Present were: Chair J. Wideman, J. Brewer, T. Cowan, R. Deutschmann, T. Galloway, J. Haalboom, R. Kelterborn, G. Lorentz, K. Seiling, and C. Zehr


OPEN REMARKS

Chair J. Wideman provided opening remarks regarding the purpose of the meeting and the advertisement history. He thanked the Councillors who sat on the project team from the Region of Waterloo as well as the City of Kitchener. Chair J. Wideman introduced Wayne Cheater, Project Manager and Don Drackley the Consultant from IBI Group.

DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST UNDER THE MUNICIPAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT

None declared.

REPORT – PLANNING, HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES - COMMUNITY PLANNING

a) Report E-13-135, River Road Extension, King Street to Manitou Drive, Kitchener, Class Environmental Assessment – Public Input Meeting for Preferred Design Concept

Received for information.

Steve Van de Keere, Head, Transportation Expansion Program provided a presentation that highlighted:

- Project Study Area;
- What Are The Problems;
- Planning Solutions Developed;
- Alternatives;
- Key Concerns Raised by the Public;
- Preferred Design Concept Alternative 5;
- What Are The Benefits of The Preferred Design Concept; and
- Next Steps in the Study.

A copy of the presentation is appended to the original minutes.

S. Van de Keere provided clarification to Committee members on the right in right out turns, the project cost and where the money will be coming from.
DELEGATIONS

i. Neil Taylor appeared before Committee providing a presentation highlighting; background information on the project, staff responses to concerns, costs, response to public, history, and species at risk. A copy of the presentation is appended to the original minutes.

ii. Peter Benninger, Pearl Valley Development Corporation and Ted Rowe, MTE Consultants Inc. appeared before Committee. P. Benninger stated he owns property in Hidden Valley. He provided Committee members with a handout as well provided a presentation. He stated his support for River Road extension and noted that he hired MTE consulting to provide some modifications to the preferred concept. He suggested that a roundabout be installed at the new Hwy 8 ramp South “on ramp” and suggested moving the Wabanki traffic circle location to the South East to allow for better use of the land. A copy of the presentation is appended to the original minutes.

Committee members asked the delegation if MTE provided an estimated cost for the proposed recommendations. T. Rowe responded saying they did not provide a cost but did provide an estimate cost for the roundabout.

iii. John Nother appeared before Committee representing Hidden Valley Residents. He stated the residents have talked about the impact the River Road extension has on them as citizens in the area. He noted their biggest concern is the entrance going in and out at River Road. He pointed out that with traffic problems on Wabanki Drive at the intersection of Fairway Road the residents are concerned about traffic cutting through Hidden Valley Drive. He asked that this issue be addressed during the planning stage.

iv. Daphne Nicholls, The Friends of Hidden Valley appeared before Committee. During her presentation she showed pictures of Hidden Valley. She noted that Ginny Quinn could not be there but wanted to thank staff and the community for coming together for option 5 the preferred concept. D. Nicholls went in detail about Hidden Valley and what it has to offer stating Hidden Valley is a well functioning eco system. She talked about the various species and wondered if the Region was complying with the Species at Risk Act. She recommended that more tree planting occur.

Committee members asked the delegation if she is opposed to the road or if she is in support of option 5 being presented with planting more trees. D. Nicholls stated she is opposed to the road but noted that option 5 is the least obnoxious and would like to see enhanced tree planting.

v. Terry Lalande appeared before Committee stating he would like to make comments on the new access road for the Stonegate/Woodview subdivision. He highlighted that currently there are 2 roads allowing access into the subdivision and the one access will be closed down and replaced with the new access on River Road. He noted the current debate is whether access should be restricted at River Road and cars only be allowed to exit. He stated that he is concerned that if access is restricted at River Road then traffic will be forced to enter at King Street and Stonegate Drive highlighting this entrance is very dangerous due to the hill and curvy road. He suggested that the Region start with open access then assess the situation.

vi. Duncan Clemens, Tri Cities Transportation Action Group (TriTAG) appeared before Committee stating his comments are his views and not of TriTAG. He did state that TriTAG is not pro road or anti road but supports the most effective use of funds for
effectively moving people. He stated that although there is a need to promote the use of active transportation it is still necessary to drive indicating road construction can be beneficial in order to connect missing links to the network to benefit all road users. He pointed out the delays currently for buses traveling on Fairway Road noting the River Road extension could elevate some of those delays. He asked that staff be directed to proceed with the extension.

Chair J. Wideman made a call for additional delegations.

vii. Ken Somers appeared before Committee stating his house is up for sale and potential buyers have asked a few questions. He inquired if Hofstetter Avenue will be rerouted to Stonegate Drive and wondered what the elevation of River Road will be.

viii. Peter Pople a resident at 56 Woodview Crescent stated he is concerned that there will only be one entrance into the subdivision off of King Street onto Stonegate Drive. He stated that access is slippery in the winter and there are no sidewalks on either side. He asked that if this is the only entrance into the subdivision it should be made safer.

Committee members asked the delegation if he would like to see accesses remain. P. Pople noted that if one access needs to be closed he asked that the access at King Street and Stonegate Drive be closed.

ix. Sonya Kochanski appeared before Committee stating she lives at 104 Woodview Crescent noting currently her house backs onto green space and wanted to know what the elevation of River Road would be.

x. Keith Townsend appeared before Committee stating he lives on Hidden Valley Road. He expressed his concerns about the traffic volumes on Hidden Valley Road connecting to River Road.

xi. Brian Ellacott a resident at 108 Stonegate Drive stated that the access to Stonegate Drive from River Road should only be used for emergency vehicles and only allow for a right turn out. He noted the inconvenience of this but highlighted that it will prevent traffic from cutting through the subdivision.

Committee members asked the delegation if he would be opposed to having two accesses into the subdivision and reevaluate at a later time. B. Ellacott stated he would be concerned about the politics on who would make that decision and he would want the guarantee that area would be monitored.

xii. Marcin Kasprzycki a resident at 4 Stonegate Drive wondered if staff has looked at the potential impact and congestion on Hwy 8 with the additional ramp being installed.

Committee members asked staff if consideration has been made at the top end of River Road closest to Wabanki Drive for a right of way that is required for phase 2 of the LRT.

ADJOURN

MOVED by G. Lorentz
SECONDED by J. Haalboom

THAT the meeting adjourn at 8:43 p.m.
CARRIED

COMMITTEE CHAIR, J. Wideman

COMMITTEE CLERK, E. Flewwelling
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What Are The Problems?

- **Heavy congestion** on Fairway Road and surrounding traffic network
  - Intersections with King Street, Wilson Avenue, Manitou Drive and Highway 8 ramp at capacity
- **Collision problem** on Fairway Road
- **Lack of cycling and walking connections** across Highway 8
- **Transportation Master Plans (1999/2010)** identified a new road as a **critically needed link in the transportation network**
Planning Solutions Developed

- Do Nothing;
- Improvements to Other Corridors in the surrounding road network;
- Increased Transit Use on Fairway Road to reduce total vehicle volumes; and
- Construction of a New 4-Lane Road parallel to Fairway Road with a new interchange with Highway 8
ALIGNMENT OF NEW ROAD PUSHED UP AGAINST HIGHWAY 8
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Key Concerns Raised by the Public

- Impacts on the natural environment
- Traffic infiltration impacts – Stonegate Drive
- Noise impacts
POTENTIAL NEGATIVE IMPACTS ON NATURAL ENVIRONMENT
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POTENTIAL NOISE IMPACTS

• NOISE STUDY COMPLETED
• REGIONAL POLICY
• MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT GUIDELINES
• PROJECTED NOISE LEVELS DID NOT MEET REQUIRED THRESHOLD
• NOISE MITIGATION IS NOT WARRANTED
PREFERRED DESIGN CONCEPT
ALTERNATIVE 5
- 4 LANES
- MULTI-USE TRAIL
- RAISED CENTRE MEDIAN
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Schneider’s Creek Crossing

[Diagram showing a proposed road crossing over Schneider’s Creek, with annotations for existing ground, proposed road, and a proposed 3.0m wide multi-use trail.]

Preliminary Rendering For Information Purposes Only
What Are The Benefits of The Preferred Design Concept?

- Reduced traffic congestion and delays
- Improved safety
- Improved access to Highway 8 for commuters and goods movement
- Vital cycling and walking link across Highway 8

**WHILE**

- Minimizing the potential negative impacts on the existing natural and social environments
Next Steps in the Study:

• Develop a **Recommended Design Concept**;

• **Present** to City and Regional Councils in Jan/Feb 2014;

• Document the study in an **Environmental Study Report (ESR)** and place the ESR on the public record in March 2014;

• **Detailed design**, property and utility work in 2014-2017; and

• **Road construction** in 2017-2019, subject to budget approval.
Functional Design
River Road extension from King Street to Manitou Drive
Typical Road Cross-Section
Natural Resources Impacts in Hidden Valley

On Woodlands

Alternative 4C
17% - 1.3 ha

Alternative 5
11% - 0.8 ha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woodlot Impact (HA)</th>
<th>Large Woodlot in Hidden Valley</th>
<th>Both Woodlots Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of Alternative 4C</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Alternative 5</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0.84 Ha (74%)</td>
<td>0.45 Ha (35%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Natural Resources Impacts in Hidden Valley

On Regionally Significant Plants

Alternative 4C
50% - 60% Impacted

Alternative 5
0% Impacted
Energy From Waste (EFW)

Minutes – March 28, 1985

“...that staff be directed to include for further study Energy From Waste as a component in the Waste Master Plan...”
Where?

B. F. Goodrich on Wilson Ave.
Kitchener

Bad Advice by staff in 1985
Neil E. Taylor appeared at a Public Input Meeting, June 21, 1985 as the only citizen in opposition to the EFW.

He was right then and again now.
There is no B. F. Goodrich.

There is no EFW.

There is no “White Elephant” for the tax payers of the Region.
Last appearance re. the River Road Extension was October 5\textsuperscript{th}, 2011

What is new?

- new route
- same problems
Staff response to concerns:
- unacknowledged letters
- unanswered concerns re.
  * list of species at risk
  * permission to build in a Provincially Significant Wetlands (PSW)
  * reduced costs
Re. Costs:
* could be reduced by having the sidewalk/trail located on one side only and by reducing the overall width.
Re. Costs:
* the planned “S” ingress/egress that significantly impacts a PSW, to have an ingress for emergency vehicles be reduced to an ingress only from the planned new 4 lane highway that would follow the existing Hidden Valley Road.
Response to Public
* only acknowledged
* to be deferred to detailed design
* no response to individual citizens
* selective editing
More costs: (no answers to:)

* Easements
* Property Acquisition
* Watermain
* Storm sewers
* Costs associated with the Species At Risk
History

* trying to make the highway fit
* EA flawed from the start
* EA incomplete at every stage
* EA represents double standards
2005 Staff Report

A number of errors

No species at risk identified in Hidden Valley
Table 5: Summary of Wildlife Observations by LGL Limited and Other Investigators within Study Area of South Kitchener Transportation Corridor Study (1994-2004)

BIRD LIST:
Red-headed Woodpecker (Sp. C)
Common Nighthawk (Sp. C.)
Chimney Swift (Threatened)
Eastern Meadowlark (Threatened)
Barn Swallow (Threatened)

HERPETOFAUNA:
Milk Snake (Sp. C.)
Table 6: National Heritage Information Centre Records of Rare Bird Species in the South Kitchener Transportation Corridor Study Area (MNR 2004)

Louisiana Waterthrush (Sp. C.)
Acadian Flycatcher (END)
Henslow's Sparrow (END)
Loggerhead Shrike (END)
Missing from:

Table 5: Summary of Wildlife Observations by LGL Limited and Other Investigators within Study Area of South Kitchener Transportation Corridor Study (1994-2004)

Butternut (Endangered)
Bobolink (Threatened)
Cerulean Warber (Threatened)
Jefferson Salamander (Endangered)
No ginseng was observed during the 2004 field work, despite extensive searches based on Ecologistics’ (1979) mapping.

Is this believable given the LGL record?
14 Species At Risk in Hidden Valley
Not just Jefferson Salamander
I have been unable to receive an exact list of Species At Risk (SAR) in Hidden Valley.

I have been unable to receive an Environmental Impact Analysis on each of the other SAR beside Jefferson Salamander.
Jefferson Salamander has been given careful attention during the Preliminary Design Stage.

From “Public Consultation Centre #3 Comment / Response Summary, October 1, 2013”

“While the focal species may be Jefferson Salamander, consideration for other SAR species within the project area will be taken into consideration.”
Why have the other 13 not been treated the same as Jefferson Salamander?

Why are these 13 being left to the Detailed Design Stage?

Regional Staff have a double standard re. Species At Risk. This is a risky business!
The current EA and EIA are incomplete when all of these SAR are excluded from analysis of effects and these SAR permits have not been identified.
There has been no identification of the cost and time to obtain these permits. These considerations represent additional glaring omissions.
Before Regional Council accepts the proposed project as is, it should demand that all aspects of the Endangered Species Act, 2007, ONTARIO REGULATION 242/08 be adhered to.
Before approval is given to further support any design for the proposed project, regional staff must provide the public and Regional Council with all pertinent strategies to reduce costs and completely protect all SAR in this environment.
It is my submission that EEAC and Regional Council made decisions based on a fatally flawed EA process.
Thank you for your attention.

Neil E. Taylor
Regional Planning and Works Committee Public Input Meeting

River Road Extension, King Street to Manitou Drive

Presented by:

Peter Benninger,
Pearl Valley Development Corp.

Ted Rowe,
MTE Consultants Inc.

December 3, 2013
River Road Extension

Figure 1
River Road Extension

- Learned through the Public Consultation process that full access to Hidden Valley Road from the River Road Extension was not provided – disappointed (Figure 1)
- Brought in MTE Consultants to review and make proposal to achieve full access
- Full access benefits a significant population south of Hidden Valley Rd
River Road Extension

Figure 2
River Road Extension

- MTE created proposal which we reviewed with Regional Staff (Figure 2)
- Staff have been helpful and supportive
- Staff have also enlightened us with some practical limitations to full access, however we feel that these practical limitations can be addressed
• Alternative: MTE developed proposal for 2\textsuperscript{nd} Roundabout (Figure 3)
• Roundabout located at the River Road access to the new Hwy 8 South “on ramp”
• Roundabout benefits the neighbours north of Hidden Valley Road, as well as the residents to the south
River Road Extension

Figure 3
River Road Extension

- Provides long term flexibility in both directions
- Relatively low cost solution
- Willing to work with Region on Pearl Valley affected land
River Road Extension

Figure 4
River Road Extension

- Original Wabanaki traffic circle location left 2 narrow slivers on the NW side of River Road Extension (Figure 4)
- Proposing moving the location of the Wabanaki traffic circle to the SE (Figure 5)
- Better/less costly option to Region/less land to expropriate/better stacking distance to railway (safety)
- Better option for landowner/usable lands
- Reviewed with Regional Staff
River Road Extension

Figure 5
River Road Extension

- Our request:
- Approve the Pearl Valley Development Corp proposed changes in the EA
  - Hidden Valley Road intersection
  - Shift alignment at Wabanaki Roundabout area
River Road Extension

Figure 6