Regional Municipality Of Waterloo
Planning and Works Committee
Minutes

February 23, 2016
10:13 a.m.
Council Chamber
150 Frederick Street


Members absent: D. Craig, S. Foxton, J. Nowak, and K. Redman

Motion to go into Closed Season

Moved by L. Armstrong
Seconded by D. Jaworsky

That a closed meeting of the Planning and Works and Administration and Finance Committees be held on Tuesday, February 23, 2016 at 9:00 a.m. in the Waterloo County Room in accordance with Section 239 of the “Municipal Act, 2001”, for the purposes of considering the following subject matters:

a) Potential litigation and receiving of advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege related to matters before an administrative tribunal
b) proposed or pending disposition of property in the City of Kitchener

c) a matter of labour relations

d) receiving of advice subject to solicitor-client privilege related to an agreement

e) receiving of advice subject to solicitor-client privilege related to a matter of labour relations

f) a matter of labour relations

Motion to Reconvene into Open Session

Moved by K. Kiefer

Seconded by H. Jowett

That Committee reconvene into Open Session.

Carried

Declarations Of Pecuniary Interest Under The Municipal Conflict Of Interest Act

None declared.

Delegations

a) Les Holdway appeared before Committee to discuss issues relating to water quality. He provided background information on his experience and highlighted the situation in Flint, Michigan. He explained what led to the problem in Flint and pointed out that in Kitchener-Waterloo there is an estimated 1500 pipe connections from the street to houses that are lead. In summary he provided many ways to help mitigate the problem and protect the citizens of the Region from a similar incident as Flint, Michigan. A copy of the presentation is appended to the original minutes.

b) Kevin Thomason appeared before Committee regarding the Provincial Greenbelt review. He provided a presentation that is appended to the original minutes. He outlined background information on the Region’s support of including environmentally sensitive and agricultural lands in the Greenbelt protection plan. He highlighted that the Crombie Report has made recommendations including expanding the Greenbelt and he suggested reaching out to the Province now for the Region to be included into the Greenbelt to provide one more level of security.
Rob Horne, Commissioner, Planning, Development and Legislative Services explained that the Province is currently reviewing Mr. Crombie’s report. He highlighted that the decision in 2008 was to develop Environmentally Sensitive Landscapes since the Region was not included in the Greenbelt in 2005. He pointed out the ESL’s was a homegrown solution which is anchored in the approved Regional Official Plan. He stated that staff is reviewing Mr. Crombie’s report and the Province has indicated that they will provide plenty of time to consult. He highlighted that they will be providing a report to Committee on this noting there is a difference between ESL and the Greenbelt.

c) TES-DCS-16-05, Class Environmental Assessment Study Fischer Hallman Road Improvements, Bleams Road to Plains Road, City of Kitchener

i. Pierre Chauvin, MHBC Planning, appeared before Committee representing his client Activa Holdings Inc. He noted his client owns property in that area and explained his client is currently working with the City of Kitchener on a development concept. He highlighted the importance of pedestrian access on both sides and noted the development relies on the proposed Rosenburg Way roundabout and additional accesses in the form of a right-in/right-out lanes. He asked that the Region acknowledge the additional right-in/right-out accesses to his client’s lands. A copy of the presentation is appended to the original minutes.

ii. Chris Pidgeon, GSP Group, appeared before Committee representing Schlegel Urban Developments. He provided a presentation that outlined the vision for Williamsburg South Neighbourhood, his client’s property, explaining the development is primarily an adult-oriented neighbourhood to allow residents to age in place. He pointed out the report recommends a pedestrian/trail crossing 280m south of Bleams Road and he asked if there is flexibility in this location, is it appropriate for warrants to be met for the trail crossing to be constructed and asked about timing on design and construction. A copy of the presentation is appended to the original minutes.

A Committee member asked both delegations if the access was changed from prohibited to regulated access would it make it easier to work through the process. Both delegations noted that would allow more flexibility.

Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services noted that that changes to access would require a by-law amendment and public consultation.
Committee members discussed maintaining a left-in access at Williamsburg Cemetery and the Portuguese Club and discussed the importance of providing walkability and proper pedestrian access.

Phil Bauer, Director, Design and Construction provided clarification on the warrants of a crosswalk and explained that during the detailed design process direction can be given at that time as to the level of crossing and location.

T. Schmidt noted that the EA can be approved today and any access issues can still be considered during the design phase and would require Council’s approval.

B. Vrbanovic introduced an amendment to the motion to direct staff to review the transition from access prohibited to access regulated, review left-in to the Williamsburg Cemetery and Portuguese Club during design process and provide serious consideration to level 2 crosswalks during design phase.

Moved by B. Vrbanovic

Seconded by G. Lorentz

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to the Class Environmental Assessment for proposed improvements to Fischer-Hallman Road from Bleams Road to Plains Road in the City of Kitchener:

a) Approve the Recommended Design Alternative for Fischer-Hallman Road as outlined in Report TES-DCS-16-05;

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

c) Upon completion of construction, that The Regional Municipality of Waterloo amend Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended to:

a) Remove from Schedule 18, Rate of Speed, 60km/h on Fischer-Hallman Road (Regional Road 58) from Activa Avenue to 375m south of Bleams Road (Regional Road 56);

b) Remove from Schedule 18, Rate of Speed, 80km/h on Fischer-Hallman Road (Regional Road 58) from 375m south of Bleams Road (Regional Road 56) to 500m north of New Dundee Road (Regional Road 12);
c) Add to Schedule 18, Rate of Speed, 60km/h on Fischer-Hallman Road (Regional Road 58) from Activa Avenue to 400m south of Huron Road;

d) Add to Schedule 18, Rate of Speed, 80km/h on Fischer-Hallman Road (Regional Road 58) from 400m south of Huron Road to 500m north of New Dundee Road (Regional Road 12);

e) Add to Schedule 16, Lane Designation, on Fischer-Hallman Road (Regional Road 58) northbound at Huron Road, Through/Left and Through/right;

f) Add to Schedule 16, Lane Designation, on Fischer-Hallman Road (Regional Road 58) southbound at Huron Road, Through/Left and Through/right;

g) Add to Schedule 16, Lane Designation, on Fischer-Hallman Road (Regional Road 58) northbound at Seabrook Drive, Through/Left and Through/right;

h) Add to Schedule 16, Lane Designation, on Fischer-Hallman Road (Regional Road 58) southbound at Seabrook Drive, Through/Left and Through/right;

i) Add to Schedule 16, Lane Designation, on Fischer-Hallman Road (Regional Road 58) northbound at Rosenberg Way, Through/Left and Through/right;

j) Add to Schedule 16, Lane Designation, on Fischer-Hallman Road (Regional Road 58) southbound at Rosenberg Way, Through/Left and Through/right; and,

d) Upon completion of development and construction of the roundabout at Fischer-Hallman Road (Regional Road 58) and Street 1 (as known today), that The Regional Municipality of Waterloo amend Traffic and Parking By-law 06-072, as amended to:

a) Remove from Schedule 18, Rate of Speed, 60km/h on Fischer-Hallman Road (Regional Road 58) from Activa Avenue to 400m south of Huron Road;

b) Remove from Schedule 18, Rate of Speed, 80km/h on Fischer-Hallman Road (Regional Road 58) from 400m south of Huron Road to 500m north of New Dundee Road (Regional Road 12);
c) Add to Schedule 18, Rate of Speed, 60km/h on Fischer-Hallman Road (Regional Road 58) from Activa Avenue to 400m south of Street 1 (as known today);

d) Add to Schedule 18, Rate of Speed, 80km/h on Fischer-Hallman Road (Regional Road 58) from 400m south of Street 1 (as known today) to 500m north of New Dundee Road (Regional Road 12);

e) Add to Schedule 16, Lane Designation, on Fischer-Hallman Road (Regional Road 58) northbound at Street 1 (as known today), Through/Left and Through/right; and,

f) Add to Schedule 16, Lane Designation, on Fischer-Hallman Road (Regional Road 58) southbound at Street 1 (as known today), Through/Left and Through/right.

e) During design phase staff be directed to take the following action:
   - Review the possible transition of the road designation from access prohibited to access regulated in accordance with Controlled Access By-law 58-87;
   - Review the possibility for a left-in at Williamsburg Cemetery and Portuguese Club on Fischer-Hallman Road; and
   - Consideration of Level 2 crosswalk for pedestrian access.

Carried, as amended

Request to Remove Items From Consent Agenda

Chair T. Galloway removed report TES-TRS-16-04/COR-FFM-16-03, GRT Northfield Drive Facility – Public Consultation Centre and Project Update from the Consent Agenda.

Motion To Approve Items Or Receive for Information

Moved by S. Strickland
Seconded by L. Armstrong

That the following items be approved:


2076760
That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve an amendment to Controlled Access By-law #58-87 for an access on the west side of Regional Road #33 (Townline Road), approximately 270 metres north of Saginaw Parkway in the City of Cambridge, as described in Report No. PDL-CPL-16-10, dated February 23, 2016.

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo Controlled Access By-law #58-87 be amended to include a temporary construction access on the east side of Regional Road #54 (Lackner Boulevard) directly opposite Corfield Drive, in the City of Kitchener, as described in Report No. PDL-CPL-16-11, dated February 23, 2016.

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo Controlled Access By-law #58-87 be amended to include a temporary access on the west side of Regional Road #58 (Fischer-Hallman Road) approximately 220 metres south of Columbia Street in the City of Waterloo, as described in Report No. PDL-CPL-16-12, dated February 23, 2016.

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the following amendments to Controlled Access By-law #58-87, subject to site plan approval by the City of Kitchener, as described in Report No. PDL-CPL-13, dated February 23, 2016:

a) delete an emergency access on the east side of Regional Road #70 (Ira Needles Boulevard) approximately 50 metres north of Regional Road #6 (Highland Road) in the City of Kitchener; and

b) approve a right-in, right-out only access on the east side of Regional Road #70 (Ira Needles Boulevard) approximately 127 metres north of Regional Road #6 (Highland Road), in the City of Kitchener.

Carried

TES-TRS-16-04/COR-FFM-16-03, GRT Northfield Drive Facility - Public Consultation Centre and Project Update

Received for information.

Chair T. Galloway pointed out that the City of Waterloo had multiple requests/conditions and inquired if that is usual practise. T. Schmidt noted that occasionally unusual requests are made and they will follow up with some of the requests.
Regular Agenda Resumes

Reports – Transportation and Environmental Services

a) TES-TRP-16-06, Transfer of Dundas Street South from Branchton Road to Southeastern City of Cambridge limit, City of Cambridge

Moved by K. Kiefer

Seconded by H. Jowett

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo request from the Ontario Ministry of Transportation the transfer of Dundas Street South, from Branchton Road to the southeastern City of Cambridge Limit, to the Region of Waterloo in accordance with Report TES-TRP-16-06 dated February 23, 2016.

Carried

Design and Construction

b) PDL-LEG-16-12, Authorization to Expropriate Lands (1st Report) For Franklin Blvd Improvements Project – Year 2 North (200m North of Clyde Road to 200m North of Avenue Road) and Year 2 South (125m South of Champlain Boulevard to 200m South of Main Street), in the City of Cambridge

A Committee member asked about the process to deal with the construction of the Saginaw roundabout. T. Schmidt highlighted that the Region agreed to construct the rest of the roundabouts along Franklin Boulevard and see how they are functioning and come back to Council with a report documenting the performance of those roundabouts.

Moved by J. Mitchell

Seconded by K. Kiefer

That The Regional Municipality of Waterloo direct and authorize the Regional Solicitor to take the following actions with respect to the expropriation of lands for the reconstruction of Franklin Boulevard from 200m North of Clyde Road to 200m North of Avenue Road (Year 2 North), and from 125m South of Champlain Boulevard to 200m South of Main Street (Year 2 South), in the City of Cambridge, in the Region of Waterloo as detailed in report PDL-LEG-16-12 dated February 23, 2016:

1. Complete application(s) to the Council of the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, as may be required from time to time, for approval to expropriate land, which is required for the reconstruction of Franklin Boulevard and described as follows:
Fee Simple Partial Taking:

i. Part of Lot 7, Concession 12, being Parts 44, 53, 54 and 55 on 58R-18803 (Part of PIN 22656-0164 (LT)) (265 Avenue Road, City of Cambridge);

ii. Part of Lot 7, Concession 12, being Parts 40, 41 and 42 on 58R-18803 (Part of PIN 03813-0012 (LT)) (800 Franklin Boulevard, City of Cambridge);

iii. Part of Lot 7, Concession 12, being Parts 27, 28, 29 and 30 on 58R-18803 (Part of PIN 03813-0013 (LT)) (710 Franklin Boulevard, City of Cambridge);

iv. Part of Lot 7, Concession 12, being Parts 23, 24, 25 and 26 on 58R-18803 (Part of PIN 03813-0014 (LT)) (700 Franklin Boulevard, City of Cambridge);

v. Part of Lot 7, Concession 12, being Part 22 on 58R-18803 (Part of PIN 03813-0015 (LT)) (692-696 Franklin Boulevard, City of Cambridge);

vi. Part of Lot 7, Concession 12, being Part 21 on 58R-18803 (Part of PIN 03813-0016 (LT)) (686 Franklin Boulevard, City of Cambridge);

vii. Part of Lot 15, Registered Plan 648, being Part 19 on 58R-18800 (Part of PIN 03813-0100 (LT)) (654 Franklin Boulevard, City of Cambridge);

viii. Part of Lot 15, Registered Plan 648, being Part 18 on 58R-18800 (Part of PIN 03813-0101 (LT)) (650 Franklin Boulevard, City of Cambridge);

ix. Part of Lot 15, Registered Plan 648, being Part 17 on 58R-18800 (Part of PIN 03813-0102 (LT)) (2 Athlone Road, City of Cambridge);

x. Part of Lot 15, Registered Plan 648, being Part 3 on 58R-18800 (Part of PIN 03813-0120 (LT)) (1 Athlone Road, City of Cambridge);

xi. Part of Lot 15, Registered Plan 1415, being Part 56 on 58R-18803 (Part of PIN 22657-0225 (LT)) (111 Bayne Crescent, City of Cambridge);

xii. Part of Lot 14, Registered Plan 1415, being Parts 58 and 61 on 58R-18803 (Part of PIN 22657-0227 (LT)) (107 Bayne Crescent, City of Cambridge);

xiii. Part of Lot 1, Registered Plan 1498, being Part 16 on 58R-18803 (Part of PIN 03825-0059 (LT)) (4 Hilborn Avenue, City of Cambridge);

xiv. Part of Lot 6, Registered Plan 609, being Part 13 on 58R-18803 (Part of PIN 03825-0055 (LT)) (657 Franklin Boulevard, City of Cambridge);

xv. Part of Lot 10, Registered Plan 609, being Part 1 on 58R-18803 (Part of PIN 03825-0007 (LT)) (721 Franklin Boulevard, City of Cambridge);

xvi. Part of Lot 5, Concession 10, being Part 4 on 58R-18801 (Part of PIN 03842-0367 (LT)) (250-270 Dundas Street South, City of Cambridge);

xvii. Part of Block E, Registered Plan 1368, being Parts 5 and 6 on 58R-18802 (Part of PIN 22673-0017 (LT)) (Land on SW Franklin Boulevard and
Permanent Easement - Drainage:

The right and easement, being an easement in gross, for itself, its successors and assigns and anyone authorized by it, in perpetuity to, at any time enter upon the following properties for purposes of constructing, installing, maintaining, inspecting, altering, moving, replacing, reconstructing, enlarging and repairing, as applicable, pipes, catch basins, swales, ditches and other works and appurtenances thereto for the purpose of the transfer or transmission and management of storm water, both above and below the ground and for every such purpose and for all purposes necessary or incidental to the exercise of the rights hereby created, through, over, upon, along and across the lands, and for all such purposes together with the free, unimpeded and unobstructed access for itself, its successors and assigns, servants, agents, contractors, workmen and anyone authorized by it, and vehicles, supplies and equipment at all times and for all purposes and things necessary for or incidental to the exercise and enjoyment of the right and easement:

xxiii. Part of Lot 7, Concession 12, being Parts 51 and 52 on 58R-18803 (Part of PIN 22656-0164 (LT)) (265 Avenue Road, City of Cambridge);
xxiv. Part of Lot 7, Concession 12, being Part 64 on 58R- 18803 (Part of PIN 03813-0014 (LT)) (700 Franklin Boulevard, City of Cambridge);
xxv. Part of Lot 1, Registered Plan 648, being Part 2 on 58R- 18800 (Part of PIN 03813-0119 (LT)) (640 Franklin Boulevard, City of Cambridge);
xxvi. Part of Lot 4, Registered Plan 609 and Part of Block 76 Registered Plan 1498, being Part 1 on 58R- 18800 (Part of PIN 03825-0132 (LT)) (639 Franklin Boulevard, City of Cambridge);
xxvii. Part of Block 38, Registered Plan 58M-241, being Part 23 on 58R- 18801 (Part of PIN 03845-0520 (LT)) (205, 225 & 235 Franklin Boulevard and 2076760)
311 Dundas Street South, City of Cambridge);

**Permanent Easement – Retaining Wall Maintenance:**

The right and easement, being an easement in gross, for itself, its successors and assigns and anyone authorized by it, in perpetuity to, at any time enter upon the following properties for purposes of constructing, installing, maintaining, inspecting, altering, moving, replacing, reconstructing, enlarging and repairing, as applicable, a retaining wall, noise barrier and/or fence, through, over, upon, along and across the lands, and for all such purposes together with the free, unimpeded and unobstructed access for itself, its successors and assigns, servants, agents, contractors, workmen and anyone authorized by it, and vehicles, supplies and equipment at all times and for all purposes and things necessary for or incidental to the exercise and enjoyment of the right and easement:

xxviii. Part of Lot 10, Registered Plan 609, being Part 2 on 58R-18803 (Part of PIN 03825-0007 (LT)) (721 Franklin Boulevard, City of Cambridge);

xxix. Part of Lot 5, Concession 10, being Parts 7, 9 and 10 on 58R-18801 (Part of PIN 03824-0099 (LT)) (200 Franklin Boulevard, City of Cambridge);

**Permanent Easement - Aerial:**

The right and easement, being an easement in gross, for itself, its successors and assigns and anyone authorized by it, in perpetuity to, at any time enter upon the following properties for purposes of constructing, installing, inspecting, repairing, altering, enlarge, replacing, correcting, operating, and maintaining aerial hydro installations and infrastructure overhead, including cables, pipes, conduits of all kinds, all appurtenances thereto, and maintaining required clearance areas for same, herein referred to as the aerial utility plant, which may be determined necessary from time to time through, over, upon, along and across the lands, and for all such purposes together with the free, unimpeded and unobstructed access for itself, its successors and assigns, servants, agents, contractors, workmen and anyone authorized by it, and vehicles, supplies and equipment at all times and for all purposes and things necessary for or incidental to the exercise and enjoyment of the right and easement:

xxx. Part of Lot 7, Concession 12, being Parts 47, 50 and 52 on 58R-18803 (Part of PIN 22656-0164 (LT)) (265 Avenue Road, City of Cambridge);

xxxi. Part of Lot 7, Concession 12, being Parts 35, 36, 37, 38, and 39 on 58R-18803 (Part of PIN 03813-0012 (LT)) (800 Franklin Boulevard, City of Cambridge);

xxxii. Part of Lot 7, Concession 12, being Parts 31, 32, 33 and 34 on 58R-2076760
xxxiii. Part of Lot 14, Registered Plan 1415, being Parts 59 and 60 on 58R-18803 (Part of PIN 22657-0227 (LT)) (107 Bayne Crescent, City of Cambridge);

xxxiv. Part of Lot 1, Registered Plan 1498, being Part 15 on 58R-18803 (Part of PIN 03825-0059 (LT)) (4 Hilborn Avenue, City of Cambridge);

xxxv. Part of Lot 10, Registered Plan 609, being Part 6 on 58R-18803 (Part of PIN 03825-0007 (LT)) (721 Franklin Boulevard, City of Cambridge);

xxxvi. Part of Lots 13 and 14, Registered Plan 1415, being Parts 62 and 63 on 58R-18803 (Part of PIN 22657-0228 (LT)) (103 Bayne Crescent, City of Cambridge);

xxxvii. Part of Lot 5, Concession 10, being Part 5 on 58R-18801 (Part of PIN 03824-0367 (LT)) (250-270 Dundas Street South, City of Cambridge);

xxxviii. Part of Block E, Registered Plan 1368, being Parts 7, 8, and 11 on 58R-18802 (Part of PIN 22673-0017 (LT)) (Land on SW Franklin Boulevard and Champlain Boulevard, City of Cambridge);

xxxix. Part of Lot 5, Concession 10, being Part 8 on 58R-18801 (Part of PIN 03824-0099 (LT)) (200 Franklin Boulevard, City of Cambridge);

xl. Part of Block 38, Registered Plan 58M-241, being Parts 19, 22 and 23 on 58R-18801 (Part of PIN 03845-0520 (LT)) (205, 225 & 235 Franklin Boulevard and 311 Dundas Street South, City of Cambridge);

Permanent Easement - Anchor:

The right and easement, being an easement in gross, for itself, its successors and assigns and anyone authorized by it, in perpetuity to, at any time enter upon the following properties for purposes of constructing, laying down, installing, inspecting, repairing, altering, enlarging, replacing, correcting, operating, and maintaining hydro installations and infrastructure, both under ground and overhead, including cables, pipes, conduits of all kinds, all necessary poles, supporting wires and braces and other equipment and appurtenances thereto, herein referred to as the utility plant, which may be determined necessary from time to time through, over, upon, along and across the lands, and for all such purposes together with the free, unimpeded and unobstructed access for itself, its successors and assigns, servants, agents, contractors, workmen and anyone authorized by it, and vehicles, supplies and equipment at all times and for all purposes and things necessary for or incidental to the exercise and enjoyment of the right and easement:

xli. Part of Lot 7, Concession 12, being Parts 43, 45, 46,48 and 49 on 58R-18803 (Part of PIN 22656-0164 (LT)) (265 Avenue Road, City of Cambridge);
xlii. Part of Lot 6, Registered Plan 609, being Part 14 on 58R-18803 (Part of PIN 03825-0518 (LT)) (647 Franklin Boulevard, City of Cambridge);
xliii. Part of Lot 10, Registered Plan 609, being Parts 3, 4 and 5 on 58R-18803 (Part of PIN 03825-0007 (LT)) (721 Franklin Boulevard, City of Cambridge);
xliv. Part of Lot 10, Registered Plan 609, being Part 7 on 58R-18803 (Part of PIN 03825-0008 (LT)) (711 Franklin Boulevard, City of Cambridge);
xlv. Part of Block E, Registered Plan 1368, being Parts 9 and 10 on 58R-18802 (Part of PIN 22673-0017 (LT)) (Land on SW Franklin Boulevard and Champlain Boulevard, City of Cambridge);
xlvi. Part of Lot 5, Concession 10, being Part 1 on 58R-18801 (Part of PIN 03843-0286 (LT)) (350 Dundas Street South, City of Cambridge);
xlvii. Part of Block 38, Registered Plan 58M-241, being Parts 12, 13, 16, 17, 20 and 21 on 58R-18801 (Part of PIN 03845-0520 (LT)) (205, 225 & 235 Franklin Boulevard and 311 Dundas Street South, City of Cambridge);

2. Serve notices of the above applications(s) required by the Expropriations Act (the “Act”);
3. Forward to the Chief Inquiry Officer any requests for a hearing that may be received within the time prescribed by the Act;
4. Attend, with appropriate Regional staff, at any hearing that may be scheduled;
5. Discontinue expropriation proceedings or any part thereof, in respect of the above described lands, or any part thereof, upon the registration on title of the required documentation to complete a transaction whereby the required interests in the lands are conveyed or if otherwise deemed appropriate in the opinion of the Commissioner of Transportation and Environmental Services and the Regional Solicitor; and
6. Do all things necessary and properly to be done and report thereon to Regional Council in due course.

Carried

c) TES-DCS-16-06, 2015 Construction Summary and 2016 Construction Update Received for Information.

Committee members thanked staff for the report and asked how often staff will be reporting back and if a budgeted column could be added to the chart.

T. Schmidt stated that staff will be reporting back quarterly.

*T. Galloway left the meeting at 11:27 a.m. and Vice Chair K. Kiefer assumed the Chair. 2076760
Waste Management

d) TES-WMS-16-02, Bill 151: Waste Free Ontario Act and Strategy

Jon Arsenault, Director, Waste Management, provided a brief overview of the report highlighting the objective is to move to a full producer responsibility regime where producers are accountable for recovering resources and reducing waste associated with their products. He pointed out a number of impacts to the existing current program operations undertaken by the Region and noted they are highlighted in attachment 1. He highlighted that staff continue to consult with the Province and other stakeholders for fair treatment during this process.

K. Seiling pointed out that one of the concerns is that municipalities have been dropped from the involvement in negotiations and introduced an amendment to the motion to include a paragraph to recognize concerns of municipalities during the process.

Moved by K. Seiling

Seconded by H. Jowett

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo:

a) support proposed Bill151: the Waste-Free Ontario Act and Strategy and endorse the key comments/principles as outlined in Attachment 1 to Report TES-WMS-16-02 and authorize staff to advocate for those principles in consultation with the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) in order to recognize the concerns of municipalities in the process;

b) submit Report TES-WMS-16-02 to the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change in response to its posting of Bill151 and the draft strategy on the Environmental Bill of Rights Registry posting (EBR 012-5832) by the comment deadline of February 29, 2016; and,

c) submit Report TES-WM-16-02 to the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO), the Regional Public Works Commissioners of Ontario (RPWCO), the Municipal Waste Association (MWA), the City of Toronto (Toronto), the Ontario Waste Management Association (OWMA) and the Members of Provincial Parliament that represent the Region of Waterloo.

Carried, as amended
Water Services

e) TES-WAS16-04, 2015 Annual Water Quality Report for the Region of Waterloo Rural and Integrated Water Systems

For information.

A Committee member pointed out that on page 132 of the agenda package highlights the Lead Testing Program and referenced the paragraph that stated several factors as to why lead is not a major concern in the Region. It was noted that the delegation raised some good ideas and valuable concerns about trying to figure out if there are lead pipes in older homes.

A Committee member asked if the Region has any lead pipes. T. Schmidt highlighted there is no lead in the distribution system which is the Region’s pipes and the Cities pipes do not have lead in them. He stated the issue of lead occurs between the pipe and the home and within the home, noting there are some cases where lead pipe is used as connection from the water main to the home and provided clarification on responsibility of replacement on the homeowner and the City.

T. Schmidt also pointed out lead is not a concern because there is extensive testing that is done by the local municipalities on the water system to ensure that lead is not an issue and the testing is specifically targeted at homes where lead could be present.

Nancy Kodousek, Director, Water Services provided clarification on the water sampling in Woolwich Township.

f) TES-WAS-16-05/COR-FSD-16-06, Conestoga College U-Pass

S. Strickland brought forward option C outlined in the report explaining that the money was intended for the Conestoga College U-Pass and that if the money is not being used for that it needs to go back to the tax payers, stating it’s a matter of principle.

Committee members discussed Conestoga College students turning down the u-pass and inquired about the students wanting it in the future.

Craig Dyer, Chief Financial Officer, highlighted that an issue paper would have to be brought forward in the future.

A Committee member inquired about potential infrastructure dollars from the Federal Government as it relates to transit and how this would affect the cost sharing.

Mike Murray, Chief Administrative Officer, highlighted that if this whole initiative is removed from the budget then we wouldn’t be seeking cost shared funding for this initiative. He did point out that the Region has put together a funding proposal that is 2076760
referenced in a couple of other reports on the agenda today that totals roughly 150 million in transit system enhancements and provided clarification on funding of those projects, including cost sharing and infrastructure dollars.

*T. Galloway entered the meeting at 11:55 a.m. and resumed the Chair.

G. Lorentz requested a recorded vote.

Moved by S. Strickland

Seconded by G. Lorentz

That the 2016 Budget be amended to reduce the 2016 property tax levy by $339,000 resulting in a $1.35 reduction to the average residential property tax bill.

Carried


Nays: K. Seiling

g) TES-DCS-16-03 University Avenue Reconstruction and Widening (Keats Way to Erb Street), City of Waterloo – Recommended Design Concept

i. Roger Suffling did not appear as a delegation. His submission was circulated to the Committee and is attached to the original minutes.

It was highlighted that the City of Waterloo Councillor J. Henry sent an email stating that the City of Waterloo is not in support of the recommendation. He stated the Region should be building the infrastructure they want to build and not build infrastructure to fit in with what they currently have. He also noted that segregated bike lanes was the consensus of the project group.

Committee members discussed in detail the need for segregated bikes lanes especially in the University area and highlighted the importance of starting somewhere.

Committee members discussed the capital plan for University Avenue as well the other roads and the potential budgeting for retrofitting. Committee members directed staff to report back on the feasibility of budgeting and on the engineering side of retrofitting bike lanes prior to full construction.

T. Schmidt stated that staff will bring back the Active Transportation Master Plan to refresh Councillors on the plan, stating within the plan there is a financial component and addresses some of the issues discussed.
D. Jaworsky introduced an amendment to the recommendation to include segregated bike lanes.

Moved by D. Jaworsky

Seconded by J. Mitchell

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to the Environmental Assessment and Preliminary Design Study for University Avenue between Keats Way and Erb Street in the City of Waterloo:

a) Approve the Recommended Design Concept for the proposed reconstruction and widening of University Avenue from Keats Way to Erb Street as described in Report TES-DCS-16-03 dated February 23, 2016 with the exception that segregated cycling lanes be included in the Design Concept instead of buffered on-road cycling lanes.

b) Direct staff to file a Notice of Completion as required by the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment and place the project file on the public record for review for a period of 30 days.

Carried, as amended

Interdepartmental Reports

h) TES-WAS-16-06/COR-FFM-16-04, P2015-31 Asset Management – Work Management System

Moved by S. Strickland

Seconded by D. Jaworsky

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo accept the proposal of eGovsolutions for P2015-31 Work Management System in the amount of $450,000 plus all applicable taxes.

Carried

Reports – Planning, Development and Legislative Services

Airport

i) PDL-AIR-16-04, Region of Waterloo International Airport – Proposed New 2016 Master Plan/Business Plan

R. Horne introduced the report and provided brief comments.
Moved by S. Strickland

Seconded by L. Armstrong

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo take the following actions with respect to the completion of a new Master Plan for the Region of Waterloo International Airport (ROWIA), as described in Report No. PDL-AIR-16-04, dated February 23, 2016:

a) Establish an updated ROWIA Master Plan Steering Committee, including the appointment of the Chair of Planning and Works Committee, the Chair of Administration and Finance Committee, the Regional Council representative to the Aeronautical Noise Advisory Committee; and a local Council representative from each of the Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener, and Waterloo, and the Township of Woolwich, with additional members as described in this report;

b) Increase the existing purchase order with WSP Canada (formerly MMM Group) by $100,000 to complete the draft Master Plan; and,

c) Direct the ROWIA Committee to undertake the following public engagement initiatives:

i. Hold a minimum of two public consultation sessions in the spring and fall of 2016 to update the public on the status of the ROWIA Master Plan and to seek input on options for the future of the ROWIA;

ii. Use the Region of Waterloo’s new online consultation portal to present information and seek feedback from the community at large;

iii. Consult with the ROWIA Business Advisory Committee and the Waterloo Region Economic Development Corporation.

Carried

Commissioner’s Office

j) PDL-16-01, Potential Delegation of Additional Planning Act Approval Authority by Regional Council to Interested Area Municipalities

R. Horne introduced the report and provided introductory comments.

Moved by H. Jowett

Seconded by L. Armstrong

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo advise the Area Municipalities that the Region will consider the delegation of additional Planning Act approval authority upon
the receipt of formal requests from an Area Municipal Council, in accordance with the terms and conditions approved by Regional Council, as described in Report PDL-16-01, dated February 23, 2016;

And That Regional staff report back with delegation requests made by Area Municipalities for formal consideration by Regional Council.

Carried

Community Planning

k) PDL-CPL-16-14, King-Victoria Multi-Modal Transit Hub Update

John Hill, Acting Manager of Development, Reurbanization provided a brief presentation on the King-Victoria Multi-Modal Transit Hub that highlighted concept designs. A copy of the presentation is appended to the original minutes.

It was highlighted that the next steps are public consultation centres and the need for senior level of government funding.

Moved by B. Vrbanovic

Seconded by D. Jaworsky

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo endorse the recommended direction described in Report No. PDL-CPL-16-14, dated February 23, 2016, as the basis for advancing the development of the King-Victoria Multi-modal Transit Hub, subject to the receipt of senior level government funding, and including:

a) Holding a Public Information Centre to update residents and adjacent land owners on the King-Victoria Multi-modal Transit Hub project, including feedback on the Waterloo Street pedestrian access options, and invite the City of Kitchener to co-host and provide updates on associated planning initiatives;

b) Retaining Ontario Infrastructure and Lands Corporation (Infrastructure Ontario) to act as the Procurement Advisor for the construction of the King-Victoria Multi-modal Transit Hub project, on terms satisfactory to the Regional Solicitor, to an upset fee limit of $305,000 plus applicable taxes, and authorize the Commissioner of Planning, Development and Legislative Services and the Chief Financial Officer to enter into agreements with associated advisors, including Legal, Fairness and Design/Engineering services;

c) Amending the Region's 2016-2025 capital budget and forecast to include the King Victoria Multi-Modal Transit Hub as set out in Attachment 2 to this report,
and reflecting the Region’s intention to fund that portion of the King-Victoria Multi-modal Transit Hub project related to meeting the increased need for service arising from development, including any excess capacity related to meeting that need by development charges; and

d) Formally pursuing funding opportunities from a variety of sources, including the Greater Toronto Transportation Authority (Metrolinx), VIA Rail, and the Federal and Provincial governments.

Carried

Information/Correspondence

a) Council Enquiries and Requests for Information Tracking List was received for information.

Next Meeting – March 22, 2016

Adjourn

Moved by L. Armstrong

Seconded by D. Jaworsky

That the meeting adjourn at 12:38 p.m.

Carried

Committee Chair, T. Galloway

Committee Clerk, E. Flewwelling
Region of Waterloo,

Dear Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you.

My Name is Les Holdway. I currently reside in Cambridge, Ontario. I have worked in construction /restoration in Montreal, Toronto, Guelph, Fergus, Elora, Cambridge and the KW region. I spent the early part of my career in Toronto in various media production capacities in documentary and feature film production, which I augmented with work in small restoration projects. In fact many of the production personnel would work together on building projects between contracts.

From there I became an original partner in Vista Homes where I picked up the art of efficient construction techniques, in a very competitive environment. I transitioned that capability into Historic restoration projects, including the purchase; design, re zoning, re - adaptive use of the St Andrew St condos in Fergus in the 90’s. This was the first significant Mill restoration and conversion in the region, which was proof of concept and lead the way for many others in the KW area.

However it was both my construction experience and my earlier connection to documentaries and Michael Moore that lead me to Flint Michigan at his invite last month. I went there to get a first hand understanding of the problem and meet with the protagonists and the principals involved, and form my own opinions. I was fortunate to meet with Michael, Jesse Jackson, and the Mayor Karen Weaver directly. The mayor and the media were interested in the fact a Canadian would bother to offer their time and support. The local TV media picked up my thoughts on the problem.

Some years ago, I worked under contract as the Information services officer with the Ministry of the Environment, which gave me an understanding of the challenges we face. Later on, I followed our own Water crisis in Walkerton very closely in attempt to understand and
learn from those mistakes. I also consulted with Doctor Naylor after the SARS crisis, on disease control as it relates to physical structures. I continue to work on a number of environmental issues.

What I discovered in Flint, although a much more extreme version of our situation, does have some parallels to industrial southern Ontario.

From the Roaring Twenties right through to the 1970's Oil crisis, the American Auto industry, Detroit, and in search of vast tracts of land, Flint Michigan, underwent an unparrelled industrial growth that seemed, for 5 decades, to reflect a kind of North American invincibility.

First and foremost, the Government and the experts now publicly agree, that there is no safe level of lead contamination in water, be it drinking or otherwise. Lead, is drawn into the body and the blood stream, both externally and internally. The lead is almost entirely retained by the body and filters its way to the human brain where a whole host of issues can result, including a significant and Life Long Impairment of Cognitive Function.

The most worrisome aspect of this is that there is no taste or immediate effect that ties a person’s understanding of what’s happening to them, and those children’s developing brains are most susceptible. Compounding the problem, as Sanja Gupta points out, is that children with poor nutrition absorb even more of the Lead. So what does this have to do with us?

Part of the problem in Flint is, that after the 1990 GM job collapse, where a staggering 80,000 jobs were lost in Flint, there are now miles of unused and dead ended water lines. Stagnant water is cause enough for concern, as water is a living environment. Stagnation will cause a Petrie dish effect, where the bacteria content will continually rise. For example, if you place a bottle of water in a cupboard, or on a store shelf for a year, it can develop bacterial levels akin to your toilet bowl... So check the expiry dates.
Amongst the entire infrastructure are an unknown number of lead water pipes installed through that 5-decade period.

One of the current big issues for Mayor Karen Weaver, and towns throughout the US and Canada that there has been no systematic inventory of where or how many there are. In our region, there appears to be no mandatory requirement for contractors to report and document lead pipe that they may be connecting to while replacing other lines.

There is no comprehensive audit and inventory of all Lead water supply lines, nor is there a funded program focused on their immediate replacement.

There is No requirement for the city or the homeowner to replace individual supply lines to a home when they are discovered to be made of lead. There is also no requirement to attach these findings to the title of the home to alert buyers of this problem. A Home inspector will attempt to verify the home itself has no Lead pipe but has no clear way to ascertain the type of line leading to the home. Even if the homeowner is made aware of the line when discovered, replacement is not mandatory. As it costs $3000 to $6000 to replace a single service, few, if any homeowners will do so. The fact that the city has not made the removal mandatory is puzzling, as you have not been allowed to install lead pipe in homes for around 30 years. The non-mandatory stance only infers to the homeowner that doesn't want to spend the money that it isn't a critical problem. I believe it is.

The subsequent test by the city to see if these discovered lines exceeds 10 parts per billion only relates to the water flowing through the pipes, On That Date. I think the ten parts needs to go as a threshold and be replaced by zero. Flint says there is no safe level.

Even at Ten parts, how much have you accumulated in a day, week or year? The test only relates to the water in the line, not the person.
If, as they have found in Flint, the acidity level of the water increases, from the 120 or so different well and river sources in the region, the water on any given day can be many multiples of that number. In Flint recent independent samples from individual homes have spikes in the Lead content to as high as 3000 parts per billion. At this level, showering or skin contact would be considered toxic.

There is a lot of talk in Flint, that if the managers’ of the water had only added the additional base chemicals to offset the acid content the Lead poisoning levels would have been a lot less.

This is true …but it begs the question that you are still allowing drinking water to flow through a pipe made of a 100% toxic material using a kind of chemical liner. To be even somewhat effective it would have to be monitored and adjusted hourly.

Would you let your child drink water from a lead cup? Would you do so after they added an additional chemical? Or… Would you do so after someone assures you it’s only 10 parts lead… But it’s accumulative?

Who would intentionally do this?

Or more graphically would you put one lead bullet in a gun, and pull the trigger, knowing you will have only a 1 in 6 chance of getting lead poisoning.

In KW alone there are an estimated 1500 connects from the street to houses that are LEAD…once they are discovered the home owner is told but the lead pipes are not identified on the title of the home nor are they required to replace them.

1500 x 3000 = $4,500,000 to $9,000,000 Clearly this is a problem that could use Federal Infrastructure Funding assistance.

Lead Pipe or Pot Holes?
I have already given a presentation on this topic to one of the Federal Infrastructure Ministers and we will be doing a follow up. However at first blush, the response was, this could use up all of our infrastructure money. Likely an overstatement, but in either event, shouldn’t Life threatening issues, particularly ones primarily targeting children’s mental development, be at the top of any list?

Erin Brocovich, the actual person behind the movie of the same name, noted 2 weeks ago, that their organization has identified at least another 130 plus towns in the US with similar infrastructure issues and potential for a "Flint like” crisis.

I don’t believe this problem stops at the 49th Parallel.

Flint and Michigan’s ultimate mistake, and now possibly a criminal one, was not about being unaware of the problem, but was in fact about becoming aware of the issue, and then attempting to bury the information. By so doing, they may have moved the issue from a civil one to one of criminal liability.

So, In SUMMARY

There is still, I believe, an unknown quantity of lead water mains in our own system. Even it only 10 percent of the line is made of Lead, as the system is linear, all the water passing through it will be affected.

We have a multi source water supply, as there are over 100 source wells plus the Grand River as water inputs in our system, all constantly fluctuating in acidity. Preventative chemical treatment for Lead is neither effective, possible nor safe. Having what people refer too as “Hard water” does not stop lead from leaching into it. Also recent increases in background salt or chloride content may be compounding the problem.

If water sources from the wells change so does the acidity.... increased sulphur or acid will leach lead from the pipes at 10’s of times or even 100’s of times the normal rate
The only safe and effective response to Lead is the removal of all Lead Water Mains, all Lead home and factory supply lines and to make it an **Immediate and Mandatory** priority for each town, the region as a whole, the province and across the country.

So...we need an immediate independent inventory and audit of all Lead lines in the system.

We need a mandatory disclosure policy for all contractors discovering lead pipe in the course of their work on any infrastructure for the municipalities or private contracts. We also need a written policy that guarantees **no recrimination** for these parties, perhaps even better, rewards them.

We also need the region to issue a policy advisory to all government personnel that it is **unlawful** to willingly or intentionally hide information on the water supply that may be a threat to the health and well being of its citizens.

We need to have all **Lead Home Supply Connections** be immediately identified on title to each home.

We need all **home inspections** and **real estate transactions** to also identify and declare all Lead supply lines to the home, just as they would with lead pipes in the home.

We need an immediate reduction in **Acceptable Lead Levels** to **Zero**, as we now know, lead accumulates in the body. We must disabuse ourselves of the notion that Lead Levels are Controllable. The **ONLY Effective Control is Elimination**.

We need the **audits and inventory** of the municipal systems to be under the purview and responsibility of the regions, provinces and ultimately the Federal government, not left to individual municipal budgets.
We need an immediate program, funded at least in part with Federal Infrastructure Funds to replace all municipal Lead water supply lines and assist homeowners and municipalities financially with individual home supply connections.

If you can fund an efficient furnace, you can fund safe water supply lines in the same way, perhaps offering Lead Audits in the same way energy audits were done.

I know from my experience as a contractor and knowing and working with other contractors, the LEAD Water pipe is there, in the ground, in use. I also know, that generally the public is unaware of the extent or seriousness of the problem.

We have ageing communities and declining industrial infrastructure assets that all contribute to the difficulty of maintaining our own system at a standard that is safe for everyone.

It is the Public that needs to hear these concerns, and it is the Public’s voice on this issue that will be required to make the funds available to protect our citizens from a Flint Michigan happening here.

Thank you for your attention.

Les Holdway

Rescom Real Estate &
Noah’s Ark Wetlands
Foundation

519 212 1880

February 23rd 2016
The Provincial Greenbelt Review

Kevin Thomason
Grand River Environmental Network

www.gren.ca
“The Region of Waterloo is strongly supportive of the Draft Greenbelt Plan. As noted in our previous submissions to the province, many of the Greenbelt Plan’s policies such as strong protection for prime agricultural areas, firm settlement area boundaries, and the protection of water resources are core principles of our own ROPP and RGMS... To ensure that we are able to continue to successfully implement the RGMS,
the Region of Waterloo recommends that the Greenbelt Protection Plan be extended to include environmentally sensitive and agricultural lands in the Region of Waterloo. It is a good plan for communities in the Greater Toronto-Hamilton area and it would be an equally good plan for communities in the Outer Ring.”

Regional Chair Ken Seiling
Submission to Provincial Standing Committee on General Government, Bill 135, The Greenbelt Act
February 3, 2005
BALANCING Environmental Protection & Growth

Submission to the Provincial Standing Committee on General Government
Bill 135, The Greenbelt Act, 2004

IMPLEMENTING OUR COMMON VISION

February 3, 2005 – Toronto, Ontario
FIGURE 1
POTENTIAL WESTWARD EXTENSION OF GREENBELT

Potential Westward Extension of Greenbelt into Waterloo-Wellington-Brant Area
Potential Westward Extension of Greenbelt into Waterloo-Wellington-Brant Area
Waterloo Region - Not Included in the Provincial Greenbelt
Protecting Vulnerable Water Supplies in the Greater Golden Horseshoe

This map recommends growing the Greenbelt into adjoining areas of critical ecological and hydrological significance, including:
1. Key headwater features,
2. Significant groundwater recharge areas (including moraines and the Lake Iroquois shoreline),
3. Important surface water features, and
4. Urban river valleys.

Vulnerable surface and groundwater features without Greenbelt protection:
- Upper and Single Tier Municipalities
- Current Greenbelt boundary
- Built up areas as of 2006
- Planned growth to 2031
- Key feature
- Key feature connection
- River
- River headwaters
- Key river valley
- Greater Golden Horseshoe

Produced for the Oak Ridges Moraine Partnership for 2015 and Ontario Greenbelt Alliance
www.marvellousmoraine.ca
www.greenbeltalliance.ca

Built up area and planned growth area data provided by Neptis Foundation, 2015. Greenbelt boundaries provided by Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, 2014.
Map design by As the Crow Flies Cartography, November, 2015.
Greenbelt Support

“OHBA supports the Greenbelt and is committed to working with government, environmental groups, farmers and civic leaders to create a “Smart Greenbelt” to better achieve Ontario’s environmental goals.”

“The Greenbelt Plan (2005) has helped preserve agricultural land and operations within its boundaries over the last 10 years. Outside the Greenbelt the prospects for preserving farmland are less certain.”
Crombie Panel Report has made 87 recommendations including expanding the Greenbelt.

Given repeated requests for Greenbelt expansion to Waterloo, we need to speak up now and be part of the conversation with the province for the best possible future for our region.
Questions?

Kevin Thomason
kevinthomason@mac.com
(519) 888-0519
February 22, 2016

Delton Zehr
Transportation and Environmental Services, Design and Construction
Regional Municipality of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3

Dear Mr. Zehr:

RE: Fischer-Hallman Road Improvements Class Environment Assessment Study,
City of Kitchener
OUR FILE: 8784AP

I am writing on behalf of our client, Activa Holdings Inc., and as a follow-up to our discussions regarding the recommended design alternative for the Fischer-Hallman Road Class Environmental Assessment. As you know, our client owns land on the east side of Fischer-Hallman Road located between Strasburg Creek and the HEPC hydro corridor (see attached). Activa’s lands are also bound to the east by the existing Huron Natural Area. Our client has been working with the City of Kitchener on a development concept as part of their active zone change application for their lands. The concept includes a mix-use development consisting of commercial/office and multiple residential uses. The intent is to rely on the proposed Rosenberg Way roundabout as the primary access to the subject lands. Additional accesses in the form of right-in/right-out lanes are also contemplated.

Recommended Design Alternative No. 2 proposes an ultimate roundabout configuration at Rosenberg Way consisting of 2 lanes of traffic on Rosenberg Way as well as right-turn by-pass lanes. It would appear that the recommended design is based on a public road access onto our client’s lands. We note, our client’s development concept was premised on a private road and not a public road. We kindly ask that Staff confirm that the design of the roundabout at Rosenberg Way does not preclude the option to consider a private road access from our client’s lands. We would also ask that Staff acknowledge that additional right-in/right-out accesses to client’s lands will be considered as part of the review of our client’s development application and that the preferred design alternative does not preclude such consideration.
Thank you for your consideration and I confirm I will be speaking to these matters at the upcoming Planning and Works Committee Meeting on February 23, 2016.

Yours truly,
MHBC

Pierre J. Chauvin, MA, MCIP, RPP
PJCce

attach

cc: Larry Masseo, Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Big Spring Farms Ltd.
Williamsburg South Subdivision
Vision for Williamsburg South Neighbourhood:

- A master planned "Complete Community"

- Primarily an Adult-oriented neighbourhood to allow residents to "age in place"

- High-density, mixed-residential community with diverse commercial and recreational uses
Vision for Williamsburg South Neighbourhood:

Create a neighbourhood that is:

• Vibrant
• Complete
• Variety of housing
• Walkable
• Place-making
• Connected
• Safe
Vision for Williamsburg South Neighbourhood:

Community Trails
Vision for Williamsburg South Neighbourhood:

- Recreational trails, cycle lanes & connectivity to Huron Natural Park, Williamsburg Cemetery and Williamsburg Town Centre
Vision for Williamsburg South Neighbourhood:

- Report recommends a pedestrian / trail crossing 280m south of Bleams Road:
  - (1) Is there flexibility in this location?
  - (2) Is it appropriate for “warrants” to be met for the trail crossing to be constructed?
  - (3) Question timing – Design in 2016 and Construction in 2020?
Submission to RMW Planning and Works Committee from Kitchener Easy Riders Bicycle Club Advocacy Committee
Feb 22nd 2016
Re: University Avenue Reconstruction and Widening (Keats Way to Erb Street) City of Waterloo
Recommended Design Concept TDS-DCS-16-03, File code: File Code: C04-30, 07259

Summary: Kitchener Easy Riders Bicycle Club’s Advocacy Committee is concerned that the proposed bike facilities for University Ave. between Erb St. West and Keatsway will be inadequate and unsatisfactory. We would like a segregated cycle path on this road section as enabled in the Walk Cycle Waterloo Region Active Transport Management Plan of 2014.

Who are Kitchener Easy Riders?

Kitchener Easy Riders Cycle Club is an adult 50+ cycling program offered through the City of Kitchener’s Downtown Community Centre. The club has a capped membership of 220 (and waiting list of 67 riders) drawn from throughout the Region. The club is nearly 25 years old. We cycle in the Region and elsewhere in Ontario several times a week from early spring to late fall and we promote safe cycling for fun, fitness and fellowship. Mostly our riding is on roads rather than on trails. Most members also cycle individually for utilitarian purposes, for recreation, and as part of an environmental ethic. We use the roads like University Avenue for commuting, as shoppers and to access services throughout the Region.

The Recommendation for on-road bike lanes is unsatisfactory. Segregated lanes have demonstrable advantages.

The proposed standard bicycle lane is unsatisfactory because this is:

1. a relatively high speed road
2. a high vehicle density road
3. a high and rising cyclist usage road
The design team concluded that “there would be no significant benefit in terms of encouraging cycling by implementing segregated or off-road cycling facilities”. In fact the Region’s own expert report on cycling contradicts them. The Walk Cycle Waterloo Region report recognized in detail what numerous other studies confirm – That cycling increases dramatically when demonstrably safe facilities are installed. On-road cycle lanes on busy streets are rarely used except by experienced, very confident cyclists. In this situation segregated lanes are needed to address safety, congestion, health and carbon emission/climate change issues. Building an effective cycle route on University Avenue will not only aid access to the universities and uptown Waterloo, but will also promote access to the LRT.

The growing need for segregated facilities is supported by Regional policy for segregated facilities in the above circumstances (Specifically: Walk Cycle Waterloo Region page 3-11, 3-13).

The design Team used the RMW’s Cycling Master Plan and the Region’s Active Transportation Master Plan (ATMP) to support retention of existing on-road cycling lanes. In fact, these two plans make minimal concessions to cycling and climate change issues in their list of roads for upgrades. They are weak in this respect and Easy Riders has pointed this out to RMW on several occasions.

Also, may we remind the Committee that the 1-year target for such lanes is 20Km? (p4-13)? Has this been met?

**Why the recommendation for on-road lanes is unsupported**

In essence, the rationale for doing nothing new on University Avenue is:

1. Segregated cycle lanes add “as much as” 15% to the project cost of $2.2m. That is a maximum of $300,000.
2. Snow clearing is “more difficult”.
3. “…both north and south of the project currently has on road bike lanes and it makes the most sense for this portion of University Ave to maintain an on-road bike lane for continuity with the adjoining sections”.

This rationale is fatally flawed:

1. **What is the real extra cost of segregated lanes?** We contend that it is much less than $300,000. The Committee should ask for the cost of the proposed sidewalks for comparison. Would widening them as a shared trail cost this much?
   In any case, one serious cyclist injury incurred by on road lanes could easily cost the community as much or more than the claimed extra lane costs.
2. **How, specifically, is snow clearing “more difficult”** with segregated lanes? Snow clearing will be needed anyway for the proposed sidewalks and for the on-road lanes. **The Committee should ask how much more clearing segregated lanes would cost.** How awkward would it be to clear on-road bike lanes properly? And what would be the cost of clearing on-road lanes properly instead of the current practice of piling snow in these areas?

3. **Is the “continuity with adjacent sections” argument valid? The Region would never upgrade any road if it always had to match the adjacent sections. Indeed we would still be using the pioneers’ cow paths!**

**Conclusion**

There is a clear mandate to build segregated cycle paths in the Region’s own active transport policy.

There is both room and need to install segregated lanes on University Avenue.

The rationale for rejecting the segregated lanes on University Avenue is deeply flawed.

The Region is giving mixed messages! It advocates building cycling facilities while staff argue that a (maybe?????) 15% increase in construction costs is unjustifiable for cyclists. We remind the Planning and Works Committee that there are 10,000 cyclists in the Region, and that annual Regional spending per cyclist barely exceeds the price of a cup of coffee! If there is one serious injury or death to a cyclist on the rebuilt stretch of road, those supposed cost savings will evaporate (but they costs will be born externally).

We cyclists pay our taxes for services, just like car drivers. We expect better facilities on a busy, dangerous road. The Region has to start paying the modest cost of the policy that it has adopted. Now is the time.

The Region should grasp the savings and opportunities afforded by immediately beginning to implement the active transport policy so recently adopted, starting on University Avenue

Roger Suffling on behalf of Kitchener Easy Riders Bicycle Advocacy Committee.

CC: D. Burgetz, Chair of Easy Riders Bicycle Club, Peter Linn (Plinn@regionofwaterloo.ca), Mike Boos, TRITAG (mike.boos@tritag.ca), Naryan Donaldson (nsdonaldson@uwaterloo.ca)
An additional off-site component under consideration, the Pedestrian Bridge, is a conceptual enclosed bridge that may connect the Transit Hall, across the GO Transit rail tracks, to the Breithaupt Block offices.