PRESENTATION OF THE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO
PLANNING AND WORKS COMMITTEE
MINUTES

Tuesday, November 8, 2011
12:30 p.m.
Regional Council Chamber
150 Frederick Street, Kitchener, Ontario

Present were: Chair J. Wideman, L. Armstrong, J. Brewer, T. Cowan*, J. Haalboom, B. Halloran, R. Kelterborn*, G. Lorentz, C. Millar, J. Mitchell, K. Seiling, C. Zehr

Members absent: D. Craig, R. Deutschmann, T. Galloway, S. Strickland

MOTION TO RECONVENE IN OPEN SESSION

MOVED by L. Armstrong
SECONDED by J. Mitchell

THAT the meeting reconvene into Open Session.

CARRIED

DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST UNDER THE MUNICIPAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT – See page 3

DELEGATIONS – See page 3

REPORTS – TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

RAPID TRANSIT

a) E-11-106, Recommended Uptown Waterloo Light Rail Transit Route Alignment and Stations – See page 3

TRANSPORTATION

b) E-11-083, Reserved Cycling lanes, Waterloo Street (Regional Road 1) Between Steinman Street and Queen Mary Street, Township of Wilmot

MOVED by L. Armstrong
SECONDED by G. Lorentz

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo amend Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended, to add to Schedule 24, Reserved Bicycle Lanes Anytime on both sides of Waterloo Street (Regional Road 1) between Steinman Street and Queen Mary Street in the Township of Wilmot, as outlined in Report E-11-083 dated November 8, 2011.

CARRIED
WATER


MOVED by J. Mitchell
SECONDED by B. Halloran

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo:

a) enter into a Consulting Services Agreement with R.J.Burnside & Associates Ltd. (Burnside) Ontario, to provide consulting geoscience services for the Region of Waterloo Groundwater Monitoring Program for the period January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2013 at an upset limit of $775,007 plus applicable taxes; as presented in Report E-11-038 dated November 8, 2011; and

b) authorize staff to renew this contract for the period from January 1, 2014 through June 30, 2016 at an upset limit of $940,576 plus applicable taxes, subject to acceptable performance of the consultant in meeting project outcomes and deliverables.

CARRIED

d) E-11-102, Approaches to Policies in the Source Protection Plan

Eric Hodgins, Manager, Hydrogeology & Source Water, delivered a power point presentation and distributed copies of the Region of Waterloo Facts on Tap Issue #4, October 2011. Copies of these documents are appended to the original minutes. He explained the classification policies regarding source water threats across Waterloo Region; the development of the Tools and Policies for the Source Protection Plan (SPP); and future public engagement sessions.

In response to Committee questions, E. Hodgins explained that the SPP deals with site specific uses rather than broad development categories such as Commercial and Industrial. Properties within an identified area of threat would be required to meet certain criteria through the development process.

There was discussion about the biggest impact on the water supply which is the application of salt in the winter and chlorinated solvents. In that regard, E. Hodgins explained that the Region is implementing a Salt Management Plan (required by the Province of Ontario program) as well as other initiatives to mitigate the negative impact that salt application has on our water supply.

Provincial funding was discussed as well as how the Region stood in relation to other municipalities and Conservation Authorities in the implementation stage. Staff and office resources were discussed once the program was in place and going forward.

Received for information.

* R. Kelterborn entered the meeting at 12:35 p.m.
* T. Cowan entered the meeting at 12:38 p.m.
DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST UNDER THE MUNICIPAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT

K. Seiling declared a pecuniary interest regarding Report E-11-106 Recommended Uptown Waterloo Light Rail Transit Route Alignment and Stations due to two of his adult children who own residential properties within the proposed corridor.

REPORTS – TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

RAPID TRANSIT

a) E-11-106, Recommended Uptown Waterloo Light Rail Transit Route Alignment and Stations

Nancy Button, Director, Rapid Transit Initiative, provided a power point presentation highlighting the information in the staff report. This presentation is appended to the original minutes. Staff advised that with the use of the Waterloo Spur line, the Rude Native vehicular entrance would be closed and that other existing vehicular accesses would be maintained for Waterloo Town Square.

There was discussion in relation to the number of stops on the line and how the potential for additional ridership must be weighed with the overall speed of the system.

DELEGATIONS

a) Brooke Ashfield, on behalf of Knox Church, Waterloo addressed Committee in support of the proposed realignment. He explained the presence of the Church in the community and felt that the Light Rail Transit system will benefit the entire community.

b) Duncan Clemens, appeared before Committee on behalf of Tri-Cities Transport Action Group (TriTAG). He advised that he supported the project. However, he expressed concern for design of the major Uptown Waterloo station platforms being split, making them not visible to one another, and thus interfering with effective wayfinding. D. Clemens explained their solution was to relocate the station at Caroline, south of Willis Way, to the corner of Erb and Caroline Streets. D. Clemens submitted a letter from TriTAG and a copy is appended to the original minutes.

c) Kate Daley expressed support for the proposed Realignment and thanked the Region for the opportunity to participate in the project.

d) John Shortreed did not come forward when called. However, he provided a written submission prior to the meeting which is appended to the original minutes.

e) Robert Milligan addressed Committee with a number of design suggestions for the LRT. He encouraged the integration of the LRT with existing trails and expressed concern for the negative impacts to Uptown Waterloo businesses resulting from construction disruption and loss of parking.

f) Joan Heaton expressed concern for the use of the Waterloo Spur line and locating a station on Allen Street. She suggested that all LRT routes be located on King Street and not on Caroline Street. She expressed concern for traffic congestion at the intersection of Caroline and Allen Streets.
g) Leon Zorzi addressed Committee on behalf of the Transportation and Trails Advisory Committee, City of Waterloo. He expressed support for the recommended route alignment. He requested that a three (3) metre wide trail be maintained for the Trans Canada Trail that runs between Allen and Erb and for the Laurel Trail between King and Caroline Streets; and that safe pedestrian/cycle crossings be added at King and the Laurel Trail spur line and at Caroline and Erb.

h) Michael Druker expressed support for the recommended alignment. However, he expressed concern for the approach to the technical aspect of the project. He commented that the actual cost impacts have not been provided with respect to utility relocation, loss of parking and local business impacts. Additionally, he felt that there was no attention paid to transit connections to the existing transit and future transit in order to form a transit network.

M. Druker clarified for Committee that he was concerned about the location of LRT stations which are located outside of the Uptown Waterloo area and recognized that those areas would be considered through a future design stage.

Written submissions were received from Pauline Shang Au and the City of Waterloo. Copies of these submissions are appended to the original minutes.

REPORTS – TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

RAPID TRANSIT

a) E-11-106, Recommended Uptown Waterloo Light Rail Transit Route Alignment and Stations

Chair Wideman indicated that the costs of utility relocates were included in the original LRT project plan and the use of the Waterloo Spur line was less costly in that regard. He commented that the Region listened to the concern about the Uptown Waterloo alignment and offered the community input.

Chair Wideman acknowledged the recommendations of the Council of the City of Waterloo from its meeting on November 7, 2011 and indicated that they would be forwarded to Regional staff for review. B. Halloran, as Mayor of Waterloo, provided the context for the City of Waterloo Council decision and indicated that they would like to be involved in the project at all times. Committee suggested that the City of Waterloo recommendations be considered for all areas throughout the project, including Kitchener and Cambridge.

There was discussion about the proposed road accesses for areas in Uptown Waterloo, in particular the Caroline Street town houses and the Bauer lofts (which require truck access for delivery of goods). Staff confirmed that those details will be brought forward at a future stage.

There was also discussion about locating a station at the intersection of Caroline and Erb Streets and it was noted that a station at Caroline would create significant complications for the intersection.
C. Zehr requested a recorded vote on the following motion.

MOVED by L. Armstrong  
SECONDED by J. Mitchell

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the modification of the Uptown Waterloo light rail transit (LRT) route alignment and stations, as described in Report E-11-106, dated November 8, 2011, to:

a) Run the alignment northbound along the existing Waterloo Spur line through Waterloo Town Square from King Street to Caroline Street;
b) Include an additional Uptown Waterloo LRT station area at the intersection of King Street and Allen Street, with a northbound station on King Street and a southbound station on Allen Street; and
c) Move the location of the northbound LRT station at Willis Way to the Waterloo Spur line at Waterloo Town Square.

CARRIED


WATER REPORTS - Continued

e) E-11-103.1, 2012 Rain Barrel Distribution

MOVED by G. Lorentz  
SECONDED by L. Armstrong

THAT the Region of Waterloo distributes subsidized rain barrels to residents at a cost of $40 each during the final distribution in April of 2012, according to Report E-11-103.1 dated November 8, 2011.

CARRIED

f) Approaches to Policy Development in the Source Protection Plan - Public Information Package

Received for information.

g) Kitchener Waste Water Treatment Plant - Phase 3 Upgrades Municipal Class Environmental Assessment – Public Information Package

Received for information.

REPORTS – PLANNING, HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

COMMUNITY PLANNING

h) P-11-086, Referral of a Portion of Map 5 of the City of Kitchener Official Plan (the lands located north of Ottawa Street that are subject to Deferral 3a) to the Ontario Municipal Board for Consolidation Into an Existing Hearing
MOVED by G. Lorentz
SECONDED by T. Cowan

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, in its role as the delegate of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, refer the currently unapproved portion of Map 5 of the City of Kitchener Official Plan (the lands located north of Ottawa Street that are subject to Deferral 3a) to the Ontario Municipal Board under the provisions of Section 17(11) of the Planning Act R.S.O. 1990 and request this referral be consolidated with the Official Plan Amendment, Plan of Subdivision application and Zoning By-law amendment appeals by Activa Holdings Inc. and 2140065 Ontario Inc. currently the subject of Ontario Municipal Board Case No. PL110574, as explained in Report No. P-11-086, dated November 8, 2011.

CARRIED

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

i) P-11-068, Amendment to Regional Municipality of Waterloo Controlled Access By-law #58-87, for Access to Regional Road #50 (Northfield Drive), City of Waterloo

MOVED by J. Mitchell
SECONDED by J. Brewer

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo amend Controlled Access By-law #58-87 to include a right-in, right-out only access on the south side of Regional Road #50 (Northfield Drive) approximately 113 metres east of Parkside Drive in the City of Waterloo subject to site plan approval by the City of Waterloo and the Ministry of Transportation.

AND THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo amend Controlled Access By-law #58-87 to include the existing access on the south side of Regional Road #50 (Northfield Drive) approximately 70 metres east of Parkside Drive, in the City of Waterloo, as explained in Report P-11-068, dated November 8, 2011.

CARRIED

j) P-11-087, Amendment to Regional Municipality of Waterloo Controlled Access By-law #58-87 for the Closure of Two Accesses to Regional Road #33 (Townline Road), and for Five New Accesses to Regional Road #33 (Townline Road), City of Cambridge, and Township of Puslinch, County of Wellington

There was discussion about other accesses on Townline Road beyond Avenue Road that may be addressed in the future. There was also discussion about the construction project on Townline Road.

MOVED by B. Halloran
SECONDED by T. Cowan

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve an amendment to Controlled Access By-Law #58-87 to close a full movement access 592 metres south of Concession 1, in the Township of Puslinch, County of Wellington; and to close a full movement access 670 metres north of Concession 1, in the Township of Puslinch, County of Wellington, both accesses being under the jurisdiction of the Region of Waterloo;
AND THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo Controlled Access By-law #58-87 be amended to include the following accesses, as explained in Report P-11-087, dated November 8, 2011:

a) A temporary full movement construction access on the west side of Regional Road #33 (Townline Road) approximately 114 metres south of Kenwood Drive, in the City of Cambridge.

b) A permanent full movement farm access on the east side of Regional Road #33 (Townline Road) approximately 185 metres south of Canamera Parkway, in the Township of Puslinch, County of Wellington.

c) A permanent full movement residential access on the east side of Regional Road #33 (Townline Road) approximately 675 metres north of Concession 1, in the Township of Puslinch, County of Wellington.

d) A permanent full movement residential access on the east side of Regional Road #33 (Townline Road) approximately 665 metres north of Concession 1, in the Township of Puslinch, County of Wellington.

e) A permanent full movement residential access on the east side of Regional Road #33 (Townline Road) approximately 635 metres south of Concession 1, in the Township of Puslinch, County of Wellington.

CARRIED
(C. Millar opposed)

k) P-11-088, Walk Cycle Waterloo Region – Active Transportation Master Plan Workshops

Received for information.

l) P-11-089, Travelwise Transportation Management Association – Proposed Pilot Program

Rob Horne, Commissioner of Planning, Housing and Community Services, provided introductory comments. John Hill, Transportation Demand Management Planner, provided a brief overview of the program. He explained how the carpool program would function.

Chair Wideman indicated that he wanted to ensure that this program discount did not exceed the transit discounts through the Ontario Disability Support Program. He advised that was not the case.

MOVED by C. Zehr
SECONDED by B. Halloran

THAT The Regional Municipality of Waterloo (the Region) enter into an agreement (the TravelWise Program Services Agreement) with interested organizations and Area Municipalities in Waterloo Region to provide a pilot program of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) services including, but not limited to, online ridematching services, the Grand River Transit online Corporate Pass, and Emergency Ride Home services, as outlined in Report P-11-089, dated November 8, 2011, in a form satisfactory to the Regional Solicitor;
THAT Fees and Charges By-law No. 11-015 be amended effective January 1, 2012 to include a fee for TravelWise program services, as described in Report P-11-089, dated November 8, 2011;

AND THAT Fees and Charges By-law 11-015 be amended effective January 1, 2012 to include the TravelWise Corporate Transit Pass fees that to be charged in accordance with the TravelWise Program Services Agreement as follows, be based on the cost of an adult monthly pass:

- Twelve (12) month passes to be discounted by 15 percent;
- Nine (9) month passes to be discounted by 11.25 percent;
- Six (6) month passes to be discounted by 7.5 percent; and
- Three (3) month passes to be discounted by 5 percent.

CARRIED

INFORMATION/CORRESPONDENCE

a) Memo re: MTO Highway 7 / 85 Rehabilitation (north of King Street North Regional Road 15 to Krug Street) Public Information Centre

Received for information.

OTHER BUSINESS

a) Council Enquiries and Requests for Information Tracking List

Chair Wideman noted that there were two requests expected for this meeting and that staff would follow up on them. J. Haalboom inquired about her previous request regarding pedestrian legislation with the Ministry of Transportation of Ontario (MTO). T. Schmidt advised that staff discussions were ongoing with MTO and that staff will bring forward an update.

Received for information.

NEXT MEETING – December 6, 2011

ADJOURN

MOVED by L. Armstrong
SECONDED by J. Haalboom

THAT the meeting adjourn at 2:17 p.m.

CARRIED

COMMITTEE CHAIR, J. Wideman

COMMITTEE CLERK, J. Reid
Source Protection Plan Development – Approaches to Risk Mitigation Policies

Planning and Works Committee
November 8, 2011

Eric Hodgins, M.Sc., P.Geo
Manager Hydrogeology and Source Water Transportation & Environmental Services
Source Protection Planning

- Clean Water Act passed in 2006 to implement recommendations in the Walkerton Report
- Defines a multiple step process
  - Assessment Report – technical work
  - Source Protection Plan (SPP) – policies to mitigate risks to manage existing Significant threats and prevent future Significant threats
- SPP required to be submitted to MOE for approval by August 2012
The Assessment Report

- Maps Vulnerable areas
- Identifies Significant threats
  - Calculation: Vulnerability score x hazard rating >= 80
  - Water Quality Issue: all threats in all WHPA are Significant
- Requires a water budget (Tier 3)

- 2750 properties with Significant threats
- Issues: Chloride, nitrate and TCE
Significant Threat Areas
Source Protection Policy
‘Toolbox’

- **Clean Water Act Tools:**
  - Prohibitions
  - Restricted Land Uses
  - Risk Management Plans
  - Prescribed Instruments
    - Permits under Pesticide Act, Nutrient Management, EPA

- **Traditional Tools:**
  - Land-use planning policies
  - Incentive Programs
  - Education and Outreach
  - Specific actions
Principles To Policy Development

- Use experience from Water Resources Protection Master Plan
- Balance protectiveness, legal requirements and financial impacts
- More protective closer to well
- Use "carrot" (incentives) before "stick" (risk management plans) approach in first implementation round
- Use provincial instruments where available
- Implementation spanned over 5 years
Proposed Tools

- **Proposed implementation tools in 4 Tables**
  - Existing threats – no Issue, with Issue
  - Future threats – no Issue, with Issue

- **Conceptual approaches will be refined**
  - Property-specific review
  - During development of detailed SPP policies
  - Based on consultation feedback
  - Further analysis of implementation costs to municipalities and private property owners
Implications

- Existing property owners may have to undertake measures to reduce risk
- ROP/Official Plans may have to be amended
  - Proposed approach attempts to achieve same level of protection as current ROP
- Region/Area Municipality implementation responsibilities
  - Education programs
  - Region – risk management and incentive programs
  - Area municipalities – septic inspection programs
  - Annual reporting of progress
Tool and Policy Examples

- **Existing Septic Tank Threat – Specific Action**
  - Municipalities implement and administer an on-site sewage system inspection program within vulnerable well head areas ($V = 10$) as required under the Building Code.

- **Future Road Salt Storage Threat – Part IV Prohibition**
  - Uncovered storage of salt greater than 5,000 tonnes will be prohibited in vulnerable well head areas ($V=10$).
Timeline to Develop Plan

Region of Waterloo & SPC discuss policy options (The ‘toolbox’)

Region of Waterloo & SPC identify policy choices

Draft Plan goes to SPC

SPC revises Plan after consultation

Plan submitted to MOE

Public meeting for start of policy development

Public engagement and pre-consultation on policy choices

Formal (required) public consultation on Draft Plan

Timeline:
- April 2011: Public meeting for start of policy development
- 2012:
  - January: Public engagement and pre-consultation on policy choices
  - April: Formal (required) public consultation on Draft Plan
In this issue, get an update on where we’re at in the process of implementing the Clean Water Act and what comes next. Equally important, learn how you can provide your input as we develop policies and tools for drinking water protection. We’re seeking your feedback through a series of public consultation sessions, so please be sure you mark your calendars per the info on page 4.

**Next Step: Developing a Source Protection Plan**

The Clean Water Act was passed in 2006 to reduce risks to drinking water sources. It set out a multiple-step process over a number of years to establish a Source Protection Plan (SPP) that contains policies for decreasing risk to drinking water supplies.

As part of this process, municipal and Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) staff recently compiled information on threats to each county, region, and municipal drinking water system. These threats have been documented in an assessment report for each watershed in the Lake Erie Source Protection Region, which provides the technical basis for development of the SPP. The multi-stakeholder Lake Erie Source Protection Committee (SPC) is responsible for coordinating the development of both the Assessment Report and the SPP.

**SPP Development Process**

Work is underway on creating a draft of the proposed SPP. This includes developing policies and tools to manage existing and future significant threats for each municipal drinking-water system in the Grand River watershed.

While some of the municipalities have elected to have the GRCA develop their policies, many, including the Region of Waterloo, have decided their own policies for inclusion in the SPP.

By early December 2011, the municipalities will provide their preferred policies to the SPC so it can compile all of the proposed policies into the SPP and proceed with formal consultation in 2012. The goal is to submit the SPP to the province for approval by August 20, 2012.

A watershed is an area of land that drains into a common water body, such as a river or lake. The Grand River watershed, along with Kettle Creek, Catfish Creek, and Long Point Region watersheds all drain into Lake Erie. All four watersheds are included in The Lake Erie Source Protection Region.
Key Principles for SPP Policy Development

In the last issue of Facts on Tap, we outlined the 21 activities considered potential threats to our drinking water as identified by the Ministry of Environment. Creating policies to reduce the risk from these threats involves considering a number of important factors.

To assess these factors, the Region looked to our own 15 years of experience in implementing source protection programs. In addition, we incorporated both information from a series of discussion papers on each threat developed by municipal and GRCA staff, and guidance offered by the province. Together, this formed the basis for a number of principles. We’ll discuss these further at public consultation sessions in November, but in brief, three key ones are:

• Balancing voluntary and regulatory approaches, where possible giving property owners and municipalities the opportunity to initiate action

• Building on existing programs for source-water protection before creating new programs

• Applying a consistent approach in addressing all threats where possible, ensuring that one type of threat or sector is not regulated to a greater degree than others

To give you a sense of how principles, threats, and the tools to manage them might work together, here are a couple of examples. Since we don’t yet know what the final SPP policies and tools will be, these are examples of potential approaches which may change during the review and approval process.

Example 1:
Potential threat of nitrates from application of manure

Potential approach or tool:
1. For properties in close proximity to a municipal well where there is the greatest threat, the approach could be to prohibit the application of manure on the property.

2. For properties further away from the well but where there is still a threat to the water supply, the approach could be to allow it – but require a risk management plan to minimize the possibility of contamination. The risk management plan would be similar to a Nutrient Management Plan.

Example 2:
Potential threat of chloride from application of salt on parking lots

Potential approach or tool:
1. For properties in close proximity to a municipal well where there is the greatest threat, the approach could be to require a risk management plan. This would include certification in an existing salt management program such as smart about salt®.

2. For properties further away from the well but where there is still a threat to the water supply, the approach might be to provide education or financial incentives to encourage property owners to become accredited in salt management.

The policies are currently being developed and at this point in the process we don’t know the extent to which you may already be managing the threat. Therefore, we can’t determine the full financial or administrative implications at this time.

Please also note that if an activity on your property is flagged as a significant drinking water threat, the policies and tools in the SPP will apply to you. However, if you are not engaged in activities considered a significant threat, the policies won’t apply. You will be contacted once the SPP policies have been finalized to discuss what action needs to be taken.

For more detailed information on principles and tools or to give us feedback, come out to the public consultation sessions being held in November (see page 4 for dates).
**Policy Tools: A Snapshot**

Below is a brief summary of the policy tools the Ministry of Environment has identified to reduce threats to our existing and future drinking water supplies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prohibition</td>
<td>Eliminate or prohibit the activity. This tool can be used for existing and future threats. However, it is only to be used for existing threats if the SPC determines that there is no other feasible option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation (Risk Management Plans)</td>
<td>Regulate the activity. This means the activity can only occur if an approved Risk Management Plan is in place. Risk Management Plans are site-specific, locally negotiated plans developed between the municipal official and the person engaged in the activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Land Uses</td>
<td>Restrict land uses where the activity (threat) takes place. Activities would be linked to land uses, and any development applications or building permits would be subject to conditions around land use. This tool would be used in conjunction with Risk Management Plans and/or Prohibition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescribed Instruments</td>
<td>Amend or revoke a prescribed instrument. For example, have the Ministry of Environment do a review of a waste disposal site where a certificate of approval exists. Alternatively, for a new site request they do not issue a certificate of approval if near the well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Planning (future threats only)</td>
<td>Use the Planning Act. Manage or eliminate the threat through land use policy decisions (official plans, zoning bylaws and site plan controls).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Outreach/Incentive Programs</td>
<td>Implement programs to drive change. Create education, outreach, and/or incentive programs (usually financial) to encourage action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Specify Actions</td>
<td>Provide specific direction to municipalities or other agencies to develop programs requiring landowners to implement measures in the Source Protection Plan, or to achieve the plan’s objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Consultation Sessions Nov 2011: Your Chance to Provide Input

This fall, the Region of Waterloo will host three open houses to present the principles that will drive policy selection. We’ll also present the preliminary policy tools to manage each particular threat. This consultation is not required by legislation, but we want to make sure you have an opportunity to share your feedback on the proposed policies as the SPP is being developed.

Please attend one of the following sessions to ensure your voice is heard as we create the draft of proposed policies and tools. Although you’ll have opportunities later to provide feedback on the larger plan that includes policies for the entire watershed, we encourage you to provide feedback earlier in the process. That way, your voice can help shape the proposed policies up front.

### Session details:

#### Kitchener
**When:** November 16, 2011 from 5:30pm to 8:30pm  
**Where:** Front Lobby, 150 Frederick Street, Kitchener

#### Cambridge
**When:** November 17, 2011 from 5:30pm to 8:30pm  
**Where:** GRCA Auditorium, 400 Clyde Road, Cambridge

#### New Dundee
**When:** November 23, 2011 from 5:30pm to 8:30pm  
**Where:** New Dundee Community Centre, 1028 Queen Street, New Dundee

### Future Public Consultation

Once the SPP is compiled in 2012, there will be two rounds of formal public consultation. These offer additional opportunities to provide your input on the SPP policies and programs. These are proposed for April and July 2012 and will be led by the GRCA and SPC. Please check [www.sourcewater.ca](http://www.sourcewater.ca) for updates on timing and locations.

### Early Response Funding Available

You may be eligible for funding for projects that address significant drinking water threats. Priority will be given to those projects that address the greatest threats. These property owners will be contacted directly. To learn more about project eligibility please visit [www.sourcewater.ca](http://www.sourcewater.ca) or for more details contact Louise Heyming at the GRCA at 519-621-2761 or lheyming@grandriver.ca.

### Be Heard

It’s important that you attend a public consultation session in November to provide your input on proposed policies and tools. The feedback we receive at these sessions will be critical input into the development of the actual policy.

If you have questions specific to the policy tool choices please contact the Region of Waterloo Water Services below. If your questions are about the Clean Water Act and the development of the Source Protection Plan, please visit [www.sourcewater.ca](http://www.sourcewater.ca) for more information.
Rapid Transit

connecting to the future
June 15, 2011

• Council approved:
  – light rail transit (LRT) as the preferred technology
  – LRT route and stations
  – implementation of Stage 1

• Council directed staff to explore the feasibility of adjusting the LRT alignment in Uptown Waterloo
Uptown Waterloo Workshop

Welcome

Please review tonight’s agenda:

1. Register and obtain your name tag
2. Familiarize yourself with the ‘Providing feedback’ guidelines
3. Review the Route Alternative Information Boards
4. Enter the hall for participation in the Workshop
5. After the presentations, exit the hall via the left-hand door on indicated
6. Thank you for your participation and have a good night!
Recommendations

- Use the Waterloo Spur line from King St to Caroline St
- Additional LRT station at King St and Allen St
  - Northbound station on King St
  - Southbound station on Allen St
- Move the northbound LRT station at Willis Way to the Waterloo Spur line
This route...

• Provides effective operations
• Has minimal impact to property and utilities
• Maintains the current attractive streetscape of Uptown Waterloo
• Makes use of existing rail line with minimal impact to public square
LRT Stations

• Allen St station provides greater service to Uptown Waterloo
• Spur line station can integrate well with the Waterloo Town Square and future redevelopment
• Proposed station spacing is similar to that planned for downtown Kitchener
Next Steps

- **November 2011**: begin the 6-month Transit Project Assessment (TPA) for Stage 1

- **December 2011**: report on a preferred project procurement and delivery method
Transit Project Assessment Process

1. Distribute Notice of Commencement
2. Minister evaluates documentation
3. 35-Day Period
4. 120-Day Period
   - Confer with interested parties & prepare EPR
5. Publish Notice of Completion of EPR
6. 30-Day Period
   - Review of EPR by interested parties
7. Issue Statement of Completion
8. Proceed with implementation & construction
Next Steps

• **January 2012**: report on procurement and engineering consultants; host public consultation centres

• **May 2012**: complete the TPA for Stage 1

• **2014**: begin construction of LRT Stage 1 and begin the TPA for LRT Stage 2

• **2017**: complete construction and begin operation of LRT Stage 1
Questions?
KnoxWaterloo Rebuilding in Uptown
• Knox chose to stay in the core.
• Looked at relocation.
• Researched carefully and chose to stay in the core of Waterloo.
• Knew the LRT was coming.
• Want to be part of the intensification in the Region.
• Built to concert hall standards.
• Welcome many musical groups to our new facility.
• Were concerned about the plan to have a train on Erb Street.
Build to Concert Hall Standards
Acoustics are Vital

• We are to be a major centre for excellence with the arts community.
• Special relationship with the Wilfrid Laurier Faculty of Music.
• Many concerts with excellent reviews
• Building constructed to deal with traffic noise
• Was concerned about closeness of Erb St. LRT
A train on Erb would have created many problems
This proposal came out of a successful workshop
This LRT plan is great for Uptown
The Process is working

• Counsellors are listening to the people.
• The workshop was very appropriate.
• The LRT is very important to get right.
• Intensification is already happening.
• The fastest growth is in core areas.
• It is appropriate to have a spiritual presence in the centre of the city.
Benefits to the entire community
Our skyline is changing
Urban transportation needed
The consultation process is working.

I am here express appreciation for being listened to. “Well Done”

We are all in this together.
Thank you
TriTAG’s Statement on the Proposed Uptown LRT Routing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>LRT Stop at Erb Street</th>
<th>LRT Stop at Willis Way</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Recreation Complex</td>
<td>715m</td>
<td>920m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominion Hotel/Barrelyards (Construction)</td>
<td>320m</td>
<td>510m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.I.G.I.</td>
<td>30m</td>
<td>95m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perimeter Institute</td>
<td>240m</td>
<td>580m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heuther Hotel</td>
<td>475m</td>
<td>580m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Hotel</td>
<td>310m</td>
<td>415m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>85m</td>
<td>285m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound LRT Stop at Waterloo Town Square</td>
<td>225m</td>
<td>265m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starbucks</td>
<td>410m</td>
<td>165m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCBO</td>
<td>445m</td>
<td>240m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound LRT Stop at King and Allen</td>
<td>715m</td>
<td>495m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We humbly submit the following:

• That staff and Council consider the impact of moving the southbound Uptown platform from Willis Way to Erb and Caroline

• That the City of Waterloo and the Region of Waterloo continue to work together to redesign the Erb and Caroline intersection in a manner sensitive to the needs of both customers of the LRT system and users of the Iron Horse and Laurel Trails, without undue impacts on other vehicular movement.
Thank You
Chair Seiling, Members of Regional Council, Members of Staff, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you this afternoon once again about this subject. We congratulate other members of the community who have also come tonight to add their voice.

The Tri-Cities’ Transport Action Group is pleased that the Region of Waterloo has taken the time necessary to carefully explain the Uptown Waterloo routing challenges to the public in its September 27 meeting. This process of engagement was good for the community, and we hope to see more of it as the detailed system design commences. Doing this kind of consultation helps the public take ownership of what will in 2017 become their rapid transit system.

The preferred option helps to address new development in the quickly-growing area of Waterloo surrounded by the new station at King and Allen. In addition, moving one of the two platforms of the station at Willis Way next to the Public Square encourages people to use Waterloo’s main public space and its surroundings. The use of the spur line and the station platform adjacent to the square will allow for the preservation of surface parking on King, traffic flow on Erb, and is truly a best practice in placemaking. The spur routing will enhance a square that is already a resounding success for the City of Waterloo.

Some may not be terribly happy with the preferred alternative because they live on Caroline Street and see no reason for transit to be routed on what they perceive to be a back street through the core of the city. Although utility and cost constraints on the system’s design may not provide a satisfactory resolution for these residents, it is a very positive outcome to see their neighbourhood better served by rapid transit with the addition of the Allen Street station in the recommended alternative. Doing so goes a long way to making LRT a relevant and appropriate option for this part of your city.

TriTAG has been concerned from its inception about the usability of mass transit in the Region of Waterloo, and today brings you only one concern about the usability of this proposed solution.

TriTAG continues to be concerned about some other design issues such as mid-block stations building design inefficiency into the system for future iXpress-style routes, or when stations are placed at the back doors of neighbourhoods giving transit users second-class status. But in this case, we are concerned that a platform for a major station is split into two parts which are not visible from one another, thus interfering with effective wayfinding.

Waterloo - especially through C.I.G.I. and the Perimeter Institute - attract academic talent from around the world. So if one arrives in Uptown Waterloo via LRT, is it apparent where one would wait for the return train? With the southbound Uptown platform at Willis Way and Caroline, concealed from the public square platform, we think not.

Our solution to this issue would be to relocate the station at Caroline south of Willis way to the corner of Erb and Caroline. A station at this corner would more directly serve the northern and expanding western ends of Uptown, as well as providing an opportunity to optimize the Erb and Caroline intersection for all users.
We have listed at the end of this letter a set of major destinations for which access to LRT would be significant. Of the destinations which would benefit from a southbound platform at Erb Street instead of Willis Way, all are institutions unique to our local community. We humbly submit the following:

That staff and Council consider the impact of moving the southbound Uptown platform from Willis Way to Erb and Caroline and

That the City of Waterloo and the Region of Waterloo continue to work together to redesign the Erb and Caroline intersection in a manner sensitive to the needs of both customers of the LRT system and users of the Iron Horse and Laurel Trails, without undue impacts on other vehicular movement.

Together, we can make using transit in the Region of Waterloo both intuitive and gratifying if we build it with wayfinding and placemaking in mind.

Thank you for listening and thank you for your time. We hope you consider our submission.

For more information, feel free to contact us at hello@tritag.ca

Appendix A: Approximate Door-to-Door Walking Distances Between Southbound LRT Stops and Uptown Waterloo Destinations (Italics indicate shorter distance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>LRT Stop at Erb Street</th>
<th>LRT Stop at Willis Way</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Recreation Complex</td>
<td>715m</td>
<td>920m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominion Hotel/Barrelyards (Under Construction)</td>
<td>320m</td>
<td>510m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.I.G.I.</td>
<td>30m</td>
<td>95m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perimeter Institute</td>
<td>240m</td>
<td>580m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Hotel</td>
<td>475m</td>
<td>580m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Hotel</td>
<td>310m</td>
<td>415m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>85m</td>
<td>285m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound LRT Stop at Waterloo Town Square</td>
<td>225m</td>
<td>265m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starbucks</td>
<td>410m</td>
<td>165m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCBO</td>
<td>445m</td>
<td>240m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound LRT Stop at King and Allen</td>
<td>715m</td>
<td>495m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Walking distances were scraped from Google Maps using Google Maps’ Distance Measurement Tool from the following basemap: http://g.co/maps/nnvqs
I ask you to modify the proposed recommendation in two ways:

1. To include explicitly a fully functioning entrance to the Bauer development at 191 King Street South in Waterloo to include all turns. I think Regional Staff said that with 500 parking places and considerable turnover this was likely part of the plan but it should be explicit, and

2. To revise the recommended LRT plan in Uptown Waterloo to a two way route using King Street to William Street, then William Street to Caroline street then Caroline street to Erb street. Below I outline why this alternative is best for UpTown Waterloo when the long-term viability of the UpTown and the support of existing residents are considered.

Support for some recommendations

I support the inclusion of a LRT station at the intersection of King and Allen streets. This is because with construction now underway there are about 600 residential units, 1000 employees, and about 30+ retail outlets within one block of the stop. This node of intensification, along with other initiatives in UpTown, will shortly exceed the Region’s targets for UpTown employment and residential units, set for 2031.

It is noted that the Region’s rational that Kitchener downtown has 4 stops and UpTown only had one stop is disconcerting since it is the demand at each stop and the utilization of the LRT, not the number of stops, that should be the consideration. Unfortunate this “count criteria” used by the Region is typical of the totally inadequate approach taken to the review of the LRT routing.

Background

As stated in the Waterloo City report “Staff from the City and the Region met with TriTag representatives to discuss the proposed options on November 1, 2011”. The report does not mention meetings with the 51 UpTown households in the Catalina development (although a meeting was scheduled and then canceled) or meetings with the Citizens 4 Sensible Transit, since there were no meetings, prior to the recommendations, with those groups. It is unacceptable that the City and Region would consult with only those groups who in the past have supported LRT and not meet with groups who oppose LRT, especially since for the issue of routing of the LRT these residents have more concerns and also will suffer more impacts from the LRT routing.

The lack of a democratic consultation process – where special groups get to provide input prior to recommendations being made public – is typical of the flawed process used by the Region to review the UpTown routing. Fatal flaws also include the analysis and evaluation methods, which are discussed below, as well as fatal flaws in the consultation process, which have previously been provided in written form to Regional staff.
The inadequate nature of the consultation process means that the recommendations depend more on historical inertia and random thoughts of various planners involved than on any sort of structured, systematic, and rational analysis and evaluation which could be reported to and assessed by members of the public. In this environment council should step back and look at alternatives in a way that will allow the best routing to be determined.

As just one example of the flawed process consider the 9 alternatives for routing of LRT in UpTown – after asking the question 5 times, Thomas Schmidt of the Region staff, at the start of the October 27th consultation process agreed that 4 of the 9 options were exactly the same option – namely the previously recommended loop. The Loop, Erb St., Allen St. and Caroline S.(west?) are all the same option. It is not clear if this was intentional or that they did not notice, but certainly it would confuse the public. I know I was confused.

At the October 27th consultation, in conversations with Region staff, Regional councilors and TriTag members, I quickly learned that the now “recommended” solution was well known, reasonably set, and had been discussed with some special interests, all prior to the consultation.

Finally, the LRT characteristics will not be known until after the “design build” contract is let and the winner undertakes their work. Regional staff indicated that details such as the cross section of the LRT tracks would not be known until then as they might change as the design-build work is done within the restrictive budget. So the consultation is about a LRT line where key factors such as flush or not flush rail with pavement is not known, not is the curbing and fencing of the LRT right of way, both have significant impact on appearance and pedestrians.

**The evaluation of the Regional Report**

The Regional report in evaluating options uses the following factors: reducing “urban sprawl”; protect valuable farmland; reduce the construction of roads; serve the heart of UpTown; impact on properties and utilities; length and number of turns of the LRT route (also the travel time and operating time); LRT traveling in its own separated Right of Way opposed to traffic flow (traffic operational concern); width of the LRT ROW (curb side versus center of street locations); cross over of cars and LRT (also traffic signals impacts); parking; Rude Native patio; pedestrian trails; taking of properties (including heritage ones); goods loading and unloading; land taken from Town Square; one way street; loss of sidewalk; seniors resident - closeness to LRT and retaining wall; loss of turning lane; connections to bus services; realignment of freight line tracks; on street parking; wider sidewalks; and utilize existing Spur line.

While these evaluation criteria are mostly reasonable they generally suffer from two fatal flaws and one minor flaw:

1. **They are never measured in comparative terms such as $ construction cost, minutes of delay to traffic, etc.** They are all just general statements. It is not possible to compare options without measuring impacts in a comparative way. Even the flawed MAE uses some sore of rudimentary comparative measurements of impacts.

2. **Key impacts are left out of the analysis and evaluation.** Specifically:
1. **Impacts on UpTown residents in Catalina and Bauer Lofts.** Many Catalina residents will lose up to 20-25% of their property values, in my opinion, and Bauer Lofts, where I live will have traffic delays and access problems. The long term plan for UpTown depends heavily on a surrounding circle of attractive and stable housing around the retail/service/business core and the LRT threatens this stability and aesthetics.

2. **Impacts on the long-term viability of UpTown due to the “ring of rails”** which like the “ring of fire” in Johnny Cash’s song will lead “down, down, down”. There is always a wrong side of the tracks and with LRT tracks on King at the retail center of Waterloo, it is the east side where the independent merchants, who give UpTown its character, are located. See more discussion below under “UpTown, BIA”.

3. **Split LRT station** a block apart for north and south bound. This confusing and will reduce LRT ridership, and make transfers difficult.

There are also a number of inconsistencies in the analysis which include; Regina Street does not serve the heart of UpTown but Caroline St. does; the cross-over of LRT and road traffic at King and Allen St. is not a problem but the same situation at Erb and Caroline is; counting the number of turns rather than the difference in turns; number of access points on east side of Caroline a concern but not on west side; LRT two way on King south of Allen is center platform but north of William would be curb; removal of sidewalk when possible on private (expropriated) property;

**There are many other difficulties with the analysis and evaluation including the process used for public input, however, those listed above are sufficient to reject the proposed recommendation as being biased, based on previous plans rather than serious analysis of options and being based on evaluation criteria which are biased to traffic and engineering concerns and leave out concerns of residents and viability of UpTown. The resulting recommendations are meaningless.**

**UpTown and BIA**

The viability of UpTown, a key concern, should be the concern of the BIA. In consultation with the BIA prior to November 21 (it appears since they had knowledge of the basic elements of the recommended plan of November 4) the city of Waterloo indicates support of the BIA for the recommended plan. In my opinion, based on limited knowledge, I think that the members of the BIA are concerned about parking and problems with access during construction and not so much on the longer term viability of UpTown. In my view, their time horizon is 2-5 years. For the independent merchants, given the rate of change in the retail sector many face the probability of going out of business in UpTown in that time frame (see also the vacancy rate in the mall). Added to this is the confusion about what the characteristics of the LRT and the impacts of the LRT route would be. This confusion comes from Regional reports and consultation process which like the ones critiqued above tend to have limited information for understanding and making choices and always are more PR in appearance than meaningful consultation.

On the other hand the UpTown Vision committee has as their mandate the long term viability of UpTown Their “Vision” is approved by council. The previous committee, of which I was a member, voted unanimously against the LRT on the basis of the impact of a LRT track and
Proposed LRT Routing in UpTOWN

A LRT route up King Street to William, then west to Caroline and onto Erb, all two way, with stations at King and Allen and at Caroline and Willis Way (station to the south where ROW is available from city owned parking lots) is proposed.

The relative advantages of this route and practical implementation details are:

1. Reduces the impact on Catalina residents and also residents of the senior’s home since the LRT will be further away and noise and vibrations will be less.
2. Removes LRT from dividing the central retail area of UpTOWN and meets with criteria for the UpTOWN Vision for Waterloo, previously approved by council.
3. Reduces the loss of parking in the central area of Waterloo where ½ hour parking can service a high number of short term shoppers and business people.
4. Makes a more understandable LRT system as there are no split stations. Also the connection to cross town buses which feed the LRT would be much better with a unified station, important especially in winter.
5. Shifts traffic problems to Caroline and William street which are minor streets.
6. Manageable cross section on William street if expropriation of the church property is used to maintain sidewalks on both sides of the street. Limited but still two way traffic would be possible. For example, there is already a retaining wall at the senior’s residence.
7. Manageable LRT cross section on Caroline due to city ownership on the west side of the street where the station would be located. Also north of Willis Way there would be still room for two way traffic and the Canada trail, however, it would be tight and the saving grace is that it is a minor street.
8. Loss of the heritage property at Caroline and William is reasonable in terms of the other benefits of this alternative, in my view.

There are many more details of this alternative, which it is not possible to go into here.

Summary

1. Both the consultation process and the analysis and evaluation of LRT routes in UpTOWN are fatally flawed. The resulting recommendation, other than being similar to the previous proposal with the sensible addition of an Allen-King station and possible use of the Spur line, are not supported or supportable by the analysis and process used.

2. A LRT two way route on Caroline, William and King street would, with a defensible analysis and evaluation be the best alternative, mainly because it addresses the major but omitted concerns of attractiveness and stability of UpTOWN residential areas and the long term viability of UpTOWN retail, business and service uses, because of the maintaining of the existing ambiance of a green and pedestrian friendly streetscape.
City of Waterloo Council
Rose Clemens, Clerks Office


Attachments: Attachments 1 and 2

Ms Clemens,

Please enter this letter and the attachments into the public record. Please have read the text shown in blue during the Council meeting on Monday, November 7, 2011 (as the entire submission to too lengthy to be read in the time allotted per person). These documents are a submission to Council so please ensure it enters into and remains as part of the public record, starting with the meeting minutes

All,

I have prepared this letter to Council for the Monday, November 7 council meeting to:

1. Express disappointment with the tight time windows imposed by the City of Waterloo and the Region of Waterloo for citizen input re LRT route matter
2. Request that the City give a mandate to the LRT Planners that as part of due diligence, they provide upfront studies to show the impact of rail/wheel interaction studies for “wheel squeal”, general steel wheel on steel track noise PLUS vibration problems while taking into account distance to homes (8-10 ft from Catalina home to the current Caroline Street sidewalk) and turn radius on the Caroline and Allen corner
3. Request that the City give a mandate to the LRT planners to identify what contingency plans and budgeting measures (consultancy fees, lawsuits, etc.) have been included in the almost $300 million dollar budget to rectify noise and vibration problems (including costs of mitigation measures (sound-proofing of homes, sound walls built on the Iron Horse Trail along the Catalina homes, etc) to private property)
4. Request that the City give a mandate to the LRT planners to conduct a traffic study on Caroline and Allen Streets over a period of time to identify traffic patterns, traffic load factor, disruption from merchandise loading and off-loading, etc.
5. Express additional observations about the decision to route the LRT by the Catalina development

This letter and its attachments reflect my personal opinions.

Item #1:

Please refer to Attachment #1 regarding the notification from the City dated November 3 in an unaddressed envelope in my home mail box on Thursday, November 3 for a representation opportunity to a Council meeting on Monday, November 7.

I think it is unreasonable for such short notice to busy citizens: These activities are what council employees do for a living, it is not what we do for a living: We have jobs and other responsibilities and often cannot change on short notice. I see this as indirect citizen voice muzzling.

Citizens on a regional email distribution list received a similar directive on the same day for a meeting on Tuesday, November 8. In fact, I believe this specific situation may now be used in a university level social policy course as a “what not to do” example.

Recommendation: Re-examine the City’s notice policy to encourage greater citizen participation.
Item #2:
I do not feel that the region’s reply regarding “wheel squeal” and general steel wheel on steel track is sufficient. I spoke to a regional consultant engineer at the unveiling of the route at the William Street church. He acknowledged that I, living on the corner of Allen and Caroline would experience “wheel squeal” problems.
We, especially the citizens living in the Catalina development, need and deserve more concrete demonstration of what the LRT planners will do, do not just say or expect:

“Staff will also ensure that the recommended route option will be designed to keep noise and vibration levels within Ministry of Environment accepted standards along the LRT route. With modern wheel/rail technology and a generous turning radius at each corner, we expect the LRT system to be quite quiet.”

From an article in “Interface, The Journal of Wheel/Rail Interaction” (http://interfacejournal.com/features/07-10/transitWRI/1.html):

- “Reducing noise generated at the wheel/rail interface is a challenge for most rail transit systems. High decibel noise originating from wheel squeal, impact at joints and special track work, and normal rolling wheel/rail contact add up quickly and can be difficult to manage. Sound walls that run parallel to the rail line are often used to mitigate noise on inner city transit systems. “
- “Unfortunately, the wheel/rail interface rarely gets the attention that it deserves during the design phase of a new system. Poorly matched vehicle/track designs and components lead to challenging (and expensive) problems that typically appear early in the service life of the system. When this occurs, the design/builder is often faced with the hassle and expense of post-engineering a solution in order to begin or maintain revenue service. In other cases, the operator is faced with unexpected maintenance costs several years down the road.
- “Proper pre-engineering of the interface requires a comprehensive understanding of vehicle/track dynamics, however, and the balancing act that managing the numerous forces that are involved represents (see Figure 1). Challenging though managing them may be, the consequences of ignoring the effects of these forces are too great to ignore.”

Also see Item #3.

Item #3:
This is related to Item #2. If you Google “LRT wheel squeal vibration” or similar search words, Google will present you with all sorts of technical and real world problems that have been encountered.

- http://projects.soundtransit.org/x12907.xml?txt:
  - “Sound Transit is working to reduce Link light rail train noise: Sound Transit has heard the complaints about noise from Link light rail trains” (Seattle, WA)
    - “When Sound Transit was designing the Link light rail system, the agency predicted the noise levels of Link light rail trains based on the experience of other similar light rail transit systems. Based on those expected noise levels, mitigation features were designed into the original project. These features included sound-insulating some of the homes along Martin Luther King Jr. Way S. in south Seattle and constructing noise walls in Tukwila. … Sound Transit has a noise consultant under contract who measures and documents noise levels throughout the alignment and in locations where complaints have been received. The consultant is working with the agency to develop solutions in areas where noise levels exceed federal standards. … On Sept. 24, 2009, the Sound Transit Board unanimously passed a motion authorizing agency staff to expedite the design, procurement, and implementation of solutions to noise problems related to wheel squeal and crossover switches.”
There are two levels of impact included in the FTA criteria, as summarized below. Project-generated noise in the severe impact range can be expected to cause a significant percentage of people to be highly annoyed by the new noise and represents the most compelling need for mitigation. Noise mitigation will normally be specified for severe impact areas unless there are truly extenuating circumstances that prevent it. … These factors include the existing noise level, the predicted level of increase over existing noise levels, the types and numbers of noise sensitive land uses affected, the noise sensitivity of the properties, the effectiveness of the mitigation measures, community views and the cost of mitigating noise to more acceptable levels”

MPR lawsuit third against Central Corridor project

“But the Met Council's Bell says lawsuits are an inevitable part of massive transportation projects. And Peter Rogoff, the head of the Federal Transit Administration, this week said as much in a conference call with reporters. Rogoff said the FTA will push the Central Corridor project forward.”

Item #4:
Please refer to Attachment 2 for item #3 regarding the transport trailer and tanker truck traffic associated with businesses having loading docks and delivery entrances on Caroline and Allen (ValuMart, Brick, Vincenzo’s, funeral home). I have seen a transport truck in ValuMart’s loading dock, and waiting at the same time, one parked in the centre of Caroline Street and one parked on the west side of Caroline Street. Also, the City did not put street parking on the north side of Allen because of the loading dock at the Bauer Lofts.

Item #5:
My specific concerns regarding the Caroline Street routing of the LRT are listed in Attachment 2. I would like to add a few other items, numbered below for future reference to this letter. I have found some of the LRT planners’ answers to some to be opposite to others held by LRT:

1. What weight is the City of Waterloo and the Regional government applying to the LRT impact on the rights of the homeowners along Caroline Street to a peaceful existence when there are other alternative routes available through non-residential areas such as Regina or King?
2. LRT planners have acknowledged that they have chosen to disrupt Catalina residents’ lives over that of the retirement home at Caroline and William. However, Catalina is primarily a seniors community which is low-built residential versus a retirement home, because of its nature and location on King, is built to be more impervious to street noise than the Catalina townhouses.
3. The provincial government’s intensification directive (is this really the law?) is cited by the region as routing it along Caroline because of the existing developments such as Seagrams, Catalina, Bauer Lofts, Alexandra School and future developments such as 144 Park. However, currently, we have the Willow street high-rise homes on the east side of King and the upcoming Red Condominiums and the proposed condos on King and William.
4. Has Council weighed the “cheaper” up-front costs for the Caroline route in context of costs associated with mitigating sound and vibration problems (technical, lawsuits, etc)

Thank you
Pauline Shang Au
Re: Region of Waterloo Rapid Transit - Uptown Waterloo Workshop
1 message
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
pauline shangau < pshangau@gmail.com > Fri, Nov 4, 2011 at 10:09 AM
To:

I am concerned about the late notice given to people on this DL (for this email showing all workshop attendees; I apologize for continuing this breach of privacy but I am making use of it...) and about the City of Waterloo unaddressed letter put in the mailboxes of the "Residents of Catalina Development/Caroline Street" yesterday regarding the deadlines for presentations for:

- The report, "Uptown Waterloo Light Rail Transit Route Alignment and Stations" report to be presented at the Region's Planning and Works Committee on Tuesday, Nov 8, 2011 (not available until after 4:30 pm, Friday, Nov 4, 2011; Delegations to request speaking time by noon, Monday, Nov 7)
- The City of Waterloo Staff report on potential changes to the Uptown Waterloo rapid transit alignments from the east side of Caroline to the west side (not posted at the given link which was to be active yesterday afternoon; written or verbal representations to council at the council meeting on Monday, Nov 7 - no deadline given)

Being naive, before becoming a homeowner, I believed that local councils would be closer to citizen opinions and needs. I am so disappointed to find out otherwise.

Citizens have full time jobs and responsibilities, they want to feel that they are heard, respected, their questions answered directly, and be given appropriate time to respond to such reports: I do not feel that this late notification by the Region of Waterloo and City of Waterloo councils demonstrate that they know what citizens want so they feel they have any say in how communities are planned.

On Thu, Nov 3, 2011 at 1:38 PM, Veronica Naas < VNaas@regionofwaterloo.ca > wrote:
Good Afternoon Everyone,
I am sending this email out on behalf of Nancy Button.

Dear Resident:

Re: Uptown Waterloo Light Rail Transit Route Alignment Workshop

Thank you to those residents who participated in the Tuesday, September 27, 2011 workshop in Uptown Waterloo and provided us with your feedback.

The recommended “Uptown Waterloo Light Rail Transit Route Alignment and Stations” report will be presented to the Region’s Planning & Works Committee on Tuesday, November 8, 2011. Any delegations for this matter will be heard at approximately 1:00 p.m. in the Regional Council Chambers, 150 Frederick Street, 2nd Floor, Kitchener.

If you wish to appear as a delegation at this Committee meeting, please register in advance by calling Council Administrative Services office at 519-575-4420 or emailing Kim Hodasy khodasy@regionofwaterloo.ca before
noon on Monday November 7, 2011. Please note that all delegates who register before the deadline will receive ten (10) minutes to speak and delegates who register after the deadline will receive five (5) minutes to speak.

The report will be posted after 4:30 p.m. on Friday, November 4, 2011 via the rapid transit website www.regionofwaterloo.ca/rapidtransit. For those people without internet access, a hard copy will be available in the Region’s Clerks Office located at 150 Frederick Street, 2nd Floor, Kitchener.

Yours truly,

Nancy Button, MBA, Ph.D., P.Eng.
Director, Rapid Transit

Veronica Naas, Hons. B.A., OCT
Rapid Transit Assistant/Communications
Rapid Transit Division
Transportation & Environmental Services
Region of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street, 6th Floor
Kitchener, ON, N2G 4J3
T. 519-575-4757 x3536
F. 519-745-4040
vnaas@regionofwaterloo.ca
RE: Uptown Waterloo LRT Route Workshops/Need for National Transportation Policy
From: Pauline SHANG AU
Sent: October-24-11 8:51:21 PM
To: n

Thank you.
However, this reply does not specifically address some of my stated concerns and my indirect concerns. In
fact, it confirms my suspicions that the region will be confirming the route down the west side of Caroline: I,
among others, will be seeking legal advice regarding any options that we may have.

My item #1 and #2: Why was an workshop format chosen when the Catalina citizens wanted to talk to
councillors about the impact on Catalina? Why only one "alternate" non-Caroline route when others were
presented throughout this process, including at least one by Dr. Shortreed? I do not see the results of your
sessions posted on your sitr. Indeed, even the workshop materials seem to have disappeared

My item #3: Transport trailer and tanker loading and offloading. For example, last week on my way to work,
I noticed a transport trailer at the ValuMart loading dock with another parked in the middle of Caroline and a
third parked by the curb on the west side of Caroline

My item #4: I heard this repeated again and again regarding intensification. I was very disappointed that
council did not seem to see if it made econimic and sociological sense for their watch areas.

My item #5: Am I to interpret the detailed response to this concern that the region has decided that it will run
down the west side of Caroline? As I noted in an earlier email, I found it hard to believe that staff did not
determine the existence of utility lines on the east side of Caroline as OZA examined my property inside and
out before the city tore up the road at the Allen and Caroline intersect at least two times

My item #8: Again, as I noted in an earlier email, an engineering consultant did confirm my query that the
train would squeal around the Caroline Allen Corner. Also, I would like an answer from each of you to my
direct query, "... would YOU want to be living with that squeal?"

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

From: NButton@regionofwaterloo.ca
To: pshangau@hotmail.com
CC: brenda.halloran@waterloo.ca; JMitchell@regionofwaterloo.ca; Melissa.Durrell@waterloo.ca;
JBrewer@regionofwaterloo.ca; JWideman@regionofwaterloo.ca; BStortz@regionofwaterloo.ca;
TCowan@regionofwaterloo.ca; SStrickland@regionofwaterloo.ca; cmillar@regionofwaterloo.ca;
GLorentz@regionofwaterloo.ca; TSchmidt@regionofwaterloo.ca; MMurray@regionofwaterloo.ca
Date: Mon, 17 Oct 2011 16:14:12 -0400
Subject: RE: Uptown Waterloo LRT Route Workshops/Need for National Transportation Policy

Dear Ms. Shang Au,
Thank you for providing your comments regarding the Uptown Waterloo light rail transit (LRT) route alignment.

I’m sorry that you were disappointed with the workshop format; we received a lot of positive feedback on the workshop format from the people who participated in the discussions. I understand that you are very busy, which is why you were unable to stay at the workshop and participate in the discussion that followed after you stated your points. The workshop discussions did cover a wide range of route options, ranging from Caroline Street to Weber Street. The discussions also covered traffic impacts, which vary by route option, and which will be considered by staff in the route recommendation. The intensification of Uptown Waterloo through redevelopment was also noted and discussed, and underlines the need for a rapid transit system to support that intensification.

Please note that access between Caroline Street and Norman, Fullerton, and Freemont Streets will be maintained. For the route option with LRT on the west side of Caroline Street, full access (the same as today) or outbound-only access are both feasible.

Staff will ensure that the recommended route option will allow emergency and service vehicle access to all of the properties and neighbourhoods along the LRT route. We recently met with the Fire Chiefs of the Cities of Waterloo and Kitchener to discuss this issue. It should be noted that emergency vehicles may use the rapidway to bypass general traffic when responding to an emergency.

Staff will also ensure that the recommended route option will be designed to keep noise and vibration levels within Ministry of Environment accepted standards along the LRT route. With modern wheel/rail technology and a generous turning radius at each corner, we expect the LRT system to be quite quiet.

If you have any further comments or questions, please feel free to contact me at your convenience.

Yours truly,
Nancy Button, MBA, Ph.D., P.Eng.
Director, Rapid Transit
Region of Waterloo
519-575-4757 x3650
NButton@RegionofWaterloo.ca
1. I was disappointed at the workshop format rather than an open forum: It indicated to me an attempt to contain citizen comments and discussion to the immediate groups (even though points were selected to be displayed). Also, no provision was made to submit comments online - make it easy for us busy citizens if you really want us involved!

2. The residents of Catalina had requested a meeting with their councillors to discuss the re-routing AWAY from Caroline - I had expected this courtesy. Instead we get a "workbook" on attending the workshops that has 9 routes, of which 7 run on Caroline. In essence only one "new" non-Caroline route

3. Traffic consideration #1: I have not heard anything from the region regarding impact on traffic flow of the LRT affecting the private vehicles AND the transport and tanker truck traffic on Caroline and Allen that now services Valu-Mart, the funeral home (casket deliveries), the beer business and the businesses at the Bauer lofts. The transport and tanker trucks now disrupt Caroline's traffic flow as they back into the loading docs

4. Traffic consideration #2: The traffic will get worse with the 18 storey condo approved for 144 Park. Mady Development has indicated that they want to build a SECOND tower that was not mentioned in their application of the approved tower.

5. Impact on the neighbourhood: As a resident, I do not want the Norman, Fullerton, Freemont to be closed off from Caroline - it will change the nature of the community and how the residents interact

6. Impact on citizen safety: As a resident, I do not want our safety compromised because of the street closings: The streets are now narrower than the city code now. Does the proposal break emergency service requirements for fire trucks and ambulances?

7. Better use of taxation dollars: As a taxpayer whose is part of the working masses paying federal, provincial, Waterloo City, and Region of Waterloo taxes, I think we should be thinking smarter about transportation and be realistic about where the real needs are. Our federal, provincial, and municipal governments should be co-operating to make best use of our tax dollars and to provide the right public transportation choices.

We need an improved expanded local bus service for Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo plus GO Train service to bring in the young workers who want to work with the firms here but are not willing to give up the social pluses of the GTA. You may think that it goes against the interests of the region to be promoting day workers from the GTA. But these young workers do get older and when that time is right for them, you'll get your increase in your tax payer base when they decide to give up the commute and settle in our tri-city area to raise their families. By the time the population grows to justify a LRT, postponing the proposed LRT means the taxpayers won't be stuck with a legacy outdated LRT system

8. As the owner of the property at the corner of Caroline and Allen, I do not want to hear the squeal of the LRT wheels as it rounds the corner from Caroline to Allen every 7 minutes: Please sit back and ask yourself, would YOU want to be living with that squeal?

Links:
http://www.therecord.com/topic/rapidtransit
http://rapidtransit.region.waterloo.on.ca/

Thank you

-------------------------------

From: SStrickland@regionofwaterloo.ca
Thanks for your comments and observations. Much appreciated. I am considering and weighing all points of view prior to the final decision on June 15th. Thanks for sharing your perspective.

Regards,
Sean Strickland
Regional Councillor
PS my proposed route change includes looking at re-routing LRT southbound along Caroline to William and then William to King...thus avoiding your section of Carolina entirety...

Join me on Facebook
http://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=100000090343416

Some of you were not included at the start of this email thread. The Region's website has changed since then such that email is done in-situ within the website so councillors' email addresses are not displayed for other methods of email contact.

To recap - further details for the following numbered items are provided earlier in the thread:

I support expansion of the current bus service: I do not support LRT because like many, I do not have any faith in the ridership forecasts for the Region of Waterloo. We, the taxpayers, cannot afford to waste money to prop up the capital and operating costs of LRT. If I assume the Hydro household count from an article in today's Record, then the municipal tax rolls AND the renter households only add up to 181,000 households (86,000 for Kitchener, 50,000 for Waterloo and 45,000 for Cambridge): I don't know the proportion of rental properties but renters are not hit as hard as home owners are, especially the $500/month students pay as rent. As someone owning a townhouse in Uptown Waterloo, I am paying higher municipal taxes ($4.2K), thus subsidizing the suburbanites who won't use the LRT because of the infrequency of bus service to this single line LRT. I add this because I notice that it is the students and new grads (Google is great for finding info) who form the majority of people who are always writing, "We pay municipal taxes too through our rent!").

Mr Strickland has proposed two route changes, of which only one was fully described in the Record. I called the Record and was told that the second was just a reversion to the initial proposal whereby it would run down the east side of Caroline instead of the west side - 3 metres is NOT going to make any difference about the screech of wheels as it turns the corner from Caroline to Allan. I want to state that I do not want the line through Caroline in my neighbourhood as it will be too disruptive (frequency and screech) to the tax paying homeowners in the Bauer lofts, Catalina, and the yet to be built 144 Park - I would not want to be the buyer of the corner townhouse at 144 Park - these start at $575K as a base price.

Regarding the reply that all councillors even those whose constituents won't be paying for it, should be able to vote for or against LRT, may I use a business parallel? An executive may sign for expense items up to say, $5,000 without getting approval. Meanwhile, his/her executive assistant who supports the same team cannot do the same.
Finally, there is a vast middle class who are too busy juggling work, families, caring for homes so they simply do not have the time or energy to write, attend the forums or march in rallies to protest this tax burden for an under-utilized LRT. Of these, some simply cannot believe that anyone could support LRT while others feel hopeless and feel that it is a done deal. The best way probably to reach this portion of the population was through the past municipal elections. Instead, fluoridation, a much cheaper item, was put to referendum.
I would like a reply to acknowledge receipt. Thanks to Ms Mitchell (2 replies to this thread), Mr Strickland (1) and Ms Millar (1)

From: JMitchell@regionofwaterloo.ca
To: pshangau@hotmail.com
Date: Wed, 8 Jun 2011 11:45:49 -0400
Subject: RE: LRT and pre-municipal election statements

No backroom deals.

Quorum will be there on the 15th.

Just like I can vote for the Museum even though there isn't a museum in Waterloo, so township councillors can vote for transit even though they don't have transit.

Sincerely,

Jane Mitchell

From: Pauline SHANG AU [pshangau@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, June 05, 2011 12:37 PM
To: Claudette Millar; Jane Brewer; Geoff Lorentz; Jim Wideman; Jane Mitchell; Sean Strickland; Brenda Halloran; Laura Armstrong; Todd Cowan
Subject: RE: LRT and pre-municipal election statements

I'd like to thank Sean Strickland, Jane Mitchell and Claudette Millar for acknowledging receipt of this email as I had requested. Could someone ensure that this email is sent to the entire Regional council? Thank you

On the weekend, I read an article that I would like to bring to your attention - it's the latest one at the top using a Ponzi scheme parallel. There are previous ones that are about LRT as well.
http://observerxtra.com/2/index.php?s=lr

I have a few other questions and followups:
1. What does the act governing municipal councils say about quorum requirements for binding decisions made by municipal councillors eligible to vote?
2. What does the act say about municipal councillors' eligibility to vote on matters that affect taxation that affects only a portion of the municipal tax roll?
3. In the event that the municipal council does vote for an LRT because they believe the dubious projected ridership and costs, Will the taxpaying public have any say in the actual configuration details? I am anticipating changes to try to reduce costs.
4. I have asked this of Mayor Halloran but have not yet received a response - I hope this is just a delay because of the volume of emails and letters to her objecting to the validity of this project. Have the regional and city councils taken proactive steps to ask their solicitors regarding the possibility of homeowner legal action against the city for the disruption of the enjoyment of our properties due to noise and the
reconfiguration of our neighbourhoods as is suddenly (Feb 2011) being proposed for the Catalina Townhouse community?
5. Is is true that there was a backroom deal done with the Uptown Waterloo BIA that for their silence and non-participation in the LRT talks, there would only be one line running through King instead of two and that's why the Caroline Street line running along peoples homes was selected?
6. I cannot believe that the City of Waterloo and the Regional Councillors have not pushed for the relocation of the Caroline St line that affects homes! I cannot support any backroom deals (if Item 5 is true) or the claim that it would be too expensive to run the line through Regina St where there are no homes directly affected. Also the claim that running the line on Caroline serves the condos that are presently there (Seagrams) and are slated to be built is not a good reason. There are condos and homes adjacent to Regina (but out of earshot unlike Caroline) such as those on Willow that should be considered.
I await all of your response to this email thread. Thank you

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

From: pshangau@hotmail.com
To: cmillar@regionofwaterloo.ca; jbrewer@regionofwaterloo.ca; glorentz@regionofwaterloo.ca; jwideman@regionofwaterloo.ca; jmitchell@regionofwaterloo.ca; sstrickland@regionofwaterloo.ca; brenda.halloran@waterloo.ca; larmstrong@regionofwaterloo.ca; tcowan@regionofwaterloo.ca
Subject: LRT and pre-municipal election statements
Date: Tue, 31 May 2011 10:07:04 -0400

I, as a City of Waterloo taxpayer, do not support any of the eleven LRT proposals: I support expansion of the current bus system and increased frequency of the upcoming GO Train service between Kitchener and Toronto: Both of these will attract the workers that Communitech wants but cannot attract due to the big city lifestyle young tech workers want.

I am writing to ask that you hold to your pre-election statements regarding rapid transit for the cities of Waterloo, Cambridge and Kitchener. For those with conditional "against" statements, please consider:

questionable ridership figures along with the likely ridership profile (30 thousand transient students being the core?), realistic growth expectations for the three cities, our proximity to our competitor Toronto recently listed as a Beta city, lack of concentrated business centres along the line between two shopping malls impact of the eleven rail proposals on the taxpayer, the cityscapes (especially downtown Waterloo) and the disruptions on residents like myself who are directly on a turning corner at Allen and Caroline in Waterloo. likely cost overruns as shown by the additional cost needed to suddenly relocate the train from the east side to the west side of Caroline in Waterloo which "requires" eliminating parking and permanently closing off three streets to traffic (and this is an area that was dug up at least two times last year)

This is not personal but I find it disturbing that some of the voting members represent populations who will not be paying for the transit project. In addition, the fact that four voting members declared conflicts of interest so late in the process, is also disturbing. There are SO many red flags, we should all take a step back before rushing into a project just because taxpayers' money in form of federal and provincial funding is available.

I would like an acknowledgement from each of you so I know my email has been read. Thanks you

From today's Record:
Regional council will hear public input on the proposal Tuesday and Wednesday evenings this week at council chambers in Kitchener.
What they said to get elected

Campaign pledges for the Oct. 25, 2010 municipal election:
Claudette Millar (Cambridge): Number one, you have to have the ridership, and we don’t yet, and we won’t, for a number of years; and number two, it has to service the whole community, not just part of it.
Jane Brewer (Cambridge): I will not support going ahead with light rail with the funding that we now have.
Geoff Lorentz (Kitchener): I cannot support the current proposal for the LRT (light rail transit system) as it is too costly for regional taxpayers.
Jim Wideman (Kitchener): Light rail is still my preferred option but it has to be affordable.
Jean Haalboom (Kitchener): Yes (to the question: Do you support the light rail transit system?)
Mayor Carl Zehr (Kitchener): I have been and continue to be a supporter of the LRT proposals.
Jane Mitchell (Waterloo): I do not support increasing property taxes to support the current LRT proposal.
Sean Strickland (Waterloo): I will not support the LRT if we have to raise taxes by nine per cent.
Brenda Halloran (Waterloo): I will not support LRT under current funding conditions.
Mayor Les Armstrong (Wilmot): The light rail proposal is so expensive that to waste taxpayers’ money on something that may never become popular is not wise.
Mayor Todd Cowan (Woolwich): No, not at this time. It is a considerable amount of money and chances are the $700-million price tag is a low estimate.
Note: Excludes four councillors who have declared conflicts of interest. Excludes Wellesley Mayor Ross Kelterborn whose campaign stance is not known.
November 8, 2011

Regional Municipality of Waterloo
Council & Administrative Services Division
150 Frederick Street, 2nd Floor
Kitchener, ON  N2G 4J3

ATTENTION:  Kris Fletcher,
Director, Council & Administrative Services/
Regional Clerk

Dear Ms. Fletcher:

RE:  Review of Light Rail Transit UpTown Options 2011

Please be advised that on November 7, 2011 the Council of The Corporation of the City of Waterloo passed the following resolution:

1) That Council receive and approve PWS2011-071, including the detailed Recommendations attached as Appendix ‘A’ to PWS2011-071;

2) that the City Clerk forward PWS2011-071, including the detailed Recommendations in Appendix ‘A’, and the related resolution of Waterloo City Council, to Regional Council prior to Regional Council’s consideration of any staff report related to Light Rapid Transit (LRT) alignments in UpTown Waterloo;

3) that Waterloo City Council request Regional Council to direct Regional staff to carefully consider the opportunities for maintaining a fully functioning entrance to the Bauer Lofts on King Street;

4) that Waterloo City Council request Regional Council to direct Regional staff to work with City of Waterloo staff with regard to traffic data collection going forward in the Caroline/Allen/Park/John area;

5) that Waterloo City Council highlight noise concerns, particularly along Caroline Street, and that Regional Council be requested to direct Regional staff to focus on noise mitigation in this area; and
6) that the correspondence received from Pauline Shang Au be forwarded to Regional Council."

A copy of report PWS2011-071 is attached for your assistance along with correspondence received from Pauline Shang Au dated November 6, 2011 as in Recommendation 6.

Yours truly,

[Signature]
Susan Greatrix, City Clerk
City of Waterloo

Tel (519) 747-8705 | Fax (519) 747-8510
TTY (866) 786-3941 | susan.greatrix@waterloo.ca

SG/rc
Encl.

C.C. Mayor Brenda Halloran
Tim Anderson, Chief Administrative Officers
Phil Hewitson, Director, Traffic
Scott Nevin, Director, Policy Development
RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That Council receive and approve PWS2011-071, including the detailed Recommendations attached as Appendix 'A' to PWS2011-071; and.

2. That the City Clerk forward PWS2011-071, including the detailed Recommendations in Appendix 'A', and the related resolution of Waterloo City Council, to Regional Council prior to Regional Council’s consideration of any staff report related to Light Rapid Transit (LRT) alignments in Uptown Waterloo.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

On June 15, 2011 Region of Waterloo Council confirmed the LRT alignment from Fairview Mall to Conestoga Mall, but directed staff to consult with the City of Waterloo and interested Waterloo citizens and Uptown businesses to explore the feasibility of adjusting the LRT alignment in Uptown Waterloo. If improvements to the routing were identified, staff would prepare a report for consideration by Region Council at the appropriate time. Regional staff, with the support of City staff, hosted a workshop on September 27, 2011 at Knox Presbyterian Church to glean public input on various LRT route options in Uptown Waterloo. City staff have been working with Region staff to review the options. This report outlines the review and makes recommendations to City Council based on this review.

On November 8, 2011, Region Planning and Works Committee will be considering a Region staff report on the route options, as well as the outcome of the City of Waterloo Council consideration of the City Council report PWS2011-071.
**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**
None.

**LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS:**
None.

**LINK TO STRATEGIC PLAN:**
Links to Strategic Pillars in the 2011 – 2014 City of Waterloo Strategic Plan:

1. Sustainability and Our Living Environment
2. Continue to plan for growing ‘up’ instead of ‘out’ — LRT supports intensification Getting Around: Support all forms of transportation; Look for alternatives
   - Support public transit in order to encourage the long-term intensification of the City along our nodes and corridors. (Transportation Master Plan)
   - Continue to consider all avenues of transportation through the city, with the progression of Grand River Transit and alternative transportation options.
3. Economic Vitality
   - Continue to build on what has become a thriving uptown with a focus on good pedestrian-oriented development as the uptown continues to evolve. This will continue to be the heart of the City for the foreseeable future. (Uptown Vision 2025)

Submitted by:

Name: Scott Nevin
Position: Director, Policy Development

Name: Philip Hewitson
Position: Director, Transportation
Report: PWS2011-071  
Subject: Review of Uptown LRT Options 2011

Introduction

At its meeting of June 15, 2011, Regional Council confirmed their previous decision of June 24, 2009, approving a rail-based system from Conestoga Mall to Fairview Park Mall, with adapted bus rapid transit extending to Cambridge, but directed Regional staff to re-evaluate several route options in Uptown Waterloo:

"Direct staff to consult with the City of Waterloo and interested Waterloo citizens and Uptown businesses to explore the feasibility of adjusting the LRT/BRT alignment in Uptown Waterloo and that any additional improvements to routing along the entire corridor be considered by staff and by Council at the appropriate time."

This report, PWS2011-071, was prepared to summarize the City staff review of various options for LRT in Uptown Waterloo. On November 8, 2011, Region Planning & Works Committee will be considering a report prepared by Region staff as well as the outcome of the Waterloo Committee of the Whole meeting.

Background

In 2009 the City of Waterloo undertook an extensive process to determine what rapid transit route in Uptown was in the best interest of the community. This process included numerous delegations before Waterloo City Council, a special "Summit" involving numerous Committees of Council, discussions with various Council Committees and various staff reports. Ultimately, after considering all the information provided, in the Spring of 2009 Waterloo City Council unanimously approved a series of recommendations that were provided to Regional Staff and Council. In short, at the time, City Council supported a looped LRT system with one-way northbound on King from Allen to Erb, west on Erb to Caroline and a one-way southbound leg on Caroline from Erb to Allen and east on Allen to King. On June 24, 2009, Regional Council approved this concept.

Recent Regional Review

Region staff hosted the Uptown Waterloo LRT Route Workshop on September 27, 2011, with approximately 120 participants, in three sessions. The purpose of the workshop was to solicit comments from stakeholders on a number of Uptown options:

1. Utilize a two-way system on King Street
2. Utilize a two-way system on Caroline Street
3. Utilize a looping system using King and Caroline one-way segments with sub-options:
   A. using Erb street as the north end of the loop
   B. using the Waterloo Spur between King Street and Caroline Street as the north end of the loop
   C. using William Street as the south end of the loop
   D. using the east side of Caroline Street south of William Street to access Allen Street
   E. using the west side of Caroline Street south of William to access Allen Street

**Regional Conclusions**

Based on discussions with Regional staff, we anticipate that Regional staff will support the original one-way Uptown alignments, with the exception of the following (see Map 1, Appendix B):

- for the northbound leg, utilize the existing Waterloo Spur line from King Street to Caroline Street instead of Erb Street;
- move the proposed northbound LRT station at Willis Way to the Waterloo Spur line;
- include an additional Uptown Waterloo LRT station at the intersection of King Street and Allen Street, with a northbound station on King Street and a southbound station on Allen Street; and
- use the west side of Caroline Street between William and Allen Streets, for southbound LRT, whereas they had previously proposed the east side of the street.

As these four points represent changes from City Council’s previous recommendations to Regional Council in 2009, they are the focus of this report.

**Erb Street versus Waterloo Spur**

In 2009 City Council supported having the northbound route proceed to Erb Street and then west to Caroline (report # PWS09-15). At that time, staff’s perspective was that an Erb Street alignment was more appropriate because the Spur Line would:

- result in the removal of additional parking;
- impact potential future opportunities to enhance the pedestrian walkway along the Spur; and
- impact the Public Square.

Importantly, in June 2009 Regional staff anticipated having to leave the existing freight line along the Spur and add another dedicated line for the LRT, substantially increasing the amount of land needed. Regional staff now advise they are able to use the existing freight line for freight and LRT and, as such, the impact on the Square, parking and pedestrian walkway is reduced.
Regional staff are of the opinion that the Spur Line now represents the best route from King to Caroline, because it:

- takes advantage of the opportunity to use the existing Spur line rail corridor with minimal impact to the Uptown Waterloo Public Square; and
- allows for the opportunity to integrate a station near the Public Square and Waterloo Town Square.

Regional staff do not prefer the Erb alignment because it would:

- necessitate LRT operating against the flow of traffic;
- require the removal of a traffic lane and the installation of traffic signals at Albert Street; and
- result in two rail corridors running through the north of Uptown Waterloo (one for LRT and one for freight).

City staff are concerned about the potential impact of the Spur use on the Public Square, particularly when events/performances are taking place. Regional staff are very confident that noise from the LRT will not be an issue, given today's LRT technology, the anticipated slow speed of the LRT turning from King Street onto the Spur and because Regional staff have incorporated a generous turning radius to minimize noise. Regional staff have committed to working with City staff to ensure potential impacts on the Square are addressed.

Staff are also concerned that use of the Spur may result in the loss of up to 16 parking spaces adjacent to the Spur. Regional staff will attempt to minimize this number and have indicated their commitment to replacing any lost spaces. The City's agreement with W.C.I. Holdings states the City will provide 213 parking spaces on the North Parking lands (City land bounded by the Spur line, Caroline Street, Erb Street and King Street).

Additionally, Protective Services prefer the Erb Street alignment because using a public street affords them better access to the LRT should emergency response be required.

While City staff are aware of the issues regarding Erb Street, staff believe it still represents a viable option. However, given that the Region no longer requires two separate rail lines to accommodate freight and LRT along the Spur, and given the Regional staff's commitment to address City concerns, staff believe the Spur option represents an acceptable approach, subject to:

- the design being done in a sensitive manner to integrate with, respect and enhance the Public Square;
- no loss of parking on King Street between the Spur and Erb;
- any lost parking in the Waterloo Town Square north lot being replaced by the Region;
- the pedestrian-way along the Spur being enhanced by the Region;
- no physical barriers or obstacles being installed along the Spur line between King Street and Caroline Street, unless expressly approved by resolution of Waterloo City Council; and,
- the LRT system not precluding the use or intensification of lands adjacent to the Spur line, e.g., consideration of development within the "air-rights" above the LRT line.

City staff have discussed with Regional staff the opportunity that the Spur alignment presents to enhance the pedestrian/cyclist crossing at King Street and the Spur as well as the opportunity to enhance the intersection of Erb/ Caroline and the Spur for all users, with emphasis on pedestrians and cyclists. Regional staff are aware of these issues and are of the opinion that using the Spur is an opportunity to address them. City staff also note that using the Spur reduces the number of rail lines through the Caroline/ Erb intersection from 3 to 2 compared to using the Erb Street routing, which should make it easier to address current operational difficulties for all users at this intersection. Various intersection improvements including channelization for vehicles and dedicated signal phases for each transportation mode should be considered in the detailed design process.

On October 21, 2011 the BIA provided the following "position statement" subsequent to a Board meeting:

"The UpTown Waterloo BIA Board of Directors strongly support the construction of a Light Rapid Transit (LRT) system in Waterloo Region. As advocates for the business community in UpTown Waterloo, we endorse the concept of a loop system that would locate the primary northbound tracks on King Street and the southbound tracks on Caroline Street. In the interests of preserving as much on street parking as possible and protecting the vehicular traffic capacity of Erb Street we prefer using the existing rail corridor between King Street and Caroline Street on the northbound line. On the southbound line we prefer the use of Allen Street over William Street as we feel it represents the safest and least disruptive alternative to complete the loop. We support the creation of an additional platform at King Street and Allen Street to serve the rapidly growing south end of the core. Strong financial support is expected from the Region for marketing UpTown Waterloo before, during and after LRT construction to help sustain normal business activity through the significant disruption of such a major construction project. It is our further expectation that the Region will replace any parking that is lost due to the construction of the LRT. We are happy to work with the City, Region and any other partner to ensure our LRT system is well designed, executed and promoted."
Impacts on On-Street Parking

Table 1 shows the number of existing on-street parking spaces on King Street between William and Erb, and the number of spaces that would remain with each LRT option:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Exist.</th>
<th>Two-Way LRT (Erb)</th>
<th>Two-Way LRT (Spur)</th>
<th>One-Way LRT (Erb)</th>
<th>One-Way LRT (Spur)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Side</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William to Willis Way</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willis Way to Spur Line</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spur Line to Erb</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Side</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William to Willis Way</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willis Way to Spur Line</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spur Line to Erb</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Two-way LRT to Erb would eliminate all fifty-three (53) existing parking spaces on King from William to Erb. There are no existing parking spaces on King Street between William and Union.

A Two-way LRT utilizing the Spur Line would retain only the spaces north of the Spur Line (15 spaces).

The One-way LRT to Erb Street would retain 27 spaces on the west side of King Street.

The One-Way LRT utilizing the Spur Line would retain more parking spaces than the other alternatives (36 spaces).

Any LRT alignment on Caroline Street will result in the removal of the ten (10) on-street parking spaces south of Willis Way.

The One-Way LRT on the west side of Caroline Street may allow some on-street parking north of Allen Street.

Council has previously indicated their expectation that the Region replace any lost parking in Uptown and staff believe it is important to emphasize this again. Previously the Region has indicated they will attempt to replace all lost parking in Uptown.
Caroline Alignment:

In 2009, City Council and staff supported the use of Caroline south of William; at that time the Region was proposing to have LRT along the east side of the roadway. In June 2011 Regional staff recommended to Regional Council that the alignment be shifted to the west side of the roadway. Regional staff do not prefer the east side alignment because it would:

- require significantly more utility relocation;
- restrict access (including deliveries) to properties on the east side of Caroline Street including the seniors residence, Brick Brewery, the funeral home, and the Adult Recreation Centre; and
- make traffic worse on Caroline Street at William Street because the LRT would have to switch from one side of Caroline to the other at this point.

City staff also note the east side alignment would require more property from the Adult Recreation Centre to accommodate the LRT turning from Caroline onto Allen. While the alignment on the east side of Caroline would maximize separation to the Catalina townhomes, it would bring the line closer to the Terrace on the Square seniors' residence. Regional staff have advised that on either side of the road, noise and vibration from the LRT are anticipated to be within Ministry of Environment accepted standards.

While an alignment on either side of Caroline would reduce on-street parking on Caroline, Regional staff have confirmed the Iron Horse Trail on this section of Caroline would be retained.

City staff support Regional staff's position that having a rail line on the east side of Caroline running counter to traffic flow is less safe and recognize the impacts on business access. Staff support the west side alignment, subject to the Region mitigating impacts on the adjacent Catalina residents through the detailed design and implementation stages. In addition, the Region should ensure there is space within the road allowance for the Trans Canada Trail Multi-Use Path on the west boulevard of Caroline from Erb Street to William as well as on-street bike lanes and vehicle travel lanes.

Station Locations

Regional staff are also recommending the following regarding LRT stations:

- that the proposed northbound LRT station on King Street at Willis Way be moved to the Waterloo Spur line; and
- that an additional Uptown Waterloo LRT station be added at the intersection of King Street and Allen Street, with a northbound station on King Street and a southbound station on Allen Street.
City staff support these stations. The proposed King/Allen station would more effectively serve the southern portion of Uptown. The Spur station would minimize impacts that a station on King and Willis Way would have on the sidewalk/tree planter at that location and Regional staff are of the opinion that it can be in a manner that is sensitive to the Public Square.

Infrastructure

City staff are working with Regional staff to ensure an appropriate approach to determining which infrastructure needs to be relocated from under the proposed rail line. As part of this undertaking, it is imperative that there be an understanding that the City will have the ability to access infrastructure that must remain under the rail line and to replace or add to that infrastructure to accommodate future growth needs.

Rapid Transit on King (Erb to Conestoga Mall):

While outside the current consideration for the Uptown routes, it is important to note that City Council supported the rail line route from Uptown to Conestoga Mall in 2009, conditional on the Region committing to a high frequency bus service between Uptown Waterloo and Conestoga Mall along King Street and between Wilfrid Laurier University and the University of Waterloo. At that time, Regional staff committed to high frequency service on King Street (see Appendix G), however, the Region’s current plans show high frequency transit on University Avenue but not on King Street. City staff believe that it is important to reemphasize the basis on which City Council supported the use of the rail line and remind the Region as to their commitment regarding this key issue for Waterloo Council.

Maintenance Yard

The Region has recently announced that they have purchased lands adjacent to the rail line on Dutton Drive for use the LRT maintenance facility. From City staff’s perspective, this location, within a rapid transit station area, may represent an opportunity for the Region to consolidate the maintenance yard needs with a potential park and ride facility, which the Region has also advised they are considering in the station area. Furthermore, from staff’s perspective, the property location along the rail line also represents an opportunity to extend the Trans Canada Trail in this area, a long-standing City goal.

Tri-Cities Transport Action Group (TriTAG)

Staff have received emails from a number of TriTAG volunteers lobbying for consideration of more options for LRT in Uptown. Staff from the City and the Region met with TriTAG representatives to discuss the proposed options on November 1, 2011. Staff believe that there was good discussion but are unsure if TriTAG was fully satisfied.

Concerns of BIA – Impact on Business Activity During Construction

The Uptown Waterloo BIA have requested that the Region take action to stage the construction and minimize its duration in order to maintain access and minimize disruption to the Uptown businesses. This could include assistance with advertising, issuance of media...
releases, maintaining detour routes and regular communication with business owners and operators.

Conclusion

Staff are of the opinion that the Erb Street corridor still represents a viable option for the north leg of LRT in Uptown. However, should the Region decide to use the Spur Line from King Street to Caroline, it should be conditional upon impacts being mitigated, as discussed in this report and the Region acknowledging their willingness to partner and facilitate development of the adjacent lands. Furthermore, staff believe that an additional Uptown LRT station at King/Allen is appropriate and desirable. Additionally, staff agree with Regional staff that an LRT alignment on the west side of Caroline is most appropriate, given the significant challenges associated with a east side alignment. The Region should mitigate impacts on residences on the west side of Caroline. Furthermore, the use of Caroline should be conditional upon the Region ensuring that the road allowance will support the Trans Canada Trail Multi-Use Path on the west boulevard, on-street bike lanes and vehicle travel lanes in addition to the LRT. The Region should confirm that the City will have the ability to access/replace/upgrade its infrastructure that remains under the rail line and the region should develop and maintain an ongoing communications and impact mitigation plan in consultation with adjacent business owners and operators. Lastly, City of Waterloo Council should re-confirm its desire for high frequency transit service on King Street north of Uptown and on University Avenue as a condition of supporting the use of the rail line north of Uptown and Regional Council should confirm the Region’s commitment to higher order transit in these areas.
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RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That Waterloo City Council continue to support a looped LRT system in Uptown Waterloo.

2. That Waterloo City Council support a second LRT station in Uptown Waterloo near King Street and Allen Street.

3. That Waterloo City Council continue to see merit in the using the Erb Street alignment for LRT, while supporting the Region’s use of the rail spur line between King Street and Caroline Street, including relocating the proposed King / Willis Way LRT station to the rail spur line, subject to:
   a. the Region enhancing the Public Square through the design of the LRT system, to the satisfaction of the City of Waterloo;
   b. the Region enhancing the pedestrian concourse (rail trail) between the east side of King Street and Caroline Street, to the satisfaction of the City of Waterloo;
   c. the Region acknowledges that the City is obligated to provide 213 parking spaces on City lands within the north area of Waterloo Town Square and will replace any lost spaces to the satisfaction of the City of Waterloo, and in accordance with the parking agreement between the City and W.C.I. Holdings Inc. (First Gulf);
   d. the Region not installing physical barriers (closed west driveway)or obstacles along the rail spur line between King Street and Caroline Street, unless expressly approved by resolution of Waterloo City Council;
   e. the Region acknowledging that the Waterloo Town Square lands will be subject to future redevelopment and that the Region partner with adjacent land owners to maximize those redevelopment opportunities, including consideration of rail realignment, if necessary in order to maximize intensification of lands adjacent to the rail spur line.

4. That Waterloo City Council support the alignment of the LRT on the west side of Caroline Street, including the section of Caroline Street south of William Street to Allen Street, subject to:
   a. the Region mitigating impacts on residential lands west of Caroline Street to the maximum extent possible;
   b. the Region ensuring space within the road allowance for the Trans Canada Trail Multi-Use Path on the west boulevard, on-street bike lanes and vehicle travel lanes; and,
   c. the Region ensuring safe and convenient crossings for pedestrians and cyclists are incorporated into the design of the Caroline/Erb intersection.

5. That Waterloo City Council confirm their previous issues and concerns regarding LRT in Waterloo, as attached as Appendices E and F of PWS2011-071, including the expectation that the Region will replace any impacted parking in Uptown
.6. That City of Waterloo Council re-confirm its desire for high frequency transit service on King Street north of Uptown and on University Avenue as a condition of supporting the use of the rail line north of Uptown and that Regional Council confirm the Region's commitment to high frequency transit in these areas.

.7. That Waterloo City Council request that Regional Council confirm that the City will have the ability to access its infrastructure that remains under the rail line and the ability to replace or add to that infrastructure to accommodate future growth needs.

.8. That Waterloo City Council request that Regional Council direct Regional staff to stage LRT construction to minimize disruption to business operations, and to develop and maintain an ongoing communications and impact mitigation plan in consultation with adjacent business owners and operators.
Region report entitled “Recommended Uptown Waterloo Light Rail Transit Route Alignment and Stations” was not available at the time the City Report PWS2011-071 was finalized.

The release date for Region report is November 4, 2011 and it can be downloaded from the Region’s website by entering the following link in your Web Browser:


Scroll down to the Planning and Works Committee location. Beside November 8, 2011, right click on the word Agenda and select ‘Open’. Scroll through the Agenda and click on report E–11–106 to download it.
Appendix ‘D’ Excerpt from Region Council Minutes
From the Minutes of Region of Waterloo Council meeting June 15, 2011:

**CONSOLIDATED RAPID TRANSIT MOTION**

THAT the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following action regarding the Region’s proposed rapid transit system:

Approve light rail transit (LRT) as the preferred technology from Conestoga Mall in the City of Waterloo to the Ainslie Street Terminal in the City of Cambridge;

Approve the LRT route and stations generally as shown in Figure A.3 in Appendix A and listed in Appendix B in report E-11-072;

Approve the implementation of option L3 as Stage 1 of the LRT system including LRT from Conestoga Mall to Fairview Park Mall and adapted bus rapid transit from Fairview Park Mall to the Ainslie Street Terminal, as shown in Figure A.2 in Appendix A in report E-11-072;

Approve the funding for the Region’s portion of the Stage 1 capital costs and operating and maintenance costs, subject to annual budget deliberations, area rated to the urban transit service area, as follows:

- budget reductions resulting from the retirement of debt on regional buildings at 150 Frederick St. and 99 Regina St. and the uploading of social assistance costs (2012 to 2018) be allocated to fund a portion of the rapid transit capital and Operating and Maintenance (O&M) costs (average 0.5% per year from 2012 to 2018)
- an annual tax rate increase of 0.7% per year, for a total tax increase of 4.9% over 7 years, to fund the remaining rapid transit capital and O&M costs;
- an annual tax rate increase of 0.3% per year, for the years 2012 to 2018, to fund the capital and O&M costs of related improvements to conventional transit (Grand River Transit);

Direct staff to pursue Regional development charge legislative amendment in order to assist with funding the LRT project;

Approve an allocation of one-time capital of $1,000,000 annually, for a 10-year period, to implement transit-supportive strategies in Cambridge, details of the program to be developed in conjunction with the City of Cambridge and to be presented to Regional Council for approval in a subsequent report;

Direct staff to pursue the following steps to expedite Stage 2 of the LRT system including LRT from Fairview Park Mall to the Ainslie Street Terminal:

a) Begin the Transit Project Assessment for LRT from Fairview Park Mall to the Ainslie Street Terminal in 2014;
b) Acquire property for the implementation of Stage 2 of the LRT system;
c) Pursue additional federal and provincial funding for Stage 2 of the LRT system;
d) Explore the location of a future multi-modal transit facility in Cambridge to link to future GO rail service and;
e) Undertake measures to encourage transit-supportive development, to enhance transit ridership throughout the urban transit service areas, including (but not limited to) developing incentives for transit-oriented developments and supporting and developing transportation demand management strategies for new and existing businesses and residents.

Direct staff to consult with the City of Waterloo and interested Waterloo citizens and Uptown businesses to explore the feasibility of adjusting the LRT/BRT alignment in Uptown Waterloo and that any additional improvements to routing along the entire corridor be considered by staff and by Council at the appropriate time.

Complete an evaluation of project procurement and delivery options, including the role of Infrastructure Ontario, with the goals of maximizing project innovation and quality, leveraging private sector expertise, and managing risks to the Region of Waterloo and our taxpayers.

Direct staff to report on the financial status of the rapid transit project as part of the Region’s periodic financial reports to Committee and Council.
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MINUTES – FINANCE AND STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
Monday, June 15, 2009

A meeting of the Finance and Strategic Planning Committee of the Council of The Corporation of the City of Waterloo was held on June 15, 2009 at 1:10 p.m. in the Council Chambers, 100 Regina Street South, Waterloo, Ontario.

Councillor McLean in the Chair.

Public Meeting recessed. (Time: 2:47 p.m.)
Public Meeting reconvened. (Time: 6:30 p.m.)

Present: Mayor Halloran; Councillor Witmer; Councillor Scian; Councillor McLean; Councillor d’Ailly; Councillor Whaley; Councillor Vieth; Councillor Freeman
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Meeting recessed. (Time: 8:48 p.m.)
Meeting reconvened. (Time: 9:02 p.m.)

9. STAFF REPORTS

c) PWS2009-15.1 REGIONAL RAPID TRANSIT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: CITY OF WATERLOO FINAL POSITION

Prepared By: Phil Hewitson and Scott Nevin

Philippe Elworthy and Marg Rowell, Municipal Heritage Committee, expressed concerns that no studies were conducted on the heritage and architectural significance of buildings in the UpTown during the environmental assessment process, and noted that no criteria have been developed to assess the impact of the construction of rapid transit on local heritage buildings. Ms. Rowell recommended the creation of a special planning policy area similar to the Heritage Conservation District to protect buildings of local significance, as well as to address provincial requirements.
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Martin Van Nierop, University of Waterloo, and Glenn Scheels, GSP Group, expressed support on behalf of the University of Waterloo for the choice of the spur line route for the Region’s Rapid Transit Initiative, and provided an overview of the expansion of the University of Waterloo campus and how this will complement Rapid Transit through the University Master Plan.

Robert Fleming questioned whether Wilfrid Laurier University would be prepared to make a financial contribution to assist in offsetting any additional costs associated with the spur line route.

Kevin Thomason informed Council that as a member of the Wilfrid Laurier University Master...
Appendix ‘E’ Excerpts from FSP Minutes June 15, 2009

Plan Committee he individually supported the proposed route for Rapid Transit, noting that the majority of students concentrate on the west side of the campus, near Albert Street, and thus the spur line route aligns with their needs.

Moved by Councillor Scian, seconded by Councillor Witmer:

1) That Council approve Report PWS2009-15.1 and;

2) that Council advise Regional Council that it is City Council’s preference that the Rapid Transit system in Waterloo utilize the Waterloo rail spur option between Uptown and Conestoga Mall, conditional upon stations being located in Uptown, Waterloo Park, the University of Waterloo, the Research and Technology Park, at Weber and Northfield and at Conestoga Mall;

3) that Council advise the Region of Waterloo that Council’s support for the Waterloo rail spur option is conditional on the Region committing to a high frequency bus service between Uptown Waterloo and Conestoga Mall along King Street and between Wilfrid Laurier University and the University of Waterloo;

4) that the Region be requested to continue to explore and advocate for additional Rapid Transit opportunities in Waterloo, including King Street and University Avenue alignments;

5) that Council request the Region to work closely with City Transportation staff through the RT detailed design and implementation to analyze and mitigate the traffic impacts on adjacent streets and neighbourhoods as a result of removing traffic lanes from the portion of King Street from Northfield Drive to Conestoga Mall and the portion of King Street from Allen Street to Victoria Street in Kitchener, and provide ongoing monitoring to assess and mitigate these impacts;

6) that Council request the Region to work closely with City staff and City Advisory Committees through the RT detailed design and implementation, including regular Regional reporting on the status of the project;

7) that Council direct City staff to work with Regional staff towards the completion of the Trans Canada Trail in UpTown Waterloo and completing the connection between UpTown and Northfield Drive during the Rapid Transit Phase I implementation; and

8) that Council request the Region to recognize its responsibility to assist the City with its local station plans.”

Carried Unanimously
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MINUTES – COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
April 6, 2009

A regular meeting of the Council of The Corporation of the City of Waterloo was held on April 6, 2009 at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers, 100 Regina Street South, Waterloo, Ontario.

Present: Mayor Halloran; Councillor Witmer; Councillor Vieth; Councillor Freeman; Councillor Whaley; Councillor d’Ailly; Councillor McLean; Councillor Scian

Councillor Freeman in the Chair.

6. STAFF REPORTS

d) PWS09-15 REGIONAL RAPID TRANSIT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: CITY OF WATERLOO POSITIONS

Prepared By: Phil Hewitson and Scott Nevin

Scott Nevin, Director, Policy Development, reviewed the report and responded to questions from Council.

Roy Broadbear, President of the Waterloo Central Railway, articulated his support of Rapid Transit in Waterloo, and expressed his concerns regarding the staff recommendation to discontinue freight service within Waterloo. Mr. Broadbear spoke to the decreased ability of the Railway to remain operational should freight service be discontinued, and thus leading to the discontinuation of the tourist railway services as well.

Moved by Councillor Scian, seconded by Councillor McLean:

1) That Council approve Report PWS09-15, including the detailed recommendations attached in Appendix A, with the following amendments to Recommendation No. 3:

i) deletion of the last bullet point in Recommendation No. 3 that:
   • "the freight service on the Waterloo Spur needs to be discontinued as soon as possible"

ii) addition of the following bullet point:
   • "that the design and creation of either a Bus Rapid Transit or a Light Rail Transit route be considerate of the response and accessibility of all emergency services, including Police, Fire and Emergency Medical Services,"

and that the Report be forwarded to Council of the Region of Waterloo as the City of Waterloo comments on the potential Rapid Transit alignments and technologies;
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2) that the Mayor be requested to represent Council’s comments to Waterloo Regional Council;

3) that Waterloo’s Regional Councillors be requested to represent Waterloo City Council’s position on the Rapid Transit Environmental Assessment as outlined in Report PWS09-15, on behalf of the community;

4) that the Region of Waterloo be requested to address the comments outlined in Report PWS09-15 in completing the Environmental Assessment for Rapid Transit; and

5) that the Region of Waterloo be requested to provide City of Waterloo Council with ample opportunity to review and comment on a final recommended Rapid Transit alignment and technology prior to it being formally considered by Regional Council."

Carried Unanimously

Detailed Recommendations from Report PWS2009-15 Appendix ‘A’

1. That Council support a RT alignment in Uptown consisting of north-bound line on King street and southbound on Caroline both from Allen to Erb;

2. That the Region be requested to evaluate option of extending the one-way King-Caroline system further north using King and Caroline/ Bridgeport to Bridgeport/ King then two-way on King to University Avenue;

3. That Council require that the following design elements be incorporated into the system design in Uptown and elsewhere in the City:
   - the Region needs to responsible for relocating all municipal services from within the RT alignment;
   - no barriers should be created along the alignment, particularly in Uptown and Waterloo Park. If barriers are required by Transport Canada in Waterloo Park to separate the RT from the freight line, the barrier must be designed to be aesthetically pleasing and provide for appropriate pedestrian crossing;
   - pedestrian and cyclist facilities along the route must be enhanced at the Region’s expense, particularly the Trans Canada Trail along Caroline Street;
   - the Region should work closely on and participate in funding a new streetscape in Uptown;
   - overhead hydro facilities should be removed at the Region’s expense along the alignment;
   - an event station should be provided in Waterloo Park;
   - the Region needs to replace displaced parking in Uptown Waterloo;
   - stations must be designed to fit the surrounding area;
   - the alignment and technology must tie into existing cycling and walking network, with particular emphasis on improving the intersection of Caroline and Erb Street for pedestrians and cyclists; and,
   - the freight service on the Waterloo Spur needs to be discontinued as soon as possible.
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Detailed Recommendations from Report PWS2009-15 Appendix’A’(Cont'd)

4. That the Region be requested to advise as to how the City's key areas of focus (Uptown Waterloo, the University of Waterloo, the Research and Technology Park, Wilfrid Laurier University, Weber and King and Weber and Northfield nodes, and Conestoga Mall) can be adequately served by RT, prior to Council taking a position on a Waterloo alignment;

In addition, the Region is requested to advise as to how adequate roadway capacity can be accommodated on University Avenue if the RT follows this alignment and the Region is requested to widen the road allowance to accommodate adequate travel lanes;

5. That Council defer a recommendation on a preferred technology, pending determination of actual capital and operating costs for the two technologies;

6. That the Region should expand the search for maintenance facilities outside of Waterloo and should evaluate potential maintenance facility locations in Waterloo based on the following criteria:
   - the facility size should be minimized to reduce the amount of land required;
   - the site should be chosen carefully to limit its impacts on intensification potential and must not be within 600 m. of a proposed station; and
   - the facility separation between the facility and sensitive uses (e.g., residential uses/areas) should be maximized;

7. That the Region be advised that RT planning and implementation will require additional financial and other resources at the City and the Region is requested to advise as to how they intend to support this.
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June 9, 2009

Mr. Tim Anderson,
General Manager,
City of Waterloo

Dear Tim,

Following our meeting on Friday June 5, 2009, you had asked us to submit our views of your proposed North Waterloo rapid transit routing option that splits the route north of University Avenue between the Waterloo Spur line and the University Avenue - King Street line. The University - King line is shown in your plan as continuing north to Conestoga Mall as opposed to the Waterloo Spur and Northfield route.

The Rapid Transit Initiative EA Project Team had previously evaluated the Waterloo Spur and University Avenue - King Street routings and provided the Pros and Cons of both at the Public Meetings in May, 2009. The plus and negative sides of both route options are summarized below:

**ROUTE 1 – WATERLOO SPUR**

**Pros:** Services the Research and Technology (R & T) Park a major emerging employment centre in North Waterloo and Northfield Drive an industrialized area with potential for substantial employment through future office uses; Waterloo Spurline is a shorter and faster route (with few roadway crossings); integrates well with feeder route concepts for University Avenue, Columbia Street, Weber Street and Northfield Drive; better location for the University of Waterloo (U of W) station at the Davis Centre, which is within walking distance to neighbouring student housing and the existing iXpress and GRT stop on the Ring Road; no impact on the road network, and the rail corridor is buffered from the adjacent residential community.

**Cons:** Slightly higher capital cost and is somewhat removed from the Wilfrid Laurier University (WLU) campus.
In order to mitigate proximity to the WLU campus, two suggestions have been made:

- A station would be constructed at the entrance to Waterloo Park (Seagram Drive) that is closer to the WLU campus than the proposed one at U of W. It's about a nine-minute walk to the centre of WLU campus which is less time than taking the bus along University Avenue. This station would also serve Waterloo Park, Seagram stadium and high-rise residential development along Seagram Drive;
- Improve the bus service on University Avenue to better connect the two universities.

**ROUTE 2 – UNIVERSITY AVENUE – KING STREET – WATERLOO SPUR**

**Pros**: More residential-based ridership can be gained from this route over the Waterloo Spur. However, the overall ridership potential is less as many residential-based trips are still destined to areas outside of the rapid transit corridor resulting in 15% lower ridership; serves both universities and the commercial/high density residential node at University Avenue and King Street.

**Cons**: requires the U of W station to be located south of University Avenue on the outskirts of the campus, requiring a longer walk to destinations; requires a stub line to the R & T Park (City of Waterloo proposal) which cost an additional $35M, reduced traffic lanes on King Street (Weber to University Avenue) and on University Avenue between Philip and Albert Streets will negatively impact the level of service provided on these busy routes; frequent bus activity on University Avenue as required with RT will affect traffic operations on this section of University Avenue; will restrict property access to commercial and residential properties on King Street and University Avenue and aggravate congestion on these busy corridors; longer RT trip time resulting from all on-road section (Conestoga Mall to U of W); and poor accessibility to feeder bus routes from Northwest Waterloo via Northfield Drive and Columbia Street.

It is difficult to mitigate many of the above "Cons" for the King-University route – i.e. problems with the station location at U of W, traffic congestion on the two-lane section of King and University Avenue, longer RT trip time as congestion builds and poor feeder bus accessibility (i.e. West side) to the RT stations. The stub line to R & T Park, however, is an attempt to link the King-University route to the Waterloo Spurline. This moderate cost solution still does not address the other issues hampering the King-University route if it is to become the principal rapid transit corridor to Conestoga Mall.
Therefore, project staff recommends adopting the Waterloo Spur rail line as the preferred routing for the Light Rail rapid transit system. We will ask for its endorsement at the upcoming Project Team meeting on Friday, June 12, 2009.

In conjunction with adopting the Waterloo Spurline as the preferred rapid transit routing in North Waterloo, and recognizing the lack of higher order transit on King Street, we propose that frequent express bus service (i.e. adapted BRT as proposed in Cambridge) be used on King Street between Uptown Waterloo and Conestoga Mall. The adapted express bus would operate in mixed traffic, thus saving traffic lanes, and would be quick to implement with queue jump/HOV lanes, bus priority at signalized intersections, unique branding, and provide a higher level of service than conventional bus transit. This higher order transit solution is used in many North American cities to build ridership and intensification opportunities along arterial roads.

We will be pleased to discuss our recommended rapid transit routing on the Waterloo Spurline with you at the next Project Team meeting.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Thomas Schmidt, P. Eng.
Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Region of Waterloo

Cc: RT EA Project Team members