Regional Municipality of Waterloo

Planning and Works Committee

Agenda

Tuesday, May 24, 2016

9:15 a.m. (Time approximate, immediately following Closed Session)

Regional Council Chamber

150 Frederick Street, Kitchener

1. **Motion to go into Closed Session**

   That a closed meeting of the Planning and Works Committee be held on Tuesday, May 24, 2016 at 9:00 a.m. in the Waterloo County Room in accordance with Section 239 of the “Municipal Act, 2001”, for the purposes of considering the following subject matters:

   a) receiving of advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege related to legal liabilities

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

3. **Declarations of Pecuniary Interest under the Municipal Conflict Of Interest Act**

4. **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.
5. Request to Remove Items from Consent Agenda

6. Motion to Approve Items or Receive for Information


**Recommendation:**

6.2 TES-TRP-16-12, Accessible Parking Spaces - City of Cambridge

**Recommendation:** See page 11-13

6.3 Biosolids Strategy - Second Public Consultation

Regular Agenda Resumes

7 Reports – Transportation and Environmental Services

Design and Construction

7.1 PDL-LEG-16-28, Authorization to Expropriate Lands (2nd Report) for Franklin Boulevard (Regional Road 36) Extension Project (Myers Road to South Boundary Road) and Phase 1 of South Boundary Road Project (Water Street South (Hwy 24) To Franklin Boulevard Extension), In the City of Cambridge and the Township of North Dumfries

**Recommendation:** See page 59-62

7.2 TES-DCS-16-11, C2016-07 Consultant Selection – Detailed Design and Services during Construction for the Preston Wastewater Treatment Plant Headworks, Blowers and Electrical Upgrades

**Recommendation:**
That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into an Agreement for Professional Consulting Services with R.E. Poisson Engineering Inc., to provide engineering services during the detailed design and services during construction for the Preston Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) Headworks, Blowers and Electrical Upgrades, City of Cambridge, at an upset fee limit of $420,714.53 plus applicable taxes.

7.3 TES-DCS-16-12, Class Environmental Assessment Study Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street from King Street to Erb Street and Erb Street
Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to the Class Environmental Assessment Study for proposed improvements to Bridgeport Road/ Caroline Street from King Street to Erb Street and Erb Street from King Street to Caroline Street in the City of Waterloo:

a) Approve the Recommended Design Concept for the proposed improvements to Bridgeport Road/ Caroline Street from King Street to Erb Street and Erb Street from King Street to Caroline Street as described in Report TES-DCS-16-12 dated May 24, 2016;

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

Transit Services

7.4 TES-TRS-16-13, GRT Customer Service Trends and Issues (For Information)

Transportation

7.5 TES-TRP-16-01, Traffic and Parking By-law to Regulate Traffic and Parking on Regional Roads

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enact the recommended Traffic and Parking By-law to regulate traffic and parking on Regional roads, as outlined in Appendix A of Report TES-TRP-16-01, dated May 24, 2016;

And that the By-law comes into effect on January 1, 2017.

Water Services

7.6 PDL-LEG-16-30, Closing and Surplus Declaration of Part of Highland Road (Regional Road 6), City of Kitchener

Recommendation:
a) That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo close and declare surplus a portion of Highland Road, in the City of Kitchener described as Daylighting Triangle, Plan 864, being Part 1, on Reference Plan 58R-18905, PIN 22457-0823 (LT), as detailed in Report No. PDL-LEG-16-30 dated May 24, 2016, pursuant to the Region’s property disposition by-law, to the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor; and

b) Approve, enter into an Agreement for, and execute all documentation related to, the conveyance of Part 1, on Reference Plan 58R-18905 to the abutting property owner, 2297868 Ontario Inc., in exchange for the lands described as Part of West Acres Crescent (closed by Bylaw No. 2012-083, Instrument WR765996) (being part of road widening, Reg. Plan 864 and Part of Lot 38, German Company Tract, being Parts 3 and 4, on Reference Plan 58R-18905, PIN 22457-0825 (LT), as detailed in Report No. PDL-LEG-16-30 dated May 24, 2016, pursuant to the Region’s property disposition by-law and the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor.

Interdepartmental Reports

7.7 **TES-16-02/COR-16-01**, P2016-01 Asset Management System Implementation

**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo accept the proposal of GM BluePlan Engineering Ltd. for P2016-01 Asset Management System Implementation at an upset fee of $2,510,274 plus all applicable taxes as set out in report TES-16-02/ COR-16-01, dated May 24, 2016.

Reports – Planning, Development and Legislative Services

7.8 **PDL-AIR-16-05**, Airport Operating Agreement with NextJet and Propair

**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo authorize the Commissioner of Planning, Development and Legislative Services to enter into an agreement, and any subsequent renewals, with Nextflightcourier Worldwide Ltd. and Propair Inc., carrying on business as NextJet and Propair, and if required, other third parties as may be contracted by NextJet or Propair, with the form and content of
such agreement to be to the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor to enable NextJet and Propair to carry on a specialized private air charter service from the air terminal building of the Region of Waterloo International Airport, as described in Report No. PDL-AIR-16-05, dated May 24, 2016, with initial service to Peterborough, Ottawa (Gatineau) and Montreal (Dorval).

8. Information/Correspondence

8.1 Ontario Water Works Association (OWWA’s) Public Education and Awareness – Public Sector and Utilities Award for Restaurant and Business Certification Program

8.2 Municipal Waste Association (MWA) Gold Award for the “Mommy Blog” Green Bin Promotion Campaign

8.3 Council Enquiries and Requests for Information

9. Other Business


11. 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>June 14, 2016</td>
<td>9:00 A.M.</td>
<td>Planning and Works Committee</td>
<td>Council Chamber 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Floor, Regional Administration Building 150 Frederick Street Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 9, 2016</td>
<td>1:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Planning and Works Committee</td>
<td>Council Chamber 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; 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><strong>Planning, Development and Legislative Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed., May 25, 2016</td>
<td>4:00 P.M. – 8:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Airport Master Plan Public Information Centre 1</td>
<td>Waterloo Region Museum 10 Huron Road Kitchener, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu., June 16, 2016</td>
<td>6:30 P.M. – 8:30 P.M.</td>
<td>East Sides Lands Stage 2 Public Information Centre</td>
<td>Père-René-de-Galinée (Cafeteria) 450 Maple Grove Road Cambridge, 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 24, 2016
File Code: D18-01

Recommendation:

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

- Approved the following part lot control exemption by-law;
- Accepted the following plan of condominium;
- Draft approved the following plans of subdivision and plan of condominium;
- Released for registration the following plans of condominium; and
- Approved the following official plan amendment.

Report:

City of Cambridge
Draft Approval of Plan of Subdivision 30T-12103
Applicant: Hunt Club Valley Inc.
Location: 1134 Hunt Club Road
Draft Approval of Plan of Subdivision 30T-12103

Proposal: To permit the development of 1529 to 1670 residential single detached, semi-detached, townhouse and apartment units.

Regional Processing Fee: Paid December 31, 2015

Commissioner’s Release: April 20, 2016

Came Into Effect: May 11, 2016

Draft Approval of Plan of Subdivision 30T-12104

Applicant: General Shale Canada GP Inc.

Location: 875/1065 Speedsville Road

Proposal: To permit the development of 300 to 771 mixed-use residential units, including single detached dwelling units, multi-residential dwelling units (townhouses and apartments), dwelling units with mixed-use commercial/residential blocks, and employment uses.

Regional Processing Fee: Paid December 31, 2015

Commissioner’s Approval: April 20, 2016

Came Into Effect: May 11, 2016

Draft Approval of Plan of Condominium 30CDM-16101


Location: 150 Water Street North

Proposal: To permit the development of 109 residential condominium apartment units, 2 rooftop mechanical units and 1 communications unit.

Regional Processing Fee: Paid April 11, 2016

Commissioner’s Approval: April 28, 2016

Came Into Effect: May 17, 2016
City of Kitchener

Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-11201

Draft Approval Date: May 11, 2011
Phase: Entire Plan
Applicant: Dyspar (Crescent) Limited
Location: 16 Cedarwoods Crescent
Proposal: To permit the conversion of 221 rental units to condominium apartment units.

Regional Processing Fee: Paid February 11, 2016
Commissioner's Release: April 26, 2016

Registration of Draft Plan of Condominium 30CDM-12208

Draft Approval Date: April 17, 2013
Phase: Entire Plan
Applicant: York Queen Inc.
Location: 214 Queen Street South
Proposal: To permit the conversion of 41 rental apartment units to condominium apartment units.

Regional Processing Fee: Paid April 29, 2016
Commissioner's Release: April 29, 2016

City of Waterloo

Part Lot Control Exemption By-law 2016-017

Applicant: Carey Homes
Location: 605 Montpellier Drive
Proposal: To allow for the creation of 2 semi-detached units.

Regional Processing Fee: Paid April 28, 2016
Commissioner's Approval: April 29, 2016
Plan of Condominium Application 30CDM-16405

Date Accepted: April 1, 2016  
Applicant: 2273090 Ontario Inc.  
Location: 112 Union Street East  
Proposal: To permit the development of 33 residential stacked townhouse condominium units.  
Regional Processing Fee: Paid February 25, 2016

Official Plan Amendment Number 13

Applicant: City of Waterloo  
Location: 40 Albert Street  
Proposal: To amend the Official Plan of the City of Waterloo Planning Area so that the Official Plan designation on the subject lands (“Low Density Residential” within Specific Provision Area 33, MacGregor/Albert Heritage Conservation District) may permit a wider range of institutional, office, advanced technology and cultural uses.  
Regional Processing Fee: Not applicable.  
Commissioner’s Approval: April 13, 2016  
Came Into Effect: May 4, 2016

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination:

These planning approvals and releases, including consultations with Area Municipalities, have been completed in accordance with the Planning Act. All approvals included in this report were supported by the Area Municipal councils and/or staff.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

This report reflects actions taken by the Commissioner in accordance with the Delegation By-law adopted by Council. Strategic Objective: Improve environmental sustainability and liability intensifying urban and rural settlement areas.

Financial Implications:

Nil.
Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:
Nil.

Attachments:
Nil.

Prepared By: Andrea Banks, Program Assistant

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

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: May 24, 2016  File Code: T01-20/8, T01-20/24
Subject: Accessible Parking Spaces – City of Cambridge

Recommendation:

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

a) Remove from Schedule 2, Limited Parking for 2 hours, on the south side of King Street (Regional Road 8) from Dover Street to Argyle Street between the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday to Saturday;

b) Add to Schedule 2, Limited Parking for 2 hours, on the south side of King Street (Regional Road 8) from Dover Street to Waterloo Street between the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday to Saturday;

c) Add to Schedule 2, Limited Parking for 2 hours, on the south side of King Street (Regional Road 8) from 41 metres east of Waterloo Street to Argyle Street between the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday to Saturday;

d) Remove from Schedule 2, Limited Parking for 2 hours, on the north side of King Street (Regional Road 8) from Argyle Street to 21 metres west of Lowther Street between the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday to Saturday;

e) Add to Schedule 2, Limited Parking for 2 hours, on the north side of King Street (Regional Road 8) from 42 metres east of Argyle Street to 14 metres west of Church Street between the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday to Saturday;
f) Add to Schedule 2, Limited Parking for 2 hours, on the north side of King Street (Regional Road 8) from Church Street to 21 metres west of Lowther Street between the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday to Saturday;

g) Remove from Schedule 2, Limited Parking for 2 hours, on the west side of Water Street (Regional Road 24) from Dickson Street to 24 m north of Main Street between the hours of 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday to Saturday; 2 Hours No Re-parking;

h) Add to Schedule 2, Limited Parking for 2 hours on the west side of Water Street (Regional Road 24) from 17 metres south of Dickson Street to 36 metres north of Main Street between the hours of 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday to Saturday;

i) Remove from Schedule 2, Limited Parking for 2 hours, on the east side of Water Street (Regional Road 24) from Main Street to 21 metres north of Warnock Street between the hours of 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday to Saturday;

j) Add to Schedule 2, Limited Parking for 2 hours, on the east side of Water Street (Regional Road 24) from 25 metres south of Main to 21 metres north of Warnock Street between the hours of 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday to Saturday;

k) Remove from Schedule 2, Limited Parking for 2 hours, on the west side of Ainslie Street (Regional Road 24) from 43 metres South of Thorne Street to 9 m South of Thorne Street between the hours of 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday to Saturday;

l) Add to Schedule 2, Limited Parking for 2 hours, on the west side of Ainslie Street (Regional Road 24) 9 metres south of Thorne Street to 35 metres South of Thorne Street between the hours of 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday to Saturday;

m) Add to Schedule 7, Disabled Person Parking on the south side of King Street (Regional Road 8) from 29 metres east of Waterloo Street to 41 metres east of Waterloo Street;

n) Add to Schedule 7, Disabled Person Parking on the north side of King Street (Regional Road 8) from 30 metres east of Argyle Street to 42 metres east of Argyle Street;

o) Add to Schedule 7, Disabled Person Parking on the north side of King Street (Regional Road 8) from Church Street from 14 metres west of Church Street to 25 metres west of Church Street;
p) Add to Schedule 7, Disabled Person Parking on the west side of Water Street
   (Regional Road 24) from Dickson Street to 15 metres south of Dickson Street;

q) Add to Schedule 7, Disabled Person Parking on the west side of Water Street
   (Regional Road 24) from 24 metres north of Main Street to 34 metres north of
   Main Street;

r) Add to Schedule 7, Disabled Person Parking on the east side of Water Street
   (Regional Road 24) from Main Street to 25 metres south of Main Street;

s) Add to Schedule 7, Disabled Person Parking on the west side of Ainslie Street
   (Regional Road 24) from 35 metres south of Thorne Street to 47.5 metres south
   of Thorne Street; and

in the City of Cambridge, as outlined in Report TES-TRP-16-12, May 24, 2016.

Summary:

On February 5, 2014, Regional Council adopted a new policy to allocate up to 2% of
on-street parking spaces along Regional roads, within designated core areas, as
accessible on-street spaces.

It was noted at the February 5, 2014 Council meeting that staff will bring reports back
to Regional Council to review and approve on-street accessible parking spaces
within the separate core areas. As such, this report details the review and proposed
accessible on-street parking along King Street, Ainslie Street and Water Street in the
City of Cambridge.

Staff prepared a report for the August 20, 2014 Council meeting which recommended
2% of existing on-street parking spaces along King Street in Waterloo. At that time,
Council approved the designation of on-street accessible parking spaces as
recommend by staff.

Accessible on-street parking along Regional roads within the “core area” of Kitchener
is being considered through the LRT design project.

Staff is recommending that the designation of an on-street accessible parking space
be implemented at 3 locations along King Street (within the core area of Preston), 3
spaces along Water Street and 1 space on Ainslie Street (both within the core area
of Galt). The proposed locations are being recommended for the following reasons:

- They would be located at the beginning of a row of on-street parking spaces;
- They would include drop curbs at the front and rear of the proposed space;
- They would have an area on the sidewalk, adjacent to the parking space
  that is or would be clear of obstructions;
• They would accommodate a 7.5 metre long space; and

• The widths and dimensions of each space would meet Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) Standards.

• The City of Cambridge, Cambridge Accessibility Advisory Committee, Grand River Accessibility Advisory Committee and the City of Cambridge BIA support the recommendation.

Report:

1.0 Background

In 2014, Transportation Division staff received a request to consider installing accessible on-street parking in the Uptown Waterloo area. At that time, current Regional practice was to consider accessible on-street parking upon request. This previous practice led to the inconsistent allocation of accessible parking spaces within the core areas of the Region.

There is no regulation today requiring a municipality to provide on-street accessible parking. Despite no regulatory requirements, staff recommended in 2014 that the Region adopt a policy to designate up to 2% of existing on-street parking spaces within downtown core areas as on-street accessible parking. A core area is generally considered the commercial area of a city and is commonly referred to as the “downtown”.

At its regular scheduled meeting on February 5, 2014, Regional Council passed a resolution to adopt a new policy for allocating on-street accessible parking along Regional roads. The approved policy now designates up to 2% of existing on-street parking spaces within core areas.

On August 20, 2014 Council approved the designation of 2% of existing on-street parking spaces along King Street in Waterloo as on-street accessible parking spaces.

Accessible on-street parking along Regional roads within the “core area” of Kitchener is being considered through the LRT design project.

This report details a review and proposed accessible on-street parking along King Street, Ainslie Street and Water Street in the City of Cambridge. Appendix A illustrates the “core areas” along each Regional road previously noted as established by the City of Cambridge.

2.0 Accessible On-Street Parking

On-street parking spaces for members of the community with accessibility needs have specific requirements to accommodate wheelchairs safely and efficiently. Accessible parking spaces should be located in an unobstructed area where the road
The surface is even and level. Accessible parking spaces should also have access to a nearby “curb cut” or ramp for wheelchairs. To enhance accessibility, on-street accessible parking spaces should be situated at the beginning or end of a row of on-street parallel parking.

Transportation staff has developed Regional standards for accessible parking. Generally, the wheelchair symbol is placed in accessible parking spaces. A blue background and white border may supplement the wheelchair symbol. Figure 1 illustrates a typical accessible on-street parking space.

**Figure 1 – Typical Accessible On-street Parking**

The Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) regulations require municipalities that develop new or redevelop existing on-street parking spaces to consult on the need, location and design of accessible on-street parking spaces with its Municipal Accessibility Advisory Committee where one has been established.

### 3.0 Core Areas of Cambridge

Through the City of Cambridge, three core areas were identified which included a section of King Street, Water Street and Ainslie Street. As such staff assessed the merits of providing on-street accessible parking along each Regional road in these three areas.

#### 3.1 King Street (Preston Area), Cambridge

King Street is a two-lane roadway with a posted speed of 50 km/h. Along each side of King Street there is existing on-street parking with a total of 148 on-street parking spaces. Based on Region policy to allocate up to 2% of on-street spaces as accessible, 3 accessible on-street parking spaces should be considered.

#### 3.2 Water Street (Galt Area), Cambridge

Along Water Street, within the core area of Galt, there are 130 parking spaces. Water Street is a two-lane roadway in the north/south direction with a posted speed of 50 km/h. Allocating 2% of the existing on-street parking spaces would amount to 3 accessible on-street parking spaces on Water Street.
3.3 Ainslie Street (Galt Area), Cambridge

Ainslie Street also runs in the north/south direction with 1 lane in each direction. The posted speed limit along Ainslie Street is 50 km/h. On Ainslie Street, existing on-street parking within the core area totals 43. Based on the policy, 1 on-street parking space should be designated as an accessible on-street parking space.

4.0 Consultation

4.1 Cambridge Accessibility Advisory Committee

As previously noted the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) regulations require municipalities that develop new or redevelop existing on-street parking spaces to consult on the need, location and design of accessible on-street parking spaces with its Municipal Accessibility Advisory Committee where one has been established. On October 22, 2014 staff attended a Cambridge Accessibility Advisory Committee (CAAC) meeting and presented the proposed accessible on-street parking spaces on King Street, Water Street and Ainslie Street. Comments received from the CAAC were as follows:

- The spaces are no wider, posing a safety concern for those loading or unloading into oncoming traffic;
- The spaces do not have designated sidewalk access. Patrons are being made to use existing driveway ramps to access pedestrian walkways/sidewalks;
- The spaces should abut a drop curb for barrier free access;
- The Ainslie Street location is congested and is a safety concern for those who will need to utilize the accessible space; and
- The King Street East location should be on the opposite side of the roadway to service the Allan Reuter Seniors Centre.

Staff reviewed the aforementioned comments and based on the comments staff reassessed the proposed accessible on-street spaces. Based on the reassessment, a new location for Ainslie Street was selected to the north of the previous location. Staff also confirmed that drop curbs can be provided separately from accesses for both the front and back of the proposed spaces. Further, staff also confirmed that the 7.5 metre space can be achieved for all spaces proposed.

On March 25, 2015 staff presented the revised accessible on-street parking plan to the CAAC. Comments received were positive and the CAAC thanked staff for addressing their concerns and making appropriate changes.
4.2 Preston Towne Centre Board of Directors

In October 2014, staff provided the proposed accessible parking recommendations to the Preston Towne Centre Board of Directors (PTCBOD). Through discussions, the PTCBOD's provided comments, concerns and recommendations regarding the proposed locations on King Street. A copy of the PTCBOD's initial comments are included in Appendix B.

Staff addressed PTCBOD's concerns and proposed new alternate locations for accessible on-street parking along King Street. Staff shared the new proposed plan with the PTCBOD, and it had no further concerns.

4.3 Grand River Accessibility Advisory Committee

On September 24, 2015, staff presented the proposed accessible on-street parking spaces to the Grand River Accessibility Advisory Committee (GRAAC). Comments received were very positive and members of GRAAC support the recommendation pertaining to on-street accessible spaces in the City of Cambridge along King Street, Water Street and Ainslie Street.

4.4 Area Municipality and Business Improvement Association

The City of Cambridge and the Cambridge Business Improvement Association (BIA) were also consulted and are in support of the installation of accessible parking spaces as proposed.

5.0 Recommendation

Based on the review and consultation with appropriate stakeholders, it is recommended that the designation of on-street accessible parking spaces be implemented as follows:

- Three locations along King Street within the designated core area of Preston;
- Three locations along Water Street within the designated core area of Galt; and
- One location on Ainslie Street within the core area of Galt.

Appendix C illustrates the proposed accessible on-street parking spaces along King Street, Water Street and Ainslie Street in the City of Cambridge.

It should be noted that the Region's Ten Year Capital Program (TCP) includes a 2016 Miscellaneous Contract. Through this contract, the existing on-street parking spaces will be modified to accessible on-street parking spaces. This will include drop curbs on either side of each space, the removal and relocation of decorative lighting, the removal of planters and the removal of some existing parking spaces to achieve the 7.5 metre space.
The proposed locations are being recommended for the following reasons:

- They would be located at the beginning of a row of on-street parking spaces;
- They would include drop curbs at the front and rear of the proposed space;
- They would have an area on the sidewalk, adjacent to the parking space that is or would be clear of obstructions;
- They would accommodate a 7.5 metre long space; and
- The widths and dimensions of each space would meet Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) Standards.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

This report addresses the Region’s goal to improve the accessibility of Regional programs and services to support our diverse community (Strategic Objective 5.1)

Financial Implications:

This project will be included in the 2016 Transportation Capital Program Mid-Year Review and funded from the Roads Rehabilitation Capital Reserve Fund (100%). The cost to install the planned accessible parking spaces is approximately $33,500.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

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

Attachments

Appendix A – Core Areas As Outlined by City of Cambridge
Appendix B – Preston Town Centre Board of Directors Comments
Appendix C – Proposed Accessible On-street Parking Spaces

Prepared By: Valerie MacQueen-Pearcey, Engineering Technologist (Traffic)

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Core Areas As Outlined by City of Cambridge
City Of Cambridge (Water/Ainslie)

Water St.

City of Cambridge (Galt) Core Area

Regional Road Being Considered for Accessible On-street Parking
At the April 15th Board Meeting, the Preston Towne Centre Board of Directors discussed the three proposed parking spots for on-street, accessible parking for Highway 8, Cambridge. The following are our conclusions and recommendations based on that discussion.

1.) Corner of Waterloo & Regional Road 8, South Side  
   Board agrees with this proposal for the following reasons:  
   - Crossing lights provide pedestrian street crossing to the Allan Reuter Centre  
   - It is a heavily used side of the street – doctor’s offices, two pharmacies, etc.

2.) South Side Corner, King Street & Westminster  
   Board does not agree with this proposal for the following reasons:  
   - This is a hard spot to park because it’s a single lane beside a bumped out corner planter

3.) Mid-block, North Side, 700 Block  
   Board does not agree with this proposal for the following reasons:  
   - This area is heavily used parking for businesses – the business area needs a large turnover of 
     these parking spaces

The Preston Towne Centre Board of Directors proposes the following alternative parking spots:

1.) Last Parking Spot in front of the Bank of Montreal, North Side  
   - This spot is close to the corner of Church Street and services all businesses and the 
     two banks – Bank of Nova Scotia and Bank of Montreal

2.) Last Parking Spot in front of Central Park, North Side, Next Corner Argyle & King  
   - This is an easy spot to park and services all businesses and three banks – CIBC, Royal Bank 
     and TD – North Side

Note – There are already accessible parking spots in the Argyle Street lot, Duke Street lot and the King 
Street lot. As well the Baptist Church lot sits empty most days.

Sincerely,

Shirley Bowman  
Preston Towne Centre BIA Co-Ordinator

More than just a place to shop.

King Street (Hwy 8) in Cambridge, between Waterloo & Dolph Streets
Figures 1 to 6 illustrate the proposed accessible on-street parking spaces along King Street, Water Street and Ainslie Street in the City of Cambridge.

Figure 1 – King Street

Figure 2 – King Street
Figure 3– King Street

Proposed On-street Accessible Parking
North side of King Street at Church
Westbound Direction

Figure 4– Water Street

Proposed On-Street Accessible Parking
West side of Water Street at Dickson Street
Southbound Direction
Figure 4– Water Street

Figure 5– Water Street
Figure 6 - Ainslie Street

Proposed On-Street Accessible Parking
West side of Ainslie Street
Southbound Direction
2018 Biosolids Strategy

WEBINAR
Follow the Drain: The Story of Biosolids in Waterloo Region

June 15, 2016 at 6:30 – 7:30 p.m.
June 16, 2016 at 12:00 – 1:00 p.m.
To talk about biosolids:

• What they are
• How they are managed now
• Goals of the Biosolids Strategy
Part 1: What are Biosolids?
Part 2: What is the Region’s Current Biosolids Management Approach
Part 3: What are the Laws and Regulations we Follow?
Part 4: The Biosolids Strategy Project
Next Steps
Your Hosts Tonight

Kaoru Yajima
Project Engineer,
Region of Waterloo

Mike Thomson
Technical Lead,
Dillon Consulting Limited
So What is the Biosolids Strategy About?

The Region will need an strategy to manage its biosolids as it grows, considering that:

• regulations evolve
• technologies advance
• new opportunities emerge

The strategy has to be robust, forward-thinking and sustainable.
Part 1:
What are Biosolids?
Where do Biosolids Come From?

Wastewater and sewage is transported through a series of pipes to a treatment plant...
How are Biosolids Made?  
...The Liquid Train

Once inside the treatment plant...

**Screening:** removes larger objects, sand and grit

**Primary treatment:** separates solids from liquid

**Aeration:** with the aid of air, microscopic bugs eat the organic matter

**Secondary treatment:** Solid material is separated out in a settling tank

**Clean water:** returned to the environment

*This is how we treat our wastewater, but there is still the solid matter to consider...*
From the primary and secondary treatment processes …

Digestion:
Digesters use more microscopic bugs to eat up organics and reduce the volume of solids.
There are 2 kinds of digesters:
Aerobic and Anaerobic

Dewatering:
The digested material is dewatered to remove excess liquid

Final End Use
Ultimately, these are sent to be beneficially used or disposed of

So: Biosolids are the treated organic materials removed from our wastewater.
Part 2: What is the Region’s Current Biosolids Management Approach?
Where are the Region's Treatment Plants?

**LARGE TREATMENT PLANTS**
Processing Capacity Greater than 50 Million Litres/day
1. Kitchener WWTP
2. Waterloo WWTP
3. Galt WWTP (Cambridge)

**MID-SIZED TREATMENT PLANTS**
Processing Capacity 5 to 50 Million Litres/day
4. Preston WWTP (Cambridge)
5. Hespeler WWTP (Cambridge)
6. Elmira WWTP
7. New Hamburg WWTP

**SMALL TREATMENT PLANTS**
Processing Capacity Less than 5 Million Litres/day
8. Ayr WWTP
9. St. Jacobs WWTP
10. Wellesley WWTP
11. Heidelberg WWTP
12. Conestogo WWTP
13. Foxboro WWTP

WWTP = Wastewater Treatment Plant
180,000 m$^3$ of wastewater treated every day, equivalent to 72 Olympic sized swimming pools.

1 Olympic Size Pool = 2,500 m$^3$ of water
Tracking Wastewater & Biosolids In Waterloo Region Before 2009

- Anaerobic Digestion of Biosolids: 93%
  - Kitchener, Waterloo, Galt & Preston (City of Cambridge)
- Aerobic Digestion of Biosolids: 3%
  - Hespeler (City of Cambridge)
  - New Hamburg, Ayr & Heidelberg
- No Biosolids Digestion: 4%
  - Elmira, St. Jacobs, Wellesley, Conestogo & Foxboro Green

Storage Lagoon

Dewatering (Elmira only)
Tracking Wastewater & Biosolids
In Waterloo Region Today

- Kitchener, Waterloo, Galt & Preston (City of Cambridge)
- Hespeler (City of Cambridge)
- New Hamburg, Ayr & Heidelberg
- Elmira, St. Jacobs, Wellesley, Conestogo & Foxboro Green

- Anaerobic Digestion of Biosolids
- Aerobic Digestion of Biosolids
- No Biosolids Digestion

- 93%
- 3%
- 4%

Drastic reduction in biosolids volume!
Significance of Volume Reduction: Reduced Trucking

Dewatering reduces the majority of biosolids to more manageable levels.

For approximately every 15 trucks we used to need …

…we now only need 1 truck!
So Where Does It All Go?

**Beneficial Use**
- Land Application (mostly outside the Region of Waterloo)
- Land Reclamation in Sudbury, Ontario

**Disposal**
- Landfills (outside the Region of Waterloo)

* - in 2015
Part 3: What are the Laws and Regulations we Follow?
Regulations apply to 3 main areas of the Region’s current operations:

**BIOSOLIDS PROCESSING & TRANSPORTATION**
Managing the environmental impacts of biosolids transportation & processing

Examples of Applicable Legislation: Environmental Assessment Act, Environmental Protection Act, Ontario Water Resources Act

**BENEFICIAL USE: AGRICULTURAL APPLICATION & MINE TAILINGS POND RECLAMATION**
Regulating the safety and quality of biosolids that are beneficially used to protect the environment & human health

Examples of Applicable Legislation: Ontario Nutrient Management Act, Environmental Protection Act

**LANDFILL DISPOSAL**
Controlling the quality of biosolids that are disposed of

Examples of Applicable Legislation: Environmental Protection Act, Ontario Reg. 347 – General Waste Management
• Current laws in Ontario provide many risk mitigating measures to protect human health and the environment during biosolids management.

• Biosolids quality in Ontario is defined primarily by two groups of criteria: metals and pathogens
How is the Region’s Current Approach Performing?

Current Quality

- Biosolids from the Region of Waterloo wastewater treatment plants is tested regularly, and consistently meets standards for:
  - Use on agricultural land based on the requirements of the Nutrient Management Act
  - Use to reclaim mine tailings ponds, or disposal in approved landfills based on the requirements of the Environmental Protection Act
  - The Region’s current approach complies with all laws and has provided stable management
Are There Any Emerging Issues?

• The Region is aware that there are emerging issues being raised concerning some contaminants that may be contained in biosolids.

• These contaminants can be detected at trace levels. Through academic and industry partnerships, the Region is closely monitoring the issue to obtain the latest information.

• Peer reviewed scientific literature that may affect laws or biosolids management practices in the future will continue to be considered as part of the planning process.
Part 4: The Biosolids Strategy Project
Key Opportunities for the Biosolids Management Program

• Improve operational flexibility and plan for contingencies

• Potentially add technology to:
  • Further reduce the volume of the final biosolids product
  • Recover energy
  • Upgrade biosolids for ease of handling, enhance beneficial use opportunities, and produce a higher value product
Project Structure

Consultation & Engagement

- Stakeholder Committee
- Project Technical Advisory Committee
- Region of Waterloo Community

PROJECT TEAM

BIOSOLIDS STRATEGY

Regional Council
Final Approval Authority
Project Process

- **STAGE 1: WHAT ARE BIOSOLIDS?**
  Launch project, collect preliminary input, establish project charter and Strategy process (2015-2016)

- **STAGE 2: DEFINING THE PROBLEM**
  Develop problem definition, vision and objectives, collect data, review existing conditions (2016)

- **STAGE 3: LONG LIST OF ALTERNATIVES & EVALUATION CRITERIA**
  Identify biosolids technologies and disposal methods; determine the evaluation criteria (2016)

- **STAGE 4: EVALUATING THE LONG LIST OF ALTERNATIVES**
  Analyze future needs, opportunities and constraints (2016-2017)

- **STAGE 5: EVALUATING THE SHORT LIST OF ALTERNATIVES**
  Identify and evaluate short list of biosolids management strategies (2017)

- **STAGE 6: RECOMMENDED STRATEGY**
  Recommend strategies and finalize the Biosolids Strategy document (2018)
Issues that Matter: What We Have Heard So Far

Environment
- Climate Change
- Pharmaceuticals in Wastewater & Biosolids
- Energy Consumption
- Beneficial use
- Sustainability

Health & Safety
- Environmental Safety
- Public Safety
- Product Safety
- Public Health
- Worker Safety

Community Impact & Values
- Public Perception of Alternatives
- Waste as a Resource
- Agriculture
- Support for Innovation
Issues that Matter: What We Have Heard So Far

Infrastructure Needs
- Existing Wastewater Infrastructure Efficiency & Compatibility
- New Infrastructure Needs
- Security & Flexibility of Options

Logistics
- Locations for Biosolids Use & Disposal
- Transportation Routes
- Storage

Quality of Life
- Truck Traffic
- Visual Impacts
- Odour
- Noise

Economic Impact
- Technology
- Innovation
- Cost
- Forms of Beneficial Uses
Next Steps
Next Steps

Consultation & Engagement

• Pop-up community events through summer 2016

• Biosolids Video #2 – Coming Soon!

• Survey: What Matters to you? Visit our website to participate.
Next Steps

Technical Work


• Draft Biosolids Technology & Disposal Options – Fall 2016

• Draft Biosolids Management Strategies for Consideration – Fall 2016
Stay Involved!

Communication Channels

- Biosolids Bulletin Email Updates
- Project Website: [www.regionofwaterloo.ca/biosolids](http://www.regionofwaterloo.ca/biosolids)
- Public Consultation Events & Workshops
- Surveys (Online, In-person, and Telephone)
- Online and Multimedia Engagement Channels: Open Town Hall Tool, Videos, Webinar & Educational Materials
- Facebook Updates: [www.facebook.com/ROWWaterServices](http://www.facebook.com/ROWWaterServices)
- Twitter Updates: [@RegionWaterloo](https://twitter.com/RegionWaterloo)
Your Questions
Region of Waterloo
Planning Development and Legislative Services
Legal Services

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

Date: May 24, 2016       File Code: L07-90

Subject: Authorization to Expropriate Lands (2nd Report) For Franklin Boulevard (Regional Road 36) Extension Project (Myers Road to South Boundary Road) and Phase 1 of South Boundary Road Project (Water Street South (Hwy 24) To Franklin Boulevard Extension), In The City Of Cambridge and The Township of North Dumfries

Recommendation:

That Council of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the expropriation of lands for the purpose of construction of the Franklin Boulevard (Regional Road 36) Extension from Myers Road (Regional Road 43) to South Boundary Road and proposed construction of Phase 1 of the South Boundary Road from Water Street South (Hwy 24) to the Franklin Boulevard Extension (Regional Road 36), part in the Township of North Dumfries and part in the City of Cambridge in the Region of Waterloo as detailed in Report PDL-LEG-16-028 dated May 24, 2016, described as follows:

Full Taking:
   i. Part of Lot 7, Concession 9, being Parts 9, 10 and 11 on 58R-18766 (All of PIN 03844-0542 (LT)) (1026 Cheese Factory Road, Township of North Dumfries);

Fee Simple Partial Taking:
   ii. Part of Subdivision Lot 2, Concession 9, East of the Grand River being Part 1 on 58R-18765 (Part of PIN 03844-1944 (LT)) (E/S Water Street South-vacant land, Township of North Dumfries);
   iii. Part of Subdivision Lot 2, Concession 9 East of the Grand River being Part 2 on 58R-18765 (Part of PIN 03844-0544(LT))(1083 Brantford Highway, Township of North Dumfries);
iv. Part of Lot 7, Concession 9, being Part 7 on 58R-18766 (Part of PIN 03844-1059(LT) (E/S Cheese Factory Road-vacant land, Township of North Dumfries);

v. Part of Lot 7, Concession 9, being Part 4 on 58R-18766 (Part of PIN 03844-2051(LT) (E/S Cheese Factory Road-vacant land, Township of North Dumfries);

vi. Part of Lot 6, Concession 9, being Parts 5, 8, 11, 13, 14 and 15 on 58R-18784 (Part of PIN 22680-0007(LT) (1049 Cheese Factory Road, Township of North Dumfries);

vii. Part of Lot 6, Concession 9, being Parts 20, 21 and 22 on 58R-18784 (Part of PIN 22680-0009(LT) (1002 Morrison Road, Township of North Dumfries);

viii. Part of Lot 6, Concession 9, being Part 28 on 58R-18784 (Part of PIN 22680-0004(LT) (405 Myers Road, City of Cambridge);

ix. Part of Lot 6, Concession 9, being Parts 25 and 30 on 58R-18784 (Part of PIN 22680-0005(LT) (455 Myers Road, City of Cambridge);

x. Part of Lot 139, Registered Plan 1368 being Parts 4 and 6 on 58R-18785 (Part of PIN 22673-0131(LT) (174 Bakersfield Drive, City of Cambridge);

xi. Part of Lot 26, Registered Plan 1433 being Part 1 on 58R-18785 (Part of PIN 22676-0040(LT) (104 Stonyburn Crescent, City of Cambridge);

**Permanent Storm Water Easement:**

The right and easement, being an easement in gross, for itself, its successors and assigns and anyone authorized by it, in perpetuity to, at any time enter upon the following properties for purposes of constructing, installing, inspecting, repairing, altering, enlarging, correcting, operating, maintaining, replacing, and reconstructing and using a system of at grade and below ground watercourses, sewers, drains, ditches, catch basins, culverts, gabion stones and other drainage works for the passage of drainage water, together with all pipes, wires, conduits, poles, markers, at grade accesses, manholes, catch basins, service boxes and other works and appurtenances thereto, which may be determined necessary from time to time through, under, over, upon, along and across the lands, and for all such purposes together with the free, unimpeded and unobstructed access for itself, its successors and assigns, servants, agents, contractors, workers and anyone authorized by it, and vehicles, supplies and equipment at all times and for all purposes and things necessary for or incidental to the exercise and enjoyment of the right and easement.

xii. Part of Lot 6, Concession 9, being Part 23 on 58R-18784 (Part of PIN
Temporary Grading Easement:

The right and easement, being a temporary easement in gross, for the free and unobstructed, right, interest and easement terminating on the 31st day of December, 2020, for itself, its successors and assigns, and anyone authorized by it, on over, under and through the following properties for the purposes of excavation, construction, installation, replacement, alteration, grading, and landscaping as required in connection with the construction of Franklin Boulevard Extension from Myers Road (Regional Road 43) to South Boundary Road and proposed construction of Phase 1 of South Boundary Road from Water Street South (Hwy 24) to the Franklin Boulevard Extension (Regional Road 36), and all related improvements works ancillary thereto and for such purposes, the free, unimpeded and unobstructed access to the lands at all times by employees, agents, contractors, workers and anyone authorized by it, and vehicles, supplies and equipment at all times and for all purposes and things necessary for or incidental to the exercise and enjoyment of the right and easement:

xiv. Part of Lot 7, Concession 9 being Parts 2, 5, 6 and 8 on 58R-18766 (Part of PIN 03844-1059(LT) (E/S Cheese Factory Road – vacant land, Township of North Dumfries);

xv. Part of Lot 7, Concession 9 being Part 3 on 58R-18766 (Part of PIN 03844-2051(LT) (E/S Cheese Factory Road – vacant land, Township of North Dumfries);

xvi. Part of Lot 6, Concession 9, being Parts 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 16 and 17 on 58R-18784 (Part of PIN 22680-0007(LT) (1049 Cheese Factory Road, Township of North Dumfries);

xvii. Part of Lot 6, Concession 9, being Parts 26, 27 and 29 on 58R-18784 (Part of PIN 22680-0005(LT) (455 Myers Road, City of Cambridge);

xviii. Part of Lot 139, Registered Plan 1368 being Parts 3, 5 and 7 on 58R-18785 (Part of PIN 22673-0131 (LT) (174 Bakersfield Drive, City of Cambridge); and

xix. Part of Lot 26, Registered Plan 1433 being Part 2 on 58R-18785 (Part of PIN 22676-0040 (LT) (104 Stonyburn Crescent, City of Cambridge);

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

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

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

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

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

**Summary:**

NIL

**Report:**

Regional Council approved the preliminary design for construction of the South Boundary Road corridor and Franklin Boulevard Extension and directed staff to file the Notice of Completion for this Class Environmental Assessment on June 29, 2011, as outlined in Report E-11-069.

The Franklin Boulevard Extension and South Boundary Road project will be constructed in two phases. Phase 1 will include construction of the South Boundary Road between Water Street (Hwy 24) and the Franklin Boulevard Extension as well as construction of the Franklin Boulevard Extension between Myers Road and the South Boundary Road. Phase 2 will include the construction of the South Boundary Road between the Franklin Boulevard Extension and Dundas Street (Hwy 8).
Phase 1 of the project is currently included in the Region’s 2016 Transportation Capital Program (TCP) for construction starting in 2017, while Phase 2 is included in the TCP for construction starting in 2022.

The Region is currently seeking to acquire property associated with Phase 1 of the project. In Phase 1, South Boundary Road will be constructed to a four lane urban cross-section with a raised centre median and with a multi-use trail on the north side of the corridor. The Franklin Boulevard Extension will be constructed to a two lane urban cross section, with provision to accommodate four lanes in the future, and multi-use trails along both sides of the road. Roundabouts will be constructed on South Boundary Road at the intersections of Water Street and the Franklin Boulevard Extension, and on Franklin Boulevard at Myers Road. A new overpass bridge will also be constructed carrying South Boundary Road over Cheese Factory Road.

As South Boundary Road will be a new roadway, property will need to be acquired for the entire proposed road right-of-way width, generally through existing farmland and through some forested areas, following the alignment established and approved through the Environmental Assessment (EA) process. The same is true for the Franklin Boulevard Extension within the Township of North Dumfries. The portion of the Franklin Boulevard Extension that lies within the City of Cambridge will be constructed within an existing Region owned right-of-way that was established through the EA process as part of the approval of the surrounding residential development. At Franklin Boulevard and Myers Road, partial acquisition of the adjacent properties will be required to accommodate the proposed four-legged roundabout at the existing three-legged stop controlled intersection.

The implementation of the improvements directly impacts 11 properties as shown in the Appendix “A” to this report. Partial land acquisitions, as outlined in the Recommendation, are required from 10 of the properties and they are for fee simple partial takings for new road and road widening purposes. One of the properties requires a full fee simple buyout. In addition, a permanent easement for storm drainage purposes is required over 2 of the properties and temporary grading easements to complete new side slopes abutting the roadway are required over 6 of the properties.

Council approved the commencement of expropriation of the subject properties on January 12, 2016 as detailed in report PDL-LEG-16-03. 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, any geotechnical surveys, tree clearing and land grading can be completed before winter which will facilitate the overall construction time line. 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 site preparation by fall 2016 and the commencement of construction of the new South Boundary Road and Franklin Boulevard extension 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 new South Boundary Road and Franklin Boulevard extension Roadway 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 has conducted corporate profile searches of affected corporate property owners and the directors and officers are listed for each. This list does not
include tenants, easement holders or holders of security interests in the subject lands.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

This Project supports the following two strategic objectives of the Corporate Strategic Plan: to optimize existing and new 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 approved 2016 Transportation Capital Program currently includes a budget of $1.71 million in 2016 and a total of $18.98 million in 2017 & 2018 for Franklin Boulevard (Regional Road 36) Extension from Myers Road (Regional Road 43) to South Boundary Road (project #07132) and South Boundary Road from Water Street South (Hwy 24) to the Franklin Boulevard Extension (Regional Road 36) (project #07192). These projects are funded from the Region Development Charges Reserve Fund. Approximately $3-4 million of the overall budget has been allocated for property acquisition.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

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

**Attachments**

Appendix “A” – Sketch Project Area and Subject Properties

Appendix “B” – Corporate Profiles

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

Fiona McCrea, Solicitor, Property

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

Corporate Profiles

1. E/S Water Street South-vacant land, Twp. of North Dumfries
   - Owner: 2293400 Ontario Limited
   - Annual Return: 3/7/2015
   - Directors/Officers:
     Monica Narula and Rachel Nischal

2. 1083 Brantford Highway, Twp. of North Dumfries
   - Owner: Gillespie Holdings Limited
   - Annual Return: 5/30/2015
   - Directors/Officers:
     Brian Gillespie, John Howard Gillespie, Audrey Jane Gillespie, Pamela Gillespie

3. 455 Meyers Road, Cambridge
   - Owner: Forward Baptist Church, Cambridge
   - Annual Return: 12/19/2015
   - Directors/Officers:
     Peter Graham, Craig A Pilkington, Stephen Roger Gowing, Jan Flietstra, Terry Fearon, Peter Faus, James P. Farquharson, Michael Shawn Dawdy, Marvin Ray Brubacher

4. 1002 Morrison Road, Cambridge
   - Owner: 1541179 Ontario Ltd.
   - Annual Return: 11/29/2015
   - Directors/Officers:
     Paul Silvestri, Mario Salvatore
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Design and Construction

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: May 24, 2016
File Code: C04-30, 08308-H
Subject: C2016-07 Consultant Selection – Detailed Design and Services during Construction for the Preston Wastewater Treatment Plant Headworks, Blowers and Electrical Upgrades

Recommendation:
That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enter into an Agreement for Professional Consulting Services with R.E. Poisson Engineering Inc., to provide engineering services during the detailed design and services during construction for the Preston Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) Headworks, Blowers and Electrical Upgrades, City of Cambridge, at an upset fee limit of $420,714.53 plus applicable taxes.

Summary:
A Request for Consulting Engineering Services for the Preston WWTP Headworks, Blowers and Electrical Upgrades was advertised in the Waterloo Region Record, Daily Commercial News, and on the Region’s Purchasing website. A consultant selection process was followed in accordance with the Region’s Purchasing By-Law 04-093 for the procurement of goods and services and included price as a factor. When considering Quality, Equity and Price Factors, the submission from R.E. Poisson Engineering Inc. of Guelph, Ontario, scored the highest. The project evaluation team therefore recommends that R.E. Poisson Engineering Inc. be retained to undertake this assignment for a total upset fee of $420,714.53 plus applicable taxes.

Report:

Background
The Preston Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) is located in a residential area at 395 Montrose Street South, in Cambridge and provides wastewater treatment for the
surrounding domestic and industrial sources, discharging treated effluent to the Grand River. The Preston WWTP is owned by the Region of Waterloo (Region) and operated by the Ontario Clean Water Agency (OCWA). The average design flow of the plant is 16,860 m$^3$/d, and the peak design flow is 43,300 m$^3$/day. Treatment processes at the plant include inlet screening, primary clarification, aeration, secondary clarification, return activated sludge and waste activated sludge, anaerobic digestion, and ultraviolet (UV) effluent treatment.

The Preston WWTP was originally constructed in the 1960’s, with plant-wide upgrades conducted in the early 2000’s, including upgrades to the plant's headworks and blowers. Since the 2000’s, other major upgrade projects have included the anaerobic digester upgrades in 2013, as well as the odour control and primary clarifier upgrades that commenced in 2015 and are currently under construction, with anticipated completion by the end of 2016.

The Preston WWTP receives raw sewage from the local sanitary collection system that is initially screened and separated in the headworks building. The Preston WWTP has been experiencing a number of screening operational deficiencies over the past several years. In order to address these issues, the Region completed a condition assessment and hydraulic analysis of the headworks facility in 2015, and developed a conceptual design for upgrading the headworks to replace aging equipment, improve performance and add operational flexibility.

The wastewater at the Preston WWTP is processed from the headworks and primary clarifiers to the secondary treatment, where it is treated using three existing blowers (duty/standby) for aeration. An energy efficiency assessment was conducted in late 2014. This assessment identified the replacement of the existing three blowers with more energy efficient blowers and addition of dissolved oxygen control as a significant energy saving opportunity.

An assessment of the facility’s electrical system has shown that the Preston WWTP high voltage substation consists of two transformers which are nearing the end of their service life and need replacement.

Based on the recommendations of the plant’s condition assessments and energy efficiency audit described above, staff recommend proceeding with detailed design and construction for improving the headworks and replacing the blowers and transformer equipment at the Preston WWTP. The recommended upgrades to the Preston WWTP will provide improved operational performance, flexibility, reliability and energy efficiency.
Consultant Selection:

In order to meet the scheduled 2017 construction start date for the proposed work, a multi-disciplinary engineering consultant must be retained now to undertake the design, approvals, tendering, and contract administration for this work. On February 24, 2016, the Region of Waterloo placed advertisements on its website, in the Waterloo Region Record and Daily Commercial News, inviting submissions from consultants for detailed design and services during construction for the Preston WWTP Headworks, Blowers and Electrical Upgrades. The following four (4) proponents submitted a Proposal (detailed Workplan and Upset Fee):

- Stantec Consulting Ltd.;
- GHD Limited;
- R.E. Poisson Engineering Inc.; and
- CIMA Canada Inc.

Each proposal was reviewed by the consultant evaluation team consisting of: Nathan Morris, Coordinator, Infrastructure Management (Water Services), Dominika Celmer-Repin, Project Engineer, Wastewater Operations (Water Services), and Nancy Corbett, Senior Project Manager, Environmental Engineering (Design and Construction). The consultant selection process was carried out in accordance with the Region of Waterloo’s Purchasing By law 04-093 for the procurement of goods and services, and included price as a factor. The evaluation criteria were subdivided into Quality, Equity, and Price factors as follows:

**Quality factors**

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

**Equity Factors**

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

**Price Factor**

- Upset Price: 15%
Quality and Equity factors were assigned and finalized during the review of the detailed Workplans. All four proposals were short-listed and the Upset Fee Envelopes from the four proponents were opened and evaluated.

When considering all Quality, Equity, and Price Factors, the consultant selection team evaluated the submission from R.E. Poisson Engineering Inc. as the highest overall score. R.E. Poisson Engineering Inc.’s upset fee of $420,714.53 plus applicable taxes was 11% below the average price of the four submissions. Therefore, the project evaluation team recommends that R.E. Poisson Engineering Inc. be awarded this assignment for an upset fee of $420,714.53 plus applicable taxes.

Scope of Work

The scope of work for the consulting assignment for the detailed design and services during construction for the Preston WWTP Headworks, Blowers and Electrical Upgrades includes the following tasks:

- Task 1: Project initiation, background review and workshop with engineering and operations staff;
- Task 2: Detailed design;
- Task 3: Approvals;
- Task 4: Tender administration and support;
- Task 5: Contract administration and on-site construction inspection services; and
- Task 6: Post-construction services.

Schedule

Subject to Council’s approval of this assignment, it is anticipated that detailed design will commence in June 2016. It is anticipated that following the completion of the detailed design, construction will take place late spring 2017 to early 2018.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

Award of this consulting assignment meets the 2015-2018 Corporate Strategic Plan objective to protect the quality and quantity of our water resources under Strategic Focus Area 3: Environment and Sustainable Growth.

Financial Implications:

The Region’s approved 2016 Wastewater Capital Forecast provides a total budget for project #8308 (Cambridge Infrastructure Upgrades) of $9,005,000 from 2016 to 2018. A total of $450,000 was allocated for engineering fees for this assignment. The
consultant’s upset fee of $420,714.53 plus applicable taxes is approximately 7% lower than the budget allowance for engineering work for this project.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

NIL

Attachments:

Appendix A: Breakdown of Consultant’s Upset Fees

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td>Project initiation, background review and workshop</td>
<td>$31,993.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>Detailed design</td>
<td>$126,940.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3</td>
<td>Approvals</td>
<td>$6,964.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4</td>
<td>Tender administration and support</td>
<td>$5,959.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5</td>
<td>Contract administration and on-site construction inspection services</td>
<td>$234,753.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 6</td>
<td>Post-construction services</td>
<td>$14,102.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Upset Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$420,714.53</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Design and Construction

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: May 24, 2016  File Code: C04-30 / 06510
Subject: Class Environmental Assessment Study
Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street from King Street to Erb Street and Erb Street from King Street to Caroline Street, City of Waterloo

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to the Class Environmental Assessment Study for proposed improvements to Bridgeport Road/ Caroline Street from King Street to Erb Street and Erb Street from King Street to Caroline Street in the City of Waterloo:

a) Approve the Recommended Design Concept for the proposed improvements to Bridgeport Road/ Caroline Street from King Street to Erb Street and Erb Street from King Street to Caroline Street as described in Report TES-DCS-16-12 dated May 24, 2016;

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

Summary:

The Region of Waterloo is currently undertaking a Class Environmental Assessment Study (Class EA) to consider improvements to Bridgeport Road/ Caroline Street from King Street to Erb Street and Erb Street from King Street to Caroline Street to King Street in the City of Waterloo. Improvements to Albert Street from Erb Street to Bridgeport Road are also being considered as part of this Class EA Study on behalf of the City of Waterloo. Please refer to Appendix “A” for a Key Plan of the Study Area for
this Class EA.

This Class EA Study has been initiated to identify a recommended design concept to address the deteriorating pavement conditions and aging sewer and watermain on these sections of roadways, as well as to consider opportunities for improvements to pedestrian, cycling and transit facilities.

The Project Team conducted a Public Consultation Centre on January 27, 2016 at the Canadian Clay and Glass Gallery. Based on a review of the technical information gathered for this project, as well as a review of all public and agency comments received, the Project Team is now recommending that Regional Council approve the following improvements to Bridgeport Road/ Caroline Street from King Street to Erb Street and Erb Street from King Street to Caroline Street to King Street in the City of Waterloo:

Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street from King Street to Erb Street:

- Complete replacement of the pavement structure including new concrete curb and gutter;
- Replacement of the storm sewers;
- Replacement of the City’s watermain and sanitary sewer from King Street to 100 metres west of Albert Street;
- Construction of a 4.0 metre wide boulevard multi-use trail on the north side of Bridgeport Road from King Street to Dorset Street;
- Construction of a 3.0 metre wide boulevard multi-use trail on the north side of Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street from Dorset Street to Erb Street;
- Replacement of the existing 1.50 metre wide sidewalk on the south side of Bridgeport Road from King Street to Albert Street with 2.0 metre wide sidewalk;
- Construction of new 2.50 metre wide sidewalk on the south side of Caroline Street from Albert Street to Dupont Street;
- Replacement of the existing 1.50 metre wide sidewalk on the south/ east side of Caroline Street from Dupont Street to Erb Street with 2.0 metre wide sidewalk;
- Removal of the existing westbound curb lane on the north side of Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street from King Street to Erb Street to accommodate the proposed boulevard multi-use trail;
- Construction of a new designated westbound right-turn lane on Bridgeport Road at Albert Street; and
- Enhanced boulevard landscaping where space permits.

Erb Street from King Street to Caroline Street:

- Complete replacement of the pavement structure including new concrete curb and gutter;
- Replacement of the storm sewers;
- Replacement of the City’s watermain and sanitary sewer on Erb Street from King Street to Caroline Street;
• Replacement of the existing 1.50 metre wide sidewalk on the north side of Erb Street from 90 metres east of Caroline Street to 30 metres west of King Street with a 2.50 metre wide sidewalk;
• Replacement of the existing 2.0 metre wide sidewalk on the south side of Erb Street from Caroline Street to 100 metres west of King Street with a 2.50 metre wide sidewalk; and
• Removal of the existing designated left-turn lanes on Erb Street at Albert Street.

The Recommended Design Concept for improvements to Albert Street from Erb Street to Bridgeport Road will be considered for approval by City of Waterloo Council on May 30, 2016 and is described in Appendix ‘E’ of this Report TES-DC-16-12

Please refer to Appendix “B” for drawings of the Project Team’s Recommended Design Concept for Bridgeport Road/ Caroline Street, Erb Street and Albert Street.

The Region’s approved 2016 Ten-Year Transportation Capital Program includes funds of $3,230,000 in years 2016 to 2019 inclusive for the roadway improvements and a portion of the storm sewer replacement on Erb Street and Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street to be funded from the Roads Rehabilitation Reserve Fund. The City of Waterloo is responsible for the cost of the improvements to Albert Street, the replacement of the City’s watermain, sanitary sewer and a portion of the storm sewer replacement costs on Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street and Erb Street.

Subject to receipt of all technical and financial approvals and relocation of utilities, construction is currently scheduled to commence in the Spring of 2018 with completion expected in the Fall of 2018. Final surface course asphalt is scheduled for placement in 2019.

Report:

1. Background

The Region of Waterloo is currently undertaking a Class Environmental Assessment Study (Class EA) to consider improvements to Bridgeport Road/ Caroline Street from King Street to Erb Street and Erb Street from King Street to Caroline Street to King Street in the City of Waterloo. Improvements to Albert Street from Erb Street to Bridgeport Road are also being considered as part of this Class EA Study on behalf of the City of Waterloo. Please refer to Appendix “A” for a Key Plan of the Study Area for this Class EA.

This Class EA Study has been initiated to identify a recommended design concept to address the deteriorating pavement conditions and aging sewer and watermain on these sections of roadways, as well as to consider opportunities for improvements to pedestrian, cycling and transit facilities. This project is being planned as a Schedule ‘B’
project under the Class EA process.

A Project Team consisting of staff from the Region of Waterloo, staff from the City of Waterloo and City of Waterloo Councillor Melissa Durrell was established to direct the planning of these improvements. The planning of these roadway improvements is being undertaken in accordance with the Regional Context Sensitive Corridor Design Guidelines, the Region’s Transportation Master Plan (TMP) and Active Transportation Master Plan (ATMP) and other relevant Regional policies and practices.

The sections of roadways within the study area are located within the Urban Core Area of the City of Waterloo and need to support future development intensification through prioritizing walking, cycling and public transit while accommodating significant peak hour traffic volumes.

Within the Study area, Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street is a one-way road (in the westerly direction) with three travel lanes. This section of Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street is classified as a Neighbourhood Connector – Main Street in the Regional Context Sensitive Corridor Guidelines and has a posted speed limit of 50km/hour. The abutting land use is a combination of residential, commercial and institutional properties. Traffic control signals exist at the intersections of Bridgeport Road and King Street, Bridgeport Road and Albert Street and Caroline Street/Erb Street. Sidewalks currently exist on each side of Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street from King Street to Erb Street, with the exception of a missing section on the south side of the road from Albert Street to Dupont Street. There are no designated cycling facilities on this section of Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street.

Erb Street from Caroline Street to King Street is a one-way road (in the easterly direction) with two travel lanes from Caroline Street to west of Albert Street and three travel lanes from west of Albert Street to King Street. There is a designated left-turn lane on Erb Street at Albert Street and vehicles can also turn left onto Albert Street from the adjacent through lane. Erb Street is classified as a Neighbourhood Connector – Main Street in the Regional Context Sensitive Corridor Guidelines and has a posted speed limit of 50km/hour. The abutting land use on Erb Street is a combination of commercial and institutional properties. Traffic control signals exist at the intersections of Erb Street/Caroline Street and Erb Street/King Street. Sidewalks exist on both sides of Erb Street and there are no designated cycling facilities. The existing storm sewer, City watermain and sanitary sewers are approaching the end of their service life and require replacement.

Albert Street from Bridgeport Road to Erb Street is a one-way, two lane roadway under the jurisdiction of the City of Waterloo. As part of this Class EA Study, the City is considering improvements to Albert Street to enhance parking, pedestrian and cycling facilities.
2. Transportation Considerations

The Region of Waterloo’s Transportation Master Plan (TMP), updated in 2010, is a high-level strategic plan that assesses existing and future travel patterns for the Regional transportation system. The goals of the plan are to optimize the transportation system, promote transportation choice, foster a strong economy and support sustainable development. Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street and Erb Street provide important transportation links within the City of Waterloo, bringing travelers to and from Uptown Waterloo as well as east-west across the City. The TMP recommends that, within the project area, priority be given to walking, cycling, and public transit rather than driving alone, and aims to improve the cycling and pedestrian networks in the project area. The TMP does not identify a need to widen these sections of roadways.

The Regional Active Transportation Master Plan (ATMP) identifies Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street as an on-road cycling route with sidewalks on both sides of the roadway. There is insufficient space to maintain three (3) travel lanes for vehicles and include a designated cycling facility on Bridgeport Road from King Street to Albert Street without the removal of one through lane of traffic. The Project Team has confirmed that two through lanes on Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street from King Street to Erb Street, combined with a new designated right-turn lane on Bridgeport Road at Albert Street, is adequate to accommodate long-term forecast traffic volumes without undue delay or congestion.

Through consultation with the City of Waterloo’s Advisory Committee on Active Transportation and the Region's Active Transportation Advisory Committee, the installation of a boulevard multi-use trail is being proposed under the Project Team’s Recommended Design Concept along the north side of Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street in lieu of on-road cycling lanes in order to allow two-way movement of cyclists along this stretch of roadway. Since Bridgeport Road and Caroline Street are one-way streets within the project area, the Project Team believes that a boulevard multi-use trail providing two-way movement for cyclists is preferred over on-road or segregated cycling lanes, which would provide only one direction of travel. Additionally, the proposed boulevard trail on the north side of Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street would connect to the existing Iron Horse Trail at the intersection of Erb Street and Caroline Street and the two trail connections northwest of Dupont Street to Waterloo Park.

The ATMP also recommends a two-way cycle track on Erb Street within the project limits. Due to the extremely close proximity of the buildings on Erb Street, there is no room to accommodate cycling facilities within the roadway corridor in the project area without removal of an existing travel lane. A separate, broader study to consider implementation of a two-way cycle track on Erb Street from Caroline Street to Margaret Avenue will be completed by the Region of Waterloo in the future. This study will consider removal of a travel lane on Erb Street from Caroline Street to Margaret Avenue.
to accommodate an on-road two-way cycle track. Until this study is completed, the transportation implications of removing a travel lane on Erb Street from Caroline Street to Margaret Avenue are unknown. Accordingly, the Project Team’s Recommended Design Concept does not include any designated cycling facilities on Erb Street within the project area. However, should the Region’s separate study ultimately recommend a two-way cycle track be implemented on Erb Street from Caroline Street to Margaret Avenue, the two-way cycle track on Erb Street from King Street to Caroline Street could, under the Project Team’s Recommended Design Concept, be implemented through means of revised roadway line markings and signage without the need for additional construction. Further, this could be incorporated into the planned 2018 construction of Erb Street if approved by that time. The Project Team does not recommend the implementation of a two-way cycle track on Erb Street from King Street to Caroline Street until the traffic implications of removing a through lane on Erb Street from Caroline Street to Margaret Avenue are known.

The ATMP also recommends sidewalks on each side of Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street and Erb Street. Sidewalks currently exist on the each side of these roads with the exception of a missing section on the south side of Bridgeport Road from Albert Street to Dupont Street. Construction of this missing section of Sidewalk is proposed under the Project Team’s Recommended Design Concept.

Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street from King Street to Erb Street and Erb Street from Caroline Street to King Street are within the Urban Core Area of the City of Waterloo and need to prioritize walking, cycling and public transit. Accordingly, the Project Team considered pedestrian crossings on Erb Street at the Albert Street intersection and on Caroline Street at the Dupont Street intersection. The Region’s current practice regarding mid-block pedestrian crossing facilities precludes the installation of a designated pedestrian crossing within 125m of a signalized intersection on a one-way road (200 metres on a two-way road). The intersection of Albert Street and Erb Street is located approximately 70 metres from the intersection of King Street and the intersection of Caroline Street and Dupont Street is located approximately 100 metres from the intersection of Caroline Street and Erb Street, accordingly these locations do not meet the minimum required distance for a mid-block pedestrian crossing.

3. Public Consultation

Plans for the proposed improvements were presented to area residents, businesses and stakeholders at a Public Consultation Centre (PCC) held at the Waterloo Clay and Glass Gallery on January 27, 2016. Notices for this PCC were mailed out to property and business owners within the project limits. Notices were also placed in the local newspaper and road-side signs were placed in the vicinity to advise the public of the meeting. Staff from the Region of Waterloo and the City of Waterloo was present at the PCC to meet the public, receive input and respond to questions.
The PCC was attended by approximately sixty (60) people. Comments received by the Project Team were generally supportive of the proposed improvements. The Project Team received seven (7) comment sheets at the PCC and thirteen (13) e-mails following the PCC. All written comments received are included in Appendix ‘C’ of this Report. The Project Team’s responses to the written comments received are included in Appendix ‘D’ of this report.

The plans presented at the PCC are generally the same as the improvements proposed under the Project Team’s Recommended Design Concept. Minor changes to the proposed design based on public comments received have been reflected in the Recommended Design Concept.

4. **Recommended Design Concept**

Based on review of the technical studies completed for this project, relevant Regional policies, practices and guidelines and all public and agency comments received for this project, the Project Team is recommending that Regional Council approve the Recommended Design Concept for improvements to Bridgeport Road/ Caroline Street from King Street to Erb Street and to Erb Street from Caroline Street to King Street described as follows:

Bridgeport Road/ Caroline Street from King Street to Erb Street:

- Complete replacement of the pavement structure including new concrete curb and gutter;
- Replacement of the storm sewers;
- Replacement of the City’s watermain and sanitary sewer from King Street to 100 metres west of Albert Street;
- Construction of a 4.0 metre wide boulevard multi-use trail on the north side of Bridgeport Road from King Street to Dorset Street;
- Construction of a 3.0 metre wide boulevard multi-use trail on the north side of Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street from Dorset Street to Erb Street;
- Replacement of the existing 1.50 metre wide sidewalk on the south side of Bridgeport Road from King Street to Albert Street with 2.0 metre wide sidewalk;
- Construction of new 2.50 metre wide sidewalk on the south side of Caroline Street from Albert Street to Dupont Street;
- Replacement of the existing 1.50 metre wide sidewalk on the south/ east side of Caroline Street from Dupont Street to Erb Street with 2.0 metre wide sidewalk;
- Removal of the existing westbound curb lane on the north side of Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street from King Street to Erb Street to accommodate the proposed boulevard multi-use trail;
- Construction of a new designated westbound right-turn lane on Bridgeport Road at Albert Street; and
- Enhanced boulevard landscaping where space permits.
Erb Street from King Street to Caroline Street:

- Complete replacement of the pavement structure including new concrete curb and gutter;
- Replacement of the storm sewers;
- Replacement of the City's watermain and sanitary sewer on Erb Street from King Street to Caroline Street;
- Replacement of the existing 1.50 metre wide sidewalk on the north side of Erb Street from 90 metres east of Caroline Street to 30 metres west of King Street with a 2.50 metre wide sidewalk;
- Replacement of the existing 2.0 metre wide sidewalk on the south side of Erb Street from Caroline Street to 100 metres west of King Street with a 2.50 metre wide sidewalk; and
- Removal of the existing designated left-turn lanes on Erb Street at Albert Street.

Please refer to Appendix “B” for drawings of the Project Team’s Recommended Design Concept for Bridgeport Road/ Caroline Street, Erb Street and Albert Street.

The Recommended Design Concept for improvements to Albert Street from Erb Street to Bridgeport Road will be considered for approval by City of Waterloo Council on May 30, 2016 and is described in Appendix ‘E” this Report.

Letters advising of the recommendations in this Report TES-DCS-16-12 were mailed on May 2, 2016 to abutting property owners and those who registered at the January 27, 2016 Public Consultation Centre and were hand-delivered to tenants of directly abutting properties.

5.   Property Requirements

The Recommended Design Concept does not require the acquisition of any property.

6.   Heritage Impacts

Portions of the proposed works occur within the City of Waterloo’s MacGregor-Albert Neighbourhood Heritage Conservation District. There are a number of properties either abutting the roadway within the project area or located in close proximity to the project area that are designated under the Ontario Heritage Act, in addition to a number of non-designated properties with cultural heritage value or interest.

Construction of the proposed improvements to Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street, Erb Street and Albert Street will be confined to the existing rights-of-way and is not expected to adversely impact any heritage properties.

Region and City Heritage Planning staff is being kept apprised of the plans for this project by the Project Team.
7. Estimated Project Costs

The estimated project cost to construct the roadway improvements and a portion of the storm sewer replacement on Erb Street and Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street improvements described the Project Team’s Recommended Design Concept for Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street, Erb Street and Albert Street is approximately $3,200,000. The City of Waterloo is responsible for the cost of the improvements to Albert Street, the replacement of the City’s watermain and sanitary sewer and a portion of the storm sewer replacement costs in an estimated amount of $1,200,000.

8. Construction Schedule

Subject to receipt of all technical and financial approvals and relocation of utilities, construction is currently scheduled to commence in the Spring of 2018 with completion expected in the Fall of 2018. Final surface course asphalt is scheduled for placement in 2019.

9. Traffic Management during Construction

It is anticipated that through traffic will be maintained on Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street during construction with lane restrictions in effect. It will be necessary to fully close Erb Street from King Street to Caroline Street to through traffic in order to complete the construction. Through traffic and transit service will be detoured via Caroline Street and Allen Street. Local and emergency traffic will be maintained during construction on Erb Street.

Pedestrian access will be maintained along each street during construction. Where the sidewalk is close to deep excavations, the sidewalk will be separated from the work area by temporary fencing. Signage will be erected in order to direct pedestrians through the project area.

Emergency Medical Services will be advised of the traffic restrictions during the construction period. Grand River Transit (Route 5) and ION service will be maintained during construction through the intersection of Caroline Street and Erb Street.

10. Next Steps

Subject to approval of the Recommended Design Concept by Council, a Notice of Completion will be filed for this Class Environmental Assessment Study by means of advertisements in local newspapers and mailings to adjacent property owners, tenants and agencies, and the Project File will be placed on the public record for review for a period of 30 days. If no unresolved concerns are brought forward within the 30 day review period, preparation of the detailed design for the proposed works will be initiated.
Corporate Strategic Plan:

The recommended improvements to Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street and Erb Street support Focus Strategic Plan Objective 2.3 to build infrastructure for, and increase participation in, active forms of transportation (cycling and walking).

Financial Implications:

The Region’s approved 2016 Ten-Year Transportation Capital Program includes funds of $3,230,000 in years 2016 to 2019 inclusive for the roadway improvements and a portion of the storm sewer replacement on Erb Street and Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street to be funded from the Roads Rehabilitation Reserve Fund.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Nil

Attachments
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Appendix B – Drawings of the Recommended Design Concept

Appendix C – Written Comments Received at the January 27, 2016 Public Consultation Centre

Appendix D – Project Team Response to Public Comments Received

Appendix E – Recommended Design Concept for Improvements to Albert Street

Prepared By: Jim Ellerman, Project Manager

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation & Environmental Services
Appendix “B” – Recommended Design Concept
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Appendix “C”

Public Comments Received from the January 27, 2016

Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street, Erb Street and Albert Street Reconstruction

Public Consultation Centre

Comments:

Proposed car lane widths are 3.65 meters on Bridgeport Road, and 3.35 meters on Albert Street. Wide lanes encourage motorists to speed, and increase the probability of collisions, as well as the severity of injuries when collisions occur. Since all of Streets are intended to carry motor vehicle traffic with a speed limit of 50 kilometres per hour, suggests that lane widths on Bridgeport/Caroline and Albert Street be no wider than 3.25 meters (which is the width allowed for each vehicle lane in the plan for Erb Street).

Erb should not be made three lanes with a sharrow lane, as planned; Some other way to maintain options in case a two-way cycle track on Erb between Caroline and Margaret is approved should be pursued.

A boulevard should be provided on Erb Street (perhaps if it turns out that Erb will have a cycle track). Having to walk directly adjacent to vehicle traffic lanes make for an extremely hostile experience, and not including a boulevard along Erb will mean foot traffic will be diminished.

A crosswalk should be provided – the report noted that counts of people crossing Erb at that location were insufficient to justify a crosswalk, but the count is lower than if a safe crossing were provided: currently, crossing at Albert Street is dangerous and most people would naturally be hesitant to undertake it.

Comments:

Intersections: Use crossrides, cycling must be accommodated on crossings for the Multiuse trails. Also, intersections with King should be protected. Finally, the intersection with Caroline is the most important intersection to get right, hopefully there will be some flexibility after Grandlinq is finished.

Albert: The bike lane is too narrow, 1.5 m minimum please (not including gutter). As well, the bike lane should be contraflow, with sharrows in the through lane, parking should be moved to the right for the contraflow bike lane on the left. Also, the bike lane should continue all the way to Erb St. Sewers should be moved out of the bike lane if possible.

Caroline: The multiuse trail should be 4 m wide because of the grade, and it should connect with adjacent trails on either side of the creek/lake.
Erb St: Needs improvement, sharrows are inappropriate here. The shoulder is unnecessary. TriTAG’s proposed design is a big improvement and I recommend using it. Removing the shoulder, adding a crossing, and making the right lane a turning only lane I believe are substantial improvements. My modifications would be to move the crossing back so that it occurs at the dividing island, and thus only requires pedestrians to cross 2 lanes, and to narrow the lane with sharrows to only 3 m wide.

Comments:

My understanding is that there will no longer be a “no right on red” sign for right turns at Albert turning onto Caroline. Please make sure that this actually happens. We are sick of having an unnecessary traffic jam outside our driveway.

Please consider placing pedestrian crossings away from some intersections, preferably with a “safe refuge” allowing pedestrians to cross one lane at a time.

Please consider “lines of sight”. The control box at Bridgeport/Albert hides adults. Children and those in wheelchairs are almost invisible here. It would be nice if cars were no required to stop here, and pedestrian crossing displaced up Albert to allow pedestrians to be visible to cars, and vice-versa.

Most of our traffic problems are caused by the Caroline/Erb intersection. I am amazed that there is no plan for this! My suggestion is to take the pedestrians off two sides of this intersection, and turn CIGI into a large one-way system.

Pedestrian crossings on the exits of two-lane intersections are dangerous. That is why they don’t exist in Europe.

Comments:

I think the painted shoulder on Erb between Caroline and Erb should be removed along with what looks to be seven or so proposed parallel parking spots in front of the Knox church and the curb brought out to where the painted shoulder would have ended.

a) this will reduce the distance people need to travel to cross Erb safely at Albert

b) for most people parallel parking on the right is challenging enough, attempting it on the un-natural and un-practiced left on a very busy street with fast moving traffic will be much harder. This will result in reduced safety and traffic flow for all road users.

The parallel parking on the left side of Albert seems unnatural; would it be better on the right?

The information sheet speaks of a lack of pedestrian crossings as evidence that safer crossing measures are not needed at Erb at Albert, but perhaps people do not cross because it is not safe; absence of evidence is not evidence of absence.

What about adding a diagonal crossing/scramble from north-west (Clay and Glass) to south-east (Waterloo Town Square) parallel to the LRT track that is activated whenever
the Ion comes through? The intersection will be at full stop every few minutes anyway, why not let the activate transportation users take full advantage of the stoppage?

I feel like this project, if implemented as is, would kill any future chance to make both Erb and Bridgeport bi-directional though which I think is the ideal solution. I would hope that the region and city would consider this potential implication prior to finalizing on this design. I would prefer to see Erb and Bridgeport both made in to two-way roads (one lane each direction) with a centre turn lane. Don't two-way left turn lane (TWLTL) roads have as much capacity as a multi-lane road without a left turn lane? If that is the case, and since Erb and Bridgeport are not near reaching those capacities along the majority of their stretches, according to 2014 regional AADT data, it would make sense to make them more liveable, safer, and efficient/connected while not reducing the capacity. The two directional travel is also adding to the connectivity (more ways to get to the same place) of the street network and so if there is a crash or construction there are alternatives.

The crossing of Albert at Erb is vastly improved. The current multi-lane nature of Albert St is dangerous and T-intersection design reduces crossing distance, and turning speeds.

**Comments:**

**Albert:**

Lane width seems high for a non-arterial road, especially at the south end before bike Lane begins.

I would consider reverting Albert to two-way traffic rather than adding parking if not, possibly contra-flow bike lane

radius of left turn from Erb to Albert is much improved from ex., but the radius still seems high which will encourage turns at high speeds. Pedestrians will not have right-of-way (no stop sign or light), it will still be a difficult crossing.

**Erb:**

Sharrows are totally inappropriate in this application

**Bridgeport/Caroline:**

like the multi-use trail

like the lane configuration
Comments:

Adding a multi-use trail along Caroline provides a great bicycle link between King St and multiple trail entrances for Waterloo Park, and finally allows northbound cycle traffic up Caroline.

Crossing Albert on the north side of Erb will be made much easier. The current multi-lane off-ramp nature of Albert St is dangerous, making walking around the old Police Station unpleasant. The new T-intersection design reduces crossing distance, turning speeds, and even introduces new green space.

Reducing Caroline to two lanes helps solve the problem of traffic backing up in the right hand lane of Bridgeport east of King. Now traffic intending to go beyond King will use the centre lane, while those turning onto King and Regina Streets will be on the left and right hand lanes, distributing traffic better across the three lanes.

Albert St still needs a legal way to cycle southbound. By moving the parking to the east side of the road, there could be a contra-flow southbound bikelane on the west side, with the northbound lane shared between cars and bicycles, with a more appropriate use of sharrows. This also puts the parking on the traditional right-hand side, which will be easier for drivers to use. Parallel parking is tricky enough, and even more so when it’s on the opposite side of the car.

If the bicycle route along Bridgeport/Caroline is a multi-use trail, then why is there a southbound on-street bike lane and bike box approaching Erb? There is no way for bicycles to access the on-road bike lane from the trail, and if they could, it would be unsafe to merge cross the constant stream of right turning traffic. The intersection design assumes that cyclists are on the road instead of the multi-use trail, when the reverse should be true. We can’t keep ending trails at crosswalks, asking cyclists to dismount to continue. With the first cross-ride in Waterloo now in service at Erb/Peppler, there is now precedent for a two-way crossing on the west side of Caroline, which will finally allow the connection of the Laurel and Iron Horse trails.

The sharrows proposed for Erb St are inappropriate. Sharrows work on low speed roads, not major high-speed multi-lane arteries. Sharrows are not a replacement for dedicated cycling infrastructure, and 2016 should be the year we stop pretending they are.

The width of Erb St is drastically wider than the planned use. There is no need for 3 through lanes and a painted shoulder lane. Staff mention a potential possibility for on-road cycle tracks, “without the need for additional construction,” but it would require waiting for “a separate, broader study to consider implementation of a two-way cycle track on Erb Street from Caroline Street to Margaret Avenue [which] will be completed by the Region of Waterloo in the future.” In the meantime, Erb will remain gratuitously wide. A pedestrian crossing at Erb/Albert is dismissed, because there are fewer than
250 people crossing day, a number that is unlikely to change if Erb remains wide and hostile. Bridges are not built by counting the number of people swimming across a river; crosswalks should not be dismissed because few are willing to unsafely cross a high-speed 4-lane arterial.

Here is a potential way to correct some of these issues. The right hand lane of Erb is used as a turn lane for the WTS entrance, and for King St. To prevent the speeding, cars cannot use it to drive from Caroline to King, only allowing cyclists to continue through, in what will now be a much lower-speed lane. The painted shoulder on the north of Erb is now removed, with the sidewalk moved south where it was. A pedestrian crossover is installed at Albert, allowing direct access from Albert to The Shops at Waterloo Town Square.

Comments:

In general, I am strongly in support of the preferred alternative. In particular, I support the multi-use trail along Bridgeport. As someone who bikes frequently, I think this is more appropriate than on-road bike lanes here and will connect well with the planned uptown streetscape. I also support the replacement of the existing wide off-ramp to Albert with a safer and slower left-turn with better ability to cross Albert on foot.

I am not in support of implementing sharrows on Erb. While this was explained as a temporary measure until another study can be complete, I believe that this would be a misapplication of sharrows on a high volume road.

However, I do believe that creating a contiguous two-way cycling corridor on Erb through uptown is an important goal, so I look forward to what can be achieved with a two-way bike lane or multi-use trail segment.

I would ask the project team to look for ways to improve the ability for pedestrians to cross Erb between Caroline and King, near Albert.

Comments:

I feel that cyclists should travel in the same direction as cars do therefore only one bike lane if the street is one way.

Comments:

Generally in agreement with the proposed design. Do not think proposed reduction in lanes will have much of an impact. I support the addition of the multi-use trail.

Concerns are elimination of the channelized left turns on and off of Albert. I understand the marked pedestrian crossing at Erb and Albert, but why not use space for a left turn lane with yield to pedestrians. Left turn from Albert to Caroline looks tight with elimination of island.
Comments:

While I applaud the direction of more bike lanes and a more walkable core, a number of the changes proposed are going to have a very significant negative impact on my office building and cause extreme frustration – much like what we are currently seeing with the ION construction. Marsland Centre has approximately 350 people working in it plus the visiting clientele. Most people arrive and depart en masse at the start & end of regular business days. I agree that Albert Street traffic flow can be supported by narrowing to one lane. However, eliminating the dedicated left from Erb Street onto Albert is an error. There isn’t enough vehicle stacking room from King to your proposed T-intersection on Albert. Traffic will be significantly hindered in getting to 20 Erb. Trucks – deliveries, garbage, moving, shredding service, mail, couriers etc will also find the one lane 90 degree left very problematic. I realize that Albert is not a truck thoroughfare but deliveries to us and the library happen daily. Leaving the dedicated left but narrowing it down to one lane will both slow traffic and will provide a much shorter and safer pedestrian crossing than currently exists with the wide two lane racetrack.

Similarly, you drawing showing the elimination of the dedicated left turn lane from Albert onto Bridgeport/Caroline and choking it down to one northbound Albert lane at that intersection is going to be a nightmare. Vehicles leaving Marsland Centre presently looking to head up Erb towards Westmount cannot exit from Dupont onto Caroline unless very aggressive moves are taken as no one will let you in. The approach many tenants take is to head north on Albert and loop around onto Caroline at the back of the line. By narrowing Caroline down, you are going to aggravate the increasingly congested traffic. If Caroline gets backed up from Erb to Albert, which we currently see very often happening, and there is a car waiting to turn left from the chokepoint lane on Albert with nowhere to go and blocking all cars behind on Albert you have essentially created a full gridlock scenario. My suggestion – narrow Albert to one lane but keep the dedicated left turn lane from Erb to Albert and widen the Albert to Bridgeport end to two lanes to allow a dedicated left as it is now.

The comment about removing the channelized island on Albert and Caroline is also an error. The island provides a pedestrian safety zone while still allowing unimpeded traffic flow.

What the changes have not addressed is the mid-block pedestrian crossing of Erb Street. This is where I see the most pedestrian issues currently. Marsland Centre has three main pedestrian entrances. See attached for clarification. Location A is the set of steps exiting mid-block beside the horticultural park and is far more heavily used than location B. This crossing of Erb is also heavily used for pedestrian traffic by Knox/Library/Perimeter and the trail through the Horticultural park across Erb to Waterloo Square / Atrium/ Angies etc. I would suggest a mid-block pedestrian activated crosswalk – it will only slow traffic when actually being used and the midblock location
provides ample car stacking space from the cross walk to Caroline St. People are inherently lazy and will not walk all the way to King to turn around and walk back the other side. This is a safety issue.

The other dangerous pedestrian hotspot that I see regularly and heavily used is crossing Caroline at Dupont to pick up the trail beside Perimeter – again people will not walk to the corner and Dupont is a natural entry to the trails around Silver Lake and entry to the Park.

Final comments – the proposed sidewalk on Caroline between Albert and Dupont on the library side where none exists now is an absolute waste of money. With a new separated multi use trail on the other side of the road, the sidewalk on the library side will never be used and no properties front on it.

Bridgeport Road is a main one way entry from the expressway into and through the Uptown Waterloo core and then carries up Erb Street towards Westmount. Erb Street acts as the major thoroughfare from Waterloo’s core back out to the expressway. To keep Uptown core business strong and vibrant, we actually want traffic flow through the core and we don’t want traffic diverted elsewhere. Every street in the City doesn’t have to have bike lanes or become a walking trail. Some streets still have to function to get people from A to B in an efficient and stress free manner.

Comments:

I’m pleased to see improved pedestrian and cyclist facilities in the preferred concepts. I like the way that the Erb/Albert intersection has been normalized, with improved pedestrian crossing.

It isn’t clear how cyclists will move from multi-use trail on Caroline to the protected stop line at the corner of Erb & Caroline. Perhaps once Grandlinq finalizes their plans?

Comments:

Overall I think the proposed changes are a big improvement. I just have concerns about a few mismatches in capacity between different parts of the project and some other relatively minor points.

First, you have Bridgeport Rd. Westbound at two through lanes, and Erb St. Eastbound at three through lanes. This makes no sense; Erb St. and Bridgeport Rd. together form a single arterial running through town. How many two-way roads in town have a different number of lanes in the two directions? I would suggest making both streets have two through lanes. This frees up lots of space on Erb St. for bicycle lanes and better sidewalks or multi-use trails, and matches the capacity of the two roads together to Erb St. West of Caroline.
On a similar note, you still have the right turn from Bridgeport onto Erb at one lane. This again makes no sense. The turn lane is part of the Westbound flow along Bridgeport and Erb all the way across the city, which as noted above form a single arterial. How many other four-lane roads in the Region have a single intersection at which one of the directions is constricted to a single lane? Note: please don't respond that the intersection itself is the responsibility of the LRT project. It’s the responsibility of every project to work together with related projects.

Albert St. should have contra-flow bicycle lanes. With eliminating the redundant vehicle lanes as you are already planning, there should be space for this.

There should be a pedestrian crossing of Erb St. at Albert, and Caroline at Dupont. The justification for not doing so (low pedestrian counts) is utterly bogus on major wide streets such as these (it’s fine for narrower streets where people will cross in the absence of a signal). If the same decision-making was used for bridges, none would ever get built because how many people swim across, using a winch to pull their cars behind them, before the bridge is built? No, what must be done is an evaluation of how many people *would* use a crossing if it were built. These signals could be synchronized with the other signals in the area in such a way that they impose essentially no additional burden on through traffic.

Finishing on a positive note, I’m very happy to see a substantial pedestrian island at Bridgeport and Erb. If the right-turn lane could move further from the intersection, making the island bigger, that would be even better. The multi-use trail on Bridgeport is another big positive. I’m looking forward to seeing construction of an improved version of this plan.

**Comments:**

The intersection at Erb and Albert is much improved for the safety of pedestrians.

It is too bad that there is no discussion about changing Erb and Bridgeport to two-way streets.

It would be good to see more traffic calming measures in the Erb St section of your project. If the speed limit is maintained at 50km/h, you can be sure traffic will be going 60 km/h.

**Comments:**

Pleased that there will be no property requirement on 22 Bridgeport Rd. Suggest that prior to construction building inspections be undertaken. Church is historic building with pipe organ. The Church Sanctuary building is a key component of the heritage district in which it is located.
Concerned with the placement of a multi-use trail across the church’s property. The trail, as proposed, will pass in front of the church’s main entrance and are concerned that the intermixing of cyclists and pedestrians, specifically congregation members, many of whom are elderly could result in an unsafe condition for the pedestrians. Requests the Region reconsider the placement of the trail - suggests the following alternatives: (1) the trail be located on the opposite side of the road and sidewalk be placed on the church side of Bridgeport Road (2) Sidewalk be placed on the church side and a short stretch of either on-road bicycle lane or off-road segregated bicycle lane be provided from Dorset Street to Albert Street. Based on the drawings and suggested cross-section at this location it would appear that there is sufficient room to provide this alternative and we are wondering why it doesn’t appear to have been explored.

As per subsequent discussions with church staff, the region is willing to explore alternative solutions for the addition of private sidewalk facilities for access to the church entrance.

Comments:

This is a welcome improvement. More biking facilities are always good to see, especially segregated ones. The reconfiguration of the Erb/Albert intersection is especially important, as it currently renders walking on the north side of Erb very unpleasant

Comments:

Though the plan has many highlights there are also significant shortcomings that keep the proposal from providing an equitable complete streets design in what is the most walkable area in our Region.

Firstly, the width of the proposed lanes falls outside the realm of best practices for safety of drivers, pedestrians and people on bikes. Multiple studies (link) have indicated that lanes wider than 3.25 m widths encourage speeding, which in turn increases the likelihood of accident and fatality in the case of pedestrian or cyclist impact. I understand the Regional standard calls for wider lanes but Uptown sees significantly higher pedestrian and cyclist traffic than most of the Region and should be held to a higher standard. Small changes in this respect can have a massive impact in saving lives (link) and all efforts should be made to mandate narrower lane widths in this high active-use area to improve safety.

Another major way in which safety can be improved is by moving the curb along Erb Street, where the proposal calls for it to abut the sidewalk and bringing it against the travel lane. This has the potential to improve walkability along the street by provide a grass median along the north side of the street to enhance the perceived and actual safety along the road for pedestrians. If this were to happen, the lane markings could also be adjusted to provide a smaller buffer along the North of Erb and a buffer between
the through lane and the sidewalk on the South side of Erb. Today, this road sees little pedestrian traffic on account of feeling highly hostile to those street users. A likely increase in foot traffic will arise as a result of the significant volume of residents that are starting to call the Barrel Yards home and making their way to the businesses along King Street. All efforts should therefore be made here to enhance the pedestrian experience and encourage active use.

Additionally, a crosswalk should be provided at Albert Street to facilitate a better pedestrian connection. A vision of 0 pedestrian deaths (link) has been embraced by many municipalities around the world and should be a goal for our Region too. Personally, I have worked at the Marsland Centre for nearly a decade and know of co-workers who pick driving to businesses on the South side of Erb over walking because of the lack of a crossing here and others who are discouraged from patronizing the business they look out across the street because it would take too long to get there by walking to one of the crossings at King or Caroline. As stated above, this is a highly walkable area of our Region and should be held to a higher standard in that regard as a result.

The Albert street changes that have been proposed are great but could be improved by moving the parallel parking lane to the opposite side of the street. Without relocating the bike lane, the parked vehicles could serve as the Region’s first protected bike lane (link) by creating a safety buffer between moving traffic and the people on bikes. Many find it difficult to parallel in the traditional manner and will find it even harder to do so on the "wrong" side of the street. This could also address the issue of eliminating the left turn off Albert and onto Caroline by maintaining the short crosswalk distance at the intersection and while allowing for safe left turns off Albert with the travel lane on the left of the road.

Though the proposed EA for a trail on the North end of Erb Street is not completed in time for this project, a justification for suddenly widening Erb Street from a two lane road to a three lane road at this particular point must also be questioned. Vehicular left turns off the Bridgeport side of Caroline are minimal and likely to remain so. Vehicular right turns off Caroline onto Erb from the opposite direction are also going to remain limited given the ION related narrowing of the street. Traffic increases at this point will therefore be negligible. Without the need to widen Erb today it would be much easier to implement a bike trail along the North end of Erb street, should the EA indicate it is warranted. This would further enhance active use of the street by provide a measure of safety acceptable to those 8 to 80 years old (link). As proposed though, sharrows are completely inappropriate (link) on all but very minor roads.

Though again outside of the scope of this project, a consideration must be made to how the Erb and Caroline streets intersection is handled. Anything that can be done to alter the design of this intersection should be considered and pursued because this
intersection is a very important juncture for trail users in the city of Waterloo. It is for this reason, that the Erb/Caroline intersection is more than likely to become the busiest active transportation juncture in the Region over the coming years. Safety to all active users must therefore be benchmark setting and a bike box that forces trail users around right turning vehicles onto Caroline street, as proposed today is unsafe. A Dutch style junction along the north end of the intersection that connects to the trail on the South side of Caroline and the potential trail along Erb would significantly improve safety at this intersection and encourage use. There are many applied examples around the world of how to implement such an intersection with this video (link) serving as a great jumping off point.

I am excited to see attention is being given and changes are proposed to improve active use, safety and usability of this important area in the city of Waterloo and believe that with some of the above changes, this area of our Region can not only improve but become a hallmark of city planning that will be used as a benchmark throughout the Region and beyond.
Appendix “D”

Project Team Response to Public Comments Received from the January 27, 2016 Public Consultation Centre

The main comments received from the public followed by the Project Team’s response are noted below.

**Comment - Support for the proposed improvements (7 comments)**

The Project Team believes that the proposed improvements are generally well supported by the public.

**Comment - Request for a pedestrian crossing on Erb Street at Albert Street (7 comments)**

The Region’s current practice regarding mid-block pedestrian crossing facilities precludes the installation of a designated pedestrian crossing within 125m of a signalized intersection on a one-way road (200 metres on a two-way road) to avoid traffic queuing into the adjacent intersection. The intersection of Albert Street and Erb Street is located approximately 70 metres from the intersection of King Street and Erb Street and accordingly does not meet the minimum required distance for a mid-block pedestrian crossing.

**Comment - Request to remove the proposed sharrows on Erb Street (6 comments)**

Sharrows are green, on-road paint markings advising motorists that a travel lane is to be shared between vehicles and cyclists. The sharrows identified on the plans presented at the January 26, 2016 PCC on Erb Street from Caroline Street to King Street were proposed as an interim solution to provide a shared-use lane for vehicles and cyclists. However, upon further review of the comments received from the public and Advisory Committees, the Project Team has eliminated the sharrows on Erb Street from Caroline Street to King Street in the Recommended Design Concept.

**Comment - Request for southbound cycling facilities on Albert Street (5 comments)**

The preliminary plans for the proposed improvements presented at the January 26, 2016 Public Consultation Centre included only a one-way cycling lane in the northbound direction on Albert Street, in line with the direction of vehicular travel. Upon review of the comments received, the Project Team is now recommending a raised 1.5 metre southbound contra-flow cycling facility on Albert Street from Bridgeport Road to Erb Street and a shared-use lane for vehicles and cyclists in the northbound direction. This contra-flow cycling lane is separated from vehicular traffic by a raised
While contra-flow cycling facilities are not common in Waterloo Region, they have been installed successfully throughout a number of cities within Ontario and the rest of North America.

**Comment - Provide cycling ‘cross-rides’ at intersections (3 comments)**

A cross-ride is essentially a modified crosswalk that designates a specific area alongside a crosswalk for cyclists to cross without having to dismount their bicycle. There are 3 standard cross-ride applications summarized in Ontario Traffic Manual Book 18 – Cycling Facilities. Pavement markings indicating either separate spaces for cyclists and pedestrians, or mixed crossings, can be provided. Currently, the Region has implemented one cross-ride as a pilot project and will be monitoring how it functions over the next several months. If the pilot project is successful, a policy or practice will be developed to set out the specific design guidelines and applications for implementing cross-rides. The Project Team will review the application of cross-rides within the project limits during the detailed design stage of the project based on the Regional policy/practice established over the next months.

**Comment - The painted asphalt area approaching Albert Street is unnecessary (3 Comments)**

The painted asphalt area on the north side of Erb Street approaching Albert Street has been provided to accommodate a future left-turn lane to ease traffic congestion if the two-way cycle track on Erb Street from Caroline Street to Margaret Avenue as recommended in the ATMP is ultimately approved and implemented. As the painted asphalt area can easily be converted to a dedicated left-turn lane by means of pavement markings, this will avoid the need for any future construction works to accommodate a future two-way cycle track on Erb Street.

**Comment - Albert Street cycling facility is too narrow (3 Comments)**

From the comments received, the Project Team has further reviewed the proposed design concept and is now recommending a raised 1.5 metre southbound contra-flow cycling facility on Albert Street from Bridgeport Road to Erb Street. While contra-flow cycling facilities are not a common occurrence in Waterloo Region, they have been installed successfully throughout a number of cities within Ontario and the rest of North America. The proposed contra-flow cycling lane on Albert Street will be raised and separated from traffic by curb and gutter.

**Comment - Need to address congestion at the Erb Street and Caroline Street Intersection (3 Comments)**

Based on forecast 2028 traffic volumes, the intersection of Caroline Street and Erb Street will operate acceptably under the Recommended Design Concept. The
narrowing of Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street from three (3) to two (2) lanes may improve traffic flow by better channelizing traffic and reducing weaving between lanes. The intersection will continue to be monitored for possible improvements in the future following the ION construction.

Comment - Suggestion to Revert Erb Street and Caroline Street from one-way to two-way Roadways (2 comments)

Converting these roads from one-way travel to two-way travel would affect the broader road network and is beyond the scope of this Class EA Study.

Comment - Convert the Third Lane on Erb Street to a right-turn lane for Waterloo Town Square (2 Comments)

The future implementation of a two-way cycle track on Erb Street, if approved, will require the removal of a travel lane to accommodate the cycle track. Under this condition, Erb Street would be reduced to two lanes of travel and both lanes would be required in order to accommodate through traffic volumes.

Comment - Maintain a dedicated left-turn lane on Erb Street at Albert Street (2 Comments)

With 3 through lanes on Erb Street as proposed under the Recommended Design Concept, a dedicated left-turn lane from Erb Street to Albert is not required based on the traffic warrants. However, should the 2-way cycle track be implemented on Erb Street in the future, thereby reducing the number of through lanes on Erb Street from three to two, a dedicated left-turn from Erb Street to Albert would be provided. The “painted shoulder” on Erb Street identified in the Recommended Design Concept has been provided in order to accommodate this future left-turn lane without the need for further construction. The Project Team notes that it also received four comments indicating support for the proposed change to the intersection of Erb Street and Albert Street.

Comment - Provide a dedicated left-turn lane on Albert Street at Caroline Street (2 Comments)

Under the Recommended Design Concept, there is a single lane of through traffic on Albert Street and no dedicated left-turn lane from Albert Street to Caroline Street. Based on existing and forecast traffic projections, the intersection of Albert Street and Caroline Street will operate acceptably with no dedicated left-turn lane. By narrowing the width of the intersection on Albert Street at Caroline Street, a shorter crossing distance is achieved for pedestrians.

Comment - Lanes are too wide, promoting higher speeds (2 Comments)

The preferred lane width for Regional arterial roadways is 3.35 metres except for curb
lanes on four-lane roadways with no bike lanes where the preferred lane width is 3.65 metres. Curb lane widths are designed to accommodate larger vehicles such as buses and to provide some snow storage in winter. The Recommended Design Concept proposes lane widths ranging from 3.35 metres to 3.65 metres for the curb lanes on Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street and 3.25 metres for the curb lanes on Erb Street. The lane widths on Erb Street are less than desirable but match the existing lanes widths.

Comment - Parallel parking should be located on the east side of Albert Street rather than the west side the roadway (2 Comments)

From the comments received, the Project Team has further reviewed the proposed design concept and is now recommending a raised 1.5 metre southbound contra-flow cycling facility on Albert Street from Bridgeport Road to Erb Street with the on road parallel parking on the east side of Albert Street.

Comment - Consider pedestrian crossing on Caroline Street near Dupont Street (1 Comment)

The Region’s current policy regarding mid-block pedestrian crossing facilities precludes the installation of a crosswalk within 125m of a signalized intersection on a one-way roadway to avoid traffic queuing into the adjacent intersection. The intersection of Caroline Street and Dupont Street is located approximately 100 metres from the intersection of Caroline Street and Erb Street and accordingly does not meet the minimum required distance for a mid-block pedestrian crossing.

Comment - No need for the proposed sidewalk on the east side of Caroline Street from Dupont Street to Albert Street (1 Comment)

The ATMP recommends sidewalks on each side of Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street and Erb Street. Sidewalks currently exist on the each side of Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street from King Street to Erb Street, with the exception of a missing section on the south side of the road from Albert Street to Dupont Street. Also, the Region’s approved Pedestrian Charter recommends sidewalks on both sides of Regional roadways where feasible. The addition of the missing section of sidewalk on Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street from Albert Street to Dupont Street will provide greater opportunity for pedestrians to access the Urban Core Area and public transit.

Comment - Provide traffic calming measures on Erb Street (1 Comment)

Regional practice does not allow for the use of hard “on-road” traffic calming measures on Regional arterial roadways due to adverse effects on emergency service vehicle response times, noise from vehicles passing over the speed humps and general delays to traffic.
Comment - Sewers should be kept out of cycling lanes (1 Comment)

The Recommended Design Concept includes on-road cycling lanes only on Albert Street. The location of sewers will be reviewed during the detailed design phase of the project. Sewer grates and lids will be kept out of cycling facilities to the greatest extent possible. Also, side-inlet catch basins will be used where possible where on-road cycling facilities are present.

Comment - Extend the bike lane on Albert Street to Erb Street (1 Comment)

The plans presented at the January 27, 2016 PCC proposed terminating the on-road cycling on Albert Street lane north of Erb Street. From the comments received, the Project Team reviewed the proposed design concept following the PCC and is now recommending a raised 1.5 metre southbound contra-flow cycling facility on Albert Street from Bridgeport Road to Erb Street and a shared-use lane for vehicles and cyclists in the northbound direction, thus extending cycling facilities on Albert to Erb Street, which is reflected in the Recommended Design Concept.

Comment - Provide a boulevard between sidewalk and the road on Erb Street (1 Comment)

Due to the constrained corridor of Erb Street from Caroline Street to King Street, there is limited space for a boulevard. In lieu of the addition of boulevards, the Recommended Design Concept includes wider sidewalks on Erb Street where possible.

Comment - Allow a diagonal or “scramble” crossing at Caroline Street and Erb Street during the ION crossing phase (since vehicle traffic will be fully closed during this phase anyway) (1 Comment)

A pedestrian scramble, also known as scramble intersection, is a pedestrian crossing system that stops all vehicular traffic and allows pedestrians to cross an intersection in every direction, including diagonally, at the same time.

The design and construction of the Erb Street and Caroline Street intersection is being completed under the Region’s ION project. Once the operational details of the LRT trains at the intersection of Erb Street and Caroline Street are established, options for pedestrian/cycling crossing opportunities could be investigated.
Appendix “E”

Recommended Design Concept for Albert Street from Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street to Erb Street

- Complete replacement of the pavement structure including new concrete curbs;
- Replacement of the City’s watermain, sanitary sewer and storm sewer;
- Conversion of the existing westerly curb lane on Albert Street from Erb Street to Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street from a through lane to a shared use lane for vehicles and cyclists heading in the northbound direction;
- Conversion of the existing easterly curb lane on Albert Street from Erb Street to Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street from a through lane to an on-road parallel parking lane;
- Construction of a southbound raised cycling lane on the west side of Albert Street from Erb Street to Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street;
- Replacement of the existing 2.0 metre wide sidewalk on the west side of Albert Street from Erb Street to Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street with a 1.50 metre wide sidewalk, to accommodate the proposed raised cycling lane;
- Replacement of the existing 1.50-2.50 metre wide sidewalk on the east side of Albert Street from Erb Street to Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street with a 2.0 metre wide sidewalk;
- Removal of the existing channelized islands at the intersection of Bridgeport Road/Caroline Street and Albert Street.
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Transit Services

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning & Works Committee
Date: May 24, 2016  File Code: M04-50(A)
Subject: GRT Customer Service Trends and Issues

Recommendation:
For information.

Summary:
This report provides a summary of GRT customer calls for the last three years. For the years 2013 and 2014 the customer calls went directly to the GRT call centre and information was recorded in a Microsoft Access database.

With the transition of all Region of Waterloo calls to the Service First Call Centre (SFCC) in April 2015, a more detailed tracking of customer concerns, feedback, and issues has been made possible through a Customer Relationship Management system (CRM). This has resulted in the ability to answer and track more calls and to have detailed information about the types of issues customers are reporting.

Redirecting all GRT calls to the SFCC allows callers 24/7 access to a team of Customer Service Representatives and ensures a complete tracking of all calls through the CRM system. GRT customer feedback received through social media platforms such as Twitter and Facebook are now also added into the CRM to allow for a more robust collection and analysis of the broad range of issues raised by transit customers.

Report:
Below is a comparative summary and a brief explanation of the GRT customer concerns, feedback and issues for the period 2013 to 2014. This information was collected in four broad categories.
2013 – 2014 GRT Customer Trends and Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fares</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Stop Environment</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery</td>
<td>1,787</td>
<td>1,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>1,716</td>
<td>1,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,099</td>
<td>4,115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A review of each of the four categories and the general trends experienced in each area is described in more detail below.

**Fares:**

In the Fare category, issues relating to the cost of fares and replacement of lost or stolen passes are the top reasons for customer calls each year. GRT’s fares have increased each year for the past three years. When a fare change does take effect some customers voice their displeasure.

**Bus Stop Environment:**

In this category issues relating to the condition of the stop and also requests for new amenities or new bus stops are the top reasons for customer calls. Snow removal at bus stops also results in a significant number of customer calls each winter.

In 2014 GRT began removing the garbage receptacles at bus stops during the winter months generating many calls of concern. The receptacles are now removed for the winter and replaced in the spring. This action was taken as the receptacles cans freeze to the ground or get buried beneath the snow when the snow ploughs clear the streets and sidewalks. When this occurs crews are not able to empty the garbage causing overflowing issues and debris to clean up in the spring.

Requests for amenities such as new stops, shelters or benches are common throughout the year. Many GRT riders would like to wait inside shelters or have a place to sit while waiting for the bus. GRT tries to place shelters and benches at well utilized stops while maintaining yearly budgets and flexibility for future route and service changes.

**Service Delivery:**

In the service category, route suggestions, scheduling and connection issues as well as operator compliments were the top reasons for customer calls.

Many customers call to request changes to existing routes, request service in a new area, or to submit comments on the service changes implemented each year. There are many requests for increased service on weekends, early mornings or late afternoons.
The majority of the scheduling comments were regarding missed connections. Customers are often frustrated when connections cannot be made at certain locations, causing them to miss their bus.

Issues with missed connections are often present when a customer is exiting a more frequent route and trying to connect to a less frequent service where connections are not possible at every time point.

**Operations:**

In the Operations category, issues relating to schedule adherence and customers being left behind at the bus stop were the top reasons customers called. Weather conditions and construction projects contributed to schedule adherence issues with various bus routes. When construction is underway, the alternate bus routes often take longer to get to their destination due to the use of side-streets and non-direct routing.

The GRT website, mobile app, and customer service center are updated regularly to keep customers current on temporary routing changes due to the large number of construction projects, but some customers may not be aware of the detours if they do not check. As a result, some customers are left waiting at stops that are temporarily closed. GRT posts closure notices at all affected bus stop locations, but temporary stop closure signs are occasionally removed or are vandalized. Customers also report being left behind at some stops because the bus is full.

**Service First Call Centre**

As part of the Region’s strategic goal to serve customers more effectively, the Region of Waterloo launched a centralized call centre. The Service First Call Center (SFCC) was designed to be the main point of contact for anyone who has a question, complaint or suggestion regarding any service that the Region provides.

There are many benefits to having a centralized call centre. One of the main benefits is that the SFCC is open 7 days a week, 24 hours a day. This provides residents with the ability to contact the Region at a time that is most convenient for them.

Implementing a centralized call center and a Customer Relationship Management system (CRM) to better manage the customer data, means staff can provide consistent information and changes to information can be made quickly when needed.

Reporting of issues that have not come through traditional channels (such as Twitter & Facebook) are also now easier to track and can be dealt with and recorded via the CRM.

In 2015, Grand River Transit’s call center was amalgamated into the SFCC. GRT has benefited from the increase in staffing, extended hours of operation, and the ability to build reports that break down the detailed data.

Chart 1 below is graphical depiction of the information recorded for 2015.
The SFCC is tracking issues using three additional categories; Lost & Found, MobilityPLUS and Security. The general trends experienced in each of these areas are described below.

**Lost & Found:**

With the transition to a CRM tool GRT introduced an improved tracking method for recording lost items. We are now able to provide a live document shared by all GRT staff to assist with locating items lost by customers.

**MobilityPLUS:**

In the MobilityPLUS category, the general trip issues section was the top reason for customer calls. The issues in this category varied. Some customers reported that the length of time spent on the MobilityPLUS bus can be too long, some cited issues relating to the type of vehicle sent to pick them up or other issues that happened on their trip.

There were also a number of calls received regarding the introduction of the $10 denominations in the TaxiSCRIP books. GRT provides subsidized trips for MobilityPLUS registrants on taxis. The books previously contained only $1, $2, & $5 voucher denominations. Last year three $10 denominations were added to the books. Customers indicated the larger denominations were too high which meant they were not able to fully utilize the value of the $10 denominations for short trips. Based on the feedback in January 2016, the TaxiSCRIP books reverted back to the smaller denominations.
Security:

The main security concerns raised were; security at transit terminals, bus stops and on buses. We also received a number of requests from for video information to assist with claims and police investigations.

2015 Customer Satisfaction Survey

In 2015 a Customer Satisfaction Survey was conducted by GRT staff.

The Customer Satisfaction Survey results indicate over 75% of riders were satisfied or very satisfied with the service provided despite significant service changes and construction detours.

Grand River Transit also has a loyal ridership base with over 80% of riders indicating they use the service daily or weekly.

Major Change Areas

Since 2013, GRT has seen changes in three major areas of transit: Ridership, Technology, and Yearly Service Changes.

Ridership:

Ridership in 2013 was 22 million rides per year. This decreased to 20.3 million rides in 2015. In 2014 the Waterloo Regional School Boards decided to provide student transportation via yellow school buses instead of using GRT. The movement of students to school buses accounted for 1.5 million of the 1.6 million ridership decrease over this period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22,000,737</td>
<td>21,596,989</td>
<td>20,327,109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Technology:

In 2013 GRT launched a real time mobile app, real time desktop map, and provided real time bus arrival information via the EasyGO text messaging tool. Real time applications have been requested by customers to allow them greater control over travel planning.

The data below outlines the impact technology played in the type of information service accessed by customers for transit information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone Calls</td>
<td>Texts</td>
<td>EasyGO App</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110,317</td>
<td>4,047,123</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106,076</td>
<td>3,858,829</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82,905</td>
<td>3,861,152</td>
<td>4,300,471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above data shows that GRT received over 110,000 calls in 2013, but at the end of 2015, the EasyGO Mobile App was used extensively and the number of phone calls was reduced with the introduction of this real time technology.
Other technologies including the implementation of an entire fleet of low floor buses, bus stop audio announcements, various real time tools, the GRT website, and successful social media sites all help to make transit easier to use.

Customers have informed GRT that it needs to be more proactive in providing alerts when buses are significantly late or for unknown detours. Customers continue to use the existing technology while GRT works to introduce new methods to keep riders informed.

**Yearly Transit Service Expansion**

Over the past few years GRT has implemented a number of service changes. These changes typically take effect in the fall. In the last three years, the number of new service hours implemented on a fully annualized basis was:

- 2013: 51,057 hours
- 2014: 28,636 hours
- 2015: 35,316 hours

During the budget process in 2013 and 2014 there were also transit service reductions of 5,227 hours and 10,415 hours respectively, on routes performing at or below service expectations.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

Supports Regional Council’s Strategic Focus Area 2.1: Create a public transportation network that is integrated, accessible, affordable and sustainable

**Financial Implications:**

Nil

**Prepared By: Shelly-Ann Rusu,** Supervisor Customer Service, Transit Services

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

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

Date: May 24, 2016 File Code: C13-30/T&P

Subject: Traffic and Parking By-law to Regulate Traffic and Parking on Regional Roads

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo enact the recommended Traffic and Parking By-law to regulate traffic and parking on Regional roads, as outlined in Appendix A of Report TES-TRP-16-01, dated May 24, 2016;

And that the By-law comes into effect on January 1, 2017.

Summary:

Regional, area municipal and Waterloo Regional Police Services staff members collectively reviewed the existing Traffic and Parking By-law and are proposing that the By-law be updated in response to the changing roadway environment. Some of the more notable changes to the By-law provisions include restrictions on the conveyance of towing services, the removal of active transportation prohibitions such as riding scooters, skateboards and rollerblades on multi-use trails and sidewalks, allowing adults to ride a bicycle on sidewalks whilst supervising children and parking restrictions in the vicinity of light rail transit tracks and stations.

Report:

1.0 Background

A working group consisting of staff from the Region, the seven local municipalities and Waterloo Regional Police Services reviewed the existing Traffic and Parking By-law to identify any deficiencies or operational concerns that could be addressed through an
update of the By-law. The new By-law, if approved, would replace the Region’s existing Traffic and Parking By-law that has been in effect since 2006.

2.0 Initially Proposed Revisions to the Existing By-law

Notable changes to the By-law originally proposed to the public and key stakeholders included but were not limited to the following amendments.

- Removal of the riding abreast cycling prohibition (removing prohibition would allow cyclists to ride side-by-side);
- Persons directly supervising children riding bicycles may ride on a sidewalk;
- Where boulevard parking is permitted, no person shall park a vehicle facing the opposite direction in which the vehicle is permitted to proceed;
- No person shall park or stop in a manner that obstructs any railway track, light rail transit track, light rail transit vehicle or station;
- Persons may not park or stop within 30 metres on the approach or 15 metres on the departure side of a bus stop or light rail transit station or stop;
- An authorized sign may be erected prohibiting the stopping of a vehicle in front of or across the street from a fire department property;
- An authorized sign may establish a “commercial loading zone”;
- No person shall make or convey an offer of services of a tow truck while that person is within 200 metres of the scene of an accident or vehicle involved in an accident; and
- No person shall park or stop a tow truck on a highway within 200 metres of a scene of an accident or apparent accident.

3.0 Public and Area Municipal Consultation

3.1 Notification Process

Staff has adhered to the Region’s Notice Policy in providing notification to the public and key affected stakeholders regarding this By-law update. Key stakeholders including 15 towing companies and 11 cycling advocacy groups located in the Region of Waterloo were notified of the initially proposed revisions to the existing By-law for review and comments and a notice was placed in the Waterloo Region Record on September 28 and October 6, 2015. Waterloo Regional Police Services staff also consulted with all independent towing companies in the Region and Towing Association. Regional staff also met with the Region’s Active Transportation Advisory Committee and presented the proposed By-law amendments related to active transportation.
3.2 Feedback

Following the notification provided by the Region, Regional staff received input from the public regarding the initially proposed revisions to the By-law. This feedback included:

- Opposition to the removal of riding abreast prohibition;
- Opposition to existing By-law provisions prohibiting skateboarding on sidewalks, boulevards, multi-use trails, shoulders and roadways; and
- Opposition to existing By-law provisions prohibiting roller-blading on sidewalks, boulevards, shoulders and roadways.

Regional staff also received responses from the Area Municipal Township Council’s of Woolwich and Wellesley expressing opposition to the removal of the riding abreast prohibition citing cycling safety concerns.

In general, cycling advocacy groups supported the cycling-related By-law amendments and expressed no concerns with By-law changes initially proposed by staff.

The Region’s Active Transportation Advisory Committee was consulted with on October 20, 2015 and expressed support for the removal of the riding abreast prohibition but also requested that staff reconsider the existing provisions related to skateboarding and other similar modes of active transportation.

In general, towing companies that were contacted expressed no concerns to Regional staff or Waterloo Region Police Services staff.

Staff from all area municipalities and the Waterloo Regional Police Services supported the originally proposed amendments to the Region’s Traffic and Parking By-law.

3.3 Working Group Review of Feedback Received

In response to the feedback received from the public, Area Municipal Township Councils, and the Region’s Active Transportation Advisory Committee, Regional staff arranged a November 19, 2015 follow-up meeting with the Traffic and Parking By-law working group to discuss the feedback received. Regional staff, Waterloo Regional Police Services staff and all area municipal staff attended this meeting with the exception of staff from the Township of North Dumfries and Township of Wellesley. The objective of the meeting was to determine if any changes to the proposed By-law were necessary based on the feedback received.
3.3.1 Riding Abreast

Some members of the public cited concerns that cyclists currently do not adhere to current rules of the road and removing any current regulations related to cycling will further degrade safety for cyclists. As well, some members of the public also cited concerns with potential increases in traffic congestion as motorists would have less opportunity to pass cyclists who elect to ride abreast with one another. Township Councils cited concerns that permitting riding abreast would provide cyclists a false sense of security, in particular on high speed rural roads with hilly terrain. The Township Council resolutions are attached as Appendix B.

In light of the feedback received on the riding abreast issue, staff is recommending that the riding abreast prohibition be maintained in the By-law.

3.3.2 Skateboarding/Rollerblading and Active Modes of Transportation

The Region’s existing by-law currently prohibits persons on skateboards and rollerblades from using sidewalks, boulevards, multi-use trails, shoulders and roadways. The proposed By-law amended the definitions and sections addressing these modes of transportation to provide more clarity for users regarding existing prohibitions. Feedback received suggested that the existing By-law unduly restricts active modes of transportation such as skateboarding and rollerblading and that the Region’s younger citizens rely on these devices as legitimate forms of transportation.

Despite a misunderstanding on the part of some members of the public that the Region was imposing new prohibitions on active transportation, and in particular on skateboarding and rollerblading, the working group opted to reconsider all active modes of transportation in light of the feedback staff received.

In summary, Table 1 below identifies various modes of active transportation discussed and where each mode of transportation is recommended to be permitted based on the working group’s discussion and agreement. The working group, however, could not achieve unanimous agreement regarding skateboarding on sidewalks. Township of Wilmot staff are not in agreement with permitting skateboarding on sidewalks. Township staff has advised that they oppose allowing skateboarding on sidewalks because:

- Under the current prohibition, there would continue to be a course of action for potential incidents wherein a skateboarder hits a pedestrian and the municipality/police would have the authority to enforce.
- The municipality will encourage skateboarders to utilize the parks (indoor and outdoor) for this recreational activity.
Table 1 – Transportation Facilities and Permitted Active Modes of Transportation Based on the Existing (Ex.) and the Proposed (Prop.) By-Laws.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Multi-use Trail</th>
<th>Sidewalk</th>
<th>Boulevard</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Shoulder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skateboard</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller Blade/Roller Skate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaster/Scooter</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- A denotes children riding bicycles excepted
- B denotes parent directly supervising children excepted

4.0 Recommended Revisions to the Existing By-law

The proposed draft By-law originally circulated for review has been updated accordingly based on the feedback received from the public and key stakeholders and ensuing working group and staff discussions. Primary changes to the original draft By-law circulated to the public and key stakeholders include:

- Reinstatement of the riding abreast prohibition; and
- Removal of active transportation prohibitions as summarized in Table 1.

Staff recommends that the Planning and Works Committee approve in principle and forward to Regional Council the recommended Traffic and Parking By-law to regulate traffic and parking on Regional roads, as outlined in Appendix A. Should Regional Planning and Works Committee request to have a certain section(s) of the By-law outlined in Appendix A modified, then appropriate direction should be provided to staff to modify the proposed By-law accordingly and a subsequent report will be prepared for Regional Council ratification on June 1, 2016.

By-law schedules were also reviewed and amended appropriately to compliment the existing conditions on Regional roads.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

The update of the Region’s Traffic and Parking By-law supports the following objectives of the Corporate Strategic Plan:

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

3.2 Develop, promote and integrate active forms of transportation (cycling and walking).
3.3 Optimize existing road capacity to safely manage traffic through Waterloo Region.

Financial Implications:

Nil

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Staff in the Legal Services Division of the Planning, Development and Legislative Services Department were consulted in the development of the Traffic and Parking By-law.

Attachments

Appendix A – Draft Traffic and Parking By-law

Appendix B – Township Council Resolutions

Prepared By: Bob Henderson, Manager, Transportation Engineering

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
(DRAFT: May 16, 2016)

BY-LAW NUMBER 16- 

OF 

THE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO 

A By-law to Regulate Traffic and Parking on Highways Under the Jurisdiction of The Regional Municipality of Waterloo and to Repeal By-law 06-072

WHEREAS the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c. 25, as amended, and the Highway Traffic Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. H.8, as amended, give The Regional Municipality of Waterloo the power to pass by-laws respecting its highways, including parking and traffic on highways; 

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

Part I - Short Title

This By-law may be cited as the Traffic and Parking By-law.

Part II - Definitions

The definitions contained within the Highway Traffic Act shall apply in the interpretation of this By-law except where they are inconsistent, in which case the definition under this By-law shall apply. For purposes of this By-law:

1. “accessible parking space” means a parking space designated under this By-law for the exclusive use of a vehicle displaying an accessible parking permit;

2. “authorized sign” means any traffic control device that has been erected on a highway under the authority of this By-law or the Highway Traffic Act, for the purpose of regulating, warning or guiding traffic;

3. “boulevard” means that part of a highway from the edge of the roadway to the nearest lateral property line, but does not include a shoulder, sidewalk, cycling lane or multi-use trail;

4. “bus stop” means that part of a highway designated by the Region by a “bus stop” sign for the use of transit buses, as a space for loading and unloading passengers;

5. “commercial/essential parking permit” means a permit that, when properly affixed, will permit a vehicle to park at any on-street motorized parking or loading zone within the local municipality specified on the permit;

6. “Commissioner” means the Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services for the Region or any successor position, or his or her designate;

7. “cul-de-sac” means a highway terminating in a turn-around;

8. “curb line”:
   a) where a curb has been constructed, means the line of the curb; and
   b) where no curb has been constructed, means the edge of the roadway;

9. “cycling lane” means a lane or portion of a highway marked with bicycle symbol or sign;

10. “drive” means to drive, move or operate;

11. “driveway” means that part of a highway that provides vehicular access to and from the roadway and an adjacent property;
12. "heavy truck" means a motor vehicle having permanently attached thereto a truck or delivery body having a gross weight or registered gross weight of more than 4,500 kilograms but does not include an ambulance, hearse, casket wagon, fire apparatus, bus, mobile crane, motor home or road service vehicle;

13. "highway" includes a common and public highway, street, avenue, parkway, driveway, square, place, bridge, viaduct or trestle under the jurisdiction of the Region, any part of which is intended for or used by the general public for the passage of vehicles and includes the area between the lateral property lines thereof;


16. "median" means that part of a highway that divides a roadway or separates two roadways within a highway, including any channelizing islands and the central islands of any roundabouts;

17. "motor-assisted vehicle" includes a motor-assisted bicycle, E-bike, power-assisted bicycle, segway, mini-bike, go-cart and any other motor-assisted transportation device that weighs not more than 55 kilograms and that does not have sufficient power to enable the transportation device to attain a speed greater than 50 kilometres per hour on level ground within a distance of 2 kilometres from a standing start, but does not include a wheelchair;

18. "motorized snow vehicle" has the same meaning as in the Motorized Snow Vehicles Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. M. 44, as amended, and any successor Act thereto;

19. "multi-use trail" means that part of a highway with surface improved with asphalt, concrete or gravel for the use of pedestrians and non-motorized vehicles;

20. "municipal law enforcement officer" means a by-law enforcement officer appointed by the Region or a local municipality;

21. "non-permitted vehicle" means a motor vehicle that does not have a currently validated permit issued to it, a number plate properly displayed or evidence of current validation affixed to the number plate as prescribed in the Highway Traffic Act; and

22. "one-way street" means a highway upon which vehicular traffic is limited to movement in one direction;

23. "parking meter" means a device that indicates thereon the interval of time during which a vehicle may be parked, and that has a receptacle for receiving payment;

24. "parking space" means that part of a roadway that is designated by the Region for the purpose of parking one vehicle;

25. "pedestrian" means any person on foot, any person in a wheelchair, any child in a wheeled carriage, and any person riding a bicycle that is not a motor-assisted vehicle with wheels less than 60 centimetres in diameter;

26. "permit properly affixed" or "properly affixed" means a permit that is clearly visible facing outward through the windshield of a vehicle;

27. "Region" means the Regional Municipality of Waterloo;

28. "re-parking" means parking the same vehicle within 5 hours of initial parking within a "no-re-parking" area designated by the Region or a local municipality;
29. “reserved lane” means a lane within a highway reserved under this By-law exclusively for use by bicycles, horse-drawn vehicles, buses or other specific classes or types of vehicles;

30. “reserved parking permit” means a permit that, when properly affixed, will permit any vehicle to park in any parking space beyond the time limit designated under this By-law at the prevailing rate;

31. “roadway” means the part of the highway that is improved, designed or ordinarily used for vehicular traffic, but does not include the shoulder, and, where a highway includes two or more separate roadways, the term "roadway" refers to any one roadway separately and not to all of the roadways collectively;

32. “roundabout” means a form of intersection for a highway that accommodates traffic flows in a circular direction around a central island;

33. “school-purpose vehicle” means a vehicle under contract with a school or school board to transport one or more students, including but not limited to a school bus;

34. “shoulder” means that part of the highway lying adjacent to the roadway that is improved with granular or paved surface and is not intended for the passage of motor vehicles or pedestrians;

35. “sidewalk” means that part of a highway with a surface improved with asphalt, concrete or gravel for the use of pedestrians;

36. “taxicab” means a taxicab that is licensed by the Region and has a taxicab top sign affixed to its roof;

37. “traffic control device” means a sign, marking or other device on a highway for the purpose of controlling, guiding or directing traffic;

38. “traffic control signal” means any device, manually, electrically or mechanically operated for the regulation of traffic;

39. “transit bus” includes a bus operated by Grand River Transit, an inter-city transit operator, or a charter transit operator but does not include a school-purpose vehicle; and

40. “wheelchair” means a chair mounted on wheels driven by muscular or any other kind of power that is designed for and used by a person whose mobility is limited by one or more conditions or functional impairments. For greater certainty, a “wheelchair” includes a scooter that is designed for and used by a person whose mobility is limited by one or more conditions or functional impairments.

Part III – Enforcement and Authority

1. Enforcement and Prosecution

A police officer may enforce all provisions of this By-law. A municipal law enforcement officer may enforce all provisions of this By-law except those pertaining to a moving vehicle. The local municipality in which the highway is located may enforce and prosecute all provisions of this By-law except those pertaining to a moving vehicle.

2. Authority

   a) The Commissioner is authorized to place, erect and maintain such traffic control devices and traffic control signals that are required to give effect to the provisions of this By-law and/or that are authorized by the schedules of this By-law.

   b) The Commissioner is authorized, notwithstanding the other provisions of this By-law, to place, erect, maintain, move and remove such traffic control devices and traffic control signals as are required for reasons of emergency or safety or for an activity for which the Region or a local municipality has granted a permit.
c) No person shall place, maintain, or display upon any highway any sign, signal, marking or device that purports to be or is an imitation of or resembles any traffic control device or traffic control signal without the prior approval of the Commissioner.

d) The Commissioner is authorized to issue a permit for use of a highway by a vehicle or combination of vehicles in excess of the dimension and weight limits set out in the Highway Traffic Act.

Part IV - General

1. Operation of Vehicles

a) Driving on a Boulevard, Sidewalk or Multi-Use Trail

(i) No person shall drive a motor vehicle, motor-assisted vehicle, bicycle, skateboard, coaster or scooter on a boulevard except on a driveway.

(ii) No person shall drive a motor vehicle or motor-assisted vehicle on any multi-use trail except on a driveway.

(iii) No person shall drive a motor vehicle or motor-assisted vehicle on a sidewalk except on a driveway.

(iv) No person shall drive a bicycle having a wheel or wheels more than 50 centimetres in diameter on any sidewalk except on a driveway or to directly supervise a child riding a bicycle having wheels not more than 50 centimetres in diameter.

(v) No person shall drive a motorized snow vehicle on any highway within city or settlement area limits, as defined by the local municipal official plan, except to cross.

(vi) No person shall drive a skateboard or scooter, or roller blade or roller skate, on a sidewalk or multi-use trail without wearing a helmet and chin strap.

(vii) No person shall drive a skateboard or scooter, or roller blade or roller skate, on a sidewalk or multi-use trail between sunset and sunrise without having or wearing front and back lights or a piece of reflective clothing either of which is visible at a distance of 200 metres.

(viii) Every person driving a skateboard or scooter, or roller blading or roller skating, on a sidewalk or multi-use trail shall yield to a pedestrian.

b) Closed Highways

No person shall drive a vehicle, except an emergency vehicle or a vehicle authorized by the Commissioner or by a police officer, on any highway that is roped, barricaded or marked by an authorized sign prohibiting its use.

c) Newly Painted Lines

No person shall drive a vehicle, or attempt to drive a vehicle on or over, or tamper with, or walk on any newly painted line or series of lines, on any roadway or shoulder, when the presence of such is indicated by signs, markers, electric lanterns or otherwise.

d) Blocking Intersection

No driver of a vehicle approaching a traffic control signal showing a circular green or a green arrow shall enter the intersection unless traffic in front of him or her is moving in a manner that would reasonably lead him
or her to believe that he or she can clear the intersection before the signal indication changes to a circular red indication.

This prohibition, however, does not apply to the driver of a vehicle who enters an intersection for the purpose of turning to the right or left onto an intersecting roadway and signals his or her intention to make the turn prior to entering the intersection.

e) Roundabouts

No person shall drive any vehicle or animal in a roundabout other than in a counterclockwise direction.

2. Pedestrians and Cyclists

a) Games or Sports

Unless allowed under a permit granted by the Region or a local municipality, no person shall play or take part in any game or sport upon a highway.

b) Transportation Devices

(i) Unless allowed under a permit granted by the Region or local municipality, no person upon roller skates, roller blades or a skateboard or riding by means of any coaster, toy vehicle, go-cart, segway, scooter or similar transportation device shall go upon a roadway except for the purpose of crossing the roadway and when so crossing such person shall have the rights and be subject to the obligations of a pedestrian pursuant to the Highway Traffic Act. Any person driving a skateboard shall dismount the skateboard when crossing the roadway pursuant to this subsection.

(ii) Unless allowed under a permit granted by the Regon or local municipality, no person riding by means of any toy vehicle, go-cart, segway or similar transportation device shall go upon a shoulder except for the purpose of crossing the shoulder and when so crossing such person shall have the rights and be subject to the obligations of a pedestrian pursuant to the Highway Traffic Act.

c) Riding Abreast

No person shall ride a bicycle on any roadway or shoulder abreast of another bicycle except in the course of passing such other bicycle.

d) Parking a Bicycle

(i) Unless otherwise permitted in this By-law, no person shall park a bicycle on any roadway or shoulder.

(ii) No person shall park a bicycle on any highway except in an upright position.

e) Obstructing a Sidewalk or Multi-use Trail

No person shall obstruct or impede a pedestrian on a sidewalk or multi-use trail unless otherwise permitted by the Commissioner.

3. Animals

a) Riding on a Boulevard, Sidewalk or Multi-Use Trail

No person shall ride, drive, load or back any animal that is not a household pet on any boulevard, sidewalk or multi-use trail except on a driveway.
b) Attendance While In Motion
   No person shall drive an animal-drawn vehicle on a roadway or shoulder unless he or she remains upon the vehicle while it is in motion or walks beside the animal drawing it.

4. Objects on Roadway or Shoulder
   Unless otherwise authorized, no person shall place or store any object or accumulation of material, including snow or ice, upon a roadway or shoulder.

Part V – Parking and Stopping Restrictions

1. Method of Parking or Stopping
   a) General
      Unless otherwise permitted in this By-law, no person shall park or stop a vehicle on any roadway except on the right side of the roadway having reference to the direction in which the vehicle has been travelling, parallel to and not exceeding a distance of 0.15 metres from the curb line.
   b) Parking on One-Way Streets
      Unless otherwise permitted in this By-law, where parking is permitted on either side or both sides of a one-way street, no person shall park or stop a vehicle except parallel to and not exceeding a distance of 0.15 metres from the curb line and so that the front end of the vehicle is facing the direction in which the vehicle is permitted to proceed.
   c) Angle Parking
      Where angle parking is permitted, no person shall park or stop a vehicle except at the angle with the roadway indicated by markings and/or signs and so that the front end of the vehicle is angled toward the direction in which the vehicle is permitted to proceed.
   d) Boulevard
      Where boulevard parking is permitted, no person shall park a vehicle:
      (i) on the abutting roadway or shoulder or any part thereof; or
      (ii) facing the opposite direction in which the vehicle is permitted to proceed.
   e) Parking Spaces
      No person shall park a vehicle in such a manner as to encroach on a contiguous parking space unless the vehicle cannot be accommodated in one parking space.

2. Parking Prohibited
   a) General
      Unless otherwise permitted in this By-law, no person shall park a vehicle on any highway:
      (i) on or overhanging any curb line;
      (ii) on or overhanging any boulevard, sidewalk or multi use trail;
(iii) on or overhanging any railway track, light rail transit track or other area designated through a sign or road marking for light rail transit vehicles;
(iv) within an intersection, including a roundabout;
(v) within 3 metres of a point on the curb line nearest a fire hydrant;
(vi) within 15 metres of the nearest rail of a level railway crossing;
(vii) within 9 metres of an intersecting roadway as measured from the intersecting curb line;
(viii) within 15 metres of an intersection controlled by traffic control signals or a roundabout as measured from the intersecting curb line;
(ix) in front of or within 1.5 metres of the entrance to a driveway or so as to prevent ingress to or egress from such driveway;
(x) in such a manner as to obstruct an entrance on the highway to or from a private road or lane;
(xi) in such a manner as to obstruct a crosswalk;
(xii) in such a manner as to obstruct traffic;
(xiii) in a position or place that prevents or is likely to prevent the removal of any vehicle already parked on the highway;
(xiv) for a longer period of time than 3 consecutive hours;
(xv) between the hours of 2:30 a.m. and 6:00 a.m.;
(xvi) for the purpose of repairing, washing, or maintenance of a vehicle, except when such use of the highway is unavoidable through emergency;
(xvii) for the purpose of soliciting, vending, buying or selling goods and/or services, unless otherwise permitted by by-law;
(xviii) in front of or adjacent to a bus stop or light rail transit station or stop or in a manner so as to obstruct a bus stop or light rail transit station or stop;
(xix) within a reserved lane during the hours and days that the reserved lane is in effect;
(x) if such vehicle is a transit bus, except at a bus stop or at a location where the transit bus is waiting for charter or emergency passengers;
(xi) if such vehicle is a school bus, except within a school bus loading zone;
(xii) if such vehicle is a heavy truck;
(xiii) if such vehicle is a trailer more than 10 metres in length;
(xiv) if such vehicle is a non-permitted vehicle; or
(xv) if such vehicle is leaking gasoline, engine oil or any other vehicular fluid.

b) Emergency Prohibition of Parking
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Despite any other provision of this By-law, when an authorized “emergency” sign is on display, no person shall park on any highway during any emergency. For this purpose “emergency” includes, but is not limited to:

(i) a fire, flood or other natural disaster;

(ii) work under a permit granted by the Region or a local municipality; or

(iii) any circumstance in which Section 134 of the Highway Traffic Act, or any successor provision, applies.

3. No Parking

a) When signs establishing a “no parking” zone are on display, no person shall park a vehicle on a highway within such zone.

b) Without limiting the generality of the provisions of Part V, Section 4 a) of this By-law, an authorized sign may be erected prohibiting the parking of a vehicle on any highway:

(i) named or described in Schedule 1 of this By-law, on the side or sides of the highway set out therein, during the times and/or days set out therein;

(ii) that is a public lane;

(iii) in a cul-de-sac along the turn around;

(iv) within 15 metres of the termination of a dead-end highway;

(v) in front of an emergency entrance to or exit from a hospital, theatre, auditorium or other building in which persons may be expected to congregate in large numbers;

(vi) within 30 metres on the approach or 15 metres on the departure side of a bus stop or light rail transit station or stop;

(vii) on that side of the highway where the same abuts onto the property of any public park or public playground;

(viii) where there is a school, on both sides of the highway contiguous to the limit of land used for school purposes;

(ix) within 15 metres on either side of an access to a multi-use trail;

(x) within 8 metres of any fire hall access on the side of the highway on which the fire hall is located and/or within 30 metres of such fire hall access on the opposite side of the highway;

(xi) within 15 metres of an intersection; or

(xii) within 30 metres of an intersection controlled by traffic control signals or a roundabout.

4. Limited Parking

When an authorized sign is on display, no person shall park a vehicle on any highway named or described in Schedule 2 of this By-law, except on the side or sides of the highway set out therein, during the times and/or days set out therein, for the length of time set out therein, for the specific class or type of vehicle set out therein.
5. **Angle Parking**

When an authorized sign is on display, no person shall park a vehicle on any highway named or described in Schedule 3 of this By-law, on the side or sides of the highway set out therein, except in accordance with Part V, Section 2 c) of this By-law.

6. **Stopping Prohibited**

Unless otherwise permitted in this By-law, no person shall stop a vehicle on a highway:

- a) within a school bus loading zone;
- b) on or adjacent to a median;
- c) on, under or within 30 metres of a bridge, elevated structure, tunnel or underpass;
- d) within a roundabout;
- e) on or overhanging any railway track, light rail transit track or other area designated through a sign or road marking for light rail transit vehicles; or
- f) in such a manner as to obstruct traffic or the movement of a light rail transit vehicle.

7. **No Stopping**

a) When an authorized sign establishing a “no stopping” zone is on display, no person shall stop a vehicle within such zone on a highway other than a transit bus at a bus stop or a school-purpose vehicle within a school bus loading zone.

b) Without limiting the generality of the provision of Part V, Section 8 a) of this By-law, an authorized sign may be erected prohibiting the stopping of a vehicle:

   (i) on any highway named or described in Schedule 4 of this By-law, on the side or sides of the highway set out therein, during the times and/or days set out therein;
   (ii) on any highway within 30 metres of a school crosswalk designated by the Region;
   (iii) on that side of any highway where the same abuts on school property except a school-purpose vehicle while actually engaged in loading or unloading passengers;
   (iv) on the opposite side of any highway adjacent to school property, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., from Monday to Friday inclusive;
   (v) On that side of any highway where the same abuts on fire department property;
   (vi) On the opposite side of any highway adjacent to the fire department property;
   (vii) within 30 metres on the approach or 15 metres on the departure side of a bus stop or light rail transit station or stop;
   (viii) on any highway within 15 metres of a pedestrian crossover.

c) When an authorized sign establishing “no stopping” in “school zone” is on display, no person shall stop a vehicle within such school zone other than
Appendix A Report: TES-TRP-16-01
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a transit bus at a bus stop or a school-purpose vehicle within a school bus loading zone.

d) An authorized tab sign indicating a “school zone” may be added to a “no stopping” sign to prohibit the stopping of a vehicle:

(i) on any highway within 30 metres of a school crosswalk designated by the Region, provided the school crossing is located on that same highway within 30 metres of the school property;

(ii) on that side of any highway where the same abuts on school property, or

(iii) on the opposite side of any highway adjacent to school property, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., from Monday to Friday inclusive.

8. Loading Zones

a) When an authorized sign establishing “loading” zone is on display, no person shall park or stop a vehicle on any highway named or described in Schedule 5 of this By-law, on the side or sides of the highway set out therein, during the times and/or days set out therein, except for the purpose of and while actually engaged in loading or unloading passengers and/or merchandise.

b) When an authorized sign establishing “commercial loading” zone is on display, no person shall park or stop a vehicle other than a commercial motor vehicle on any highway named or described in Schedule 5 of this By-law, on the side or sides of the highway set out therein, during the times and/or days set out therein, except for the purpose of and while actually engaged in loading or unloading merchandise from the commercial motor vehicle.

9. Taxicab Stands

When an authorized sign is on display establishing a “taxicab stand”, no person shall park or stop a vehicle other than a taxicab on any highway named or described in Schedule 6 of this By-law, on the side or sides of the highway set out therein, except that the driver of a passenger vehicle may temporarily stop in a taxicab stand for the purpose of and while actually engaged in loading or unloading passengers and/or merchandise provided that such stopping does not interfere with any taxicab entering or exiting such taxicab stand.

10. Accessible Parking for Persons with Disabilities

When an authorized sign is on display establishing “accessible parking”, no person shall park or stop a vehicle in an accessible parking space on any highway named or described in Schedule 7 of this By-law, on the side or sides of the highway set out therein, other than a vehicle upon which is properly affixed a valid accessible parking permit that is issued and displayed in accordance with the Highway Traffic Act and is at the time being used to transport a disabled person.

Part VI – Parking Meters and Parking Permits

1. Parking Meter Zones

When an authorized sign establishing a “parking meter zone” is on display on any highway named or described in Schedule 8 of this By-law, the side or sides of the highway set out therein are designated as parking meter zones. Within a parking meter zone, no person shall:
Appendix A Report: TES-TRP-16-01
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a) park a vehicle between the hours and during the days set out in Schedule 8 of this By-law, except when such days are statutory holidays, unless the person pays the required fee in the parking meter provided for the parking space occupied;

b) allow a vehicle to remain parked for a period longer than that for which payment has been made, provided however, that this shall not prevent the driver of a vehicle from using the unexpired time remaining in the meter or meters from its previous use without further payment;

c) allow a vehicle to remain parked for a period longer than the maximum length of time for which continuous parking is permitted as set out in Schedule 8 of this By-law;

d) deposit or cause to be deposited in any parking meter any slug, device or other substitute for the required fee; or

e) park a vehicle in such a manner that it is not wholly within a parking space unless the vehicle is of such length as to prevent it being parked within one space, in which case the person parking same shall make the necessary payment in the parking meter provided for each parking space occupied.

2. Funeral Services

Churches, other places of worship and funeral homes within a parking zone at which funeral services are being held are hereby given authority to place signs on parking meters or otherwise in a manner approved by the Commissioner indicating that parking, except for those attending such service, is temporarily prohibited in the parking spaces so marked for a period of one hour in advance of the scheduled time of such service, and during such service, and any person disobeying the instructions of said signs shall be considered as violating the provisions of this part of the By-law. It shall not be necessary for the owner or driver of a vehicle validly parked in connection with such service in the parking spaces so marked to make any payment for parking during the aforesaid period.

3. Commercial/Essential Parking Permit

a) The Commissioner may issue a commercial/essential parking permit to the owner of any motor vehicle.

b) Any motor vehicle for which a commercial/essential parking permit has been issued and properly affixed may be parked at any on-street parking or loading zone within the local municipality specified on the permit without further payment for any period of time not exceeding the time limit designated under this By-law.

4. Reserved Parking Permit

a) The Commissioner may issue a reserved parking permit to the owner of any motor vehicle.

b) Any motor vehicle for which a reserved parking permit has been issued and properly affixed may be parked at any parking space on a highway within the local municipality specified on the permit beyond the time limit designated under this By-law, provided that such vehicle is engaged in loading or unloading or carrying out repairs to public utilities or other essential public services.

Part VII – Tow Trucks

1. Offer of Service

No person shall make or convey an offer of services of a tow truck while that person is within 200 metres of,
12

a) the scene of an accident or apparent accident; or
b) a vehicle involved in an accident,

on a highway.

2. Station / Position

No person shall station or position a tow truck on a highway within 200 metres of,

a) the scene of an accident or apparent accident; or
b) a vehicle involved in an accident,

if there is a sufficient number of tow trucks already at the scene to deal with all vehicles that apparently require the services of a tow truck.

3. Exception

Part VII. Sections 1 and 2 do not apply to a person who is at the scene of the accident at the request of a police officer, a municipal law enforcement officer, a person engaged in highway maintenance or a person involved in the accident.

Part VIII – Pedestrian Crossovers

1. Level 1 Pedestrian Crossovers

When an authorized sign establishing “Level 1 pedestrian crossover” is on display on any highway named or described in Schedule 9 of this By-law, any location set out therein is designated as a Level 1 pedestrian crossover.

2. Level 2 Pedestrian Crossovers

When an authorized sign establishing “Level 2 pedestrian crossover” is on display on any highway named or described in Schedule 10 of this By-law, any location set out therein is designated as a Level 2 pedestrian crossover.

Part IX – Through Highways

Any highway named or described in Schedule 11 of this By-law is designated as a “through highway” except at an intersection thereon where there is a traffic control signal, an all-way stop or a roundabout. For any highway designated as a “through highway”, a stop sign or a yield sign shall be erected facing approaching traffic on any roadway intersecting the “through highway”.

Part X – Intersection Stop Signs

Stop signs shall be erected at the intersections named or described in Schedule 12 of this By-law, facing the traffic travelling in the direction specified therein.

Part XI – Vehicle Movements

1. U-Turns

When an authorized sign prohibiting “u-turns” is on display, no person shall operate a vehicle in such a manner as to make a U-turn on any highway named or described in Schedule 13 of this By-law.

2. Prohibited Movement(s)
When an authorized sign prohibiting “movement” is on display, no person operating a vehicle on any highway named or described in Schedule 14 of this By-law, proceeding in the direction or emerging from a property set out therein, shall make the movement(s) set out therein, during the times and/or days set out therein.

3. Lane Designation

When an authorized sign designating “lanes” is on display, no person operating a vehicle on any highway named or described in Schedule 15 of this By-law, proceeding in the direction set out therein, at the location set out therein, shall make any movement other than the movement(s) set out therein.

Part XII – One-Way Streets

When an authorized sign designating a “one-way street” is on display, any highway named or described in Schedule 16 of this By-law is designated as a one-way street in the direction of travel stated therein.

Part XIII – Rates of Speed (km/h)

When an authorized sign designating a “rate of speed” is on display, the maximum permissible rate of speed on any highway named or described in Schedule 17 of this By-law shall be that rate of speed set out therein.

Part XIV – Centre Lane: Two-Way Left Turns

When an authorized sign designating a “centre lane” is on display, no person shall operate a vehicle on the centre lane of any highway named or described in Schedule 18 of this By-law, except for the purpose of turning left.

Part XV - Loads

1. Reduced Loads on Highways

When an authorized sign designating a “reduced load” is on display, no person shall drive a vehicle or combination of vehicles if the gross weight is in excess of the weight posted on the highway.

2. Reduced Loads on Bridges

When an authorized sign designating a “reduced load” is on display, no person shall drive a vehicle or combination of vehicles if the gross weight is in excess of the weight posted for a bridge on a highway.

3. Oversize Loads

No person shall drive a vehicle or combination of vehicles on a highway that is in excess of the dimensions and weight set out in the Highway Traffic Act without first having obtained a permit from the Commissioner.

Part XVI – Heavy Truck Prohibitions

1. No Heavy Trucks

When an authorized sign designating “no heavy trucks” is on display, no person shall drive a heavy truck on any highway named or described in Schedule 19 of this By-law, during the times and/or days set out therein.

2. Exception
Part XVI, Section 1 of this By-law shall not apply to the driver of a heavy truck making a delivery to, or a collection from a premise or premises that cannot be reached by any route other than the highway where heavy trucks are prohibited within this By-law, provided that when making such a delivery or collection the same highway is travelled only as far as is unavoidable in getting to and from such premise or premises.

Part XVII – School Bus Loading Zones

When an authorized sign designating a “school bus loading zone” is on display, the driver of a school-purpose vehicle must not stop on any highway named or described in Schedule 20 of this By-law other than on the side or sides of the highway set out therein.

Part XVIII – Community Safety Zones

When an authorized sign designating a “community safety zone” is on display, any highway named or described in Schedule 21 of this By-law is designated as a community safety zone as set out therein.

Part XIX – Reserved Lanes

When an authorized sign designating “reserved lanes” is on display, no person shall drive a vehicle on the reserved lanes named or described in Schedule 22 of the By-law, during the times and/or days set out therein, unless the person is driving a vehicle of the specific class or type set out therein.

Part XX – Exception

This By-law shall not, if compliance therewith would be impractical, apply to an emergency vehicle or a vehicle engaged in works undertaken for or on behalf of the Region, local municipalities or public utilities.

Part XXI – Penalties

1. General Offence

Every person who contravenes a provision of this By-law is guilty of an offence and upon conviction is liable to a fine as provided for in the Provincial Offences Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.33, as amended.

2. Owner Offence

The owner of a vehicle that is parked, stopped or left standing in contravention of this By-law is guilty of an offence and is liable to such penalties as are provided for by this By-law unless, at the time of the offence, the vehicle was in the possession of some person other than the owner without the owner’s consent.

3. Accessible Parking

Notwithstanding Part XXI, Sections 1 and 2 of this By-law, any person violating Part V, Section 11 of this By-law is guilty of an offence and upon conviction is liable to a fine of not less than $300 and not more than $5,000.

4. Highway Traffic Act

Notwithstanding Part XXI, Section 1 of this By-law, any person violating any of the provisions of Parts VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII, XIV, XV, XVI, XVII, XVIII and XIX of this By-law is guilty of an offence and shall be subject to the penalty provided for such violation in the Highway Traffic Act.
Part XXI – Vehicle Removal

In addition to any other penalties provided for in this By-law, a police officer, police cadet, municipal law enforcement officer or an officer appointed for carrying out the provisions of this By-law, upon discovery of any vehicle parked or standing in contravention of any provision of this By-law may cause it to be moved or taken to and placed or stored in a suitable place and all costs and charges for the removal, care and storage of the vehicle, if any, are a lien upon the vehicle, which may be enforced in the manner provided by the Repair and Storage Liens Act, R.S.O. 1990, Chapter R. 25, as amended, or any successor Act thereto.

Part XXII – Enactment

1. Enactment

This By-law shall come into force and effect at 12:01 a.m. on January 1, 2017.

2. Repeal

By-law Number 06-072 of the Region, as amended, is hereby repealed as of the effective date set out in Part XXII, Section 1 of this By-law.

3. Exception

Notwithstanding Part XXI, Section 2 of this By-law, By-law Number 06-072 of the Region, as amended, shall continue to apply to proceedings in respect of offences that occurred before its repeal.

Part XXIII – Validity

Should any part, section or provision of this By-law be declared by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, the same shall not affect the validity of the By-law as a whole or in part thereof, other than the part that was declared to be invalid.

By-law read a first, second and third time and finally passed in the Council Chamber in The Regional Municipality of Waterloo this day of 
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October 7, 2015

Region of Waterloo
Regional Clerk’s Office
150 Frederick Street
2nd Floor
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3

Dear Ms. Fletcher,

Re: Traffic and Parking By-law - Side-by-side Cycling

This letter is to inform you that Council of the Township of Woolwich passed the following resolution at the Council meeting held on October 6, 2015:

THAT the Council of the Township of Woolwich express their opposition to the proposed amendments in the Region of Waterloo Traffic and Parking By-law related to side-by-side cycling;

AND FURTHER THAT this resolution be circulated to Regional Council and area municipalities for support.

Council expressed serious concerns that permitting side-by-side cycling has the potential to give cyclists a false sense of security while riding on the road. Especially on rural roads, the danger is increased as vehicle drivers are travelling faster and may crown a hill to find cyclists in their lane. Just as it is unsafe for motorcycles to ride side-by-side, it would be unsafe for bicycles to ride two-abreast.

Please contact me at 519-669-1647 ext. 6106 or sshantz@woolwich.ca should you have any further questions.

Yours truly,

Mayor Sandy Shantz
Township of Woolwich

cc: Regional Council
    Township of Wilmot, Clerk
    Township of North Dumfries, Clerk
    Township of Wellesley, Clerk

"Proudly remembering our past; Confidently embracing our future."
The Corporation of the Township of Wellesley
4639 Lobsinger Line, R. R. # 1
St. Clements, Ontario N0B 2M0
Telephone: 519.699.4611 Fax: 519.699.4540
LOCATED AT CROSSHILL, ONTARIO

October 22, 2015

Regional Municipality of Waterloo
150 Frederick St., 2nd Floor
Kitchener, Ontario N2G 4J3
Attention: Kris Fletcher

Regarding: Township of Wellesley Resolution - Side-by-side Cycling

Please be advised that the following resolution was passed at the Regular Council Meeting of the Wellesley Township Municipal Council held on October 20, 2015 at the Council Chambers in Crosshill:

“That the Council of the Township of Wellesley support the resolution brought forth by the Township of Woolwich regarding Side-by-Side Cycling as detailed in File No. R. & B.; P. & F. 11/15; and further, That this resolution be forwarded to Regional Council and area municipalities for support.” Carried

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at (519) 699-3946 at your earliest convenience.

Yours truly,

Grace Koseh, Clerk

cc: Kevin Beggs, Director of Public Works
Bob Henderson, Manager, Transportation Engineering
Township of Woolwich, Clerk
Township of Wilmot, Clerk
Township of North Dumfries, Clerk
Region of Waterloo

Planning Development and Legislative Services

Legal Services

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

Date: May 24, 2016

Subject: Closing and Surplus Declaration of Part of Highland Road (Regional Road 6), City of Kitchener

Recommendation:

a) That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo close and declare surplus a portion of Highland Road, in the City of Kitchener described as Daylighting Triangle, Plan 864, being Part 1, on Reference Plan 58R-18905, PIN 22457-0823 (LT), as detailed in Report No. PDL-LEG-16-30 dated May 24, 2016, pursuant to the Region’s property disposition by-law, to the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor; and

b) Approve, enter into an Agreement for, and execute all documentation related to, the conveyance of Part 1, on Reference Plan 58R-18905 to the abutting property owner, 2297868 Ontario Inc., in exchange for the lands described as Part of West Acres Crescent (closed by Bylaw No. 2012-083, Instrument WR765996) (being part of road widening, Reg. Plan 864 and Part of Lot 38, German Company Tract, being Parts 3 and 4, on Reference Plan 58R-18905, PIN 22457-0825 (LT), as detailed in Report No. PDL-LEG-16-30 dated May 24, 2016, pursuant to the Region’s property disposition by-law and the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor.
Summary: NIL

Report:

Corridor Management staff have advised that the subject road allowance is no longer required for road purposes and will not be required in the future.

The subject lands have a total area of 827.88 square feet and are located at the south west corner of Highland Road and the former West Acres Crescent. There are Region wells and piezometers located on the former West Acres Crescent abutting the subject lands that are currently accessed by way of easement. Water Services staff have been in discussion with the owner of the abutting property about a land exchange to provide the Region with ownership of the lands on which the Regional wells and piezometers are located together with direct access from Highland Road. The surplus portion of the daylighting triangle will provide additional frontage along Highland Road to the abutting property. The area of land being conveyed to the Region is also 827.88 square feet.

When the road has been closed and the requirements of the Region’s property disposition by-law have been met the subject land exchange will be completed. The subject lands are shown attached as Appendix “A”.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

One of the focus areas of the Corporate Strategic Plan is to foster a culture of citizen/customer service that is responsive to community needs.

Financial Implications:

The future purchaser of the subject lands will be responsible for all associated costs of the road closing and conveyance of the subject lands.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Corridor Management staff and Water Services staff have been consulted in the preparation of this report.

Attachments

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

Prepared By: Joan Moore, Property Agent

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

1. 42 West Acres Crescent, Kitchener
   Owner: 2297868 Ontario Inc.
   Annual Return: December 22, 2015
   Directors/Officers: Peter Catana and Richard Fernando Martins
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Corporate Services

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

Date: May 24, 2016

File Code: F18-40

Subject: P2016-01 Asset Management System Implementation

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo accept the proposal of GM BluePlan Engineering Ltd. for P2016-01 Asset Management System Implementation at an upset fee of $2,510,274 plus all applicable taxes as set out in report TES-16-02/COR-16-01, dated May 24, 2016.

Summary:

The procurement of a Corporate Work Management system has recently been awarded to replace numerous aging and obsolete Work Management Systems currently in use at the Region. These systems are used by staff from many divisions to schedule and issue work orders, track historical work and record equipment details and condition.

Consulting services are required to configure this new corporate system to meet the needs of the 8 user groups, including approximately 450 staff, within different divisions across the Region. Work flows in all areas must be reviewed to optimise the setup and use of the new corporate system. This system must also be integrated with other corporate applications such as Financial and HR systems and other specific software used to monitor equipment condition and performance.

On completion of the implementation, this system of connected applications will centralize and streamline data collection and improve performance reporting. It will improve decision making and help staff provide more consistent and meaningful asset reports to Council.

A consultant selection process was carried out in accordance with the Region’s Purchasing
By-law 04-093 for the procurement of goods and services and included price as a factor. When considering quality, equity and price factors GM BluePlan Engineering Ltd. scored the highest and the project evaluation team recommends GM BluePlan Engineering Ltd. be retained to undertake the assignment at an upset limit of $2,510,274 plus all applicable taxes.

Report:

Background

As part of the Corporate Asset Management Strategy, a Corporate Work Management System was selected before retaining Consultant Services for implementation. On February 23, 2016, Council accepted the proposal of eGovsolutions for P2015-31 for the procurement of the Lucity Work Management System (report TES-WAS-16-06/COR-FFM-16-04). That system now needs to be configured to meet the needs of the 8 user groups, including approximately 450 staff, within different divisions across the Region.

The Asset Management System will replace multiple aging, obsolete systems and will centralize all technical, financial, warranty, condition, performance and risk information relating to Regional assets. Region staff will have a better understanding of the full asset lifecycle costs through performance metrics, dashboards and comprehensive reporting.

Integrated with other key corporate systems, these systems will enable staff to make better decisions related to asset maintenance, help forecast capital works, improve efficiencies through enhanced work planning and scheduling, provide consistent metrics for comparing assets in all Divisions and allow better reporting to help Council make more informed decisions.

One of the Corporate Asset Management Strategies is to develop an Asset Management Plan. The Asset Management Plan is a long range planning document, intended to improve the Region’s ability to meet its corporate goals and objectives in a way that best serves its customers. The Asset Management System will streamline the development of this plan as all asset-related information will be stored in one place. Currently, it is a very manual process of gathering and reconciling asset data from many sources. Staff is working on an updated Corporate Asset Management Plan which will be presented to Regional Council this year.
Consultant Selection

Proposals were called for P2016-01 Asset Management System Implementation and were advertised in the Record, on the Ontario Public Buyers Associate website and on the Region’s website. Three (3) proposals were received. The proposals were opened in the presence of K. Howald, R. Pinder and A. Dooling.

The proposals were evaluated using pre-determined technical criteria which included project understanding and approach, project manager, project support staff and the firm’s experience on similar projects and price. Following the qualitative evaluation, two proponents were shortlisted, interviewed and their price envelopes opened.

The shortlisted proponents are as follows:

GHD Limited Waterloo, ON
GM BluePlan Engineering Ltd. Stoney Creek, ON

The proposal submitted by GM BluePlan Engineering Ltd. obtained the lowest cost and the highest overall score. GM BluePlan has provided Asset Management, Work Management and Business Process Mapping consulting services for many years and has proposed an experienced and qualified project team with clear leadership. They have completed several projects of a similar scope for other local municipalities in Ontario as well as other clients across Canada. For this project, GM BluePlan has partnered with eGovsolutions, the software supplier, for the Lucity installation and integrations.

The scope of this RFP included:

1) Implementation of the Lucity Work Management System;
2) Review, evaluate, acquire, and implement the Decision Support Systems;
3) Provide training, documentation and a planned process to transition to operations and;
4) Provide a long term support model

The Work Management System configuration will require multiple meetings with each user group and is expected to take over two years to complete. The implementation includes integration with at least 13 other software applications currently in use at the Region. A study will be included to review regional asset management processes to determine gaps and identify supplementary decision support software requirements to assist with short and long term decision making. The consultant will assist with the procurement of that software, integrate it with the Lucity work management system and develop and provide training for all new software. Finally, the consultant will help the Region clearly define and document in a report a long term support model for the implemented systems.
The Asset Management System implementation project is scheduled to commence in June 2016 and be complete in late 2018.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

Award of this contract aligns with the 2015-2018 Corporate Strategic Plan objective to plan for and provide the infrastructure and services necessary to create the foundation for economic success under Strategic Focus Area 1, Thriving Economy. This includes continuing to implement and improve an asset management plan to optimize the use and availability of existing and new infrastructure.

**Financial Implications:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P2016-01 Asset Management System Implementation</td>
<td>$2,510,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus: Applicable Net HST of 1.76%</td>
<td>$44,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,554,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All figures are rounded to the nearest $100.

The Region’s approved 2016 Transportation and Environmental Services Capital Program includes a budget of $10.4 million in 2016-2018 to implement an Asset Management System (Projects 07053, 01011, 04159, 08327) to be funded from the Water and Wastewater Capital Reserves (43%; $4,440,000), the Roads Rehabilitation Capital Reserve (32%; $3,350,000), Regional Development Charges (15%; $1,560,000) and Debentures (10%; $1,040,000).

Of the budgeted $10.4 million, $3.5 million had been allocated for the professional support services to implement the work management system, as well as the review, purchase and implementation of supplementary decision support systems. The actual cost of the professional services was 27% under the projected budget. The funds will remain in the respective reserves and will reduce debenture requirements.

The final date of acceptance for this proposal is October 11, 2016.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Staff representatives from Divisions within Transportation and Environmental Services, Corporate Services and Planning Development and Legislative Services Departments are involved in the Corporate Asset Management Program and have been consulted in the preparation of this report.
Attachments: Nil

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

Charles Allen, Manager, Facilities Planning & Performance Management

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

Craig Dyer, Commissioner, Corporate Services/Chief Financial Officer
Region of Waterloo
Planning, Development and Legislative Services
Region of Waterloo International Airport

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: May 24, 2016  File Code: L04-20
Subject: Airport Operating Agreement with NextJet and Propair

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo authorize the Commissioner of Planning, Development and Legislative Services to enter into an agreement, and any subsequent renewals, with Nextflighcourier Worldwide Ltd. and Propair Inc., carrying on business as NextJet and Propair, and if required, other third parties as may be contracted by NextJet or Propair, with the form and content of such agreement to be to the satisfaction of the Regional Solicitor to enable NextJet and Propair to carry on a specialized private air charter service from the air terminal building of the Region of Waterloo International Airport, as described in Report No. PDL-AIR-16-05, dated May 24, 2016, with initial service to Peterborough, Ottawa (Gatineau) and Montreal (Dorval).

SUMMARY:

The Region of Waterloo International Airport currently provides scheduled daily passenger service to Calgary and Chicago. Previously, schedule service to Ottawa and Montreal had been provided by Bearskin Airlines, but this service ceased in 2014. Now, a new carrier to the Airport, operating as NextJet, is seeking to provide regular service to Peterborough, Ottawa (Gatineau) and Montreal (Dorval). This report recommends the Region of Waterloo enter into an agreement to support this new service.

REPORT:

On May 30, 2016, NextJet, a Federally incorporated Vancouver-based passenger and cargo services company, wishes to commence regular charter operations from the Region of Waterloo International Airport. NextJet plans to use the services of Propair, a Quebec based (and Quebec corporation) airline company to provide all aviation
services as a sub-contractor to NextJet. Propair would operate a 9 seat Beechcraft King Air 100 series aircraft for this service. Flights would depart the Region of Waterloo International Airport and serve Peterborough, Ottawa (Gatineau) and Montreal Dorval. The initial schedule is proposed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flight</th>
<th>Departing</th>
<th>Arriving</th>
<th>Arriving</th>
<th>Arriving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NJ 303*</td>
<td>Waterloo Region at 6:45 a.m.</td>
<td>Peterborough at 7:20 a.m.</td>
<td>Ottawa (Gatineau) at 8:20 a.m.</td>
<td>Montreal at 9:20 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ 703*</td>
<td>Montreal at 4:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Ottawa (Gatineau) at 5:15 p.m.</td>
<td>Peterborough at 6:20 p.m.</td>
<td>Waterloo Region at 7:20 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ 888 Friday</td>
<td>Waterloo Region at 7:45 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ 999 Sunday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Waterloo Region at 7:20 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NextJet wishes to use the terminal building to process its passengers. Regional staff understand that Waterloo Esso Services, a business based at the airport, has been contracted by NextJet to provide ground handling and fuel services for its operations.

This report recommends that the Region of Waterloo enter into a Commercial Carrier Operating Agreement to permit NextJet and Propair to utilize the air terminal facility and associated services such as baggage handling and passenger processing equipment for the check-in and arrival of their personnel and passengers.

The recommended agreement would require NextJet and Propair to pay all applicable fees, as established by Council in its current fees and charges by-law, including $15.00 for each passenger embarking from the air terminal. This fee is equivalent to the current fee charged for passengers of regularly scheduled domestic flights operating from the airport. The term of the agreement would be for an initial one year period which may be renewed for additional one year periods depending upon the requirements of NextJet and Propair. The agreement would also contain provisions providing for indemnity of the Region and its employees and a requirement that NextJet and Propair provide a suitable certificate of insurance evidencing that each NextJet and Propair has a policy of insurance which would respond to any insured risks associated with its operations.

As part of the joint marketing and promotion of the Airport and this service, it is recommended that the agreement also provide for regular ongoing airport communications as well as contribution to marketing expenses that would promote use of the Airport through this service.

Airlines have extreme challenges during the initial start-up phase and face many
obstacles and barriers to entry. Many airlines have tried similar service and have been unsuccessful for a variety of reasons. Regional staff is cognizant of this reality and would provide support for this service to the greatest possible extent.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

One of the focus areas of the Region’s Corporate Strategic Plan is to support aviation-related activities at the Region of Waterloo International Airport.

Financial Implications:

NextJet is expecting to operate 365 flights per year (once a day Sunday – Friday, and an extra arrival flight Sunday and an extra departure Friday evening) and are expecting an 80% load factor on average. Expected revenues to the Region are estimated at $35,000 per year. NextJet would be invoiced and pay all published fees starting on May 30. This $35,000 revenue has not been previously budgeted.

At the conclusion of 3 months of service, and again at 6 months, the Region would provide a lump sum payment as a contribution towards NextJet’s marketing initiatives. This payment would be based on the number of passengers actually flown, and would not exceed $7,500 for each payment ($15,000 total).

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Corporate Services (Finance) has been consulted in the preparation of this report.

Prepared By: Chris Wood, General Manager, Region of Waterloo International Airport

Approved By: Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Development and Legislative Services
For immediate release  
May 3, 2016

Region wins provincial water efficiency award

Waterloo Region – The Region of Waterloo has won the Ontario Water Works Association (OWWA)’s Public Education and Awareness - Public Sector and Utilities award for its Restaurant and Business Certification Program.

The program uses a point system to give local restaurants and businesses credit for water conservation activities they perform at their site. Once they accumulate enough points, they are awarded the water efficiency certification. In 2015, five local restaurants were certified. With the expanded program, certifications are expected to double in 2016.

The Region received the award at the OWWA’s annual conference in Windsor on May 3, 2016.

“It is an honour to receive this recognition from the OWWA,” said Water Services Director Nancy Kodousek. “We always strive to bring new programs forward that conserve our long-term water supply and this is a unique program that partners with local restaurants and businesses who want to be good stewards.”

For more information, please contact Dan Meagher, Communications Coordinator, 519-588-7047, dmeagher@regionofwaterloo.ca
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