Regional Municipality of Waterloo

Planning and Works

Agenda

Tuesday, May 28, 2019

Approximately 9:15 a.m.

Council Chamber

150 Frederick Street, Kitchener

1. Motion to go into Closed Session

That a closed meeting of the Planning and Works Committee be held on Tuesday, May 28, 2019 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) instruction to be applied to negotiations on behalf of the municipality

2. Motion to Reconvene into Open Session

3. Declarations of Pecuniary Interest under The “Municipal Conflict Of Interest Act”

4. Delegations

a) Tova Davidson, Sustainable WR re: PDL-CPL-19-22, Corporate and Community-wide GHG Reduction Update (Information)
b) Gina Ruttan, New Hamburg Board of Trade re: TES-TRS-19-06.1, Proposed Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover on Huron Street (Regional Road 4) On-Street Parking Review, in the Township of Wilmot

**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the installation of a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover on Huron Street at Mill Street and amend the Region’s Traffic and Parking By-law 16-023, as amended, to add the following:

- Add to Schedule 10 a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover (Type D) on Huron Street (Regional Road 4) at Mill Street;
- Remove from Schedule 2, Limited Parking on Huron Street (Regional Road 4), North side, between 22 m East of Union Street to 30 m East of Mill Street, 8:00 am to 6:00 pm, Monday to Saturday, 2 hours;
- Add to Schedule 1, No Parking on Huron Street (Regional Road 4), between 74 m East of Union Street to 14 m East of Mill Street;
- Add to Schedule 2, Limited Parking on Huron Street (Regional Road 4), North side, between 22 m East of Union Street to 74 m East of Union Street, 8:00 am to 6:00 pm, Monday to Saturday, 2 hours;
- Add to Schedule 2, Limited Parking on Huron Street (Regional Road 4), North side, between 14 m East of Mill Street to 30 m East of Mill Street, 8:00 am to 6:00 pm, Monday to Saturday, 2 hours;
- Remove from Schedule 2, Limited Parking on Huron Street (Regional Road 4), South side, between 90 m West of Wilmot Street to 40 m West of Wilmot Street, 8:00 am to 6:00 pm, Monday to Saturday, 2 hours;
- Add to Schedule 1, No Parking on Huron Street (Regional Road 4), between 78 m West of Wilmot Street to 40 m West of Wilmot Street; and
- Add to Schedule 2, Limited Parking on Huron Street (Regional Road 4), South side, between 90 m West of Wilmot Street to 78 m West of Wilmot Street, 8:00 am to 6:00 pm, Monday to Saturday, 2 hours;

in the Township of Wilmot, as outlined in Report TES-TRP-19-06.1 dated May 28, 2019.

**Consent Agenda Items**

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

6. Motion to Approve Items or Receive for Information

6.1 Spring Valley Sewage Pumping Station, Schedule B Class Environmental Assessment - Public Consultation Centre #1 Information Package

Page 30

6.2 William Street and Strange Street Water Supply System, Cities of Waterloo and Kitchener – Pre-Construction Public Information Centre #2 Information Package

Page 43

6.3 PDL-CPL-19-21, A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Information)

Page 65

Regular Agenda Resumes

7. Reports – Planning, Development and Legislative Services


Page 74

Recommendation:


7.2 PDL-CPL-19-23, 2019 Community Environmental Fund Grants

Page 108

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve project funding allocations totalling up to $145,861.47 from the Community Environmental Fund to support twenty environmental stewardship and sustainability projects as described in Attachment 1 of Report PDL-CPL-19-23, dated May 28, 2019.

7.3 PDL-AIR-19-04, Airport Master Plan Update

Page 120
**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo proceed with the design of a temporary expansion for the Airport Terminal Building and issue Requests for Proposals to consultants for the design of the temporary expansion as described in report PDL-AIR-19-04 dated May 28, 2019.

8. **Reports - Transportation and Environmental Services**

Page 127

Page 140

**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve transit service improvements to be effective Monday, September 2, 2019, as described in Report No. TES-TRS-19-10, dated May 28, 2019

8.3 **TES-TRS-19-11**, Recommended Grand River Transit 2019 Fare Structure  
Page 155

**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the following fare structure changes as described in Report No. TES-TRS-19-11, dated May 28, 2019:

a) Implement the Grand River Transit (GRT) fare structure as detailed in Table 1, in accordance with Regional Council’s approved 2019 budget, effective September 1, 2019;

b) Amend the Region’s Fees and Charges By-law No. 19-016 (Schedule E), to include the 2019 GRT fares described in this report.

8.4 **TES-RTS-19-07**, Stage 2 ION: LRT from Kitchener to Cambridge- Project Team Preferred North Cambridge (Preston Area) Station and Route Refinement  
Page 162
**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo endorse the Project Team Preferred Route Refinement as displayed in Attachment 1 as the preferred route for Stage 2 ION: LRT from Kitchener to Cambridge as shown in Report TES-RTS-19-07 dated May 28, 2019; and,

That the Region of Waterloo increase the contract with WSP Canada Group Limited by $796,000 plus applicable taxes for a revised total of $3,626,030 to cover the requested amendments to the project scope and to complete the study.

8.5 **TES-WAS-19-10**, Supplemental Studies for Project C2016-21 – Regional Water System Upgrades in Cambridge and North Dumfries Class Environmental Assessment

**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve an increase in scope for contract C2016-21 previously awarded to GM Blue Plan Engineering Ltd., at a total cost of $160,850 plus applicable taxes, as per report TES-WAS-19-10.

9. **Information/Correspondence**

9.1 2018 Transportation and Environmental Services [Annual Report](#)

9.2 [Council Enquiries and Request for Information Tracking List](#)

10. **Other Business**

11. **Next Meeting – June 18, 2019**

12. **Adjourn**
List of Upcoming Public Events

Spring Valley Sewage Pumping Station, Schedule B Class Environmental Assessment - Public Consultation Centre #1

- **Thursday, June 6, 2019** – 5:00-7:00 p.m., Breithaupt Community Centre, Room 109, 350 Margaret Avenue, Kitchener

William Street and Strange Street Water Supply System, Cities of Waterloo and Kitchener – Pre-Construction Public Information Centre #2

- **Tuesday, June 17, 2019**– 5:00 – 7:00 p.m., Region of Waterloo Public Health and Community Services Building Main Foyer, 99 Regina Street Waterloo, Ontario
Region of Waterloo
Planning, Development and Legislative Services
Community Planning

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

Date: May 28, 2019  File Code: D06-80

Subject: Corporate and Community-wide GHG Reduction Update

Recommendation:

For Information.

Summary:

The Region is actively supporting greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction at both the community and corporate scale. The current community-wide target endorsed by Regional Council in 2018 is to reduce emissions by 80% of 2010 levels by 2050. ClimateActionWR is beginning a community-wide consultation process for the 80 by 50 Climate Action Plan, which will be developed over the next two years.

Corporately, the Region has met and exceeded the Region’s corporate GHG reduction target of 10% over 2009 levels by 2019. The Region is currently reporting on 2017 year end figures, and has reduced overall GHG emissions by 19% or 24% per capita. These significant reductions have primarily been made through Regional energy management, wastewater biosolids diversion, and waste management initiatives. Staff continue to work on reducing corporate GHG emissions and plan to return to Council to recommend a new corporate GHG target in early 2020. The Region’s figures have been included in the Sustainable Waterloo Region (SWR) 2018 Program Updates report.

Report:

The Region is actively supporting greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction at both the community and corporate scale.

Community GHG Reduction

At the community scale, a Community Greenhouse Gas Action Plan and Reduction
Target was approved by Regional and Area City Councils in 2013 (report CR-FM-13-022, dated December 3, 2013). A comprehensive progress report on Community Greenhouse Gas Action Plan was brought to Council in June 2017 (report PDL-CPL-17-14, date June 6, 2017). At that point in time, community GHG emissions had decreased by approximately 5% below the base year of 2010, with the decrease being largely due to the phase out of coal from the provincial electricity grid.

In the spring of 2018, Regional and Area Municipal Councils endorsed a new region-wide community greenhouse gas emission reduction target of 80% below 2010 levels by 2050, and directed staff to continue to collaborate with community partners to develop incremental action plans and implement specific local actions in support of reaching the long-term target (report PDL-CPL-18-26, date May 29, 2018).

ClimateActionWR is facilitating the development of an 80 by 50 Climate Action Plan, and has received funding through the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) through the Transition 2050 Program. Broad community consultation and planning activities will take place during 2019 and 2020, with the final 80 by 50 Climate Action Plan being developed in 2021. The timing for the new Plan coincides well with final reporting on the earlier 2020 Community GHG Action Plan and Reduction Target and considerations around the potential renewal of municipal support for ClimateActionWR which is in place until 2021.

**Corporate GHG Reduction**

The Region’s corporate GHG target is 10% reduction of 2009 emissions by the year 2019 (CR-FM-13-015.1, October 9, 2013). A detailed progress update on corporate GHG emission reductions achieved up to calendar year-end 2015 was provided at the mid-point (PDL-CPL-16-38, September 13, 2016), and noted that emission reductions from Regional operations were estimated to be 15% below the base year of 2009 despite significant increases in the size of Regional facilities and fleet of vehicles.

The Region is a pledging member of SWR’s Regional Carbon Initiative (RCI) program which requires annual progress reports on the reduction targets. The Region is currently reporting on the 2017 year end figures which have been included in the Sustainable Waterloo Region (SWR) 2018 Program Updates report. ([https://www.sustainablewaterlooregion.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/SWR007_AnnualReport_2018_FA2.pdf](https://www.sustainablewaterlooregion.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/SWR007_AnnualReport_2018_FA2.pdf)).

The following table provides additional detail on the Region’s annual GHG reduction progress. The Region has met, and almost doubled, the Region’s corporate GHG reduction target. The reductions have primarily been made through energy management, wastewater biosolid diversion, and waste management initiatives.

Energy Management: As stated in the recent Council report, Corporate Energy Plan 2019 – 2028 (COR-FFM-19-05, dated April 30, 2019), since the approval of the first corporate energy plan in 2014, the Region has avoided $5.0 million in energy costs and
2,240 tonnes of GHG emissions by implementing energy management measures. The updated Corporate Energy Plan identifies over 350 energy conservation measures for implementation in the next 10 years. After all projects are implemented, it will result in $3.0 million in annual cost savings for each of the next 5 years, at which time the projects will reach the end of their lifetime. This will result in an estimated 20-year forecasted savings of over $30 million and 20,000 tonnes of GHG emissions.

Wastewater Biosolids Diversion: In the last two years, the Region has been able to gradually increase the beneficial use of biosolids through land application and mine reclamation. This has contributed to a significant reduction in atmospheric emissions, a decrease from approximately 30,000 tonnes of CO2-eq/year in 2012 to about 8,000 tonnes of CO2-eq/year in 2017. Overall, the percentage of biosolids beneficially used increased to 95% in 2016, with about 45% going to agriculture and 50% going to mine reclamation sites. The amount of biosolids that were beneficially used decreased to about 70% in 2017 due to weather related and operational issues at the mine site.

Waste Management: The Region has been diverting household organic waste from the landfill at a community-wide scale since 2010. The green bin organics program has achieved waste reduction of just over 22,000 tonnes (2010 to 2017). This program helps to create a reusable soil resource, reduce landfill odours and greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) as well as prolong the life of the landfill. Additional GHG emissions were reduced from the landfill by using portable flares to burn methane thereby reducing their CO2e impact to the atmosphere.

Table 1 - Region’s Corporate GHG Emissions (Tonnes) by Source: 2009 - 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green Bin Organics/Landfill</td>
<td>53,668</td>
<td>42,743</td>
<td>49,748</td>
<td>50,828</td>
<td>49,628</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet (including contracted transport e.g.</td>
<td>36,013</td>
<td>37,254</td>
<td>38,344</td>
<td>39,547</td>
<td>39,659</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waste collection)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas Use</td>
<td>14,821</td>
<td>14,268</td>
<td>14,598</td>
<td>15,708</td>
<td>15,909</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosolids from Wastewater Treatment *</td>
<td>30,355</td>
<td>38,191</td>
<td>21,460</td>
<td>16,317</td>
<td>12,110</td>
<td>-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity Use</td>
<td>17,345</td>
<td>14,288</td>
<td>11,886</td>
<td>8,404</td>
<td>6,285</td>
<td>-64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Business Travel</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals (rounded)</td>
<td>152,721</td>
<td>147,234</td>
<td>136,495</td>
<td>131,322</td>
<td>124,077</td>
<td>-19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Biosolids numbers have been updated to reflect an improved calculations methodology.

The Sustainable Waterloo Region 2018 Program Update used these same numbers to calculate GHG emissions reductions in tonnes/100 residents, with an overall result of a
24% reduction per capita since 2009. Staff continue to work on reducing corporate GHG emissions and plan to return to Council to recommend a new corporate GHG target in early 2020.

**Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination:**

Staff at the Region worked collaboratively with Area Municipal staff and community partners, such as ClimateActionWR on GHG reduction related initiatives.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

This initiative supports Focus Area 3 – Environment and Sustainable Growth, and specifically Strategic Objectives 3.5 (Preserve, protect, and enhance green space, agricultural and environmentally sensitive lands, and Regionally-owned forests) and 3.6 (Improve environmental sustainability and livability in intensifying urban and rural settlement areas).

**Financial Implications:**

The Region of Waterloo’s approved 2019-2028 Community Planning Capital Program includes a budget of $110,000 in 2019; $110,000 in 2020 and $110,000 in 2021 (total $330,000) for Community Sustainability (project #22036) to be funded from the cities of Kitchener, Waterloo and Cambridge (75%; $247,500) and the Community Planning Capital Reserve (25%; $82,500). Of this budget, $279,000 is committed to the ClimateActionWR initiative for overall plan management, which includes preparing and delivering all public communications and events, meeting facilitation and progress reporting. Collaborative agreements which address this cost-sharing arrangement, as well as governance, are in place until 2021 when reporting on the 2020 reduction target concludes.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Regional staff in Community Planning, Transportation and Environmental Services, and Corporate Services work collaboratively on corporate sustainability initiatives, including GHG emissions reduction.

**Attachments**

Nil.

**Prepared By:** Kate Hagerman, Manager of Environmental Planning and Sustainability

**Approved By:** Rod Regier, Commissioner, Planning Development and Legislative Services
Region of Waterloo

Transportation and Environmental Services

Transportation Division

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

Date: May 28, 2019

File Code: T01-20/04

Subject: Proposed Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover on Huron Street (Regional Road 4) On-Street Parking Review, in the Township of Wilmot

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the installation of a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover on Huron Street at Mill Street and amend the Region’s Traffic and Parking By-law 16-023, as amended, to add the following:

- Add to Schedule 10 a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover (Type D) on Huron Street (Regional Road 4) at Mill Street;
- Remove from Schedule 2, Limited Parking on Huron Street (Regional Road 4), North side, between 22 m East of Union Street to 30 m East of Mill Street, 8:00 am to 6:00 pm, Monday to Saturday, 2 hours;
- Add to Schedule 1, No Parking on Huron Street (Regional Road 4), between 74 m East of Union Street to 14 m East of Mill Street;
- Add to Schedule 2, Limited Parking on Huron Street (Regional Road 4), North side, between 22 m East of Union Street to 74 m East of Union Street, 8:00 am to 6:00 pm, Monday to Saturday, 2 hours;
- Add to Schedule 2, Limited Parking on Huron Street (Regional Road 4), North side, between 14 m East of Mill Street to 30 m East of Mill Street, 8:00 am to 6:00 pm, Monday to Saturday, 2 hours;
- Remove from Schedule 2, Limited Parking on Huron Street (Regional Road 4), South side, between 90 m West of Wilmot Street to 40 m West of Wilmot Street, 8:00 am to 6:00 pm, Monday to Saturday, 2 hours;
- Add to Schedule 1, No Parking on Huron Street (Regional Road 4), between 78 m West of Wilmot Street to 40 m West of Wilmot Street; and
• Add to Schedule 2, Limited Parking on Huron Street (Regional Road 4), South side, between 90 m West of Wilmot Street to 78 m West of Wilmot Street, 8:00 am to 6:00 pm, Monday to Saturday, 2 hours;

in the Township of Wilmot, as outlined in Report TES-TRP-19-06.1 dated May 28, 2019.

Summary:

At its regular scheduled Planning and Works Committee meeting on April 30, 2019, Regional staff presented a recommendation to install a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover (PXO) on Huron Street at Mill Street, in the Township of Wilmot. The installation of the Crossover at the Mill Street location would result in the loss of nine on-street parking spaces on Huron Street. At that time, the Regional Planning and Works Committee requested that staff review and report back on an alternate location suggested by Township of Wilmot Councillor Jennifer Pfenning that would result in the loss of fewer parking spaces. Appendix A provides a copy of the April 30, 2019 Planning and Works report (TES-TRP-19-06).

Staff has completed an assessment of the alternate location for the crossover. The alternate location would result in the loss of three fewer on-street parking spaces than the original location at Mill Street; however, staff do not support the alternate location due to sightline deficiencies and driveway conflicts that could result in operational and safety deficiencies.

Therefore, staff recommends that a Level 2 PXO, Type D, be installed on Huron Street at Mill Street.

Report:

1.0 Background

Regional staff assessed the need for additional traffic control to assist pedestrians crossing Huron Street in the vicinity of Mill Street. Based on a turning movement count including pedestrians undertaken at this intersection, Regional staff has determined that this location meets the justification for a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover (PXO), Type D. The installation of the Level 2 PXO at the Mill Street location would require the removal of nine on-street parking spaces in order to meet minimum installation requirements set out within the Highway Traffic Act and to ensure adequate sightlines for drivers and pedestrians.

Regional staff undertook public consultation to assess residents’ and businesses’ support or concerns regarding the potential installation of a Level 2 PXO. Based on the results of a public survey, Regional staff determined that many members of the public were concerned with the loss of parking spaces on Huron Street. To address these concerns, Regional staff assessed alternative locations on Huron Street between Mill
Street and Union Street. Based on sight line concerns and the impact of accesses to numerous businesses, staff had determined that the Huron Street at Mill Street intersection was the most appropriate location for a Level 2 PXO.

Staff presented a recommendation to install the Level 2 PXO on Huron Street at Mill Street at the Planning and Works Committee meeting on April 30, 2019 (Report TRP-TES-19-06). At this meeting, the Planning and Works Committee heard from a number of members from the community who expressed their concerns with the removal of nine on-street spaces in order to accommodate a Level 2 PXO on Huron Street at Mill Street. Gina Ruttan, President of the New Hamburg Board of Trade, supported the installation of the crossover but stated that the loss of on-street parking is a major concern.

Township of Wilmot Councillor, Jennifer Pfenning spoke in support of the need for the pedestrian crossover but suggested that staff review an alternate location located adjacent to the Public Parking lot approximately 39 metres east of Union Street that could possibly result in the loss of fewer on-street parking spaces than the location originally proposed by staff.

After listening to the delegations and a brief discussion, Regional Council requested that staff review the suggested alternate location presented by Township Councillor Pfenning and report back to the Planning and Works Committee on May 28, 2019.

This report serves to provide a summary of Regional staff’s review of Councillor Pfenning’s alternate location of the Level 2 PXO.

Additional detail regarding existing conditions, traffic control warrants and the originally proposed Level 2 PXO location can be viewed in Report TES-TRP-19-06 attached as Appendix A.

2.0 Review of Alternate Location Suggested by Councillor Pfenning

Subsequent to the Planning and Works Committee meeting on April 30, 2019, Regional staff reviewed the alternate location presented by Councillor Pfenning and undertook an additional parking utilization survey. The results of this review and survey are included in the following sections of this report.

Appendix B includes a map that includes the alternate Level 2 PXO location suggested by Councillor Pfenning. The map in Appendix B also illustrates some notes regarding staff’s assessment of this location.

2.1 Sightlines

Staff measured the available sight distance to the alternate location suggested by Councillor Pfenning. Sight distance is defined as the distance between a car and an object at the point in time when the driver is able to see the object. Minimum stopping sight distance is defined as the distance required between a car and an object that is
sufficient, based on the speed the car is travelling, to provide enough time for the driver to see the object, assess it’s nature and decide on an evasive manoeuver and apply the brakes in time to stop the car before hitting the object. In this case, the minimum stopping sight distance required is 65 metres. Staff measured the available eastbound stopping sight distance to the stop line at 73 metres. In this regard, the minimum stopping sight distance is met. If a minimum of two cars have stopped to allow pedestrians to cross (this would occur relatively frequently) the stopping distance from the last vehicle is approximately 64 metres (less than the minimum stopping distance). While the alternative location does meet the minimum stopping distance requirements when one or no cars are already stopped it provides less stopping distance than the location originally proposed.

2.2 Blockage of Fire Hall Access

Locating a Level 2 PXO at the alternate location locates the eastbound sharks’ teeth (stop line) approximately 5 metres east of the Fire Hall access. If two or more vehicles are stopped while waiting for pedestrians to cross Huron Street, egress from the Fire Hall access will be blocked which may increase response time.

2.3 Private Access Conflict

As highlighted in the illustration in Appendix B, as per the alternate crossover location, there is a drop curb located midpoint between the proposed crosswalk and the stop line. The curb drop is an access to 91 Huron Street. To safely operate a Level 2 PXO at the alternate location the access should be closed. Allowing the access to remain would create the potential for a motorist to back over the crosswalk and potentially strike a pedestrian within the crosswalk. Therefore, staff would recommend that this private access be closed if Regional Council decides to implement the alternate Level 2 PXO location.

2.4 On-street Parking Impacts of Alternate Location

In order to accommodate a Level 2 PXO at the alternate location, no vehicles would be permitted to park between the sharks’ teeth as indicated in Appendix B. Sharks’ teeth denote where motorists are to stop. Parking spaces on each approach would also have to be removed for sightline purposes in order for motorists to see and react to pedestrians either crossing or about to cross Huron Street. Good sightlines are also required by the pedestrians to see oncoming traffic before they decide to start their crossing. In total, six on-street parking spaces would have to be removed to install the Level 2 PXO at the alternate location. Therefore, the alternate location would impact three fewer spaces than the location originally proposed by staff at Mill Street.
3.0 Parking Utilization Survey

Given concerns raised by Regional Councillors at the April 30, 2019 Planning and Works Committee meeting with regards to the use of the on-street parking, and in addition to the Region’s previous utilization surveys (please reference report TES-TRP-19-06), Regional staff undertook parking utilization surveys on Friday, May 3, 2019 between 4:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. and on Saturday, May 4, 2019 between 12:00 p.m. and 3:00 p.m. Appendix C provides a summary of the parking utilization survey.

The average utilization on Friday was approximately 75% usage for on-street parking and 55% usage of the public parking area. On Saturday, the average utilization for on-street parking was approximately 66% where the public lot usage was approximately 41%.

4.0 Alternate Location Consultation

On May 16, 2019 Regional staff met with Councillor Pfenning and Gina Ruttan and Steve Wagner of the New Hamburg Board of Trade, to discuss Councillor Pfenning’s proposed alternative location for the a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover. Please reference Appendix B that illustrates a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover (PXO) at the alternate location. Regional staff advised that the proposed location was reviewed and communicated the concerns associated with the proposed location as described in this report. Staff advised given the concerns that the Region continues to recommend a Level 2 PXO on Huron Street at Mill Street. Councillor Pfenning and members of the New Hamburg Board of Trade re-iterated their concerns with the loss of on-street parking.

5.0 Potential “Bump-out” Design

Staff are also considering some modifications to the existing curbs at the proposed crossover location to create curb extensions or “bump-outs”. A concept sketch of this “bump-out” design is illustrated in Appendix E. The curb extensions would create the potential to improve the safety of the crossover by shortening the crossing distance for pedestrians and improving visibility of both cars and pedestrians. Another potential benefit of the curb extensions is a narrowing of the roadway which could assist in traffic calming by encouraging drivers to drive slower. The curb extensions would also provide some additional boulevard space for streetscaping.

At this time, staff cannot confirm the feasibility of the curb extensions without additional investigation into potential conflicts with road drainage or utilities. Staff will undertake this investigation and subject to Regional Council approving the installation of the crossover would schedule the installation of the curb extensions into the Region’s Transportation Capital Program as soon as practical in the near future.

Notwithstanding the future work to create the “bump-outs”, staff would install the
crossover in 2019 and anticipate minor “throwaway” costs when the “bump-outs” are constructed in the future. The construction of the “bump-outs” would not result in any additional loss of on-street parking over the nine spaces currently needed to implement the crossover.

At the May 16, 2019 meeting both Councillor Pfenning and Gina Ruttan were supportive of the “bump-out” concept as long as it did not increase the loss of on-street parking.

6.0 Recommendation

The alternate crossover location suggested by Councillor Pfenning would result in the loss of three fewer on-street parking spaces than the location at Mill Street; however, staff believe the installation of a Level 2 PXO at this alternate location would present additional challenges to safety and operation than the location originally proposed by staff at Mill Street. Staff’s concerns with the alternate location are:

- The available sightline does not meet the minimum requirement if more than one eastbound vehicle is queued waiting for crossing pedestrians;
- If more than one vehicle is stopped behind the eastbound stop line, egress from the Fire Hall access will be blocked which may increase response time; and
- There is an access located midpoint between the stop bar and crosswalk and, if allowed to remain, would create a potential for a motorist to reverse over the crosswalk and potentially strike a pedestrian.

Therefore, based on a review of sightlines, accesses, operations and the loss of on-street parking, Regional staff recommend that the Level 2 PXO be located on Huron Street at Mill Street.

Locating a Level 2 PXO on Huron Street at Mill Street would require removing nine on-street parking spaces. The removal of the parking spaces ensures that the design meets the minimum requirements of the Highway Traffic Act and ensures that sufficient sight lines are provided for both motorists and crossing pedestrians.

Members of the public expressing an interest in this matter have been advised of the Region’s recommendation and timing of this report to the Region’s Planning and Works Committee.

Regional staff anticipates that the Level 2 PXO would be installed and operational in the summer of 2019. Please refer to Appendix D, which provides a figure illustrating the type of PXO that is warranted for the Huron Street/Mill Street intersection.
Corporate Strategic Plan:

This report addresses the Region’s goal to build infrastructure for and increase participation in, active forms of transportation in cycling and walking (Strategic Objective 2.3).

Financial Implications:

The cost to implement the Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover, not including construction of any “bump-outs”, is estimated to be approximately $5,000. The Region’s 2019 Transportation Capital Budget includes sufficient funding for this project, allocated from the New Traffic Control Installation (Project 7478) funded from the Development Charges Reserve Fund.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

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

Attachments:

Appendix A – TES-TRP-19-06 Proposed Level 2 Crossover on Huron Street (Regional Road 4) at Mill Street, in the Township of Wilmot

Appendix B – Huron Street Overview and Alternate Proposed Location(s)

Appendix C - Parking Utilization Survey

Appendix D - Warranted Pedestrian Crossover

Appendix E – Proposed “Bump-out” Design

Prepared By: Mike Jones, Engineering Technologist (Traffic), Transportation

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

Transportation and Environmental Services

Transportation Division

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

Date: April 30, 2019

File Code: T01-20/04

Subject: Proposed Level 2 Crossover on Huron Street (Regional Road 4) at Mill Street, in the Township of Wilmot

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the installation of a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover on Huron Street at Mill Street and amend the Region’s Traffic and Parking By-law 16-023, as amended, to add the following:

- Add to Schedule 10 a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover (Type D) on Huron Street (Regional Road 4) at Mill Street;
- Remove from Schedule 2, Limited Parking on Huron Street (Regional Road 4), North side, between 22 m East of Union Street to 30 m East of Mill Street, 8:00 am to 6:00 pm, Monday to Saturday, 2 hours;
- Add to Schedule 1, No Parking on Huron Street (Regional Road 4), between 74 m East of Union Street to 14 m East of Mill Street;
- Add to Schedule 2, Limited Parking on Huron Street (Regional Road 4), North side, between 22 m East of Union Street to 74 m East of Union Street, 8:00 am to 6:00 pm, Monday to Saturday, 2 hours;
- Add to Schedule 2, Limited Parking on Huron Street (Regional Road 4), North side, between 14 m East of Mill Street to 30 m East of Mill Street, 8:00 am to 6:00 pm, Monday to Saturday, 2 hours;
- Remove from Schedule 2, Limited Parking on Huron Street (Regional Road 4), South side, between 90 m West of Wilmot Street to 40 m West of Wilmot Street, 8:00 am to 6:00 pm, Monday to Saturday, 2 hours;
- Add to Schedule 1, No Parking on Huron Street (Regional Road 4), between 78 m West of Wilmot Street to 40 m West of Wilmot Street; and
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- Add to Schedule 2, Limited Parking on Huron Street (Regional Road 4), South side, between 90 m West of Wilmot Street to 78 m West of Wilmot Street, 8:00 am to 6:00 pm, Monday to Saturday, 2 hours;


Summary:

Regional staff were requested to consider additional traffic control to assist pedestrians crossing Huron Street in the vicinity of Mill Street in New Hamburg. Based on a turning movement count undertaken at this intersection, Regional staff has determined that this location meets the justification for a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover, Type D. The implementation of the crossover would require the elimination of nine on street parking spaces on Huron Street in order to provide adequate sightlines for pedestrians and motorists.

Regional staff undertook public consultation to assess residents' and businesses' support or concerns regarding the potential installation of a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover. Based on the results of a public survey, Regional staff has determined that many members of the public are concerned with the loss of parking spaces on Huron Street. To address these concerns, Regional staff assessed alternative locations on Huron Street between Mill Street and Union Street, in an effort to find a location that would require the elimination of fewer parking spaces. Based on sight line concerns and the impact of accesses to numerous businesses, staff has determined that the Huron Street at Mill Street is the best location for a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover.

It is therefore recommended that a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover Type D be installed on Huron Street at Mill Street. The addition of a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover at this location will serve to enhance pedestrian mobility and encourage active forms of transportation.

Report:

1.0 Background

Regional staff were requested to consider additional traffic control to assist pedestrians crossing Huron Street in the vicinity of Mill Street. Potential control to assist pedestrians includes, crossing guards, refuge islands, Level 2 Pedestrian Crossovers (PXO), pedestrian traffic signals and full traffic signals. Each control has its own justification process, which is typically based on vehicular volume, pedestrian volume, delay, speed and collisions. As such, staff reviewed current volume data, speed and collisions along Huron Street to determine if additional traffic control was warranted for Huron Street.

This report serves to document Regional staff’s analysis and justification for a Level 2 PXO on Huron Street at Mill Street in the Township of Wilmot.
2.0 Existing Conditions

Huron Street in the vicinity of Mill Street is a 2-lane roadway. The posted speed limit on Huron Street is 40 km/h. The Average Annually Daily Traffic is approximately 8092 vehicles per day.

Approximately 80 metres east of Mill Street, Huron Street intersects Peel Street. Recently, staff recommended that an Intersection Pedestrian Signal (IPS) be installed on Peel Street immediately south of Huron Street. Based on pedestrian volume crossing Peel Street, an IPS is warranted. It is anticipated that the IPS will be operational by Fall 2019.

Approximately 195 metres west of the Mill Street intersection, the Hartman Bridge crosses the Nith River. When crossing the Hartman Bridge, motorists must navigate a horizontal curve when approaching Union Street from the west. The sight lines in this area are limited.

Huron Street between Peel Street and the Hartman Bridge has numerous accesses to businesses. There are approximately 15 accesses within a distance of 275 metres. There are 28 on-street parking spaces along this stretch of Huron Street. This environment creates challenges for selecting a suitable location for a new pedestrian crossing.

Appendix A shows an overview of Huron Street between Union Street and Mill Street.

2.1 Huron Street at Mill Street Collision History

During the previous five-years (2013 to 2017) at the Huron Street / Mill Street intersection, there were a total of three collisions. During this same period the intersection ranks 698 out of 3301 locations reviewed. Of the three collisions no collisions involved a pedestrian.

3.0 Need and Justification for Additional Traffic Control

To assess the need for additional traffic control, current Regional practice is to follow the warrant methodology established by provincial guidelines as documented and developed through the Ministry of Transportation of Ontario. Staff assessed the following traffic control options:

- Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover;
- Pedestrian Traffic Control Signals (Intersection or midblock); and
- Full Traffic Control Signals.
3.1 Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover

The criteria used to establish the need for a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover includes pedestrian volume crossing the main road, vehicular volume on the main road and a detailed assessment of the roadway characteristics. Generally, a minimum of 100 pedestrians crossing the roadway must be observed over the highest 8-hour typical peak periods, and traffic volumes must not exceed 35,000 vehicles (in 24 hours) as driver compliance can become problematic on higher volume roads. Generally, traffic control signals are considered more appropriate for these higher volume roads.

On January 16, 2018, staff surveyed pedestrian volumes at the Huron Street / Mill Street intersection. Through the survey, there were 114 pedestrians crossing Huron Street. Applying the pedestrian volumes to the warrant for a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover, a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover, Type D is warranted.

Please refer to Appendix B, which provides a figure illustrating the type of Pedestrian Crossover that is warranted for the Huron Street / Mill Street intersection. The figure illustrates the general traffic control concepts that will be applied at this location. In order to accommodate the crossover at this intersection, no vehicles would be permitted to park between the sharks’ teeth denoting where motorists are to stop and parking spaces on each approach would also have to be removed for sightline purposes in order for motorists to see and react to pedestrians either crossing or about to cross Huron Street. In total, nine on-street parking spaces would have to be removed.

3.2 Pedestrian Traffic Control Signals

Criteria used to establish the need for a Pedestrian Traffic Control Signal are very similar to a Level 2 Crossover which includes vehicular / pedestrian volumes and delay, and a detailed assessment of the roadway characteristics.

When assessing the need for a Pedestrian Traffic Control signal there must be a minimum of 200 pedestrians over the highest 8-hour typical peak periods crossing the main road and those pedestrians must experience excessive delay when crossing.

As previously noted there were 114 pedestrians observed crossing Huron Street. Therefore, a pedestrian traffic control signal is not warranted at this time.

3.3 Full Traffic Control Signals

Criteria for traffic control signals to be met also includes a detailed review of vehicular / pedestrian volumes and delay, and a detailed assessment of the roadway characteristics and a review of the collision experience.

For traffic control signals to be considered, at least one of the following justifications must satisfy 100%, or the Minimum Vehicle Volume Warrant and Delay to Cross Traffic
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Warrant must both satisfy 80% in combination.

- Justification 1: Minimum Vehicle Volume;
- Justification 2: Delay to Cross Traffic;
- Justification 3: Combination Warrant;
- Justification 4: Minimum Four-Hour Vehicle Volume; and
- Justification 5: Collision Experience.

Applying a January 16, 2018 traffic and pedestrian volume to the Region’s traffic control signal warrant, traffic control signals are not warranted at this time. The following is a summary of the results:

- Justification 1: Minimum Vehicle Volume – 0%;
- Justification 2: Delay to Cross Traffic – 19%;
- Justification 3: Combination Warrant – Not Satisfied;
- Justification 4: Minimum Four-Hour Vehicle Volume – 0%; and
- Justification 5: Collision Experience – 13%.

4.0 Public Consultation

Regional staff initiated a public survey between January 21, 2019 and January 31, 2019 to receive feedback on the potential installation of a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover on Huron Street at Mill Street. Staff received a total of 445 responses to the survey.

As nine on-street parking spaces would have to be removed on Huron Street in the vicinity of Mill Street to accommodate the crossover, the following question was asked in the survey:

“Based on the benefits of having a crosswalk and the need to remove parking spots, please rate your level of support for the crosswalk”.

Of those that responded, 269 stated that they did not support the proposal and 77 respondents stated that they support the proposal. Of the remaining 99 respondents, the majority stated that they did not want to see on-street parking removed to accommodate a level 2 PXO; however, they also stated that they could support the crossover if the loss of parking could be minimized.

The primary concern for those who opposed the crossover was the number of parking spaces to be removed in order to accommodate the safe operation of the crossover. The loss of parking spaces was viewed by some residents as being detrimental to businesses in the area. Those in favour of the proposal agreed that there needed to be a crossing in the area to assist pedestrians crossing Huron Street.
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4.1 Area Municipality Consultation / Coordination

Township of Wilmot staff are not in support of the installation of a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover at Huron Street and Mill Street in New Hamburg as staff are concerned with the removal of on-street parking.

5.0 Review of Potential Alternative Locations

Based on the feedback received through the Region’s public consultation process, staff assessed alternative locations for a Level 2 Crossover west of Mill Street in an effort to minimize the removal of on-street parking.

Regional staff assessed the installation of the Level 2 Crossover on Huron Street in the vicinity of Union Street. However, this location was not suitable due to the limited sight distance resulting from the horizontal curvature of Huron Street and the Hartman Bridge. Staff further assessed a location on Huron Street between Union Street and Mill Street. This location was also found to be unsuitable due to numerous accesses to properties such as the access to the New Hamburg Board of Trade/Fire Hall building.

Locating a Level 2 Crossover anywhere within the midblock section 50 meters east of Union Street and Mill Street would have the same impact on parking removal as the location of Huron Street at Mill Street. Appendix A shows an overview of Huron Street between Union Street and Mill Street.

6.0 Recommendation

Based on the Region’s review, a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover, Type D, is warranted on Huron Street at Mill Street, in the Township of Wilmot. The installation of a Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover would benefit the community because of the following:

- Provides pedestrians with a designated crossing;
- Serves to enhance pedestrian mobility;
- Encourages active forms of transportation;
- Enhances connectivity;
- Encourages pedestrians to cross where they can best be seen; and
- Reminds motorists that pedestrians can be expected.

Based on a review of sightlines and accesses, Regional staff believes that the Mill Street location is the best alternative for this crossover that minimizes the loss of on-street parking. Therefore, Regional staff continue to recommend that the Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover be implemented at Mill Street.

Locating a Level 2 Crossover on Huron Street at Mill Street would require removing nine on-street parking spaces. The removal of the parking spaces would ensure that sufficient sight lines are provided for both motorists and crossing pedestrians.
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Members of the public expressing an interest in this matter have been advised of the Region’s recommendation and timing of this report to the Region’s Planning and Works Committee.

Regional staff anticipates that the Level 2 Crossover would be installed and operational in the summer of 2019.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

This report addresses the Region’s goal to build infrastructure for and increase participation in, active forms of transportation in cycling and walking (Strategic Objective 2.3).

Financial Implications:

The cost to implement the Level 2 Pedestrian crossover is estimated to be approximately $5,000. The Region’s 2019 Transportation Capital Budget includes sufficient funding for this project, allocated from the New Traffic Control Installation (Project 7478) funded from the Development Charges Reserve Fund.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

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

Attachments:

Appendix A - Huron Street Overview and Alternate Proposed Location(s)

Appendix B - Warranted Pedestrian Crossover

Prepared By: Satinderjit Bahia, Engineering Technologist (Traffic), Transportation

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
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Huron Street Overview and Alternate Proposed Location(s)

Figure 1 – Huron Street between the Hartman Bridge and Peel Street
Huron Street Alternate Location (as Proposed By the Board of Trade)

Figure 1 – Huron Street between the Hartman Bridge and Peel Street
## Parking Utilization Survey - New Hamburg Parking Study

### Total Number of Parked Cars Friday, May 3, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>On-street</th>
<th>Public Lot</th>
<th>% Utilization On-street</th>
<th>% Utilization Public Lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available</td>
<td>27 spaces</td>
<td>82 spaces</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Number of Parked Cars Saturday, May 4, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>On-street</th>
<th>Public Lot</th>
<th>% Utilization On-street</th>
<th>% Utilization Public Lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available</td>
<td>27 spaces</td>
<td>82 spaces</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Warranted Pedestrian Crossover

Figure 2 – Huron Street at Mill Street Level 2 Pedestrian Crossover, Type D Layout
Proposed “Bump-out” Design
Spring Valley Sewage Pumping Station

Schedule B Class Environmental Assessment

Public Consultation Centre No. 1
June 6, 2019 – 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Breithaupt Community Centre, Room 109
350 Margaret Ave, Kitchener, ON N2H 4J8
Welcome!

Goals of this Public Consultation Centre

- Introduce the project and the reasons why it is being undertaken.
- Provide background information on the Spring Valley Sewage Pumping Station.
- Answer any questions you may have and provide an opportunity to get involved in the project.
Spring Valley Sewage Pumping Station project overview

What are we doing?

This study is being done to identify the preferred improvements to meet the long-term servicing needs for the Spring Valley Sewage Pumping Station.

Why are we doing it?

The Spring Valley Sewage Pumping Station needs improvements to ensure the continued reliable operation of the station. This study provides an opportunity to make sure the work done now aligns with future needs.

What does it mean to you?

Improvements for the Spring Valley Sewage Pumping Station may include work at the existing station or constructing a new station close to the existing location.
Pumping stations are an important part of our wastewater system

**Pumping stations make sure wastewater from low-elevation areas get to our wastewater treatment plants**

**Homes & Businesses**
Wastewater is generated at homes and businesses.

**Sewers**
The City has a network of underground sewers that collect wastewater from homes and businesses.

**Pumping Stations**
Pumping stations convey wastewater to treatment plants.

**Treatment**
Wastewater is treated fully before clean effluent is returned to the environment.

**Receiving Water**
Water is returned to the local watershed.

Kitchener has one wastewater treatment plant. There are many pumping stations that are needed to ensure wastewater can reach this plant.
Spring Valley Sewage Pumping Station

- Located at 365 Riverbend Drive.
- Serves northeastern Kitchener sending sanitary flows to the Kitchener Wastewater Treatment Plant’s collection system.
- Built in 1961.
- Current capacity of 245 L/s with three pumps (two duty, one standby).
The Spring Valley Sewage Pumping Station sanitary sewer catchment area is close to 400 hectares. The area serviced by the station is primarily developed lands.
Overview of the Class Environmental Assessment process

- Identify Problem and/or Opportunity
  (see next board)
- Develop and Evaluate Alternatives and Identify Preferred Alternative
- Project File Report
  30-day Public Review Period
- Implementation
  (Design and Construction)

This study is being completed as a Schedule B Class Environmental Assessment. A Class Environmental Assessment is a decision making process that all municipalities in Ontario follow for building new infrastructure.
The Spring Valley Sewage Pumping Station requires upgrades to ensure its continued reliable operation in the future. This study is being conducted to identify the long-term improvements to:

- Meet future servicing requirements
- Increase operating flexibility and reliability
- Meet current industry standards and best practices
Project study area

- Ground elevations and location of the existing sanitary sewer network were used to identify the study area.
Environmental features in the study area
Archeological potential in the study area
Project schedule

Review background information
- Collect data, review existing conditions, and develop project constraints and opportunities.

Public Consultation Centre 1
- Introduce the project.

Develop alternatives
- Develop options to meet the sewage pumping needs based on the problem and opportunity statement.

Evaluate alternatives
- Evaluate the alternatives using criteria related to environmental, social, technical, and economic considerations.

Identify preferred alternative
- Identify the preferred alternative based on the evaluation process. The preferred alternative is the option that is considered to be the best overall solution.

Public Consultation Centre 2
- Obtain input on the preferred alternative.

Reporting
- Prepare the Project File report to document project information and the decision making process.

Region of Waterloo Council for Approval
- Region of Waterloo Council will make the final decision to adopt the recommended alternative at the end of the process. Once adopted, there will be a 30-day review period for public comment.
Thank you for your participation!

Get Engaged!

We are still at the beginning of the Spring Valley Sewage Pumping Station Environmental Assessment. Do you have any questions, comments, or want to stay up to date?

Please contact:

Nicole Sapeta, B.A.Sc., P.Eng.
Region Project Manager
Region of Waterloo
150 Frederick Street, 7th Floor
Kitchener, Ontario, N2G 4J3
Tel: 519-575-4757 ext. 3682
Email: nsapeta@regionofwaterloo.ca

Kelly Frensch, M.Eng., P.Eng.
Consultant Project Manager
CIMA Canada Inc.
101 Frederick Street, Suite 900
Kitchener, Ontario, N2H 6R2
Tel: 519-772-2299 ext. 6224
Email: Kelly.Frensch@cima.ca
William Street and Strange Street Water Supply System
Cities of Waterloo and Kitchener
Pre-Construction Public Information Centre #2
Information Package

What: The Region of Waterloo is preparing for construction of the Strange Street Water Supply System (WSS), which will pump raw water from both the Strange Street and William Street Well Fields to a new water supply system at Strange Street, which will supply treated water to both Kitchener and Waterloo.

Where: New Watermain construction will be constructed starting at the William Street Pumping Station, then running along Herbert Street to John Street, John Street to the Iron Horse Trail, and then along the Iron Horse Trail to the Belmont and Glasgow intersection

Why: To improve water quality and the security of water supply in Kitchener and Waterloo.

When: Raw Watermain Construction July – September 2019
Strange Street WSS Construction Fall 2019 – Fall 2021
William Street Modifications and Decommissioning Spring/Summer 2022

Who: Region of Waterloo Project Manager
Ryan Snider, M.A.Sc.
Region of Waterloo
Phone: (519) 575-4757 Ext. 3436
Email: rsnider@regionofwaterloo.ca

Public Information Centre #2
Tuesday, June 18, 2019 from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.
Region of Waterloo Public Health and Community Services Building
Main Foyer
99 Regina Street
Waterloo, Ontario

There is a comment sheet at the back of this package. Please fill it out and share your comments with us.
Key Plan

Legend

- ION Route
- Preferred Alignment of 450 mm Watermain

Herbert Street Open-Cut Construction

LRT Crossing using Trenchless Technology

Iron Horse Trail Open-Cut Construction

Iron Horse Trail Open-Cut Construction

Connection to Remont Park and Bend Park

1:2000 Scale
1. **Why is the Region constructing this project?**

The 2012 Water Supply and Distribution Operations Master Plan recommended combined treatment of raw water from both the William Street and Strange Street sites. A 2016 Schedule ‘C’ Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Study subsequently determined that raw water from the William Street Well Field should be conveyed to a new water treatment facility to be constructed on the existing Strange Street Pumping Station site.

Combined raw water treatment will improve the reliability of the water supply to both Kitchener and Waterloo, improve water quality, and minimize cost by centralizing treatment.

2. **Who is directing this project?**

The detailed design for this project is being directed by staff from the Region of Waterloo. The consulting engineering firm Stantec Consulting Ltd. has been retained by the Region of Waterloo to provide detailed design and contract administration services during the design and construction phases of this project.

3. **How was the project planned?**

This project was planned in accordance with the requirements of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA) process. The Municipal Class EA process is a planning and decision-making process approved under the Environmental Assessment Act that is used by municipalities to plan public infrastructure projects in order that potential environmental impacts are considered before a project is approved. It requires consultation with the public, involved stakeholders, and agencies in consideration of alternatives and their potential impacts on the project environment.

This project was planned as a Schedule ‘C’ Class EA project, which applies to larger, more complex projects with the potential for significant environmental impacts (natural, social, cultural and economic) and required multiple opportunities for public input. Public Consultation Centre Events were held previously in September 2014, October 2015, May 2016, and November 2016. This project was approved by Region of Waterloo Council in September of 2016. A design and construction Public Information Centre (PIC) was subsequently held in January 2019.

Construction of this project is planned to start in the spring of 2019.
4. **What is the purpose of this Public Information Centre?**

The purpose of this PIC is to:

a) Provide an update on the final design of the William Street and Strange Street Water Supply System Upgrades;

b) Identify how the 2016 Class EA Recommendations are being adhered to; and

c) Introduce the watermain construction contractor and provide preliminary information on construction impacts and mitigation measures.

Region, consultant, and contractor staff are available at this PIC to answer any questions you may have. We request that you fill out the Comment Sheet attached to the back of this Information Package and either put it in the Comment Box at the Public Consultation Centre or send it to the address noted on the Comment Sheet. Your comments will be considered by the Project Team in conjunction with all other relevant information in preparation for construction.

5. **Is any private property required for this project?**

No private property will be required to complete this project.

6. **How is the natural environment being considered?**

As part of the Municipal Class EA, a Natural Environment Impact Study (EIS) was completed. Included within the EIS were: amphibian and reptile road mortality surveys, turtle surveys, amphibian call surveys, vegetation community surveys and boundary delineation, and bat habitat assessment. The review determined that there are no Core Environmental Features, Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI), wildlife movement corridors, or provincially designated areas within the project area. During field investigations a number of significant features and functions were identified at both the William and Strange Street Sites, including: observations of Common Nighthawk and Chimney Swift foraging, and observations of Regionally Significant or Regionally Rare plant species (e.g. Common Hackberry, Black Oak, and Black Walnut). Based on information provided within the EIS, the proposed works present no potential for impact on observed environmental features and functions.

A tree assessment to inventory the various trees within the Project Area has been completed, and tree protection measures have been designed and incorporated into the contract drawings. The trees have been assessed for overall health and significance in order to develop mitigation and protection plans for all trees to be retained. Where trees must be removed, two trees will be planted for any tree removed wherever space permits. No tree removal is currently anticipated along the raw watermain route through Herbert Street and John Street.
7. **How is the cultural/heritage/archaeological environment being considered?**

A Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment, and Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment were completed as part of the 2016 Municipal Class EA. In addition, a Cultural Heritage Conservation Plan to protect the heritage features identified during the Municipal Class EA study has been completed by Stantec Consulting Ltd.

A Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (Background Research and Property Inspection) was completed during the Municipal Class EA process. The Stage 1 Background Research indicated that one (1) undisturbed area on the Strange Street site, and one (1) undisturbed area on the William Street site would require Stage 2 Archeological Assessments to be completed. These assessments have been completed with no archaeological resources identified within the study area.

8. **What is the estimated cost of this project?**

The Region’s 2018 Water Capital Program includes a total budget $26,546,000 for the William Street and Strange Street Upgrades.

9. **What is the project schedule and what are the next steps for improvements?**

The construction contract for the Strange Street Raw Watermain works was awarded on June 5th, 2019 to **INSERT CONTRACTOR NAME**. Intermittent road closures will occur along Herbert Street and John Street between July and October 2019. Additionally, sections of the Iron Horse Trail will be closed during construction between September and December 2019. A detailed staging plan for road and trail closures will be presented at this PIC.

The Strange Street WSS will begin construction in Fall of 2019, with commissioning of the facility planned to be completed in Fall of 2021. The Raw Watermain will be constructed from June through December of 2019. The William Street Pumping station works will then be completed and connected to the Raw Watermain in the summer of 2022.

Homeowners impacted by road closures will be notified a minimum of 48 hours in advance of works commencing. The project team will co-ordinate to provide parking passes to any impacted residents unable to access driveways. Additionally, the contractor will be providing curbside waste and recycling collection, detour signage, and business signage.
10. **How will I receive further notification regarding this project?**

Property owners and tenants adjacent to the project site and members of the public registering at this Public Information Centre will receive all forthcoming public correspondence, and will be notified of all future meetings.

11. **How can I provide my comments?**

In order to assist the Project Team in addressing any comments or concerns you might have regarding this project, we ask that you fill out the attached Comment Sheet and leave it in the comment box provided at the registration table. Alternatively you can mail, fax, or email your comments to the Project Team member listed below, no later than Thursday, Tuesday July 10, 2019.

We thank you for your involvement and should you have any questions or concerns please contact one of the following:

- Ryan Snider, M.A.Sc.
  - Senior Project Manager
  - Region of Waterloo
  - 150 Frederick Street, 6th Floor
  - Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3
  - Telephone: 519-575-4757 Ext. 3436
  - Fax: 519-575-4430
  - Email: rsnider@regionofwaterloo.ca

- Al Mueller
  - Project Manager
  - Stantec Consulting Ltd.
  - 300 Hagey Blvd
  - Waterloo, ON N2L 0A4
  - Telephone: 519-585-7261
  - Fax: 519-579-6733
  - Email: al.mueller@stantec.com

12. **How can I view project information following the PIC?**

All of the PCC display materials and other relevant project information, notifications of upcoming meetings and contact information are available for viewing at the Region of Waterloo municipal office as identified above. Alternatively, you may visit the Region’s website at [www.regionofwaterloo.ca/water](http://www.regionofwaterloo.ca/water) under “Water Projects”.


Comment Sheet  
Regional Municipality of Waterloo  
William Street and Strange Street Water Supply System  
Cities of Waterloo and Kitchener  
Public Information Centre #2 – Tuesday, June 18, 2019

Please complete and hand in this sheet so that your comments can be considered for this project. If you cannot complete your comments today, please take this home and mail, fax, or email your comments by Tuesday, July 10, 2019 to:

Ryan Snider, M.A.Sc.  
Senior Project Manager  
Region of Waterloo  
150 Frederick Street, 6th Floor  
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3  
Telephone: 519-575-4757 Ext. 3436  
Fax: 519-575-4430  
Email: rsnider@regionofwaterloo.ca

Al Mueller  
Senior Project Manager  
Stantec Consulting Ltd.  
300 Hagey Blvd  
Waterloo, ON N2L 0A4  
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William Street and Strange Street Water Supply Systems
Detailed Design and Construction
Public Information Centre No. 2

Tuesday, June 18th, 2019 5:00pm-7:00pm
Region of Waterloo Public Health and Community Services Building 199 Regina Street, Waterloo, ON
Welcome to Public Information Centre No. 2

The Region is planning to connect the Strange Street and William Street Water Supply Systems.

We are here tonight to:

• Provide an overview of the first phase of construction, which includes installation of the raw watermain from Belmont Avenue to the William Street Pumping Station Site
• To introduce the construction contractor
• To answer your questions!
## Helpful Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term/Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WSS</td>
<td>Water Supply System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUS</td>
<td>Integrated Urban System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTP</td>
<td>Water Treatment Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw Watermain</td>
<td>Pipe that brings untreated water from the source (e.g. a well) to the treatment plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Test</td>
<td>Small-scale version of a full-sized water treatment plant used to confirm whether treatment will function as proposed. It helps guide the design of the full scale treatment plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class EA</td>
<td>Municipal Class Environmental Assessment – a planning study that includes public and stakeholder consultation to determine a recommended approach to infrastructure upgrades and design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Cut and Trenchless Construction</td>
<td>Different construction methods for installing pipes in the ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIC</td>
<td>Public Information Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have any questions about the material presented or require alternate formats, please see a member of the project team. We are here to help!
The Story So Far...

- The Region’s Water Supply and Distribution Operations Master Plan recommended connecting the William Street and Strange Street WSS.

- A Class EA was completed in 2016 to identify a preferred design for connecting the William Street and Strange Street WSS.

- The recommendations were developed to minimize overall impacts to heritage structures, transportation corridors, and businesses.

- Contractor has now been awarded for the first construction phase (raw watermain only)
Purpose of the Project

Why should we do this?

Combining the William Street and Strange Street IUS has the following benefits:

- Improves the security and supply of water in Kitchener and Waterloo
- Improves water quality
- Reduces operational costs by having one water treatment plant.

North façade of the Strange Street Pump Station with overhead door and date stone
Raw Watermain Route
Construction Staging

Legend
- ION Route
- Preferred Alignment of 450 mm Watermain

Stage A: Herbert St: Allen St to Waterloo Pumping Station

Stage B: Herbert St from John St to Allen St

Stage C: John Street from Mary St to Herbert St

Stage D: John St from King St to Mary St

**** Order of Stages Subject to Change
Construction Staging

Stage E: John Street from King Street to Iron Horse Trail

Stage F: Iron Horse Trail from Union Blvd and John St

Stage G: Iron Horse Trail between Glasgow St and Union Blvd

Stage H: Glasgow Street

****Order of Stages Subject to Change
What Will Happen During Construction?

- Tree Protection Fencing will be installed prior to construction
- Advance notice will be provided for disruptions to driveways
- Alternative parking (e.g. on adjacent side streets) will be made available, if required
- Disturbed grass and boulevards will be restored to better than existing conditions
- Pre-construction foundations assessments will be completed prior to construction.
What Will Watermain Construction Look Like?

Typical Open-Cut Watermain Construction

Open-cut construction involves digging a trench to install the watermain. Watermain construction along the Iron Horse Trail, John Street, and Herbert Street will be constructed using the Open Cut method.
What Will Watermain Construction Look Like?

Trenchless construction involves the use of a drilling machine to install underground pipes without an open trench.

Trenchless construction will be used to cross under the new Light Rail Transit line at John Street.
Proposed Iron Horse Trail Detour Routes

Iron Horse Trail (IHT) Closures and Detours
Traffic Management

- PLACEHOLDER FOR TMP INFO/DETOUR ROUTES
## 2016 Class EA Commitments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016 Class EA Commitment</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate with the Cities of Kitchener and Waterloo for Iron Horse Trail improvements</td>
<td>The design teams have been working together to coordinate Trail improvements (construction in fall 2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain the Herbert Street barrier</td>
<td>Herbert Street barrier is being maintained. It will be used for equipment access during construction, but will be closed to traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain an Arborist to provide specific tree protection measures and to oversee trees during construction</td>
<td>Tree inventory completed, and detailed tree preservation plan is underway. Watermain has been designed to minimize tree removals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install fencing to protect tree trunks, where appropriate</td>
<td>Tree preservation plan will identify specific tree protection measures including fencing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant 2 trees for everyone 1 tree removed</td>
<td>For every 1 tree removed, 2 trees will be planted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

Municipal Class EA
- PCC 1: September 2014
- PCC 2: October 2015
- PCC 3: May 2016
- PCC 4: November 2016

Detailed Design
- PIC 1 held on January 17, 2019 to update the public on the progress of Detailed Design

Award Contractor
- PIC 2 held to present final alignment and Contract 1 Construction Details

We Are Here

Begin Contract 1 Construction
- Construction will be conducted in phases along the watermain route
  - Spring 2019

Award Contract 2 Strange Street WTP Upgrades
- Upgrades at the Strange Street WTP will be undertaken during Contract 2
  - Fall 2019

The Region is committed to ensuring you are informed as the project progresses. If you have any specific concerns, please contact a member of the project team:

Ryan Snider, M.A.Sc.
Senior Project Manager,
Design and Construction Division
Region of Waterloo
519-575-4570 x. 3436
rsnider@regionofwaterloo.ca

Al Mueller
Consultant Project Manager
Stantec Consulting Ltd.
519 585-7261
al.mueller@Stantec.com
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Region of Waterloo
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To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: May 28, 2019
File Code: D16-60

Subject: A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe

Recommendation:
For information.

Summary:
On May 2, 2019, the Province of Ontario released A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Growth Plan). The new Growth Plan follows a draft amendment to the Growth Plan, 2017 that was released for public feedback and comment earlier this year (Report PDL-CPL-19-10). The new Growth Plan reflects the proposed amendment and replaces the 2017 Growth Plan. The new Growth Plan came into effect on May 16, 2019.

This report provides some brief background on the new Growth Plan and highlights the key policy changes. The key policy changes of the new Growth Plan include:

- Decreased intensification targets for the Built-Up Area (BUA);
- Decreased density targets for Designated Greenfield Areas (DGA);
- Refinements to the delineation of Major Transit Station Areas (MTSA);
- Provincially Significant Employment Zone Framework and mapping;
- Consideration of employment conversions outside of a Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR);
- Consideration of settlement area boundary expansions outside of a MCR
- Consideration for refinements of settlement area boundaries outside of a
MCR; and,

- Implementation of the Agricultural System and Natural Heritage System mapping for the Growth Plan.

Report:

On May 2, 2019, the Province of Ontario released A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Growth Plan). The new Growth Plan follows a draft amendment to the 2017 Growth Plan that was released for public feedback and comment earlier this year (Report PDL-CPL-19-10). The new Growth Plan closely tracks the proposed amendment and replaces the 2017 Growth Plan. The new Growth Plan came into effect on May 16, 2019.


Under the Planning Act, all planning decisions must conform to the policies of the Growth Plan. As a result, Regional and Area Municipal planning staff refer to the Growth Plan on a regular basis in their work and the policies of the Regional Official Plan (ROP) and the Area Municipal Official Plans must conform to the Growth Plan.

First introduced in 2006, the Growth Plan provides a framework for managing growth in the GGH by focusing growth in urban areas, encouraging more compact urban development and protecting natural systems and agricultural lands. The Growth Plan was updated in 2017 and included increased targets for density and intensification and policies with respect to MTSAs.

What are the key policy changes in the new Growth Plan?

The new Growth Plan amends the policy framework set out in the 2017 Growth Plan and closely reflects Proposed Amendment 1 to the Growth Plan, 2017 that was released for comment in early 2019. Several key areas of change in the new Growth Plan include:

1. Intensification Target

- The Intensification Target has been decreased to 50% of all new residential development to occur annually within the BUA from the time that the ROP is brought into conformity with the Growth Plan to 2041. The 2017 Growth Plan had required 50% from the time of the MCR to 2031 and 60% from 2031 to 2041.

- The ROP currently requires that a minimum of 45% of all residential development occurs annually within the BUA and Regional staff monitor the achievement of
this target on a regular basis. This target has been met or exceeded each year since 2010 with 6 years exceeding 50% of all residential development occurring annually in the BUA.

- The new Growth Plan also simplifies the process for requesting an alternative target. The request must demonstrate that the target cannot be achieved and that the alternative target will be appropriate given the size location and capacity of the delineated built-up area.

2. Designated Greenfield Area Density Target

- The Designated Greenfield Area (DGA) Density Target has been decreased from 80 to 50 persons and jobs per hectare. Currently, the ROP DGA density target is 50 persons and jobs per hectare.
- The process for requesting an alternative target has been simplified. Municipalities can request an alternative density target where it is demonstrated that the target cannot be achieved and that the alternative target will support the diversification of the total range and mix of housing options and the achievement of a more compact built form that is appropriate given the characteristics of the municipality and adjacent communities.

3. Major Transit Station Areas

- The new Growth Plan contains policies that permit municipalities to delineate Major Transit Station Areas (MTSA) and set density targets for these areas in advance of a municipal comprehensive review using the Protected Major Transit Station Area tool under the Planning Act.
- Under the new Growth Plan, the parameters for delineating MTSAs have been modified to provide flexibility. These parameters have been increased from generally 500 meters to generally 500 to 800 meters from a station.
- In addition, the new Growth Plan simplifies the process for requesting an alternative minimum density target for a MTSA by removing the requirement to “make-up” any reduction in density requested through the alternative target at another station. It also recognizes the diversity of MTSAs and provides for alternative target requests where a station meets the definition of a Major Trip Generator and significant number of residents and jobs are not associated with the current or planned built form.

4. Settlement Area Boundary Expansions

- The new Growth Plan contains a policy framework which provides for the consideration of settlement area boundary expansions outside of a MCR. The size of the expansion would be limited to 40 hectares and the additional lands and associated forecasted growth must be fully accounted for in the land needs assessment associated with the next MCR.
5. Minor Adjustments to Settlement Area Boundaries

- The new Growth Plan contains a policy framework (Policy 2.2.8.4) for municipalities to adjust the boundaries of settlement areas outside of a MCR provided there is no net increase in land within the settlement area. A similar policy framework that provides for the rationalization of Township Urban Areas and Breslau Urban Area boundaries is contained within the ROP. The ROP also contains a policy framework that provides for the rationalization of Rural Settlement Areas. This policy framework (ROP Policy 2.B.8 and 6.G.9) allows for land to be removed from one Rural Settlement Area and added to another Rural Settlement Area or Township Urban Area, provided there is no net increase. As these settlement areas are serviced by individual water and wastewater services or some form of partial services, these rationalizations would not conform to Policy 2.2.8.4 of the Growth Plan and would need to occur through the MCR of the ROP.

- The new Growth Plan also contains a policy framework to provide minor adjustments to the boundaries of Rural Settlements outside of a MCR subject to a number of criteria, including that the change would constitute a minor rounding out of existing development, in keeping with the rural character of the area and confirmation that that water and wastewater servicing can be provided in an appropriate manner.

5. Employment Lands

- The new Growth Plan provides for the consideration of employment conversion outside a municipal comprehensive review subject to a number of criteria outlined in Policy 2.2.5.10. These criteria including maintaining a significant number of jobs, that the conversion does not adversely effect the overall viability of the employment area and that there is existing or planned infrastructure to accommodate the proposed uses.

- The new Growth Plan contains the following definition of Provincially Significant Employment Zones: “Areas defined by the Minister in consultation with affected municipalities for the purpose of long-term planning for job creation and economic development. Provincially significant employment zones can consist of employment areas as well as mixed-use areas that contain a significant number of jobs.”

- The Minister has identified 29 Provincially Significant Employment Zones and three of these zones are located in the Region of Waterloo. Based on feedback received through consultations earlier in 2019, any technical errors to the boundaries of the zones have been corrected. The Region provided comments on the proposed Provincially Significant Employment Zones through Report PDL-CPL-19-10. In response to these comments, a portion of lands adjacent to
Riverbank Drive located outside of the Urban Area boundary have been removed from the employment zone.

- In correspondence dated May 15, 2019 (Attachment 1) the Province committed to reviewing and considering requests to modify, remove or add Provincially Significant Employment Zones.
- Provincially Significant Employment Zones cannot be considered for employment conversions outside of a MCR.

6. Natural Heritage and Agricultural System

- The new Growth Plan contains language to clarify that the Natural Heritage System and the Agricultural System mapping for the Growth Plan mapping does not come into effect until a MCR and that refinements to this mapping is to be implemented through a MCR.

How will the new Growth Plan affect the Region of Waterloo?

The new Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe came into effect on May 16, 2019. Pursuant to the Planning Act, all decisions made on or after May 16, 2019 must conform to the new Growth Plan.

The Region is required to undertake a MCR and related amendment(s) to the ROP to conform to the new Growth Plan. Through Report PDL-CPL-18-33 in August 2018, the Region commenced a review of the Regional Official Plan (ROP) intended to fulfill the requirements of a MCR. Further to this, through report COR-TRY-18-109 in December 2018, the Region retained Dillion Consulting Ltd. to assist with growth-related components of the review.

Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination

Implementation of the new Growth Plan will require collaboration between the Region, the Area Municipalities and the GRCA. This report has been provided to Area Municipal and GRCA staff for information.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

The new Growth Plan support the Region’s priorities with respect to Focus Area 2 (Growth Management and Prosperity) and Focus Area 3 (Sustainable Transportation) of the Corporate Strategic Plan.

Financial Implications:

Implementation of the new Growth Plan requires the Region to undertake a MCR and update the ROP accordingly. The Region’s approved 2019-2028 Community Planning Capital Program includes a budget of $1,148,000 in 2019 for MCR (project #22007) to
be funded from the Community Planning Capital Reserve (10%; $114,800) and the General Government Development Charge Reserve Fund (90%; $1,033,200). As described in report COR-FSD-19-25 dated May 28, 2019 on the Administration & Finance Committee agenda, Bill 108 “the More Homes, More Choices Act, 2019” was introduced and received first reading on May 2, 2019. If enacted, it is likely that costs associated with the MCR will be considered ineligible for funding under the Development Charges Act. Staff will report to Committee at a future date with the impacts of Bill 108, if and when enacted, and any required amendments to the Region’s capital program.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Staff from Transportation and Environmental Services, Community Services, Public Health and Legal Services will all play an important role in implementing the policies of the new Growth Plan. Planning staff will continue to consult, collaborate and coordinate with each of these departments to ensure that the Region’s policies and programs conform to the new Growth Plan.

Attachments:

Attachment 1 – Correspondence from the Minister of Municipal Affairs regarding Provincially Significant Employment Zones

Prepared By: Alyssa Bridge, Principal Planner

Approved By: Rod Regier, Commissioner, Planning, Development and Legislative Services
Dear Regional Chair Karen Redman,

On May 2, I released **More Homes, More Choice:** Ontario’s Housing Supply Action Plan. It lays out our government’s comprehensive plan to increase the supply of housing that is affordable and provides families with more meaningful choices on where to live, work and raise their families.

The Greater Golden Horseshoe is a critical economic driver, both provincially and nationally, with 85 per cent of the province’s population growth expected in this region by 2041. We know that we need a growth plan to not only address the current housing crisis, but to also prepare the region for the exponential growth that will occur over the next 20 years. That is why **A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe** is a critical part of Ontario’s Housing Supply Action Plan.

A Place to Grow addresses the needs of the region’s growing population, its diversity, its people and its local priorities. It is the result of the recent consultations on growth plan policies in the Greater Golden Horseshoe, and I would like to thank you for sharing your input during that process. All input was carefully considered in the development of A Place to Grow and the introduction of the Provincially Significant Employment Zones. A Place to Grow will help increase housing supply, create jobs, attract investments and promote economic development. It comes into effect on May 16, 2019 and aims to provide planning flexibility at the local level.

In my letter of May 2, 2019, I outlined that we have identified 29 Provincially Significant Employment Zones that we consulted on to provide enhanced protections for existing employment areas. The 29 zones have not changed as a result of consultations; however, we have revised them to address any factual errors in the mapping based on municipal official plans that are in effect. These zones can be viewed on our web portal.
Requests for Reconsideration

During the next phase of work, we will be reviewing more than 750 requests we received during the consultation period to reconsider a particular zone and/or add new zones. As a part of this, we may require additional information from municipalities and others who submitted requests. Each request will be assessed on its own merit, and other considerations, such as local planning context and provincial interest.

To help process these reconsiderations, we will be seeking demonstrable municipal support, such as a council endorsed letter that outlines local support for the request. We will work with the parties involved to connect with the appropriate municipal officials.

Any requests for reconsideration received after May 2, 2019 should be submitted to the impacted municipality to include in its planning process or should be accompanied by a letter of endorsement from the impacted municipality when submitted to the Province. Further details on the Requests for Reconsideration process including how requests are assessed can be found online at www.ontario.ca/page/provincially-significant-employment-zones.

If you have questions about the zones, the Requests for Reconsideration process, or accessing mapping files of the existing zones, please contact ministry staff at growthplanning@ontario.ca.

Engagement on longer-term use of Provincially Significant Employment Zones

The last phase of work will look at the longer-term use of Provincially Significant Employment Zones. The ministry has already begun to consider innovative ways to use the zones to leverage economic development investments, programs and strategies both inside and outside the Greater Golden Horseshoe. Our goal is to maximize the economic opportunities that these zones can provide. This includes but is not limited to the number of jobs and people in these zones as they play a strategic and significant role in keeping Ontario economically viable both provincially and internationally.

Provincially Significant Employment Zones can be areas with high concentrations of employment, areas that are recognized to have high economic output, or areas that are understood to play an economically strategic or significant role to the region. They will help provide stable, reliable employment across the region and opportunities for greater integration of the different facets of longer-term planning.

With our partners from the ministries of Economic Development, Job Creation, and Trade; Transportation; Infrastructure; Finance; Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs; and the province’s Open for Business Division, we will be holding stakeholder discussions this summer. These discussions will focus on ways to maximize the use of the zones as tools in investments, infrastructure planning and economic activity.

In the interim, if you have any questions, concerns or ideas, feel free to contact the representative in my office, Jae Truesdell, Senior Policy Advisor – Planning, Zoning & Development at jae.truesdell@ontario.ca. You may also contact Cordelia Clarke Julien, Assistant Deputy Minister, Ontario Growth Secretariat, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing at cordelia.clarkejulien@ontario.ca or at 416-325-5803 for any process-related matters.
Thank you once again for sharing your input. I value your feedback and look forward to continuing to work together in the months ahead.

Sincerely,

Original signed by

Steve Clark
Minister

cc:

Michelle Sergi, Director, Community Planning

Mike Murray, CAO

Kris Fletcher, Regional Clerk
Region of Waterloo
Planning, Development and Legislative Services
Community Planning

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

Date: May 28, 2018

File Code: D06-04

Subject: Regional Response to Proposed Bill 108 - “More Homes, More Choice Act, 2019” (ERO Posting Nos. 019-0016 and 019-021)

Recommendation:


Summary:

On May 2, 2019, the Provincial government released Bill 108, the proposed “More Homes, More Choice Act, 2019”. If passed, Bill 108 would make major changes to 13 different Provincial statutes, including the Planning Act, the Development Charges Act, the Ontario Heritage Act and the Local Planning Tribunal Act. Highlights of the proposed changes include: significantly reducing timelines for making planning decisions; substantially changing how growth-related costs are funded through the Development Charges Act; establishing a new approach to the Endangered Species Act; and creating a new process for addressing Ontario Heritage Act designations.

Bill 108 would also repeal many of the reforms to Ontario’s planning system enacted through Bill 139 (the Building Better Communities and Conserving Watersheds Act, 2017) and other amendments over the past decade. These changes would bring back a land use planning appeal system similar to the former Ontario Municipal Board. Attachment A contains a summary of the key legislative changes proposed by Bill 108.

The proposed amendments are a cornerstone of the government’s new “More Homes, More Choice Housing Supply Action Plan”, which was released simultaneously with Bill 108 on May 2, 2019. The stated intent of this initiative is to address housing supply and
affordability in Ontario by: streamlining development approvals; reducing and providing more certainty about municipal development charges; and creating conditions that would make it easier to build new ownership and rental housing.

This report provides staff’s comments and recommendations from multiple Regional departments on the following Schedules to Bill 108:

- Schedule 1 (Cannabis Control Act);
- Schedule 2 (Conservation Authorities Act)
- Schedule 5 (Endangered Species Act);
- Schedule 6 (Environmental Assessment Act);
- Schedule 7 (Environmental Protection Act);
- Schedule 8 (Labour Relations Act);
- Schedule 9 (Local Planning Appeal Tribunal Act);
- Schedule 10 (Occupational Health and Safety Act);
- Schedule 11 (Ontario Heritage Act);
- Schedule 12 (Planning Act); and
- Schedule 13 (Workplace Safety and Insurance Act).

Considering the size and complexity of Bill 108, staff's comments with respect to Schedule 3 (Development Charges Act), Schedule 4 (Education Act) and the community benefits charge portion of Schedule 12 (Planning Act) are outlined separately in Report No. COR-FSD-19-25 dated May 28, 2019.

The government has posted Schedules 3, 11 and 12 on the Environmental Registry of Ontario (ERO) for a 30-day review period ending June 1, 2019. If adopted, this report will be submitted to the ERO as Regional Council’s formal comments on the proposed legislative changes. Comments for Schedules 2 and 5 were due on May 21, 2019 and May 18, 2019, respectively and staff comments were submitted as a placeholder pending consideration of this report.

As part of this housing supply initiative, the government has also released the final version of “A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe”, which implemented amendments to the previous Growth Plan that came into effect in 2017. Staff's comments regarding the amended Growth Plan are outlined in Report No. PW-CPL- 19-21 dated May 28, 2019.

The area municipalities were circulated a preliminary draft of this report for review.
Report:

Background

In November 2018, the Provincial government released a Consultation Document titled “Increasing Housing Supply in Ontario”. The document sought input on how the Province could address the barriers to creating new ownership and rental housing in Ontario. This initiative was outlined in the government’s “2018 Ontario Economic Outlook and Fiscal Review – a Plan for the People.” It is intended to help address the recent housing affordability challenges in Ontario, caused in part by rising development costs, delays in planning approvals and other barriers restricting the supply of new housing. In recent years, house prices and rents in Ontario, especially in high-growth areas such as the Greater Toronto Area and surrounding urban centres have increased rapidly because of low interest rates, population growth, and other positive economic factors.

On January 29, 2019, Regional Council submitted its comments on the Province’s Housing Supply Consultation Document through Report No. PDL-CPL-19-03/COR-FSD-19-06/CSD-HOU-19-04. That submission provided input on five broad themes:

- Speed – streamlining the development approval process;
- Housing Mix – increasing the mix of housing, including the “Missing Middle”;
- Development Charges – ensuring growth continues to pay for growth;
- Rents – improving the rental housing system for landlords and tenants; and
- Innovation – encouraging new and creative ways to increase housing supply.

More Homes, More Choice: Housing Supply Action Plan


Bill 108 proposes significant changes to 13 different Provincial statutes across multiple ministries, including the Planning Act, the Development Charges Act, the Ontario Heritage Act and the Local Planning Tribunal Act. A summary of the proposed amendments are contained in Attachment “A”. Some of the government’s stated objectives of Bill 108 include:

- Streamlining development approval processes to facilitate faster decisions;
- Supporting a range and mix of housing options, and boost housing supply;
- Addressing concerns about the land use planning appeal system;
• Making housing more attainable by reducing costs to build certain types of homes;
• Increasing the certainty of costs of development; and
• Providing clearer rules and tools, and creating more consistent appeals processes to help conserve cultural heritage resources while allowing housing supply to increase.

General Comments

Although the focus of Bill 108 is on bringing more housing to market quickly, supply is not the primary factor or the only factor affecting the Province’s and Waterloo Region’s housing market. It is also influenced by a variety of other key economic factors, including lower interest rates, higher after-tax incomes, house price “spill-overs” from the Greater Toronto Area and other economic factors. Consequently, increasing housing supply alone will not solve such a complex and wide-ranging issue as affordable housing. Ongoing Provincial support for community housing will be critical to accommodating people with low and moderate incomes.

Bill 108 would repeal many, but not all, of the reforms to Ontario’s planning appeal system enacted by Bill 139 (the Building Better Communities and Conserving Watersheds Act, 2017) and earlier amendments. All of these planning reforms were endorsed by Regional Council to support the development of a more compact, transit-supportive urban form, and to give municipal elected officials greater control over local planning decisions.

Although Bill 108 would revert to many of the old planning rules that Regional Council sought to change, the proposed Bill would retain key elements of the earlier planning reforms, including:

• prohibiting “global appeals” of official plans (i.e., no appeals of entire official plans);
• removing the right to appeal Provincial approvals of official plans and official plan updates, including for conformity exercises to the Growth Plan;
• allowing 10-year review cycle for official plans and zoning by-laws; and
• removing the right to appeal municipal policies that support appropriate development within major transit station areas.

In addition to amending the Planning Act and the Local Planning Appeals Tribunal Act, Bill 108 would also amend several other Provincial statutes. Staff’s detailed comments and recommendations regarding those legislative changes are outlined below.

Detailed Comments

Schedule 1 – Proposed Amendments to the Cannabis Control Act

The purpose of the Cannabis Control Act is to regulate and establish prohibitions for the sale, distribution, purchase, possession, cultivation propagation and harvesting of
cannabis. The proposed amendments provide greater clarity to enforcement officers on the closure of premises, obstruction of officers and fines. If passed, Bill 108 would make the following changes to the Act:

- Allow residential properties to be closed and all persons present to be removed if a contravention of the Act has occurred and a charge laid;
- Allow police and emergency personnel to enter, or re-enter a closed premise in important or urgent circumstances until the final disposition of the charge;
- Prohibit any person from hindering, obstructing or interfering, or attempting to hinder, obstruct or interfere with police officers and other person designated by the Minister in enforcing the Act; and
- Establish a new minimum penalty of $10,000 for a first conviction in respect of Section 6 (i.e., unlawful sale, distribution of cannabis) and Section 13 (i.e., landlord allowing a premise to be use for prohibited activities), and a new minimum penalty of $5,000 for any subsequent convictions. Maximum penalties for these convictions already exist in the legislation.

These proposed amendments will have little impact to the Region of Waterloo but will impact Waterloo Region Police Service (WRPS). Currently, there are no persons from the Region other than WRPS who are designated by the Minister for enforcing the Cannabis Control Act.

Schedule 2 – Proposed Amendments to the Conservation Authorities Act

If passed, Bill 108 would amend the Conservation Authorities Act to help Conservation Authorities better focus and deliver on their core mandate, and to improve governance. The Province has defined the Conservation Authorities’ core mandatory programs and services provided to be: natural hazard protection and management; conservation and management of Conservation Authority lands; drinking water source protection (as prescribed under the Clean Water Act); and protection of the Lake Simcoe watershed (as prescribed under the Lake Simcoe Protection Act). These core services are particularly important as the Province adapts to increasing extreme weather and climate change impacts.

Other key changes proposed under Bill 108 include: improving transparency in how Conservation Authorities levy municipalities for services; establishing a process for Conservation Authorities and municipalities to enter into service delivery agreements; enabling the Minister to investigate conservation authorities; and clarifying the duty of Conservation Authority boards.

Staff’s comments regarding the above changes are detailed in Attachment B. These comments, which were due on May 21, were submitted as a placeholder pending Regional Council’s consideration of this report. The comments in Attachment B are
consistent with and supportive of the GRCA’s comments (Report GM-04-19-41 – Environmental Registry Posting 013-5018: Modernizing Conservation Authority Operations, dated April 26, 2019). Staff’s key recommendations to Province are:

Recommendations

a) The Province should add “the broad conservation of natural heritage features related to surface and/or groundwater” as one of the Conservation Authorities’ core mandates and services, so that the direct and positive impacts of conservation programs and services can be supported consistently across municipalities;

b) The Province should provide a strong and supportive framework to clarify the duty of Conservation Authority boards, and to continue enabling watershed based collaboration and leadership on natural hazard protection, source water protection, and natural heritage conservation;

c) The Province should ensure that any changes to the Conservation Authorities Act regarding service delivery agreement processes be made in consultation with Conservation Authorities and municipalities, with the intent of developing a practical, non-prescriptive approach that covers core programs and services, and gives local decision makers the flexibility to determine the scale and scope of any additional programs and services;

d) The Province should ensure that the Conservation Authorities Act continues to acknowledge and support the critically important role that Conservation Authorities fill in long-term community planning, wise use and management of resources, and community health and safety;

e) The Province should ensure that the responsibility for funding and oversight for source water protection remain with the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks; and

f) The Province should consult with municipalities and Conservation Authorities during the development of any future regulations associated with the amended Conservation Authorities Act.

Schedule 5 – Proposed Amendments to the Endangered Species Act

Staff has reviewed the Province’s proposed changes to Ontario’s Endangered Species Act with respect to:

- Enhancing the Province’s oversight and enforcement powers to ensure compliance with the Act;
- Improving transparent notification of new species’ listings;
- Ensuring appropriate consultation with academics, communities, organizations and
Indigenous peoples across Ontario on species at risk recovery planning; and,

- Creating new tools to streamline approval processes, reduce duplication and ensure costs incurred by clients are directed towards actions that will improve outcomes for the species or its habitat.

While the proposed changes to the Endangered Species Act are meant to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Act, there are publically stated concerns that:

- Species listed as threatened or endangered may no longer be automatically protected;
- There will be increased opportunity for political interference in the listing process;
- Developers and other activity proponents will be able to pay into a fund to compensate for harming species at risk and their habitats, rather than providing an on-the-ground overall benefit to species; and
- Southern Ontario species at the northern limit of their range may receive less or no protection, depending on their status outside Ontario.

Staff’s comments concerning the above changes are detailed in Attachment C. These comments were due on May 18, and submitted to the Province as a placeholder pending Regional Council’s consideration of this report. Staff’s key recommendations are:

a) The Province should prioritize in-situ conservation, with very strict criteria for opting out. In addition, the Province should continue to support proactive species at risk research with funding that is not directly related to development;

b) The Province should include Aboriginal traditional knowledge, and better define “community knowledge” so that is as apparent what value the additional member(s) would be bringing to the Committee. In addition, the Province should continue to rely on scientific expertise as a sound foundation for decision making;

c) The Provincial assessment process for endangered species should continue to be science-based, and taken from a long-term, risk-averse and apolitical perspective. This process should ensure that geographic or circumstantial protections do not arbitrarily allow for the exclusion of important habitats and species from protection. Any decisions regarding endangered species should prioritize environmental benefits over other potential social and economic benefits;

d) The Province should not proceed with its proposed nine month gap between the Committee on the Status of Species at Risk in Ontario assessments and listing, nor the decoupling of listing with automatic protection, as these proposed changes would increase the risk of vulnerable plants, animals and their habitats being eliminated before protections are in place. Environmental Bill of Rights consultation requirements
should be maintained;

e) The Province should revise its proposed approach to landscape agreements to prioritize conservation over economic and social factors, and ensure that such agreements address the full scope of site-specific and species-specific concerns; and

f) In considering the use of instruments under other Acts to protect species at risk, the Province should adopt an approach that best manages long-term impacts to species and habitats, and any potential risks that may be associated with allowing permanent Endangered Special Act exemptions under other laws (i.e., forestry industry).

Schedule 6 – Proposed Amendments to the Environmental Assessment Act

If passed, Bill 108 would amend the Environmental Assessment Act to include new exemptions for certain undertakings, and to establish new limitations and deadlines for when the Minister could issue orders. The proposed exemptions relate to: Provincial transportation facilities; the Ministry of Natural Resource’s Stewardship and Facility Development Projects; the Management Board Secretariat and Ontario Realty Corporation services; Provincial Parks and Conservation Reserves; and the Ministry of Northern Development and Mine’s activities under the Mining Act.

For undertakings where the Region or the area municipalities are the proponent, the proposed amendments would exempt Schedules A and A+ of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment. These undertakings are currently preapproved under the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment, but Schedule A+ undertakings currently require public notification. If these undertakings are exempted through Bill 108, then public notification may no longer be required under the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment. In practice, however, it is expected that the Region would continue to provide public notice of upcoming projects.

It is expected that the Province, the Region and the area municipalities would continue to coordinate projects to address matters such as traffic management for road projects, even if the undertakings are exempt from the Environmental Assessment Act. Staff support reducing the amount of time required to resolve requests for orders.

Orders

Bill 108 would also amend the Environmental Assessment Act to establish new limits on the Minister’s authority to issue orders. Under the proposed amendments, the Minister could only issue orders to prevent, mitigate or remedy adverse impacts on constitutionally protected aboriginal or treaty rights, or a prescribed matter of Provincial importance.

The proposed amendments would also impose new limitations on any persons making requests for orders by requiring that the person be a resident of Ontario, and that the request be submitted within a prescribed deadline. The amendments would also require
the Director to refuse any requests for an order that do not comply with the applicable criteria.

The Minister shall decide whether to make an order before any deadline as may be prescribed. If the Minister has not made a decision in respect of a request by a deadline prescribed for the purpose, the Minister shall provide written reasons indicating why a decision was not made and when a decision is expected to be made.

Limiting the Minister's ability to issue orders and imposing deadlines for decisions may reduce the amount of time required to resolve requests for orders.

**Schedule 7 – Proposed Amendments to the Environmental Protection Act**

If passed, Bill 108 would amend the Environmental Protection Act to allow a provincial officer to seize the number plates for a vehicle, if the officer believes that the vehicle was used or is being used in connection with an offence under the *Environmental Protection Act*, the *Nutrient Management Act*, the *Ontario Water Resources Act*, the *Pesticides Act*, the *Safe Drinking Water Act*, or the *Toxics Reduction Act*. In addition, Schedule 7 would broaden the scope of administrative penalties to ensure compliance with any requirements or orders made under the *Environmental Protection Act* or the regulations.

Regional staff have no concerns with the proposed changes.

**Schedule 8 – Proposed Amendments to the Labour Relations Act**

The amendments to the Labour Relations Act address several provisions. First, a special rule in the Act that focuses upon concrete formwork in relation to The Carpenters’ District Council of Ontario (under section 150.7) is repealed. Second, the provisions of section 153 (which addresses Province-wide bargaining) that allow exclusions under that section to be limited to specified geographic areas are also repealed. Additional proposed amendments will also provide the Lieutenant Governor in Council the authority to address any transitional matter arising from the More Homes, More Choices Act, 2019. In the event that this legislation has an impact upon bargaining agent certificates and agreements, regulations can be made to resolve any such issues.

As a partial consequence of the recent passage of Bill 66 (which deemed municipalities, among others, as non-construction employers), we believe that these changes to the Labour Relations Act will not have any significant municipal implications. No action should be required in response to these changes, if passed.

**Schedule 9 – Proposed Amendments to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal Act**

The government is proposing significant changes to the Province’s land use planning appeal system, which was overhauled in 2017 following a major review by the former Provincial government. Regional Council participated in that review since 2016 and has been very supportive of the reforms to the former Ontario Municipal Board, to support...
timelier decisions making and give more weight to elected municipal councils.

If passed, Bill 108 would amend both the Planning Act and the Local Planning Tribunal Act (formerly called the Ontario Municipal Board Act) to reverse some of the key reforms to Ontario’s planning appeal system. Staff’s comments with respect to the Planning Act are outlined below starting on page 17. The key proposed changes to the Local Planning Tribunal Act (LPAT) include:

- Providing for mandatory case management conferences for appeals of official plans/official plan amendments, zoning by-law amendments and plans of subdivision;
- Providing for mandatory mediation or other dispute resolution processes in specified circumstances;
- Repealing provisions relating to the Tribunal's ability to state a case in writing for the opinion of the Divisional Court on a question of law;
- Restoring the rights to examine or cross-examine witnesses, and allowing the Tribunal to limit any examination or cross-examination of a witness in specific circumstances;
- Limiting the submissions by non-parties to a proceeding before the Tribunal to written submissions only, but providing the Tribunal with the authority to examine such parties; and
- Providing the Tribunal with the power to determine fees for classes of persons, or classes of matters.

The government has not released details on how these changes will be implemented. There remain matters to be dealt with through regulation, including the transition of matters currently before the LPAT to the new rules once in force. Transition regulations may deal with different classes of matters differently, and may make modifications to the application of the LPAT Act as it read before the effective date of the amendments for some matters. There is presently a regulation that sets the time lines for the disposition of matters by the LPAT. There has been no indication that regulation would be repealed or replaced.

Overall, the changes proposed by Bill 108 essentially return the practice and procedures for appeals of planning matters to those under the former Ontario Municipal Board. There is potential to achieve efficiencies and reduce the time to resolve appeals through the case management process and the power of the Tribunal to require mediation or other dispute resolution to resolve one or more issues in an appeal. While the explicit power to limit examination and cross-examination accorded to the Tribunal may permit efficiencies in the hearings, it is anticipated that the exercise of that power may result in challenges.
Recommendation

The government should consult with municipalities and affected stakeholders prior to amending the implementing regulations to the LPAT Act, or approving any proposed changes to the LPAT’s Rules of Practice and Procedure.

Schedule 10 – Proposed Amendments to the Occupational Health and Safety Act

The Occupational Health and Safety Act contains provisions that empower the Province’s Chief Prevention Officer at the Ministry of Labour to advance their goal of prevention of health and safety issues in workplaces. The proposed changes address the ability of the Chief Prevention Officer to make changes relating to the certification of joint health and safety committee members. If adopted, the Chief Prevention Officer will have greater flexibility in amending the training requirements required for certification, the conditions required to maintain certification (including specifying time-limited certifications), and the clear ability to revoke or amend certifications for joint health and safety committee members.

These changes will not have a direct impact upon Region operations, if passed. Health and Safety will continue to ensure appropriate certifications are held by joint health and safety committee members, and where changes are made through the Ministry of Labour’s Chief Prevention Officer, compliance will continue to be monitored in the event that there are any changes required to certifications of committee members.

Schedule 11 – Proposed Amendments to the Ontario Heritage Act

Bill 108 proposes several key changes to the Ontario Heritage Act (OHA), including:

- Establishing principles that municipalities must consider when making decisions under Parts IV (Conservation of Property of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest) and V (Heritage Conservation Districts) of the Act;
- Creating regulatory authority to establish mandatory requirements for the content of designation heritage conservation by-laws;
- Revising the process for adding properties not yet designated (known as “listed”) to the municipal heritage register, by notifying property owners if their property is “listed” and enabling them to object to the municipal council; and
- Requiring that municipal decisions regarding heritage designations and alterations be appealable to the LPAT.

The above changes would not directly affect the Region’s mandate and responsibilities with respect to heritage conservation. As a result, staff have no objection in principle to any legislative changes that seek to provide greater clarity to area municipalities on how to interpret the requirements of the OHA. Staff also generally support any changes that
would facilitate a timelier and more transparent heritage conservation process for property owners and the public.

Despite our broad support, staff are concerned that some of the proposed changes may have a detrimental effect on the heritage conservation efforts of the Region’s seven area municipalities. Currently, area municipal councils have the authority to make final decisions with respect to the conservation, alteration or demolition of designated heritage structures. Bill 108 would enable property owners to appeal such council decisions to the LPAT, rather than the Conservation Review Board.

Staff do not support transferring this important responsibility to an adjudicating body that is not elected or accountable to the local community. Decisions regarding heritage conservation should be in the hands of members of the community who understand its unique traditions, its local history and valuable cultural heritage resources. Currently, the Conservation Review Board hears disputes on matters relating to the protection of cultural heritage, and provides expert recommendations on the matters to local councils. The proposed changes will mean that the LPAT will adjudicate disputes and render binding decisions to area municipalities on local cultural heritage matters.

In addition, staff also question whether transferring heritage-related appeals to the LPAT will have any meaningful impact on the supply of new housing in Ontario. Although heritage-related issues often generate much publicity and debate, they only affect a small percentage of housing applications in a municipality. In fact, transferring such appeals to the LPAT may potentially increase delays further by diverting the Tribunal’s resources from larger housing proposals that require more immediate attention.

Recommendations

a) The Province should not transfer the authority to make final decisions with respect to heritage-related matters to the LPAT; and

b) In drafting the prescribed principles noted above, the Province should consider incorporating those principles that form the basis of existing international heritage conventions and charters, and Parks Canada’s Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada.

Schedule 12 – Proposed Amendments to the Planning Act

1. Additional residential unit policies

The Planning Act currently requires local official plans to authorize a second dwelling unit on a residential property. The second unit could be located either in an existing detached, semi-detached or row house, or in an ancillary building or structure on the property (e.g., above laneway garages). Bill 108 would amend the Act to permit two units in the primary dwelling, and one unit in an ancillary building or structure. This would allow up to three
units on a property instead of two.

Staff generally support this change to make it easier for homeowners to create residential units above garages, in basements and in laneways. Most second units are created in established neighbourhoods that are near schools, shopping centres, recreational facilities and other important amenities. They also help provide affordable housing options for those looking to live in lower density areas and, in many cases can be more affordable than apartment rentals. The Region’s Ontario Renovates program provides up to $25,000 as a forgivable loan to create or legalize an affordable second unit.

Despite our support for this proposal, there are some ongoing challenges to creating additional units on existing properties, such as:

- municipalities with large post-secondary student populations (e.g., City of Waterloo) have circumstances where additional units may not be appropriate based on good land use planning principles;
- the high cost of retrofitting a home or ancillary building to add additional units, including the need to ensure fire and building code compliance; and
- the ability to meet municipal parking requirements.

One way to address these challenges is to encourage more home builders and residential land developers to accommodate additional units in new construction. Designing new houses to accommodate a second unit at the outset can be more efficient than retrofitting an existing home to have a second unit. While a home with a second unit may be more expensive to purchase initially, the ability to combine a new home purchase with the purchase of an income property may be attractive to some home buyers.

**Recommendations**

a) The Province should review the Ontario Building Code to address barriers specific to making the creation of second units easier, including making it less onerous for developers to rough in secondary units during the construction of a new home, while maintaining safety of future residents. The Province should also help municipalities by creating guidelines for homeowners and other tools to help create more second units; and

b) The Province should examine ways to encourage more home builders and residential land developers to accommodate additional units in new construction. This could include financial incentives through the Development Charges Act or modifications to the Ontario Building Code.

**2. Inclusionary zoning policies**

Inclusionary zoning is a planning tool that a lower-tier municipality may use to require
affordable housing units to be included in residential developments of 10 units or more. The use of this tool is discretionary, and it is typically applied to create affordable housing for low and moderate-income households.

If a municipality chooses to use inclusionary zoning, the Planning Act currently enables a municipality to apply it within all or parts of their community. There are no restrictions on where it can be applied. This gives municipalities the flexibility to adapt inclusionary zoning to reflect local context, and to apply it where it is needed most. To date, none of the Region’s seven area municipalities have established inclusionary zoning policies in their official plans.

If approved, Bill 108 would amend the Planning Act to restrict the parts of a community that a municipality could apply inclusionary zoning if it chose to use it. Under the proposed amendment, a municipality could only use inclusionary zoning in Major Transit Station Areas (MTSAs), or areas where a development permit system has been adopted or established in response to an order made by the Minister.

Staff recognize and agree with the need to build more affordable housing close to higher order transit. However, the capacity to accommodate new housing within MTSAs can vary and staff does not support creating restrictions on which parts of a community a municipality can apply inclusionary zoning. Fundamentally, this works against the goal of building complete communities that provide a diverse range and mix of housing options, including affordable housing. The Province’s goal, and indeed every municipality’s goal, should be to build more affordable housing wherever it is needed most in a community, not just within major transit station areas.

The Region of Waterloo continues to face challenges in meeting the demand for affordable housing as our community continues to grow. During the consultation on Bill 204 (Promoting Affordable Housing Act), the Region expressed its support for the Province’s inclusionary zoning initiative under the Planning Act. We continue to view inclusionary zoning as an important and necessary tool for area municipalities that can help increase the supply of affordable housing, to meet the needs of housing across the entire region.

**Recommendation**

The Province should not amend subsection 16(5) of the Planning Act to restrict the areas where non-prescribed municipalities can apply inclusionary zoning. Municipalities should continue to have the ability to tailor inclusionary zoning to address local needs.

**3. Reduction of decision timelines**

The proposed amendment would significantly reduce the timelines for municipalities and the Province to make a decision on a development application before an appeal can be filed, as follows:
• Official Plans and amendments from 210 to 120 days
• Zoning by-laws from 150 to 90 days (except where there is a concurrent official plan amendment)
• Plans of subdivision from 180 to 120 days

Undue delays and uncertainty in the approval process can increase a developer’s or home builder’s costs and financial risks, resulting in less new housing supply, higher housing prices and a less efficient housing market. However, reducing the current timelines under the Planning Act will not necessarily bring needed housing to market quicker and could actually have a detrimental effect.

Process delays can occur for many reasons, including the need to extend public consultation on contentious development projects. They can also occur when developers propose changes to their applications midway through the process. Other delays can arise when major gaps or omissions are identified in an applicant’s submission materials.

With respect to plans of subdivisions, once a municipality has granted draft approval of a plan, the developer controls how quickly a plan is registered and when new housing is brought to market. The timing for registration depends on a range of factors, including market conditions, financial considerations and the staging of development of surrounding lands. As a result, reducing decision timelines by 60 days as proposed for plans of subdivision would not yield significant time savings and could inadvertently increase delays by:

• Increasing the number of appeals for non-decisions, thereby diverting municipal resources away from applications already in the queue or from municipal official plan and zoning by-law updates; and

• Prompting more appeals to the LPAT from the public on development applications approved with insufficient consultation with affected residents (see comments below on page 19 with respect to Bill 108’s restrictions on third party appeals).

Staff believe the current timelines are appropriate and provide a good balance between a municipality’s responsibility for making informed decisions, and a developer’s expectation for a timely and efficient approval process.

One of the challenges with the timelines for planning decisions is that after a development application has been deemed complete by the municipality, it has no ability to pause the timelines (i.e., “stop the clock”) if the applicant requests a major revision to the application, or issues arise during the municipality’s review and processing of the application (e.g., the applicant’s submission contains errors or omissions). Depending on the application, such revisions or issues can add several weeks to the approval process.
Recommendations

a) The Province should maintain the current timelines under the Planning Act to ensure municipalities have sufficient time to review applications and make a decision. If the Province decides to change the current timelines, it should consider adopting a sliding scale approach that would set timelines based on the level of complexity of the application. This approach could, for example, set shorter timelines for smaller development proposals and longer timelines for more complex ones; and

b) The Province should establish a mechanism for a municipality to pause the decision timelines, if it identifies significant errors or omissions in the applicant’s submission materials after the application has been deemed complete by the municipality.

4. Repeals to portions of Bill 139 (the Building Better Communities and Conserving Wetlands Act, 2017)

In 2017, the Province introduced a number of positive changes to the Planning Act through Bill 139. Bill 108 would repeal recent amendments to the Planning Act that:

- restricted the grounds of appeal in many instances to inconsistency with a provincial policy statement and/or non-conformity with a provincial or official plan;

- limited the introduction of new evidence or information at hearings; and

- imposed a two-step appeal process, limiting the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal’s ability to make a final decision on a first appeal and requiring it to provide municipalities with an opportunity to make a new decision before it could issue a final decision on a second appeal. Bill 108 reverts back to the single appeal process providing the Tribunal with the authority to render a final decision at the first instance.

Staff do not support repealing the restriction on the grounds of appeal to conformity or consistency matters as it will establish a lower threshold for appeals. The current test for appeals is appropriate and affords municipalities more flexibility in determining the best options for their community. Maintaining the current legal test for appeals would also help to ensure that municipal council decisions stand, and that the Tribunal is tasked only with valid planning disputes.

Further, staff do not support returning to “de novo” hearings as proposed because it undermines local municipal decision-making processes. The Tribunal should not be given the power to review and make final decisions on substantially revised development applications. Reverting back to “de novo” hearings provide the opportunity for an applicant to submit inadequate information as part of their initial submission knowing that they can introduce new information as part of an appeal. Further, it would scale back the public’s participation in the hearing by limiting persons who are not parties to written submission only.
If passed, Bill 108 would return to a single hearing similar to the former OMB process. This process would provide the Tribunal with the authority to change a municipal council’s decision, without sending it back to council for reassessment, based on what the Tribunal believes to be the “best” planning outcome.

Staff do not support this proposed change as it works against the policy-making authority of democratically elected councils, particularly as it relates to “de novo” hearings and the introduction of new information during the appeals process. Municipal planning decisions typical undergo extensive public consultation, professional analysis and debate at council. Such decisions should not be easily dismantled or overturned on appeal.

Recommendations

a) The Province should maintain the current grounds of appeal for major land use planning decisions to issues of consistency with the Provincial Policy Statement, and/or conformity with the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe and, or in the case of a local official plan amendment, conformity with the upper-tier municipality’s official plan;

b) If the government decides to revert to the previous standard for appeals, the government should seek way to require the Tribunal to exercise its dismissal powers more frequently, provided a dismissal is properly justified and will meet any challenge for judicial review;

c) The Province should introduce a more robust pre-screening tool to identify appeals without merit. One pre-screening criterion could be to require that appeals relate to identifiable pieces of land. Appeals should also relate to site-specific policies to assist with scoping an appeal and/or determining its validity;

d) The Province should not return to “de novo” hearings to ensure that planning appeals are considered in the context of the application and supporting information submitted to a municipality before municipal council made its decision;

e) If the Province decides to return to “de novo” hearing, the Province should explore additional ways to require the Tribunal to exercise its powers to remit matters back to municipal council for input prior to making a final determination on a planning appeal. The Province should also not limit to submissions by non-parties to proceeding before the LPAT to written submissions only;

f) The Province should maintain the current “two-step” appeal process in the Planning Act to give municipalities an opportunity to make a second planning decision, prior to the LPAT overturning a municipal council’s planning decision and substituting it with its own decision; and

g) If the Province decides to delete the current “two-step” appeal process, the Province should seeks ways to require the LPAT to enforce the current “have regard to”
language for municipal planning in the Planning Act, to give greater weight to democratically elected council decisions.

5. Restricting third party appeals for non-decisions on official plans

Currently, section 17 (40) of the Planning Act enables any person or public body to file an appeal the LPAT with respect to official plans, if no decision was given within the specified timeline (i.e., appeals for non-decisions). Bill 108 proposes to limit the right to file such appeals to: the municipality that adopted the official plan; the Minister or; in the case of official plan amendments, the person or public body that requested the amendment. Third party individuals or community interest groups would no longer have the right to file such appeals to the LPAT.

Staff have no objection in principal to this change to help reduce the potential for appeals for non-decisions. Restricting third party appeals for non-decisions would give municipalities more time to resolve any community issues outside the more rigid and expensive LPAT process. Once a decision is made by council, any individuals or community interest groups who do not agree with the decision would still have the right to file an appeal.

6. Restricting third party appeals of plans of subdivision

Currently, under section 51(39) of the Planning Act, any person or public body who participated in the public process leading up to a municipal council’s decision to approve a draft plan of subdivision has the right to appeal council’s decision to the LPAT. Bill 108 proposes to amend this section so that only the applicant, the municipality, the Minister, or a public body have right to appeal a council decision on draft plan of subdivision. Individuals, adjoining developers, and community groups would no longer be able to file an appeal, regardless of the potential impacts the plan of subdivision may have on them.

Staff do not support this change because it weakens citizen involvement in local land use planning process. An important principle of land use planning is to foster public participation and engagement in the decision-making processes. This is especially crucial for individuals that may be directly impacted by a municipality’s decision to approve a plan of subdivision. As a result, the Planning Act should not remove the right for individuals or community groups to appeal a plan of subdivision to the LPAT.

Recommendation

The Province should not amend the Planning Act to remove the rights of individuals, adjoining land owners, or community groups to appeal a municipal council’s decision to approve a plan of subdivision.

7. Mandatory development permit system

Under the Planning Act, a local municipality may by by-law establish a development
permit system within the municipality for any area set out in the by-law. A development permit system (i.e., formerly known as the community planning permit system) is a planning tool that provides an alternative to the current development approval processes. It effectively combines zoning, site plan and minor variance applications into a single approval process. By combining these applications into one step, a development permit system can result in faster approvals and give applicant’s more certainty about the requirements for development. To date, none of the Region’s seven area municipalities have established a development permit system.

Currently, under section 70.2.2 of the Planning Act, the Minister and an upper-tier municipality may require a local municipality to establish a development permit system. If required to do so, the local municipality has discretion to determine what parts of the community would be governed by the development permit system. Anyone who participated in the public process leading up to the municipality’s decision to adopt the development permit system can appeal the municipality’s decision to the LPAT.

If passed, Bill 108 would amend section 70.2.2 of the Planning Act to:

- remove an upper-tier municipality’s ability to require a local municipality to establish a development permit system;
- enable the Minister to not only require a local municipality to establish a development permit system, but also specify what parts of the community would be governed by the system (e.g., major transit station areas and provincially significant employment zones); and
- except for the Minister, remove the right to appeal a municipality’s official plan amendment to implement a development permit system.

The government has not said how quickly it intends to use its new authority, or which municipalities it would require to implement the new permit system. However, staff anticipate that the system will be likely aimed primarily at high-growth communities with higher-order transit systems and major transit stations, including potentially the Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo.

Overall, although staff have no objections in principle to the above proposed changes, we would request the Province to consult with municipalities on any future changes to O. Reg.173/16: Community Planning Permits.

**Recommendation**

The Province should consult with municipalities and other stakeholders on any future changes to O. Reg.173/16: Community Planning Permits.

**Schedule 13 – Proposed Amendments to the Workplace Safety and Insurance Act**
The proposed changes are narrow in scope, and address the establishment of premiums for a narrow class of parties. These changes will allow the Workplace Safety and Insurance Board to establish premium rates for partners and executive officers who perform no construction work in the course of their duties that are different than the premium rates established for the organization that employs them. In other words, a construction organization may now receive differential premium rates between the organization as a whole (i.e. including those employees that actually perform construction work), and partners and executive officers, who presumably would not perform direct construction work.

This amendment should not have any significant Region implications. No action should be required in response to these changes, if passed.

Proposed Next Steps

The final content of Bill 108 has not yet been determined and proposed regulations are not yet available. Transition and other matters that were addressed in regulations to the LPAT Act are expected to be dealt with in the regulations. In addition, as part of the initial consultation last fall, the Province indicated that is also considering amendments to the Provincial Policy Statement. However, the Province has not announced any changes to this document to date.

Staff will continue to monitor Bill 108 and any proposed changes to the Provincial Policy Statement, and report back to Council as necessary.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

The Region’s participation in this consultation broadly supports the following strategic objectives;

- Objective 1.2 - Plan for and provide the infrastructure and services necessary to create the foundation for economic success;

- Objective 4.3 - Increase the supply and range of affordable and supportive housing options; and

- Objective 3.6 - Improve environmental sustainability and livability in intensifying urban and rural settlement areas.

Financial Implications:

It is difficult to predict all the financial implications of Bill 108 on the Region. Reducing the timelines for making planning decisions could potentially increase the number of appeals for “non-decisions” to the LPAT, thereby increasing the Region’s legal costs participating in various hearings.

In addition, the proposed changes to the Conservation Authorities Act could potentially
lead to downloading of certain services currently performed by the Grand River Conservation Authority to the Region through future changes to service delivery agreements.

The most significant financial impacts to the Region arising from Bill 108 relate to the proposed changes to the Development Charges Act and the community benefits portion of the Planning Act. These impacts are discussed in detail in a companion report listed on the May 28, 2019 agenda of the Administration and Finance Committee (see Report No. COR-FSD-19-25).

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

This report was prepared with input from the following departments and divisions:

- **Community Services** – Housing Services
- **Corporate Services** - Financial Services & Development Financing
- **Human Resources & Citizen Service** – Employee Relations
- **Planning, Development & Legislative Services** - Community Planning; Legal Services; Cultural Services; and Licensing and Enforcement;
- **Transportation and Environmental Services** – Design & Construction, Water Services

Attachments

Attachment “A” - Summary of Key Legislative Changes to Bill 108

Attachment “B” – Staff’s comments regarding proposed changes to the Conservation Authorities Act (ERO Posting Nos. 013-5018 and 013-4992)

Attachment “C” – Staff’s comments regarding proposed changes to the Endangered Species Act (ERO Posting No. 013-5033)
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Planning Act

- Permitting two residential units in detached, semi-detached or rowhouses, as well as one residential unit in an ancillary building structure;

- Applying inclusionary zoning policies to areas that are generally high growth, including major transit station areas and areas where a development permit system has been required by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing;

- Reducing timelines for making planning decisions:
  - Official Plans from 210 to 120 days;
  - Zoning By-laws from 150 to 90 days;
  - Plans of Subdivision from 180 to 120 days;

- Repealing amendments previously introduced through Bill 139 (the Building Better Communities and Conserving Watersheds Act, 2017) that:
  - restricted the grounds of appeal in many instances to inconsistency with a provincial policy statement and non-conformity with a provincial or official plan;
  - limited the introduction of new evidence or information at hearings; and
  - imposed a two-step appeal process, limiting the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal's ability to make a final decision on a first appeal and requiring it to provide municipalities with an opportunity to make a new decision before it could issue a final decision on a second appeal. Bill 108 reverts back to the single appeal process providing the Tribunal with the authority to render a final decision at the first instance.

- Restricting third party appeal rights for plans of subdivision and non-decisions of official plans or official plan amendments;

- Repealing and replacing the existing Section 37 density and bonusing provisions with a new community benefits charge system. This new authority will allow municipalities to charge for community benefits, such as libraries and daycare facilities, but not facilities or services set out in the Development Charges Act, 1997. Contributions will be based upon the value of the land at building permit, subject to a maximum percentage to be set by regulation;
• Deeming parkland by-laws of no force and effect if a community benefits charge by-law is in force and repealing a municipality’s ability to require an alternative rate. Plans of subdivision that are approved with a condition of parkland conveyance are not subject to a community benefits charge by-law if the approval is on or after the day Section 37, as re-enacted, comes into force;

• Enabling the Minister to require that municipalities establish a development permit system that applies to a specific area, such as major transit station areas and provincially significant employment zones, and remove appeals associated with its implementing planning documents; and

• Broadening regulation making authority to include transition regulations that would permit existing appeals to be replaced with a new notice of appeal under the amended Planning Act.

Local Planning Appeal Tribunal Act

• Repealing the highly controversial provisions of Bill 139 which limited a party’s ability to introduce evidence and call or examine witnesses;

• Providing for mandatory mediation or other dispute resolution processes in specified circumstances;

• Repealing provisions relating to the Tribunal’s ability to state a case in writing for the opinion of the Divisional Court on a question of law;

• Allowing the Tribunal to limit any examination or cross-examination of a witness in specific circumstances; and

• Limiting the submissions by non-parties to a proceeding before the Tribunal to written submissions only, but providing the Tribunal with the authority to examine such parties.

Development Charges Act, 1997

• Providing exemptions for second dwelling units in new residential buildings, and the ability to exempt other classes of dwelling units as may be prescribed;

• Providing for additional services to be included in a development charge by-law as may be prescribed;

• Eliminating the 10% reduction on capital costs and the 10 year limit on estimating an increase in the need for service;

• Providing transition periods for municipalities to coordinate development charge by-laws with the passage of community benefit by-laws under the new s. 37 of the Planning Act;

• Allowing for the payment of development charges in installments over 5 years for:
– Rental housing development;
– Institutional development;
– Industrial development;
– Commercial development;
– Non-profit housing development; and

• Requiring the amount of the charge to be calculated on the date of submission of a planning application.

**Education Act**

• Providing for notice to the Minister of an intention to expropriate land;

• Allowing education development charge revenue to be applied to alternative projects, subject to the Minister’s approval. An ‘alternative project’ includes a project, lease or other prescribed measure that would address the need for pupil accommodation and reduce the cost of acquiring land;

• A board may allocate education development charge revenue towards an alternative project if the Minister is provided with plans related to the project, and the Minister approves the allocation, subject to prescribed criteria; and

• To allow for a board to enter into an agreement with an owner of land to provide a lease, real property or other prescribed benefit to be used by the board for pupil accommodation in return for not imposing education development charges, subject to the approval of the Minister.

**Ontario Heritage Act**

• Providing for ‘prescribed principles’, which shall be considered by a council when exercising its authority under Part IV or V of the Act;

• Providing for notice to property owners when a property is included in a heritage register;

• Granting the ability for a property owner to object to the inclusion of a property on the register, which objection shall be considered by council;

• Imposing a 90 day limitation on the designation of a property after a prescribed event has occurred;

• Appeals of a notice of intention to designate, amendments to a designating by-law, repealing by-laws and applications to alter a heritage property, are to the Tribunal for a binding decision, whereas objections were previously made to the Conservation Review Board for a non-binding decision;

• Deeming applications for alteration or demolition to be approved should the municipality fail to make a decision within the specified time period;
• Providing additional procedures and time periods for the submission and consideration of complete applications to alter a designated property; and

• Clarification that applications to demolish include the demolition or removal of any of the property’s heritage attributes.

Other Changes

May 17, 2019

Carolyn O’Neill
Great Lakes and Inland Waters Branch, Great Lakes Office,
Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks
40 St. Clair Avenue West,
Toronto ON M4V 1M2

And

Alex McLeod
Natural Resources Conservation Policy Branch
Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry
300 Water Street
Peterborough, ON K9J 8M5

RE: Modernizing Conservation Authority Operations - Conservation Authorities Act (ERO Registry Number 013-5018)
And Focusing conservation authority development permits on the protection of people and property (ERO Registry Number 013-4992)

Dear Ms. O’Neill and Mr. McLeod:

On April 5, 2019, the Province posted the documents titled "Modernizing conservation authority operations - Conservation Authorities Act" and "Focusing conservation authority development permits on the protection of people and property" to the Environmental Registry of Ontario for comment. The following are comments from Regional staff on the proposed changes to the Act and related. These comments will be included as part of a Council Report that will be submitted to the Province as comments on Bill 108, More Homes, More Choice Act, 2019.

Conservation Authority Mandate and Services

The core mandate in the current Conservation Authorities Act (2017) and as described in the Province’s “Made in Ontario Environment Plan”, is “to undertake watershed-based programs to protect people and property from flooding and other natural hazards, and to conserve natural resources for economic, social and environmental benefits”, with two main objectives:

1. Develop and maintain programs that will protect life and property from natural hazards such as flooding and erosion; and
2. Develop and maintain programs that will conserve natural resources.

Staff have no objection to better defining Conservation Authorities' core mandates and services, but recommend that the conservation of natural heritage features related to surface and/or groundwater be included, along with natural hazard protection and management, conservation and management of conservation authority lands, drinking water source protection (as prescribed under the Clean Water Act), and protection of the Lake Simcoe watershed, as a core mandatory program and service.

The Region and partnering area municipalities, upstream and downstream, work closely with the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) to provide programs and services related to natural hazard protection, natural heritage conservation, and source water protection. The GRCA’s existing programs and services are all interconnected and are mutually beneficial.

Recommendation

The Province should add “the conservation of natural heritage features related to surface and/or groundwater” as one of the Conservation Authorities’ core mandates and services, so that the direct and positive impacts of conservation programs and services can be supported consistently across municipalities.

Conservation Authority Boards

Municipal support for Conservation Authority programs and services are directly linked to the ongoing funding decisions made by the municipally representative GRCA Board of Directors, which oversees the operation of the GRCA and approves policies, programs and budgets. As a result, the Province should provide a strong and supportive framework to clarify the duty of Conservation Authority boards, and to continue enabling watershed based collaboration and leadership on natural hazard protection, source water protection, and natural heritage conservation.

Recommendation

The Province should provide a strong and supportive framework to clarify the duty of Conservation Authority boards, and to continue enabling watershed based collaboration and leadership on natural hazard protection, source water protection, and natural heritage conservation.

Service Delivery Agreement

The Province is proposing to increase transparency in how Conservation Authorities levy municipalities, and establish a transition period and process for Conservation Authorities and municipalities to enter into agreements for non-core services. The Region has an existing Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the GRCA that focuses on planning review services. The current MOU with the Region is working well, and could be expanded to address additional core and non-core services. Having the
Region, an upper-tier municipality, enter into the agreement on behalf of the area municipalities provides for simplicity, accountability and increased transparency.

Although staff generally support amending the Conservation Authorities Act to help improve service delivery, any such changes to the Act regarding service delivery agreement processes should be made in consultation with Conservation Authorities and municipalities, with the intent of developing a practical, non-prescriptive approach that covers core programs and services, and gives local decision makers the flexibility to determine the scale and scope of any additional programs and services.

The Region and its area municipalities rely heavily on the technical capabilities of Conservation Authority staff; as a commenting agency on behalf of the Province with regard to natural hazards; as a regulator with respect to development and interference with wetlands and alteration to shorelines and watercourses; as a reviewer of development applications; and as a supporter of watershed planning. As result, any changes to the Conservation Authorities Act should continue to acknowledge and support the critically important role that Conservation Authorities fill in long-term community planning, wise use and management of resources, and community health and safety.

**Recommendations**

a) The Province should ensure that any changes to the Conservation Authorities Act regarding service delivery agreement processes be made in consultation with Conservation Authorities and municipalities, with the intent of developing a practical, non-prescriptive approach that covers core programs and services, and gives local decision makers the flexibility to determine the scale and scope of any additional programs and services.

b) The Province should ensure that the Conservation Authorities Act continues to acknowledge and support the critically important role that Conservation Authorities fill in long-term community planning, wise use and management of resources, and community health and safety.

**Source Water Protection**

The Region, the GRCA and the area municipalities work together on source water protection, and rely on Provincial funding through the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP). The Region recommends that although drinking water source protection is recognized as a core mandatory program for Conservation Authorities, responsibility for funding and oversight should remain with the MECP.

**Recommendation**

The Province should ensure that the responsibility for funding and oversight for source water protection remain with the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks.
Regulation Consolidation for Conservation Authorities

The Province has also posted a proposal for “Focusing Conservation Authority development permits on the protection of people and property”. This proposal would create one new regulation for all Conservation Authorities and will replace 36 existing individual Conservation Authority regulations under Section 28 of the Conservation Authorities Act.

Staff support this proposed change to create a more consistent set of regulations and approaches for Conservation Authority permits. These changes would support faster approvals while ensuring there are no impacts on natural hazards and public safety. The proposed changes also include exemptions for some low risk activities and other initiatives. These changes would result in less costly approvals and allow Conservation Authority staff to focus on more complex applications to provide faster approvals.

The Region has had a positive experience working with the CRCA in the planning review process. It is important to include the Conservation Authority’s expertise as part of long-range planning, as well as their input early during development review, so that there is a logical progression for applications through the permitting stage.

Recommendation

The Province should consult with municipalities and Conservation Authorities during the development of any future regulations associated with the amended Conservation Authorities Act.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to the Ontario Conservation Authorities Act and related regulations. Please contact Kate Hagerman, Manager of Environmental Planning and Sustainability at khagerman@regionofwaterloo.ca should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Rod Regier
Commissioner, Planning, Development & Legislative Services

cc: Nancy Davy, Director of Resource Management
    Grand River Conservation Authority

    Joe Farwell, CAO, Grand River Conservation Authority
May 17, 2019

Public Input Coordinator
Species Conservation Policy Branch
Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry
300 Water Street, Floor 5N
Peterborough, ON K9J 3C7

RE: 10th Year Review of Ontario’s Endangered Species Act: Proposed changes
(ERO Registry Number 013-5033)

Dear Public Input Coordinator:

On April 18, 2019, the Province posted the document titled “10th Year Review of Ontario’s Endangered Species Act: Proposed changes” to the Environmental Registry of Ontario for a 30-day comment period. The following are comments from Regional staff on the proposed changes to the Act. These comments will be included as part of a Council Report that will be submitted to the Province as comments on Bill 108, More Homes, More Choice Act, 2019.

Ontario’s Endangered Species Act

Staff has reviewed the Province’s proposed changes to Ontario’s Endangered Species Act (ESA) with respect to:

- Enhancing the Province’s oversight and enforcement powers to ensure compliance with the Act;
- Improving transparent notification of new species’ listings;
- Ensuring appropriate consultation with academics, communities, organizations and Indigenous peoples across Ontario on species at risk recovery planning; and,
- Creating new tools to streamline approval processes, reduce duplication and ensure costs incurred by clients are directed towards actions that will improve outcomes for the species or its habitat.

While the proposed changes to the Endangered Species Act are meant to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Act, there are publicly stated concerns that:

- Species listed as threatened or endangered may no longer be automatically protected;
- There will be increased opportunity for political interference in the listing process;
- Developers and other activity proponents will be able to pay into a fund to
compensate for harming species at risk and their habitats, rather than providing an on-the-ground overall benefit to species; and
- Southern Ontario species at the northern limit of their range may receive less or no protection, depending on their status outside Ontario.

The Region relies on the Province to effectively require the identification and protection of significant species and their habitat. Over the past 10 years a great deal of knowledge has been gained on the health and vulnerability of Ontario’s species at risk, and the challenges and opportunities experienced while planning for their ongoing protection and conservation.

The system-wide changes being proposed by the Province reflect frustrations that are a result of a relatively young policy framework and practice, coupled with increasingly high development pressures. A balanced long-term approach will be necessary to ensure that the planning and development decisions made in the present do not prohibit conservation opportunities in the future. Ontario must remain committed to protecting its biodiversity, including Ontario’s most vulnerable plants and animals, and their important habitats.

Option to pay

Proposed changes to the Endangered Special Act would allow developers and other proponents to pay into a fund in lieu of fulfilling requirements for on-the-ground compensation.

The conservation of habitats and species in-situ is fundamental to the long-term effectiveness of conservation efforts. Having the option to pay, instead of actively conserve, will result in the incremental loss of critical habitat and individual lifeforms, and will limit the overall research and conservation potential for the species at risk. The Region acknowledges that there are circumstances where a broader research-based approach to addressing a particular threat to a species is needed. Funding, from a development related source such as the proposed “Conservation Trust”, could be construed as being able to “pay to slay”. An alternative source of funds must be found to enable that important work to be undertaken.

Recommendation

The Province should prioritize in-situ conservation, with very strict criteria for opting out. In addition, the Province should continue to support proactive species at risk research with funding that is not directly related to development.

Non-science-based influence

The Committee on the Status of Species at Risk in Ontario (COSSARO) is a committee comprised of qualified scientists who perform science-based assessments of whether a
species is at risk. The Province is proposing to broaden COSSARO membership so that it includes those with “community knowledge or aboriginal traditional knowledge”. The proposed changes would also enable the Minister to require COSSARO to reconsider its science-based listing decisions, and removes the current requirement that the Minister consult with an independent expert prior to creating certain regulations or issuing permits.

Aboriginal traditional knowledge is an important addition to COSSARO. Community knowledge is a vague term that could open up COSSARO to those who do not have adequate expertise in species assessment or have a differing agenda.

Recommendation

The Province should include Aboriginal traditional knowledge, and better define “community knowledge” so that is as apparent what value the additional member(s) would be bringing to the Committee. In addition, the Province should continue to rely on scientific expertise as a sound foundation for decision making.

“Edge of range” species and protection limitations

The Province is proposing a change that would require COSSARO to base its assessments not on the status of a species in Ontario, but instead on its status throughout its range. For example, southern Ontario endangered species at the northern limit of their range may receive less or no protection, depending on their status outside Ontario. The Minister would also be able to limit Endangered Species Act protections so that they apply only in specific geographies or under specific circumstances.

Protecting species that inhabit geographies that do not conform to political boundaries will always be a challenge. In light of climate change, it will be increasingly important to protect healthy species populations at their northern limits to help species adapt to changing climatic conditions. As result, we believe the Provincial assessment process of a species’ status must be a science-based and taken from a long-term, risk-averse and apolitical perspective.

The provincial assessment process must also ensure that geographic or circumstantial protections would not arbitrarily allow for the exclusion of important habitats and species from protection. It should also ensure that decisions regarding endangered species prioritize environmental benefits, over other potential social and economic benefits.

Recommendations

The Provincial assessment process for endangered species should continue to be science-based, and taken from a long-term, risk-averse and apolitical perspective. This process should ensure that geographic or circumstantial protections do not arbitrarily
allow for the exclusion of important habitats and species from protection. Any decisions regarding endangered species should prioritize environmental benefits over other potential social and economic benefits.

Listing and protection delay

The proposed process is to list species nine months after COSSARO makes its assessments public. Listing of species at risk would no longer result in automatic protections for threatened and endangered species and their habitats. The Minister would have greater “discretion on protections” including the ability to suspend species and habitat protections for up to three years based on social or economic considerations. Such delays would be exempted from Environmental Bill of Rights (EBR) posting and consultation requirements.

Staff do not support this proposed change. Introducing a nine month delay in protection after a species at risk is listed is counter intuitive. It also increases the risk of vulnerable plants, animals and their habitats being eliminated before protections are in place. Once it has been determined that a species is vulnerable, the consideration and timely implementation of protective measures is a logical next step.

Property-owners are investing in a Province where protecting the natural environment has been identified as a priority. Protecting threatened and endangered species is a responsibility shared by all and must become an ingrained and expected part of the planning and development process. Elimination of EBR consultation requirements, coupled with delays in protections, may result in development that does not adequately fulfill Provincial priorities.

Recommendation

The Province should not proceed with its proposed nine month gap between the COSSARO assessments and listing, nor the decoupling of listing with automatic protection, as these proposed changes would increase the risk of vulnerable plants, animals and their habitats being eliminated before protections are in place. EBR consultation requirements should be maintained.

Multi-site authorizations and other approvals

The Province is proposing to create “landscape agreements” for proponents undertaking activities in multiple locations, and wants to allow activities approved under other laws to be carried out without any additional authorizations under the Endangered Species Act.

We acknowledge and agree that landscape agreements may provide opportunities for additional positive outcomes for endangered species. However, to ensure they are
effective, such agreements must prioritize conservation over economic and social factors, and be implemented to address the full scope of site-specific and species-specific concerns.

With respect to the use of instruments under other Acts to protect species at risk, the Province should carefully consider how best to manage long-term impacts to species and habitats, and any potential risks that may be associated with allowing permanent Endangered Species Act exemptions under other laws (e.g., the forestry industry).

**Recommendations**

a) The Province should revise its proposed approach to landscape agreements to prioritize conservation over economic and social factors, and ensure that such agreements address the full scope of site-specific and species-specific concerns; and

b) In considering the use of instruments under other Acts to protect species at risk, the Province should adopt an approach that best manages long-term impacts to species and habitats, and any potential risks that may be associated with allowing permanent Endangered Species Act exemptions under other laws (i.e., forestry industry).

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to Ontario’s Endangered Species Act. Please contact Kate Hagerman, Manager of Environmental Planning and Sustainability at khagerman@regionofwaterloo.ca should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Rod Regier  
Commissioner, Planning, Development & Legislative Services

cc: Nancy Davy, Director of Resource Management,  
Grand River Conservation Authority

Document Number: 3002636
Region of Waterloo
Planning, Development and Legislative Services
Community Planning

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: May 28, 2019
File Code: D03-80/CEF 201
Subject: 2019 Community Environmental Fund Grants

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve project funding allocations totalling up to $145,861.47 from the Community Environmental Fund to support twenty environmental stewardship and sustainability projects as described in Attachment 1 of Report PDL-CPL-19-23, dated May 28, 2019.

Summary:

The Community Environmental Fund (CEF) was established by Regional Council in October 2011 (Report CR-FM-11-022/P-11-085). The Fund provides financial support to a wide variety of environmental stewardship and sustainability projects that:

- Provide a positive and lasting environmental return,
- Engage citizens and encourage collaboration,
- Seek innovative solutions and/or increase knowledge, and
- Produce measurable and achievable outcomes.

To be eligible for consideration, a project proposal to the Community Environmental Fund, must:
- be implemented within the Waterloo Region;
- fall within at least one of the eight Project Categories;
- and satisfy at least two of both the project (category) specific criteria and the General Criteria.

Requests for funding typically range from $1,000 to $25,000 per project.

The Community Environmental Fund was widely advertised in the spring of 2019, and the application package made available both in hard copy and on the Region’s website. By the April 12, 2019 deadline, twenty-one diverse proposals were received.

Staff have reviewed applications to ensure that they conform to the funding guidelines, where
necessary, followed up with applicants to further clarify details of their proposals, and evaluated the proposals based on the program funding criteria. Out of the twenty-one applications received, seventeen are being recommended for funding. In addition, three projects that were recommended for multi-year funding in 2018 have been added to the seventeen new projects recommended from the 2019 applications.

In total, staff are recommending that the Region approve funding of $145,861.47 for twenty projects listed in the table on page four of this report. The full list of applicants with project summaries has been included as Attachments 1 and 2. Applicants recommended to receive funding include eleven community organizations; seven schools, including both elementary and post-secondary schools; and two projects under the auspices of an Area Municipality.

The recommended projects would involve a wide variety of community stakeholders and cover a range of environmental activities:

- Fifteen projects would involve citizens, from school children to seniors, learning about some aspect of environmental stewardship or sustainability;
- Three projects would occur within or contiguous to Regionally-designated Environmentally Sensitive Policy Areas (ESPAs);
- Twelve projects would include planting of trees and native wildflowers in community gardens and municipal settings;
- Three schoolyard projects would further the Region’s skin cancer prevention program and enhance the urban tree canopy;
- Four of the projects are of Region-wide significance; and
- Five projects are specific to local area neighbourhoods.

The recommended allocations would significantly assist with a variety of environmental projects many of which might not have been considered or which would have been initiated at a smaller scale without the assistance of the Community Environmental Fund.

Based on the project applications, the recommended Regional grants would leverage an additional estimated $172,000 in cash and/or in-kind contributions from the applicants. Staff has calculated that for every dollar of the recommended CEF grants, an additional $2.20 in cash and in-kind would be invested by the proponents.

There are four project applications that are not being recommended for funding from the Community Environmental fund at this time. These projects were either deemed premature, incomplete or fell outside the scope of eligible funding. Staff plan to offer assistance to community members of unsuccessful applications who may wish to re-apply in the future.

Report:

The Community Environmental Fund was established by Regional Council on October
26, 2011 (Report CR-FM-11-022/P-11-085) as an action under the Region’s former 2011-2014 Strategic Plan to “Develop and implement an integrated funding program to support community-based environmental initiatives.” The Community Environmental Fund accepts applications for environmental projects falling within the following eight categories:

**Stewardship grants for:**
1. Enhancement and restoration of natural areas
2. Naturalization of landscapes
3. Acquisition of ecologically significant natural areas
4. Public education/awareness initiatives related to environmental stewardship
5. Research related to environmental stewardship

**Sustainability grants for:**
6. Projects that:
   - Reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) and/or air emissions,
   - Increase energy conservation or efficiency,
   - Reduce or divert waste, and/or
   - Assist with Climate Change adaptation
7. Public education/awareness initiatives which promote long term behavioural change related to environmental sustainability
8. Research related to environmental sustainability

Stewardship and sustainability grant applications are accepted from: charitable or non-profit organizations (clubs, associations, land trusts); neighbourhood associations and other unincorporated community-based groups; co-operative corporations; schools, school boards, universities, colleges, hospitals, library or other public institutions; and individuals/students with a documented collaborative agreement with an eligible applicant. Stewardship applications are also accepted from private landowners and Area Municipalities, the Grand River Conservation Authority or Regional departments. In the case of schools and government agencies, the projects must be demonstrated to promote Regional interests such as enhancing natural heritage features, increasing the tree canopy, providing shade on schoolgrounds in order to prevent skin cancer, and promoting public awareness and support for various aspects of environmental stewardship and sustainability.

The Community Environmental Fund was widely advertised in the spring of 2019 to attract proposal submissions. The application package was also made available on the Region’s website. By the April 12, 2019 deadline, twenty-one proposals were received from a wide variety of local applicants.

Staff reviewed applications to ensure that they conform to the funding guidelines, where necessary, followed up with applicants to further clarify details of their proposals,
evaluated the proposals based on the program funding criteria. Attachments 1 and 2 include brief project summaries for the full list of applicants. Out of the twenty-one applications received, seventeen are being recommended for funding. In addition, three projects that were recommended for multi-year funding in 2018 have been added to the seventeen new projects recommended from the 2019 applications.

Staff are recommending that $145,861.47 be allocated to the twenty projects listed within the Table below. The recommended grants will support a range of stewardship and sustainability projects throughout the Region. Taken together, the proposed projects would involve hundreds of the Region’s citizens of all ages and backgrounds. Not only would they foster a culture of sustainability and environmental stewardship, but they also have the potential to nurture new skills and develop community capacity to care for various aspects of our environment.

The recommended funding levels for the projects range from $1,500 to $23,192. The recommended allocations would significantly assist with a variety of environmental projects many of which might not have been considered or which would have been initiated at a smaller scale without the assistance of the Community Environmental Fund. Applicants recommended to receive funding include eleven community organizations; seven schools, including both elementary and post-secondary schools; and two projects under the auspices of an Area Municipality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KW Urban Harvester</td>
<td>Pollinator Garden</td>
<td>$1,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheppard Public School</td>
<td>Soaking Up Rain</td>
<td>$3,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre Éducatif Village d'Elisabeth</td>
<td>A Natural Playground</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley Township</td>
<td>Bee City project</td>
<td>$3,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kestway Public School</td>
<td>Revitalize with Depave</td>
<td>$2,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Frederick Neighbourhood</td>
<td>Pollinator Gardens</td>
<td>$12,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bee City Kitchener</td>
<td>Iron Horse Trail Pollinator Pathway</td>
<td>$12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Heights Community</td>
<td>Pollinator Patch</td>
<td>$12,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Cycling Club</td>
<td>Petersburg Regional Forest Trail Improvements and Naturalization</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KW Habilitation</td>
<td>Our Farm Trail</td>
<td>$16,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Region Community Garden Network</td>
<td>School Community Garden Project</td>
<td>$23,192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were four additional applications where grants are not being recommended at this time. These applications were either deemed premature or fell outside the scope of eligible funding. Staff will endeavour to work with these applicants to help them apply in a future round of CEF funding should they wish to proceed.

**Conclusion and Next Steps**

Subject to approval of the recommended allocations by Regional Council, successful recipients would receive formal letters specifying the total amount of their grant and the items for which it may be used. Where appropriate, some of those letters would be accompanied by an agreement, prepared with the assistance of Legal Services, by which the recipients commit to abide by the terms and conditions of the grant. Before payments are authorised, staff would continue to verify that the agreed upon works have been accomplished by reviewing brief reports completed by the recipients, conducting site inspections where necessary, or receiving copies of studies or research.

Applicants will be advised that the grants are available for one year. At the end of the calendar year, staff will review previously approved grants for completion. Where applicants have not requested an extension, the grants will be canceled.
Area Municipal Consultation/Coordination:

The application guideline makes Area Municipalities eligible recipients for project funding. The City of Kitchener and Township of Wellesley have submitted applications for 2019 funding.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

This initiative supports Focus Area 3 – Environment and Sustainable Growth, and specifically Strategic Objectives 3.5 (Preserve, protect, and enhance green space, agricultural and environmentally sensitive lands, and Regionally-owned forests) and 3.6 (Improve environmental sustainability and livability in intensifying urban and rural settlement areas).

Financial Implications:

The Region’s approved 2019 budget for Planning, Development and Legislative Services included $150,000 for the Community Environmental Fund funded from the property tax levy. Staff are recommending that the Region approve funding of $145,861.47 for twenty projects.

The Community Environmental Fund and its predecessor Environmental Stewardship Fund have been funded through the Regional Budget since 2009. The Fund received an ongoing annual allocation of $150,000 during the 2018 budget cycle. Staff provided Council with a review and update on the CEF Program in August 2018 (Report No. PDL-CPL-18-35 Community Environmental Fund: Program Review and Update).

Subject to approval of the recommended projects in this report, the two funds would have provided cumulative grants from 2010 to 2019 totalling $1,538,675 for 228 environmental stewardship and sustainability projects.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Corporate Services staff assist with the financial aspects of administering the Community Environmental Fund.

Attachments

Attachment 1 – Applicants Recommended for Full or Partial CEF Funding
Attachment 2 – Applicants Not Recommended for CEF Funding at this Time

Prepared By: Kate Hagerman, Manager of Environmental Planning and Sustainability

Approved By: Rod Regier, Commissioner, Planning Development and Legislative Services
Attachment 1 – Applicants Recommended for Full or Partial CEF Funding

Full Grant Request Recommended

Stewardship Stream

Our Farm Trail Building Project
Our Farm, a program of KW Habilitation (KWH) has been working to restore and enhance the 7 acre parcel of land adjacent to the David Fisher Residence (DFR) located on the Waterloo Moraine in the Region's Environmentally Sensitive Landscape on the corner of Erbsville Road and Kressler Road in Waterloo. The purpose of this project is to build a trail, or series of trails, that will allow those supported by KWH, as well as the extended community to explore and enjoy the property. The trail(s) will showcase the unique and desirable features of the property and provide opportunities for wellness, both physical and mental, gathering, education and accessibility.

Requested $16,175 - Recommend $16,175

Soaking Up Rain at Sheppard Public School
Sheppard Public School intends to install two rain gardens in 2019 in coordination with some grading work being conducted by the Waterloo Region School Board. These rain gardens have been strategically located to maximize effectiveness at mitigating stormwater problems, and to be integrated into the outdoor learning and play environment at the school, as part of their Schoolyard Enhancement Master Plan.

Requested $3,052 - Recommend $3,052

Stone Soup for Butterflies: Planting Pollinator Gardens in the Central Frederick Neighbourhood
Stone Soup for Butterflies is a project that will educate, engage and empower homeowners and business owners in the Central Frederick Neighbourhood Association (CFNA) to become supporters of butterflies and other pollinators. As in the well-known fable, Stone Soup for Butterflies works on the premise that an urgent need can be met when many people work together, offering what they have. The goal is for the CFNA to be the first neighbourhood association in the Waterloo Region to harness its connections, resources and neighbourly goodwill to build a network of pollinator gardens.

Requested $12,280 - Recommend $12,280

Pollinator Garden for KW Urban Harvester's Northdale Site
This project is intended to increase pollinator habitat, biodiversity and food production, as well as improve soil health and the overall ecological wellness of the project site. A 200 square foot pollinator garden will be planted to provide habitat for native pollinators and increase food production in a community garden. The pollinator garden will be planted at the back of Wilfrid Laurier University's Northdale Campus site in Waterloo.

Requested $1,980 - Recommend $1,980
Pollinator Patch in Meadowlane Park
In the fall of 2019 the Pollinator Patch Committee of the Forest Heights Community Association will be installing the first community based pollinator garden in the neighbourhood. The 800 square meter site chosen for the Pollinator Patch is at the juncture of several community paths in Meadowlane Park - a large, open area that is currently lacking in biodiversity. The goal of our project is twofold: to create a three-season garden with an emphasis on native plants that will serve as a haven for pollinators, and secondly to educate the community on the importance of pollinators.

Requested $12,600 - Recommend $12,600

School Community Garden Project
The WR Community Garden Networks’ goal is to provide 7 schools with pollinator and food hedges, “fedges”, compost systems, and fruit trees to provide students and educators with an education tool for outdoor and environmental learning. This project involve working with schools with existing food gardens, and schools without gardens, as part of the School Food Garden Project collective in the region.

Requested $23,192 Recommend $23,192

Petersburg Regional Forest Trail Improvement and Naturalization Project
The Petersburg Regional Forest Trail Improvement and Naturalization Project is comprised of two parts: 1) improvements to both the multi-purpose trails and mountain bike trails that span the property, and 2) naturalization of the lands adjacent to the trails through native tree planting. With continued use over time, issues of trail compaction, poor drainage, standing water, and loose surfacing material have created unfavourable trail conditions and the potential for negative environmental impacts in some areas of the trail system. This project aims to address visitor safety, environmental sustainability, and ecological concerns through ongoing trail maintenance.

Requested $5,000 - Recommend $5,000

A Natural Playground to benefit our children (Centre Educatif Village d'Elisabeth)
The purpose of this project is to provide the young children at Centre Educatif Village d'Elisabeth the chance to learn in a natural environment—and to be able to appreciate all that it can offer. The center has a focus on nature and learning in nature, and they are looking to create a natural 'play scape' that could be utilized in every season. The center works with children from age 18mos-4 years in a non-profit setting and they think it is never too young to appreciate, learn and grow in nature.

Requested $3,000 - Recommend $3,000

Wellesley Township Bee City Project
Wellesley Township, which is composed of five main settlement areas: Wellesley, St. Clements, Linwood, Hawkesville and part of Heidelberg, became designated as the 20th Canadian Bee City (city, township, First Nation) in late summer of 2018. Program participants must commit to creating, maintaining and/or improving pollinator habitats and
educating their community about the importance of pollinators each year. The Township’s goal for 2019 is to expand community engagement to beyond the village of Wellesley by establishing working groups in the other villages and creating demonstration pollinator habitats in each.

**Requested $3,530 - Recommend $3,530**

**Revitalization with Depave! – Keatsway School**
Keatsway School Staff, Students, Community Members and Council are going to work together to expand and diversify our outdoor play area by transforming an unused area of tarmac into a dynamic naturalized play space. This space will include 1) native trees and shrubs to provide shade for students and a buffer between the tarmac and the teachers’ parking lot, 2) natural objects, such as stumps, logs, and boulders and natural play and 3) naturalized ground surface that will absorb more stormwater runoff and reduce heat off the play surface during hot days.

**Requested $2,977 - Recommend $2,977**

**Sustainability Stream**

**Alternatives Journal - Waterloo Region Environmental Leadership Editorial Insert**
Alternatives Journal will create a special on-line and in-magazine 8-page editorial insert that focuses on the history of environmental leadership that has emanated from Waterloo Region, from the country’s first blue box program more than thirty years ago to the newest LEED-certified building. The editorial will be delivered in three chapters: past, present and future, leveraging A\J’s unparalleled history of capturing the important stories from almost 50 years of Canadian environmentalism.

**Requested $10,000 - Recommended $10,000**

**Sustainable Waterloo Region – Regional Sustainability Initiative (RSI) Change Management Workshops**
Sustainable Waterloo Region’s flagship program the Regional Sustainability Initiative is working to address the internal obstacles that their pledging partners are facing through hand-on education on change management. The workshops will provide a set of processes and tools that will inspire behavioural change and result in positive impacts on the organization’s ability to achieve their carbon/energy, waste and water reduction targets. These workshops and educational materials will become a best practise that can be adopted elsewhere.

**Requested $4,250 - Recommended $4,250**

**Crestview Public School – Water Bottle Refill Station**
Crestview Public School parent council will install a water bottle refill station that will limit the need for plastic disposable bottles, and reduce water use compared to a traditional fountain. To encourage use of the station, education and promotion activities are planned. To measure the success of the project, the school will be tracking numbers of
students bringing water bottles and using the refill station. Metrics will be shared to promote future projects of a similar nature.

**Requested $2,125.47 - Recommended $2,125**

**Partial Grant Request Recommended**

**Recommended for approval** * - Grants recommended for partial approval are less than the amount requested by the applicant largely due to total grant requests exceeding available funds. There are three recommendations for multi-year funding for projects originally approved for partial funding in 2018. The funding for these projects in 2019, totals $21,500.

**Stewardship Stream**

**Expanding outdoor space at Manchester**
Manchester Public School is hoping to improve their school yard and bring a natural environment into an industrial area. Manchester PS is a community of almost 400 students including 4 kindergarten classrooms who, each day look forward to their outdoor learning time. At present there are a few play structures, and big landscaping rocks but what very few young trees in the play space. This project intends to expand the space by adding mature trees, plants, bushes, and gardens to enhance the outdoor learning environment.

**Requested $5,000 - Recommended $3,000**

**Sustainability Stream**

**ECOLife - Mobile Digital Solution to Reduce Waste by Creating a User-Built Sustainable Ecosystem**
The purpose of this project is to reduce or eliminate single-use plastics in the food industry by making it convenient for individuals to find businesses with sustainable initiatives. “We will provide information and convenience for users who want to be more sustainable by closing the gap between what people want to do and what people end up doing.” ECOLife will be undertaking this project in collaboration with GreenHouse, an innovation community and social impact incubator at St. Paul’s University College. Funding for this project will be subject to the Region receiving a further refined project plan and budget.

**Requested $19,780 - Recommended $5,000**

**Conrad Grebel College – Green Roof Construction**
The College is proposing the development of a green roof as part of their planned new Kitchen and Dining Room facility. The benefits of the project include diversion of rain water away from the storm sewer, lower energy usage in their building, provision of a
better compost system, and vegetation that provides habitat for pollinators. The construction is scheduled to start in spring 2019 until Spring 2020.

Requested $25,000 - Recommended $12,500
Plus $12,500 received in 2018

REEP Green Solutions – Green Neighbourhood Workshops
Reep is planning to provide workshops that will engage local residents and stakeholders in reducing stormwater runoff in their neighbourhood. The goal is to reduce flood risks from increasingly intense rain storms by encouraging uptake of nature-based solutions such as rain gardens. The format of each workshop will be a design charrette, a commonly used method in urban planning to promote shared ownership of projects by bringing together neighbourhood residents with professional stakeholders such as municipal staff and conservation authorities. Reep has adapted the charrette format to put a focus on climate adaptation and flood resiliency and successfully piloted it in a Cambridge neighbourhood during 2017. The workshops will run until March 2020.

Requested $15,000 - Recommended $5,000
Plus $5,000 received in 2018

Waterloo Global Science Initiative - Energize Game for High School students
“Energize – the Sustainable City Challenge” is a resource designed for students in grade 7-12 and local community partners to simulate a shift of the Region of Waterloo's local energy consumption and generation patterns onto sustainable, low-carbon pathways. The goal of the simulation is to identify ways to reach Waterloo Region’s community greenhouse gas emission reduction target of 80% by 2050. This project will create a more streamlined, stand-alone and truly gamified version of the resource, that will improve participant engagement and assist with the upcoming local action planning by ClimateActionWR. To make up the gap between the requested amount and recommended CEF grant, staff are currently exploring if some of the Region’s and City funding support for ClimateActionWR can be allocated to this parallel initiative given that it will support action planning in the near future.

Requested $5,500 - Recommended $ 4,000
Plus $1,500 received in 2018
Attachment 2 – Applicants Not Recommended for CEF Funding at this Time

Not Recommended for funding at this time:

**Stewardship Stream**

**University of Waterloo Campus Aerial Mapping**  Requested $2,000

The purpose of this project is to use an aerial drone to map the University of Waterloo (UWaterloo) main campus’s Ring Road perimeter in 3D using Photogrammetry and Geographic Information Science (GIS) techniques. This project requested funding from the Region of Waterloo’s Community Environmental Fund to help cover the cost of purchasing a consumer drone.

**Youth-led Mural Creations for Climate Action**  Requested $8,000

This proposal is for funding to lead and create a series of three climate-themed murals with our local communities, in particular aiming to engage local high schools, including high school teachers and students, in the mural creation process. The murals would serve to help support the conversation around climate change and its solutions with our Region’s youth and young adults, who are already changing the social conversation on climate throughout the Region through grassroots efforts such as the Youth Climate Strike. The proponents of this project received a CEF grant in 2018 and staff is recommending that they complete that project before receiving additional funding.

**St. John's-Kilmarnock School - Observation Deck & Walkway**  Requested $48,000

The School intends to build an observation site above a pond (Chalmers Pond) situated on school property. The deck and replacement docks will allow for better study of the pond aquatic life and natural vegetation. This will enhance the student experience and they will gain more appreciation for the outdoors. Part of the rejuvenation project for the site and surrounding natural waterfront includes the addition of new outdoor learning spaces, such as an observation deck, new docks and the removal of invasive, non-native species as part of the learning experience. Staff recommends that a more detailed project plan be prepared and that additional sources of funding be secured before CEF funds are committed to this project.

**Knowledge of Clean Air Plants to Our Lives**  Requested $50,000

This project would create awareness about the goodness and benefits of clean air plants for home, school, workplaces, hospitals, old age homes and care facilities, usage related to sports, martial arts, and dance. Staff feels that the request is extremely high with very little project detail supplied and recommends that a more detailed project plan be prepared outlining what the components of the project are, as well as the specific deliverables.
Region of Waterloo
Planning, Development and Legislative Services
Region of Waterloo International Airport

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: May 28, 2019
File Code: T18-80(A)
Subject: Airport Master Plan Update

Recommendation:
That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo proceed with the design of a temporary expansion for the Airport Terminal Building and issue Requests for Proposals to consultants for the design of the temporary expansion as described in report PDL-AIR-19-04 dated May 28, 2019.

Summary:
This report provides an update to the current progress of the implementation of the 2017 Airport Master Plan.

Report:
In April 2017, Regional Council approved the Region of Waterloo International Airport Master Plan (Report PDL-AIR-17-02). The Master Plan outlined a systematic development process that would be initiated in response to increased demand for air service, broken down into 5 distinct stages. Upon approval of the Master Plan, Regional Council directed staff to initiate Stage 1 of the plan. This stage focuses on the completion of a variety of detailed studies that would prepare the Airport, the Region and funding partners to expand infrastructure, only once demand for air services expanded. The second stage of the Master Plan will only be initiated once the airport exceeds about 250,000 passengers annually. Traffic at the airport in 2018 was less than 100,000 passengers.
Stage 1 consists of the following projects:

- Terminal Expansion Feasibility and Site Selection Study
- Existing Terminal Expansion Design
- Runway 14-32 and 08-26 Extension Design
- Runway Extension Assessment
- Master Servicing Study
- Federal Zoning Regulation Update
- Rail Alignment Study
- Air Service Development

Work has now commenced on these Stage 1 projects. In September 2018, Council awarded a contract for consulting services to aviation engineering firm Avia NG to execute four Stage 1 projects of the Airport Master Plan (Report PDL-AIR-18-07/COR-TRY-18-82). A project team of Facilities, Transportation and Environmental Services and Planning, Development and Legislative Services staff has been meeting with the consultant through the early stages of these projects. In March 2019, Council established a Steering Committee to provide support and direction to the Airport planning process (Report PDL-AIR-19-03).

The majority of Stage 1 projects are expected to be complete by 2021.

A summary of the progress for each project is presented in the following sections.

**Terminal Expansion Feasibility and Site Selection Study**

The Terminal Expansion Feasibility and Site Selection Study project involves determining the optimal long-term location and development plan for the terminal building. It considers expansion up to 2,500,000 annual passengers as described in the Airport Master Plan.

The project team has reviewed the current terminal building location and five other potential sites around the airport. These sites were assessed and narrowed down to three preferred options: the existing location, an area south of the current location, and an area north of Runway 08-26.

The terminal campus area is expected to require a significant amount of land for various facilities such as the terminal building, aprons, parking, roadways, landscaping, hotels and other commercial areas. The long-term terminal building is estimated to account for only 10% of the total required terminal campus area.

Although the existing location is considered one of the preferred options, the location of the existing terminal building cannot remain in its current location due to future airspace constraints. Therefore this option considers the long-term development plan for the terminal building in the vicinity of the existing building.
Evaluation criteria were developed to assess these remaining three sites and to determine the preferred option. The criteria consist of construction and opportunity costs, environmental and societal impacts, design effectiveness, and potential connectivity with the Region.

The project team is now taking a detailed look at the three preferred options in order to evaluate and determine the optimal location.

**Existing Terminal Expansion Design**

The current terminal building can accommodate approximately 250,000 annual passengers, or potentially more if flights are spaced out appropriately. The terminal building cannot currently handle more than 2 flights at the same time, as passengers would experience very poor customer service levels. The Terminal Expansion Design project involves the design of a terminal expansion to accommodate short-term passenger growth of approximately 500,000 annual passengers.

The project team has identified that the holdroom, domestic baggage claim and outbound baggage areas require expansion to accommodate the short-term passenger growth. Check-in procedures can be improved through the implementation of new technology.

Through the Terminal Expansion Feasibility and Site Selection Study, it was determined that the existing terminal building cannot remain in its current location due to future airspace constraints. Expansion of the existing building to accommodate short term growth requirements would largely be throwaway cost. The project team has determined that expansion to the existing terminal building can be completed using a temporary approach. This will significantly mitigate cost impacts, with a temporary approach expected to defer approximately $13,000,000 to $15,000,000 of the Stage 2 terminal expansion construction cost to Stage 3. A temporary approach is also expected to mitigate schedule impacts, allowing the expansion to be completed in a shorter timeframe and with less disruption to operations. The current level of service can still be maintained or improved through this temporary expansion until such time as a new terminal building would be required.

The terminal expansion design was approved through acceptance of the Airport Master Plan, however the project team requests Council approval to implement a temporary expansion approach for the Airport Terminal Building. Requests for Proposals will then be issued for the design of the temporary expansion. Implementation of the temporary expansion would still be on hold until Stage 2 of the Airport Master Plan is triggered.
Runway 14-32 and 08-26 Extension Design

The Runway Extension Design project involves the detailed design of a Runway 14-32 extension to 7,000 feet and a preliminary design Runway 08-26 extension to 8,737 feet. The project also includes the design of associated infrastructure such as parallel taxiways, precision approach lighting systems, stormwater management systems, servicing, and mitigation of impacts to the future airspace.

Conceptual design of the runway extensions has been completed. A geotechnical investigation has been initiated to determine the pavement structure and water taking requirements. Impacts to the future airspace have been identified and are being assessed. Impacts to Shantz Station Road due to the Runway 08-26 extension are currently being evaluated by Transportation and Environmental Services staff.

Runway Extension Assessment

The Runway Extension Assessment project involves completing a screening level assessment and public consultation for the proposed Runway 14-32 and Runway 08-26 extensions as described in the Airport Master Plan.

The proposed runway extensions are not subject to the requirements of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act or the Municipal Class EA process. However, the project will still follow the Schedule C Municipal Class EA process to be consistent with typical Region practice.

Desktop and field studies have commenced, including archaeological, cultural heritage, wetlands and wildlife habitat, contaminated soil and groundwater investigations.

The first Public Consultation Centre for this project is scheduled for June 20, 2019 at the Breslau Mennonite Church. Public materials will be provided to Planning and Works Committee for review in advance of this event.

Master Servicing Study

The Master Servicing Study project involves developing a plan to accommodate the servicing requirements of future development at the Airport. The study will determine the capacity of existing services and will identify the necessary upgrades required to accommodate future development. The services to be reviewed consist of stormwater, sanitary, water, power, communications, gas and glycol.

Desktop studies have commenced identifying the existing conditions and requirements to facilitate future development.
Federal Zoning Regulation Update

The Federal Zoning Regulation Update project involves updating the existing Airport Zoning Regulations, such that the Airport is adequately protected from surrounding development to facilitate the proposed runway extensions as described in the Airport Master Plan. The project will follow the Transport Canada process which includes public consultation, and resources have already been allocated to this project by Transport Canada.

The new zoning regulations will provide increased protection for the runways, to ensure that instrument approach procedures will not be affected by future development. The new approaches will extend 15 kilometers from the end of each runway and will have a reduced slope from 2.0% to 1.6%.

The new zoning regulations will also provide protection for a potential third runway, located 1.5 kilometres east of and parallel to Runway 14-32. Although a third runway is not planned to be constructed in the foreseeable future, protecting the airspace for this runway will permit it to still be an option if and when it is needed in the long run. A third runway would allow for more airspace capacity and increased safety, as it would reduce mixed operations between commercial and general aviation traffic.

The first Public Consultation Centre for this project is scheduled for June 20 at the Breslau Mennonite Church.

Rail Alignment Study

The Rail Alignment Study project involves assessing the feasibility of implementing a rail connection from the future terminal building to the Breslau GO Station. The preferred public transportation option and optimal location of the rail corridor will be determined.

This project has not yet commenced, although discussions with the Greater Toronto Airports Authority, Metrolinx and Transport Canada have been initiated regarding a possible rail connection.

Air Service Development

Region of Waterloo and Waterloo Region Economic Development Corporation (Waterloo EDC) staff have continued to aggressively pursue new air service and industrial investment opportunities. Four companies continue to position themselves in the Ultra Low Cost Carrier (ULCC) market space and Regional staff has been in contact with all carriers regarding opportunities to serve the market area for YKF. Global and national market conditions combined with increasing congestion at Toronto Pearson continue to put pressure on potential airlines and aerospace companies to consider YKF as an alternative.
Conclusion

Stage 1 of the 2017 Airport Master Plan has commenced. Future reports will be presented to Council seeking direction to:

- Finalize the preferred terminal building location;
- Issue a Request for Proposal to temporary structure vendors for the Terminal Expansion Design project; and,
- Finalize the characteristics of the new Federal Zoning Regulation.

Note that all major projects will require Council approval prior to proceeding.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

This initiative directly supports Strategic Objective 1.1.3 in the Corporate Strategic Plan – “Develop a Master Plan and associated Business Plan that guides the growth and development of the Region of Waterloo International Airport to provide a full-service, customer friendly facility which supports commercial, corporate and general aviation.”

Financial Implications:

The 2019-2028 Airport Capital program includes $2,071,000 in 2019 and $964,000 in 2020 for Airport Master Plan Stage 1 projects. Taking into account costs incurred in 2018, the total estimated cost of the Stage 1 work described in this report is $3,340,000. Funding for the work is from Regional Development Charges ($1,928,000) and the Airport Capital Reserve ($1,412,000).

As described in report COR-FSD-19-25 dated May 28, 2019 on the Administration & Finance Committee agenda, Bill 108 “the More Homes, More Choices Act, 2019” was introduced and received first reading on May 2, 2019. If enacted, the Bill would deem Airport capital costs ineligible for funding under the Development Charges Act (DCA). The Bill would create a new capital cost recovery regime called a “community benefits charge” which would be capped. It is unclear if Airports will be considered as an eligible service under this new framework. Implementing a capped community benefits charge is expected to significantly reduce municipal revenue for growth-related capital costs.

The cost per household forecast used in the Airport Master Plan assumed 50% of all capital costs would be funded from non-property tax sources (i.e. development charges and federal/provincial subsidy). Subsidies from senior levels of government have yet to be identified, and if Bill 108 were to be enacted Airport development charges would be eliminated. The Region’s 10 year capital program includes $154 million in Master Plan capital costs and almost $75 million of development charge funded debt to implement Stages 1, 2 and 3 of the Airport Master Plan. If development charges are not available as a source of funding, alternative funding sources for Airport development and expansion costs will need to be identified, possibly including an increase in property tax.
The cost of property acquisitions required for airport development has been financed from long term debt, funded in part from property taxes and in part from future development charge collections. Another impact of Bill 108 as written is that funding responsibility for existing development charge funded debt servicing costs will be transferred to the property tax levy, impacting future Airport operating budgets by an estimated $527,000 as early as 2020.

The temporary approach for the terminal building expansion is expected to defer approximately $13,000,000 to $15,000,000 (20%) of the overall Stage 2 costs to Stage 3, which will relieve some financial pressure on the Airport capital program.

Once the component projects of Stage 1 are complete, staff will commence an update of the Airport Master Plan financial analysis including the cost per household forecast, and report back to the Steering Committee and Council as required.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

The Master Plan project team includes staff from Airport, Community Planning, Design and Construction, Transportation, Water Services, Facilities and Fleet Management.

**Attachments:** None

**Prepared By:** Jordan Vander Veen, Senior Project Manager, Planning, Development and Legislative Services

**Approved By:** Rod Regier, Commissioner, Planning, Development and Legislative Services
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Transit Services
Community Services

To: Chair Tom Galloway and Members of the Planning and Works Committee
Date: May 28, 2019
File Code: S12-01
Subject: Low Income Transit Study Findings and Next Steps

Recommendation:
For Information.

Summary:
In June 2017 a joint Community Services and Transportation and Environmental Services report (CSD-EIS-17-10 / TES-TRS-17-13) provided an update to members of the Community Services Committee and Regional Council on the progress of a study of a low income transit program.

This report provides an update on the study and next steps.

Report:

Historically, the Region of Waterloo has shown a strong interest in increasing the availability of affordable transit options for persons with low-income. The Transportation and Environmental Services and the Community Services Departments have provided the leadership and administration needed to provide affordable public transit programs.

The Region of Waterloo has invested in affordable transit through various services and programs. A summary of these programs is displayed in Table 1 below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Cost to Customer</th>
<th>Cost &amp; Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Transportation for Reduced Incomes Program (TRIP) | - Customer must live below the Low-Income Cut-off (Statistics Canada income measure).  
- Program administered in partnership with The Working Center and Lutherwood.  
- 1,600 passes provided per month. | - Customer pays $43 monthly (50% discount). | - Approximately $830,000 per year.  
- Funded from the Municipal tax levy and budgeted in Community Service Department, Employment and Income Support |
| Transportation Affordability Pass Program (TAPP) | - Must be on Ontario Works (OW), attending academic upgrading full-time, or enrolled in the community participation program or in a substance use treatment program. | - Free                 | - Approximately $1.2M per year.  
Provincial funding through Ontario Works. |
| Free Bus Tickets/Two Ride Cards               | - Given to OW participants attending OW appointments (caseworker, counselling, etc.). | - Free                 | - Approximately $100,000 per year.  
Provincial Funding through Ontario Works. |
| Community Agencies Buying Tickets/Two Ride cards at the Discounted Rate | - Community agencies buy GRT tickets/cards at a 15% discount.  
- Community agencies distribute these tickets/cards to individuals attending their offices/programs | - Free                 | - The discount is approximately $25,000 annually.  
- Funded from the Municipal tax levy and budgeted in Community Service Department, Employment and Income Support |
The Transportation for Reduced Incomes Program (TRIP) has been the principal affordable transit program supporting individuals living with low-income. The number of one-month passes sold through the TRIP has increased ten-fold since its inception in 2002, with over 16,500 passes sold in 2018. Despite this success, there are waiting lists of people wanting to access the program.

In the fall of 2017, a twelve-month randomized controlled trial study involving 506 people was initiated in order to evaluate effects of reduced-fare transit passes for people living with low income. The study was led by researchers from the University of Waterloo and involved Regional staff from Grand River Transit, Community Services, and Finance, as well as staff from Lutherwood and The Working Centre.

The study produced statistically significant quantitative evidence that:

- Reduced-fare transit options increase the likelihood that people will travel by bus;
- Reduced-fare transit options increase quality of life insofar as they increase the ratio of time spent on activities to time spent on transit;
- The affordable transit options offered in the study increased the likelihood that people in the study sample would buy transit passes.
- Preferences for affordable transit options vary. Some people prefer low-cost passes with limited flexibility (Off-Peak Pass, 20-Ride Pass), while others prefer somewhat higher priced passes with more flexibility (Combo Pass, Unlimited Pass).
- People living with low-income are much more price sensitive than the median transit user.

Based on the study data and their experience as study leaders, the researchers offered the following recommendations:

- Offer subsidized transit products that are reduced by an average of 48%.
- Make multiple types of reduced-fare transit passes available to people living with low-income, including a product that costs as little as $20.
- Consider making lower-cost off-peak transit passes available to the general public.
- Develop a capacity for experimentation in the interests of acquiring knowledge and proactively shaping the future.
- Continue to work with local community support organizations in a common effort to make affordable transit a reality.

Staff from Transit Services, Community Services, and Finance who were involved in the study are working on developing a series of options and recommendations to present to Regional Council. It is anticipated that a report with options and recommendations will be ready to present to Regional Council prior to September 2019.
An Executive Summary of the study findings can be found in Appendix A. The full report is available in the Regional Councillors' Library.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

Transit programs and fares for people living with low-income meet one of more of the Strategic Objectives under the Region’s Corporate Strategic Plan Focus Areas “Sustainable Transportation”, “Healthy, Safe and Inclusive Communities”, and “Responsive and Engaging Government Services”.

**Financial Implications:**

Nil

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Representatives from Corporate Services, Transportation and Environmental Services, and Community Services provided input to this report.

**Attachments**

Appendix A - Executive Summary of Study Findings

**Prepared By:** Peter Zinck, Director, Transit Services

  Chris McEvoy, Supervisor, Quality Assurance, Community Services

**Approved By:** Douglas Bartholomew-Sanders, Commissioner, Community Services

  Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation & Environmental Services
Appendix A – Executive Summary of Study Findings

Executive Summary

Caring communities protect and enable their most vulnerable citizens. Transportation, like health care, education, and communication is essential to well-being and engagement. Public transit in particular is more than just a mode of transport: It is a means for people with limited means to fully participate in economic, social, and political life (Hertel et al., 2016). While government resources are limited, citizens in the Region of Waterloo (RoW) and elsewhere need access to affordable public transit to be able to provide for themselves and their dependents and to participate in community life through work, study, volunteer activities, or accessing social services. While cost is not the only barrier to public transit use, an earlier RoW study suggested it was the primary barrier (RoW, 2013a, Figure 12). In 2002, the RoW showed its commitment to affordable transit by introducing the Transit for Reduced Incomes Program (TRIP) pass, a half-price pass for low-income individuals. The TRIP pass currently costs $43, half the price of the regularly-priced adult pass ($86). Notwithstanding the popularity of the TRIP pass, it is not a complete solution as demand for the TRIP pass exceeds supply, current resources limit supply, and because for some individuals, even the half-price TRIP pass is unaffordable (Dempster & Tucs, 2012).

Study Design

This study is designed to evaluate the effects of reduced-fare transit passes. The expectation, illustrated in the figure below, is that the offering of reduced-fare transit passes will result in immediate, short, and medium-term outcomes. The expected immediate outcome is that the fare reduction will increase the likelihood that study participants buy a transit pass. If cost is the major obstacle to the purchase of a transit pass and if the price reduction is sufficient, then we will observe the expected outcome. Over the short-term we expect that study participants will change their travel behaviours. People that could not previously afford public transit may be more likely to travel by bus. They may also increase the number and variety of the bus trips they take; although people who previously bought a full-price pass may not change their travel behaviour but may instead save money, alleviating financial burdens. Over the medium term we expect there to be impacts on the quality of life of study participants who are increasing their use of public transit. This may appear as an increase in the ratio of time spent on activities to time spent on transportation. In some cases, there may eventually appear impacts on health, employment, or income.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Immediate Outcome</th>
<th>Short-Term Outcome</th>
<th>Medium-Term Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced fare transit passes</td>
<td>Increased likelihood of buying transit pass</td>
<td>Impacts on travel behaviours</td>
<td>Impacts on quality of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 The expected effects of reduced-fare transit offerings
To produce the most reliable results on the effects of the reduced-fare offerings, our investigation was designed as a randomized controlled trial (RCT). The advantage of an RCT design is that it addresses the question of causality. Causality is important because if we find that people with access to reduced-fare transit passes do better than people without such access, we want to be sure that the transit pass, and not some inherent difference between the two groups, is the cause. We can ensure that the transit pass (the treatment) is the cause of differences if we ensure that the people who receive the treatment (the opportunity to purchase a reduced-fare bus pass) are as much like the people who do not receive the treatment as possible. This similarity between the two groups is achieved by randomly allocating study participants to treatment and control groups. We examine differences in the behaviours and outcomes of treatment and control group study participants to measure the effects of the reduced-fare transit offerings.

Collection of Data on Transportation Needs, Behaviours, and Outcomes

To capture data on transportation needs and behaviours, and the effects of reduced-fare passes, we surveyed study participants on four occasions: November 2017, prior to the availability of reduced-fare passes; March 2018, after treatment group participants had had a four-month opportunity to buy reduced-fare passes; July 2018, after treatment group participants had had an eight-month opportunity to buy reduced-fare passes, and December 2018, after treatment group participants had had a twelve-month opportunity to buy reduced fare passes. A challenge in survey-based studies is eliciting survey responses, particularly from control group participants. We took several steps to ensure sufficient participation throughout the study. First, we enabled participation by working with community support organizations, The Working Centre and Lutherwood, who offered assistance of various kinds to participants throughout the study, by offering extensive documentation on the study, by offering information sessions, and by providing the survey and reminders in both English and Arabic. Through our registration process we identified Arabic as the second most common first language, after English. Second, we incented participation, through rolling additions to the treatment group in which some control group participants were added to the treatment group after each four-month period, a five-month period at the conclusion of the study in which both treatment and control group participants will be eligible to purchase the reduced-fare pass of their choice, and by offering grocery-store coupons and two bus-tickets each time a survey was completed. 506 people completed the first survey, 405 people completed the second survey, 338 people completed the third survey, and 315 people completed the fourth survey.

To garner a more in-depth understanding of the perspectives of the study participants, 70 in person interviews were conducted with a subset of our study sample. In order to stimulate participation, these interviewees were offered incentives in the form of grocery coupons and bus tickets to participate in the interviews. In order to make travel more convenient for interviewees, we conducted the series of interviews over a timeline of one week, in both Kitchener and Cambridge. As Arabic was the second most common language of our study participants, we provided Arabic translators during interviews with
Arabic speakers. The responses illuminated specific issues people face when using GRT’s services, and also specific areas in which GRT is performing well.

Representativeness of Study Sample

We compare the attributes of the people in the study sample to those of the target population — people in the RoW who are between the ages of 18 and 65, who are not students, and whose household income is below the low-income cut-off (LICO)1. We used 2011 population data from Statistics Canada and 2016 population data from the RoW for the comparison (Statistics Canada 2011; Statistics Canada 2016, and Statistics Canada 2017). The study sample fairly represents the low-income population in the RoW in terms of age, gender, marital status, ethnicity, education, and income, but differs in terms of the propensity to use the bus, the length of commute to work, the likelihood of having dependents, being born outside Canada, not being Canadian citizens, and having poor or fair physical and mental health, all which were higher in our sample than in the population.

Reduced Transit Fare Preferences of Study Participants

We investigated the reduced-fare transit preferences of study participants to determine the centrality of the cost barrier. We designed four reduced-fare transit passes from which study participants could choose: An Off-Peak Pass (which cost $23), a 20-Ride Pass ($25), a Combo Pass that offered both off-peak travel and 20 rides ($48), and an Unlimited Pass ($65). Asking participants to state their preferences may have impacted the results as cognitive biases may lead people to provide responses that resonate with their feelings in the moment, but which do not reflect their more enduring needs and constraints. In fact, when we presented alternative reduced-fare options in the first focus group, 100% of the participants declared that they were only interested in the Unlimited Pass. We ensured that our preference data would be reliable by conducting a field experiment in which we asked study participants to identify the pass they would prefer to buy for the duration of the 12-month experiment (followed by an additional incentive period of five months). When presented with four alternative reduced-fare options, each of which represented a fair benefit-cost trade-off, study participants made choices that were distributed across the four products: 78 people (15%) chose the Off-Peak Pass, 71 (14%) chose the 20-Ride Pass, 134 (26%) chose the Combo Pass, and 223 (44%) chose the Unlimited Pass. The Unlimited Pass remained the most popular choice, but 29% of participants chose the two passes with limited flexibility, presumably in the interests of saving money.

The Effect of Reduced-Fare Transit Offerings on the Likelihood of Purchasing a Transit Pass

Our first expected outcome is that people who are eligible to buy the reduced-fare pass of their choice (those in the treatment group) will be more likely to buy a transit pass than people who are not eligible to buy a reduced-fare pass (those in the control group). This will be true if cost is a significant barrier to the purchase of a transit. It is important because if the fare reduction does not make it more likely that people purchase a bus
pass, either because the fare reduction is insufficient or because cost is not a major barrier, then the fare-reduction program will yield no downstream benefits. We use logistic regression to examine the effect of treatment (eligibility to purchase a reduced-fare pass) on the likelihood that a person purchases a pass and on the frequency of pass purchase. The results show that treatment is a significant predictor of the likelihood that a person purchases a transit pass, and of the frequency of pass purchase (significant at the 99% level).

The research literature on the price elasticity of the demand for public transit is pertinent to the consideration of the cost sensitivity of low-income transit users. Recent literature reviews conducted by Canadian researchers suggest that elasticities range between 0 and -1. Litman (2004) concludes that the price elasticity of the demand for transit is between -0.2 and -0.9, and the federal Department of Finance (2011) median estimates are between -0.4 and -0.75. Grand River Transit uses -0.3. These estimates may be appropriate for the median rider, but they do not capture the price sensitivities of low-income individuals.

We use our experimental data to compute the price elasticities of the demand for transit for the study sample. The price elasticity of demand is the change in demand (DD) divided by the change in price (DP). The change in demand is the differential propensity of the treatment group versus the control group participants to buy passes. The change in price is the percentage reduction in the price of the reduced-fare pass versus its imputed “regular” price. We find that across the entire sample, the price elasticity of demand is -1.47, surpassing the high end of the conventional ranges (in absolute value), and more than five times the value used by GRT. For those participants who chose the Off-Peak and 20-Ride Pass, the value is -4.07 and -2.45, respectively. This is much higher, in absolute value, than the conventional ranges meaning that the people in our sample are much more price sensitive than is commonly assumed.

It is important to note that while our results show that treatment group participants are more likely to buy a transit pass than control group participants, suggesting that the fare reduction was sufficiently large to change transit pass buying behaviours of some people in the study sample, it did not change the behaviour of all. Overall, 37% of treatment group participants did not buy the reduced fare pass they were eligible to buy. Collectively, reduced-fare pass prices would have to have been 48% lower to induce 80% of the treatment group participants to buy passes. Moreover, the fare-reductions would likely have been too small to change the transit pass buying behaviours of the target population. The study sample is comprised of active bus riders, who are more likely to use public transit than the target population. Larger fare reductions would likely be required to induce low-income people who are not bus riders to purchase transit passes.

Focus group contributions, responses to open-ended survey questions, and interview data suggest that cost is not the only barrier to transit usage. Even though many individuals expressed satisfaction with GRT for a variety of reasons, and are heavily dependent on GRT for their daily transportation needs, there are a number of important issues that respondents face regarding use of GRT’s services. The following ten categories were cited most frequently by interviewees: 1) bus timing, 2) travel times,
bus connections, and transfers, 3) accessibility, 4) interactions with drivers and other GRT employees, 5) Infrastructure, 6) affordability, 7) proximity to home, 8) purchase and use of bus passes, 9) safety, and 10) level of physical and mental comfort. Categories that most frequently made a positive or negative impression on interviewees were interactions with drivers or other GRT employees (51% positive and 20% negative), proximity of bus stops or terminals to home (67% positive and 3% negative), and bus timing (30% positive and 37% negative).

The Effect of Reduced-Fare Transit Offerings on Travel Behaviours

Our second expected outcome is that reduced-fare transit offerings will have an effect on travel behaviours. We examine effects on travel frequency, the number of different travel purposes (work, dropping children at daycare, visiting friends or family, etc.), and on the propensity to use public transit. We found no effects of transit subsidies on travel frequency or on the number of different travel purposes. There are several possible explanations for this finding. The magnitude of the cost reduction may have been insufficient to induce increased travel frequency or variety; the duration of the study may have been too short to give participants time to adjust their behaviours (some, but not all, researchers suggest that transit price changes take years to have an effect); participants that previously bought full-price transit passes would have experienced a cost savings rather than an increase in transit availability; for some participants the quality of public transit may present a more significant obstacle to travel than cost; and for some participants personal challenges may present a more significant obstacle to travel than cost. More data is required to determine why travel frequency and the variety of travel purposes did not increase.

We found a significant effect of reduced-fare offerings on the propensity to use public transit. Study participants with bus passes are more likely to use the bus than study participants without bus passes, and are more likely to have increased their use of the bus as a consequence of treatment. This is shown in the table below which shows that treatment (Row 3) has a significant effect on the differential propensity of treatment and control group participants to use the bus (Columns 3, 4 and 5) and on the differential propensity of treatment and control group participants to increase their usage of the bus (Columns 6, 7 and 8). The result is significant at the 99% level in columns 3 and 4, at the 99.9% level in column 5, at the 95% level in column 6, and at the 99% level in columns 7 and 8. This effect on travel behaviours is important because it is the primary path through which effects on quality of life are achieved (secondary paths are through transit cost savings and reduced stress). Using the bus increases the ease, speed, and comfort of travel relative to walking and so makes time and energy available for other activities.
Table 1 Effect of treatment on participants’ propensity to use the bus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row #</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Propensity to Use Bus (%)</th>
<th>As Treated</th>
<th>Increased Propensity to Use Bus (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey 2</td>
<td>Survey 3</td>
<td>Survey 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>+**</td>
<td>+**</td>
<td>+***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TRIP waitlist</td>
<td>+ α</td>
<td>+ α</td>
<td>+**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>OW</td>
<td>+ α</td>
<td>+ α</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ODSP</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ α</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dependents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Physical health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mental health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Public transit expenses ($)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Private transit expenses ($)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Off-peak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>20-Ride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Combo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Unlimited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Off-peak + treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>20-Ride + treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Combo + treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Unlimited + treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Public transit expenses + treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Distance to core</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Model characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.94***</td>
<td>4.05***</td>
<td>4.95***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a = p < .1, * = p < .05, ** = p < .01, *** = p < .001

The Effect of Reduced-Fare Transit Offerings on Quality of Life

If reduced-fare offerings have a significant effect on quality of life, the primary mechanism will be through increasing the ease and speed of travel. If travel is easier and quicker, people can spend the savings in energy and time on other things. So the first quality of life impact of reduced-fare transit offerings will be on the ratio of time spent on activities to time spent on travel.

We considered 18 activities that people undertake, ranging from work, volunteering, studying, and accessing community services to shopping for groceries, going to an exercise or recreational facility, seeing a doctor. We asked study participants to estimate the time spent doing activities in the past week, and the time spent travelling to and from each activity in the past week. Of all activities, going to and from work consumed the most time. Thirty-six percent (36%) of study participants spent more than five hours a week commuting to and from work and 13% spent more than 10 hours
commuting. This is in a region where the average citizen spends just over three hours per week commuting (37.6 minutes/day, Canadian Index of Wellbeing, 2018).

As shown in the table below, treatment (Row 3) had a significant effect on the ratio of time spent on activities to time spent on travel (Columns 3, 4 and 5) and on the increase in the ratio of time spent on activities to time spent on travel over time (Columns 6, 7 and 8). The result is significant at the 95% level for columns 3 and 4, and at the 90% level for columns 5, 6, 7 and 8. We also tested for an effect of transit subsidies on other quality of life measures such as health, employment, and income but did not find a statistically significant effect, possibly because there has not yet been sufficient time for these more substantive changes.

Table 2 Effect on participants’ ratio of time spent on activities to time spent on travel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row #</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Ratio of Time Spent on Activities to Time Spent on Travel</th>
<th>Increased Ratio of Time Spent on Activities to Time Spent on Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>+*</td>
<td>+*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TRIP waitlist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>OW</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ODSP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>+*</td>
<td>+*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dependents</td>
<td>+*</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Physical health</td>
<td>+*</td>
<td>+**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mental health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Income</td>
<td>+*</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Public transit expenses ($)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Private transit expenses ($)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Off-peak</td>
<td>+*</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20-Ride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Combo</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Unlimited</td>
<td>+*</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Off-peak * treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>20-Ride * treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Combo * treatment</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Unlimited * treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Public transit expenses * treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Distance to core</td>
<td>+*</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Model characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.64*</td>
<td>1.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a = p < .1, * = p < .05, ** = p < .01, *** = p < .001
Results and Recommendations

Based on a twelve-month randomized controlled trial experiment involving 506 people in the region of Waterloo, we now have statistically significant quantitative evidence that:

- Reduced-fare transit options increase the likelihood that people will travel by bus.
- Reduced-fare transit options increase quality of life insofar as they increase the ratio of time spent on activities to time spent on transit.
- The affordable transit options offered in the study increased the likelihood that people in the study sample would buy transit passes. But bus riders are over-represented in our study sample, relative to the target population. The price reductions were sufficient to induce some bus riders to buy a pass, but may have been insufficient to induce non-bus riders to do so.
- Preferences for affordable transit options vary. Some people prefer low-cost passes with limited flexibility (Off-Peak Pass, 20-Ride Pass), while others prefer somewhat higher priced passes with more flexibility (Combo Pass, Unlimited Pass).
- People living with low-income are much more price sensitive than the median transit user. While conventional estimates of the price elasticity of the demand for public transit suggest a rule of thumb value of -0.3 (the value used by Grand River Transit), the average value for study participants was -1.47, and much higher (in absolute terms).
- Transit subsidies as low as $21/month (the subsidy associated with the Unlimited Pass) yield a benefit for some people.

The findings above, coupled with qualitative data obtained from 70 in-person interviews conducted with a subset of our study sample, make a case for expanding existing transit subsidies for people living with low-income as it would likely contribute positively to their quality of life.

A difficulty in designing reduced-fare transit products is that the target population, as represented by our study sample, is diverse. Of the people in our sample, many work (39% work more than 10 hours a week), many care for children or other dependents (47%), and a significant proportion are struggling with poor or fair physical (35%) or mental (32%) health. The common element is the importance of public transit in their lives. The most common alternative to public transit is walking and that is difficult if you are working, taking care of children or dependents, or have compromised health. Not having affordable public transit limits opportunities for work, engagement, and healthy living. While the TRIP pass suffers from demand that exceeds supply and from being unaffordable for some people, our results suggest that offering a range of affordable transit products may be a more effective and equitable solution. The TRIP pass is subsidized at a rate of $43 per pass which, given current resources, does not allow the Region to meet the current demand. The passes in our study were subsidized at lower rates: Off-Peak ($23 subsidy), 20-Ride ($25 subsidy), Combo ($26 subsidy), Unlimited ($21 subsidy). Each pass was preferred by some of the study participants and each pass led to an increased propensity to use the bus and an increased ratio of time spent doing activities to time spent on travel.
Alternatively, the Region may wish invest more resources to ensure that all low-income individuals have access to public transit. For example, the Government of British Columbia offers a $45 annual transit pass to people that receive income assistance, of which there are 86,000 eligible people (Rivers & Plumptre, 2016: 15-16). The BC pass now costs $52 annually, but is free for people with disabilities. Our results suggest that low-income people travel relatively infrequently and so may consume less transit resources than the passes allow. Furthermore, bus riders are over-represented in our study sample, and still 37% of study participants chose not to buy the reduced-fare passes they were eligible to buy, so the price reductions may have been insufficient. The benefits for low-income people of more generous passes are more flexible access to transit, cost savings, and less stress. For the community the investment may result in eventual economic payoffs as the availability of reduced-fare passes has an effect on the likelihood of employment, study, and income of some recipients. It will also make the lives of vulnerable people easier, and our society more equitable and just (Hertel et al., 2016).

Based on our study data and our experience as study leaders, we offer the following recommendations for the Region of Waterloo:

1. Offer subsidized transit products that are reduced by an average of 48%.
2. Make multiple types of reduced-fare transit passes available to people living with low income, including a product that costs as little as $20.
3. Consider making lower-cost off-peak transit passes available to the general public.
4. Develop a capacity for experimentation in the interests acquiring knowledge and proactively shaping the future.
5. Continue to work with local community support organizations in a common effort to make affordable transit a reality.

The Region of Waterloo stakeholders - Community Services and Transportation and Environmental Services at the Region of Waterloo, Grand River Transit, The Working Centre, and Lutherwood - are to be commended for their commitment to affordable transit—a commitment that has been demonstrated through many years of working together to build understandings, forward momentum, effective services for people living with low income. The affordable transit challenge is significant and evolving and can only be addressed through the sustained, concerted, and informed efforts of all parties.
Region of Waterloo

Transportation and Environmental Services

Transit Services

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

Date: May 28, 2019  File Code: D28-50

Subject: Grand River Transit Proposed 2019 Transit Network and Conestoga College U-pass Service Impact

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve transit service improvements to be effective Monday, September 2, 2019, as described in Report No. TES-TRS-19-10, dated May 28, 2019.

Summary:

The proposed transit network changes in 2019 are focused on two main priorities. One is the introduction of a new iXpress line in Cambridge. The second priority is to realign routes to improve integration with the iXpress network, improve access and capacity to Conestoga College and improve service to employment areas. Improved frequency and span of service are required to accommodate significant ridership growth generated by Conestoga College.

An integrated plan to redesign the transit network has been developed that would introduce the new 206 Coronation iXpress line that directly connects west Galt via Preston to the ION LRT at the Fairway station. Local routes in Preston, west Galt, Lovell Industrial Park and Cambridge Business Park would be restructured to connect to the new iXpress line and ION BUS, and to improve access to Conestoga College. Improved peak frequency on routes connecting south Kitchener with the College, including a new route in Doon South, will better accommodate ridership demand to the College.

While the province has made a policy decision which will not allow the Conestoga College U-Pass to be implemented, projected ridership growth generated by the College
will continue to be significant and warrant implementation of most of the service improvements identified by the U-Pass program. For September 2019, Conestoga College is projecting an increase of over 1,000 full-time students for an enrollment total of 16,575. International students, whom primarily choose public transit as their mode of travel, are expected to increase by 1,600 to 7,800, or 47% of all students. Given the projected enrollment increase and higher proportion of international students, it is expected the Conestoga College semester pass sales will increase by 1,500 to a total of 7,176 in September 2019.

Staff have fine-tuned the proposed 2019 service plan and are able to reduce the original request for an additional 15,225 service hours by 2,000 hours in the off-peak.

A series of public consultation centres (PCCs) were held in November 2018 to gather preliminary feedback from the public on the proposed service changes. A second round of public information centres (PICs) were held March and April 2019. Staff have reviewed the feedback and refined the service plan based on public input provided from both series of public consultations.

The service improvements would be implemented in September 2019 by introducing the new 206 Coronation iXpress route and redesigned local routes.

Report:

The 2019 service improvements reflect three key initiatives in GRT’s New Directions Ridership Growth Strategy within the GRT Business Plan 2017-2021:

- Completion of the iXpress network with limited-stop express service
- Restructuring routes towards a grid network
- Frequent service on high ridership routes

The plan concentrates most of the 2019 service improvements in the Cambridge service area. Additionally, significant ridership increases in the Doon South area of Kitchener have prompted additional service improvements in anticipation of further ridership increases associated with growing Conestoga College enrollment.

Feedback from Public Information Centres

As outlined in the previous report (TES-TRS-19-06), a series of public information centres (PIC’s) were held in March and April 2019. Three sessions were held in Cambridge and one session was held in the Doon South area. Staff also held informal Q&A sessions at Ainslie Terminal and Cambridge Centre Station. Feedback was received by transit staff at the meetings as well as through an online form. One hundred and twelve people signed in at the PIC’s and one hundred and twenty-three comment forms were received. Based on feedback, staff have considered a number of adjustments to the proposals to reflect concerns and further refinements to the service
design. The feedback has been summarized including staff responses and shown in Appendix C.

**Preferred 2019 Transit Network**

Service changes in 2019 would focus on extending the iXpress network with the introduction of the 206 Coronation iXpress. Local routes in west Galt, Preston, Lovell Industrial Park and the Cambridge Business Park would be restructured to connect to the new iXpress route, provide more of a grid network, reduce duplication, increase hours of operation and serve new growth areas in south-east Galt. Additional service to Conestoga College Doon and Cambridge campuses would be provided to accommodate increasing transit demand.

The proposed route changes and service level improvements are outlined in Table 1 below and are illustrated in Appendix A and B.

Table 1: Proposed Service Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Key Service Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 Strasburg-Belmont</td>
<td>15-minute peak service would be provided for the full length of the route, including the section between Ottawa Street and Conestoga College Station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Elmira</td>
<td>Service improvements on the existing route. New 30-min frequency on weekdays and Saturday. Extended service on Saturday evenings until 7:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Thomas Slee</td>
<td>New route would travel between Conestoga College Station and the Robert Ferrie/South Creek roundabout, via New Dundee Road and Thomas Slee Drive. Service would be provided by conventional buses which provide additional capacity to accommodate the growing ridership demand in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Dundas</td>
<td>New route would travel between new growth areas in south-east Galt (past the South Cambridge Shopping Centre) to Cambridge Centre Station via Dundas Street and Coronation Boulevard. The route would serve Cambridge Memorial Hospital and provide customers a direct ride to Cambridge Centre Mall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Coronation</td>
<td>Current local service between Fairway Station and Ainslie Terminal would be replaced by the new 206 iXpress Coronation. Local service on Preston Parkway would be replaced by Route 61 Fountain. Local service on Fountain Street and Cherry Blossom Road would be replaced by Route 67 Eagle-Pinebush.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Key Service Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 St. Andrews</td>
<td>Combined with Route 62 Woodside to become a two-way loop, providing direct service from Ainslie Terminal to neighborhoods throughout west Galt. Renamed 55 Grand Ridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 Blair</td>
<td>Combined with Route 111 College Express to provide all-day, direct service between Ainslie Terminal to Conestoga College Cambridge Campus and Doon Campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 Fountain</td>
<td>Revised to travel on Preston Parkway and replace current service provided by Route 52. Additional peak trips to and from Conestoga College Doon and Cambridge campuses would operate during Fall, Winter and Spring service periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 Woodside</td>
<td>Combined with Route 55 St Andrews to become a two-way loop, providing direct service from Ainslie Terminal to neighborhoods throughout west Galt. Renamed 55 Grand Ridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 Lovell Industrial</td>
<td>Extended to Sportsworld Station by travelling via Eagle Street, King Street, Fountain Street and Cherry Blossom Road. The route would provide Preston more connections to Cambridge Business Park and Lovell Industrial Park. Renamed 67 Eagle-Pinebush.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 Cherry Blossom</td>
<td>Revised to operate as a flex transit service that would provide direct connections between Sportsworld Station and major employers in Cambridge Business Park (i.e. Toyota, Loblaws). The route would also provide new transit service to Boxwood Business Campus. Renamed 72 Boxwood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 Doon South BusPLUS</td>
<td>Revisited to travel between Conestoga College Station and Pioneer Plaza via Doon South Drive, Doon Mills Drive, and Old Carriage Drive. Current service on Thomas Slee Drive and Robert Ferrie Drive would be replaced by Route 36 Thomas Slee. Renamed 76 Doon Mills BusPLUS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 College Express</td>
<td>Combined with Route 57 Blair to provide all-day, direct service between Ainslie Terminal to Conestoga College Cambridge Campus and Doon Campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 iXpress – Fischer-Hallman</td>
<td>Additional trips from Block Line Station to Conestoga College Station would be provided during the morning peak period. In addition, 10-minute peak service would start ½ hour earlier at 2:00PM during weekdays.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Route** | **Key Service Changes**
---|---
203 iXpress – Maple Grove | New midday service and new spring service to Conestoga College would be provided.

206 iXpress – Coronation | New iXpress route would provide a frequent and direct connection between west Galt, downtown Galt, Cambridge Memorial Hospital, Preston, Sportsworld Station and Fairway ION Station. The route would also provide a direct non-transfer ride to ION light rail for some of the densely developed, transit-supportive areas of Cambridge.

Other | Supplementary service would be provided to routes serving Conestoga College Waterloo Campus to accommodate the increasing transit demand starting in the fall 2019 school term.

### Conestoga College U-Pass Update and Service Impact

In a directive issued to Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, The Ministry of Training Colleges and Universities informed Conestoga College that no compulsory ancillary fee may be charged to support a student transit pass that did not have a fully executed agreement in place before January 17, 2019. The result of this directive is that the planned U-Pass agreement with Conestoga College, as approved by College Students via referendum in Spring 2018 and by Regional Council during 2019 Regional budget deliberations, will not be able to go forward.

Nevertheless, Conestoga College student enrollment, projected semester pass sales and ridership will continue to experience growth in 2019. According to Conestoga College staff, student enrollment at the Cambridge, Doon and Waterloo campus for September 2019 is projected to increase by over a 1,000 students and there is a high probability that enrollment will be even higher. Enrollment at the college increased 34% from 2017 to 2019. This, in combination with the changing make-up of the enrollment, is leading to the significant increase in transit use at the college.

For September 2019, international students are again expected to make up a large majority of new student enrollment and will increase their share of total enrollment from 40% in 2018 to 47% in 2019. International students predominantly choose public transit to travel in the community. It is expected that increased student enrollment combined with a higher proportion of international students will generate an additional 1,500 semester passes in September 2019.

The additional fifteen hundred daily riders will be distributed among the routes serving Conestoga College requiring most of the service improvements originally identified for the U-Pass program.
The Budget Issue Paper for the Conestoga College U-Pass proposed a number of service improvements. Staff have now developed the proposed 2019 service plan in greater detail and suggest that the original request for an additional 15,225 service can be reduced by 2,000 hours in the off-peak. Peak period service improvements and the related expansion buses, will continue to be warranted based on projected ridership increases which are concentrated in the peak period.

**Transit Priority/Queue Jump Lanes**

The proposed 206 iXpress - Coronation and 61 Fountain will benefit from three queue-jump lanes as shown in Appendix D located on northbound King Street West at Fountain Street North (transit only lane), southbound Shantz Hill Road at Fountain Street South (transit only lane) and southbound King Street East at Eagle Street South (combined with a right turn lane). Buses will be able to by-pass traffic delays and maintain a more reliable schedule. Signage and white-bar signals (bus only signals) are already in place and ready to be activated.

**Future GRT Business Plan Service Improvements (2020 - 2021)**

For 2020 and 2021, the business plan identified new service improvements for other areas of Cambridge, including East Galt, Shades Mills, Northview, L.G. Lovell Industrial Park and Preston. Highlights include:

- Extension of ION Bus to South Cambridge Shopping Centre to connect East Galt directly to Hespeler Road. The extended route would provide a direct connection to ION light rail at Fairway Station.
- Expanded evening and weekend service to local routes.
- Streamlining local routes to connect to ION Bus stations and to provide more direct service.
- Additional services to new growth areas and Townships.

**Next Steps**

Based on the approved 2019 Regional budget, the route restructuring and the majority of the new service would occur on September 2, 2019. Implementing the service changes would also require adjustments to bus stop locations and bus stop markers, final scheduling of routes and bus operator shifts, hiring of additional bus operators and ensuring sufficient number of buses are available.

As part of ongoing service and operating performance monitoring, the new service improvements would be monitored on a regular basis, and if warranted, staff would recommend service adjustments at a later date.

Marketing to promote awareness of the new service improvements would include:
• Posters on buses, at transit terminals and other key locations;
• Ads in local newspapers;
• Ads on local radio stations;
• Alerts to media;
• Notices on the GRT website;
• Announcements via various social media, including Rider e-alerts, Twitter and Facebook.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

The 2019 network changes would support the implementation of Council’s Strategic Focus Area Objective 2.1: Create a public transportation network that is integrated, accessible, affordable and sustainable.

**Financial Implications:**

The approved 2019 Transit Services operating budget includes a taxy levy contribution of $1,907,000 (net of anticipated ridership revenue) to provide for the launch of an additional 35,000 annual service hours in support of the GRT Business Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRT Business Plan</strong></td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>$1,907,000</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$2,852,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The approved 2019 Transit Services operating budget also includes a net tax levy contribution of $619,000 to provide an additional 15,225 hours as part of the originally proposed Conestoga College U-Pass Program, as set out in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>U-Pass Budget Issue Paper</strong></th>
<th>Service Hours</th>
<th>2019 Budget</th>
<th>2020 Annualization</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td>$668,000</td>
<td>$824,000</td>
<td>$1,492,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td>49,000</td>
<td>558,000</td>
<td>607,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total $ Levy Impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,225</td>
<td>619,000</td>
<td>266,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the absence of the proposed service expansion for the College, staff estimates that fare revenue from the Conestoga College Term Pass will exceed budget by $527,000 in
2019. As outlined in this report, ridership will continue to grow requiring most of the identified service improvements with the exception of 2,000 off-peak service hours. Based on projected semester pass sale increases due to planned enrollment increases, the increasing proportion of international students, and the reduction of 2,000 off-peak service hours the net funding required is now estimated to be $229,400 annually. The net funding required does not include incremental revenue that will be realized in the absence of the proposed service expansion, as set out in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Service Expansion</th>
<th>Service Hours</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020 Annualization</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td>$597,100</td>
<td>$714,400</td>
<td>$1,311,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td>441,500</td>
<td>640,600</td>
<td>1,082,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total $ Levy Impact</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,225</strong></td>
<td><strong>$155,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>$73,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>$229,400</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The approved 2019 Transit Services capital program includes $3,780,000 for conventional vehicle additions to serve the Conestoga College area, and $3,000,000 for the Conestoga College Terminal, to be funded from the Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program (73%, $4,949,000), from Property Tax Supported Debentures (17%, $1,153,000) and from the RDC Reserve Fund (10%, $678,000).

**Implications of Not Approving:**

Not increasing service to Conestoga College would have negative customer service impacts. The anticipated additional transit use resulting from increased enrollment and a greater proportion of students relying on transit for travel would result in increases in overcrowded buses and waiting passengers not being able to board. Responding to complaints of by-passed customers with unplanned service corrections will result in unbudgeted costs at premium rates and ultimately have a negative impact on ridership and revenues in the longer term.

Further, the proposed service expansion plan for Conestoga College was developed in concert with the proposed Cambridge expansion plan to support the redesigned route structure and improved service levels in Cambridge. Without the College expansion, the proposed Route 57 that connects Galt to Conestoga College via Blair Road would have to be shortened and could not serve the College. Hours and frequency of service during evenings and weekends on the redesigned Cambridge routes would be reduced.

The Route 76 flex service is funded via the Regional Transit Supportive Strategy – Cambridge as described in Report No. PDL-CPL-1919/ TES-TRS-19-09, dated April 30, 2019. The budget is $70,000 in 2019, $180,000 in 2020 and $186,000 in 2021.
Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Finance staff were involved in reviewing the budget allocations for the service.

Attachments

Appendix A: Map of Preferred 2019 Transit Improvements
Appendix B: Map of Preferred Route 76 Doon South Improvements
Appendix C: Summary of Feedback from Public Consultation Centres
Appendix D: Transit Priority along King Street / Shantz Hill Road Corridor

Prepared By: Howard (Shen-Hao) Chang, Principal Planner, Transit Development

Blair Allen, Supervisor, Transit Development

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Appendix A: Map of Preferred 2019 Transit Improvements

Routes with Proposed Changes

- 28 Xpress - Maple Grove
- 26 Xpress - Coronation
- 16 Strasburg-Belmont
- 21 Elmira
- 30 Thomas Slee
- 52 Dundas
- 51 Grand Ridge
- 71 Blair
- 61 Fountain
- 50 Eagle-Pinebus
- 72 Boxwood
- 76 Doon Mills busPLUS
Appendix B: Map of Preferred Route 76 Doon South Improvements
Appendix C: Summary of Feedback from Public Information Consultation Centres

Overall level of support for the Preferred 2019 Transit Service Improvement Plan

Respondents were generally favourable of the service improvement plan with only 22%, or twenty seven of one hundred and twenty three comments showing any lack of support for the preferred transit improvement plan. Most commonly received comments and staff responses are listed below:

**West Galt**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss of service on Tait Street, Fourth Avenue and Stanley Street</td>
<td>Staff have reviewed planned stops in the area and recommends adding a 206 iXpress stop at St Andrews/Stanley. As a result, the majority of residents along these streets would be within a 5-minute walk from the redesigned Route 55 along Glenmorris Street or Route 206 along St Andrews Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns with traffic and stop placement on Glenmorris Street / West River Road</td>
<td>Staff have reviewed routing options in the area and have concluded that buses traveling two-way on Glenmorris Street is the most preferred option for bus operations. Concrete landing pads would be constructed at two stops on the east side of Glenmorris Street to provide a comfortable passenger waiting environment and to accommodate for wheelchair boarding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns with traffic and stop placement on Grand Ridge Drive</td>
<td>Staff have planned stops on Grand Ridge Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>placement on Grand Ridge Drive</td>
<td>at street intersections and at the side of residential parcels where possible. Traffic would not be a significant issue since Grand Ridge Drive serves a predominantly residential area. Furthermore, buses would travel every 30 minutes in each direction throughout the day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of direct service from residential areas in west Galt to Westgate Centre</td>
<td>Route 206 iXpress would provide direct and frequent service between most residential areas in west Galt to Westgate Centre. To further increase service access to the iXpress route and to Westgate Centre, staff recommend adding new stops at Cedar/Glenmorris, Cedar/Southgate, and St Andrews/Stanley. In addition, current ridership data show that the majority of riders in west Galt are travelling to Ainslie Terminal instead of Westgate Centre. Therefore, Route 55 was redesigned to provide direct, two-way service to Ainslie Terminal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cambridge Business Park**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concerns with early morning service span</td>
<td>Staff would ensure new routes would have matching or similar span of service and schedules as today. In addition, schedules for the Route 72 Flex Boxwood would be developed in coordination with major employers to accommodate important shift times where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend Route 72 to Compass Trail (Hunt Club subdivision)</td>
<td>A new 203 iXpress stop will be constructed at the intersection of Maple Grove Road and Compass Trail for Summer 2019. Service inside the Hunt Club subdivision will be developed as the neighbourhood expands, and will be presented as part of future service plans for Cambridge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preston**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss of direct service from Preston Parkway to Kitchener and downtown Galt</td>
<td>Direct service to Kitchener and downtown Galt would be provided by Route 206 iXpress, with a stop at Shantz Hill Road and Preston Parkway. Buses would be available every 15 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit service on Preston Parkway would be retained by a revised Route 61 Fountain. This route would provide customers access to new destinations including Conestoga College, and Cambridge Centre, where route connections to other areas of Cambridge are available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street East (Kitchener) / Sportsworld area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for a 206 iXpress stop at 3227 King St E</td>
<td>Staff reviewed the stop activity and service coverage at these existing Route 52 stop, and has determined that an additional 206 iXpress stop would be appropriate while continuing to maintain acceptable average stop spacing for an iXpress route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for a 206 iXpress stop at Gateway Park/Sportsworld</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for earlier and later service on Route 206 iXpress, especially on weekends</td>
<td>In the draft schedule, Route 206 iXpress would begin service as early as 5:45am, and ends service in midnight. Hours of service during weekends would be consistent with GRT’s other iXpress routes. Additional early morning or late evening trips may be added depending on public feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Doon South

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss of one-seat ride between Robert Ferrie Dr / Thomas Slee Dr and Pioneer Park Plaza</td>
<td>The new Route 36 is designed to provide additional capacity by using conventional buses, reducing overcrowding at stops along Thomas Slee Drive and Robert Ferrie Drive. The revised Route 76 would also have a faster travel time to Conestoga College. These changes together would benefit 71% of existing Route 76 riders, who are travelling to/from Conestoga College. Staff analyzed current ridership data and observed the majority of passengers at Pioneer Park Plaza transferred to another bus to/from Fairway Station or Forest Glen. Under the preferred plan, these transfers can still be made at the new Conestoga College Station, which would have faster and more frequent services as well as improved passenger amenities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for evening and weekend service</td>
<td>As part of GRT’s 2017-2021 Business Plan, the revised Route 16 would address customer requests in the Doon South area regarding span of service, and weekend service. The route would be extended to connect Strasburg Road and Thomas Slee Drive via Robert Ferrie Drive. This route would operate 7 days a week with 15-minute peak service and evening service. The route extension is subject to the opening of Strasburg Road extension, as well as funding and Regional Council approval as part of future annual transit service plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for 15-minute peak service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for route extension via Robert Ferrie Rd / Strasburg Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Positive Feedback by Route

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Name</th>
<th>Number of Comments Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route 206 iXpress – Coronation</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 50 Dundas</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 55 Grand Ridge</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 57 Blair</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 61 Fountain</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 67 Eagle-Pinebush / Route 72 Boxwood</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 36 Thomas Slee / Route 76 Doon Mills</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Transit Services

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

Date: May 28, 2019       File Code: D28-60(A)

Subject: Recommended Grand River Transit 2019 Fare Structure

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve the following fare structure changes as described in Report No. TES-TRS-19-11, dated May 28, 2019:

a) Implement the Grand River Transit (GRT) fare structure as detailed in Table 1, in accordance with Regional Council’s approved 2019 budget, effective September 1, 2019;

b) Amend the Region’s Fees and Charges By-law No. 19-016 (Schedule E), to include the 2019 GRT fares described in this report.

Summary:

The approved 2019 Regional Budget includes a 3% increase to GRT fares. With the budget approval, Council directed that staff report back to Committee prior to September 1, 2019 with a proposed fare structure taking into account the outcome of the Low Income Pilot Project (Transit Affordability Study).

Fare increases help the transit system keep pace with increased costs, and help to balance the municipal contribution to operating costs with the fare revenue contribution. As well, fare increases sustain ongoing service improvements. Service improvements planned for Fall 2019 include introduction of a new iXpress route in Cambridge, realigned local routes to improve integration with the iXpress network, improved access and capacity to Conestoga College in response to growth, and improved service to employment areas. These are described in more detail in report TES-TRS-19-10.
Table 1 outlines the proposed fare structure that would take effect on September 1, 2019.

Various programs exist to assist residents who may not have the means to pay the full transit fare. For example, the Transit for Reduced Income Program (TRIP) provides a subsidy for those who live on a reduced income, while the Transit Affordability Pass Program (TAPP) provides free transit passes to Ontario Works participants who are upgrading their education to Grade 12 level or equivalent. These programs continue to be offered, and the monthly pass subsidy for TRIP is proposed to increase from $43 to $47 in 2019 to fully offset the fare change in advance of a new program being implemented in 2020 based on the recommendations of the affordability study.

Report:

The approved 2019 Regional Budget includes a 3% increase to GRT fares effective September 1, 2019, consistent with the 2017-2021 GRT Business Plan. The Plan envisions annual fare increases as one tool to offset increasing operating costs associated with increasing service. Staff is recommending approval of the fare structure in Table 1 below.

GRT has now introduced the EasyGO electronic fare management system (EFMS), and roughly 71% of trips made in March used the new system. With this system, all fare payments except cash on buses will be made via an electronically-encoded card (plastic or paper). It should be noted that fares previously paid via paper tickets are now called “stored value” products.

The recommended fare change results in fare levels that are in line with comparable transit systems, as illustrated in Attachment 1. Cash fares, adult passes and adult stored value fares would be below the median for the province. Passes prices are in line with prices across the country outside of the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area (GTHA). The frequent rider would continue to be rewarded with discounted passes and tickets compared to the cash fare, which encourages continued ridership growth.

The GRT Business Plan recommended annual fare increases averaging 2% to off-set inflation costs and sustain annual transit service improvements. The last fare increase was in July 2017, with an average increase of 2%. The proposed September 2019 fare increase averages 3% following a year with no increase.

Table 1: Recommended September 1, 2019 GRT Fares

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fare Type</th>
<th>Current Fares</th>
<th>% Riders (2018)</th>
<th>2019 Fares (Recommended)</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Fare</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Ride Fare†</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare Type</td>
<td>Current Fares</td>
<td>% Riders (2018)</td>
<td>2019 Fares (Recommended)</td>
<td>% change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Monthly Pass</td>
<td>$86.00</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Monthly Pass (^2)</td>
<td>$73.00</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stored Value Payment (Adult)</td>
<td>$2.76</td>
<td>14.6% (^3)</td>
<td>$2.86</td>
<td>3.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stored Value Payment (Reduced)(^2)</td>
<td>$2.40</td>
<td>14.6% (^3)</td>
<td>$2.49</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TravelWise Corporate Pass</td>
<td>$73.10</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>$76.50</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Pass (per 4-month term)</td>
<td>$292.00</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Summer Pass (July &amp; August)</td>
<td>$123.00</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>$126.00</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day/Family Pass</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>$8.50</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIP Pass</td>
<td>$43.00</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>$43.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-Pass(^4)</td>
<td>$93.91</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>$98.60</td>
<td>4.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EasyGO Fare Card(^5)</td>
<td>Free(^5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Fare Increase: 3%

Notes:

- Children under five ride free with a paying customer.
- Percent of riders column does not include high school passes, free rides (including the TAPP Pass), GO Co-Fare, and adults riding at the student rate.
  1. Special fare type only available at ION platform fare vending machines.
  2. Reduced fares are available to seniors, elementary and high school students.
3. Stored value data is not yet separated as EFMS implemented; stored value products replace tickets.
4. U-Pass fare prices are set by an existing contract approved by Regional Council in September 2015.
5. The EasyGO fare card is currently being distributed at no cost as a limited-time promotion. When purchased at fare vending machines on ION station platforms, riders will be charged $5. The $5 charge covers the cost of producing the card.

**U-Pass Programs and Conestoga College**

The current rate in the existing universal bus pass (U-Pass) agreements covering the undergraduate and graduate student associations at Wilfrid Laurier University, the University of Waterloo, and Renison University College are set by an existing contract approved by Regional Council in September 2015. For 2019, the rate increase is 4.99%.

During the 2019 budget process, Regional Council approved the 2019 Conestoga College U-Pass Budget Issue Paper. A U-Pass program was planned to begin in September 2019.

As discussed in Administration and Finance Committee Report COR-FSD-19-23, the Province has recently provided clarification with respect to U-Passes related to the 2019 Provincial Budget. Institutions may not charge compulsory fees for transit agreements that were planned or under negotiation as of January 17, 2019. This includes planned transit pass agreements that have passed referenda.

Conestoga College did not have a fully executed agreement with GRT prior to January 17, 2019, so the U-Pass would have to be listed as an opt-out fee. This leaves the Region without a U-Pass program for Conestoga College. College students would only be eligible for the current student pass discount. This pass is included in Table 1, above.

A report with further details on the implications of this policy clarification will be submitted to the Planning & Works Committee on May 28, 2019 (TES-TRS-19-10).

**Transit Fare Affordability Programs**

Various programs exist to assist residents who may not have the means to pay the full transit fare. The Transit for Reduced Income Program (TRIP) provides a subsidy for those who live on a reduced income (below the Low Income Cut-Off), while the Transit Affordability Pass Program (TAPP) provides free transit passes to Ontario Works participants who are upgrading their education to Grade 12 level or equivalent.

In October 2017, the Region launched a Transit Affordability Study to look at how affordable access to public transit makes a difference in people’s lives. The study will inform a revised transit affordability fare program.

Staff are in the process of transitioning all transit study participants to the new EasyGO fare card when they go to the terminals to purchase their products. Transit study products will
continue to be offered until the end of December 2019. Current TRIP customers who are not participating in the study are also being transitioned to the new EasyGO fare card.

It is estimated that the full proposed 2019 fare increase could be absorbed within the exiting TRIP program budget for current TRIP users and study participants who completed the study. This would maintain price stability and affordability for low income residents during this transitory period.

The results of the Transit Affordability Study will be presented to Planning & Works Committee on May 28, 2019 (TES-TRS-19-13/CSC-EIS-19-04). The options and recommendations for a revised Affordable Transit Program are anticipated to be ready for Regional Council consideration prior to September 2019.

**MobilityPLUS Fares**

The Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) required communities to introduce fare parity between conventional and specialized transit services on or before January 1, 2013. On July 1, 2012, the MobilityPLUS fare structure was broadened to include all fare categories available to conventional transit customers. All GRT fares are now available to MobilityPLUS customers, and consequently MobilityPLUS fares would increase at the same 3% average rate as recommended in this report.

**TravelWise Service Fee Structure and Corporate Pass Fare**

The Region’s TravelWise program has experienced significant growth in membership since it was piloted in 2012 with 13 employers. As of April 2019, 43 employers now participate in TravelWise, representing over 30,000 employees.

As part of the EFMS project, the TravelWise Corporate Pass was transitioned to the new EasyGO fare card as a monthly product. Any employee of an organization participating in TravelWise can receive a fare card from GRT that allows them to load and reload a Corporate Pass onto their card. The Corporate Pass rate is set based on the cost of an Adult Monthly Pass, and consequently would increase 4.65% as recommended in this report.

**Review of Fare Structure**

A strategic review of transit fares and policies is underway based on using the EFMS to generate opportunities to increase ridership and offer customers a new range of products to better meet their travelling needs. This work is intended to help clarify the direction the Region may want to take with future fare products, by evaluating existing and future technological capability against internal and external stakeholder needs. When that review is complete, a report will come back to Committee with any recommendations on changes to the fare structure. At that time, an increase to the cash fare will be considered. The cash fare is generally higher than other fare options as it is used by infrequent riders, while various discounts reward the frequent transit user.
Next Steps

If the recommended fare structure is approved, staff would implement changes effective September 1, 2019, and would inform customers through a number of means. These include:

- Ads at fare agent locations;
- A revised fare guide;
- Posters at terminals and on buses;
- Print ads; and
- Electronic notifications on the GRT website, Facebook, Twitter, Rider Alerts and automated messages on the phone system.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

The 2019 transit fare change helps sustain ongoing service improvements and therefore supports the implementation of Regional Council’s Strategic Focus Area 3: Sustainable Transportation – Develop greater, more sustainable and safe transportation choices.

Financial Implications:

The proposed 3% average fare increase, to be implemented September 1, 2019, is expected to increase GRT ridership revenue by $267,000 in 2019. This amount was included in the approved 2019 GRT operating budget. Annually, this proposed fare increase is anticipated to increase GRT ridership revenue by $770,000. This annual revenue impact will be factored into the development of the 2020 GRT operating budget.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Staff from Finance and Transportation and Environmental Services worked together to develop the recommended transit fares.

Attachments:

Attachment 1 – Transit Fare Comparison

Prepared By: Eric Pisani, Principal Planner, Transit Development

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
### Attachment 1 – Transit Fare Comparison

#### 2019 Fares in Comparable Ontario Municipalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Cash Fare</th>
<th>Adult Ticket</th>
<th>Reduced Ticket</th>
<th>Adult Monthly Pass</th>
<th>Reduced Monthly Pass</th>
<th>2017 Average Fare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York Region</td>
<td>$ 4.00</td>
<td>$ 3.75</td>
<td>$ 2.35</td>
<td>$ 150.00</td>
<td>$ 63.00</td>
<td>$ 3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham Region</td>
<td>$ 3.75</td>
<td>$ 3.15</td>
<td>$ 2.10</td>
<td>$ 117.00</td>
<td>$ 46.00</td>
<td>$ 2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>$ 4.00</td>
<td>$ 3.00</td>
<td>$ 1.60</td>
<td>$ 124.00</td>
<td>$ 52.00</td>
<td>$ 2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>$ 3.25</td>
<td>$ 3.00</td>
<td>$ 2.05</td>
<td>$ 146.25</td>
<td>$ 116.75</td>
<td>$ 2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>$ 3.75</td>
<td>$ 3.00</td>
<td>$ 2.00</td>
<td>$ 130.00</td>
<td>$ 61.00</td>
<td>$ 2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>$ 3.25</td>
<td>$ 3.00</td>
<td>$ 2.05</td>
<td>$ 146.25</td>
<td>$ 116.75</td>
<td>$ 1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>$ 3.00</td>
<td>$ 2.40</td>
<td>$ 2.00</td>
<td>$ 105.60</td>
<td>$ 29.50</td>
<td>$ 1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>$ 3.50</td>
<td>$ 3.45</td>
<td>$ 2.60</td>
<td>$ 116.50</td>
<td>$ 44.50</td>
<td>$ 1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudbury</td>
<td>$ 3.40</td>
<td>$ 2.70</td>
<td>$ 2.10</td>
<td>$ 93.00</td>
<td>$ 56.00</td>
<td>$ 1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRT</td>
<td>$ 3.25</td>
<td>$ 2.76</td>
<td>$ 2.40</td>
<td>$ 86.00</td>
<td>$ 73.00</td>
<td>$ 1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thunder Bay</td>
<td>$ 2.75</td>
<td>$ 2.48</td>
<td>$ 2.48</td>
<td>$ 77.00</td>
<td>$ 55.00</td>
<td>$ 1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>$ 2.75</td>
<td>$ 1.90</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 81.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median</strong></td>
<td>$ 3.33</td>
<td>$ 3.00</td>
<td>$ 2.08</td>
<td>$ 116.75</td>
<td>$ 55.50</td>
<td>$ 1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ontario Average</strong></td>
<td>$ 3.29</td>
<td>$ 2.79</td>
<td>$ 2.00</td>
<td>$ 101.71</td>
<td>$ 55.71</td>
<td>$ 2.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Ontario Average includes all municipalities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUT OF PROVINCE</th>
<th>Cash Fare</th>
<th>Adult Ticket</th>
<th>Reduced Ticket</th>
<th>Adult Monthly Pass</th>
<th>Reduced Monthly Pass</th>
<th>2017 Average Fare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>$ 2.50</td>
<td>$ 2.00</td>
<td>$ 1.45</td>
<td>$ 78.00</td>
<td>$ 58.00</td>
<td>$ 1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnipeg</td>
<td>$ 2.95</td>
<td>$ 2.60</td>
<td>$ 1.30</td>
<td>$ 100.10</td>
<td>$ 50.05</td>
<td>$ 1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>$ 2.50</td>
<td>$ 2.25</td>
<td>$ 2.25</td>
<td>$ 85.00</td>
<td>$ 45.05</td>
<td>$ 1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>$ 3.40</td>
<td>$ 3.40</td>
<td>$ 3.40</td>
<td>$ 106.00</td>
<td>$ 11.66</td>
<td>$ 1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec City</td>
<td>$ 3.50</td>
<td>$ 3.05</td>
<td>$ 2.55</td>
<td>$ 88.50</td>
<td>$ 56.15</td>
<td>$ 1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal</td>
<td>$ 3.25</td>
<td>$ 2.80</td>
<td>$ 1.70</td>
<td>$ 85.00</td>
<td>$ 51.00</td>
<td>$ 1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>$ 3.50</td>
<td>$ 2.63</td>
<td>$ 2.30</td>
<td>$ 97.00</td>
<td>$ 15.50</td>
<td>$ 1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laval</td>
<td>$ 3.25</td>
<td>$ 2.88</td>
<td>$ 2.00</td>
<td>$ 95.00</td>
<td>$ 57.00</td>
<td>$ 1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Out of Prov. Median</strong></td>
<td>$ 3.25</td>
<td>$ 2.71</td>
<td>$ 2.13</td>
<td>$ 91.75</td>
<td>$ 50.53</td>
<td>$ 1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Out of Prov. Average</strong></td>
<td>$ 3.11</td>
<td>$ 2.70</td>
<td>$ 2.12</td>
<td>$ 91.83</td>
<td>$ 43.05</td>
<td>$ 1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

- For Adult & Reduced Tickets, the GRT comparable fare is stored value. Tickets are no longer sold since the transition to the EasyGO fare card.
- Average fare data from Canadian Urban Transit Association statistics – 2017 is the most recent year data is available.
Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
Rapid Transit

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

Date: May 28, 2019  File Code: D10-40/TPAS2

Subject: Stage 2 ION: LRT from Kitchener to Cambridge – Project Team Preferred
North Cambridge (Preston Area) Station and Route Refinement

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo endorse the Project Team Preferred Route Refinement as displayed in Attachment 1 as the preferred route for Stage 2 ION: LRT from Kitchener to Cambridge as shown in Report TES-RTS-19-07 dated May 28, 2019; and,

That the Region of Waterloo increase the contract with WSP Canada Group Limited by $796,000 plus applicable taxes for a revised total of $3,626,030 to cover the requested amendments to the project scope and to complete the study.

Summary:

In June 2018, Region of Waterloo Council endorsed a Preferred Route for the Stage 2 ION project, as recommended in Council report TES-RTS-18-06, subject to further evaluation of the portion of the route between Shantz Hill Road and Eagle Street North at William Street.

With most of the Preferred Route confirmed following Regional Council endorsement the Project Team considered further route refinements that consisted of track alignment and station locations within the evaluation area. An additional PCC (4b) was held in March 2019 to gather further public input to the route refinements.

The Project Team has reviewed all of the input received from Public Consultation Centre 4b. Comments received were consistent with past input. Unfortunately with major infrastructure projects there will always be some impacts. There continues to be much positive feedback and excitement related to the project to date. However, even with route refinements in the Preston area, some residents continue to express
concerns, in particular around three main topics: property impacts, traffic (during and after construction) and the need for LRT (in particular in the Preston area).

Following PCC No. 4b, City of Cambridge staff presented a Report 19-117(CD) to their Council. The City of Cambridge staff and Council expressed their support of the station location and route refinements subject to having a future opportunity to consider specific property impacts and cultural heritage impacts prior to finalization of this Environmental Assessment process. As well, the City of Cambridge requested that Regional staff meet with impacted homeowners around the Preston station prior to the next PCC later in 2019.

The Project Team will continue to consider design refinements to mitigate the project’s impacts. Therefore, the Project Team recommends endorsement of the Project Team Preferred Route Refinement as the final preferred route for Stage 2 ION: LRT from Kitchener to Cambridge.

Pending Regional Council endorsement of a preferred station and route refinement, the project team will complete the preliminary design, identify the preliminary property impacts, and complete the business case, all of which will be presented to the public at PCC No. 5 in 2019. After PCC No. 5, the recommended preliminary design and the business case will be presented to Regional Council to conduct the Transit Project Assessment Process. Region staff will prepare and submit Provincial and Federal funding applications.

Report:

1. Background

In June 2011, Region of Waterloo Council approved a staged approach to light rail transit (LRT) from Waterloo to Cambridge. Stage 2 Light Rail Transit (LRT), from Kitchener to Cambridge, alignment/station locations were endorsed by Council as part of the initial work done on Stage 1 Light Rail Transit (LRT). To proceed with Stage 2 LRT, an environmental screening must be completed through the Transit Project Assessment (TPA) Process. The pre-planning activities for the TPA Process are underway. Since 2015 there have been four rounds of public consultation and 12 public consultation centres (PCC).

In June 2018, Region of Waterloo Council endorsed a Preferred Route for the Stage 2 ION project, as recommended in Council report TES-RTS-18-06, subject to further evaluation of the portion of the route between Shantz Hill Road and Eagle Street North at William Street. Refer to Attachment 2 for the Regional Council Endorsed Preferred Route (2018) and to Attachment 3 for the Evaluation Area Map.

2. Stage 2 LRT – Kitchener to Cambridge Study Process and Structure

A technical team is guiding the project with oversight by the established Rapid Transit
Steering Committee which includes Region Chair Karen Redman, and Councillors Tom Galloway, Sean Strickland, Elizabeth Clarke, Geoff Lorentz and Karl Kiefer. The technical team is being assisted by an engineering consultant, WSP, and includes staff from the Region of Waterloo, City of Cambridge, City of Kitchener, Grand River Conservation Authority and the Ministry of Transportation.

To progress with Stage 2 LRT, an Environmental Assessment study must be completed, as was done for Stage 1 LRT. The Stage 2 LRT study is following the Transit Project Assessment (TPA) process, a special, streamlined process for transit projects approved by the Province under the Environmental Assessments Act. The TPA process is part of the provincial approvals required to implement Stage 2 LRT. The process is intended to ensure that any impacts of “provincial significance” are properly managed, and includes opportunities for public involvement and input.

3. Route Refinements

A number of routes were considered and evaluated leading up to PCC 4, including routes that didn’t follow Shantz Hill Road. The previous evaluation processes established that:

- the Preferred Route travels down Shantz Hill Road
- the preferred crossing of Speed River starts at the bottom of Shantz Hill and crosses toward Chopin Drive
- a station located in the “Queenston Block” (north-west corner of King Street and Eagle Street, bounded by King Street, Eagle Street, Queenston Road, and Chopin Drive) is preferred over a station located on Eagle Street North, east of King Street
- the Preferred Route travels along the abandoned Canadian Pacific Rail spur north of Eagle Street, which requires the LRT route to rise up and over the existing Canadian Pacific Rail tracks

Only alternatives between the above-noted Speed River crossing and Canadian Pacific Rail spur were considered as part of the route refinement process. For example, routes along Maple Grove Road were not re-evaluated. Refer to Attachment 3 for the Evaluation Area Map.

With the Preferred Route confirmed following Regional Council endorsement in June 2018, the route refinements consist of track alignment and station locations within the evaluation area (between the Speed River and Eagle Street at the Canadian Pacific Rail tracks).

The route refinements must include a station. While the station platform is 65 m long, it requires a minimum 93 m length of straight track.

Some potential refinements were initially considered, but screened out. For example, an elevated track and station over King Street was screened out because of the significant
additional cost, poor pedestrian access, poor transit integration, the marginal reduction in impacts, and only a minor reduction in traffic impacts.

The evaluated route refinements include:

- a route along Eagle Street with a station either diagonally across the “Queenston block” (A1), or rotated to be parallel to King Street (A2)
- a route on Eagle Street that is either centre-running (down the middle) with a lane of traffic on both sides (B1), or side-running with both vehicular lanes together on the other side (B2)
- a route between the River’s Edge apartment towers and the existing Canadian Pacific Rail tracks, with the station either along the Speed River (C1), or along Chopin Drive (C2).

See Attachment 4 for the route refinements to the Preferred Route that were carried forward for evaluation.

4. Evaluation Process and Results

The method used to evaluate the refinements was comparable to the evaluation of the previous route alternatives. Some of the evaluation criteria did not apply to this process because the evaluation area was relatively small and the differences between the alternatives were not significant enough to distinguish them from each other.

However, for the criteria that were applied even with a conceptual level of design detail some clear differences did emerge.

The project team, which includes specialized technical experts from a variety of fields, used the evaluation criteria as a framework to assess each refinement’s ability to meet project objectives while minimizing its impact, and then compared the route refinements to each other.

The criteria were used together with technical analysis and what we heard from the public, businesses and stakeholders to identify the Project Team Preferred Route Refinement to the Preferred Route.

5. Public Consultation Centre No. 4b

Public Consultation Centre (PCC) No. 4b was held on March 20, 2019 at the Preston Memorial Auditorium in Cambridge from 4 p.m. to 8 p.m. to present an overview of comments from PCC No. 4 related to North Cambridge, the potential refinements to the Preferred Route, the evaluation of the refinements, and the Project Team Preferred Refinement to the Preferred Route.

A notice was sent to residents and property owners within the evaluation area, and the public was notified of PCC No. 4b using emails, letters, on-street advertising, social
media, newspaper advertisements and a media release.

Presentation material included large display boards with maps, project timeline, evaluation results and other information, as well as a take-home Information Package with more detailed information. Region and consultant staff were available to answer questions during the event. The display boards and information package are available on the project website www.stage2ION.ca. Members of the public were encouraged to provide feedback either by speaking with staff at the event, writing on a comment sheet at the event, sending an email to the project team, and/or completing an online survey. A total of 341 people signed in and 148 comments were submitted as of April 3, 2019.

Comments covered a wide range of issues, encompassing both positive feedback and concerns. All written comments received are included in the PCC Summary Report Appendices, currently available at www.stage2ion.ca.

The following summarizes aspects of the Project Team Preferred Refinement to the Preferred Route that respondents support:

- Ease of access to Preston Towne Centre and to Riverside Park
- Preston is serviced with station
- Station is easily accessible on foot
- Improved geometry with reduces track noise
- Redevelopment potential in the Queenston block
- Station is close to the library
- Minimal disruption to traffic on Shantz Hill
- Less impact on some existing road traffic
- Avoids King and Fountain
- Reduced impacts to walking trail compared to 2017 route
- LRT provides transportation choice and an alternative to automotive travel, especially given the congestion that will continue
- Affects fewer people
- Keeps the trains off the King Street bridge
- Good redevelopment opportunities around the station; will spur investment in Preston and revitalize the community
- Station has good access for pedestrians and cyclists

The following summarizes aspects of the Project Team Preferred Refinement to the Preferred Route that concern respondents:

- Traffic and congestion, especially at King & Eagle, during construction and after
- Traffic from 401 overflow, emergencies etc.
- Does not service Hespeler
- Don’t need train service in Cambridge; buses are fine; project isn’t needed; don’t
extend LRT to Cambridge

- Questions about the choice of technology
- Use taxpayer money for the something else (hospital, sports complex), waste of taxpayer money
- Impacts to views and scenery
- Does not service Conestoga College
- Impacts to heritage buildings. Should protect them or avoid them altogether.
- Impacts to the established neighbourhood
- Don’t put the route through Preston; route should go somewhere else; take Maple Grove and Speedsville; down King through Preston; should serve new subdivisions and industrial areas; should put route along existing railways
- Expected that the process included looking at all of the alternatives again
- Impacts to businesses
- Should have more stations in Preston
- Impacts to properties, cost of property acquisition
- Not close enough to downtown Preston
- Environmental impacts to wildlife
- Houses being torn down and demolished
- Won’t be enough ridership that will support the system
- Process – expected alternatives to Shantz Hill to be looked at, the refinement hasn’t changed anything, it’s the same as PCC 4
- Won’t have economic benefit
- Preston residents commute to Toronto and so won’t use the LRT
- Route should not come through Preston
- Provide public washrooms
- Include pedestrian bridge as part of Speed River crossing
- Add a station at Speedsville Rd
- That the process will stall; desire to see progress towards implementation

6. City of Cambridge Response

On May 21, 2019 City of Cambridge Council endorsed the following recommendation:

“THAT Council support the Project Team Preferred Refinement to the Preferred Route as identified in Report 19-117(CD) subject to having a future opportunity to consider specific property impacts and cultural heritage impacts prior to finalization of this Environmental Assessment process;

AND FURTHER THAT Council request Regional Council to direct Regional Staff to meet with City staff and the property owners within the future station block bounded by King Street, Eagle Street, Queenston Road and Chopin Drive to discuss future potential property impacts following endorsement of the North
Cambridge (Preston) Route and prior to Public Consultation Centre 5.”

As part of the preliminary design impacts to property impacts and impacts to cultural heritage features will be identified, then presented to the public at Public Consultation Centre No. 5.

The project team will arrange a meeting with City staff and property owners within the “Queenston block” noted above to discuss the identified property impacts. This meeting will occur after completion of the preliminary design and identification of preliminary property impacts but prior to PCC No. 5.

7. Key Concerns and Responses

Many of the issues raised in the responses at PCC No. 4b are consistent with the feedback that has been submitted during previous Public Consultation Centres. The following section highlights the most frequently raised issues and concerns about the Preston area, and summarizes how these have been addressed and/or future action to be taken by the project team.

**Property Impacts:** Loss of homes, businesses and impact on heritage properties and to community character continue to be major concerns among residents in the Preston area. Residents are concerned that details on specific property impacts will not be available until the later in the study, and that these details were not part of the route evaluation process. Residents were also concerned about how impacted property owners will be compensated for property acquisition and/or construction impacts. Some residents expressed concern regarding potential impacts to the value of their property as a result of proximity to the LRT corridor.

**Project Team Response:** As with previous evaluations, the potential for property impacts was a key criterion in the evaluation of the refinement options.

Property impacts were assessed using a conceptual level of design, which is enough to evaluate and compare the various route refinements. To be confident of the estimated impacts to an individual property the project team must complete the preliminary design. It would be premature to display individual property impacts prior to completing the preliminary design, potentially resulting in undue concern and unnecessary stress for residents and property owners.

For those properties that will be impacted, the Region has a process to identify those impacts, notify property owners, negotiate partial or full acquisition, and compensate property owners. The Region strives to reach an agreement that is fair and equitable for both the property owner and the Region. The vast majority of the Region’s property acquisitions are negotiated and are not completed by expropriation. Property acquisition uses fair market value at the time of acquisition as a basis for compensation, and
negotiated agreements include compensation for other impacts, such as grading onto retained property. The PCC No. 4b information package includes further description of the Region’s process for identifying property impacts and acquiring property.

With regard to potential impacts on property values for lands not directly impacted by the project, there is a wide variety of factors that can affect property value. Experience in other jurisdictions has indicated that proximity to a rapid transit station can have a positive effect on land value, particularly in areas experiencing traffic congestion and where new development is occurring.

**Traffic Impacts (during and after construction):** Many comments were received that expressed concern that the introduction of LRT through the intersection of King Street and Eagle Street would make an already congested intersection worse, reduce access for vehicles and increase delays. Construction of the project would disrupt and delay traffic, negatively affecting businesses in the area.

**Project Team Response:** The project team is aware that the King Street and Eagle Street intersection and surrounding roads currently experience congestion and significant queues during peak hours. While the traffic signals will need to be adjusted, the timing will be coordinated with approaching trains so that they will pass through the intersection at the same time as other compatible movements that don’t cross the tracks. This will have some impact to overall vehicle capacity, but it increases total people capacity when including riders on the trains.

During construction automobile and pedestrian access to residences and businesses will be maintained. However, the nature of construction will require some temporary closures, detours, and temporary service interruptions, and travelled routes may not be as direct. The Region is committed to providing ample notice to residents, businesses, and travellers of construction activities and to posting signage at the project limits as to local access to businesses.

**Need for LRT in the Preston Area:** A number of comments noted that Preston does not need a station or that the route should go around Preston (e.g. north side of the Speed River to Hespeler Road), or that the station should instead be located elsewhere (e.g. on Eagle Street closer to Speedsville Road).

**Project Team Response:** An LRT station located at King Street and Eagle Street is very important to achieving the goals of the project because it will have strong opening-day transit ridership, it will benefit from the kind of mixed-use, transit-supportive, higher-density redevelopment in the Preston Towne Centre that supports the Region’s target densities, it has good local transit connections, and it has good pedestrian and cyclist connectivity. This location also provides a strategic transfer point for future express buses travelling up and down King Street through Preston.
In the Regional Official Plan, Major Transit Station Areas (lands within 600-800 metres of an ION stop) are to be planned to support rapid transit with increased densities and a mix of land uses such as residential, office, institutional and retail (ROP policy 2.D.6). The proposed ION station at King Street and Eagle Street (and the surrounding lands), are identified in the Cambridge Official Plan as part of the Preston Towne Centre, Community Core Area as well as a Regeneration Area.

The Preston Towne Centre is one of the historic business centres of Cambridge, which is planned to maintain its historical role as a community focal point with a concentration of diverse land uses and density (COP policies 2.6.3.2 and 2.6.3.2). It currently has a range of housing types including high-rise and mid-rise apartments, townhouses and single detached houses, as well as a wide variety of land uses such as specialized commercial uses, offices, and community facilities. As a Community Core Area, the City's objective is to encourage higher residential densities and mix of land uses in the Preston Towne Centre, promoting infrastructure renewal, enhanced transportation opportunities for pedestrians, cyclists, and transit users, as well as transit-supportive development such as sensitive infill, intensification and mixed-use buildings (COP policies 2.2.g and 2.6.3.2).

To encourage intensification within walking distance of the Preston Towne Centre, the Cambridge Official Plan has identified a Regeneration Area which is planned to transition from one use such as industrial, to another use such as commercial and multi-unit residential by 2031. Regeneration Areas are planned to transition to a higher-density, transit-supportive uses.

To help achieve the goals of the Preston Towne Centre Community Core Area and Regeneration Area, the proposed Major Transit Station Area will be subject to further studies. However, the existing land uses and planning framework make it an ideal location for a rapid transit station.

8. Recommendation

Many comments were received about the route refinements, but none of the comments offered new information. It is recognized that as with most major infrastructure projects there will be impacts and the Project Team will continue to consider mitigation to identified impacts during preliminary design. Therefore, the Project Team recommends endorsement of the Project Team Preferred North Cambridge (Preston Area) Station and Route Refinement as the final preferred route for Stage 2 ION: LRT from Kitchener to Cambridge.

Without Council endorsement some Regional projects will be delayed, the public will not have the property impact information they are demanding and some developments will be deemed premature impacting economic development.

Pending Council endorsement of the Preferred Refinement, the next steps in the project are to:

- Complete the preliminary design and the identification of the associated property requirements
- Prepare the preliminary business case for the project and identify a preferred site for the maintenance and storage facility
- Host PCC No. 5 to present the preliminary design and property requirements (fall 2019)
- Present recommended route (including the preliminary business case) to Regional Council for final authority to initiate the formal Transit Project Assessment Process (Late 2019)
- Address any comments submitted during public consultation or Minister of Environment, Conservation and Parks’ review periods
- File the Environmental Project Report for public review and complete the Transit Project Assessment Process (2020)
- Submit Provincial and Federal funding applications (2020)

Corporate Strategic Plan:

Stage 2 ION: LRT Kitchener to Cambridge supports the Council Strategic Area:

Sustainable Transportation: 2.1 Create a public transportation network that is integrated, accessible, affordable and sustainable.

Corporate Strategic Action 2.1.3 Complete the Environmental Assessment for ION Stage 2 and pursue funding from the Federal and Provincial governments.

Financial Implications:

The Region’s Approved 2019-2028 Rapid Transit Capital Program includes a budget of $1,430,000 in 2019 to undertake the Stage 2 ION Light Rail Transit TPA Process study, to be funded from the RTMP Reserve fund (75%, $1,072,500) and from the Transit Development Charge Reserve Fund (25%, $357,500). Regional Staff estimates that this budget is sufficient to fund the recommended contract increase.

The Region of Waterloo will require an increase to the WSP Canada Group Limited contract by $796,000.00 plus applicable taxes for a revised total of $3,626,030.00 to cover the amended project scope which results from the changes to the preferred route in Kitchener, Preston and Downtown Cambridge, including:

- Updates to existing conditions work and reports that were previously completed, including natural environmental studies, traffic analysis, hydraulic modelling,
noise and air quality baseline studies, and cultural heritage studies

- Topographic surveys of new sections of the alignment
- Preliminary design, impact assessment and mitigation resulting from significant changes in the alignment and station locations, including at both watercourse crossings (Grand River and Speed River) and crossings of CN and CP railways
- Development of alternatives, consultation with GRT and the City, and preliminary design of a new bus station in Downtown Cambridge, to replace the Ainslie Street Bus Terminal
- Updates to the site selection study for the Maintenance and Storage Facility

The study has also involved additional engagement with technical agencies and the public to address the changes in the alignment and project elements, including preparing material, analyzing results and attending meetings/events.

Also, for future information, the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) have increased their requirements for the timing of specific studies. The MTCS will be requiring more detailed studies as part of the TPA Process that were not included in the original scope of this study, as in the past they wouldn’t be required until a later stage. As the preliminary design continues and resources are identified, assessments like Cultural Heritage Evaluation Reports along with potentially a Heritage Impact Assessment Report will need to be completed sooner than later. This will require about $100,000 to $150,000 additional in budget, but the final amount is unknown until more design is complete.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Regional staff from Planning, Development and Legislative Services, Transportation and Environmental Services (Transportation and Design and Construction) have been consulted along with staff from the Cities of Cambridge and Kitchener, Grand River Conservation Authority and the Ministry of Transportation.

Attachments

Attachment 1: Project Team Preferred Refinement to the Preferred Route
Attachment 2: Regional Council Endorsed Preferred Route (2018)
Attachment 3: Evaluation Area Map
Attachment 4: Refinements to the Preferred Route in North Cambridge
Attachment 5: Evaluation Criteria
Attachment 6: Evaluation Results

Prepared By: Paula Sawicki, Manager, RT Coordination

Approved By: Thomas Schmidt, Commissioner, Transportation and Environmental Services
Attachment 1: Project Team Preferred Refinement to the Preferred Route

Legend
Station
Potential Property Impacts
Rail

B2 alignment requires relocation of the Rivers Edge Apartments access
Attachment 2: Regional Council Endorsed Preferred Route (2018)

Stage 2 ION – Preferred Route

Route endorsed by Regional Council in June 2018

Subject to further evaluation from Shantz Hill Rd. to Eagle St. at William St.

Legend
- Preferred Route
- LRT Station
- Rail Corridor

Note:
- Refer to Report TES-RTS-18-06 for additional details
- Public Consultation material is available at stage2ion.ca
Attachment 3: Evaluation Area Map

Legend
- Project Team Preliminary Proposed Route 2018 (as presented at PCC No. 4)
- Rail

Evaluation Area

Exact Station location and orientation was not determined until after PCC No. 4
Attachment 4: Refinements to the Preferred Route in North Cambridge

Legend
- Station
- Property Impacts
- Rail

Relocated access to Rivers Edge Apartments; only required for B2 option
## Attachment 5: Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Impact on traffic operations</td>
<td>How many new signalized intersections are required? How many existing intersections have capacity issues and would be further impacted by LRT?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/cultural</td>
<td>Properties impacted</td>
<td>How many residential, commercial, industrial or institutional properties are impacted and how many of those could potentially require full buyout?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/cultural</td>
<td>Cultural heritage impacts</td>
<td>How many heritage properties and buildings are impacted and to what extent? Can the impact be mitigated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>Impact on the floodplain</td>
<td>What area of floodplain does the route cross?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Opportunities for revitalization/ intensification</td>
<td>Is there potential for transit-oriented land use intensification close to the station?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>What is the estimated cost to design and build?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 6: Evaluation Results

Is a diagonal station (A1) or a parallel station (A2) preferred in the “Queenston block”?  

**A1: Diagonal station in Queenston block**
- PREFERRED
  - Better pedestrian and cyclist connection to King Street/Eagle Street
  - Better track geometry – less track noise on tight corners
  - Less expensive to build
  - Higher number of properties impacted and more full buyouts
  - Higher number of cultural heritage resources impacted

**A2: Parallel station in Queenston block**
- NOT PREFERRED
  - Fewer residential properties directly impacted
  - Fewer cultural heritage resources impacted overall
  - More expensive to build
  - Tighter curves resulting in more track noise

Is centre-running (B1) or side-running (B2) preferred on Eagle Street?

**B1: Centre running on Eagle Street**
- NOT PREFERRED
  - Less traffic impacts
  - Better property access
  - More properties impacted
  - More expensive to build
  - More complicated bridge over CP/Eagle St

**B2: Side running on Eagle Street**
- PREFERRED
  - Fewer properties impacted
  - Less expensive to build
  - Simpler bridge over just CP
  - More traffic impacts
  - Greater impact to property accesses
Which is preferred: a station along the Speed River (C1) or along Chopin Drive (C2)?

**C1: Station beside the Speed River – NOT PREFERRED**
- Less property impacts
- Less accessible to pedestrians and cyclists
- Further into the floodplain
- More impacts to natural habitat
- Crossing of King Street impacts bridge

**C2: Station beside Chopin Drive – PREFERRED**
- More accessible to pedestrians and cyclists
- Avoids King Street bridge
- More property impacts
- Greater impact to property accesses

Is Eagle Street (A1+B2) or around the apartment towers (C2) preferred?

**A1+B2: Diagonal station in Queenston block, side running on Eagle Street – PREFERRED**
- More land use benefits (redevelopment)
- Fewer engineering and construction challenges
- Less overall impacts to buildings
- More properties impacted
- More cultural heritage resources impacted
- More impact to traffic operations and property accesses

**C2: Station beside Speed River, track between apartment towers and Speed River – NOT PREFERRED**
- Fewer residential properties impacted and fewer full buy-outs
- Fewer cultural heritage resources impacted
- Less impact to traffic and accesses
- Less opportunity for revitalization and intensification
- More overall impacts to buildings
- More difficult to construct, (won’t fit between the Canadian Pacific Rail property and parking garage, would need to be substantially or completely re-built)
Region of Waterloo

Transportation and Environmental Services

Water Services

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

Date: May 28, 2019   File Code: E03-20

Subject: Supplemental Studies for Project C2016-21 – Regional Water System Upgrades in Cambridge and North Dumfries Class Environmental Assessment

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo approve an increase in scope for contract C2016-21 previously awarded to GM Blue Plan Engineering Ltd., at a total cost of $160,850 plus applicable taxes, as per report TES-WAS-19-10.

Report:

Background

In 2014, the Region of Waterloo completed the Water Supply and Distribution Optimization Master Plan (WSDOMP), which outlined the water supply strategy for optimizing the Integrated Urban System (Cities of Cambridge, Kitchener, and Waterloo). A number of projects were identified for the City of Cambridge and further developed in the Implementation Plan for Cambridge Water System Upgrades, which was completed in 2015. One of the projects was upgrades in the water distribution system on the west side of the City of Cambridge and an area of North Dumfries. The project includes upgrades to the existing Wells G4/G4A, a new elevated storage tank, various transmission main upgrades, upgrades of the existing St. Andrews pump station, rehabilitation/replacement of the existing St. Andrews storage tanks, and the decommissioning of the existing Inverness Tank.

In January 2017, Regional Council awarded consulting contract C2016-21 to GM Blue Plan Engineering Ltd. for completion of a Class Environmental Assessment (EA) and
detailed conceptual design for the upgrades project, later renamed to the Regional Water System Upgrades in Cambridge and North Dumfries (refer to Planning & Works Committee Report TES-WAS-17-02). These upgrades will optimize the water supply and distribution system for this community, as recommended in the WSDOMP (2014).

**Change in Project Scope**

The Class EA for the Regional Water System Upgrades in Cambridge and North Dumfries was initially planned to be completed in 24 months, from February 2017 to February 2019. During the study, the Project Team identified that due to public interest in the project and a large number of potential alternatives for the recommended upgrades, the project will now be completed by October 2020. Additional work will be required in the following areas:

- Developing and analyzing alternatives
- Field investigations and analysis
- Public consultation

A key component of the consulting assignment includes field investigations and review of historical studies to understand potential impacts. These studies include environmental impact studies, archaeological assessments, and cultural heritage assessments for the potential sites to inform the evaluation process and development of mitigation measures. The Region's Terms of Reference specified six (6) potential locations. During the alternatives development task of the EA project, a total of 14 potential sites for water tower locations were approved by the project team and Steering Committee for further evaluation. A greater number of sites increases the efforts related to these field investigations and review of historical studies. The consulting team and Regional staff agreed that reducing the list of options further without more detailed evaluation of the alternatives would risk eliminating good solutions from consideration.

This study is being completed as a Schedule ‘B’ project in accordance with the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (October 2000, as amended in 2007, 2011, and 2015). In addition to the standard public consultation process, enhancements have been made to promote public engagement. Based on the high level of interest from the public in this project, additional effort has been required for public consultation. The increased level of effort is related to additional meetings with stakeholders as well as preparing responses to inquiries and keeping members of the public informed. Public consultation is a key component of the EA process, and continued effort to promote meaningful participation from the public provides a more thorough alternatives development and evaluation process.
The extent of the efforts related to development alternatives, field work and analysis, evaluation, and public consultation exceeds the budget and schedule allowances in the contract terms. The consultant and the Region staff have reviewed the additional scope in detail. The additional study work required beyond the scope of the existing contract includes the following additional costs:

- Engineering for developing and analyzing alternatives: $67,070
- Field investigations and analysis: $48,140
- Public consultation efforts: $25,220
- Project management: $20,420

An increase to the C2016-21 contract upset budget limit of $160,850 plus applicable taxes is required to complete the project. The existing approved budget is $543,948, thus the recommended revised budget upset limit is $704,798 plus applicable taxes.

It is recommended that the consulting assignment previously awarded to GM BluePlan Ltd. be extended to include the additional services outlined above.

**Updated Schedule**

The field work will continue through to August 2019. The project team will not have sufficient information to complete the comparative evaluation of the alternative solutions until the field work is complete. As a result, it is necessary to revise the anticipated milestone schedule as follows:

- Completion of EA including publication of Project File Report:
  - Original schedule November 2018
  - Revised schedule May 2020
- Completion of detailed conceptual design:
  - Original schedule February 2019
  - Revised schedule October 2020

Upon completion of detailed conceptual design, the Region will proceed to procurement of detailed design and construction services to implement the components of the project.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

The Class EA for the Regional Water System Upgrades in Cambridge and North Dumfries supports the 2015-18 Corporate Strategic Plan Focus Area 1: Thriving Economy, under Strategic Objective 1.2: “Plan for and provide the infrastructure and services necessary to create the foundation for economic success.”
Financial Implications:

The value of the Council awarded contract C2016-21 was $543,948. A total of $367,201.23 of this contract was expended in 2017 and 2018, leaving the remaining contract value of $176,747.77 as of the beginning of 2019. With the required additional study funding of $160,850, a revised total of $337,597.77 will be allocated between May 2019 and contract completion in 2020.

The Region’s approved 2019 Ten Year Water Capital Budget and Forecast includes a total of $43,371,000 for the Cambridge Water Distribution Upgrades (Project #4181) of which $700,000 has been allocated in 2019 and 2020 for this Class EA and other supporting studies for this Class EA. This budget is sufficient to fund the additional work part of this report and the other supporting work for the project.

All figures in this section are exclusive of applicable taxes.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

Nil

Attachments:

Nil

Prepared By: Nicole Sapeta, Project Engineer, Water Services

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

I am pleased to contribute to this annual report on behalf of the Planning and Works Committee of Regional Council. The various Divisions in the Transportation and Environmental Services Department have a profound effect on all our daily lives. From curbside waste and recycling collection to Regional roads to conventional transit and ION bus and LRT to water and wastewater services this Department provides many important services. The women and men who drive the transit vehicles or the winter maintenance equipment or who operate our water supply system or wastewater treatment facilities or who manage our solid waste services or who perform many other duties contribute to the great quality of life that we enjoy.

Council works hard to maintain and improve these services at a reasonable cost for the benefit of all its citizens.

Councillor Tom Galloway

Every day Transportation and Environmental Services (TES) touches some aspect of every citizen’s life in Waterloo Region. Whether it is the shower in the morning, taking out the recyclables, riding a bicycle to the ice cream shop or jumping on the bus, TES is there providing the services. Most of this work is done quietly in the background and usually done so well that many people don’t even realize it is being done.

This Annual Report shows just a small part of the work TES does and it is intended to demonstrate and recognize the work being done to maintain and improve the quality of life for all citizens of Waterloo Region.

Thomas Schmidt
Commissioner
Transportation and Environmental Services
Region of Waterloo
Waterloo Region

Waterloo Region includes the cities of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo, as well as the townships of North Dumfries, Wellesley, Wilmot and Woolwich. The Region covers roughly 1,300 square kilometres and has a population of about 590,000 people.

The Region of Waterloo is the regional municipal government responsible for providing important services that affect the daily lives of its residents — such as waste collection, water treatment, road maintenance and public transit services — to roughly 200,000 households. The Region of Waterloo’s programs and services are divided into six departments: Community Services; Corporate Services; Human Resources and Citizen Services; Planning, Development and Legislative Services; Public Health and Emergency Services and Transportation and Environmental Services.

The Region of Waterloo’s Strategic Plan for 2015–2018 outlines five focus areas for the organization:

- Thriving economy
- Sustainable transportation
- Environment and sustainable growth
- Healthy, safe and inclusive communities
- Responsive and engaging government and services

In this 2018 annual report for Transportation and Environmental Services (TES), we will outline how the work TES does supports these critical focus areas.

Transportation and Environmental Services

Transportation and Environmental Services (TES) provides the physical services and infrastructure necessary to support Waterloo Region’s economic prosperity and quality of life. This includes maintaining and replacing aging infrastructure; ensuring adequate infrastructure is available to support growth; and ongoing expansion of the transit system.

TES is comprised of groups that plan and provide transportation networks, operate the bus and rapid transit (ION) systems, complete design and construction, collect and manage waste and provide clean, safe drinking water to the community. Together, TES helps shape and transform Waterloo Region in to create a sustainable future with a strong economy.

The Region of Waterloo’s corporate values of service, integrity, respect, innovation and collaboration are all present in the work TES undertakes.
Thriving economy

The Region of Waterloo as an organization recognizes that a strong, thriving economy is critical to maintain the community’s status as a technology and environmental leader in Canada. TES provides services and initiatives that ensure the local economy continues to grow and support the community’s goals.

2018 was a pretty typical year for construction in TES with over 40 major construction projects underway. These included roads, bridges, water and wastewater treatment plants and waste management projects. Many of these projects take several years to complete and the total value of these major projects was about $300 million. Several smaller projects were also completed in 2018 to repair and maintain our infrastructure. While this construction can be noisy and disruptive at times, it is also the sign of a healthy economy with investment in its key infrastructure.

The new ION light rail transit system is encouraging better land use by intensifying development in our existing urban areas. This type of development helps limit urban sprawl, protect the region’s precious agricultural lands and groundwater sources. In 2003, only 15 per cent of all new development was in our urban cores. By 2017 that number had climbed to 51 per cent. Since Council’s 2011 decision to build the ION light rail, we have seen more than $2.3 billion invested in development in the ION corridor, with more than $700 million in the area around Central Station in Kitchener.

37% of all people working in Waterloo Region work within 800 metres of an ION light rail station or ION bus stop
The Region is also active in seeking funding to support our long-term plans to improve all transportation and environmental services, and was fortunate to receive $70 million in funding from the Provincial Transit Infrastructure Fund (PTIF). Access to this money meant Grand River Transit (GRT) could install a driver simulator to enhance the effectiveness of the operator training program as well as outfit remaining vehicles with traffic signal priority equipment to improve travel time. Design costs were covered for a new transit operating centre on Northfield Drive to accommodate GRT’s increasing fleet. The Region also received over $2 million of provincial funding to support the building of new urban cycling facilities.

A number of active transportation improvements were made including new multi-use trails connecting local neighbourhoods to Mill Station and Laurier-Waterloo Park Station, a new covered bike parking area at Cambridge Centre Station and improvements to a central portion of the Iron Horse Trail to connect to the future Central Station Transit Hub.

TES understands that a thriving economy is dependent on people being able to move freely around the community in a timely fashion through whatever mode of transportation they choose. Work continues on building up these transportation networks to make sure the economy continues to thrive and people want to live in Waterloo Region.

Since 2011 more than $2.3 billion has been invested in development in the ION corridor.

Collaboration

“In the past few years we’ve worked on the ION light rail construction and Waterloo streetscape projects as a Municipal Infrastructure Inspectors. As an inspector we work with partners throughout the Region as well as external contractors while providing on-site inspection and supervision of construction projects. Collaborating and being able to work effectively with people across different teams, municipalities and organizations is essential to the success of every project we work on.”

—Frank Stolch and Alex Rojas, Municipal Infrastructure Inspectors
Sustainable transportation

When creating a sustainable transportation network, it takes years of planning, innovation, consultation and a focus on accommodating various modes of transportation that reflect a diverse community.

The Region’s Transportation Master Plan was updated in 2018 and recommends extensive new investments to be carried out in public transit, walking, cycling, and strategic road improvements. The plan reviewed the impacts of “new mobility” trends such as driverless cars, alternative fuels, protected automated vehicle or shuttle corridors, ridesharing, and ride hailing on congestion, safety, efficiency, land use and public transit. It also outlines strategies for moving forward in sustainable ways.

Every five years, GRT updates its business plan and the current 2017 plan guides significant planned improvements to support the addition of ION light rail service and to achieve the Transportation Master Plan ridership target of 28 million annual riders by 2021. An ambitious action plan is underway to provide riders with a faster, more efficient transit network that integrates with ION. GRT’s local bus, express and specialized transit service will soon include ION light rail which has meant significant changes to the entire transit network.

GRT created new bus stops and improved passenger facilities specifically around ION stations, making future passenger connections easy and convenient. As we began to see services integrate in 2018, we witnessed the successful launch of ION bus service, which is the first step to LRT in Cambridge. The network saw the addition of the 205 iXpress and several alternative service pilots beginning with service in areas not served by conventional bus service or a fixed-route.

GRT plans for 28 million riders per year by 2021
Another exciting change is the EasyGO fare card that makes it easy and convenient to pay for a transit ride in Waterloo Region. GRT completed the installation of platform card readers and fare vending machines at all ION stations after the fleet of buses had received their new fare boxes. Today, more than 50 per cent of riders are tapping the card to ride. Once ION is running, the EasyGO fare card will mean “one system, one fare” where riders pay one fare and can transfer between the bus and train within 90 minutes.

With ION construction substantially completed in summer 2017, the landscape in our urban centres is changing. Before ION, freight and passenger trains crossed King Street and Weber Street, halting traffic as they passed. As part of planned infrastructure improvements, King Street and Weber Street have moved below the railway allowing traffic, transit, cyclists and pedestrians to travel along those streets without being impacted by the freight and passenger trains above.

The Region’s new “ARIA” advanced traffic signal management system is a state-of-the-art centralized control system. ARIA recently won the 2018 Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Canada Award in the category of “New Canadian ITS Technology Research and Development/Innovation.” The Region of Waterloo collaborated with the Region of Durham in developing the Aria system.

On the road side of 2018, residents were quite happy to see the new Fountain Street Bridge over the Grand River re-opened in August 2018 after nearly two years of careful dismantling and reconstruction over the river. The 60-year-old bridge needed to be replaced because it could no longer be repaired to a safe condition. The new bridge and road includes multi-use trails for pedestrians and cyclists that extend from Blair Road to Preston Parkway. Although the bridge had to be closed to vehicle traffic, pedestrian and cycling access across the bridge was maintained throughout construction.

Whether it’s light rail, buses, roads, trails, cycling lanes or pedestrian initiatives, TES is constantly planning and working on ways to build a sustainable transportation network that supports living, working and playing in Waterloo Region. That network took major steps forward in 2018.

**Integrity**

“Over the years the Traffic Systems Management Team has built up a great deal of public trust by demonstrating a deep commitment to public safety and quality of service. No request is considered too small and every request receives a personal response. When we find an issue in one location, we review signals in other locations to confirm optimal performance across the entire network of signals.”

—Mark Liddell, Traffic Systems Management Analyst
Environment and sustainable growth

Waterloo Region is known globally for its attention to the natural environment and TES plays a large role in complementing the key infrastructure investments with sound environmental programs and planning.

Water conservation has always been a key focus for our community because we rely on limited groundwater resources as our primary source of drinking water. Once again, the community demonstrated its ability to conserve water by saving the equivalent of 4,000 homes’ worth of water. This was achieved largely through the Region’s forward-thinking programs for water efficiency. These include the rain barrel distribution program, the summer Water Conservation Bylaw, and the cutting-edge WET (Water Efficient Technology) program, which provides direct in-home water saving tips and advice to high water users and businesses looking to reduce their footprint. Through constant education, residents have become ‘smarter’ about their water use.

Water isn’t the only environmental concern that residents have addressed through their participation in Region programs. Residents embraced the change to every second week garbage collection in 2017, and their enthusiastic participation in the green bin, blue box and yard waste programs and respect for the new bag limits meant that our residential diversion rate increased from 52 to 65 per cent in only two years. The change to collecting garbage every second week, the new bag limits, and the change to a standard level of service across Waterloo Region saves the community $3 million annually and extends the life of our Erb Street landfill.

The 2013 Waste Management Master Plan included a recommendation to consider treating waste to recover energy (known as Energy from Waste or EfW) as an option for when the landfill is full. With about 20 years of capacity left in our landfill, there’s no immediate need for EfW planning, but we continue to monitor developments in technology and Ontario’s waste legislation to stay informed about options.

Another issue of concern is that organics breaking down in the landfill contribute to greenhouse gas production. The successful diversion of organics through the green bin program to turn them into compost, has resulted in a reduction of 28,000 tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions over the last eight years. We harness our
landfill methane and either use it to power a Cambridge steel recycling plant or turn it into electricity at our Waterloo site – enough to power between 4,000 and 6,000 homes.

On the theme of energy reduction, TES was also active on the lighting front. In 2017 the Region of Waterloo and all area Municipalities were involved in a shared street-lighting conversion project called the LED Conversion Project which resulted in significant savings. The Region alone converted 8,650 High Pressure Sodium (HPS) and Mercury Vapour (MV) Cobra Head Luminaires to LED Luminaires in the street lights, resulting in a massive reduction in electricity consumption. This also saves 15,600 tonnes of CO₂ equivalent per year and $2.4 million in savings – of which the Region saved $600,000.

2018 was also a major turning point for the Grand River Watershed. After a decade in the works, a key phase of the Kitchener Wastewater Treatment Plant upgrades was completed in 2017. The benefits were nearly instant, as documented by University of Waterloo professor Dr. Mark Servos, whose research team extensively monitors and studies the health of the Grand River. Their research showed that the health of the fish in the Grand River vastly improved after the upgrade, which is indicative that the overall ecosystem is improving.

Perhaps the biggest challenge for the Region’s water sources in the past 15 years has been rising chloride levels. The Region has implemented many strategies to reduce the salt levels in our groundwater including a massive awareness campaign in 2018. This included collaborating with over 20 community partners to cordon off some sections of properties in winter to reduce salt application. These local partnerships are seen as vital to sustaining our water sources into the future.

As the community continues to grow and attract new businesses and residents, TES will continue to play a vital role in protecting our natural environment through various programs and initiatives. Any successful community finds a key balance between growth and sustainability and the Region of Waterloo is constantly seeking innovative approaches to find that balance.

### Innovation

“By capturing biogas in our wastewater treatment process, we can harness the energy to heat the buildings on site which reduces our electricity needs and reduces harmful greenhouse gases.”

—Pam Law, Senior Project Engineer, Water Services
Responsive and engaging government services

In following the Region’s corporate values, including integrity, TES aims to consult with the public, listen to their input, respond in a thoughtful way and continue to engage them as projects and plans develop. On a number of occasions in 2018, that engagement with the community led to some pretty impressive results.

For Stage 2 ION, light rail will replace the ION bus service to the City of Cambridge, creating a continuous light rail system across the region’s three urban centres. Planning for Stage 2 has been ongoing since 2015. Four rounds of public consultations were held between 2015 and 2018. More than 1,200 people have attended the public consultation meetings and staff received more than 600 responses online through email and engagement surveys on the proposed light rail route. With input from the public, new route refinements were identified and incorporated as part of the preferred route, endorsed by Regional Council in June 2018. Public engagement will be ongoing as staff work toward preliminary design in 2019.

The Waste Management group are also constantly engaging the public in numerous ways to enhance their programming. They work with residents every day to make sure everyone knows how to get the most out of our programs and services. Over 2,000 students participated in their educational centre program; 5,900 residents visited the exhibits and displays; and 770 attended our public tour days. Online, over 3,000 residents subscribe to Waste’s eNewsletter and nearly 54,000 mobile and online users accessed the “My Waste” app for information. With more than 196,000 impressions each month through the Waste Facebook and Twitter accounts, the group takes pride in excellent customer service. Whether dealing with the 50,000 annual calls we receive through the Service First Call Centre, the 390,000 transactions handled at our transfer stations each year, or the one million curbside collection stops we make each month, needless to say the Waste group is constantly engaged with the community.

The Region also continues to implement novel ideas that focus on wastewater as a resource rather than waste and consulting the public to help plan a future that makes sense for the community. For these efforts, the Region was recognized as a Utility of the Future by the Water Environment Foundation in 2018. Additionally,
the International Association for Public Participation awarded the Region a Core Value Award for its Biosolids Strategy study relating to the innovative efforts taken to engage the public with visual concepts. The end result was the community-assisted creation of a biosolids management strategy for the future.

GRT is also heavily consulting the public as it starts to implement the network changes which may require a significant change in habits for many riders and the community overall. As bus service is integrated with the ION, communicating these changes and reaching out to individual residents and business is vital. GRT maintains a series of EasyGO customer information tools to make taking transit and planning to take transit easy. Over 50 per cent of our riders use these tools to access next bus information or planning a trip.

Regular two-way communication takes place through channels such as Public Consultation Centres, Public Information Centres, over 116 Transit Talks and travel training sessions as well as involvement in a number of community events and college and university open houses. GRT’s online presence plays an important role as well with a combined following of more than 10,000 on Facebook, Twitter and Instagram and more than 800 Rider Alert subscriptions.

But not all of TES's projects focus on travel for the future. In some cases, paying attention to the public’s wishes and restoring travel routes from “a long ago” past are equally important. In 2018, a bridge engineering specialist assisted in the development of a major rehabilitation plan for the West Montrose Bridge.

This represents a significant step in the ongoing efforts of the Transportation team, to preserve and protect this important heritage structure and tourist attraction. Also known as the “Kissing Bridge” and built in the 1800’s, it is the last wooden covered bridge in Ontario. In 2014, the Region created a long term preservation plan to improve signage, add new guide rails and upgrade lighting and structural strength.

When we continue to engage the public, everyone gains an understanding of what is important to the community and what is necessary to plan a future that works for Waterloo Region. TES is committed to responding to the public and making community engagement a key building block in all future planning.

More than 1,200 people have attended public consultation meetings on the proposed Stage 2 ION route (2015–2018)

Service

“With waste collection contractors making over a million stops a month, there are bound to be some hiccups. I work with residents to help solve problems at the curb so they can get the most from our services.”

—Eileen Knowles, Inspector, Waste Management
Healthy, safe and inclusive communities

The last but certainly not least important focus area for TES in 2018 was ensuring that all plans consider the need to protect the health and safety of residents. Whether promoting and designing infrastructure for active transportation or protecting our water sources and natural environment, there are a variety of considerations when attempting to build a safe and healthy community.

In 2018, the updated Transportation Master Plan called for increased funding to improve our active transportation network by the year 2031. This will support expansions to the current network and upgrading and building more separated facilities. Currently, there are 720 km of cycling facilities in the Region. Multi-use trails and separated bike lanes account for about 12 per cent and the rest consist of on-road bike lines and paved shoulders. An estimated total of 795 km of cycling facilities are planned to be built. By 2031, separate cycling facilities and multi-use trails will account for about 18 per cent while the rest will consist of on-road bike lanes and paved shoulders.

A number of other active transportation improvements were also made in 2018, including new multi-use trails connecting local neighbourhoods to the ION’s Mill Station and Laurier-Waterloo Park Station, as well as a new covered bike parking area at Cambridge Centre station. Residents will also notice the improvements to a central portion of the Iron Horse Trail that connects travellers to the future Central Station Transit Hub.

A more subtle strategy to maintain a healthy, safe community is seen in the efforts to shift development from the suburban edges to redeveloping existing urban cores. This helps to protect our valuable groundwater resources and agricultural and environmentally sensitive lands. With water being top of mind to a growing community, TES invests heavily in protecting our water supply and meeting water treatment standards. The Region received a score of 100 per cent compliance from the Province of Ontario on its water treatment facilities. This means that at each of its 43 groundwater treatment systems and the one surface treatment plant, all provincially regulated water quality standards were met. The public can have confidence in the drinking water provided by the Region to the local municipalities.
Residents have also expressed concern for their safety when travelling around the region on foot or on bikes, which has led to some unique design features being implemented on local roadways. Beginning in May, 2017, the Region initiated a pilot project to implement a Leading Pedestrian Interval (LPI) at signalized intersections in close proximity to elementary schools. The LPI gives three to five seconds of walk indication signal at these intersections before the green light is given to cars to proceed through the intersection. There are currently 36 signalized intersections running LPI at certain times of day with 12 intersections about to be added in 2019. This project increases pedestrian safety and general awareness of all modes of transportation.

Also on the topic of planning roads and keeping safety top of mind, two new multi-lane roundabouts were opened in 2017 on Ottawa Street at Homer Watson Boulevard and at Alpine Road in the City of Kitchener. The new roundabouts were constructed to improve traffic flow and reduce injuries from collisions at these intersections. TES is happy to report these projects were finished ahead of schedule and on budget and include new multi-use trails for pedestrians and cyclists. The project won a Consulting Engineers of Ontario Award in 2017. In 2019, new separated cycling lanes are planned for Ottawa Street to connect the new multi-use trails to Mill Street. A new multi-use trail is also planned in 2019 on Homer Watson Boulevard to connect Ottawa Street to the Conestoga College Doon campus.

As we travel around Waterloo Region we notice the subtle changes to the landscape and the design of our community that increase safety for everyone. When residents can have confidence in clean, safe drinking water and well-designed travel routes for all modes of transportation, it lends peace of mind to the community and promotes active, healthy lifestyles. 2018 was an important year for TES in continuing to enhance the health and safety of the community.

Respect

“Respect is foundational to all other Regional values. For example, I collaborate regularly on projects with fellow staff, municipal counterparts, riders, and businesses. To collaborate effectively and honestly, we must respect and appreciate one another’s ideas, values and uniqueness. At GRT, we strive to not only be open and transparent, but to listen. We invite open discussion on the decisions we make to help us best shape and improve our services day-by-day.”

—Kevan Marshall, Principal Planner, Transit Services
2018 by the numbers

**Transit**
- **14** light rail vehicles were delivered by Bombardier
- ION has over **36** kilometres of track
- **18%** of all residents in Waterloo Region live within 800 metres of an ION light rail station or ION bus stop
- EasyGO online trip planner provided over **3 million** individualized trip plans
- GRT ridership increased **6.7%** from just over **19.5 million** to **21.1 million**
- Route 7 GRT’s busiest route had over **3.5 million** riders in the year
- GRT has a fleet of **273** buses – **11** are Hybrid Electric-Diesel buses
- GRT operates **40** MobilityPLUS vehicles

**Waste**
- All waste management services cost taxpayers about the same as a cup of coffee a week (**$148** average annual cost per household)
- **11%** increase in Blue Box material collected*
- **15%** increase in yard waste collected*
- **31%** decrease in garbage collected*
- Over **390,000** transactions handled at all waste management sites
- **10,340** tonnes of woodchips and compost given away
- **50,000** customer calls to Service First Call Centre
- **1 million** curbside collection stops per month
- Engineering teams monitor **500** groundwater wells and **200** landfill gas wells to help reduce possible impacts of the landfill on local air and water
- Over **2,000** students participated in the Educational Center Program

*change since new curbside policy implemented (2018 over 2016)
Water

- 219 home water use audits
- 55,000 rain barrels distributed to date (2400 in 2018)
- 34 risk management plans completed and 120 in progress for source protection
- 23 Commercial, Industrial and Institutional (CII) sector water use reviews
- 6 large audits
- 26 funded water saving projects
- 159 m³ of water saved per day through CII program

Over 1000 fixture/flapper replacements, saving 382 m³ of water per day

750 million litres of water saved
the through Water Conservation Bylaw
(3000 Olympic-sized swimming pools)

Heroism Award

GRT Operator Vimal Jegatheswaran – recipient of CUTA’s Heroism Award for saving the life of a person who attempted to jump off a bridge in the City of Cambridge in June 2018. Vimal secured the GRT vehicle he was operating and grabbed the man from behind, while at the same time urging him not to jump. He was able to talk this person down and contact authorities to find him help. Vimal has worked at GRT since 2011. He came to Canada as a refugee from Sri Lanka in 1999. GRT is proud to have operators like Vimal on our team.
For more information please contact:

Region of Waterloo
Transportation and Environmental Services
150 Frederick Street, 7th Floor
Kitchener, Ontario N2G 4J3

Phone: 519-575-4400
TTY: 519-575-4608

www.regionofwaterloo.ca
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting date</th>
<th>Requestor</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Assigned Department</th>
<th>Anticipated Response Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09-Apr-19</td>
<td>K. Redman</td>
<td>Banning of single use plastics</td>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>May-19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>