and prepare the East Side Lands for future development. A list of recommended next steps were identified including the recommendation that the Region prepare a Structure Plan to outline land use objectives to develop the East Side Lands.

**East Side Community Structure Plan, 2006**

The East Side Community Structure Plan was developed in 2006 in consultation with the Township of Woolwich and City of Cambridge to assist in staging the East Side Lands development and identifying the recommended first stage to accommodate short term land needs. This plan recommends Scenario #4, a staging of development starting in the City of Cambridge progressing north towards the Township of Woolwich. The recommended scenario identified Stage 1 as the preferred first stage of development to accommodate an identified land need of 300 net hectares for large lot employment purposes. The preferred second stage of development includes the MESP Stage 2 lands in North Cambridge and lands south of the Airport.

In 2010, the East Side Lands Master Environmental Servicing Plan and Community Plan (MESP Stage 1) was initiated to guide the development of the Stage 1 Lands and to fulfil...
the requirements set out in the Scoping Study and Structure Plan. The MESP Stage 1 was approved by Regional Council in April 2014 and subsequently filed. The MESP Stage 1 identified the need for expansion of transportation facilities as well as water distribution and sanitary services along the Fountain Street corridor to accommodate forecasted growth in the East Side Lands. Fountain Street construction is scheduled to be completed in stages commencing in 2018. Additionally, the East Side Lands Wastewater Servicing Class Environmental Assessment is continuing and a servicing agreement with the City of Cambridge is required to provide sanitary servicing to the Region of Waterloo International Airport. A draft agreement has been prepared by staff in Legal Services and is under review by the City of Cambridge.

**MESP Stage 2**

The MESP Stage 2 lands are part of an overall plan to accommodate growth over the next twenty years in the form of new employment and limited new residential development as prescribed in the (approved) Regional Official Plan. These lands form part of the Region’s Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve and will enhance the supply of new employment lands including larger lots for “campus” development and will provide for new business opportunities in proximity to the airport.

Master Environmental Servicing Plans are long range plans which integrate infrastructure requirements for existing and future land use with environmental assessment planning principles. The MESP process uses an integrated approach for the various components of the study recognizing that there are benefits to using a more comprehensive approach to studies where it is expected that a series of projects will be distributed throughout the study area, and work will be prioritized and implemented at different stages of development. This study will provide the necessary environmental, stormwater management, transportation, water and wastewater servicing, utility and fiscal impact analysis to facilitate the development of the MESP Stage 2 lands.

Integrating the planning of infrastructure with the subwatershed study process allows for the full impact of decisions to be evaluated and understood. The Regional Official Plan (ROP) also sets out the steps and studies that need to be completed to facilitate development in the Stage 2 Lands. These studies include consideration of the mix of uses and densities to contribute to a complete community in North Cambridge, provide additional residential land adjacent to Breslau that can be integrated with the existing community, the potential reconfiguration of the existing Prime Industrial/Strategic Reserve to ensure compatibility of existing and future residential uses with the adjacent employment lands, the completion of a subwatershed study, and appropriate servicing. In conjunction with the Airport Master Plan, there is an opportunity to study the lands south of the Airport as part of the potential reconfiguration as future residential land development in this area will be limited. Following the completion of MESP Stage 2, an amendment to the ROP will be required to bring lands into the Urban Area.
The project study area is shown on Figure 1. It encompasses approximately 590 gross hectares generally coincident with the subwatershed boundaries of the Breslau and Randall Drains and the intervening lands that drain to the Grand River. Included in the project study area are the Stage 2 lands (170 hectares). It should be noted that while all the Stage 2 lands will be subject to detailed study, it is anticipated that not all the lands will be appropriate for development. Figure 2 identifies the Prime Industrial Strategic Reserve (MESP Stage 1) lands and the MESP Stage 2 lands.

In combination with environmental work that was completed prior to the initiation of this study, the requirements for a subwatershed study for the Randall and Breslau Drains will be met. Work will include a review of source water protection studies and policies relating to wellhead protection areas, stormwater management strategy, and salt reduction strategy. Work will also include the development of an integrated monitoring plan including pre, during and post-construction monitoring to determine and address the impacts of development on the natural environment.

As part of MESP 2, the Secondary Plan component of the study will be focused on a mix of land uses within the City of Cambridge. The land uses within the Township of Woolwich lands will be considered through the study, but at a higher, more conceptual level. This information will assist in determining the infrastructure requirements for the Stage 2 lands.

The MESP Stage 2 study will fulfill, at a minimum, the first two phases (i.e., up to selecting the preferred solution) in the Planning and Design Process of the Class Environmental Assessment for all non-major road, water and wastewater projects and will clarify the broader questions about the necessary servicing and infrastructure required to inform specific development proposals. An implementation and staging plan will also be included to identify how to implement the recommendations of the study and identify the timing, financing and responsibility for the additional phases of the EA process.

Public consultation will also be an important component of this initiative. Stakeholders, including residents, landowners and existing industries in the area, as well as members of Council and various advisory committees will have opportunities to participate throughout the process and will be encouraged to have input to the study. The final work plan, to be approved by the Project Team, will identify the consultation process and the number and type of meetings required. At minimum, there will be specific opportunities for general public consultation, along with a series of presentations to the various councils and the various advisory committees.

In addition to the MESP Stage 2, a number of other related Regional initiatives are underway that will assist in continuing to advance the development of the East Side Lands, including updates of the Wastewater Treatment Master Plan, the Regional Transportation Master Plan and the Airport Master Plan.
Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination
This project is being jointly led by the Region, the City of Cambridge and the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA). Representatives from the City of Cambridge, the Township of Woolwich and the GRCA are members of the Project Team.

Corporate Strategic Plan:
This report is aligned with the Environment and Sustainable Growth Strategic Objective 3.6 “Improve environmental sustainability and livability in intensifying urban and rural settlement areas”, Thriving Economy Strategic Objective 1.1 “Support existing businesses and attract new employers and investments (to stay, grow, thrive and prosper), and 1.2 “Plan for and provide the infrastructure and services necessary to create the foundation for economic success.”

Financial Implications:
East Side Lands (Stage 2) MESP costs are shared as follows:

Region of Waterloo $502,900
City of Cambridge 147,400
Total $650,300

(All figures are rounded to the nearest $100.)

The Region’s approved 2016 Planning, Development and Legislative Services Capital Program includes a budget of $769,000 for Watershed Growth Studies (Project # 22021) to be funded from the RDC Reserve Fund ($692,000 / 90%) and from the property tax levy ($77,000 / 10%). This amount is sufficient to cover the Region’s share of the costs of the MESP. The remaining budget funds will be used for other required Watershed Growth Studies.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:
Transportation and Environmental Services have representatives on the Project Team.

Attachments:
Figure 1 – Project Study Area and MESP Stage 2 Lands
Figure 2 – MESP Stage 1 Lands and MESP Stage 2 Lands

Prepared By: Brenna MacKinnon, Manager, Greenfield Planning
Approved By: Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Development and Legislative Services
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Water Services
Planning, Development and Legislative Services
Community Planning

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

Date: May 3, 2015  File Code: E12-40(A)

Subject: 2016 Water and Wastewater Monitoring Report

Recommendation:


Summary:

The 2016 Water and Wastewater Monitoring Report (2016 WWWMR) outlines the ability of the Regional water supply and wastewater treatment facilities to accommodate demands to 2026. The full report will be made available on the Region’s Water Services website and at the Regional Administrative Headquarters (Water Services). Draft copies of the report have been circulated to the cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo and also to the townships of North Dumfries, Wellesley, Wilmot and Woolwich.

Generally, water supply capacity was adequate to meet the actual maximum demands in all communities supplied by a Regional system in 2015. The only exception was in West Montrose where operation limitations reduced the ability to operate the wells to their rated capacity. Wastewater treatment capacity was sufficient at all Regional plants to treat the actual average flows in 2015. Water supply and wastewater capacities in 2026 are based on the implementation of works from the Region's current capital programs. Both water supply capacity and wastewater capacity is anticipated to be
adequate to accommodate all current development commitments. The allocation of remaining capacity to new development is determined by Region of Waterloo staff in consultation with the Area Municipalities. The available capacity expressed in this report is the capacity available to service future Planning Act approvals (subdivisions, condominiums, consents, zoning bylaw amendments and minor variances) and/or any building permits issued for development outside of residential plans of subdivision that complies with existing zoning (e.g. site plans).

Report:

Water Services produces the annual Water and Wastewater Monitoring Report with input from the Region's Planning, Development and Legislative Services. The purpose of this report is to:

1. Document actual water consumption and wastewater flows;
2. Provide a basis for water consumption and wastewater flow forecasts required in preparing the capital budgets and user rates;
3. Document water production and wastewater treatment capacities;
4. Update Regional Council with respect to remaining uncommitted capacities of water supply and wastewater treatment infrastructure; and
5. Provide a basis for Water Services staff to provide comment on the water and wastewater aspects of development applications.

In addition, the 2016 WWWMR report will be one of the inputs used in preparing the 2017 water and wastewater capital budget, longer term water and wastewater capital forecast, and in formulating responses to development applications.

Methodology

The WWWMR follows the 1994 Ministry of Environment (Now renamed Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MOECC)) guideline for determining available capacity of water and wastewater infrastructure. Actual water use data is analysed and interpreted in order to forecast future water use. In order to help temper the seasonal impact of anomalous years, a five year average of maximum day water use per person is used to calculate the maximum day per capita flow. The five year average of maximum day water use per person is then multiplied by the population to get the Maximum Day Demand for the current year, and is also multiplied by the population forecasts to get the future design demands.

Maximum day demands are used for demand forecasts in most of the systems with the exception of the Integrated Urban System (IUS) where Maximum Week Demand is used. The MOECC has approved this approach as the IUS is a very large, complex system with multiple water supply sources, storage and redundancies. The maximum week demand is approximately 10% lower than the usual maximum day demand.
A similar approach is used for the wastewater plants. Actual wastewater flow data is used to calculate the average flow per capita for each wastewater treatment plant catchment area. The major difference between water and wastewater systems is that the Average Day Wastewater flow is used instead of the maximum day flow. A five year average is also used to calculate the average per capita flow, and then it is applied to the current year population to calculate the Projected Flow for each plant. The five year average flow per capita is also applied to population forecasts to get the future flow projections.

**Comparison to the 2015 WWWMR**

There have been no changes to the methodology used in the 2016 WWWMR from the 2015 report.

Water consumption patterns and wastewater flows are a function of yearly weather fluctuations. In 2015, the annual precipitation was below the average annual precipitation recorded at the University of Waterloo weather station. Seasonal impacts at some wastewater treatment plants showed generally average or slightly below average flows. The water consumption in 2015 was slightly below the average maximum week. Overall the 5-year average consumption is continuing to decrease.

**2015 Water Supply Capacity and Commitments**

Generally, water supply capacity was adequate to meet the actual maximum demands in all communities supplied by a Regional system in 2015. The only exception was in West Montrose where operation limitations reduced the ability to operate the wells to their rated capacity. Water supply capacities up to 2026 are based on the implementation of works from the Region's current capital programs. Table 1, attached, summarizes the remaining water capacity as of December 31, 2015. The long-term water supply strategy has recently been updated with the Water Supply Master Plan Update. Recommendations from the master plan update are incorporated into this monitoring report.

- The Integrated Urban System (IUS) (Cambridge, Kitchener, Waterloo, Elmira and St. Jacobs water systems) has 50,430 m$^3$/d of remaining capacity, which is equivalent to approximately 143,000 people.
- The Baden/New Hamburg water system has 7,678 m$^3$/d of remaining capacity, which is equivalent to approximately 23,000 people.
- The Ayr water system has 1,432 m$^3$/d of remaining capacity, which is equivalent to approximately 2,500 people.
- The Wellesley water system has 1,799 m$^3$/d of remaining capacity, which is equivalent to approximately 5,250 people.
- The St. Clements water system has 1,307 m$^3$/d of remaining capacity, which is equivalent to approximately 3,600 people.
Small Water Supply Systems

There are 12 small water supply systems owned and operated by the Region. These systems include Conestogo (Conestogo Golf Course and Conestogo Plains), Maryhill (Maryhill and Village Heights) and West Montrose in Woolwich; Linwood and Heidelberg (reported as one system including a portion of Heidelberg in Woolwich and in Wellesley); Foxboro Green (Foxboro) and New Dundee in Wilmot; and Roseville and Branchton Meadows (Branchton) in North Dumfries.

Most of these small systems were designed to only service specific subdivisions in the respective settlement areas and have no additional capacity to service units beyond those subdivisions. Given the complexity of calculating available capacity for the small systems, available system capacity will be evaluated on an individual basis prior to commenting on applications made under the Planning Act. Table 2 summarizes the data on small water systems.

2015 Wastewater Treatment Capacity

Wastewater treatment capacity was sufficient at all Regional plants to treat the actual average flows in 2015. The below-average annual precipitation in 2015 resulted in reduced inflow and infiltration flows throughout the Region. Wastewater capacities up to 2026 are based on the implementation of works from the Region’s current capital programs; Table 1 summarizes the remaining wastewater capacity as of December 31, 2015.

- The Kitchener WWTP has 40,845 m$^3$/d of remaining capacity, which is equivalent to approximately 138,000 people.
- The Waterloo WWTP has 7,305 m$^3$/d of remaining capacity, which is equivalent to approximately 21,900 people.

The projected flows plus committed flows at the Waterloo WWTP is approximately 90% of the rated capacity of the plant. Background work has been initiated through the Wastewater Master Plan to confirm the timing of a future expansion. Timing of the plant capacity expansion will be planned to accommodate projected flows.

- The Galt WWTP has 20,636 m$^3$/d of remaining capacity, which is equivalent to approximately 51,000 people.
- The Preston WWTP has 5,152 m$^3$/d of remaining capacity, which is equivalent to approximately 12,000 people.

In the 2011 WWWMR, wastewater capacity was reserved for the Boxwood Industrial Subdivision in the Preston Wastewater Service Area in the amount of 1,860 m$^3$/d. This number will be assessed annually and adjusted according to the rate of build out of the subdivision. Partial occupancy in the Boxwood subdivision started in late 2014, and continued to increase in 2015. However, the new buildings were generally not occupied until later in the year, so the impact on the wastewater received at the plant would be negligible for 2015, and therefore no adjustments to the reserve capacity have been
made in the 2016 WWWMR. In future years, the reserved capacity will be reduced proportionally based on the development activity.

- The Hespeler WWTP has 2,114 m$^3$/d of remaining capacity, which is equivalent to approximately 7,700 people.
- The Elmira WWTP has 1,694 m$^3$/d of remaining capacity, which is equivalent to approximately 4,000 people.
- The St. Jacobs WWTP has 269 m$^3$/d of remaining capacity, which is equivalent to 541 people. One of the key recommendations from the 2012 Elmira and St. Jacobs Master Plan is to direct wastewater received at the St. Jacobs WWTP to the Waterloo WWTP once the Waterloo WWTP undergoes an expansion. This concept will be confirmed through the Wastewater Master Plan update.
- The Baden/New Hamburg WWTP has 982 m$^3$/d of remaining capacity, which is equivalent to approximately 3,350 people.
- The Ayr WWTP has 1,028 m$^3$/d of remaining capacity, which is equivalent to approximately 3,750 people.
- The Wellesley WWTP has 279 m$^3$/d of remaining capacity, which is equivalent to approximately 1,200 people.

**Servicing Commitments**

Section 51 (24) (i) of the Planning Act obliges the Region to ensure the “adequacy of utilities and municipal services.” In addition, ROP Policy 5.D.1 states that the “servicing requirements for planned development and projected growth will be monitored to ensure that the total system capacities are not exceeded, and to provide sufficient lead time for the planning, design, approval, financing and construction of new facilities.”

Except for site plan approvals, most Planning Act approvals, including plans of subdivision, zoning amendments, and consents require acknowledgement by the Region of Waterloo Water Services Division that water and wastewater servicing capacity is available. Draft approvals are granted based upon the availability of uncommitted capacity in existing water and wastewater systems.

Servicing commitments are made through separate servicing agreements between the Region and the developer, which are executed prior to the registration of a plan of subdivision. The servicing agreement expires within six to 18 months of being signed, at which time the developer would be required to seek a new commitment for servicing if registration of the plan of subdivision has not occurred.

In 1996, Regional Council by Report PC-96-061/ E-96-138 revised the conditions of draft approval for plans of subdivision to include a new condition requiring an Agreement for Servicing and allowing future, unbuilt service capacity to be considered, if three criteria are met:
1. The capacity expansion project must be imminent for construction and thereby included within the first five years of the 10 Year Capital Forecast;

2. There must be a sound technical basis for the anticipated new capacity associated with the project, as a result of completion of the Environmental Assessment, a suitable master plan or other Regional engineering evaluation;

3. Approval of new draft plans of subdivision will be guided by Area Municipal Staging of Development programs and will not exceed 50 per cent of the estimated capacity of major planned service capacity projects or 75 per cent of minor planned projects.

It is important to note that the actual service capacity of a water or wastewater facility to be delivered from a future project cannot be guaranteed until a Certificate of Approval is issued by the MOECC.

Since 1996, the registration of a plan of subdivision has been the point at which the capacity of water and wastewater systems is committed in accordance with MOE policies. However, a significant portion of all residential development is occurring outside of plans of subdivision. For example, in 2015, approximately 50% of residential building permits issued were outside of plans of subdivision. This is primarily development on lands within the built up areas. This trend is expected to continue. Currently, there is no mechanism to provide for a servicing commitment for lands that have zoning in place that would allow development to proceed without additional planning approvals.

The “Remaining Capacity” expressed in this report is the present capacity available in the water system and/or wastewater treatment plant to service future Planning Act approvals (subdivisions, condominiums, consents, zoning amendments, part lot control and minor variances) as well as/or building permits issued for all development outside of residential plans of subdivision.

For the purposes of this report, a “commitment” is presented in terms of number of people and includes the estimated population within: plans of subdivision which have Draft Approval, building permits issued but not yet occupied, and unbuilt registered plans.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

A draft copy of this report was circulated to Area Municipal Planning staff for comment.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

The 2015 Water and Wastewater Monitoring Report supports the Corporate Strategic Focus Area: “Thriving Economy” in the 2015-18 Strategic Plan; specifically Strategic Objective 1.2: “Plan for and provide the infrastructure and services necessary to create the foundation for economic success.”
Financial Implications

The financial implications of this report will be addressed in the preparation of the 2017 Water and Wastewater Capital Programs.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Nil.

Attachments:

Table 1 - Remaining Water and Wastewater Capacity as of December 31, 2015
Table 2 - Small Rural Water System Summary as of December 31, 2015
Table 3 - Commitments as of December 31, 2015

Prepared By: Kevin Dolishny, Senior Project Engineer, Servicing and Development Planning

Brenna MacKinnon, Manager, Greenfield Planning

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

Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Development and Legislative Services
TABLE 1: REMAINING WATER AND WASTEWATER CAPACITY AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WATER</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D = A - (B+C)</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F = D / E * 1000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRATED URBAN WATER SYSTEM</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>177.39</td>
<td>22.18</td>
<td>50.43</td>
<td>0.3516</td>
<td>143,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BADEN-NEW HAMBURG</td>
<td>12.61</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>0.3353</td>
<td>22,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYR WATER SYSTEM</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.5663</td>
<td>2,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELLESLEY</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.3429</td>
<td>5,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. CLEMENTS</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.3651</td>
<td>3,578</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WASTEWATER</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D = A - (B+C)</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F = D / E * 1000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KITCHENER WWTP</td>
<td>122.70</td>
<td>70.29</td>
<td>11.56</td>
<td>40.85</td>
<td>0.2961</td>
<td>137,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATERLOO WWTP</td>
<td>57.50</td>
<td>45.67</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>0.3340</td>
<td>21,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GALT WWTP</td>
<td>56.80</td>
<td>34.87</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>20.64</td>
<td>0.4051</td>
<td>50,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESTON WWTP</td>
<td>16.82</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>0.4327</td>
<td>11,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HESPELER WWTP</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.2752</td>
<td>7,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELMIRA WWTP</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.4272</td>
<td>3,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BADEN-NEW HAMBURG WWTP</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.2926</td>
<td>3,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYR WWTP</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.2742</td>
<td>3,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. JACOBS WWTP</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.4970</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELLESLEY WWTP</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.2332</td>
<td>1,198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2: SMALL RURAL WATER SYSTEM SUMMARY AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ND WIL WOOL WOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D = A - B</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONESTOGA GOLF COURSE</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>0.9076</td>
<td>Case by Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONESTOGA PLAINS</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>0.6247</td>
<td>Case by Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARY HILL</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.7334</td>
<td>Case by Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARY HILL VILLAGE HEIGHTS</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>0.8629</td>
<td>Case by Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST MONTROSE</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.8048</td>
<td>Case by Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEIDELBERG</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>0.2937</td>
<td>Case by Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINWOOD</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>0.2970</td>
<td>Case by Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOXBORO</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>0.3851</td>
<td>Case by Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW DUNDEE</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>0.3857</td>
<td>Case by Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSEVILLE</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>0.5688</td>
<td>Case by Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRANCHTON</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.8194</td>
<td>Case by Case</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A) See Water Distribution Master Plan and Wastewater Treatment Master Plan for capacity details of each system.
(B) See section 2.5 and 2.6 and appendix B & C for details of how average flow is calculated for individual systems.
(C) See Table 3 for details about how committed flow is calculated from committed population in the DGA and BUA.
(D) Both Water systems and Wastewater systems average/max day/week flow equals the average of the previous 5 years per capita flow.
(E) See Section 2.4 and 2.5 for an explanation of average/max flows per capita.
(F) Remaining Capacity divided by Average/Max Flow Per Capita multiplied by 1000. Any new service in the small rural systems must be reviewed by the Region of Waterloo Water Services staff and will be evaluated on a case by case basis.
### TABLE 3: COMMITMENTS AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WATER</th>
<th>COMMITMENTS (PEOPLE)</th>
<th>MAX DAY / WEEK FLOWS PER COMMITMENTS (m3/d/c)</th>
<th>COMMITMENTS (m3/d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DGA</td>
<td>BUA</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRATED URBAN WATER SYSTEM</td>
<td>52,155</td>
<td>10,923</td>
<td>63,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BADEN-NEW HAMBURG</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>1,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYR WATER SYSTEM</td>
<td>2,242</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELLESLEY</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. CLEMENTS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WASTEWATER</th>
<th>COMMITMENTS (PEOPLE)</th>
<th>AVERAGE FLOWS PER COMMITMENTS (m3/d/c)</th>
<th>COMMITMENTS (m3/d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DGA</td>
<td>BUA</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KITCHENER WWTP</td>
<td>34,307</td>
<td>4,747</td>
<td>39,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATERLOO WWTP</td>
<td>7,663</td>
<td>5,285</td>
<td>12,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GALT WWTP</td>
<td>2,773</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESTON WWTP</td>
<td>1,896</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HESPELER WWTP</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELMIRA WWTP</td>
<td>4,264</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BADEN-NEW HAMBURG WWTP</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>1,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYR WWTP</td>
<td>2,242</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. JACOBS WWTP</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELLESLEY WWTP</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A) See appendix D for a detailed breakdown of committed population from known development
(B) Average of the previous five years. See Section 2.5 and 2.6 for an explanation of the Average/Max Flow Per Capita Per Day in Column 'B'
(C) * * Column 'A' multiplied by column 'B'

Preston WWTP commitments include 1,860 m3/day for the Boxwood Industrial Subdivision
Region of Waterloo
Planning Development and Legislative Services
Legal Services

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

Date: May 3, 2016

File Code: L07-90

Subject: Authorization to Expropriate Lands (2nd Report) for Ottawa Street South (Regional Road 4) Improvements Project (Dreger Avenue To Midland Road), In The City of Kitchener

Recommendation:

That Council of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the expropriation of lands for the purpose of reconstruction of Ottawa Street (Regional Road 4) from Dreger Avenue to Midland Road in the City of Kitchener in the Region of Waterloo as detailed in Report PDL-LEG-16-034 dated May 3, 2016, described as follows:

Fee Simple Partial Taking:

i. Part of Lot 1, Registered Plan 1152 being Parts 1 and 2 on 58R-18642 (520 Franklin Street North, Kitchener);

ii. Part of Lot 22, Registered Plan 1152 being Parts 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 on 58R-18642 (38 Evelyn Crescent, Kitchener);

iii. Part of Lot 23, Registered Plan 1152 being Parts 9, 10 and 11 on 58R-18642 (42 Evelyn Crescent, Kitchener);

iv. Part of Lot 24, Registered Plan 1152 being Parts 12, 13 and 14 on 58R-18642 (46 Evelyn Crescent, Kitchener);

v. Part of Lot 37, Registered Plan 1152 being Parts 15 and 16 on 58R-18642 (6 Dreger Avenue, Kitchener);

vi. Part of Block G, Registered Plan 1170 and Part of Lot 2 Registered Plan 976 being Part 2 on 58R-18641 (29 Midland Drive, Kitchener);
And that staff be instructed to register a Plan of Expropriation for the property within three months of the granting of the approval to expropriate the property, as required by the *Expropriations Act*;

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

And that all above-referenced fee simple partial takings situated adjacent to an existing Regional public highway be acquired for road widening purposes and therefore be deemed to form part of the adjacent public highway in accordance with subsection 31(6) of the Municipal Act, 2001, S. O. 2001, c.25;

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

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

**Summary:**

NIL

**Report:**

Regional Council approved improvements on Ottawa Street between the Highway 7 Eastbound Ramp and Lackner Boulevard in Kitchener on April 22, 2015, under By-Law 15-026 as outlined in Report TES-DCS-15-09.

The project improvements include the reconstruction of Ottawa Street with new cycling lanes, curb and gutters, sidewalks and multi-use trails, transit stops, as well as replacement of storm sewer. The implementation of the improvements directly impacts 8 properties as shown in Appendix “A” to this report. In the vicinity of the affected properties (between Highway 7 and River Road) utility relocations are scheduled to commence in the fall of 2016, and construction is scheduled to start in the spring of 2017.

Land acquisitions as outlined in the Recommendation are required from 6 of the
properties and they are for fee simple partial takings for road widening purposes and
transit shelters. There are also acquisitions of two additional partial takings, being the
Waterloo Catholic District School Board from their property known municipally as 39
Midland Drive and the City of Kitchener from their property at the north-east corner of
Nottingham Avenue and Ottawa Street, that have not been included in the expropriation,
as a negotiated agreement is expected.

Council approved the commencement of expropriation of the subject properties on
September 15, 2015 as detailed in report PDL-LEG-15-65. The appropriate forms under
the Expropriations Act were served in order to initiate formal proceedings under the Act
for these properties. 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 being
presented to Council, as detailed in the Region’s Expropriation Information Sheet.

Council approval of the expropriations is being sought at this time to permit registration
of the Plans of Expropriation this summer and possession of the required lands and
interests in the fall of 2016 so that the majority of advance utility relocation work can be
completed before winter which will facilitate the overall construction timeline. Legal
Services staff has been negotiating property acquisitions over the past several months
and intends to continue negotiations with property owners to achieve settlements of their
claims under the Act.

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

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

The expropriation process is proceeding to ensure that the Region has possession of the land for advance utility relocations in 2016 and construction of the Ottawa Street roadway improvements at this location in 2017.

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

The Ottawa Street Improvement Areas are shown attached as 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:

This Project supports the following two strategic objectives of the Corporate Strategic Plan: to optimize existing road capacity to safely manage traffic throughout Waterloo Region, and to develop, promote and integrate active forms of transportation (cycling and walking).

Financial Implications:

The Region’s 2016 Ten-year Transportation Capital Program includes funding of $8,585,000 in the years 2016 - 2020 for the Region’s share of this Ottawa Street Improvements project, to be funded from development charges ($470,000; 5%) and from property taxes through the Roads Rehabilitation Capital Reserve Fund and/or from Federal Gas Tax transfers ($8,115,000, 95%). As part of the upcoming mid-year review of the Transportation Capital Program, staff will be recommending the advancement of funds that are currently approved in 2019 ($3,675,000) be allocated to the year 2017 to allow all of the construction work to proceed in advance of the Ministry of Transportation’s closure of Victoria Street in Late 2017. There is sufficient budget in 2016 to accommodate the acquisition costs of this project. The City of Kitchener is also funding its portion of sidewalk and storm sewer replacements on this project.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

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

Appendix “A” – Sketch of Subject Properties
Appendix “B” – Corporate Profile

Prepared By: Brian Timm, Property Agent
             Fiona McCrea, Solicitor, Property

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

Corporate Profiles

1. 29 Midland Drive, Kitchener, ON
   • Owner: The Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation of the Diocese of Hamilton in Ontario
   • Annual Return: June 21, 2010
   • Directors/Officers:
     David Douglas Crosby

2. 42 Evelyn Crescent, Kitchener, ON
   • Owner: Parents For Community Living Kitchener-Waterloo Inc.
   • Annual Return: November 10, 2014
   • Directors/Officers:
     John Badham, Chris Barker, Daren D Becks, Timothy Flannery, Gary Howell, Marion Kelterborn, Chris Lasovich, Katherine Loveys, Alexandra Milne, Timothy O’Leary, Shereen Rowe, Larry Scanlon, Brittany Seigner, Sharath Thundiyil.
William Street and Strange Street Water Supply Systems

Class Environmental Assessment
Public Consultation Centre No. 3

May 17, 2016 – 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.
Region of Waterloo
Public Health and Social Services Building
99 Regina Street South, 5th Floor, Waterloo
William Street and Strange Street
Water Supply Systems
Class Environmental Assessment
Public Consultation Centre No. 3

May 19, 2016 – 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.
St. John Catholic Elementary School
99 Strange Street, Kitchener
Welcome to Public Consultation Centre No. 3

The Region is planning to combine the Strange Street and William Street water supply systems (WSS).

The Region’s Project Team would like to:

• Provide a progress update
• Discuss your comments and ideas on the conceptual designs that have been developed for the water treatment plant (WTP)
• Outline next steps
The Vision…Getting it Together

The concept was identified through a master planning process.

25 Strange Street, Kitchener

17-23 William Street East, Waterloo

This concept would:

• Improve distribution flexibility and water quality
• Streamline operations

• Reduce Costs
• Allow for uninterrupted water supply during maintenance or in an emergency

The concept requires further development through the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) process.
Planning Process …
We Are Here in the Class EA Process

Phase 1
Identify Problem and/or Opportunity

Phase 2
Develop and Evaluate Solutions and Identify Preferred Solution

Phase 3
Develop and Evaluate Design Concepts for Preferred Solution and Identify Preferred Design

Phase 4
Environmental Study Report (ESR)
30 Day Public Review

Phase 5
Implementation (Design and Construction)
The Story so Far: Develop and Evaluate Solutions

First the following were examined for the location of the Water Treatment Plant:

- William Street Pump Station
- Strange Street Pump Station
- Third site

Next, the following were examined for a water main to connect the pump stations:

- Belmont avenue
- Iron Horse Trail
- Allen Street
- John Street
The Story so Far: Considerations
The Story So Far: Location for Water Treatment Plant

- The **Strange Street site** is ranked the highest because:
  - There is flexibility to supply water to both Kitchener and Waterloo
  - It meets water quality objectives
  - The land is owned by the Region; sufficient space for construction
  - Has lower construction costs
The Story So Far: Watermain Route for Connecting the Sites

The watermain route along the Iron Horse Trail and John Street is ranked the highest because:

- It is the most direct route
- There is less disruption to Belmont Village businesses, Mutual Drive parking users
- There is a potential opportunity to coordinate with Iron Horse Trail construction
- There are fewer utility crossings
The Watermain ...

- Will be constructed within existing road right-of-way
- Will have continued access to properties during construction
- Estimated to take 4 to 6 months for construction and is expected to start in 2017/2018
- Will be constructed in sections to limit impacts
Here are the Design Concepts for the Water Treatment Plant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Demolish Existing Pump Station and Build New WTP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>Build New WTP Parallel to Existing Pump Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>Build New WTP Perpendicular to Existing Pump Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>Merge New WTP In Line with Existing Pump Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 5</td>
<td>Build New WTP Connected Behind Existing Pump Station</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation Criteria

The following criteria were used to evaluate the design concepts for the water treatment plant:

• Ability to Maintain Heritage Features
• Amount of Utility Services Re-Routing Required
• Flexibility of Existing Site
• Impacts on Cost
Alternative 1 – Demolish Existing Pump Station and Build New WTP

Advantages:
- greater flexibility for layout of new WTP, buildings and access roads
- avoids impacts on existing watermain and sanitary sewer

Disadvantages:
- additional cost for demolition of existing pump station
- heritage feature removed
- large building footprint results in higher costs
- removal of existing pump station puts extra demand on overall water supply system until construction of new pump station completed

Estimated cost: $ 20.1 M
Alternative 2 – Build New WTP Parallel to Existing Pump Station

Advantages:
• use of existing pump station results in smaller WTP and lower costs
• no impact to heritage feature

Disadvantages:
• added cost for removal and re-routing of watermain and sanitary sewer
• operational challenges associated with maintaining existing pumping equipment
• less flexibility for future expansion due to proximity of new WTP to floodway
• extra heating, lighting and electric costs for maintaining two buildings instead of one building

Estimated Cost: $19.2 M
Alternative 3 – Build New WTP Perpendicular to Existing Pump Station

Advantages:
- use of existing pump station results in smaller WTP and lower costs
- less watermain and sanitary sewer removal and re-routing
- location of new WTP minimizes site excavation and grading
- no impact to heritage feature

Disadvantages:
- new WTP constrained due to required setbacks from floodway
- operational challenges associated with maintaining existing pumping equipment
- extra heating, lighting and electric costs for maintaining two buildings instead of one building

Estimated Cost: $ 19.3 M
Alternative 4 – Merge New WTP Inline with Existing Pump Station

Advantages:
- use of existing pump station results in smaller WTP and lower costs
- more flexibility for future expansion since new WTP further from floodway
- minor watermain and sanitary sewer removal and re-routing

Disadvantages:
- cost of construction higher due to location of new WTP on a slope
- impact to key elements of heritage feature
- more complex routing for access road

Estimated Cost: $ 19.6 M

Legend
- Floodway
- Property Line
Alternative 5 – Build New WTP Connected Behind Existing Pump Station

Advantages:
• maximizes use of available land
• small building footprint results in lower costs
• location of new WTP minimizes site excavation and grading
• new WTP further away from floodway

Disadvantages:
• some impact to heritage feature
• re-routting of sanitary sewer required

Estimated Cost: $18.1 M

Based on the preliminary evaluation, this alternative ranked higher than the other alternatives.
### Preliminary Evaluation of WTP Design Alternatives by the Project Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alternative 1 Demolish Existing Pump Station and Build New WTP</th>
<th>Alternative 2 Build New WTP Parallel to Existing Pump Station</th>
<th>Alternative 3 Build New WTP Perpendicular to Existing Pump Station</th>
<th>Alternative 4 Merge New WTP In-Line with Existing Pump Station</th>
<th>Alternative 5 Build New WTP Connected Behind Existing Pump Station</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Features Maintained</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer / Water Main Re-Routing Required</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Road Design</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Development Limitations Due to Floodway</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts on Cost</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking of Alternatives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Summary Highest Ranking...

Water Treatment Plant Design

Alternative 5

- key heritage features preserved
- maintains purpose of existing pump station
- maximizes use of available land
- small building footprint results in lower cost
- lowest capital cost of all alternatives
What Will the Site Look Like?

These drawings were prepared to present a three-dimensional outline of the conceptual building layout. Building materials and other specific architectural elements for the new facility will be developed during the detailed design stage of the project. As a result, the finished building may not appear exactly as shown here.
What Will the Site Look Like?

These drawings were prepared to present a three-dimensional outline of the conceptual building layout. Building materials and other specific architectural elements for the new facility will be developed during the detailed design stage of the project. As a result, the finished building may not appear exactly as shown here.
What Happens Next?

Spring 2016
Consider comments received at this Public Consultation Centre, Confirm preferred design concept

Fall 2016
File Environmental Study Report for Public Review – Phase 4
Ways to Get Involved:

- Complete the Comment Sheet Provided Today
- Contact the Region and/or Consultant on the Handout
- Provide Comments on the Environmental Study Report Through Future Notification
- Register with the Region / Consultant to Receive Future Notifications

Thank you for your participation!
We'd Like to Hear From You

Please deposit your comment sheet in the box provided or forward to the Region.

Contact information:

Kaoru Yajima  
Senior Project Engineer  
Region of Waterloo  
Water Services  
150 Frederick St, 7th Floor  
Kitchener ON N2G 4J3  
519-575-4757 ext 3349  
kyajima@regionofwaterloo.ca

Stephen Nutt  
Project Manager  
XCG Consultants Ltd.  
820 Trillium Drive  
Kitchener ON N2R 1K4  
519-741-5774  
stephen.nutt@xcg.com
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Transit Development

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

Date: May 3, 2016         File Code: D 28-20/ITS

Subject: End User Maintenance Agreement for INIT services - Grand River Transit

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into the End User Maintenance Agreement (EUMA) for the on-going support of software services provided by INIT Innovations in Transportation, Inc. at a total cost of $608,137.88 for a three year term, plus applicable taxes, on terms and conditions satisfactory to the Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services and the Regional Solicitor;

And that the Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services be authorized to execute the agreement as described in Report TES-TRS-16-06, dated May 3, 2016.

Summary:

In early 2007, Grand River Transit (GRT) began equipping buses with the Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) transit management system supplied by INIT Innovations in Transportation. This partnership was endorsed by Council on February 15, 2006 when it passed report P-06-014.

The computer-aided dispatch and automatic vehicle location (CAD/AVL) system and automatic passenger counting (APC) systems have provided significant benefits relating to operational efficiency, service quality and customer service.

Recently customer information for patrons has been enhanced by the addition of on-board, at stop, and the EasyGo suite of applications all providing real time information. The current GRT Business Plan recommends the expansion of the availability of real time passenger information and the continued automation of transit operations and
dispatch control. The continued relationship with INIT will allow GRT to achieve the business plan recommendations for advanced transit technology.

One of the key benefits of the advanced transit technology is the ability to provide on-board visual and audible annunciation of next stops. The entire active fleet consists of all low-floor fully accessible buses installed with the automated audio and visual announcements. The Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) requires that transit systems and services reduce, and do not create barriers for customers with disabilities. The continued operation of the software systems will facilitate the announcement of bus stops on regular routes, routes on detour and will enable route announcements to be made outside the bus.

The three-year end user maintenance agreement will ensure INIT continues to provide support for the Intelligent Transportation System including client, server, vehicle and communications software, and future software upgrade implementations. The total cost for the three year term is $608,137.88 plus applicable taxes and is funded from GRT’s operating budget.

**Report:**

INIT’s intelligent transportation control system has been in operation on GRT buses since the initial launch in 2007. The INIT in-vehicle system and other components are currently installed on all 254 buses in the GRT active fleet. INIT’s integrated central system includes functions for analyzing, planning, implementing and improving on street transit vehicle operations through continuous tracking and communications with transit buses. The performance of the INIT system has been effective and reliable, providing considerable benefits to customers and service delivery.

The intelligent transportation control system is divided into several subsystems which focus on the specific tasks of the transit service. Each of these components helps to optimize the transit service performance and increases service reliability in general. INIT’s intelligent transportation control system provides the following functionalities:

- CAD/AVL system for real-time tracking of vehicles at the transit control centre, which provides enhanced ability for central control of on-street operations to achieve greater operational efficiency and improved service reliability.
- Data communication between vehicles and dispatch to provide continuous tracking and message transmission.
- In-vehicle variable message sign (VMS) display and next stop audio announcements as per requirements set by the AODA.
- Automatic passenger counters (APC) that provide the data required to optimize route designs, service levels and schedules.
- Central data processing and analysis software
• Variable message sign (VMS) at stops displaying next bus arrival information on a real-time basis
• Integration with third party software through Google Real-time Interface and an API (application programming interface) to provide real time information for smart phone application, Google trip planning, real-time maps, Interactive Voice Response (IVR) phone system and Short Message Service (SMS) text messaging.
• Transit Signal Priority (TSP) at intersections for the Route 200 and ION iXpress

Through this agreement INIT provides software maintenance services to support the access, delivery and management of the Intelligent Transportation System. This includes support for client software, server software, vehicle software, and communications software which would cover support for version updates, error correction, and assistance with temporary corrective actions. GRT Staff make abundant use of the 24/7 telephone support provided by INIT to keep systems operating smoothly for GRT patrons and internal Regional staff. This is the third renewal of the INIT End User Maintenance Agreement and the duration is for another three year term.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

The continued relationship between the Region and INIT Innovations in Transportation, Inc. through this agreement supports the implementation of Council’s Strategic Focus, identified under Focus Area 2: Sustainable Transportation within Waterloo Region. This agreement will aid with Strategic Objective 2.1 creating a public transportation system that is integrated, accessible, affordable and sustainable.

Financial Implications:

The total cost of extending the End User Maintenance Agreement with INIT Innovations in Transportation, Inc. for a further three years is $608,137.88 plus applicable taxes. The agreement is effective from August 15, 2015 to August 31, 2018.

The annual costs associated with this contract extension are $206,280 including net HST. The approved 2016 GRT Operating Budget includes $167,700 for INIT Maintenance Agreement costs. It is expected that the additional $38,580 required in 2016 will be accommodated within the approved 2016 GRT operating expenditure budget of $112.3 million. The 2017 base budget will include additional funding for this contract.

The Purchasing By-Law provides that a “Purchase by Negotiation” is appropriate when “there is only one known source of supply” and “the acquisition involves ongoing maintenance and service requirements for Regional property”. Such negotiated acquisitions still require Council approval when the contract value exceeds $100,000.

Additional vehicles that have been added to the overall fleet since the last agreement was
reached have resulted in an overall increase in the annual maintenance charges provided by INIT. The cost of the previous contract was $545,890.05 plus applicable taxes.

The cost of the end user maintenance agreement provided by INIT is considered to be fair and reasonable and reflect current market conditions. Staff has reviewed this cost and find it reasonable and competitive based on discussion with another transit authority using the same CAD/AVL vendor. INIT Innovations in Transportation, Inc. has proven to be a reliable company and its technology effective for GRT use.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

This report was prepared in cooperation with staff from Transit Services, Legal Services and Purchasing.

Attachments

Nil.

Prepared By: David Sutherland, Project Implementation Coordinator, Transit Services

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

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning & Works Committee
Date: May 3, 2016 File Code: D28-50(A)
Subject: Change to Grand River Transit (GRT) Route 34 Bingemans at Lancaster Street West Railway Crossing

Recommendation:
For information.

Summary:
To improve service reliability, schedule adherence and to address customer comments, Route 34 Bingemans is planned to use the Margaret Avenue Bridge starting from the summer GRT schedule in June 2016. The route currently crosses the Metrolinx rail corridor at-grade on Lancaster Street West just north of Victoria Street North. Data analyzed by staff indicates that buses are being delayed by trains at this location, and a grade separated crossing would address this issue. The route change would provide a more reliable service for GRT customers.

Report:
Multiple comments from customers have been received regarding delays to Route 34 associated with the at-grade railway crossing on Lancaster Street West (see Figure 1). Two concerns relate to a late-night freight train that operates in this corridor, affecting the 10:30pm trip from Charles Street Terminal, while a third concern relates to train service in the afternoon, affecting the 3:05pm trip.
Figure 1 – Lancaster Street West Railway Crossing

Data analyzed by staff determined that while delays to Route 34 do not occur on a daily basis, over the course of one month (January 4 – February 3, 2016) there were several days where significant delays were experienced. The largest delay occurred on the evening of January 7, 2016, when a bus was stopped for over seven minutes on Lancaster just before the railway crossing.

These delays resulted in buses running behind schedule at the Shirley Drive/Bingemans Centre Drive timepoint, where 24% of observed trips arrive late by greater than 3 minutes after the scheduled time, resulting in on-time performance of only 76%.

While not all of this delay can be attributed to waiting for a passing train, it is quite likely this is a key contributing factor. To address this issue, adjusting service to use the bridge on Margaret Avenue instead of Lancaster Street West was assessed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Drawbacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ No chance of delay due to train crossing; improved schedule adherence</td>
<td>- Difficult stop placement and loss of a shared stop with the 204 iXpress at the Victoria Street North/Margaret Avenue intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Protects route from anticipated additional train traffic in the rail corridor (i.e., improved GO service)</td>
<td>- Partially removes route from the Victoria Street North corridor, which is envisioned for frequent combined service towards the future Regional Transit Hub</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Addresses customer complaints

Addresses operator concern with waiting time to make inbound left-turn from Wellington Street North to Lancaster Street West

Provides closer access to the Victoria Common development via stops at Wellington Street North/St. Leger Street, which could increase usage of the route

While there are a couple drawbacks to this route change, staff are of the opinion that these are relatively minor issues at the time-being, and are outweighed by the benefits of the change, especially regarding schedule reliability. As Route 34 is a peak-only industrial service, poor or erratic schedule reliability affects customers' ability to arrive at work on time. The route likely would have operated along Margaret Avenue when it was first introduced in September 2015; however, the new bridge replacement was not open at that time.

Figure 2 – Current Routing (light, thin line) and Proposed Routing (dark, thick line)

The option of using Weber Street West to cross under the railway was considered, but not carried forward because there is an at-grade crossing of the Spur Line on Wellington Street North just west of Margaret Avenue that would remain in the route path. This would also further remove the route from Victoria Street North, the arterial
road and main service corridor in the area.

Simply adjusting the Route 34 schedule to avoid train times was also considered, but is not a feasible option as Route 34 is interlined with other routes, schedule times are set to ensure arrival for shift times in the Victoria North Industrial Park, and the late-night freight train does not have a published schedule to work around.

This service change would be implemented for the summer 2016 schedule, which begins on Monday, June 27, 2016. No change to service hours would be required, and there would therefore be no operating cost impact.

Next steps include: posting notices for customers at stops and online, describing the route change; implementing two new bus stops at the Victoria Street North/Margaret Avenue intersection and removing two current bus stops at the Lancaster Street West/Victoria Street North intersection; changing bus stop signage; and updating information for operators. The City of Kitchener will also be notified.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

This route change supports Council’s Strategic Focus Area 2.1: Create a public transportation network that is integrated, accessible, affordable and sustainable.

**Financial Implications:**

Nil.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

This report will be circulated to City of Kitchener Transportation Planning staff for their information.

**Attachments:**

Nil.

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

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

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: May 3, 2016 File Code: E03-20-04181
Subject: C2016-06 Consulting Services – Creation of Cambridge Pressure Zone 1 West Environmental Assessment

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into an Agreement for Professional Consulting Services with GM BluePlan Engineering Ltd. to provide engineering services for a Class Environmental Assessment and conceptual design for the Creation of Cambridge Zone 1 West Pressure, at an upset fee limit of $217,072 plus applicable taxes.

Summary:

In 2014 the Region completed the Water Supply and Distribution Optimization Master Plan, which outlined the water supply and operation strategy for the Integrated Urban System (IUS). In the master plan, a number of supply and operation projects were identified for the City of Cambridge that would increase the storage and transmission functionality in this community. A subsequent study titled the Implementation Plan for Cambridge Water System Upgrades further developed the concepts for eight of the projects from the master plan in order to execute the preferred strategies. This Environmental Assessment (EA) will address two of the eight projects. The project consists of a proposed low lift booster pumping and chloramination station, supporting trunk watermain, supporting pressure reducing valves, and system boundary adjustments to create a new pressure zone Cambridge 1 West.

A consultant selection process was followed in accordance with the Region By-law 04-093 for the procurement of goods and services and included price as a factor. It is
recommended that GM BluePlan Engineering Ltd. of Kitchener, Ontario, provide consulting engineering services to complete the Class EA and conceptual design for the Creation of Cambridge Pressure Zone 1 West at an upset limit of $217,072 plus applicable taxes.

Report:

1. Background

The Region of Waterloo (Region) completed a Water Supply and Distribution Optimization Master Plan in 2014 which outlined the strategies for operating and optimizing the Integrated Urban System (IUS). The major recommendations from the study involved several projects in the City of Cambridge that would increase the operational functionality of the Cambridge distribution system. The Region completed a subsequent study entitled Implementation Plan for Cambridge Water System Upgrades (Implementation Plan). The Implementation Plan further developed the concepts recommended in the master plan and outlined how each of the projects are to be implemented. The recommendations of the Implementation Plan include eight specific projects:

1) Cambridge Zone 3 Upgrades
2) New Kress Hill Pressure Reducing Valve (PRV)
3) Creation of New Cambridge 1 West Pressure Zone
4) Cambridge Zone 1 Pressure Zone Changes
5) Pinebush System Re-configuration
6) Rahmans Wells Re-configuration
7) New Hespeler Water Treatment Plant
8) New CAM 2 West Booster Pumping Station

The focus of this environmental assessment is on projects 2 and 3 noted above. The other projects are being considered under separate studies.

The purpose of this EA is to detail the necessary infrastructure requirements and system modification in order to create a new pressure zone Cambridge 1 West in the City of Cambridge.

2. Consultant Selection

On February 22, 2016, the Region placed advertisements for this project on its website and in the Waterloo Region Record, inviting submissions from consultants to provide services for the Cambridge Pressure Zone 1 West Environmental Assessment.

Two (2) consultants submitted a Proposal (Technical and Upset Budget): C3 Water Inc.
Each proposal was reviewed by the consultant selection team consisting of: Kevin Dolishny, Senior Project Engineer (Water Services Division); Matt Bender, Supervisor Operations and Maintenance, (Water Services Division); Adelaide Batista, Senior Project Manager Environmental Engineering (Design and Construction Division), and Joanne Markovic (Treasury Services, Procurement).

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

Quality factors

- Project Approach/Understanding/Work Plan 25%
- Qualifications and Experience of the Project Manager 20%
- Qualifications and Experience of the Project Support Staff 20%
- Experiences of the Consultant on Similar Projects 15%

Equity Factors

- Current Workload of the Consultant with the Region 3%
- Local Office of the Consultant 2%

Price Factor

- Upset Price 15%

The Quality, Equity, and Price Factors were then considered for the two (2) submissions and the submission from GM BluePlan Engineering Ltd. received the highest points in total, and the upset fees were very close, within 5% of each other. Staff therefore recommends that GM BluePlan Engineering Ltd. be awarded this assignment for an upset fee of $217,072 plus applicable taxes.

3. **Scope of Work**

For this assignment, the Consultant will provide professional consulting services during the Class EA process to detail the facilities identified in the Implementation Plan, including the proposed low lift pumping station and chloramination facility, supporting trunk watermain, supporting pressure reducing valve, and system boundary adjustments to create the new pressure zone Cambridge 1 West. Once the details for the facilities and infrastructure are confirmed during the Class EA study, the consultant
will complete a conceptual design for the preferred solution.

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

4. Schedule

Subject to Council’s approval of this assignment for professional consulting services, the Class EA will commence in May 2016 with anticipated completion of the assignment in May 2017.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

The Creation of the Cambridge Pressure Zone 1 West EA supports the Corporate Strategic Focus Area: Thriving Economy in the 2015-18 Strategic Plan Strategic Objective 1.2: “Plan for and provide the infrastructure and services necessary to create the foundation for economic success.”

Financial Implications:

The Region’s approved 2016 Ten Year Water Capital Budget and Forecast includes $31,025,000 for the Cambridge Water Distribution Upgrades (project # 4181) of which $250,000 is allocated in 2016 and 2017 for this Class EA and conceptual design. The consultant’s upset fee of $217,072 plus applicable taxes is within the budget allowance for this engineering work. The Creation of Cambridge Pressure Zone 1 West Environmental Assessment and conceptual design will be funded 75% ($162,804) by the User Rates Water Reserve Fund and 25% ($54,268) by the Regional Development Charges.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Nil

Attachments

Appendix A: Breakdown of Consultant’s Upset Fee

Prepared By: Kevin Dolishny, Senior Project Engineer, Engineering and Planning

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

Creation of Cambridge Pressure Zone 1 West Environmental Assessment
Breakdown of Consultant's Upset Fee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Assessment</td>
<td>$169,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Design</td>
<td>$47,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Upset Fee (excluding applicable taxes)</td>
<td>$217,072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Water Services

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: May 3, 2016  File Code: E06-05/INC/RMP/SEPTIC/P&W
Subject: Source Protection Incentive Program Details

Recommendation:
That The Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the Source Water Protection Incentive Program project categories, funding rates and maximum grants as outlined in report TES-WAS-16-14 dated May 3, 2016;

And That The Regional Municipality of Waterloo delegate to the Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services the authority to approve the detailed program guidelines and innovative projects submitted as part of the Source Protection Incentive Program as outlined in report TES-WAS-16-14 dated May 3, 2016;

And That The Regional Municipality of Waterloo extend the Preliminary Incentives for Septic Systems first year grant rate to Baden residents as outlined in report TES-WAS-16-14 dated May 3, 2016.

Summary:
The Grand River Source Protection Plan policies will protect municipal drinking water sources. The Region is responsible for implementing a range of policies, including providing incentives to manage risks. In October 2016, Regional Council approved the incentive program principles and directed staff to develop program details. The incentive program’s proposed grant rates (Attachment A) specify the percentage of cost share and maximum grant available within each incentive category. The proposed grant rates are based on the successful Rural Water Quality Program (RWQP) and the Business Water Quality Program. Areas closest to the water supply wells will be prioritized for implementation.
In addition staff propose incentives to upgrade or decommission private non-farm water supply wells, although not required in the SPP. This would protect municipal water sources from improperly constructed or decommissioned wells, which create pathways for contamination. Currently funding is available to farmers through the RWQP and this funding would provide support to non-farm residents.

Incentive Program Guidelines will include additional details regarding application process, project cost limitations and eligibility criteria. It is recommended that the detailed guidelines be approved by the Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services.

In October 2015, Regional Council approved the Septic System Inspection Incentive Program with a decreasing annual funding rate; however, Baden residents were not initially eligible therefore staff propose extending the 2015 funding rate to these residents for 2016.

Report:

Background

The Source Protection Plan Policies Will Protect Municipal Drinking Water Sources
To protect the quality and quantity of drinking water sources, the ‘Clean Water Act’ (2006) established a process to create watershed based, locally-developed Source Protection Plans (SPP) for each watershed in Ontario. Policies to protect drinking water sources in Waterloo Region are in the Grand River SPP. On November 26, 2015, the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) approved the Grand River SPP with an effective date of July 1, 2016. The status of implementation preparation was provided to Region Council on March 22, 2016 (TES-WAS-16-09).

Region Council Approved Incentive Program Principles and Preliminary Septic Incentives
The Region is required to implement many SPP policies, including providing incentives. Region Council directed staff to develop an incentive program for existing activities where incentive policies apply, as required by the SPP (E-12-075, August 14, 2012). Council approved the program’s foundational principles and rationale (TES-WAS-15-25, October 6, 2015):

- Improve water protection and maximize funding by encouraging beneficial management practices and sharing project costs
- Improve the implementation of more restrictive policies through incentives
- Build on the successful Business and Rural Water Quality Programs.
In addition, Region Council approved preliminary septic incentives (TES-WAS-15-25, October 6, 2015) to encourage early participation for new septic inspection requirements.

This report proposes the Source Protection Incentive Program project categories, grant rates, and grant maximums. It also recommends an extension to the preliminary septic incentive program.

**Incentive Program Details**

**Areas Closest To Municipal Wells Will Be Prioritized During Implementation**

As described in report TES-WAS-15-25, incentives would be provided in the following two scenarios:

- In the most vulnerable areas (e.g. closest to wells) incentives would be provided in parallel with prohibition and risk management policies which may require removal or upgrades to existing structures or practices. These changes will be at the owner’s or tenant’s expense and would be beyond what is required in other areas. Incentives would ease the burden of landowners required to meet these new policies.

- In less vulnerable areas incentives and education will be the primary tool to manage an activity.

The majority of activities eligible for incentives fall under the first scenario; therefore, the incentive program will be rolled out in parallel with the RMP process starting with properties closest to the wells.

**Incentive Program Ensures Appropriate Water Protection Projects Will Be Funded**

The structure of the Source Protection Incentive Program is presented in Attachment A, which shows the incentive program categories, project categories, and cost share and maximum grant rates for each project category. The incentive categories align with the RMP classes (as identified in the Clean Water Act Risk Management By-law proposed in report TES-WAS-16-15 dated May 3, 2016) and include agriculture, chemical, and salt. In addition, two additional categories are proposed for small septic systems and wells even though these activities do not require RMPs. Septic systems are included because they can be identified as significant threats and upgrades could reduce the risk to municipal drinking water supplies. The rationale for including wells is presented below.

For each incentive program category a number of eligible projects have been identified and a cost share and project maximum proposed. Eligible projects were selected for each incentive category based on technical analysis; program experience; and industry, municipal staff and stakeholder input. The grant rates and grant maximums have been
developed based on data from the successful Rural Water Quality Program and the Business Water Quality Program, both of which provided funding to property owners for projects similar to those proposed as part of this program.

In general, grants are proposed at a 75 percent grant rate which is greater than that provided by the rural and business programs at around 50 percent. It is proposed that the grant rates in this program be higher to reflect that most of the incentives will be linked to required RMPs and benefit the Region’s municipal source waters. However, the grant rates still include a portion to be provided by the property owner as there may be benefit to the property owner/tenant and it helps ensure they will continue to maintain the project or practice.

To implement the incentive program, detailed implementation guidelines will be developed to ensure that funding is provided to projects for which a SPP incentive policy applies, and ensure accountability and transparency for applicants. Specifically, the Guidelines will provide details regarding eligibility criteria, including eligible project costs and eligible applicants; limitations to grant availability. These will be adapted from the Rural Water Quality Program and modified to reflect the structure of the SPP policies. It is recommended that the detailed guidelines be approved by the Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services.

The Guidelines will also include a category for “Innovative Projects” to allow flexibility for individual property circumstances (e.g. differences in size, magnitude of potential impacts and/or mitigation approach to chemical storage). This concept recognizes the uncertainty in trying to anticipate all types of mitigation strategies across the many different properties and activities that could pose a risk to municipal water supply sources. A similar approach was included in the Rural Water Quality Program to encourage new and emerging techniques to manage activities. These projects would be considered on a case-by-case basis and an upset limit of $25,000 is proposed. It is recommended that applications for innovative projects be approved by the Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services.

As noted in Region Council-approved reports (TES-WAS-15-25, TES-WAS-15-12, and E-12-075) incentives would only be provided to private property owners and for existing activities. Activities undertaken by local area municipalities, the GRCA or the Region e.g. storm water management, application of road salt) would not be eligible for funding.

**Incentive for Wells Will Reduce Risk to Source Water Areas**

Staff propose including funding to decommission and upgrade private non-farm wells as part of the Source Protection Incentive Program. Wells are not a prescribed activity under the Clean Water Act, and therefore cannot be considered significant threats; however, wells can increase the vulnerability of groundwater to contamination.
Older wells may not be properly constructed to current standards and many of these wells have been replaced by newer wells or are not being used. These wells may be a direct conduit (called “transport pathway” under the Clean Water Act) between surface activities and municipal water sources.

Incentives to upgrade private water supply wells or properly decommission these wells would reduce the risk that existing activities could impact the Region’s drinking water sources. Currently within Waterloo Region, rural non-farm residents are not eligible for funding related to their wells. Since 1993, farmers have received funding through the Rural Water Quality Program to decommission or upgrade existing wells. Incentives in this program would be directed to non-farm residents with active or inactive private water supply wells in municipal well head protection areas identified in the Grand River SPP, which are located primarily in the rural townships of the Region.

The proposed well funding would match the rates currently available to the farming community: 75% for well upgrades and 100% for well decommissioning. The higher cost share for well decommissioning recognizes that well owners may not see the direct benefit of decommissioning, which can be expensive; whereas the Region benefits when these wells are properly decommissioned.

Funding would not be provided for wells installed for commercial, irrigation or monitoring purposes.

In considering the incentives for private non-farm well upgrades or decommissioning, Region staff propose an annual cap of $25,000, which depending on project costs, could decommission approximately ten wells and upgrade six wells. Because wells cannot be a significant threat under the ‘Clean Water Act’, staff would not allocate incentives for private well work beyond this annual amount, this funding would be available on a first-come/first-serve basis.

Program Roll-out and Cost Implications
The RMP and incentive programs will be initiated early fall 2016 in areas closest to municipal wells. This time is to ensure a smooth transition to the new screening process for development applications and building permits following the July 1 implementation date (TES-WAS-16-09 dated March 22, 2016). As previously mentioned, the initial priority of the Source Protection Incentive Program will focus on those activities being undertaken in our most vulnerable areas and requiring a RMP.

The total disbursement of incentives, over the proposed ten-year RMP implementation plan, is estimated at approximately $5-6 million. This is based on a number of assumptions, including the number of properties requiring upgrades, the cost of the upgrades, the number of RMPs completed each year and the timing for when the project is actually constructed following negotiation of the RMP. Once the program has
been initiated, the incentive projections will become more accurate and staff will obtain a better sense of the number and type of projects required, cost estimates for these projects and construction timing. In addition to regular updates to Regional Council on the progress of implementation, staff will undertake a comprehensive review of the incentive program arising from the first three years of implementation and will present any proposed changes to Regional Council for consideration.

Preliminary Incentives for Septic System Modifications

Preliminary Septic Pump-Out Incentives Encouraging Early Participation
Region Council approved a preliminary incentive program (TES-WAS-15-25) to assist the local municipalities meet their new septic inspection requirements in wellhead protection areas. Incentives were approved to encourage early action and therefore the grant rate decreases each year until the inspection deadline, August 16, 2017. In the first six months, almost one third of the estimated 650 septic owners have claimed their grant: 190 grants for a total of $49,270.

Extending Septic Pump-Out Incentives to Offer First Year Rates to Baden
In May 2015, the septic system inspection program in Wilmot Township was initiated but notices were not sent to residents in the Baden wellhead protection area as because the Baden wells are not currently operational. Upon further consideration it was decided that implementation of the septic system inspection program should proceed as these wells are identified as the back-up supply to Baden and New Hamburg in the approved Baden/New Hamburg Master Water Supply Strategy (2015). Therefore, staff recommend extending the first-year funding rate to the eligible septic owners in Baden: in 2016 they would receive $260 instead of $195. In 2017, septic system owners in Baden would receive $130, the same as the other eligible septic owners throughout Waterloo Region.

Corporate Strategic Plan:
The implementation of the Grand River SPP is an action item in the Region's 2015-2018 Strategic Plan in Focus Area 3: Environmental and Sustainable Growth to protect the quality and quantity of our water resources.

Financial Implications:
The approved 2016 Water Capital Budget includes $210,000 for ‘Clean Water Act’ incentives funded from the Water Reserve Fund.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:
Not applicable
Attachments:
Attachment A: Incentive Program Grant Rates

Prepared By: Leanne Lobe, Supervisor Source Water Protection Programs
Amy Domaratzki, Risk Management Official

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner Transportation and Environmental Services
Source Protection Incentive Program Grant Rates
Grant Percentages and Maximum Grant Dollar Amounts by Category

1. Site Assessment and Innovative Projects (grants available per property)
   - Chemical and Nutrient Site Assessment 75% $ 4,000
   - Innovative Projects 75% $25,000

2. Chemical Handling and Storage (grants available per activity)
   - Spill Prevention & Response 75% $ 3,000
   - Spill Containment 75% $10,000
   - Storage of Home Heating Oil 75% $ 2,000

3. Farming Activities (grants available per activity)
   - Application of Nutrients 75% $ 7,500
   - Confined Areas 75% $ 7,500
   - Grazing Areas 75% $ 7,500
   - Storage of Nutrients 75% $25,000
   - Application of Pesticides 75% $ 3,000

4. Winter Maintenance (grants available per activity)
   - Smart About Salt Certification 75% $ 300
   - Ice Formation Prevention 75% $ 5,000
   - Salt Storage 75% $ 5,000

5. Small Septic Systems (grants available per system)
   - Tertiary System Sampling, Reporting and Maintenance (3 years at $800) 75% $ 2,400
   - Septic Upgrades to Tertiary 75% $10,000

6. Well Projects (grants available per well on a first-come/first-serve basis)
   - Well Decommissioning 100% $ 2,500
   - Well Upgrades 75% $ 2,000

Note: An annual budget of $25,000 has been allocated for well projects. It is available on a first-come/first-serve basis for eligible projects.
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Water Services

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: May 3, 2016
File Code: E06-05/BY-LAW/FEE-P&W
Subject: Clean Water Act Risk Management By-law and Fees

Recommendation:
That the proposed Clean Water Act Risk Management By-law, substantially in the form attached as Attachment A to Report TES-WAS-16-15 dated May 3, 2016 be placed on an upcoming agenda of Regional Council for its consideration;

And That The Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the Clean Water Act Risk Management Fee Schedule as described in Report TES-WAS-16-15 dated May 3, 2016; and amend the Regional Fees and Charges By-law 16-001 to include these new fees.

Report:
The Source Protection Plan is effective on July 1, 2016

To protect the quality and quantity of drinking water sources, the ‘Clean Water Act’ (2006) established a process to create locally-developed Source Protection Plans (SPP) for each watershed in Ontario. The Grand River SPP contains policies to protect Waterloo Region drinking water sources and becomes effective on July 1, 2016. The status of implementation preparation was presented to Region Council on March 22, 2016 (TES-WAS-16-09).
Proposed by-law provides clarity for risk management process

The Region is responsible for implementing a range of policies, including negotiating Risk Management Plans (RMPs). In order to provide for various procedures in the administration of the risk management process, a new by-law is proposed, in accordance with the ‘Clean Water Act’ and regulations. The by-law includes details related to the following:

- **Classes of RMPs**: Specifies the activities included in each type (or “class”) of RMP.
- **Application process for RMPs**: Specifies the requirements to initiate the RMP process.
- **Notices**: Specifies the application and approval requirements for the notice to be issued by the Risk Management Official prior to development or building approvals in areas subject to certain SPP policies.
- **Inspections**: Specifies the inspection types and the inspection schedule.
- **Enforcement**: Makes provision for enforcement of the by-law.
- **Fees**: Specifies requirement to pay approved fees in accordance with the Region’s Fees and Charges By-law 16-001.

Notice about the Clean Water Act Risk Management By-law was provided in accordance with the Region’s Engagement Guidelines and Notice By-law – Class 3, which requires a minimum of 21 calendar days notice. Notice was provided in local newspapers, on the Region’s website, through social media, and to municipal Clerks. The proposed by-law, included as Attachment A, provides clarity and certainty regarding administrative procedures to implement the Region’s responsibilities under the ‘Clean Water Act’.

**Fees proposed for risk management process for “future” activities**

RMPs will be required for applicable “existing” activities (e.g. applying salt on parking lots) and “future” activities (e.g. new fuel storage). Fees will not be charged for RMPs for an existing activity, because costs to property owners to implement risk management measures for existing activities will be partly offset through incentive programs (as detailed in Report TES-WAS-16-15 dated May 3, 2016). However, the following scenarios will be subject to fees for both existing and future activities: an amendment to the RMP is required; a RMP plan is established under Section 58 (i.e. the property owner is unwilling to negotiate and the Region creates the RMP); or an inspection is required following a non-compliance visit. It is estimated based on analysis of previous years’ applications that approximately five applications per year may be subject to these fees.

Fees would cover some of the Region’s costs associated with implementing the risk
management policies. The proposed fees are based on an estimate of resources required for negotiations, technical review of applications, and inspections. The fees for non-Winter Maintenance RMPs are higher to account for the increased level of complexity and therefore the increased level of time required for review, negotiation and inspections.

Staff recommend that the fees, if approved, be included in the Fees and Charges By-law 16-001. Notice about the Fees and Charges By-law amendment was issued with the Clean Water Act Risk Management By-law and provided in accordance with the Region’s Engagement Guidelines and Notice By-law – Class 3. As noted above, the proposed fee schedule is included as Attachment B.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

The implementation of the Grand River SPP is an action item in the Region’s 2015-2018 Strategic Plan in Focus Area 3: Environmental and Sustainable Growth to protect the quality and quantity of our water resources.

Financial Implications:

The approved 2016 Water Capital Budget includes $275,000 for ‘Clean Water Act’ implementation, of which $715,000 (26%) is funded from Regional Development Charges and $203,500 (74%) is funded from the Water Reserve Fund.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Legal staff from Planning, Development and Legislative Services were part of the project team preparing the by-law. Staff from Citizen Services provided input on the development of fees and notice requirements.

Attachments

Attachment A: Proposed Source Protection By-law
Attachment B: Proposed Source Protection Fees

Prepared By:
Amy Domaratksi, Risk Management Official
Leanne Lobe, Supervisor Source Water Protection Programs

Approved By:
Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner Transportation and Environmental Services
Proposed Source Protection By-law

WHEREAS The Regional Municipality of Waterloo, as a municipality that has authority to pass by-laws respecting water production, treatment and storage under the Municipal Act, 2001, is responsible for the enforcement of Part IV of the Clean Water Act, 2006, S.O. 2006, c. 22 (the "Act") in the municipality pursuant to subsection 47(1)(b) of the Act;

AND WHEREAS pursuant to subsection 47(6) of the Act The Regional Municipality of Waterloo passed By-Law Number 14-051] appointing a Risk Management Official and such Risk Management Inspectors as are necessary for the purpose of such enforcement;

AND WHEREAS section 23.1 of the Municipal Act, 2001 permits The Regional Municipality of Waterloo to delegate its power under subsection 47(6) of the Act;

AND WHEREAS subsection 47(7) of the Act requires the Regional Clerk to issue certificates of appointment to each Risk Management Official and Risk Management Inspector;

AND WHEREAS subsections 55(1) (a) to (h) inclusive provide that The Regional Municipality of Waterloo may pass by-laws respecting various matters for purposes of enforcement of Part IV of the Act;

AND WHEREAS the Grand River Source Protection Plan Under the Clean Water Act, 2006 (Ontario Regulation 287/07) was approved by the Minister of the Environment on November 26, 2015 and effective on July 1, 2016;

NOW THEREFORE, the Council of The Regional Municipality of Waterloo enacts as follows:

Definitions

1. In this By-law:
   b. "Commissioner" shall mean the Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services for the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, his or her delegate and any successor position thereto;
   c. "Council" shall mean the Council of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo;
   d. "Grand River Source Protection Plan" shall mean the source protection plan that applies to the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approved pursuant to the Clean Water Act, 2006;
   e. "Proponent" shall mean a person who engages or proposes to engage in an activity that is an activity to which section 58 of the Act applies or the location of the activity is within an area to which section 58 of the Act applies; and
f. “Region” shall mean The Regional Municipality of Waterloo.

2. All other capitalized terms shall have the same meaning as in the Act.

Risk Management Plans

3. For purposes of those activities and areas identified in the Grand River Source Protection Plan as activities and areas to which section 58 of the Act applies the classes of Risk Management Plans, identified in Schedule A, shall apply where appropriate.

4. The form of Risk Management Plan for each of the classes identified in Schedule A shall be prescribed by the Commissioner.

5. The Proponent of a Risk Management Plan shall immediately notify, in writing, the Risk Management Official of any of the following events:
   a. A proposed change to the activity, its location on the property or any risk management measures set out in a Risk Management Plan;
   b. A new activity to which section 58 of the Act is proposed on the property; and
   c. A change or proposed change in any information contained in the Risk Management Plan.

6. Upon receiving notice of a change set out in section 5 of this By-law if the Risk Management Official determines that an amendment to the Risk Management Plan is required, the Proponent shall make application for an amendment to the Risk Management Plan prior to undertaking any action to implement the change or proposed change.

7. The Risk Management Official may initiate an amendment to a Risk Management Plan where a determination has been made that any of the risk management measures set out in a Risk Management Plan require revision, alteration, augmentation or replacement with additional risk management measures.

8. The form of Amendment to a Risk Management Plan shall be prescribed by the Commissioner.

Applications

9. Prior to engaging or proposing to engage in a new activity in an area identified in the Grand River Source Protection Plan as an activity to which section 58 of the Act applies a Proponent shall make an application to the Risk Management Official for a Risk Management Plan in accordance with this By-law.

10. An application for a Risk Management Plan under sections 58 and 59(2)(b) of the Act shall include the documents specified in Schedule “B” and such other documents deemed necessary by the Risk Management Official.
11. An application for an amendment to a Risk Management Plan under section 58 of the Act shall include particulars of the nature and extent of any proposed change and such documentation identified in Schedule B related to the proposed change, and such other information and documentation deemed necessary by the Risk Management Official.

12. An application for the issuance of a notice under subsection 59(2) of the Act shall be made in the form prescribed by the Commissioner and include particulars of the type of application under the Planning Act and/or Ontario Building Code, the activity occurring or proposed on the property and the location of the property. If subsection 59(2)(a) of the Act applies no further details are required. However, if subsection 59(2)(b) of the Act applies then an application for a Risk Management Plan must be submitted as in sections 9 of this By-law.

Notices

13. A notice issued under subsection 59(2) of the Act shall be in the form prescribed by the Commissioner, as it may be amended from time to time.

Inspections

14. Inspections of property for compliance with a Risk Management Plan that has been agreed to or established under section 58 of the Act shall be conducted in accordance with a schedule of inspections prescribed by the Commissioner or at such times as the Risk Management Official determines appropriate according to the requirements of an applicable Risk Management Plan.

15. Inspections of property to confirm compliance with sections 57 and 58 of the Act shall be conducted in accordance with a schedule of inspections prescribed by the Commissioner or at such times as the Risk Management Official determines appropriate.

Fees

16. A Proponent of an application for a Risk Management Plan pursuant to sections 58 and 59(2)(b) of the Act, an Amendment to a Risk Management Plan, or a Notice under section 59 of the Act shall pay the applicable fee as prescribed by by-law of Council of the Region.

17. A Proponent shall pay the applicable fees for inspections of property carried out pursuant to sections 14 and 15 of this By-law prescribed by by-law of Council of the Region.

Administration and Enforcement

18. The Commissioner is responsible for the administration of this By-law and shall have all necessary authority.
19. Every Person who contravenes any provision of this by-law is guilty of an offence and is liable to a fine and such other penalties as provided for in the Provincial Offences Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.33 and the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c. 25 each as amended.

20. This By-law may be enforced by the Commissioner, the Risk Management Official, a Risk Management Inspector, a municipal law enforcement officer of the Region or police officer.

21. If any section or sections of this By-law or parts thereof are found by any Court to be illegal or beyond the power of Council to enact, such section or sections or parts shall be deemed to be severable and all other sections or parts of this By-law shall be deemed to be separate and independent and shall continue in full force.

22. This By-law may be cited as the “Clean Water Act Risk Management By-law”.

23. This By-law shall come into force and effect on July 1, 2016.

By-law read a first, second and third time and finally passed in the Council Chamber in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo the ______ day of May, 2016.

________________________________________  ________________________________
Regional Clerk                        Regional Chair
Schedule A – Classes of Risk Management Plans

The following list identifies the six classes of Risk Management Plans, including the activities that they incorporate:

Chemical Handling and Storage
- Aircraft De-icing
- Storage of DNAPLS
- Storage of Fuel
- Storage of Organic Solvents
- Storage of Fertilizer
- Storage of Pesticides

Farming Activities
- Application of manure
- Livestock yards or pastures
- Storage of manure
- Application of fertilizer
- Storage of fertilizer
- Application of Non-Agricultural Source Material (eg: compost or biosolids)
- Storage of Non-Agricultural Source Material (eg: compost of biosolids)
- Application of Pesticides
- Storage of Pesticides

Provisional
- Acknowledgement by Risk Management Official and Proponent that an RMP is required at a specific time in the future

Stormwater Management
- Discharge from a Stormwater Management Facility

Waste Handling
- Landfilling of Waste
- Storage of Hazardous Waste
- Storage of PCB Waste

Winter Maintenance
- Application Of Road Salt
- Storage Of Road Salt
- Storage Of Snow
Schedule B – Required Documents for Risk Management Plan Applications (under Section 58 of the Clean Water Act)

The following list identifies the minimum requirements for submitting a complete application for a Risk Management Plan:

Chemical Handling and Storage
- Standard Chemical Handling and Storage RMP completed and signed
- Property and Activity Detailed Document
- Site Map
- Payment if applicable

Farming Activities
- Standard Farming Activities RMP completed and signed
- Property and Activity Detailed Document
- Site Map
- Payment if applicable

Provisional
- Property and Activity Detailed Document
- Payment if applicable

Stormwater Management
- Stormwater Management Plan consistent with the MOECC’s Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual (2003) and Regional Implementation Guidelines.
- Site Grading Plan
- Property and Activity Detailed Document
- Site Map
- Payment if applicable

Waste Handling
- Details of waste stored
- Descriptions of spill prevention, containment and response measures, including applicable drawings
- Property and Activity Detailed Document
- Site Map
- Payment if applicable

Winter Maintenance
- Standard Winter Maintenance RMP completed and signed
- Property and Activity Detailed Document
- Site Map
- Payment if applicable
Proposed Source Protection Fees

Risk Management Plan Fee Schedule – Clean Water Act (CWA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Management Plan Applications</th>
<th>Future Activity</th>
<th>Existing Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Handling and Storage</td>
<td>$ 1,350</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming Activities</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional RMP</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management</td>
<td>$ 1,350</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Handling</td>
<td>$ 1,350</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Maintenance (Municipal Roads)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Maintenance (Other)</td>
<td>$ 650</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendments to a Risk Management Plan Administrative(^1)</td>
<td>$ 250</td>
<td>$ 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical(^2)</td>
<td>$ 500</td>
<td>$ 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a RMP under Section 58 (10, 11, 12) CWA</td>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notices Issued under Section 59 of the CWA</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspections:</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection to confirm implementation of RMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspections following a non-compliance visit</td>
<td>$ 200</td>
<td>$ 200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Includes change of RMP ownership. Excludes updating contact information.
\(^2\) Includes changes to activities and/or management measures.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting date</th>
<th>Requestor</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Assigned Department</th>
<th>Anticipated Response Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>