Corporation of the City of Cambridge
Special Council Meeting
Agenda

Date: Tuesday, April 13, 2021, 5:00 p.m.
Location: Virtual Meeting

COVID-19
Due to COVID-19 and recommendations by Waterloo Region Public Health to exercise social distancing, members of the public are invited to submit written comments or requests to delegate via telephone related to items on the agenda.

The public wishing to speak at Council may complete an online Delegation Request form no later than 12:00 p.m. on the day of the meeting for Special Council Meetings occurring at 5:00 p.m. and no later than 12:00 p.m. the day before the meeting for Special Council –Statutory Public Meetings occurring at 10:00 a.m.

All written delegation submissions will be provided to the Mayor and Council prior to the meeting, and will form part of the public record.

1. Meeting Called to Order
2. Indigenous Territory Acknowledgement
3. Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest
4. Presentations
   4.1. Jaime Griffis re: Celebration of Women
   4.2. Shery Ayres re: Canadian Award for Financial Reporting
   4.3. Dennis Lopes re: 21-071(CD) Newman Drive Sidewalk Installation
5. Delegations and Consideration of Related Reports
   5.2. Ajirioghene Evi, Kind Minds Family Wellness re: 21-064(CRS) Community Grants
   5.3. Joanna Stein re: 21-071(CD) Newman Drive Sidewalk Installation
6. Consent Agenda
The Consent Agenda groups reports together that are of a routine nature and provides opportunity to vote on one motion rather than separate motions. However, Staff may not be in attendance to respond to queries on items contained in the Consent Agenda. Council Members wishing to pull an item from Consent Procedure should notify the City Clerk. Members will also have the opportunity to pull the item at the Meeting.

6.1. Special Council Minutes- March 30, 2021  
6.2. Council Information Package- April 1, 2021  
6.3. Cambridge Accessibility Advisory Committee Minutes- February 22, 2021  
6.4. Economic Development Advisory Committee Minutes- January 13, 2021  
6.5. 21-085(CD) 50 Lansdowne Road South  
6.6. 21-022(CRS) Development Charges Statement for the Year Ended December 21, 2020  
6.7. 21-039(CRS) 2020 Year End Operating Update  
6.8. 21-079(CD) 7 Queens Square, Central Presbyterian Church- Request for Funding from the Heritage Conservation Reserve Fund  
6.9. 21-112(CRS) T21-03 Dover Street Sanitary Pump Station Upgrade  
6.10. 21-090(IFS) Capital Status and Forecast Report  
6.11. 21-135(CRS) Fire Safety Grant from the Office of the Fire Marshal

7. Consideration of Reports

7.1. Corporate Services  
7.1.1. 21-064(CRS) Community Grants

7.2. Corporate Enterprise

7.3. Community Development  
7.3.1. 21-097(CD) – Growing the Greenbelt – Recommendation Report  
7.3.2. 21-071(CD) Newman Drive Sidewalk Installation  
7.3.3. 21-001(CD) Bishop Street Community Update  
7.3.4. 21-089(CD) Additional Building Division Staff

7.4. Infrastructure Services  
7.4.1. 21-059 (IFS) Request from Hindu Community to Scatter Cremated Human Remains in the Grand River

8. Other Business

THAT Council endorse that the 10 year maximum term limitation be waived to permit Martyn Champ to be eligible for one additional year as a Director by the Shareholders of Cambridge and North Dumfries Energy
Plus Inc. at the Annual Shareholder Meeting;

AND THAT Council endorse the slate of Directors for the upcoming year, as recommended by the Board of Directors, to be endorsed at the Annual Shareholder Meeting as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Directors</th>
<th>Designated Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Woeller</td>
<td>Kathryn McGarry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martyn Champ</td>
<td>Susan Foxton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita Davis</td>
<td>Ian Miles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AND FURTHER THAT Council endorse as recommended by the Board of Directors, that KPMG be appointed Auditors to Cambridge and North Dumfries Energy Plus Inc. for 2021.

9. Closed Session

10. Motions

10.1. Councillor Hamilton

WHEREAS there have been ongoing problems for more than nine years concerning safe pedestrian crossings at Holy Spirit school, and insufficient parking spaces provided for parents and their children at Moffat Creek Public School on Myers Road;

WHEREAS, despite more than 80 cars now parking on Myers Road twice daily to get their children to school, the Region of Waterloo is planning to rebuild Myers Road with no parking spaces whatsoever, resulting in, twice a day, cars parking on distant residential streets, and making parents with young children walk in potentially adverse conditions;

WHEREAS Cambridge and Waterloo Region face an acute need for parking on this road at this specific location and a general and increasing need for parking as this area of the city, Southeast Galt, grows and intensifies substantially;

THERE IT BE RESOLVED that Cambridge Council request Regional Council to direct Region staff to work in consultation with parents and residents of Cambridge, to evaluate options for parking spaces on Myer’s Road at Moffat Creek Public School, and that correspondence be sent on behalf of Cambridge Council requesting Regional Council to consider that parking on Myers Road is essential for the overall safety and wellbeing of its parents, children, and residents of today, and the future.
11. Motion to Receive and File
12. Consideration of By-laws
13. Confirmatory By-law
   13.1. 21-028
       Being a by-law to confirm the proceedings of the Council of the
       Corporation of the City of Cambridge
14. Adjournment
Council Members in Attendance: Councillors Reid (Ward 1); Devine (Ward 2); Mann (Ward 3); Liggett (Ward 4) (Arrived at 5:00 p.m.); Wolf (Ward 5); Adshade (Ward 6); Hamilton (Ward 7); Ermeta (Ward 8) with Mayor McGarry in the Chair.

Staff Members in Attendance: David Calder, City Manager; Dave Bush, Deputy City Manager – Corporate Services; Yogesh Shah, Deputy City Manager – Infrastructure Services; Hardy Bromberg, Deputy City Manager – Community Development; Cheryl Zahnleiter, Deputy City Manager – Corporate Enterprise; Lisa Shields, City Solicitor; Sheryl Ayres, Chief Financial Officer; Kevin De Leebeeck, Director of Engineering; Elaine Brunn Shaw, Chief Planner; Bryan Cooper; Senior Planner-Policy; Danielle Manton, City Clerk; Jennifer Shaw, Deputy City Clerk; Briar Allison, Council Committee Services Coordinator; Greg Elgie, Business Systems Analyst;

Others in Attendance: Diana Morris, River Mill Development Corporation; Mary-Jane Patterson, Reep Green Solutions; Members of the general public are participating via Live Stream.

Meeting Called to Order

The meeting of the Council of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge is held virtually via Microsoft Zoom and live streamed to the City of Cambridge website. Mayor McGarry welcomes everyone present and calls the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. and the meeting adjourns at 11:03 p.m.

Indigenous Territory Acknowledgement

Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest

There are no disclosures of pecuniary interest.
Public Meetings

Statutory notice of today’s Public Meetings was given by publication in the Cambridge Times on Friday, February 26, 2021 for Public Meeting A.


Presentations


Using a PowerPoint presentation, Bryan Cooper is in attendance virtually to speak to Public Meeting Report - 155 Equestrian Way- River Mill Development Corporation – Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment.


Using a PowerPoint presentation, Diana Morris is in attendance virtually to speak to Public Meeting Report - 155 Equestrian Way- River Mill Development Corporation – Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment

Delegations

The Chair called for two recesses to allow additional members of the public attending virtually to call in to speak regarding Public Meeting A.

There were no call ins to speak to Public Meeting A.

Resolution: 21-068
Moved by: Councillor Devine
Seconded by: Councillor Mann
THAT report 21-075(CD) – 155 Equestrian Way- River Mill Development Corporation – Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment be received;

AND THAT the application R02/21 be referred back to staff for a subsequent report and staff recommendation.

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 8-0

In Favour: Councillor’s Adshade, Devine, Ermeta, Hamilton, Mann, Reid, Wolf and Mayor McGarry

Opposed: None

The Chair declared Public Meeting A closed at 10:58 a.m.

Council reconvened at 5:02 p.m.

Presentations

1. Mary-Jane Patterson, Reep Green Solutions re: 21-003(IFS) Reep Impact Report

   See item #1

2. Danielle Manton, City Clerk and Paul Kan, Manager of Realty Services re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

   See item #2

3. Sue Cummings re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

   See item #2

Delegations

2. Dan Clements on behalf of Dr Hank Nykamp re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
3. Dan Clements re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

4. Bob Howison re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

5. Sandra Sutherland re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

6. Kayla Andrade re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

7. Cindy Watson re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

8. Amy Di Nino re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

9. Samuel Puchala re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

10. Laura Laugalys re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

11. Adam Cooper re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

12. Ted & Cheryl Kewley re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

13. Carol Thorman on behalf of the Cambridge Wellbeing Advisory Committee re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

14. Carol Thorman re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

15. Jim Boni re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

16. Stacey Bauer, Montessori School of Cambridge re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
17. James Dover re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

18. Matthew Hayes re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

19. Amar Bhuee re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

20. Lori Bennett re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

21. Nicole Blair re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

22. Priya Hiebert re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

23. Jesse Burt, ACCKWA re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

24. Jeffrey Shaver re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

25. Henry Bout re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

26. Kyla Shaw re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

27. Dave re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

28. Brian Kennedy on behalf of Downtown Cambridge Business Improvement Area re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

29. Lee MacNeil re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

30. Cindy re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
31. Meaghan Fariello re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
32. Anna Maria Iredale re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
33. Glen Stewart re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
34. Deborah Donner re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
35. Keith B Rivers re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
36. Clifford Vanclief re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
37. Breanna Hawke re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
38. Daryl Tyrwhitt re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

Correspondence
1. Klaus Gute re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
2. Ed Heather re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
3. Bev Langlois re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
4. Ted Kewley re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
5. Robert Pettit re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
6. Donna Wilkie re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
7. Kyla Shaw re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
8. Glen Stewart re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
9. Kate Fraser re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
10. Maureen Boyce re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
11. Christopher Dalton re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
12. Lori Roy re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
13. Lee Taggart re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
14. Stephanie Pye re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
15. Laura Down re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
16. Keenan Meyer re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
17. Alex and Elaine Kovacevic re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
18. Donna Friese re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
19. Stacey Perry re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
20. Kevin Nixon re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
21. John Fink re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
22. Kay Nadalin re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

23. Carman M. Curtis re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

24. Pam and Tony Spagnola re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

25. Christine Carey re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

26. Jill Ruth re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

27. Henry Baulier re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

28. Margret Thiesburger re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

29. Melanie House re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

30. James Dover re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

31. Ashley Williamson re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

32. Lynette Amalfi re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

33. Patrick Sparrow re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

34. Shelley-Ann Jelley re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

35. Linda Fletcher re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

36. Sabrina Laramee re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
37. Eric re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

38. Cory Kirchin re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

39. Glenn & Shelley Marriott re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

40. Gord Flett re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

41. Jim Boni re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

42. Todd Wilson re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

43. Michele Holmes re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

44. Jim Holmes re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

45. Pat Grant re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

46. Sherri Roy re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

47. Breanna Hawke re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

48. Pat Stagger re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

49. Curtis Rae re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

50. Doug Spry re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

51. Tony Potopilnyj re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
52. Rondi Zeeman re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

53. Julie MacLeod re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

54. Geoff Smith re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

55. Chandler Balsdon re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

56. Shari Vezeau re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

57. Lori O’Brien re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

58. Wesley Crawford re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

59. Maryann Hendriks re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

60. Stuart Johnston re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

61. Jamie Bennett re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

62. Anke Wilson re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

63. Maria Smith re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

64. Amar Bhuee re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

65. Paul Galvao re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

66. Eva Murphy re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
67. Breanna Lytle re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

68. Greg Quinnell re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

69. Sandy Falkiner re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

70. L L Boldt re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

71. Jenn Roswell re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

72. Gary Staveley re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

73. Michael Fister re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

74. Ethan M re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

75. Robert Lofsky re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

76. Shane Wilmot re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

77. Cindy Rocha re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

78. Joanne Kitzman re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

79. Marlee Waldron re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

80. Brooklyne Road re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

81. Carolyn McLean re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
82. Ellen Heuss re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

83. Dave Berry re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

84. Ingrid Town Cowan re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

85. Cambridge Memorial Hospital re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

86. Carol Whitehead re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

87. Tracy Shaban re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

88. Kathryn Schuiling re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

89. Araya Jupp re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

90. Dave Schmalz re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

91. Carol re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

92. Liane McPhee re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

93. Irene O'Toole re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

94. Stacey Baur re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

95. Brian Kennedy, Downtown Cambridge Business Improvement Area re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
96. Francine Boucher re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

97. Ron and Barbara Rogers re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

98. Stacy Vazquez-Abrams re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

99. Rick Heidenreich re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

100. Kaylea Findlay re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

101. Kim Decker re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

102. Angela White re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

103. Donalee McIntyre re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

104. Christine Wingate, Moms Stop the Harm re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

105. Ed Gazendam re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

106. Brenda Adams re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

107. Heather Kickham re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

108. Tena Chaves re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

109. Linda Albright-Thiel re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

110. Shannon Heidenreich re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
111. Patricia King re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

112. Patrick Vannan re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

113. Taylor Dunstan re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

112. Jill Nielsen re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

113. Anna Maria Iredale re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

114. Bridget Norris-Jones re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

115. Susan Benton re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

116. Waterloo Region Integrated Drugs Strategy re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

117. Wilmot Family Resource Centre re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

118. Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

119. Cassandra Burrows re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

120. Stephany Rocha re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

121. Rev Michiko Bown-Kai re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

122. Jennifer Hutton, Women's Crisis Services of Waterloo Ontario re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
123. Constance Peacock re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

124. Joanna Han re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

125. Deborah Donner re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

126. Christine re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

127. Jason and Judith Lefebre re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

128. Kenneth Lin re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

129. Michele Dunsford re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

130. Jack Jackman re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

131. Patricia Thomas re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

132. Meredith and Clifford Vanclief re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

133. Scott Corbett re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

134. Alissa Poore re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

135. Sue Rivers re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

136. Ron & Marlyn MacFarlane re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

137. Denise Schmalz re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification
138. Jessica Hutchison re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

139. Marlee Waldron re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

140. Nicole Blair re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

141. Jill Bennett re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

142. Louise Sims re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

143. Tibor Muzslai re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

144. Ewa Durakiewicz re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

145. Glen Whittall re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

146. Trish Miner re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

147. Martin Sinclair re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

148. Hope A Dekker re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

149. Bev Whittall re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

150. Ulrike Gute re: 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

Consideration of Reports

Infrastructure Services

1. 21-003(IFS) Reep Green Solutions 20+ Years of Community Action Impact Report
Resolution: 21-069
Moved by: Councillor Adshade
Seconded by: Councillor Hamilton

THAT Report 21-003(IFS), Reep Green Solutions 20+ Years of Community Action Impact Report be received.

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 8-0

In Favour: Councillor’s Adshade, Devine, Ermeta, Hamilton, Ligget, Mann, Reid, Wolf and Mayor McGarry

Opposed: None

Corporate Services

Councillor Mann left the meeting at this time.

2. 21-125(CRS) Appointment of Deputy Mayor and Alternate at Regional Council

Moved by: Councillor Hamilton
Seconded by: Councillor Reid

THAT Council receive Report No. 21-125(CRS) Appointment of Deputy Mayor and Alternate at Regional Council for information;

AND THAT Councillor Mike Mann be appointed as Deputy Mayor for the remainder of the 2018-2022 term of Council;

AND THAT Councillor Mike Mann be appointed as an alternate to Regional Council pursuant to the Regional Policy for alternate members;

AND THAT staff be directed to incorporate the Deputy Mayor role, as well as the Acting Mayor structure into the Procedure By-law once it is revised;

AND THAT staff be directed to complete a review of the structure for Acting and Deputy Mayors with Mayor and Council at the start of each terms of Council;

AND FURTHER THAT Council direct the City Clerk to notify the Regional Clerk once Council appoints the alternate member of Regional Council.
Waive Notice Requirements

Resolution:  21-070
Moved by:  Councillor Reid
Seconded by:  Councillor Hamilton

THAT the notice requirements of the procedure by-law be waived to consider a matter in closed session.

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 8-0

In Favour:  Councillor’s Adshade, Devine, Ermeta, Hamilton, Liggett, Reid, Wolf and Mayor McGarry

Consideration of Matters in Closed Session

Resolution:  21-071
Moved by:  Councillor Adshade
Seconded by:  Councillor Devine

THAT in accordance with Section s.239 (2)(f) of the Municipal Act, 2001, Council convene in Closed Session to consider the following subject matter:

Advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose (legal advice)

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 8-0

In Favour:  Councillor’s Adshade, Devine, Ermeta, Hamilton, Liggett, Reid, Wolf and Mayor McGarry

Council to Rise from Closed Session

Resolution:  21-072
Moved by:  Councillor Wolf
Seconded by:  Councillor Reid
That Council rise from Closed Session and reconvene in Open Session at 6:42 p.m.

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 8-0

In Favour: Councillor’s Adshade, Devine, Ermeta, Hamilton, Liggett, Reid, Wolf and Mayor McGarry

Opposed: None

Amendment

Resolution: 21-073
Moved by: Councillor Wolf
Seconded by: Councillor Ermeta

THAT Clause 2 of Report 21-125(CRS) Appointment of Deputy Mayor and Alternate at Regional Council be amended to add the following after the words “Deputy Mayor”: “until the lifting of the Municipal Emergency or the end of 2021, whichever comes first;”

AND THAT the following new clause be added to the recommendation after Clause 4: “AND THAT staff be directed to complete a review of the structure for Acting and Deputy Mayors with Mayor and Council by the end of 2021.”

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 7-1

In Favour: Councillor’s Adshade, Devine, Ermeta, Hamilton, Reid, Wolf and Mayor McGarry

Opposed: Councillor Liggett

Main Motion, as amended

Resolution: 21-074
Moved by: Councillor Hamilton
Seconded by: Councillor Reid
THAT Council receive Report No. 21-125(CRS) Appointment of Deputy Mayor and Alternate at Regional Council for information;

AND THAT Councillor Mike Mann be appointed as Deputy Mayor until the lifting of the Municipal Emergency or the end of 2021, whichever comes first;

AND THAT Councillor Mike Mann be appointed as an alternate to Regional Council pursuant to the Regional Policy for alternate members;

AND THAT staff be directed to incorporate the Deputy Mayor role, as well as the Acting Mayor structure into the Procedure By-law once it is revised;

AND THAT staff be directed to complete a review of the structure for Acting and Deputy Mayors with Mayor and Council by the end of 2021.

AND THAT staff be directed to complete a review of the structure for Acting and Deputy Mayors with Mayor and Council at the start of each terms of Council;

AND FURTHER THAT Council direct the City Clerk to notify the Regional Clerk once Council appoints the alternate member of Regional Council.

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 5-3

In Favour: Councillor’s Adshade, Hamilton, Reid, Wolf and Mayor McGarry

Opposed: Councillor’s Devine, Ermeta and Liggett

3. 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification

Councillor Mann rejoined the meeting at this time.

This report was subsequently referred to the April 6th Special Council Meeting per below the below motion.

Motion: Refer all Remaining Items

Resolution: 21-075
Moved by: Councillor Wolf
Seconded by: Councillor Hamilton
THAT Council refer all remaining items from the March 30th Special Council Meeting to the Special Council meeting to be scheduled for April 6th, 2021.

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 9-0

In Favour: Councillor’s Adshade, Devine, Ermeta, Hamilton, Liggett, Mann, Reid, Wolf and Mayor McGarry

Opposed: None

Introduction and Consideration of By-laws

Resolution: 21-076
Moved by: Councillor Wolf
Seconded by: Councillor Hamilton

21-024 Being a by-law to Appoint a Deputy Mayor and an Alternate on Regional Council for the Corporation of the City of Cambridge, as amended.

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 8-1

In Favour: Councillor’s Adshade, Devine, Ermeta, Hamilton, Mann, Reid, Wolf and Mayor McGarry

Opposed: Councillor Liggett

Motion to Receive Correspondence and Presentations

Resolution: 21-077
Moved by: Councillor Wolf
Seconded by: Councillor Mann

THAT Council receive all presentations and correspondence at the Special Council Meeting held on March 30, 2021 for information.

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 9-0
In Favour: Councillor’s Adshade, Devine, Ermeta, Hamilton, Liggett, Mann, Reid, Wolf and Mayor McGarry

Opposed: None

**Confirmatory By-law**

Resolution: 21-078
Moved by: Councillor Mann
Seconded by: Councillor Adshade

21-025 Being a by-law to confirm the proceedings of the Council of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 9-0

In Favour: Councillor’s Adshade, Devine, Ermeta, Hamilton, Liggett, Mann, Reid, Wolf and Mayor McGarry

Opposed: None

**Close of Meeting**

Resolution: 21-079
Moved by: Councillor Liggett
Seconded by: Councillor Ermeta

THAT the Council meeting does now adjourn at 11:03 p.m.

CARRIED, on a recorded vote 9-0

In Favour: Councillor’s Adshade, Devine, Ermeta, Hamilton, Liggett, Mann, Reid, Wolf and Mayor McGarry

Opposed: None
Hello,

This is an initiative that will not serve our community well. Not only are the locations proposed terrible locations as they are close to schools and families living in the area, it is not safe for children. There is already too much drug abuse happening in our area as we find needles everywhere. I now have a newborn at home and we don't feel comfortable having addicts around our home. We are already scared to walk alone. This CTS site is a band aid solution to a problem that isn't being solved. our taxpayer dollars should not be going into this solution but rather it be contributed to mental health funding and rehab centers and halfway home solutions between rehab so people struggling with homelessness and addiction are not found back in the same position after coming out of rehab.

Please have this letter included in the agenda for the meeting.

Thank you

Alden Isaacs
We request that our letter be included in the agenda for the council meeting scheduled for Tuesday, March 30th. We are NOT in support of a drug consumption site in Cambridge. We would like to know we live in a safe neighbourhood. And that children will be safe attending school and playing outside. As we are senior citizens it is very important for us to feel safe. It is bad enough we have to stay indoors because of the pandemic. But to know we have to stay indoors because there are drug influenced people walking around the neighbourhood is not a good thing. PLEASE do not let CTS sites into Cambridge.

Thanking you in advance for you cooperation in this matter. We remain

Your truly,
Alex and Elaine Kovacevic
Dear Mayor McGarry and City Councillors

I am writing to you today to express my unwavering support for a Consumption and Treatment Services Site in the City of Cambridge. Please include my letter as part of the official records for the meeting of March 30, 2021.

As a resident Cambridge, I understand the benefits of the Kitchener CTS site, not least of which is the saving of lives. Within the first 6 months of the Kitchener site being open, 71 overdoses occurred and not one was fatal. Had the CTS not been running, many, if not all these people would have died.

Similarly, at InSite in BC, since opening in 2003 there have been 2395 overdoses and not a single fatality.

Simply put, CTS's save lives. The people who need this service are human beings; they are people. They are members of our communities who are our parents, siblings, aunts, uncles, friends, children. They are citizens of the City of Cambridge and deserve access to a safe, supportive environment in which to use drugs.

You may not understand why people use drugs, and you may judge them for doing so. However, one thing I am hopeful you can understand is that they deserve to live. And a CTS will significantly increase the chances that they will.

I urge you to open a CTS site in the City of Cambridge and to do so with haste as it is literally a matter of life and death.

Sincerely

Alissa Poore

Student, WLU
Resident of the City of Cambridge
Hello it has come to my attention of the two CTS sites (8 Oxford St. and 15 Easton St.) . This is very concerning to me as a mother of 3 who lives right in the middle of both proposed sites . I’ve lived on Haddington Street for almost 30 years great memories on this street as a child now I’m raising my own children and let me tell you the past 4 plus years living on this street has been ridiculous I’m sure your well aware we had a drug house to which we finally as a neighbourhood came together to get rid of . My children seen far to much living a couple doors down from a drug house , my youngest was terrified to play outside . Just when I thought great we can have peace and quite and my children don’t have to witness drug addict behaviour I find we now may be close to a CTS site .... This worries me as a parent . Both my children’s schools will be close by these proposed sites (Manchester and G.C.I) . I do not agree with this and it’s not fair to the residents and children whom live near by . Please hear my voice !

Amanda Field
I live at 62 Roseview Ave and am very concerned with the proposal for the injection site to be situated on Oxford St.

I, like most of my neighbours, do not want this located in a very dense residential area. There are many home owners and rentals in this area including apartment buildings.

Many children live here and would be exposed to potentially very volatile situations that they will not be able to handle. Within blocks is Galt Collegiate Secondary School, Manchester Elementary School, Montessori School of Cambridge and Pluto Daycare.

There are several commercial businesses and home businesses, like my own, in this area that will undoubtedly experience a negative impact by this site location.

There are also many elderly who live in this area and may have a difficult time if any possible altercations arise.

My neighbourhood has issues with crime. I have experienced my car being rummaged through on several occasions, my garage was broken into and 4 bikes stolen. My property is often used as a cut through to the bridges. In the past the wooded area behind my property has been used as a camping location. I already called the police on several occasions annually.

I feel by putting this site in this neighbourhood you will be putting the residents, especially children and the elderly, at a greater risk and create an exponential increase in existing issues with theft and property damage. This will have an absolute negative impact on an area in the midst of revitalization.

I do not want this here, my neighbours do not want this here.

Sincerely
Amar Bhuee
Attention to Mayor, council and staff,
Please include my email in the upcoming agenda package for council.

I find it alarming that we are now at the point of proposed site locations, despite the overwhelming opposition to any such site by your elected constituents and consultation reports.
I have lived on Cambridge St since 2000 which was a great neighbourhood for many many years. We have had so many break ins and trespassers on our property we have had multiple cameras installed. After a trespasser in summer 2020 we upgraded our system and as a result between July and December we have had 6 occurences all caught on camera and reported to police.
#20-139707 theft of bike and skateboards
#20-139237 theft of generator
#20-177361 trespasser
#20-242119 stole popcorn machine
#20-257584 attempted break in to vehicles
#20-260454 attempted break in to vehicles
Having this site so close to our home will only amplify the issues. I will have a daughter going to GCI in a year and she will be walking past this area. Along with the students from Manchester. I will simply write this; I do not support a drug consumption site anywhere in Cambridge. I do not support the continuing path of site selection.
Regards,
Angela White
Good Day Everyone,

With meetings being held online and at times I cannot speak at, I am writing an email to express my concerns about a CTS in Cambridge.

Putting a CTS in Cambridge has been an ongoing battle/debate for the past 4 years. During those 4 years little time or money has been spent on getting people help to get off of drugs. The CTS caters to only a small group of people, where as improving our rehab, detox and mental health services would benefit so many more. I understand that you want to save lives (I do as well) but in reality a CTS does not save a life. Anytime you use illegal drugs it causes damage to your major organs, including your brain. Every time naloxone is used to revive a person it causes damage to their bodies. We all need to have compassion for anyone addicted to anything but there is a point where you are basically loving them to death. Add to that talk of a safe drug supply and we really are loving them death because those drugs are not "safe" they are still causing damage to the persons body and brain.

Kitchener has had their CTS for over a year now and fatal ODs are still going up. People are blaming that on covid but since I see groups clustered together outside the CTS and outside the shelters I do not think that is the reason. When you walk into the CTS in Kitchener there is nothing that would point someone to treatment, no signs, no pamphlets etc. and the staff are not allowed to talk about treatment unless they are asked by the client. The treatment part of the CTS is nowhere to be found in the actual CTS. If a client would by chance ask about treatment they are referred to long wait lists and lots of red tape. A lot of the rehab programs say you have to be clean for X number of days to get in so most will need to go to detox first. The wait list for detox can be anywhere from 3 to 6 months, then once you are finished with detox you then have to wait for a bed to open up in rehab (wait lists are well over 6 months) so you are basically just put back out onto the streets. By the time a bed opens up they have already gone back to drugs as that is the only life they had to go back to, so now they need to detox again. Its a wash, rinse and repeat cycle of life that needs to be broken and the only way to do that is to spend money for on demand detox, rehab and sober living so when they ask for help they can go then and there.

Cambridge needs to stand up and be the city that puts treatment first and says NO to a CTS / Safe drug supply and says YES to fighting to get people out of the addiction cycle.

Could you please include this email in the agenda of the next council meeting that deals with CTS, thank you.

Sincerely
Angie Campbell
This email is being written and should be included in the March 30, 2021 council meeting.

The 2 proposed CTS sites in Galt on Easton Street and Oxford Street are unacceptable!

There are families and businesses located in the direct vicinities of both addresses. Do you not care for the safety and well being of your constituents?

I usually walk to and from work daily, sometimes very early in the morning or late at night. The proposed locations would not make me feel safe doing this AT ALL, knowing that people that are freshly injected and influenced by whatever drug was just taken are also going to be in the same area and could possibly bother and/or attack me or my children.

My son goes to Manchester Public School and again, I walk him to and from school on a daily basis. He's still pretty young and we walk with him, but at some point he will want and need to walk on his own without parent supervision. That's part of growing up. Can you GUARANTEE HIS SAFETY when he walks by Easton Street to get to or from school?

Having to keep an eye open for junkies to avoid should not be a responsibility of children that are on their way to school, or even just walking in their own neighborhoods.

Property values in the area are going to plummet if these sites are used. Houses are currently selling well above asking prices here and across all of the K/W area. We feel that the value of our homes would be negatively impacted if either of these sites are chosen.

I realize there is a possible need for something like the CTS sites, keep it downtown where the users usually are and keep them in a more controllable area to some degree instead of spreading them even further into residential areas. How about adding the CTS site right in the Bridges building?

Or, how about in your own back yards? You want to tell me that you would be fine, knowing there would be a safe injection site right next door or across the street from YOUR homes? I think not.

Anke Wilson
To the citizens that are concerned about the upcoming safe consumption site.
I understand why you would have concerns. And it makes sense that you would. I want to help explain if I may why having a safe consumption site is a smart plan. First of all let me tell you that the problem of substance use has been ongoing world wide. It is in all our towns and cities and in all the countries world wide. But there is one country that has handled this some years ago and has been highly successful. Portugal now has less people using substances. They have less overdose deaths. The money that used to be spent on policing, courts and jails went to rehabilitation and it worked. People were given safe supply and therefore the death toll lowered. If this country can reduce the number of people using and dying from contaminated substances then we should be seriously getting on board with what they are doing so we can start to get this pandemic under control. No one wants high crime rates. No one wants to see people dying in the streets. No one wants to see needles in our parks. No one wants to see this continue the way it has been going People use substances for many reasons. Substances like alcohol, gambling cigarettes, whatever it takes to feel better are often wanted “just to take the edge off or to forget or to stop the pain- mental or physical. It could be a student that is stressed. A young lady that was raped. A kid that was abused. The problem is that eventually it causes more problems that what it was originally intended to help. Addiction is a disease. And it needs to be treated as such. Quite often it stems from trauma of some sort and develops into something that people cannot control. None of these people wanted to be addicted. And had no idea that they would be - until the were. Just like all the cigarette smokers. And a lot of us know how hard that was to give up. Prohibition doesn’t work.
If people have a safe place to use their substances they aren’t going to be dying from fentanyl or carfentanyl poisoning or any of the other stuff that is cut into the supply. Crime rates will lower if people aren’t buying stuff on the streets. With safe supply and safe consumption sites, we can clean up the horrendous pandemic that is going on in your neighbourhoods. We can stop all these deaths. There are university students, musicians, lawyers, highly successful people that are dying from a contaminated supply. We NEED safe consumption sites.
I know what I’m talking about. 3 1/2 years ago I lost my 36 year old beautiful son to a fentanyl poisoning. Mathew had been very successful with his recovery for several years. His kindness to others was ongoing and a part of who he was. He was an incredible stone mason and bricklayer, he was a funny guy that loved to laugh and make others laugh- a handsome young man that had many friends and a huge family that all loved him. When his stepbrother was killed in a car accident, my son was devastated and his pain was too much- he relapsed. Just once. But it didn’t turn out to be just once. The addiction grabbed hold. And there was no help. He was desperate for help with his grief and for his substance use. He had to wait several months for a bed in rehab. He was trying his best and going to meetings and going to work and keeping in touch with me, his mom. And then he didn’t. I got the call that ever parent dreads. I held my sons hand for 6 days while he was in a coma and as his brain died. I don’t want to hear of more moms going through what I have gone through. Please, consider doing something that will change the route this pandemic is going. My boy is gone. But your neighbours and your nieces, nephews and sons and daughters and friends and grandchildren- don’t let them be next. Don’t let this continue to go on the way it has been going. If it isn’t working, we need to do something different. Thousands every year in Canada are dying and it needs to stop. What we have been doing in the past hasn’t worked. So let’s try this. Let’s do something different. Let’s get on board and give it a chance.
Please do the smart thing and let’s stop this pandemic once and for all. Support a safe consumption site in Cambridge.
Sincerely
Anna Maria Iredale
I am NOT support the proposal of the cts locations at all. I have great concerns for families, children, their schools and community in the main. Please stop this project for the sake of us all.
Thank you,
Cambridge resident.

Araya Jupp
I am no comfortable with a consumption side in Cambridge at all. We have enough going on with bridges not being taken care of I can’t even go to shoppers drug mark with my daughter cause if the things I don’t not want her to see. Now you want to place a consumption site between a school and a daycare are you insane. I works at OATC and they don’t get enough support to get people clean and you just want to invite addict in and be ok with it. We need to get this off the street but encourage more people to do drugs. Use your heads support places trying to get people clean. I also think you need to rethink bridge and stop allowing addicts in it should be for a homeless center only you are on drugs you should not be aloud in! You wanna make it safe in Cambridge go add a drug consumption site go put it beside the cop shop so they can deal with is not the public

Ashley Williamson
It will be an absolute no for me. This solves nothing other than prolonging people’s lives that don’t want to live and ruining others lives in the process. We can provide many examples of cities that have these sites and the damage it does to the neighbourhood. You can’t undue this once you approve it. It will forever take our city down a path we won’t recover from.

Bev Langlois
Dear Council,

I would like to urge the council to vote in favour of a CTS in Cambridge.

A CTS would provide a safe location for those members of our city experiencing addiction. A place that ensures safe consumption, possibility of immediate treatment and connection to wrap-around services, which could help overcome addiction. As a city we owe this very important site to assist our most vulnerable citizens.

We need act together to show our humanity.

Bev Whittall
Dear Council
I know you folks are probably tired of hearing from me but I worry so much that the voices you do hear
don't not fairly represent many if not most of us who love our community.
I would hope that the council will be supportive of the recommendations that staff come up with. We
have had the advantage of time since the Guelph and then the Kitchener started operating and so many
of the myths put forward by those opposed to a CTS have proven to be incorrect.
Cambridge is certainly as caring for its citizens as either of our neighbours.
Thank you for all the time and effort you all contribute to making Cambridge a better place to live and
work.
Take care

Bob Howison
To whom it may concern,

I am emailing each of you to address a letter in the mail I received in regards to safe injection sights in Cambridge. One location being directly across from my residence. Offering safe injection sites does not solve the ever growing problem not only Cambridge but KW region faces. Our area has the highest fentanyl overdoses in Ontario and by allowing safe injection sights we are fueling the issue instead of resolving it. The purpose of our tax dollars is to change the path our city is headed not allow it to continue. I am heavily against the proposed locations but even more opposed to any other locations being explored. Perhaps look at providing healthcare and mental health services to those who need it rather than allow a "safe" place to do illegal substances and further destroy their lives.

Tax payers safety should be more of your concern. I am a single 20 year old female who works afternoons. I would not feel comfortable or safe coming home to my residence after work at night. This would force me into a position of finding new accommodations to call home and with the damage the pandemic has caused to many locals this is not an option.

Thank you,
Breanna Hawke
To whom it may concern:

As a new resident of Cambridge Ontario, it was very shocking to receive a letter regarding TWO proposed locations for a CTS site, so close to child learning centers, among other amenities!

There shouldn't be any further thought towards allowing a drug consumption site in Cambridge!

This is very concerning to myself, my family and friends. 
What if something were to go wrong? 
Have you put your complete trust in these addicts NOT to; break in to our homes our businesses, to harm or god forbid do worse crimes to our children, to our family, our friends because the addict failed to thrive in this society?
I would NOT feel safe to go anywhere if these site were accepted.
Does the city council really think it is appropriate to proceed with a CTS!? 

There are young children, elderly family members, daycare, schools and businesses, who are near these "proposed locations."
This is not something I am supportive of.

I am requesting that this letter be included in the agenda for the council meeting scheduled for Tuesday March 30th.

Thank you for your time.

-Breanna Lytle
Hi, I've just received information that you are considering placing a CTS on Oxford St. As a former homeowner on Roseview I would beg you to find a site that is not within the downtown boundaries. The residents in this area have had to deal with problems from the bridges for years and a CTS would just be adding insult to injury for these homeowners. Their property value will be greatly affected by this movement. I'm not sure why this location is even being considered since there was a bylaw passed to ensure that this couldn't happen in the core.

Brenda Adams
Greetings.

The thought of a CTS site in our City just infuriates me. Knowing that someone is trying to install one within 500 m of my home and many other residents of this community is absurd. You as our elected officials must take into consideration the needs of the tax paying citizens who live close to these selected sites. I'm sure you are aware there is a elementary school in close proximity to both of these sites, as well as two daycares, and The Muslim academy, not to mention many families with very young children, some within feet of said proposed sites.

I understand there is a need to help people who are addicted, a site where people can use the drugs that they are addicted to is in no way shape or form of help. We need these funds put forth for detox and rehab. Anything else would be in my opinion be cruel and unusual treatment not just for those that are fighting addiction, but those who have to live near and raise their children near these sites.

Please vote against any such site in our City. And forge ahead with treatment for those affected by addiction.

Please include this e-mail in the agenda for the council meeting for March 30th. Re: item# 21-121 (CRS)

Respectfully yours

Brent Woodworth
Greetings Jan

I am very disappointed in the news today of the selection committee choices for the location of the proposed safe injection sites. Have we the people of Haddington St not seen enough in the last 5 years, with 32 finally closed our children can venture out to play with other kids on the street, however this will be short lived! The committee who selected these sites must not be looking at the broader picture and only see dollar signs in there field of view.

I have spoken with many businesses in the impacted area of these two proposed sites and all have said the will move there business elsewhere.

You know how passionate the residents of Haddington St have been over the problems seen on this street, can you imagine a drug deper selling his drugs eight next to a school of day-care, because it will happen, so will the gun violence, the theft, and so on.

What do we as tax paying citizens have to say or do to let the powers that be know that we will not stand for this.

Respectfully yours

Brent Woodworth
Dear business and property owners,

TOMORROW, Tuesday, March 30, Cambridge City Council will be reviewing a report on possible Consumption & Treatment Site (CTS), formally called Safe Injection Site (SIS), locations within our City. **WE NEED YOUR SUPPORT. SPEAK OUT AGAINST the proposed location within the 500m buffer area of our downtown Galt Core.**

Presently, there are two locations identified in the report for Council's review and approval for public consultation; one of the two locations, 8 Oxford Street, is within the 500m buffer of the downtown Galt core. City Council should immediately remove this location from the public consultation process as it goes against their promise.

Last year, Council ultimately decided to forgo enacting a permanent by-law prohibiting a CTS within the City of Cambridge, choosing instead to move forward on a path that relies heavily on trust that their position would be unwavering. That position is that they would not support a CTS within the Galt core or within 500m of the downtown.

The BIA continues to echo Council's promise to stakeholders; that no CTS will be located in the core or within 500m of the downtown. BUT a report from City staff, putting forth a location for approval to proceed to Public Consultation, within the 500m buffer of the downtown Galt core, threatens our assurance from Council.

Some of our elected leaders and a couple of outspoken community members have shared that they believe there is a change in the opinion of CTS within our City; that there is growing support for a CTS, and some have even gone as far as to say that Council should reconsider their stance and move forward with supporting downtown Galt as a viable location.

The BIA's stance has remained the same: No Consumption Treatment Site, formally called Safe Injection Site (SIS), within our Galt core or within the 500m buffer of the downtown. THAT SAID our collective voice might not be enough to dispel the recent spike by some individuals to encourage City Council to sway in their position.

We need support from each of you to ensure that our Mayor and Council hear us loud and clear as we say **NO to a CTS within the Galt core and 500m buffer of the downtown. And further to that, City Council sees to it that the proposed location at 8 Oxford Street, as outline in the report, is immediately removed from moving forward to the public consultation phase.**

Email City Council at: 
council@cambridge.ca
and remember to forward or CC us at  info@downtowncambridgebia.ca

Request to be a delegate at tomorrow's Special Council Meeting at 5:00 pm: 
CLICK HERE to register.

Email or call our Mayor & Councillors, and speak directly with them: 
CLICK HERE for their contact information.

See below the link to the full report on proposed CTS Locations:
Turn to page 177 for the report on CTS site recommendations. Location #2, 8 Oxford Street, is within the 500m buffer of the Galt Core and in a residential area not supported by the Province’s guidelines.

Best Regards,

Brian Kennedy  
Executive Director | Downtown Cambridge Business Improvement Area  
Explore The Core! #DTCbridge  
Telephone: 519-622-3510  
info@downtowncambridgebia.ca  
www.downtowncambridgebia.ca  
Book A Phone Meeting with Brian Kennedy: 
https://meetings.hubspot.com/info6801
Dear Mayor McGarry,

My name is Bridget and I am writing in response to the proposed CTS in Cambridge. I understand there is a council meeting tomorrow to make a decision.

My youngest son who is about to turn 6 years old currently attends the Montessori School of Cambridge at 9 Roseview Ave. I am also a member of the Board of Directors.

I am very concerned about the proposed sites. While I understand that the approved distance from a “Consumption and Treatment Services” site (CTS) to schools or daycares is at least 200m, MSC is 280m away; not far outside of this approved acceptable distance. Not to mention the children enjoy going for walks in the neighbourhood. My son and I take the bus and walk to school several times a week and I am concerned for mine and my son’s safety if the CTS were to be so close to our school and within our walking route.

It is also located within a residential neighbourhood and is surrounded by family homes; which is not part of the criteria for a CTS site location. In addition, the proposed travel route from the Bridges and Downtown Core up Cambridge St. is a short 66m to MSC if they choose to take this route. They could in fact go up Park Hill, which would then lead them to go right past our school on their way to the CTS site. Both of these scenarios are unacceptable in keeping our children and families safe!

Further, Laneway 173 is directly behind our school and is adjacent to our playground. This creates another clear pathway between the school and the CTS site as well as providing a sheltered area for those using and discarding needles. We have grave concern that by having a CTS site so close to the school and within a residential area, this will promote more crime related activity.

The Montessori School of Cambridge has personally been a part of our family and community for over 5 years now. My older son attended and now my younger son is finishing up his final year. I know the impact this school has had on my children’s growth, development and learning. I hope that many more families will be able to experience MSC and I would be so extremely disappointed if they had to close due to families feeling unsafe in the neighbourhood.

I do sympathize with the complexity of the ongoing opioid crisis and hope that alternative options are provided to help those in need. In conclusion, the proposed CTS locations are unacceptable and I oppose such a site being in any residential community.

Sincerely,
Bridget Norris-Jones
With our mayor's background in nursing, she will understand the need to start with mental health supports. Social workers, beds for immediate mental health crisis, low income housing. When addicts have received counselling/medication to help with rational cognitive thoughts, they can then choose their own path for recovery. Right now we are asking people in crises, with their untreated mental health issues controlling their every waking hour to put all of that aside and fix themselves. Meanwhile we're giving them the wrong "support" by feeding their addiction with everything except the street drugs. We're telling them that we'll keep them "safe" with a clean needle to inject what will become their death sentence. Overdose in a consumption site, we'll bring you back to life. We won't talk about the brain damage, organ damage and reduced life expectancy with every injection. We're let them feel that overdosing is no longer a feared outcome. Russian roulette with every injection, until the "safe" injection site is closed and they die on the doorstep. How irresponsible of those officials elected to protect all citizens of our community. This issue is complex with many overlapping resources needed to help people get their minds and bodies out of the cycle of addiction.

Your constituents have been very vocal with a clear message. Help those who at this moment, with their complex needs, can not possibly help themselves. Is is irresponsible to do anything less and downright immoral to feed into their addiction by supporting drug dealers and looking the other way at all other illegal activities. A loud and unmoving no to any consumption site within Cambridge. Yes to treatment with ongoing supports.

Brooklyne Road, Cambridge
Ward 4
I think the current galt shelter is a mess an putting the local children in harms way.

Bruce Deighan
March 29 2021
City of Cambridge Council
50 Dickson Street
Cambridge, ON
N1R 5W8
re: Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation

Dear Members of Cambridge City Council,

People who use drugs are important, valuable, and vulnerable members of our community. The ongoing risks to their health and welfare due to drug use are high. Many individuals present to Cambridge Memorial Hospital’s Emergency Department with infections, overdoses, and other health challenges related to drug use. Tragically, some of those people die in our local hospitals. Others do not make it to the hospital to begin with. 98 people in Waterloo Region died related to overdoses in 2020. These people are mothers, fathers, siblings, children, loved ones and friends.

Consumption and Treatment Services sites are an important part of a comprehensive healthcare system. They provide essential services including overdose prevention and reversal, education, linkage to treatment options, and access to harm reduction supplies. They are staffed by nurses, peer support workers, and outreach workers who engage their clientele with caring and compassion. The benefits of these sites are well-researched and wide-reaching – from decreased rates of communicable diseases and reduced pressure on emergency departments to decreasing discarded sharps and enabling access to treatment. However, the most critical benefit is the lives that are saved. This leaves people with an opportunity to seek treatment. It means families don’t experience that tragedy. First responders, healthcare workers, and peers do not have to witness deaths and then share that terrible news with loved ones. These sites prevent trauma, loss, death, and pain.

Consumption and Treatment Services sites are unhelpful if they are not located where they can be used. They must be in areas where drug use occurs and be available by transit. Accessibility to people with differing abilities, backgrounds, and support needs is important. The operating hours must be adequate, and there are many other considerations to ensure that these sites are best positioned to meet the local needs. The perspective of people who use drugs and the personal and professional connections that support them is critical in planning effective access to healthcare. We need to move ahead with a Consumption and Treatment Services site in Cambridge, ensure the site is available and accessible to those who need it, and focus on the lifesaving care necessary for some of our most vulnerable citizens.

Sincerely,

Dr. Arthur Eugenio
Chief of Emergency Medicine

Melissa Sockett, RN
Manager of Emergency Department

David Hopkins, RSW
Social Worker, Emergency
To whom it may concern:

At this very late date, I have just learned of a proposed site at Rose and Oxford Streets. I was under the impression that a site had been confirmed at 150 Main Street which is easily accessible.

I was therefore shocked to learn of a proposed site at Oxford and Rose Streets. This is a very residential area in rather close proximity to not only the Montessori School on Rose Street but also the Pluto Day Care on Brook Street. Manchester School also draws children from this area.

It is necessary to have CTS Sites in order to help those with addictions. They have proven to be helpful. However, I am of the opinion that the choice of a site on Oxford at Rose is not a "safe" one.

I sincerely hope my comments will be read and heard by those in the Cambridge Council who are considering this matter.

Sincerely,
Carman M. Curtis
I do not support the implementation of drug consumption sites in Cambridge!!!!!! Please include my letter in the agenda for the council meeting on March 30.

Carol
To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to express my many concerns regarding having a CTS site located at 8 Oxford Street. This neighbourhood is, an old established neighbourhood with many retired and seniors living within their homes for years. Their lives, properties damaged, vehicles broken into, and feelings of being unsafe, have already been disturbed with the presence of The Bridges and "questionable" people wandering the area.

Not only are the seniors at risk with this location, as are the children that walk daily to Manchester School. Who are going to protect these children? Pluto Daycare is just around the corner, and you often see the workers taking those children for a walk. All these people are vulnerable if this location goes through.

Please take this wonderful neighbourhood and the people living within it, feelings into consideration. Please have my letter included in the agenda scheduled Tuesday March 30th.

Thank you.
Carol Whitehead
Please include this letter in your council meeting scheduled for Tuesday March 30th.

I would like to state that our household IS in support of a proposed CTS site for Cambridge. Our issue with the 2 proposed sites is that it's close to our neighbourhood. Since the implement of The Bridges our neighbourhood has experienced events which have caused us to feel unsafe. We have had backyard invasions in the middle of the night on 3 occasions and our garage was broken into. Theft of only food from the fridge and a men's bicycle tells me the break in was from a homeless person in survival mode.

We request that you select a location other than our neighbourhood for the CTS site. Please consider how having a CTS site close to your home would affect the value of your home and your household's sense of security. Our suggestion is that you find a location that will least affect Cambridge residences.

Carolyn McLean
Dear Mayor McGarry and City Councillors

I am writing to you today to express my unwavering support for a Consumption and Treatment Services Site in the City of Cambridge. Please include my letter as part of the official records for the meeting of March 30, 2021.

As a resident of the Region of Waterloo and an undergraduate student at WLU, I understand the benefits of the Kitchener CTS site, not least of which is the saving of lives. Within the first 6 months of the Kitchener site being open, 71 overdoses occurred and not one was fatal. Had the CTS not been running, many, if not all of these people would have died.

Similarly, at InSite in BC, since opening in 2003 there have been 2395 overdoses and not a single fatality.

Simply put, CTS’s save lives. The people who need this service are human beings; they are people. They are members of our communities who are our parents, siblings, aunts, uncles, friends, children. They are citizens of the City of Cambridge and deserve access to a safe, supportive environment in which to use drugs.

You may not understand why people use drugs, and you may judge them for doing so. However, one thing I am hopeful you can understand is that they deserve to live. And a CTS will significantly increase the chances that they will.

I urge you to open a CTS site in the City of Cambridge and to do so with haste as it is literally a matter of life and death.

Sincerely

Cassandra Burrows
Just to be clear I do not support the CTS-sites any where in the City of Cambridge specifically near the Bridges. We already have tremendous problems there. Furthermore I think the Bridges should relocate to a more suitable location and convert that building for only homeless families in need.

Celia Chaplin
Attention to Mayor, council and staff,

Please include my email in the upcoming agenda package for council.

It's taken me a few days to compose this email to all of you in regards to site selection of a CTS within Cambridge.

I find it alarming that we are now at the point of proposed site locations, despite the overwhelming opposition to any such site by your elected constituents and consultation reports.

As a tax paying citizen of Cambridge who has children, I beg of you to reconsider having any consumption site within Cambridge. I will simply write this; I do not support a drug consumption site anywhere in Cambridge. I do not support the continuing path of site selection. I do however, support the investment in rehabilitation services for individuals suffering from addiction. Having a consumption site will only enable these individuals addictions rather than helping them. They need services that will help get them the treatment they need, not supply them with the drugs they are trying to escape from. Please for the safety of our children, and all of the Cambridge tax paying citizens, do not move forward with ANY consumption site within Cambridge. My children deserve the right to a safe community to grow up in.

Regards,

Chandler Balsdon
As a resident of Cambridge the Safe Injection Site issue was brought up in the past. The residents of Cambridge made it quite clear we are not in favor of a injection site in our city.

A resident of Cambridge
Christine Carey
As a concerned resident of Cambridge the Safe Injection Site issue was brought up in the past. The residents of Cambridge made it quite clear that they are not in favor of a Injection Site in our city. For the life of me why would you even consider the 2 sites you are looking at, close to schools and smack dab in the middle of Residential areas. Lots of children and Seniors live in these areas have you even considered this Seniors will be a prisoner in their own homes how fair is that. Its proven that these sites don’t work. BC is prime example. Have you even considered Rehabs why would you enable this

A concerned resident
Christine
Dear Mayor McGarry and Council Members,

My name is Christine Wingate and I am on the Board of Directors (Ontario) for Moms Stop The Harm (MSTH). I am writing in support of Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services new site identification that is scheduled to be discussed at the Special Council meeting on Tuesday, March 30.

Moms Stop The Harm is a network of Canadian families impacted by substance use-related harms and deaths. We advocate to change failed drug policies and provide peer support to grieving families and those with loved ones who use or have used substances. Our mission is to end substance use related stigma, harms and deaths. Our vision calls for an end to the failed war on drugs through evidence based prevention, treatment and policy change; we support a Harm reduction approach that is both compassionate and non discriminatory for people who use substances.

We know from experience that stigma forces people to use substances alone and sadly all too often die alone. Structural stigma is created by laws and policies. I am sure that you know that supervised consumption sites and services save lives and benefit communities. They provide a safe, clean spaces for people to bring their own substances to use, in the presence of trained staff. This prevents accidental overdoses and reduces the spread of infectious diseases, such as HIV. Supervised consumption sites can offer a range of evidence-based harm reduction services, such as drug checking. These sites can also provide access to important health and social services, like housing, employment assistance and food banks. including substance use treatment for those who are ready. These sites also help reduce the strain on emergency medical services.

According to the Office of the Chief Coroner (Ontario) effective March 1st, 2021, there are 2,167 opioid related deaths (confirmed and probable) that were reported to date from January to November 2020. This represents a 59% increase over the same time period in 2019 (1,367 deaths).

The overdose crisis continues to be one of the most devastating public health emergencies of our lifetime with an estimated 20,000 deaths in the last five years alone. These are preventable deaths of community members who are children, parents, siblings, friends and family.

As per the government of Canada, Canadian and International evidence shows clearly that supervised consumption sites and services help to save lives, connect people to social services and serve as pathways to treatment.

Please vote "yes" to saving lives and reducing harm by approving a Consumption and Treatment Services site in Cambridge.

Christine Wingate
Moms Stop The Harm
Board of Director Ontario
Hello,
I have been recently made aware of two proposed locations for CTS in Cambridge, both in close proximity to where I live at [redacted], Cambridge, ON, N1R 4B3. 
I would like to say that I am in full support of these services being available at 15 Easton street and/or 8 Oxford Street.
These are life saving services that not only prevent people from dying of overdose, they also provide a safe place for people to use their drugs so that they are not doing so in backyards, alleys, store bathrooms or other public spaces.

The overdose crisis has taken many lives, so many families are torn apart from addiction and unable to mend because their loved ones are gone. I believe as a member of my community we need to be doing as much as we can to help people who are struggling. These services provide a pathway to change and help.

I have seen these services in Vancouver, Ottawa, Montreal and Toronto. Consumption and Treatment sites are one proven effective method to reduce overdose deaths and make neighbourhoods safer.
If we give into fear mongering and misinformation and allow that to stop Cambridge from providing this service, more people will die.

Thank you for taking the time to read my letter. Please include this in the agenda for the council meeting scheduled for Tuesday March 30th. I would be happy to talk more about this in the future.

Christopher Dalton
To whom it may concern this is in regards to the safe injection site hello my name is Cindy Rocha I live at [redacted] St my concern with this is due to my home day care and my child safety I've done day care for the last 13 years in this home I also have lived in this neighborhood my whole life i have always felt safe . my mother and father live on the next street my aunt and uncle also live on the street after they have been here for about 60 years in these houses I do feel a safe injection site is not fit for this neighborhood it is a residential area with lots of elderly people day cares schools and businesses perhaps of rehabilitation site located downtown near the bridge would be something to consider being a single mom and a day care provider it is my job to protect these children and I feel with a safe injection site i just wont feel safe i am not in support of this

please include this in the agenda for the council meeting scheduled for Tuesday March 30th

cindy rocha
Dear Mayor McGarry and City Councillors

I am writing to you today to express my unwavering support for a Consumption and Treatment Services Site in the City of Cambridge. Please include my letter as part of the official records for the meeting of March 30, 2021.

I am a resident of the Waterloo. As a concerned citizen, I feel that Cambridge has a CTS. Saving lives no matter what area should be of a first response action. Statistically it is shown that the CTS's do save lives.

You may not understand why people use drugs, and you may judge them for doing so. However, one thing I am hopeful you can understand is that they deserve to live. And a CTS will significantly increase the chances that they will.

I urge you to open a CTS site in the City of Cambridge and to do so with haste as it is literally a matter of life and death.

Sincerely

Constance Peacock
Morning,

I am sending this email to inform you as a resident of Cambridge I am against the proposal of a CTS. I like many others thought it was pretty clear residents are against a location in Cambridge but here we are wasting time on this topic again. Galt has already been devastated by the uprise of crime, drug use, discarded needles and litter. This would just be one more thing to send Cambridge in the wrong direction. Enabling drug users instead of offering proper services like rehab will never be the right direction.

Cheers,
CK
Attention to Mayor, council and staff,

Please include my email in the upcoming agenda package for council.

I do not support a drug consumption site anywhere in Cambridge. I do not support the continuing path of site selection.

Care for our kids safety, care for our properties, care for a clean SAFE city and overwhelmed police service with a weak justice system that works to release offenders under "supervision" which is merely a revolving door. Possession under, intoxicated in a public place, theft, mischief, threats, Arsen, property damage. These all have a direct correlation to drug use, homelessness and mental health. We need to address the mental health issues, not make an environment for drug addicts to USE MORE and abuse the resources (ODSP, WELFARE, CERB, METHADONE, HOSPITALS)

My dog keeps biting kids and doesn't know how to stop. I am not going to introduce him to a daycare once a day until he realizes he doesn't enjoy biting kids anymore.

Overall, the government has failed the drug addicts and the public when mental health hospitals were closed and the justice system believed in social work and enabling the patterns to continue.

Talk a walk through yours jail's, your police departments, your court systems and hospital's and speak to FRONTLINE staff for the real picture in what is happening on a daily basis.

Regards,

Curtis Rae
New sites are not the solution to our problem in the Cambridge region. Let’s invest public money in rehabilitation centres. CTS is not working. This is encouraging use. Let’s promote a better lifestyle.

Dan
I called Jan L, council member for ward 4, this morning and spoke to my displeasure at these proposed CTS's. Mostly residential neighbourhood(s), we shouldn't be having these conversations at all, as these sites are breeding grounds for crime. Look at east end Vancouver, Toronto, Hamilton etc. all prime examples for what you can expect. Children and elders scared to walk down the streets for fear of being harassed or worse. No one wants to see or deal with this negative behaviour. I do not want my tax dollars funding or supporting any such sites that only enable drug users. Those council members who virtue signal to the benefits of these sites should be ashamed of themselves, or if they really think a CTS is a good idea, put the site beside your own house and see how that works out for you. Please include my letter in your agenda for tomorrow's meeting 21-121 regarding CTS proposal.

Dave Berry
As a long time resident of Haddington st 35+ years we have delt enough with Shirley and 32 Haddington st and drugs crime and thefts on our st. It has been nice after 32 has been shut down, kids out playing riding bikes on the street again new neighbors moving in, more kids After numerous times voicing our feelings on injection sites seems like nobody listens to the people of Cambridge, treatment is better than enabling ,to put this anywhere in Cambridge is absolutely ridiculous let alone in a residential area

Dave Schmalz
Good day Mrs McGarry,

I with my family have lived in Hespeler for 35 years. We moved from the Toronto area to provide a slower pace and safe environment for our children to grow up and go to school. I’m sending this email to voice my opposition to a safe injection site anywhere in the city of Cambridge. I believe in recent years the city of Cambridge has seen a dramatic increase in crime and I believe that an injection site anywhere in the city of Cambridge would only create more problems as well as lowering property values. Yourself and city council were elected by the citizens of Cambridge to serve and listen to the citizens of Cambridge.

This city is changing and not for the good. I urge you to please reconsider a safe injection site anywhere in the city of Cambridge.

Regards,

David Savoie
Hello Cambridge Council
I am writing to you to support a consumption and treatment service site,
My name is Deborah and I am Amelia's Granny, for those of you who don't know, please let me share a brief piece of our story.
Nicole is my daughter age 29 and Amelia is my granddaughter age 20 months
Nicole has been an addict for 15+ years. She has overdosed, not sure how many times, contracted hepatitis, worked in sex trade, multiple incarnations, all due to her addiction disease. I lived life waiting for the dreaded phone call to identify my child.
When she called me to say she was pregnant, I had several questions, which she answered with one statement, "I got into the methadone program. I'm not using street drugs anymore." Amelia was born June 17, 2017. I was there, I cut her umbilical cord, it was a happiest day. Nicole and Amelia moved in with my husband and I. Nicole and Amelia both thrived here, Nicole continued to achieve many successes, and Amelia was growing into a sweet, compassionate, well-behaved little princess. In November of 2018 I started noticing some behaviour changes in Nicole, in late January 2019, she abruptly moved out taking only bare minimum, on February 21, 2019, Amelia had a fatal accident, when she went into her mommy's zippered pocket and found mommy's "candy bag" while mommy was "sleeping", At age 20 months Amelia passed away from carfentinal poisoning.
My life, as well as many others, will never be the same again, ever. I not only lost my precious Angel Princess Amelia, but I also lost my baby, Amelia's mommy, my daughter, Nicole,
In Nicole's recovery she accomplished:
- Taking drivers training, getting her driver's license, and securing automotive insurance
- Replacement of all her identification and keeping it safely kept
- Obtained her GED
- Applied and was accepted into the WIST program at Conestoga College
Obtained part-time employment as part of her college program
Made arrangements for daycare
These are just some of the accomplishments.
Now my daughter Nicole is locked up in prison for Criminal Negligence causing Death, the death of her precious daughter. And a place where when you go to visit, you yourself are treated like a criminal, judged, looked down upon.
Yes my daughter Nicole did the most horrific, unforgiving act by having her stash accessible to Amelia, but Nicole is still my daughter, and I love her, she is a human being, and while in recovery an accomplished human being.
My daughter Nicole suffers from addiction disease, and when she is in suffering stage, that is no longer my Nicole.
And now when Nicole has finished serving her 4 years sentence, I will spend every day waiting for the phone call.

Had there been a place where she could have gone safely, she might not have been in an unsavory place with my Granddaughter and just maybe my precious Princess Elmo, Cookie Monster, and Trolls loving Angel might still be alive, for me to continue watching her grow up.
Please vote yes for safety, let your vote make a difference for all the families who have a person in their life, with a horrendous illness.
Thank You
Deborah Donner
Good Morning,

I was astounded to see the news report that 8 Oxford St. is being considered as a consumption site. This location is in the centre of a residential area. The only way to get to the site without a vehicle is by foot through residential streets. The other option is through the wooded area where the city just erected fences to stop trespassers. Even though this is an area of century homes it is home to many young families and two daycare centres. In this time of crazy real estate prices, this is an area where a young family might actually afford a home with a backyard. This site seems like someone has put a pin in a map to avoid visibility in the core but not considered any other factors. If we really cared about the people needing these services there are several empty buildings surrounding the main bus terminal. Look at the attached picture taken on Roseview Ave and please take this site off your list of possibilities.

Thank you

Don Cowan
I write to state I am strongly opposed to any CTS, SIS or any other named addiction enablement program in Cambridge.

It didn't take a lot of research effort to see that since the Kitchener site was opened late in 2019, overdose deaths have in fact increased by a whopping 155% region wide, with 98 in 2020 and 63 in 2019. Hasn't

I take no issue with giving a helping hand to those of our fellow citizens in need but believe this considered approach will only serve to make their addiction more acceptable in the users mind while offering no treatment or deterrent. Sites like this will only serve to be a beacon in bringing more of these troubled people from outside of our city. It will destroy, diminish and devalue whatever community it is placed in.

My support for this position:
- Not even Sanguen's own website mentions treatment services "supports and referrals" are as close as they get.....pamphlets?
- There were no such issues downtown Galt or Cambridge before Bridges was built, do not add to it.
- Overdose deaths have in fact risen since the first site was opened in KW.
- Will only serve to bring more of these addicts to our city.
- Increased crime in whichever neighborhood it is placed in.

Don Dewsbury
40 year resident of Cambridge
Good afternoon,

I’m writing a letter in support of the SCS (supervised consumption services). I was born in Kitchener and have remained a resident of the region of Waterloo for over 20 years. In that time I have lived in Galt, and enjoyed being a part of that community. As a professional, I am also a social worker, and a community advocate.

I’d like to start by making a few comments about the history of health/community services. The social work and services come out of a desire to pursue social justice. The society as a whole was not in agreement of why societal issues existed or what should be done, but we understand now that peoples opinions and feelings about people (good people (deserving)) or bad people (undeserving)) influenced their beliefs about what should be done (punishment or services) and that approach has caused harm.

Unfortunately, social services and programs are often still left to peoples opinions and feelings. As a social worker, I am very aware of the lack of knowledge and understanding about addiction. People see it as a reflection of character flaws, failing morality, weakness, and is punishment for those who made ‘bad choices’. However, addiction is not those things, using that ideology has not stopped or lowered the rates of addiction. I believe this fear, anger, shaming and abstinence only mindset is continuing to hinder needed progress. When science based responses, research led service provision, results that show transformation in peoples lives is available for our community.

I would urge this council to consider the lives being lost as we wait for the feelings and opinions of some. Consider the specific objections to this site. There are doctors, executive directors, front line workers, people with first hand experience who are giving responses to the concerns of the community. However, some people will not be satisfied because they don’t believe this community deserves this service. The existence of an SCS challenges their beliefs about people. The answers to those questions can be dealt with in counselling, or at religious institutions but should not be allowed to influence the launching of this public health service.

The SCS has been in conversation for some time, and it continues to be delayed under the guise of community consultation. As council people I’m sure an ideal process is one where everyone agrees, but lives of value, worth, purpose, joy, lives that deserve care are being lost and we can’t afford to continue waiting. This process might be a struggle and bring discomfort, but that is what your role (council members) calls you to endure. We need council members who respond to opportunities that will create the best outcomes for peoples lives, because you are in a position of power I hope you use it well.

Thank you for your time.

Donalee Mc Intyre
Hello,

I would like to voice my concern regarding the recent proposed CTS locations in Cambridge.

The two locations proposed are 15 Easton St and 8 Oxford St.

The idea of a consumption and treatment site, where people have a safe place and are cared for and have their needs met and are looked after is not something I have any concerns about. The only concern I have is the proximity to Manchester Public School. The location of 15 Easton St is 500 meters (approximately) from Manchester and the location of 8 Oxford St is 750 meters (approximately) from Manchester.

If consumption sites are to be implemented in Cambridge, I would prefer that they were not adjacent to our schools or nearby our schools.

Thank you,

Donna Friese
Kathryn
It is incredibly disappointing that you and council are not listening to your constituents. The proposed locations are in close proximity to businesses, residential and to public schools? The money needs to be put into rehabilitation options. More money and effort has to be put into mental health and drug addiction solutions not into CTS sites. It is obvious that this is the cheapest way that the government can appear to be doing something about drug addiction and mental health issues. **We do not want any CTS sites in Cambridge.** Vancouver has a number of CTS sites and deaths from drug overdoses continue to rise. Do you want Cambridge to be the next East Hastings?
Please add my letter to the agenda for the council meeting scheduled on Tuesday, March 30th, 2021.
Sincerely,
Donna Wilkie
Attention to Mayor, council and staff,

Please include my email in the upcoming agenda package for council.

It's taken me a few days to compose this email to all of you in regards to site selection of a CTS within Cambridge.

What can I possibly say, that hasn't already been said and ignored? I've been pondering over the years of emails, delegations, reports, statistics, public consultations, recommendations, petitions and community feedback.

I find it alarming that we are now at the point of proposed site locations, despite the overwhelming opposition to any such site by your elected constituents and consultation reports.

I do not doubt that there are some who support, mainly invested proponents of drug consumption sites from surrounding communities, but there continues to be a lack of consideration from the thousands of voices in opposition. May I remind council and staff of the report in which it addressed and affirmed, that council was not listening.

I will simply write this; I do not support a drug consumption site anywhere in Cambridge. I do not support the continuing path of site selection.

I know I will be called upon by my community to speak again with the need to stand up for our concerns. I will not let our voices be cast aside.

Regards,

Doug Spry
Cambridge Resident & Taxpayer
Your Worship Ms. McGarry, Councillor Liggett and Cambridge Councillors:

I am opposed to the location of CTS within 500 metres of the downtown core and therefore am opposed to the option of a possible location at 8 Oxford Street (as outlined in the Staff Report). In spite of the fact that Council did not pass a permanent by-law prohibiting a CTS within 500 metres of the core, I request that City Council abide by previous assurances and immediately remove the proposed location at 8 Oxford Street from any further consideration (including the public consultation phase).

I would also note that the report states that CTS locations are not to be within 200 metres of residential areas even though it is not a provincial criteria (stated criteria as per 3) c. iv.). Yet the 8 Oxford Street location is directly within a residential area. This is another reason why this location should not be considered any further.

Regards,

Ed Gazendam, Ph.D., P.Eng.
Dear Mayor McGarry and Council

I am writing to express my continued opposition to consumption sites in Cambridge and hope instead you will advocate, like me, for more detox beds, rehabilitation on demand, mental health supports and affordable housing. As long as we continue to only fund down stream efforts we will never make a dent in the number of tragic and needless deaths.

While other communities with CTS sites are being touted as success stories, NONE have shown a decline in overall death rates from opioids. We need to try better solutions, that will address the fact that most deaths are happening in private homes which people are less likely to leave to use distant consumption sites.

I urge you to reject the identified sites and concentrate on long term solutions that will actually stem the tide of people falling into addictions as well as providing hope for those already affected.

Ed Heather
Good morning,
Please include my email in the upcoming agenda package for council at the March 30th meeting.

I am writing to voice my opinion on the proposed sites (SIS) etc.

I do not want to say too much about the specific proposed locations, because I believe you will just remove them from your list and continue on finding alternative ones.
I will state though, that I do not understand whatsoever, why you would choose either of these, in lieu of how close they are to schools/daycares and right in the middle of residential areas.
I live on York Place (right behind the proposed site on Oxford), and I can tell you that for some time already, there have been drug addicts/dealers roaming around the area, because there is a dead end on York, situated right behind this proposed site, PLUS, a laneway, right off that same dead end. We already find garbage/needles etc., in that laneway. If this site is chosen, it will be much worse.

What a great location for all the addicts to gather, leave garbage and needles everywhere....maybe even a place to sleep??!!
So, between the dead end and the laneway, the residents of this street will be terrified and likely our homes will be broken into. We've already found a guy walking up and down our driveway looking into our house and around our property. I work from home and am usually alone during the day. My husband actually put a golf club beside my desk in my home office in case I should need to protect myself. You all well know, that drug addicts will do anything to get money or something to steal to get the money. The trash, crime and disorder will only get worse.
My husband and I are in our 60's and walk our dog at least twice per day, and always worried about our dog stepping on a needle or broken glass. I also, often go for walks alone, and when I do, am always on edge about who or what I might run into. We have a 2-year-old granddaughter we would like to take out for walks or to the park, but will not take the risk or expose her to an environment where we might be approached by someone tweaking out and/or being offensive or assertive towards us - maybe even attacked.
We pay almost $4,000 year for taxes and we are afraid to walk in our neighbourhood! Is this fair? So not only do we pay unusually high taxes in this city, but now we can't even enjoy the city. And may I add, there is becoming less and less TO enjoy in this city.
Everywhere you go in this city, you are on edge either about stepping on needles/glass or being confronted by a drug addict. Even the parks are off limits now because of all of this. You want $4,000 a year from me and I can't even go the park OR walk in my neighbourhood without fear? You can't possibly be serious.

I certainly don't have all the answers, nor do I profess to, but I think I have common sense. Something this council is showing very little of.
There are homeless in this city and there are drug addicts. The homeless are NOT a problem. The drug addicts ARE a problem. Two separate issues.
The drug addicts will never go away or stop being a problem until they get help/rehabilitation. In fact, will only get worse, if they don't get the help they need.
Providing a safe place for them to get clean needles etc. is NOT helping them. So, eventually, you will need more and more of these sites to accommodate the growing number of addicts. You need to push back on our prov/fed government to get what this city NEEDS.
We need the resources for helping and rehabilitating these drug addicts. PERIOD.
For all the money this province has spent on SIS’s, we probably could have helped a lot of addicts become clean and sober instead.

Would you like it if one of these sites was in your neighbourhood? Of course, you wouldn't. But it seems to be ok for others. As long as it's not in the "upper class" neighbourhoods, right? What a shame. Is there no longer any respect for residents/citizens?
The addicts deserve respect too - they need HELP. How long are you going to avoid this root of the problem? Help them get clean.
Is this not just plain and simply about HUMANITY??

I do not support a drug consumption site anywhere in Cambridge. I do not support the continuing path of site selection.

Respectfully,

Ellen Heuss
I am a home owner @ [redacted]. My family and I are 100% against this proposed application for a CTS site. We have got to see first hand the drama - ODs, police, fire, and ambulance services 24/7 form drug use and activity - just good my street.

Despite the controlled environment implication, its what happens out side the building when people are buying and selling drugs to shoot up.

Places like this do not belong around schools or even neighbourhoods. Our streets turn into a highway of questionable people at best, and a garbage dump covered in litter from the drug induced state or the craving and lack of thinking leading up to injecting.

I suggest in the cambridge smart center, the hospital, or in an industrial area period. Away from the hard working family's and their property.

As a closing note, Let me ask: what is the point of a clean needle when the person is still injecting God knows what into them. Why not supply clean drugs at this point?

Eric.
Hello,

My name is Erin Dej and I am a resident of Cambridge, and East Galt specifically. I am writing to City Councillors to voice my whole hearted support for a Consumption and Treatment Site in Cambridge.

Criminal justice efforts to address substance use have failed miserably. This is because drug use is a health issue, not a criminal justice issue. People who use drugs are not bad people. They are not inherently dangerous or criminal. They are people; people who happen to use drugs. Their lives are as valuable as mine, or yours, or anyone else, and they deserve access to life saving care as all Canadians should expect in this country. People are dying because the drug supply is unsafe and because people are forced to hide and often use alone for fear of criminal charges. The overdose crisis is concomitant with the pandemic. There is expected to be a 50% increase in the number of deaths this year in Ontario. In the first three months of the pandemic 695 people in Ontario died from an opioid-related death. That's 695 people - actual human beings in our province who mattered and who had loved ones who cared about them. The devaluation of life that has penetrated our social systems and policies for decades has become increasingly visible throughout this pandemic. The lives of the elderly, of low-wage workers, and yes, of people who use drugs, have been positioned as 'less than' others. This is not ok. We cannot allow this to continue.

So many Canadians are proud of our universal health care system, as they should be. But how universal is that care if we know a way we can save people's lives and choose not to because we don't like it? It is un-Canadian and it is inhumane to deny access to a CTS in this community. Not only should there absolutely be a CTS in Cambridge, but it also needs to be located in a place where people will actually use it. It must be located in the urban core where people can walk to access it and it should be located somewhere where people do not feel judged or stigmatized for using drugs.

I implore City Council to do the right thing - to say yes to a CTS and to find a location that works for people who use drugs. You will not be able to find a location that is NIMBY-free so if the NIMBY comments are going to come regardless, it might as well be a site that Councillors can be proud of, knowing it will work best for its users and save people's lives.

Thank you for your consideration,

Erin Dej
To whom it may concern
Making a safe injection site at both the locations stated is a bad idea and is in a bad location. People don't need a safe injection site, they need a rehabilitation site where they can get help. Giving them a safe injection site is not helping them. The locations these safe injection sites are being made is in the middle of a residential area with schools and daycares nearby. Having these people and needles near these locations could be dangerous for the people and kids nearby.

Ethan.M
The argument is simple: safe injection sites have not delivered on their promises and have caused a significant increase in trash, crime, and disorder. Public health experts have built safe injection facilities with little public input, creating problems for long-time residents. As Ontario Premier Doug Ford told reporters: "If I put (a safe injection site) beside your house, you'd be going ballistic."

An emerging body of evidence suggests safe injection sites may cause more harm than good. In Alberta, public health authorities released a bombshell report that showed the sites did not reduce overall overdose deaths or opioid-related emergency calls. And they led to an increase in crime, discarded needles and social disorder in surrounding neighborhoods. Residents complained that they were not involved in the process and felt "less safe than before." After the release of the report, Alberta Premier Jason Kenney announced that the provincial government would consider closing or relocating some of the safe injection sites.

Ontario, Alberta and Manitoba are three of the five largest Canadian provinces, and home to the urban populations of Toronto, Calgary and Winnipeg. Premiers Doug Ford, Jason Kenney and Brian Pallister all challenge the ideology of "harm reduction" and have spoken on the public’s frustration about safe injection sites.

Since taking office, Premier Ford cut funding for three safe injection sites, Premier Kenney froze funding for new safe injection facilities and Premier Pallister announced his intention to support law enforcement over harm reduction.

First, the activist narrative on harm reduction—that it saves lives without collateral costs—cannot be maintained. Safe injection sites have an extremely poor record of moving drug users into treatment and recovery, with some referral rates as low as 1%. As a result, neighborhoods that host safe injection sites, like the Downtown Eastside in Vancouver, often devolve into open-air drug markets, with hundreds of homeless addicts sleeping in the streets. This, of course, only compounds the problem and externalizes the social costs onto neighbors and small businesses.

Already, in some American cities that have come closest to implementing safe injection sites, there are echoes of the Canadian uprising. In 2017, five cities surrounding Seattle quickly passed local ordinances banning safe injection sites; U.S. Attorney Brian Mora warned Seattle lawmakers that any attempt to create safe injection site would immediately be shut down by the federal government. Earlier this year, Philadelphia announced it would open the nation's first safe injection site, then quickly reversed course after working-class residents in South Philadelphia rebelled against the plan.

Moving forward, opponents of "harm reduction" must build on these successes and develop a coordinated strategy to prevent the establishment of safe injection sites. We all can learn an important lesson from cities like Vancouver and Seattle: there is no such thing as safely using heroin, fentanyl and methamphetamine. If all else fails move the bridges and the site to a Location away from schools, daycares and old folks homes. Consider an industrial location with access to public transport!

Eva
An open letter to Katherine McGarry mayor, and to regional council and staff, regarding site selection of Drug Consumption Sites in Cambridge.

Attention to Mayor, council and staff,

Please include my email in the upcoming agenda package for council.

I've been pondering over the years of unanswered emails except by a select few and few I mean one or two people. I am sure this will be one of many more that will fall on deaf ears. It has become glaringly apparent that Community feedback does not seem high on your list of priorities.

Despite the overwhelming opposition to any such site by your elected constituents and consultation reports you choose to doggedly push on.

Yes the addicts need help but not at our expense! Not at the expense of the Elderly, the children, business owners, taxpaying citizens. Their needs do not supercede the majority. They can receive the same help on the outskirts of town. It in the heart of our town!! There continues to be a lack of consideration from the thousands of voices in opposition. May I remind council and staff of the report in which it addressed and affirmed, that council was not listening.

Simply Said ; I do not support a drug consumption site anywhere in Cambridge. I do not support the continuing path of site selection anywhere in our town! Move the bridges to the outskirts of town so the bulk of addicts will relocate and then you can build your CTS sites once the bulk of these addicts has moved to those areas! Stop destroying tourism and our beautiful down town core. Stop endangering our vulnerable citizens the children and the elderly! Stop forcing local business to move out!
I won’t allow our voices be silenced.

Regards,
Eva R. Murphy
Good morning

I am NOT support the proposal of Consumption narcotics and Treatment site between Pluto Daycare and Montessori School of Cambridge.
This is a crazy idea to put the crack heads more in Cambridge town they are already making our beautiful Downtown like a junkyard, you People don't have grandkids or own kids so please don't do that to our children. We vote for you because we trust you.

Mother, and Teacher
Ewa Durakiewicz
To whom this may concern,

As per the majority of the people around this area, I believe it is important to express my/our level of concern regarding the upcoming CTS location as per described in the most recent letter shared with the neighbourhood. There is already a men’s shelter within 1 KM of here which the majority of the people residing here have had to deal with. With the shelter in the area, we have had to face disturbances, police contact as well as small and big crimes in the neighbourhood. Allowing a CTS site so close to daycares as well as our homes and children is OBSURD! Why should we as homeowners have to worry and stress the safety of ourselves, our children and our possessions?? This is ridiculous. I am 150% OPPOSED to this proposition. Long term effects of the CTS may be beneficial to the actual addicts but will have a VERY NEGATIVE impact on our geographical region. I VOTE AGAINST THIS GARBAGE PROPOSITION.

Thank you!

Francine Boucher

A VERY CONCERNED HOMEOWNER
Attention to Mayor, council and staff,

Please include my email in the upcoming agenda package for council.

I find the proposed site locations to be absolutely ridiculous. Not only are they in residential areas with many children living mere feet away but also a stones throw from a public elementary school. Does nobody see the dangers in this? Also there is a plaza beside one site, there are already enough people in the parking lot asking for money, smokes and quite frankly, some are so brazen that it is scary at times. Also, the buildings are not big enough to supply all of the support that is required. To simply enable addicts is one thing and that's all this sized building would be good for, but one would figure that other supports should also be involved as a start to prevention. A large building like old city hall is required and all support systems could be together. Why would you consider moving these people farther away from all of their other resources to survive which are in the core. Or is it because you make too much money as Hollywood North to allow that to possibly effect it.

I do not support a drug consumption site anywhere in Cambridge. I do not support the continuing path of site selections.

Regards

Gary Staveley
Mayor,

Respectfully, staff has brought forward TWO potential sites.

TWO.
Both of which are bad choices, particularly the Oxford Street location.

Hardly what one might call a careful consideration to be brought forward to the taxpayers for THEIR consideration.

Please include this as a response as a part of the agenda record.

Regards,

Geoff Smith
As a resident of Roseview Avenue for over 20 years, I am writing to express my extreme disappointment at the lack of leadership shown by the Mayor and the rest of City Council in considering the site at Oxford Street as a potential candidate for the location of a CTS facility.

This neighbourhood already has more than its fair share of group homes and has seen a marked decline due to its proximity to The Bridges. Break-ins and drug addicts passed out on the street are now routine as more and more people migrate up the hill looking to use drugs or who are wandering through the neighbourhood looking for homes that are not as secure as they could be. There is even now a drug supplier living in a rental unit who has a steady stream of dealers who drop by during the day to resupply. Business is booming! It is open and brazen and the city has done nothing to address the decline; the solution for the city is to now foist even MORE of a burden onto this neighbourhood because it is conveniently located to the source of a problem that was created by the City of Cambridge in the first place.

The real issue at the heart of this matter is the ill-advised and poorly planned location of The Bridges. When this facility was first proposed, we were promised that it would serve young families in need of temporary or transition housing. What happened to that vision? The old adage of “build it and they will come” has never been more appropriate and this site is now a draw for drug addicts outside our community who break into our homes to feed their addictions. Look at what this has done to our downtown – is this what Council wants for this city? This is a problem of your own making and yet the taxpayers in THIS neighbourhood are the ones who are paying for your lack of direction and control. We moved into this neighbourhood at a time when it had the potential to be something. Owners took pride in the maintenance of their homes and the beautification of their yards. It was right on the edge of a vibrant downtown core and now look at what it has become – a dumping ground for sites and services that have NO place in a residential area. We have done our part, thank you.

City Council has actively taken steps to degrade this neighbourhood because it is a convenient location for services that are not wanted in other, more affluent areas of the city. For example, by granting variances and changing the zoning in the area, the neighbourhood has seen a marked increase in the number of apartments owned by absentee landlords who do nothing to maintain their properties. But what do you care? and councillors who don’t even reside in their own wards.

Furthermore, there are CHILDREN who live and play in this neighbourhood – there are schools and a long-established daycare that regularly walks toddlers past this proposed site. What are you thinking?? Your planning assumes that this is an acceptable site because the daycare falls JUST outside the 200m exclusion zone (275m by my calculations). These children walk through the neighbourhood EVERY day – is the onus supposed to be on the daycare staff to walk the children in their care down a route that doesn’t take them past a site that will inevitably draw even more drug addicts to the area? The daycare is NOT a fixed site and the children who attend have every right to walk and get the exercise that they need without being concerned for their safety or being exposed to users of a CTS site. Council needs to address the problem in its ENTIRETY by relocating The Bridges and its ancillary services including a CTS site to a location that does NOT impact the taxpayers who pay your salary. Given the unlikelihood of this ever happening, please reconsider your intent to locate the CTS site at Oxford Street and find a more suitable location. This neighbourhood has already done its part.

Please include a reading of this letter as part of the official agenda.

Thank you.

Regards,

Geoff Smith
I am a long time resident at 23 Bond Street. I am most concerned of the idea of a safe injection site that is being looked at for Oxford street. Our neighborhood is being slowly renewed with new families, with lots of kids playing in the neighborhood. Also friendly neighborly people who love this area. We have had to deal with the repercussions of the Bridges for years. We don’t need a drug site in our neighborhood. We have young families, schools daycares and older people who have made this area our home, and neighborhood we are proud of.

Glen Stewart
Cambridge Council,

I have examined the data regarding the number of lives saved in communities that support CTS’s and find it to be very positive. While a CTS may not be the cure for the underlying issue, it will save lives. And that is a start.

I want to live in a community that is compassionate towards those people and families struggling with this terrible problem. I want my community to take steps to save lives and stop the pain and grief.

I support a CTS in Cambridge.

Thank you,

Glen Whittall
Hello,
We are residents of Roseview Ave.
We are deeply concerned of the locations that have been chosen for the CTS Sites in our
neighbourhood, a neighbourhood which already has significant problems with The Bridges and with
Argus House.
Your proposed sites are ludicrous, being in such close proximity to 2 schools and a daycare and should
not be in any residential area, especially in a residential neighbourhood that has been saturated with
issues due to the Bridges for many years.
I would suspect that none of you would like a CTS Site in your neighbourhood.
Please include our correspondence in the agenda for the council meeting scheduled for Tuesday March
30, 2021.
Glenn & Shelley Marriott
I would approve this for Cambridge however would qualify it by saying it should not be located in the three major downtown areas.
This site needs transportation facilities and room to be surrounded by supporting infrastructure. Gord Chaplin Sent from my iPhone
My name is Gord Flett and I have been a lifelong resident of Cambridge all of my 56 yr life. I'm emailing you all my opposition to any CTS sites anywhere in Cambridge. I speak from my own experience of being addicted to opioids for more then 10yrs and have seeked out help and treatment of all kinds. There is already several facilities that offer treatment to addicts that WANT help. Suboxone is considered the number one treatment available to get off these street drugs and is now available to prescribe from family doctors/nurse practioner in Ontario and available at several other locations in our cities downtown core. Its maintains addicts at a safe dose and allows addicts to live a normal life while being monitored by trained professionals. Its also 6 times safer then methodone regarding overdose. Promoting programs like this is much safer then enabling addicts to continue putting toxic drugs into needles and injecting themselves. Not to mention its covered under OHIP,most drug plans,ODSP and OW. Tell me how much this would reduce crime in Cambridge?? Addicts wouldnt need to steal to feed there addiction. Providing CTS sites is just prolonging drug addiction and wasting useful resources that could be better spent on other programs that actually help people get off drugs. This is where our leaders need to focus attention on. I hope all that receive this email read it and are welcome to share at any city hall meetings or agendas.

Thank You,
Gord Flett
I live on Rich Ave and have participated in meetings, in person and virtually, where this matter has been discussed.

I find myself torn as the need for these facilities is real and urgent but the location - 150 Main Street - seems to present a real risk that the merchants in the area between there and the river will be adversely affected. If that should happen then we face the risk that that section will not be viable as a commercial centre. Additionally the residents in adjacent streets have been subjected to disturbing interactions with ‘homeless’ people.

If an alternative locale could be found I would wholeheartedly support the establishment of a CTS.

Gordon Divitt
Hello.
I am totally not in support for a drug consumption site in cambridge. Especially at the 2 sites that were selected as they both are way to close to residential neighborhoods. There is a couple schools in very close walking distance. 1 is a high school who’s us bad for our youth today. The other is even worse as there is a junior public school and also a couple daycare's within 2 blocks of both locations.
First of all. Allowing people to do those illegal things is bad enough without them being in jail. And now promoting to allow them to do these bad things in our city. This is not good.
I believe that there are other cities that have done this and the areas that they allowed one of these sites to be set up. Just turned that area into a red light district of those individual cities.
I feel that cambridge as a whole should not be promoting these sites. Not even in the proposed locations.... but not at all. Cambridge is a nice place to live and this would totally ruin our town. That myself and my entire family. Extended as well. All have lived in cambridge our whole lives.
This is not worth it. Those people that you are trying to help. By allowing them to do illegal drugs right in front of us it wrong........

How about trying to get real help and not put a bandage on the situation that is the wrong way to go.
Please spend our tax dollars on the people that actually are part of society and pay taxes...
I would like this letter to be included in the agenda of the upcoming meeting!!!
Thanks
Greg Quinnell
Please do not continue with placing a safe injection site in Cambridge. The people of Cambridge have spoken and do not want it in our city. According to Vancouver and Seattle these sites cause more problems of drug traffickers being allowed in the area of the sires. The results are there.
Please put the money the sites would cost to assist those who are homeless, those who need help with mental health issues and those who are trying to get off the drugs but have no where to go to get assistance.
Please do no go ahead in Cambridge.
Heather Kickham
Kindly include my letter to the agenda for the council meeting on Tuesday March 30th

I am a homeowner and resident in Cambridge Ward 4.

It has come to my attention that Council will be discussing possible areas for a CTS site within Cambridge. I have never voiced my concerns yet, I would like to start by saying I empathize strongly with homelessness and the many challenges faced by individuals who are often battling addictions, but while I strongly support drives to save lives and prevent overdoses, I am firmly against enabling and normalizing the use of illicit drugs.

A CTS site in Cambridge:

1) Will result in a strong concentration of drug users in the area near the CTS site looking to finance their drug habit, home break-ins and robberies will skyrocket within walking distance of the CTS site.

2) Drug dealers will congregate nearby the CTS site to cater to their clients, as we have noticed from nearly every drug busts in the news, these are dangerous and unstable individuals that carry weapons with intent, and have an extensive criminal record which gives them little regard for human life, whether it be the lives of addicts or innocent bystanders.

3) We are not a big city, we are a combination of villages in a semi-rural setting. This lower population density and lack of foot traffic and policing resources (unlike cities such as Vancouver or Toronto) make us ill suited to control a large concentration of individuals battling addiction, this also facilitates break in’s and other criminal activities, they generally go unnoticed until it is too late. Do not compare outcomes of CTS sites in Vancouver, Toronto, or even Kitchener to Cambridge!

Discarded needles in public are a major source of concern, but by facilitating and centralizing drug usage, we will be making things worst, the strain on our community and our public resources will be unbearable.

I have been the victim of copper wire theft at my home last year, the thief being a drug user, proceeded to inject intravenous drugs by my front door. My reaction to this event (once the frustration of being robbed faded), was to go to the water street pharmacy to inquire about obtaining a naloxone kit in the event I could save a life. I was not able to get one, I was met with questions as to why I would even want one, and the obligation to enter a registry of methadone kit carriers that will be associated with my health card. With the stigma that comes with drug usage, I doubt anyone who is not directly implicated with drug addiction would be willing to enter a registry that could see them facing stronger scrutiny when looking for prescription drugs or healthcare! This is simply unacceptable.

If you would like to battle this opioid epidemic,

1) Lay down more resources to awareness programs, ensuring first responders and the population in affected areas are well prepared to identify signs of drug overdose and know what
to do. **Provide training sessions open to the public** to train people to understand signs of drug overdose and know when and how to use Naloxone kits.

2) Allow individuals in areas with high rates of drug usage and overdose to have **access to naloxone kits without scrutiny or a need to enter a registry**.

3) **Enroll more police and social workers to help addicts seek treatment, and ensuring they have proper access to essentials**, not to help them inject a drug that is killing them!

You do not fight a drug epidemic by helping people get high with wraparound services, this CTS site will endanger our lives, our community, and disincentivize addiction recovery.

--

Henry Baulier
I think you need to read the Childrens Charter of Rights. Putting these sites near schools or residents homes where young children live endangers these children as addicts have a tendency to leave dirty needles thrown on the ground where young children can find them. Enabling addicts does not help them, what they need are more mental health and addiction facilities where they can get the proper help they need.

-------------------------------------
Origin: https://www.cambridge.ca/en/your-city/Childrens-Charter-of-Rights.aspx?fbclid=IwAR2F9AOSngZ4kNiPowZ1tQgEpqN6U7ZEUYy-\_X0IVqR\_4\_8KcLDWAPbnqw

-------------------------------------
This email was sent to you by Hope A Dekker
Dear Mayor McGarry and Council members:

I was very concerned to hear that my neighbourhood (Oxford at Roseview) is being considered as a location for the proposed consumption site.

I have worked in the not-for-profit sector for more than 20 years and understand the importance of healthy communities. The suggestion of installing a site like this in a residential neighbourhood is not acceptable.

It is already bad enough that we frequently have foot traffic coming up from the Bridges down the hill - people climbing into the waste bins outside the corner units, and often sleeping behind them. There is empty land right behind the proposed building with a lane close to our home where we have found people loitering and leaving garbage. It can be quite scary to walk the dog early in the morning and have men coming out from the bushes there. Please don’t compound this issue.

This is a residential neighbourhood - and adding this service here where we have families, daycares, schools and lots of seniors and children is very disturbing.

We have already had issues with someone leaving their needle kit on our front porch, others taking shelter there sitting on our front deck to smoke...

As I work from home alone during COVID while my husband has to go into the workplace, this has been scary enough.

This is currently a pretty great neighbourhood with friendly neighbours, lots of dogs, kids and great access to downtown Galt and walking trails. We understand the need for the Bridges of course, but making our street a destination for drug use is not OK.

Please consider a different site - a non-residential area possibly close to transit like across from bus station seems to make more sense.

We love our home and don’t want to have to leave - but having a consumption site two houses away from our home is scary... it will also signal a rapid drop in property value and in community safety for us, our senior neighbours, the two daycares in the area and our schools.

Please look at other options.

Best regards,

Ingrid Town Cowan
Dear Mayor McGarry and Council,

I am writing to ask you to please go ahead with the CTS for Cambridge. I am aware that Cambridge has huge addiction issues and a large number of drug dealers. The supply of drugs is unregulated and dangerous and the constant stress for those suffering with addiction is consuming their lives.

When the main task of the day is to get money for the next fix, it is impossible to think of anything else, it is a form of slavery that results in crime, in order to get the drug and death because of the fentanyl risk in all drugs. The local drug industry is run on violence, coercion and crime. If we are to feel safe we need services to help control this pattern. Safe Treatment sites have been proven to take the stress and often the crime out of addiction so that people can focus on getting their lives back together again.

The fear of CTS is based on a public lack of knowledge of how these sites work and the outcomes for citizens. Each person with an addiction disability has at least six friends and family around them who are affected by this disability. Addiction is not social behaviour, it is a disability condition.
Please move forward on the CTS by voting to approve it at Council.

Irene O'Toole
I am a resident at bond street and I do not support the drug consumption site in cambridge at 15 Easton street and 8 Oxford street

Jack Jackman
Dear council members,

As a local resident of Oxford street neighbour in East Galt I am against the proposed CTS site location. Not only are the two proposed locations in primarily residential neighbourhoods but they are also located close to schools (Galt Collegiate Institute, Manchester public school, Montessori school of Cambridge) and a daycares (pluto). These are homes of hard working single families with children. The implementation of these sites must be reversed or at least placed downtown where the majority of users are located. To bring these sites into a residential area is completely irresponsible by the local government.

I think there are much better solutions to crisis of drug users rather than setting up CTS site and i am against the idea.

Should we not shield our children from the dangers of the world? Children should not be subjected to the company of drug users on a daily basis. If your interests are truly in community development then getting rid of the proposed CTS program and putting funding in other forms of treatment would be better. Passing the buck onto residential neighbourhoods will only help to spread the crisis further afield. A high school is literally steps away. Please contain this matter in the downtown core where it persists. The community of Oxford shire should not be imposed upon by the problems of its neighbour.

Please include this letter in the city council meeting for Tuesday March 30th. I would like the link for the meeting and I would like to read this email out loud on March 30th.

Best,

James Dover
Attention Mayor, City Council, and Staff,

Please include my email in the upcoming agenda package for council.

There has been an overwhelming amount of opposition to any and all Consumption and Treatment centres in Cambridge. That has been shown time and time again through community pushback and Councillors who do not support the CTS sites.

Although I understand there are those who support CTS sites in our community, I do not support the continued process of CTS site selection in Cambridge for multiple reasons.

1. I do not support the current proposed sites being in residential areas, close to schools, daycares and my own home. The proximity to these areas are outlined as being necessary to take into consideration within the Government of Ontario’s CTS application guide, and it appears as though the proposed locations have been chosen because they lay just outside the outlined parameters. There has been no public mention as to how community concerns will be addressed, because they lay just outside the 200m mandated by the CTS application. This is unacceptable.

The proposed location at 8 Oxford St is just under 400m from a daycare, and 250m from a Montessori school. This equates to a 5 minute walk. It is necessary for the city to take this into consideration and do better for our children and families in the area. I walk these streets everyday with my child and family, and they are close proximity to the proposed location despite the parameters laid out in the CTS application.

I live 100m from this proposed location and have not been contacted or consulted. Further, I have lost family to opioid abuse, and I still do not support CTS sites in Cambridge.

2. Within the Government of Ontario’s application guide, neighbourhood data surrounding opioid related mortality and morbidity is taken into consideration. The proposed location at 8 Oxford St. is located approximately 550m from the Bridges Shelter Location. Educational and life saving services should be better funded within an already problem laden location in the city instead of moving these types of services to yet another location in the city. The city already ignores the issues running rampant within and surrounding the Bridges, and I do not believe that a CTS site will help to alleviate these issues.

3. Public education of this matter has been practically non existent. I am not convinced this model is best suited for our city and believe the city has not done its due diligence to inform and educate the community in Cambridge as to how this model will be enacted, monitored and supported as it moves forward. I fear the CTS sites will simply be a bandaid solution that will be enacted and ignored. Again, I live less than a 2 minute walk from a proposed location and have not received any information or education on CTS sites in Cambridge.

4. Multiple studies on CTS sites in other areas and countries show that many people who use these sites still inject themselves the majority of time outside the site. CTS sites simply spread already known drug use throughout our communities, closer to schools and daycares. Studies in Lethbridge Alberta have shown an increase in drug abuse anti social behaviour, and an increase in the quantity and types of drugs circulating due to CTS sites. Observations outside a Toronto Safe injection site include drug use,
drug deals, violence and harassment of people walking down the street. Again, these proposed sites in Cambridge are MINUTES away from daycares and schools.

My final statement is that I do not support Consumption and Treatment Service sites in Cambridge in their current models.

Thank you
Jamie Bennett
Good evening:

We are requesting to please include this letter in the planned City Council meeting to happen this Tuesday March 30th, 2021.

We just found out with great disappointment, frustration and disapproval, about the 2 proposed Consumption and Treatment Services sites in our beautiful city of Cambridge; my husband being a lifetime resident of Galt (45 years) and myself for 15 plus years, our family live very close to the 2 proposed sites (Easton St and Oxford St. - Galt), so you can understand our worry, concerns and fear about this wrongly proposed decision, not just to our family but all our neighborhood and the families in the surrounded residential areas.

Having these CTS sites in our city, its just going to escalate and worsen the situation of what we already deal with the dependants from the Bridges area, and it will further attract other homeless/drug users from surrounding cities.

Personally, myself and my children (age 7 and 13) have dealt in the past with scary experiences with homeless/drug users/panhandlers, e.g. being stopped to ask for money in a rude way; happen to see the individuals being high and yelling in the streets to themselves or car drivers; seeing on the streets used needles that have almost stepped on; to see the camping, littering, being high, yelling to themselves and even fighting by Grand River Dan Spring Way.

While my children have had these bad experiences in our regular family walks and sometimes in their way to school, which they attend to St. Peters Catholic School and soon, my teen to go to GCI, it makes them feel very scare and unsafe. No children should feel this way nor growing up in this kind of unhealthy environment and it affects their mental health and put in risk their well-being. Young ages should not being taught nor explain about drug issues but instead they should be growing up with a healthy mind, free of these kind of sights... having to try to explain to them in a "soft" way, still it makes them not wanting to play with their friends in our neighborhood. So, as parents of two, we strongly believe these sites are not beneficial in any way for our children nor any children. To be growing up around these injection sites, are not a good example for the children, teenagers neither for our society.

We have considered moving away from Cambridge for these important reasons, but economy and the concern of leaving behind relatives, has made this difficult to do. So we are here instead, trying to speak up and turn our city to be more family friendly and a beautiful town again.

It should be a common sense than, instead of providing these individuals with CTS sites, that "feeds" their addiction and keeps them away from turning their life around, they rather feel that the government is approving their addiction, which is totally wrong. What these indiviuals need is the support of the Goverment by proving them instead proper Mental Health institutions where they should be interns to help them quit their addictions, so they can find the light at the end of their dark tunnel. This is what these individuals really need, please! For their own sake and our society.

We want to quote what the Convention of the Rights of the Child says:
# 6 Life, Survival and Development. Every child has the right to be alive. Governments must make sure that children survive and develop in the best possible way.
# 24 Health, Water, Food, Environment. **Children have the right to** the best health care possible, clean water to drink, healthy food and a clean and **safe environment to live in**. All adults and children should have information about how to stay safe and healthy.

# 33 Protection from harmful drugs. **Governments must protect children from** taking, making, carrying or selling harmful **drugs**.

According to Children's Rights, we as parents are doing our part to provide this for our children, you as Governorment of our city should support, contribute and provide this safe environment as well.

Please, we hope that you would reconsider your proposals and STOP going ahead with the CTS sites; as affected citizens, we are AGAINST not only to proposed addresses sites but against to locate the Consumption and Treatment Services in Cambridge at all!

Sincerely,
Mr. & Mrs. J. Lefebre (Jason and Judith) and family.
I live near both sites. Our neighbour hood is already not that great due to the homeless people that wander up Cambridge street from the bridges. We already have [redacted] in our alley ways we don’t need more crazy stuff happening from people getting high in our neighborhood too. We are very close to 2 day care centres and a elementary school and a high school. This is not a good area to have this location. It should be at the hospital or at the police station where it can be closely monitored so it does not affect tax paying citizens.

I would like to say we should not have a site in Cambridge at all.

The two locations purposed are certainly not the locations you should be considering.

Thanks a Cambridge resident

Jenn Roswell
March 29, 2021

Dear Mayor McGarry and City Councillors:

Please accept this letter in support of Safe Consumption and Treatment Services in the City of Cambridge.

At Women’s Crisis Services of Waterloo Region, we have seen first-hand the devastating impact of addictions. Often, addictions and mental health are a significant part of the struggles our clients navigate alongside the trauma that they have experienced.

We work hard to partner with other organizations to ensure our clients get the services that they need and deserve. The Safe Consumption Site in Kitchener has been a great resource for our Anselma House residents and outreach clients from the Kitchener Waterloo area. We would advocate for a similar site for our Haven House residents and Cambridge Outreach clients. These sites truly save lives.

Thanks for your consideration

Sincerely,

Jennifer Hutton

Jennifer Hutton MSW, RSW, MBA
Chief Executive Officer
Women’s Crisis Services of Waterloo Ontario
(519) 741-9184 (2111)
Jennifer.hutton@wcswr.org
Dear Mayor McGarry and City Councillors

I am writing to you today to express my unwavering support for a Consumption and Treatment Services Site in the City of Cambridge. Please include my letter as part of the official records for the meeting of March 30, 2021.

As a resident of the Region of Waterloo and PhD Student in the Faculty of Social Work at WLU, I understand the benefits of the Kitchener CTS site, not least of which is the saving of lives. Within the first 6 months of the Kitchener site being open, 71 overdoses occurred and not one was fatal. Had the CTS not been running, many, if not all of these people would have died.

Similarly, at InSite in BC, since opening in 2003 there have been 2395 overdoses and not a single fatality.

Simply put, CTS's save lives. The people who need this service are human beings; they are people. They are members of our communities who are our parents, siblings, aunts, uncles, friends, children. They are citizens of the City of Cambridge and deserve access to a safe, supportive environment in which to use drugs.

You may not understand why people use drugs, and you may judge them for doing so. However, one thing I am hopeful you can understand is that they deserve to live. And a CTS will significantly increase the chances that they will.

I urge you to open a CTS site in the City of Cambridge and to do so with haste as it is literally a matter of life and death.

Sincerely
Jessica Hutchison
Hi there,

I support implementing a Cambridge CTS with wraparound services in our City. I think it would be beneficial having it located in downtown Galt or as close as possible.

Thank you,

Jill Bennett
Hi:
I have been saddened to see the responses of so many rejecting Consumption and treatments sites in Cambridge. Our neighbours who are suffering with addictions need to have some improved safety and better opportunity to ask for help. It does not help anyone to try to ignore the problem. It is here and it is dangerous for all involved. Please go ahead and set up these important sites. I am a retired Public Health Nurse from this region.
Jill Nielsen
With all respect to the Cambridge officials who obviously do not live nor have children attending schools close by, nor have any concern for any child's welfare,

These proposals will directly affect innocent children, perhaps create even more young people to get involved in the sub culture of drug use let alone all and any aspects of this situation.

Find a place far away from children at the very least.

I'm not against a safe injection site.

I'm in favour of one but absolutely NOT in these proposed sites.

Put them in your neighborhood away from children or create a safe site within the hospitals or convert the Rona store into a safe injection site. They could get covid shots and help for their health issues. And its on a bus route. Give them a bus pass.

Problem solved.

Stay away from congregations of innocent and vulnerable children.

Respectfully

Jill Ruth
“Dear Mayor, Councillors and Staff of the City of Cambridge, Ontario

We, the undersigned, as residents, business owners and tax payers of the City of Cambridge, ask that you vote against any motion which includes placing, allowing, or asking for a drug consumption site (also known as a SCS, CTS, SIS or OPS) in the City of Cambridge.
Instead, we ask that you advocate for treatment for those suffering with addictions, by focusing on detox, rehabilitation and mental health supports.
We ask that you please listen to those you were elected to represent and work with the province and the Region to find a solution that does not include the continued consumption of illegal substances.”

Cambridge has enough issues already with the homeless and other failed projects, you are ruining our city, stop it!

Jim Boni, property owner, Taxpayer in City of Cambridge
Dear Mayor, Councillors and Staff of the City of Cambridge

As a resident, business owner and tax payer of the City of Cambridge, I ask that you vote against any motion which includes placing, allowing, or asking for a drug consumption site (also known as a SCS, CTS, SIS or OPS) in the City of Cambridge.

Instead, I ask that you advocate for treatment for those suffering with addictions, by focusing on detox, rehabilitation and mental health supports.

I ask that you please listen to those you were elected to represent and work with the province and the Region to find a solution that does not include the continued consumption of illegal substances."

Sincerely,

Jim Holmes
Council of Cambridge,

My family has received a letter with the information that on March 30th Cambridge City Council will consider a city staff report on possible locations for a Consumption Treatment Site (CTS) for citizens-in-need in our community.

I have several points to make. Although the letter presumes that "results refute any negative arguments" and implies that there is no other way to prevent overdose deaths. But YES, there are many other ways to avoid ODs. Preventing kids from using drugs in the first place can be simple and cheap. Instead of investing in Consumption Treatment Sites (CTS) we would rather invest that budget in sports and many other community driven activities, keeping our kids busy and away from a lifestyle that would bring them to harm's way.

We are all aware that drugs don't affect its user alone, it affects their family and our entire community for sure. The first time it is always a choice and if we don't show our kids that there are other ways to deal with their problems they will also end in this terrible situation. Some might say that addiction is not a choice, but read carefully my sentence "first time it is always a choice".

I definitely don't want to raise my family in a city with this kind of program, I chose Cambridge just to stay away from it (common in big centres) and grow my family in a safer place. I already have suffered several incidents in life because of drugs (robbery, guns to my head, etc), and I don't want my kids to go through the same issues I went through.

I want to remind you all about the known law of supply and demand: where there are customers there will be sellers (drug dealers). This fact will not change just because we are creating a "Safe" site for drug use. As a matter of fact it will happen exactly the other way around.

Another point is that whoever is under influence does NOT think straight and they can no longer decide what to do in a proper way even when they want out after being chemically hooked. No one can prevent them from committing crimes as bluglaries, roberies or even rape.

I would not think twice about moving away from Cambridge if this bad idea moves forward, I would be taking my investments and taxes far away from here.

Sincerely
Joana Borges
Dear Mayor McGarry and Town Council,

I am writing to express my wholehearted support for a Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services (CTS) Site. Please include my letter as part of the official records for the Special Council Meeting on March 30th, 2021.

As an individual who recently bought a home in Cambridge, and works in the Waterloo Region, I would like to express my sincere and serious support of a Cambridge CTS site. CTS sites are an integral part of addressing substance use in communities across Ontario and Canada. They at a minimum save lives and that should be enough proof to implement a CTS site in Cambridge. On top of providing lifesaving services, CTS sites have so many other valuable benefits. Research shows that providing harm reduction services like CTS leads to a reduction in fatal and non-fatal drug poisonings and are also key in providing a safe space where people can receive care free from stigma. CTS sites also reduce risk factors that lead to infectious diseases, and provide increased access to health and social services, and are a cost-effective means to help address problematic substance use.

The Waterloo Region has seen an alarming rise in drug-related poisonings, approximately 98 people died from suspected opioid-related overdoses in 2020 alone, this number is likely an underrepresentation as it does not capture deaths from other substances. From 2019-2020 Waterloo Region had a 56% increase in opioid related deaths and a 158% increase from when opioid surveillance started. This number is astounding as they are all deaths that could have been prevented.

The solution to helping address problematic substance use in Cambridge will not be solved by a CTS site alone but I hope that it is the first step towards deeper community discussion around Nimbyism, collaboration, compassion, and understanding on substance use.

In closing, I cannot stress the urgency of this matter, literal lives depend on it.

Sincerely,

Joanna Han
Dear representatives of our city,

I am writing to express my disapproval and disappointment with the consideration of a CTS in Cambridge. I am not writing regarding the proposed locations as I believe no site is acceptable.

I have not heard or read any good results in other locations that have had CTS sites.

Please please go against what other cities have tried, and failed, and do something different and successful that addresses the mental health needs, homeless needs, safety concerns, drugs getting in to our city, etc that our city is dealing with. A CTS is a bandaid solution in my opinion.

Thank you for taking the time to read my email.

Joanne Kitzman
Hello

I am writing this regarding the two locations proposed for a SafeR injection Site. I refer to it as safer rather than safe because it never completely safe to inject drugs into one’s system, moreso with street drugs cut with fentanyl, heroin and others.

In such a lengthy time I find it difficult to see that only two locations passed muster, yet both are reasonably close to Manchester School and Montessori.

Even with no schools nearby, they are residential areas. Having a CTS should not be seen as a win as others who live, shop or go to school may lose.

A year or so ago at least one councillor hoped it would be within an existing medical facility.

As for wraparound services onsite, what are they exactly? If mental health counselling, the general public should also be permitted to use such services as their cases continue to go unchecked. Trust me when I say teleconferencing or zoom is not the same as one to one interaction.

Even with a CTS in Kitchener numbers are still high. Even if a fatal overdose were to happen at a CTS they do not confirm the death so in a way zero deaths at CTS would be true if only on paper.

Addicts do not all operate on a timeline. They get high when and where they are.

If any proposed CTS were to be, I could only agree to one in an existing medical building or the hospital, not in a residential area.

Joe Lethbridge
Hello,

I am writing to voice my concerns about the proposed locations for the consumption and treatment services sites within Cambridge. Please include this letter in the agenda for the Cambridge council meeting scheduled for Tuesday March 30, 2021.

First, let me begin by stating that I understand and appreciate the need to support members of our community who are struggling with addiction and mental health concerns. They deserve care and support.

However, I am deeply concerned about the locations of the proposed CTS sites, particularly 8 Oxford Street.

The neighbourhood within which the 8 Oxford Street location is situated is residential. It is surrounded by single family homes, multi-unit homes, apartment buildings, places of worship, and several childcare facilities and schools. While it does border on the railyard and contains a handful of small businesses, there is no denying that the neighbourhood is just that—a neighbourhood where people are living.

Additionally, the close proximity of this proposed site to schools and childcare facilities is a grave issue. These extremely short distances (such as 750m to Manchester Public School, 650m to Galt Collegiate Institute, 350m to Pluto Daycare, and 290m to Montessori School of Cambridge) should be evidence enough that 8 Oxford Street is the wrong location for a CTS site.

Thank you for listening to the concerns of myself and my family. We hope that a more suitable CTS site can be found.  
John Fink
Good morning,

I am writing in regards to a CTS site that will be coming to council once again in the coming weeks.

I ask that council remember that there was overwhelming opposition to a CTS site anywhere in Cambridge during the last round of consultations.

I as well as many others have done extensive research and connected with people across the country where similar issues exist and it is clearly evident that these harm reduction policies are failing, not only those struggling with addiction but also the surrounding communities as a whole.

At this time, the definition of “need” in our community supports rehab and preventative education. I urgently request that Council respect the community as a whole and to not have a CTS allowed anywhere in Cambridge, but instead advocate for a designated centre that supports on demand mental health treatment, rehabilitation and preventative education within our schools and community.

Kind regards,

Julie Currie
Say NO to CTS
All it is doing is keeping addicts addicted.
We need rehab, not places to use drugs. Give people a chance to get clean instead of making them wait and fend for themselves. There are many who want to get clean and get a job and get an apartment and take pride in themselves and in their community... this is not working!!!!!!
You think this is helping but it's not.
You are "helping a few" for the sake of the general public.. turning neighbourhoods into holes (literally).. vandalism, theft, drugs offered to children, violence... is this the city you want? Would you want a HARMFUL injection site next to your house? So the drug addicts can be around your children and grand children?? Give your heads a shake and SHUT THIS DOWN!!!!!!
This is ridiculous.
Open rehab centre's or life help centre's not drug centre's.

Julie MacLeod
I write this email concerning the issue of a Safe Injection Site in Cambridge. Thank you for the extensive study regarding the appropriate location of an SIS.

The gravity of the opiate crisis in our community has reached epidemic levels. In my work of 24 years at the Cambridge Self Help Food Bank I often met individuals that would benefit from such a site. I would encourage council to consider putting this site at 150 Main St. This has already proven to be most valuable in a location with other services used by this population. I believe to establish it outside of the core area of Galt would be a huge mistake.

I realize that there are some individuals in our community that do not agree with this suggestion. However, I believe the less vocal segment of our city would support this initiative proven to have worked for the benefit of those that need the service in a multitude of cities across Canada.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of this request.

Respectfully submitted.

June Anderson.
Mayor McGarry, Council, Clerks and to whom it may concern:

I am a concerned citizen of Cambridge and I have recently become aware of the possibility of a "Harm Reduction" site being considered here in Cambridge - again! In no way do I, and many of the constituents of Cambridge, agree on having a "harm reduction" site in Cambridge.

People promoting these "harm reduction" sites claim they save lives and yet a person using the site can leave while they are still high and OD just down the street. A pregnant woman can use the site with no questions asked. This is not safe at all.

People promoting these sites claim there are wrap-around services available knowing full well there are none available. These sites are not open 24/7. A person struggling with addiction isn't going to wait until business hours to use the site. A person struggling with addiction isn't even going to go out of their way to use the site. They will use when and where it is convenient for them. Continued drug use will eventually damage the brain and internal organs not to mention damaging the families involved.

Suggestion: The funding used to hand out free drug paraphernalia (that gets tossed all over the streets and parks) and the funding going towards "harm reduction" sites could be used towards funding something that will work - Treatment Centres.

When promoting saving lives - please consider Treatment over Enabling. Long term treatment with supports in place, once the person leaves the treatment centre, should be considered.

I truly believe a lot more lives will be saved with Treatment Centres not the "harm reduction" sites.

Karen Houston
Hello,

In light of an upcoming city council meeting that will be addressing a CTS in Cambridge, I wanted to share that I strongly support a CTS in Cambridge.

It’s time to recognize how much a CTS location is needed to target overdose deaths. Folks who are suffering from drug addictions need support and access to safe drugs — in order for them to stay alive to hopefully one day receive help they need to overcome their addictions.

There’s a loud voice from a small group of folks in Cambridge that are against CTS— please don’t let their loud voice convince you that the majority of the folks in Cambridge feel this way. I’d also encourage each city councillor to look at the research conducted around CTS’ and also to look to other city’s, who have already implemented this type of support. Please use this information make a decision on how we are going to help citizens of Cambridge who are suffering from addiction. Their lives are important and we have a responsibility to help.

Kind regards,

Karin Devries
Please reconsider. Please don't do this to our city. It is bad enough already. We do not need CTS's to bring more users.
Please add my email to the agenda for your Mar 30th meeting.
Thank you.
Kate Fraser
Good morning,

I am a resident of Cambridge and live on Oxford Street, the same street as one of the potential CTS sites. I am requesting that my email be added to the agenda for the meeting discussing these issues.

When I read the article in the Cambridge Times about these potential locations I was absolutely disgusted. Both potential locations are in close proximity to numerous schools and located in residential neighborhoods. The council has determined that those students at Galt Collegiate Institute, Manchester Public School, Montessori School of Cambridge, and the small children that attend Pluto Daycare's safety and peace of mind are unimportant. It is completely unacceptable that children would have to walk past a CTS site on their way to school. I do not understand why placing a CTS site in a residential neighborhood would be considered an acceptable choice?

The potential location 8 Oxford Street is a block away from Galt Collegiate Institute, down the street from Montessori School of Cambridge, and two blocks away from Pluto Daycare. I would like an explanation why these student's safety is not a concern and how the City Council will justify having drug addicts and drug use in a residential neighbourhood with families and small children.

I purpose the City Council members should recommend their own neighbourhoods or sites close to their children's schools instead since they see no problem with having a CTS next door to homes of families.

I sincerely hope the City Council members are prepared to explain to these schools and this neighborhood why they consider these families so unimportant, and insignificant.

These locations need to be rejected. And City Council should think about what kind of message they are sending to this neighbourhood.

It goes without saying how unbelievably saddened and disappointed I am that I have to write such a strongly worded email. My partner and I have had so much anxiety and stress since learning the City has picked these locations. We live 4 doors down from one of the potential locations. We had hoped to start a family and live in this neighbourhood for the foreseeable future. Now we must think about the safety and peace of mind of ourselves and our future family. If either of the potential locations is chosen, we will feel there is no other option but to move.

It is the responsibility of City Council members to reject these locations.

I hope your conscience will guide you to the only acceptable choice, rejecting these potential CTS sites.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Schuiling
Region of Waterloo undertaking a review of the Regional Official Plan (ROP) to bring it into conformity with the Growth Plan and to be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement.

One component currently under review is the Intensification Strategy which includes:

- Delineating Major Transit Station Areas (MTSAs).

Regional Council will receive this information on April 20, 2021.
Major Transit Station Areas (MTSAs)

• The area within an approximate 500 to 800 metre (1640 to 2624 feet) radius of a transit station (ION LRT stop), representing about a 10-minute walk.

• MTSAs are planned to achieve:
  - higher densities to provide opportunities for living and working close to higher-order transit; and
  - a mix of residential, office, institutional and commercial development where appropriate.
Each MTSA has a unique boundary based on the following criteria:

- Include whole blocks and avoid cutting/dissecting blocks;
- Use streets, highways, rail corridors and natural features to define the boundaries;
- Remove areas inaccessible by pedestrians from the boundary;
- Vacant parcels and lands designated for high density land uses are included in the boundary;
- Avoid overlapping between MTSAs.

Larger MTSAs are preferred to maximize the number of potential riders within walking distance to a stop.

Seven MTSAs are proposed in Cambridge.
• MTSAs on the ION LRT route are planned to achieve a minimum density of 160 people and jobs/hectare at build out.

• All MTSAs in Cambridge, except Delta Station, are anticipated to be able to meet the minimum density target.

• A request to the Province has been made for an alternative density target for Delta Station of 120 people and jobs/hectare.

• Delta MTSA has restrictions related to the protection of existing employment uses, an existing established residential neighbourhood, and the presence of natural heritage features.

• A lower density target in one MTSA does not result in an increase to another MTSA.

AND THAT Cambridge Council endorse the draft Major Transit Station Areas in Cambridge as outlined in Report 21-081(CD) and recommended by Regional staff;

AND FURTHER THAT Report 21-081(CD) and its resulting resolution be provided to the Regional Municipality of Waterloo.
CONTACT INFORMATION

Kathy Padgett
Senior Planner - Environment
(519) 623-1340 ext. 4826
PadgettK@cambridge.ca
Hello, I am writing to voice my concerns about the proposed locations for the consumption and treatment services sites within Cambridge. Please include this letter in the agenda for the Cambridge council meeting scheduled for Tuesday March 30, 2021.

First, let me begin by stating that I understand and appreciate the need to support members of our community who are struggling with addiction and mental health concerns. They deserve care and support.

However, I am deeply concerned about the locations of the proposed CTS sites, particularly 8 Oxford Street.

The neighbourhood within which the 8 Oxford Street location is situated is residential. It is surrounded by single family homes, multi-unit homes, apartment buildings, places of worship, and several childcare facilities and schools. While it does border on the railyard and contains a handful of small businesses, there is no denying that the neighbourhood is just that—a neighbourhood where people are living.

Additionally, the close proximity of this proposed site to schools and childcare facilities is a grave issue. These extremely short distances (such as 750m to Manchester Public School, 650m to Galt Collegiate Institute, 350m to Pluto Daycare, and 290m to Montessori School of Cambridge) should be evidence enough that 8 Oxford Street is the wrong location for a CTS site.

Thank you for listening to the concerns of myself and my family. We hope that a more suitable CTS site can be found.

--
Kay Nadalin
This letter is to inform the Cambridge City Council that I am a citizen living on Easton St. the newly proposed CTS site. I am not in support of this decision. I do not want a site in Cambridge at all. I do not want this site on Easton St. for many reasons ......
1st being children live directly located next to and 2 doors down from this building. 2nd a partially disabled single woman and an elderly lady who has care that comes into her home for her also live on this street.
3rd this neighborhood is vulnerable and does not need to have a council that doesn't even care about Cambridge's innocent tax payers.

I don’t understand the wish to install a crime ridden, needle ridden CTS site. The city already neglects this area, they do not clean up the homeless sites at the end of this road... they allow the addicted and homeless to defecate, urinate and shoot needles into their arms on this street as it is. Giving them a safe place will only attract more undesirable behavior. If you can’t clean it up now what makes you think you can clean up after the site goes in. These addicts will get high and wander out into the street....into the plaza, panhandling, stealing, approaching customers....they can be angry, and irate, they get naked in the parking lot across from my home and they are confrontational. Never mind their drug dealers who wait and supply them with illegal drugs hanging around all the children and schools in the area. I continually watch cop cars sit in the parking lot not doing anything... they just sit there with total disregard for people’s safety. I literally have seen cops drive by a drug addict defecating across the street directly in front of the window where 2 children under 5 yrs old live. I Am so disappointed with my city.... grew up here, I used to be able to walk my dog downtown, I can no longer do that... last time I was attacked by a drunk homeless man.... I can no longer order my food from a restaurant downtown safely as i was accosted by a homeless drug addict last time I tried to pick up my red basil food. Oh by the way I didn't report these incidents because your police force does nothing to the aggressors, calling police has only ever wasted my time, they stand their looking into your eyes and say "what do you want us to do about it" my answer.... Your Job.

I am shocked that this CTS site was ever even thought over.... clean up the downtown core, clean up your city, move CTS sites, move the bridges, put them near the hospital, put them near a police station, put beside an industrial area........ say no to residential and school districts..... say no altogether. say no to CTS sites in Cambridge,........

I have lived in Galt for 43 years and had to move out of downtown to get away from the blatant disregard for our downtown core and for our innocent residents.. I could no longer live there and was forced out due to the concern for my safety. I moved up to the delta onto Easton St. And here comes the Cambridge council to force me out again... So what are you gonna due to protect me .... put in a CTS site that should do the trick....NOT! Why are these drug addicts safety more important than the safety of innocent tax paying citizens.

I would like this letter to be included in the meetings agenda for Tuesday March 30th.

She should ask herself how it would feel if they put a CTS/SIS site beside her home...... but of course higher paying taxed area's with high income housing would never be considered ... just throw us expendables under the bus instead.

From Kaylea Findlay
resident from Easton St.
Good morning,

This email is in regards to proposed safe injection sites at 15 Easton Street and 8 Oxford Street in Cambridge. Please do not invite drug users into family friendly residential neighborhoods with several schools and daycare centers nearby. I should not need to tell you how irresponsible the selection of either of these locations would be. I do not feel there is really any good locations to create a safe haven for the use of narcotics, but you could at least keep it away from neighborhoods packed with children if you feel the need to enable such activity. I will be sure to keep your decision in mind the next time I have an opportunity to vote.

Thank you and be well.

A concerned lifelong resident of Cambridge,

Keenan Meyer
I do not support drug consumption site in Cambridge at 15 Easton street and 8 Oxford Street

Kenneth Lin
Honourable Council:

I am writing today to express my concern with Council Item 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification to be addressed Tuesday March 30th for consideration.

I cannot express not only how disappointed I am in the recommendation of the Community Wellbeing Committee recommendation of only 2 sites located at 8 Oxford St. and 11 Easton St. but also how obviously uninformed and irresponsible these recommendations are. It would certainly seem they were chosen out of desperation with little regard for the wellbeing of the community and a lack of other options. Perhaps the competence of the committee should be questioned or additional resources be made available to them.

Personally I will state I am not in favour of a Consumption and Treatment Services site however it has become quite obvious Council is bent on implementing such a site within The City of Cambridge.

I cannot speak to 11 Easton St. but I do live directly in the neighbourhood of 8 Oxford St. and I can attest this is a family neighbourhood of single family or low density housing. It is a quiet neighbourhood where people live and play, you will see people walking the neighbourhood on a regular basis, elderly walking their dogs, children playing or riding their bikes and skateboards down the quiet streets.

How you can even contemplate placing a building that will have a steady flow of people travelling through this family neighbourhood while under the influence of mind altering substances often leading to very unpredictable behaviour. I say once again this is beyond irresponsible.

If you must move forward with such a site then a residential neighbourhood is not an acceptable choice. If people are not in favor of such sites they should have the choice to avoid such areas but when you actually place it in the back yard of where they live that choice is removed.

Regardless of your preference, can you honestly look in the mirror and say yes I would want this directly beside my residential home, beside the home of my elderly parents, beside the home of my son or daughter or their young children. I suspect if you are willing to be honest that answer would be no.

I strongly urge Council to reconsider location for such a site that once placed will be placed forever. These proposed locations are unacceptable and the Wellbeing Committee should be directed to find alternative sites that are not directly in the middle of a residential neighbourhood.

I am not even arguing if a site should be implemented but should Council move forward with a site, then move forward with a site that considers all the residents of Cambridge.

I implore Council to reject this recommendation from the Community Wellbeing Committee and direct them to re-evaluate options in search of a more suitable site.

I can assure you, should you move forward these sites, they will be met with overwhelming public objection. As much as those suffering from addiction need support, a residential neighbourhood is not an appropriate place to supply such services.

I do hope you take the time to read this and your consideration is appreciated.

Regards

Kevin Nixon
Cambridge Council Members;

Please accept this email as my support for:
1. A CTS site in Cambridge
2. The two locations that have been recommended by City staff.

There has always been a need for a CTS site in our community and the pandemic has only shone a bigger spotlight on the problem of overdoses in Cambridge. Perhaps if we had established a CTS earlier, many more people would be alive to tell the story of how important it was in their lives. As a community we have a responsibility to provide services to ALL members of Cambridge. Research, and the experiences of centres in Guelph and Kitchener, highlight the positive impact that CTS sites have had in their communities. Don’t our community members deserve the same?

Sincerely,
Kim Decker

--
Kim Decker
Ladies / Gentlemen,

I strongly object to the two proposed sites (see subject line).

Both sites are in/or very close to residential areas with many elderly people and young families with kids and schools and daycare places.

I also feel strongly that a site like this should not be in this town.

Sincerely,

Klaus Gute
Good Afternoon,
As a life-long resident of Cambridge I am saddened and angry at the way my city is deteriorating. Setting up these sites is not the solution to people's problems. Individual issues need to be addressed and supported, we need to provide mental health support, detox sites and other solutions for these people. There are many reasons why people use drugs and by giving them a constant supply, you are not addressing the issues.
I do not support the CTS sites in Cambridge, they do not work!
I am requesting that my letter be included in the agenda for the council meeting scheduled for Tuesday March 30th.

Regards,
Krys Woods
Dear clerks,

I own a rental property and am a resident in close proximity of both proposed sites of the CTS. I understand the city feels it needs to keep it close to where people can access it but the locations you have chosen will have a negative impact on the neighbours and businesses near them. As statistics have shown there is an increase in crime and disturbances near every CTS location that has been built so far. All you have to do is look at any site and speak to any of the neighbours near it. There are schools, daycares and residential houses near each of the proposed sites and you have not taken into account the impact on the people that are in the area. Where do you think the addicts that just received their drugs will go when they are high? Where do you think drug dealers will want to spend time to get clients? The locations are also near to Bridges which we know has already caused problems due to the behaviour and the loitering that is allowed in the area and now this site will be added which is in close proximity. Does it not make sense that a large percentage of the homeless and addicted will congregate in this area of the city? I have 4 children and my tenant has 4 children and I no longer allow my children to walk alone in the neighbourhood or ride their bikes around the street unsupervised due to the clientele at the Bridges and the fact they walk our street high and possibly violent. There has been an increase in break-ins and theft and it will only get worse if a CTS is put in the neighbourhood. As soon as my tenant heard it would be located near us she notified me she would be leaving if it does happen. It will not be easy for me to find another tenant already with the issues we have been facing and with a CTS near I am sure it will be impossible. I will be forced to sell my home and my investment property and purchase something somewhere I and my tenants will feel safe living. The city does not have a plan to increase the budget or offer more spots in rehabilitation programs or shorter waiting lists to addicts yet it wants to provide addicts with a safe place to continue to be addicted while ignoring the needs and wants of the homeowners and business around it. There is already a lack of accountability for the actions of this population and the citizens in Cambridge are becoming increasingly frustrated with the actions of the council and the mayor. I have seen grassroots groups spend their own time cleaning up discarded tent cities due to a lack of response from the city as well as an increase in people considering vigilante actions due to a lack of action from the police to deal with the blatant crime that continues to occur unchecked in the city. The Bridges is no longer a safe place for the homeless which is what is meant to be and is overrun with addicts and the area is no longer a safe place to be. By adding a CTS you are again adding another problem to the situation and not addressing the real needs and solving any issues. The continued response of the govt officials of the region is contributing to the citizens leaving in droves, businesses closing doors and the community becoming increasingly upset with the situation that is happening. You are not listening to what your voters are saying and I would hope that you would see that these locations will continue to alienate the very people that pay taxes and want to make this community a better place. There are many other ideas you could support and I am passionate about helping people in need and helping them heal but this is NOT the way to do it. It is enabling people, ruining the city and negativity affecting the people you have been elected to protect. Please consider not only choosing a different site but also changing your mind about putting a CTS in any location. I would ask that you look to alternative options that other cities are doing that actually work, think outside the box and provide support that actually would help addicts to stop doing drugs and become productive members of society and heal from their trauma. A CTS will never do that and it is naive of you to expect that this is helping anybody at all other than the people that will profit monetarily from this situation.

I would ask that you include me in any notifications regarding this site and I would like to attend all upcoming meetings in relation to the proposed sites.

Kyla Shaw
Dear Mayor & elected Councillors

It is my understanding that you have been asked to proceed with the process of securing a CTS site in Cambridge.
The two options being proffered include Easton St and/or Oxford St.

Both these sites are residential areas with neighbours as close as a driveway away - poor choice.

Both these sites are very close to elementary schools and/or daycare centers.

Despite loud and prolonged objections from the citizens of Cambridge, why you have decided to pursue ANY location is extremely questionable and unnerving to me. The interim bylaw passed not once, but twice negating the downtown cores was but a slight indication that people were opposed.

The NUMEROUS reports from Seattle, WA., Vanvouver, BC among many others speak volumes as to the negativity of these sites. The so-called benefits have been repeatedly outnumbered by the cons. Why is this being ignored repeatedly???

If a single person TRULY wanted helpful solutions to this Opioid crises, you would blatently refuse any site, service, or dollar to be invested in a CTS and demand such monies be put into detox and rehab facilities.

Why and how could you support an addict in the throes of said addiction until such time as they eventually die from such a game of russian roulette? Why and how could you support enabling as opposed to stopping such action? Open the venues that will remove the addiction, not the places that enable it to continue.
To deny that’s what a CTS, SIS, SCS, or any acronym of the day, does - is to deny your common sense.

Six months to a year to even begin the actual help process is not acceptable. Getting the necessary funds into treatment cannot happen as long as those valuable dollars are funneling into enabling establishments.

Please do the humane thing. Please do the right thing and keep those places out of Cambridge and stand firm & proud in pursuit of true assistance, not the farce these alternative money wasting sites have become.
Put Cambridge on the map for detox and rehab .... stop following the crowd into the depths of death.

Please.

L L Boldt
I request my letter be included in the agenda for the council meeting scheduled for Tuesday March 30th.

I am opposed to safe consumption sites in the city of Cambridge Ontario. I believe there is no such thing as safely using heroin, fentanyl and methamphetamine. I believe rehabilitation is the way to truly help and cure an addiction.

I also believe having a safe consumption site will attract addicts from other areas outside of Cambridge just as the Bridges did years ago, and continues to do almost on a daily basis. I used to volunteer at Out of the Cold. I thought The Bridges was a good idea, so the homeless could go to one localized place for meals and to sleep. I now see that The Bridges was a huge mistake and no longer feel safe in the city I have lived in for the last 40 years.

Thank you

Laura Down
To whom it may concern,
I can’t tell you how upset I am to hear that this address might be of consideration for a CTS site.
It is in the middle of a neighbourhood consisting of two day care schools, an elementary school and a high school not to mention the many families of elderly people.
This location once had a beer store in place. The traffic almost destroyed the neighbourhood.
Fortunately it was removed from the area into a more suited address.
I hope the powers to be will do a better assessment of areas and realize that 8 Oxford St. would be a disaster.
Would you please send me notification of any meetings or information concerning this topic.
I thank you in advance,
Lee Taggart..(resident for 50 years)
Dear Mayor McGarry and City Councillors,

I am writing to you today to express my unwavering support for a CTS Site in the City of Cambridge. A professor of mine, Jessica Hutchison, informed us of the meeting on March 30, 2021. As someone who is pursuing a MA in Community psychology following my undergraduate degree, I felt a responsibility to send this message in the hopes that my voice is heard.

Although I was fortunate enough to be raised in an upper-class household, I am not ignorant of those who live on government assistance such as welfare, assisted housing, and charitable donations. As I continue my journey through post-secondary education, my ultimate goal is to use my knowledge to continue to help those in need. Having the opportunity to someday work in a field supporting those who have been deemed “addicts” or “criminals” would be one of the most rewarding pathways I can choose. Ultimately, no matter where life takes me, I will carry the structured values I uphold, which surround equitable resource allocation for all. I acknowledge that the fortune and privilege life has offered me can be used to make a positive contribution to society.

As a psychology major with a minor in criminology at Laurier, I understand the benefits of the Kitchener CTS site, which has proven to save lives. Within the first 6 months of the Kitchener site being open, 71 overdoses occurred, and not one was fatal. Had the CTS not been running, many, if not all of these people would have died. Similarly, at InSite in British Columbia, since its opening in 2003, there have been 2395 overdoses and not a single fatality.

These facilities save lives, and people who need this service are a part of our communities. They deserve access to a safe, supportive environment to use drugs. You may not understand why people use drugs, and you may judge them for doing so. I know that my perspectives on the population have changed as I chose to educate myself rather than resort to societal norms of bias. However, I hope you can understand that they deserve to live and that it has been shown that a CTS site will significantly increase these odds.

I urge you to open a CTS site in the City of Cambridge and do so with haste, as it is literally a matter of life and death.

Sincerely,

Liane McPhee
An open letter to mayor, council and staff, regarding site selection of Drug Consumption Sites in Cambridge.

Attention to Mayor, council and staff,

Please include my email in the upcoming agenda package I am going my strong concern in regards to site selection of a CTS within Cambridge. Ayr would be a perfect location!!!!

What can I possibly say, that hasn't already been said and ignored? I've been pondering over the years of emails, delegations, reports, statistics, public consultations, recommendations, petitions and community feedback.

I find it alarming that we are now at the point of proposed site locations, despite the overwhelming opposition to any such site by your elected constituents and consultation reports.

I do not doubt that there are some who support, mainly invested proponents of drug consumption sites from surrounding communities, but there continues to be a lack of consideration from the thousands of voices in opposition. May I remind council and staff of the report in which it addressed and affirmed, that council was not listening.

I will simply write this; I do not support a drug consumption site anywhere in Cambridge. I do not support the continuing path of site selection.

I am part of the Cambridge community and we need to voice our concerns. You as our mayor and councillors need to listen. I will not let our voices be cast aside.

Regards,
Linda Albright-Thiel
Hello Everyone.

I am expressing my opposition of the proposed CTS site for Cambridge, Ontario. I feel that money would be better spent on treatment and rehabilitation site instead.

I am making a formal request that my email be added as a letter to be included in the agenda for the council meeting scheduled for Tues., March 30, 2021. Re: Item #21-121(CRS)!

I'm thinking that the city is using this problem as a money grab for provincial/federal monies to add to the coffers to host such a site in our city. It is bad enough that users are being bussed to The Bridges from other cities because they will not, cannot, won't deal with the problem that is in THEIR own city. Shame on our Mayor and Councillors!!!

These sites also attract those who deal in these drugs to accost the attendees of said "safe injection" sites to use what they have instead. "Get a better high" from our stuff. From what I've seen in the news and read in the papers, Vancouver’s drug problem has only gotten worse with such sites in their once fair city.

My father and first husband were both substance abusers - their substance of choice was alcohol. Through all of the years, I have found that giving them more alcohol was NOT the way to get them to stop drinking. Once an alcoholic, they cannot have even one drink of alcohol without the very real threat of relapsing back into the abusive, anxious, person with many interpersonal problems.

- My dad went to the Chedoke treatment centre in Hamilton - court ordered because he had been stopped for drinking and driving. He wasn't sent to a "safe alcohol consumption" site. He was sent where he went through a program designed to help him understand that he did not have the ability to function as a contributing member of society while he was abusing alcohol.
- My first husband went to the St. Thomas Psychiatric Hospital - court ordered because he had tried to kill himself jumping off a bridge because he was fully intoxicated and did not have the ability to function as a contributing member of society.

The same affects are seen in drug-substance abusers. A so-called "safe" injection site has not proven successful in various cities (i.e., Vancouver is a prime example), nor in the studies that have looked at the benefits to the abusers of such a program.

An addict does not care where he/she gets their state of euphoria. Think about it..... why would he/she walk, take a bus, ride a bike to an injection site when he/she can sit on the sidewalk or wherever is the MOST convenient to do the same thing only MUCH quicker??!! Videos and pictures have been posted on Facebook of addicts literally shooting up in downtown Galt in the alleyway that leads to various businesses (who are also taxpayers).
Some abusers are doing so on the grounds of the local public schools!! How nice for the children of Cambridge to see, touch, and potentially get stabbed by one of these needles. Why go to a safe injection site when the "Tent City" will provide them a place to go and abuse themselves on government property?

Crime is up significantly because these addicts need fast money to get their next fix of euphoria. And.... while in the state of euphoria, they do not know what they are doing and/or they do not care because they are not in their sane state of mind. They are not mindful of their surroundings or of their actions while the drugs take all coherency from them.

**Instead of enabling these addicts to further destroy their dignity and health, send these people to an institution that has programs designed for them to become lose their dependency on any type of substance (alcohol/drugs). Help them learn to become good members of society where their function is to stay sober/healthy and contribute to the good of the community as a whole.**

Perhaps they could/should learn a trade or a hobby that uses their too abundant free time to think about something other than their next fix ... **that should NOT be handed to them at a CTS.**

*Thank you.*

Kind regards,
Linda Fletcher
Ward 6 Resident

Lessons Learned from Vancouver SIS:

“I feel like we’re telling people to just stay on drugs, keep ruining your life!” said Joelle Anderson, who is in recovery.

... 

“It’s funny, the poorest postal code in Canada — the moniker the Downtown Eastside often takes — literally overlaps the most expensive neighborhood in Vancouver,” said Travis Lupick, a local journalist who wrote a book about the history of supervised injection in Vancouver. “This neighborhood, it’s being crunched into a tighter and tighter space.”

The neighborhood’s main businesses shuttered decades ago, making way for poverty and pain of all kinds.
Attention to Mayor, council and staff,

* Please include my email in the upcoming agenda package for council.

This email is in regards to site selection of a CTS within Cambridge and outlines my position.

I find it alarming that we are now at the point of proposed site locations, despite the overwhelming majority opposition to any such site by your elected constituents and consultation reports.

I do not doubt that there are some who support, mainly invested proponents of drug consumption sites from surrounding communities, but there continues to be a lack of consideration from the thousands of voices in opposition. May I remind council and staff of the report in which it addressed and affirmed, that council was not listening.

My entire family (including extended), do not support a drug consumption site anywhere in Cambridge. I do not support the continuing path of site selection. I live in Galt near the methadone clinic and the crime is absolutely exploded exponentially since it’s inception. Adding a consumption site is going to have an even bigger effect on surrounding neighborhoods. When people get high they leave the front door and when they’re high kicks in they commit crime, are out of their minds and no longer have any form of self control. These sites will be an invitation to all of the addicts from the surrounding towns to come here as well. This is simply not acceptable.

These people need treatment and rehab’s but the majority are not willing to go and it is unacceptable to pander to their addictions when they may never be ready to go into recovery. I will never support my tax dollars to support people who use illegal drugs and then force the community to accept their criminal behaviour. These sites - AND the BRIDGES need to be put nowhere near the rest of our vulnerable society that’s been continuously attacked by the criminal behaviour that these addicts force upon it.

Regards,

Lori Obrien
City of Cambridge
Re: Consumption and Treatment Site Proposal

Mayor McGarry and Council,
I am opposed to safe consumption sites in the city of Cambridge, Ontario. I truly believe there is no such thing as safely using heroin, fentanyl, methamphetamine, and the like.
I believe the only viable and compassionate solution to help and cure addiction is through rehabilitation.
I ask that my email be included in the agenda and be notified of all upcoming meetings regarding this topic.

Truly,
Lori Roy
Please include in the agenda for the council meeting schedule to Tuesday March 30th, 2021

Honourable Council:

I am writing today to express my concern with Council Item 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification to be addressed Tuesday March 30th for consideration.

I cannot express not only how disappointed I am in the recommendation of the 2 sites located at 8 Oxford St. and 11 Easton St. but also how obviously uninformed and irresponsible these recommendations are.

Personally I will state I am NOT in favour of a Consumption and Treatment Services site.

I live directly in the neighbourhood of 8 Oxford St. This is a family neighbourhood of single family homes. It is a quiet neighbourhood where people live and play, you will see people walking the neighbourhood on a regular basis, elderly walking their dogs, children playing or riding their bikes and skateboards down the quiet streets.

I am a woman approaching 50 and I take pride in my home with fruit trees and landscaping. We have invested money, and a lot of effort to make our home beautiful. It is our retirement income. We have already installed lighting and security cameras to mitigate the thieving that has progressed substantially in our area over the last 5 years. Who will pay for the additional measures that we will have to take should a consumption site be placed in our near vicinity? Who is going to compensate for the loss in equity of our home. I do not want to live in fear of being pricked by a needle while doing my gardening. I don’t want to live in fear going for a walk around my block or even getting out of my car to enter my home after dark. I DO NOT WANT TO LIVE IN FEAR!

I understand that something must be done but how you can even contemplate placing a building that will have a steady flow of people travelling through this family neighbourhood while under the influence of mind altering substances often leading to very unpredictable behaviour. I say once again this is beyond irresponsible. Who will claim responsibility for me, or the 85 year old woman down the street walking her dog, or the 7 year old little girl that was riding her bike this morning when something happens because of your recommendation? We matter too.

If you must move forward with such a site then a residential neighbourhood is not an acceptable choice. If people are not in favor of such sites they should have the choice to avoid such areas but when you actually place it in the back yard of where they live that choice is removed.

I strongly urge Council to reconsider location for such a site.

I am not even arguing if a site should be implemented but should Council move forward with a site, then move forward with a site that considers all the residents of Cambridge.

I implore Council to reject this recommendation and to re-evaluate options in search of a more suitable site.
I can assure you, should you move forward with these sites, they will be met with overwhelming public objection. I have spoken with many residents in my area who feel that their voices are not being heard. As much as those suffering from addiction need support, a residential neighbourhood is not an appropriate place to supply such services.

I do hope you take the time to read this and your consideration is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Lynette Amalfi
Please councillors consider what a big waste of money these CTS sites are. They do NOT help as they only continue to have the drug user continue their cycle of drug use damaging their bodies further. Mayor McGarry having a background in healthcare, I would hope you would use that medical knowledge to know CTS is not the solution the drug users or the taxpayers need. Please advocate to help get users off drugs using rehab and counselling. We sorely lack funding for this and mental health. Don't waste it on CTS please! They don't work and the only ones trying to convince you they do are companies like Sanguen that are getting rich off of these poor users keeping them perpetually addicted.

Feel free to read this email at any upcoming council meetings.

Thank you,
Lynn
Dear Mayor

The thought of drug addicts, which would be drawn in concentrated numbers, as well as the gathering of drug dealers, so close to where I live, and a grocery store which I frequent disturbs me tremendously. I feel the city needs to pursue viable options to help addicts recover physically, mentally and emotionally. If instead the city goes ahead with safe injection sites then they need to be away from controversial areas. I fear the cost of the fallout of having these injection sites in the proposed areas will be greater than anyone anticipates. I strongly implore the city to not put any safe injection sites in Cambridge.
Thank you
Margie Lake
To whom it concerns

I feel it is necessary for a CTS site in Cambridge, preferably with counseling available. However the site must be located in an area that is safe and compatible with the neighbourhood. Eight Oxford Street is not such a site.

Please consider the upset and worry to the residents and schools nearby. Using 150 Main Street as a site seems to be a much more logical choice for a site.

Margret Thiesburger, Bond Street
Mayor,

This report outlines two potential sites for the CTS facility only. Where is the transparency in the process, what happened to the other 25 candidate sites? Where was the community participation in that part of the process? This lack of transparency must stop.

Please include this response in the Agenda for Tuesday Council meeting.

Maria Smith
Mayor & City Councillors,

I have come across the disappointing news that a CTS site is being proposed at 8 Oxford St. Conveniently located one block over from the Bridges and thereby centrally locating the CTS facility within the neighbourhood that has brunt the majority of the negative impacts associated with a drug culture originating at that Bridges location. And the blame for this I place on the shoulders of City Council.

With the introduction of the Bridges my neighbourhood has changed completely and further impacted how I interact with my surroundings. I no longer take walks beyond Roseview Ave and Bond St out of fear. Experiences such as:

1. Driving down Cambridge Street towards City Hall and having a young lady jump in front of the car and refuse to leave the roadway, bringing potential harm to herself and myself.
2. Attempted break-in at our garage from inside our backyard.
3. Harassment while gardening in the front yard.
4. Finding a discarded bag of drug paraphernalia on the boulevard in front of our home with 16 needles.
5. Discarded personal items strewn on the front lawn, abandoned after an evening of drug induced revelry.
6. Decorative items placed at the front of the house stolen and damaged.
7. Drug trafficking in the lane way behind our home.
8. Witnessed two individuals casing a neighbours home (....the neighbour already having had the misfortune of a break-in and subsequent theft.).
9. Being verbally assaulted and having a broom handle thrown at myself while walking my dog in the neighbourhood.
10. Finding a young lady passed out on the street and having to call the authorities.
11. A walk down town to the river’s edge now means having to be aware of discarded needles. (This is no longer an option).
12. Taking a walk through Soper Park now means being extra vigilant as you do not know what you will encounter. (This is no longer an option).
13. Having the Police come knocking at my door to encourage reporting of suspicious activities. Is this suppose to make us feel safe? Not in the least.

And the experiences of neighbours:
1. Being broken into and having personal items stolen.
2. Squatters on their property and being told by the authorities that they cannot be told to leave.
3. Have uninvited guests enter their home while they are present.
4. Neighbours being physically assaulted.
5. Neighbours having to stay up into all hours of the night to protect their loved ones and property from intruders.
6. Good neighbours selling their homes because of fear.

No citizen should have to live under these circumstances. No citizen should have to fear the surroundings that they call home.

The Bridges originally, as sold to the neighbourhood, was to provide transitional housing for families in need. How it went from this to a haven for drug addicts is unclear to me. When was this change of use communicated to the public? What approvals process did this change of use go through? This has placed
both the clientele of the Bridges and the surrounding residents in harms way. This is unacceptable and unconscionable. City Council by turning a blind eye has created this situation.

And now to add insult to injury a CTS facility is being proposed to be located within the heart of this community. A community that has more than shared the brunt of the harmful impacts of locating a care facility in a site that is not compatible with the programmed use and where there is inadequate infrastructure for the specific program. The current “Bridges” is not compatible with its location and needs to be relocated in its entirety. The Mayor and Council need to address this situation fully and not continue to proceed with half measures.

The “check marks” on the list that supposedly make 8 Oxford a viable site for the CTS facility are disingenuous. To indicate that the proposed site is located 200 m away from schools, day care facilities and parks is not true. Oh yes, these may be located just outside the 200 m boundary, but does Council really believe that the clientele will not walk walk or locate themselves within the exclusion zone surrounding the Montessori school or the Pluto Day care? Where are the clientele going to go AFTER they have injected their drugs? Does Council really believe that the clientele will not walk to Soper Park as they do now from the Bridges? (Note that needle collection still takes place in the park as I witnessed last Monday.) And does Council really believe that locating the CTS facility one block over from the Bridges lessens the impact on the student population of GCI? Do we really want our impressionable youth exposed to this type of culture?

My street, Roseview Ave, exists in a residential neighbourhood. A street that has toddlers from the Day Care facilities walked by every morning. Their path takes in the laneways and streets of the surrounding neighbourhood, including Oxford Street. Students from GCI come and go at various times of the day. Throughout the day there is a flurry of dog walking, trips from doing groceries on foot, mothers taking their children for a stroll, neighbours visiting out on the street etc. This is a neighbourhood that is very much alive with activity. When will City Council acknowledge this and start making decisions that support the positive development of this side of Galt? From City Council we continue to experience and receive decisions that thwart the progress and development of this area - zoning modifications that are non-compliant but City Council turns a blind eye to that fact (44 Roseview Ave), alterations to the fabric of the neighbourhood altering its character permanently (the development of the School of Architecture student housing, an eye sore and not in keeping with the contextual language of the neighbourhood, eliminating a public transition path that allowed for cohesiveness between the upper residential zone and the lower core zone.) In addition, by not including the neighbourhood in the Heritage designation proposed for the core area, but conveniently setting the boundary at Park Hill, Council has revealed their true agenda and the entire process is rather calculated. This neighbourhood has an impressive collection of period architecture, a history that is rooted in the fabric of the Town and already designated Heritage buildings.

The so-called “hot spot” in the study is a creation of Council’s own doing. And as such, Council needs to correct the situation and not further impact the citizens of this neighbourhood and the rest of the city.

Please include the reading of this letter as part of the official agenda for Tuesday’s meeting.

Regards,

Maria Smith
Mayor McGarry, Councillor Liggett, and members of Cambridge City Council:

I believe that the services provided by The Bridges and other outreach agencies are critical for the well-being of all, especially the most vulnerable members of our community. I also believe that research supports CTS sites save lives.

With that said, I do not believe the proposed location of 15 Easton St. or especially 8 Oxford St. are appropriate locations for a CTS.

Both the ROW Literature review and Cambridge Supervised Consumption Site studies provided examples of CTS sites across Canada. The vast majority of these sites are in urban core areas, and many are in very close proximity or adjacent to other health facilities/agencies. They are not located in residential neighbourhoods.

On page 53 and 54 of the Cambridge Supervised Consumption Services Planning Study: “In addition to the above, the OP could also be amended to identify other land use considerations as they relate to avoiding land use conflicts, such as whether the proposed CTS site was separated an appropriate distance from:

- Busy commercial areas or active public spaces that could generate conflicts between the general public and those leaving supervised consumption facilities after consuming;
- Parks;
- Childcare centres;
- Key pedestrian corridors;
- Elementary or secondary school properties;
- Municipal pools, arenas and community centres; and,
- Residential neighbourhoods.”

There are licensed home childcare providers and several public childcare providers and schools (including Montessori School of Cambridge, Pluto Daycare, Ontario Muslim Academy), and these programs regularly take their children for walks around the neighbourhood.

In addition, children who attend Manchester Public School (750m from the proposed site) come from all across the neighbourhood and funnel through the intersection at Oxford and Bond Streets (less than 50m from the proposed site) to cross the tracks to get to school. This "key pedestrian corridor" is filled with children and families multiple times a day. This is not an appropriate distance. These children already have to cross busy railroad tracks and a secondary highway (Hwy 8/Dundas St.) to get to school, many without adults.

Adding a CTS in any residential neighborhood is not appropriate. If we want to follow the lead of other cities, we need to find a space right downtown with other supports nearby to help our most vulnerable community members.

Sincerely,
Marlee Waldron
As a resident of Cambridge the safe injection site issue was brought up in the past. The residents of Cambridge made it quite clear that they are not in favor of an injection site in our city. If you feel you cannot represent the people who elected you maybe you should step down a resident of Cambridge

Martin Sinclair
In consideration of a proposed CTS site location in Cambridge ON,

I find it beyond comprehension that you collectively, the Cambridge City Council directed by the Region of Waterloo, are now at the point of proposing site locations for a CTS site, despite the overwhelming opposition to any such site by an ever growing number of your elected constituents, consultants, by hoards of emails, delegations, reports, statistics, public consultations, recommendations, petitions and community feedback not only here, but across Canada.
Obviously there is a sector who will support this effort, proponents of the idealism of harm reduction, fanfair from neighbouring communities in Ontario, those that expect financial gain from such endeavours, but there continues to be a lack of consideration from the thousands of voices in opposition in the city of Cambridge and Waterloo Region in this direction.

I wish my voice to be heard. **I DO NOT SUPPORT A DRUG CONSUMPTION SITE ANYWHERE IN CAMBRIDGE, ON.** I do not support the continued path of this site selection.

Thank you, Maryann Hendriks

Maryann Hendriks
I live at 60 Roseview Ave and am very concerned with the proposal for the injection site to be situated on Oxford St. I, like most of my neighbours, do not want this situated in a very dense residential area. There are many home owners and rentals in this area including apartment buildings. Many children live here and would be exposed to potentially very volatile situations that they will not be able handle. Within a kilometre of this area is Galt Collegiate Secondary School, Manchester Elementary School, Montessori School of Cambridge and Pluto Daycare.

There are several commercial businesses and home businesses in this area that will undoubtedly experience a negative impact by this site location.

There are also many elderly who live in this area and may have a difficult time if any possible altercations arise.

My neighbourhood has issues with crime. I have experienced my car being rummaged through on several occasions, my garage was broken in to and 4 bikes stolen. My property is often used as a cut through to the bridges. In the past the wooded area behind my property has been used as a camping location. I feel by putting this site in this neighbourhood you will be putting the residents, especially children and the elderly, at a greater risk and create an exponential increase existing issues with theft and property damage. This will have an absolute negative impact on an area in the midst of revitalization.

I do not want this here, my neighbours do not want this here and the community at large DOES NOT WANT THIS INJECTION SITE.

Sincerely
Matthew Hayes
Hi,

My wife and I live at 60 Roseview ave, our back yard backs on to The Bridges shelter and my front lawn intersects with Oxford. When we moved into this area a few years ago we knew there would be some extra issues with being in such close proximity to the shelter. We have had our garage broken into as well as our car more then several times. Our backyard is frequently used as a short cut to the shelter. The wooded area that surrounds the lot has often been used for tents and it’s not an uncommon sight for drug users to be both on the street in the surrounding blocks as well in the wooded area. We have taken this all in stride and have been understanding with the homeless issue that our community is facing.

The proposal to put a safe injection site on Oxford street will only take an existing problem and increase it exponentially. This neighbourhood already has many issues with crime and to add another driving factor seems as the region is intentionally causing more issues for the residents in this area. There is a preschool and Montessori with in a block of this location and a school with in two. How is the location in the middle of such a dense residential area being considered? Would not a better location be the hospital? I believe they had been receptive to the idea but were not able to accommodate it while under construction.

I implore you and the other councillors to reconsider this as a potential site.

All the best,
Matthew Hayes
I would like this letter to be entered into the meeting on Tuesday April 30th regarding the CTS Site Location.

Typically a drop in numbers indicates something is working when it comes to disease. CTS sites for some reason work the other way. Any time a CTS site opens the numbers increase – more deaths and more addiction. Yet people applaud this as if something positive is happening. There is a spin put on this that reverses all logic. In fact they tell us that because of these increases, and the fact it is working so well, that we need another one.

Stop and think about that. Really think about that. Does it make any sense at all?

CTS sites do postpone death, but not even for THAT DAY, only for the period the person is in the site.

If we all get vaccinated, everyone, and the number of illnesses and deaths from Covid increases – do we keep using the same vaccines? Do we allow the government to tell us ‘it is all we have available’? Especially if we know we have options, options that actually work. Would we honestly allow them to tell us to just keep taking it, because they believe (even without changing it in any way) that miraculously one day it might work? Would we be okay with that? No. So why have we accepted this argument for 20 years when it comes to CTS? It doesn’t work and we should be ashamed of ourselves that we have watched this for almost 20 years and did nothing but keep repeating the same thing.

Really help our addicted, really do something to get people real help. Put accessible detox and rehab anywhere you want. But please be the leader and not the follower. Please say no to CTS sites in our City. Please give real hope to the addicted and to their families and not another 20 years of ‘but it’s all we have’. CTS operators have a loud voice, they use the Media and Social Networks, they are highly organized and manage to run campaigns for years to open one single site (Cambridge is a perfect example of that) they are determined and will not quit. Yet they are totally silent on getting readily accessible to rehab, detox or mental health. For 20 years their mantra has been ‘another CTS’ and nothing but ‘another CTS’. Time for a change don’t you think?

I beg of you – do not open this in our City. Lead the way to really helping the addicted.

Maureen Boyce
Hello,

I am writing to plead the city that they don’t put an CTS site in either of these locations. We have many families with small children on this street and the street behind that will be put at risk. There are daycares and schools very close to both locations. This is a very public spot and doesn’t serve anyone in the community.

There is already too much drug abuse happening in our area as we find needles everywhere. I now have a newborn at home and we don’t feel comfortable having addicts around our home. We are already scared to walk alone in the day and never in the evening. This CTS site is a band aid solution to a problem that isn't being solved. Our taxpayer dollars should not be going into this solution but rather it be contributed to mental health funding and rehab centers and halfway home solutions between rehab so people struggling with homelessness and addiction are not found back in the same position after coming out of rehab.

We are angry that we were not notified of this. We are very concerned for the safety and well-being of the children and families of this community.

Please have this letter included in the agenda for the meeting.

Thank you,

McKenzie Burrill
I am voicing my objection to the implementation of a safe consumption site anywhere in Cambridge. My reasoning behind my objection is not relevant suffice to say it is not wanted.

Please include this letter in the agenda for the council meeting on Tuesday March 30th.

Melanie House
Dear Mayor McGarry, Council and City Staff

RE: Report 21-121(CRS) Cambridge Consumption and Treatment Services Community Consultation and Site Identification.

I request that this email be included in the agenda and that I receive notification of any and all upcoming meetings concerning this topic.

I am opposed to a CTS facility in Cambridge. I support rehabilitation facilities that focus on well-being and improving quality of life for all community members. We have an opportunity to be a world class leader in coming up with a made in Cambridge solution to the overdose situation.

I fully support the well-being of all community members and ask that Council and City Staff look carefully when deciding on locations of any CTS.

Neighbourhoods, where community is growing and where children ride their bikes and play together are not ideal for CTS locations and the crime, tenting and drug use that comes with CTS locations. The proposed sites of the CTS facilities do not consider the existing community around the location, the families, children, elderly that live and play throughout the neighbourhood.

It is estimated (stats from realtor.ca) that the neighbourhood where 8 Oxford St is located, has 64% of homes with children. Of those homes, 46% have children under 14 years of age. Again, over half of the residences have young people living there. It is a disservice to those young people in our community to be forced to live with hard drug use being the norm in their streets. The community around Oxford Street location has been held hostage due to the increase in crime, trespassing, yelling, screaming and overall discomfort for over 5 years now, we do not need more added to the ongoing situation.

8 Oxford St. is a 4 minute walk to Pluto Day Care, a 4 minute walk to Montessori school, a 6 minute walk to a Muslin School and there is a resident daycare 290 meters from the locations of Oxford St.

If you are not familiar with this neighbourhood, you may not realize that there are laneways behind the homes, laneways that provide easy targets of homes for thieves, an easy place to hide for illegal activities like drug dealing or using substances, all right where families walk and children play.

It is known there is a “safe zone” around CTS or similar locations and we do not want our homes to be in that safe zone as we need continued Police presence due to the already uncomfortable occurrences we are experiencing.
I ask each of you when voting on this agenda item, please remember you are voting to allow City Staff to explore these locations which gives a green light to the site selection. These locations are less than ideal and I strongly urge that Council direct City Staff to come up with a better solution and better location. Each of you know where we stand and what we expect to see for all community members, we contribute to this City on many levels and are disappointed to see these two locations as the best options.

Thank you

Meredith and Clifford Vanclief
I DO NOT support any drug consumption sites (CTS) in the city of Cambridge. I DO NOT support the continuing path of site selection in the city of Cambridge!!

Michael Fister
Council of Cambridge,

My family and I OPPOSE to the CST in Cambridge.

Firstly there is nothing positive about (if you ever went to Kitchener downtown when it is dark you would understand how bad it is) and I am stunned by the patronizing paragraph “Unfortunately, Councillors are still hearing loud messages from a small group of Cambridge citizens who continue to argue that a CTS will increase drug use and cause harm to local residents and business owners alike. They want CTS banned from ever coming to our community. We have carefully observed the implementation of a Guelph CTS and a Kitchener CTS. Both have produced very positive results that refute negative arguments.” Absolutely NO ONE is in favor of it, at least no one I know who lives in the entire Cambridge / Waterloo / Kitchener is ok with it.

Secondly we came from Vancouver, a city completely changed to worse due to those “progressive” policies that filled many great spots of the city with drug dealers and its “customers” (victims). We left Vancouver for Ontario due to that as well. We can’t raise kids in a place like that and we won’t think twice about moving away from here if we ever see any of this in our city. Consequently taking our Tax Payment away from this Community.

Thirdly you should be focusing on eliminating the drug dealing in our city, not validating / normalizing its consumption. REFUND OUR POLICE AND ALLOW THEM TO WORK! Only then treat the population / victims from this hideous crime, by providing them the detox needed for them to think clearly. They cannot think straight under effect and reviving them from OD is not the way.

Lastly although Canadian Citizens my family and I came from Latin America, from a place that still suffers from Drug Cartels and the “collateral” violence. ALL of this is a consequence of several things allowed by the Government. It is all good until authorities lose control and the cartels take charge. We saw that once and it hurts us a lot to see that Canada might be going in the same path.

Sincerely,

Michel L. Chagas
*****URGENT- INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING LETTER (EMAIL) IN THE AGENDA FOR COUNCIL MEETING TOMORROW MARCH 30, 2021*****

Monday March 29, 2021

Your Worship Mayor McGarry, city councilors, city clerk and all present at this City Council Meeting for Tuesday March 30, 2021,

I am writing this letter because I recently received two hand-delivered letters from concerned citizens in my Ward 4 neighbourhood concerning City Council’s selection of 8 Oxford Street and 15 Easton Street in Cambridge for drug consumption sites to be operated in the Region of Waterloo. I was both shocked and appalled at this selection, for many reasons, first of all that it would be right in the middle of a residential area. I have lived in the Region of Waterloo for 26 plus years, the past almost six years on Bond Street. I chose to live here because it is an excellent neighbourhood where people actually talk to and help one another.

I see the daily parade of young mothers walking their school aged children along Bond Street to Manchester Public School. I also see, in warmer weather, the Montessori School teachers from the Montessori School on Roseview Avenue walking their young charges along the street. Walking through the neighbourhood several times a day, I see the preschoolers outside the Brook Street location of Pluto Day Care. Your selection of 8 Oxford is within 290 to 350 metres of the preschool and daycare. It is also within 750 metres of Manchester PS. It is also very close to Galt Collegiate Institute, whose students also pass by my home.

This neighbourhood has already come to terms with and supported The Bridges shelter. This did not come without loss of property, damages and disruptions. We are however a community and wish to work together to help our fellow citizens. This selection of CTS sites is telling your citizens that you wish to totally disregard the safety and well-being of the many young children who reside in this area. Further, there are many young mothers who have recently moved to these neighbourhoods, and had no idea that this was a possibility, let alone pending.

The opioid crisis is not going away any time soon. However, this was started by legitimate drug companies who sold opiates knowing that they were addictive. Millions of dollars of lawsuits have been paid out to verify this result. Now, across Canada and in the U.S. opioid addiction is killing people and leaving families decimated.

CTS Sites need to be connected to Region of Waterloo sites and or medical facilities like our hospitals. They do not belong in any residential area. I do not support a CTS site at 8 Oxford Street or 15 Easton Street.

Respectively,

Michele Dunsford
Dear Mayor, Councillors and Staff of the City of Cambridge

As a resident, business owner and tax payer of the City of Cambridge, I ask that you vote against any motion which includes placing, allowing, or asking for a drug consumption site (also known as a SCS, CTS, SIS or OPS) in the City of Cambridge.

Instead, I ask that you advocate for treatment for those suffering with addictions, by focusing on detox, rehabilitation and mental health supports.

I ask that you please listen to those you were elected to represent and work with the province and the Region to find a solution that does not include the continued consumption of illegal substances.

Sincerely,

Michele Holmes
Dear Council,

I wanted to pass in my thoughts regarding a CTS here in our city.

As an 18 year resident of this city I am more worried about our fellow citizens than ever before. The opioid crisis has taken a bad problem and made it catastrophic. We are losing people day in and day out. A safe place to be able to deal with their daily troubles and better connection to the services available is essential. To just simply leave people to live and use on the streets is giving up our humanity.

Please move forward with the next steps in bringing a CTS to Cambridge. Let's not give up and allow our humanity to erode further.

Mike Shanks
I wish to inform Councillors that I STRONGLY OBJECT to the proposed CTS site on Oxford Street, I am sure you all realize that the location is surrounded by residential, primary school, and a daycares. If you have not surveyed the area, please do so, to see how children will see what is happening on a daily basis. Also we have so many brake-ins in this neighborhood, as we are so close to the Homeless shelter.

Please re-think the decision you are making, as this is a residential neighborhood and surrounded by secondary, primary and daycares. I STRONGLY OBJECT TO THE 8 OXFORD STREET, LOCATION FOR THE CTS SITE.

Nelson & Lumina Rodrigues
Attention: Mayor, council and staff

Re: Item # 21-121(CRS)

Please include this letter in the agenda.

I have lived in Cambridge all my life. I am very concerned by the thought of a consumption site being in my city. I and my family DO NOT condone this anywhere in Cambridge.

Our mom lives near the area you are proposing to put this site in. She is 88 years old, lives alone, and pays municipal taxes. She is already afraid to go for a walk, even though she is totally self-sufficient and of sound mind. Because we already have an issue in Cambridge of increased crime and theft, caused predominantly by drug use, she is afraid to go for a walk with her dog by herself. There are many seniors that live on this same street, one woman who is 101 years old! The site being recommended by council is in the neighbourhood of family! An injection site has no right to be near schools, seniors, or children!!!!

It has been proven statistically that these injection sites are not helpful to any community. There are more overdoses, more criminal activity so addicts can get their “fix”. I do not want that “risk” near my mother!

There is a daycare across the street from her, with children from 1 – 3 years old. Kids don’t need to see that. People with drugs go to the “site” and “safely” inject. What about those people who need their fix and don’t have the money? You don’t think they won’t be hanging around looking for their fix?

Cambridge’s biggest focus should be on treatment facilities. I have a child who is suffering from addiction, and unless I have millions of dollars, there is no help for him!!!! And I know I am not alone. Almost everyone I speak to has someone or knows someone who has this problem. A CTS site doesn’t solve the problem. Drug addicts use wherever and whenever they can. Focus should be on treatment, mandatory if it has to be.

I know of so many people that are leaving Cambridge because of the drug problems and crime that exists here now. Most of my friends have left, or are leaving because they just can’t take the B.S. anymore. I refuse to leave at this point because I have decided that until this is made right again, and we can walk our streets safely I have to have a voice!!

Nicole Blair
Dear elected representatives of Cambridge,

How many petitions? How many votes of NO do we need to emphasize that the citizens of Cambridge do not want a safe injection site in the struggling downtown core? Is the strategy to wear down the electorate? To keep trying until no one is looking?

Please find another solution. Perhaps fund the regional hospitals to provide these additional services in outpatient type environments. Perhaps look at alternatives such as rehabilitation and addiction counselling services.

I’ve lived in Vancouver’s downtown east side. I’ve walked through neighbourhoods in Hamilton and Kitchener with these CTS facilities. It’s not pleasant and hurts the potential for commercial development in these areas. Our downtown core is struggling with business closing faster than they’re opening. Do we want a downtown with nothing more than shuttered businesses and a CTS site? Right beside a new LRT station?

There are other options to help those with addiction issues. Safe injection sites are not the only answer. Let’s do what fits our city best and helps our downtown core get back on its feet and drive commercial and local development and growth.

Please vote NO on yet another proposal to open a CTS site in downtown Cambridge.

Nuno
Please include this email in the minutes and meeting Tuesday March 30th 2021.

Like an overwhelming number of Cambridge residents have said in the past and continue to say, my husband and I say NO to a CTS site ANYWHERE in our beautiful historic city. This strategy has failed over and over in other cities as it will here! Please take the monies allocated for CTS and spend it more wisely on rehabilitation to give the addicted a fighting chance to get their lives and self respect back. Enabling has never helped anyone and never will.

NO TO CTS IN CAMBRIDGE! Please listen to your constituents.

Pam and Tony Spagnola
Cambridge, Ontario
PLEASE say NO to this site in Cambridge. We as taxpayers (me for the last 40 plus years) should be heard.

The sites listed are in a residential area and close to schools. That is unfair to the taxpayers living in those areas.

After growing up in Cambridge including my family and now 5 grandkids I am so disappointed in what Cambridge is becoming.

I understand times change and we get bigger but there has to be some control on how the budgeting is working along with the safety of all citizens.

We are paying to promote gaslight and bailing out theatres, painting stripes on sidewalks and yet there is no money for detox and help centers. It seems like we are puppets for the region in all of the decisions.

The $ for the site could be used for help for the drug addicts. This is just enabling and not treating the root of the problem.

PLEASE listen to Adam Cooper and Kayla Andrade. We are lucky to have these individuals trying to help all people of our community.

Kind Regards,

Pat Grant
Good afternoon,

This email is in regards to the above report. It is my understanding that 2 sites have been identified as possible locations for a CTS in Cambridge.

As outlined in previous emails by myself and others, I don’t believe the sites being presented in the report are the best choices for the families/children living and attending schools, daycare centres and using the public park in these neighbourhoods.

I find it hard to accept that Council would vote for either of these 2 locations.

1. 15 Easton Street is only a 2 minute walk from Manchester School and a 3 minute walk from Soper Park.

2. 8 Oxford Street is only a 2 minute walk from Pluto Day Care and 1 minute walk from Montessori School as well as a 4 minute walk from Soper Park.

Facilities assisting those with addictions, mental health issues and counselling are needed in our community, however, harm reduction centres are not necessarily the best solution to this crisis and definitely not situated so close to schools, daycare centres and public parks.

I would hope that Council would consider the Cambridge Memorial Hospital as the only feasible site.

Thank you,
Pat Stager
Cambridge Council and Mayor:

I am opposed to a CTS site in Cambridge. On record Mayor McGarry says health services are calling for this. Are they the only ones who have a say? What about the rest of us? Like my neighbour Nick. He was kneeling on his lawn removing weeds because he likes to keep his place looking nice. A homeless person walking casually knocked Nick over. For keeping his place nice Nick was treated with scorn, disdain and violence from a passing homeless person. Meanwhile the homeless feel they are entitled to free shelter, food, and now a safe injection site. We owe them! They don't have to do anything such as work, or even pick up their own garbage. And those of us who do are beneath their contempt because we do. And let us not forget the drugs they will be using are still illegal. How are they going to pay for them? I know! By breaking into people's houses - like mine has, twice! Or the next best option - trafficking in substances themselves. Yes, let's do whatever we can for these people. They cannot, or more like will not, do anything for themselves. Except put a needle in their arm, knowing full well it could kill them. I call it voluntary assumption of risk. How much do we owe them? An intractable problem that will never go away if you build a safe injection site, now that Bridges brought the problem to downtown Galt.

Please ensure that this letter is included in the agenda for the council meeting scheduled for Tuesday, March 30, 2021.

--

Patricia King
(I would appreciate my email to be included as part of the agenda package for the Cambridge City Council meeting on Tuesday, March 30, 2021)

Mayor McGarry and City of Cambridge Councilors,

Once again I would like to add my opposition to any form of CTS within the City of Cambridge and that will never change. The only option I would support is funding for counselling, mental health, detox, rehab, an advanced sober living program and eventual housing. To take up the challenge WITH us via local, regional, provincial to federal because that is what it is going to take.

Keeping people trapped in a broken system of drug addiction and poverty is inhumane in my eyes and sometimes we have to step up and be the parent, teacher or caregiver instead of the enabler. We have to be the voice of change.

Since I last wrote:

The Region of Waterloo had the Raddison hotel in Kitchener as a temporary shelter. Violence, motel damages and ODs were common place before that option ended.

Next was the Inn of Waterloo which had approximately 130 people in winter over flow. Transportation to a CTS, which Kitchener does have, was offered for those who wish to go there. Yet that very motel was having daily over doses and (weekly?) deaths. After a few short months a fire broke out in a room by one of those being housed. News media stated damages were estimated at one million dollars.

No other location in the Region would offer further accommodations so they were moved over to the Holiday Inn in Guelph where staff has stated they were the worst ever to be accommodated. Last week one of the “residents” committed robbery at a near by variety store and it took three hours with a stand off with police before that person was arrested. The next day Guelph social media headlines read “Thanks Kitchener”. I wonder what options will be available for winter of 2021/22. Let alone landlords which are very aware of what its happening out there.

Guelph has also opened a CTS in their city yet their latest news states their OD rates have gone up by 242 per cent.

The majority of those with mental health and addiction issues are not IV drug users. Alcohol, cannabis, crystal meth and cocaine are a bigger problem. Many use at any given time in a social setting with “friends”. Some do use alone. Of all that I have met, none are interested to take the time out during these moments to go to a consumption site even when free transportation is provided.

People are continually told these sites save lives and possibly so. But common sense for those who look beyond that, we see that the “majority” are being over looked. Adequate funding for detox, treatment, etc is not as profitable as keeping the addiction alive. Who ever thought of the advertising and marketing strategy of ‘CTS SAVES LIVES” should be commended as creating one of the best slogans ever since it did appear to have worked. Yet IMO a bigger change needs to happen with funding as this is not the answer.

Respectfully,

Patricia Thomas
Hello. I would like to request the following letter be included for the city council meeting scheduled for this coming Tuesday March 30th.

I'd like to state this right off the bat, I am very much in favor of CTS Cambridge locations regardless of where they go. I feel that it is essential that these sites are opened so that the risks and deaths associated with drug use can be mitigated and helped. I am a resident of 32 Portland St in Cambridge along with my wife and infant daughter and we basically are a few doors down from the proposed 8 Oxford St location.

The people that these CTS Cambridge sites will service are just that, people. They are citizens of this city same as me and my wife and daughter and they are hurting and in need. Denying the CTS locations is an effort to sweep the drug problems of Cambridge under the rug and away from people eyes and neighborhoods but that will just prolong the problems that need to be addressed. The people who will be using these CTS sites are already in our neighborhoods, they're already our neighbors and as a community we should be concerned with helping our neighbors, not shuffling them off and saying, "not in my backyard".

CTS will not encourage drug use, drug use happens regardless of whether it's right or wrong, legal, or illegal, it's a symptom of many much greater societal problems that we face, and seeing as they are societal problems, we should face them together as a society and as a community and not shy away from them.

Thank you for hearing this message and for seeing this project through, no matter what the outcome is I appreciate your efforts.

Patrick Sparrow
Attention to Mayor, council and staff,

Please include my email in the upcoming agenda package for council.

I have seen the rancour surrounding the proposal of safe consumption sites coming to our beautiful city and find it disappointing. I along with many others applaud the decision to address the cities drug problem. Those Individuals against the site are misguided on the science and get their beliefs off each others hate for those who they see as lesser.

Do not listen to the vocal minority. Listen to the science. The only way to get these needles out of our parks is safe supervised sites with services available for those willing to seek treatment.

I am adding my name to those for the site. For the safety of the community and for the betterment of our most vulnerable.

No location will ever satisfy those that rant about “those people” on Facebook. They don’t want to admit the problem exists everywhere, our city is not an isolated case. Only by confronting the problem will we be able to solve it. Please vote yes on scs in Cambridge.

Patrick Vannan
Hello,

I believe we need to proceed with a CTS in Cambridge. Guelph and Kitchener CTS have produced very positive results.

I believe that implementing a Cambridge CTS with wraparound services is an important action for Cambridge to take.

Thanks,
Patti Toporowski
To Whom it may Concern.

I would like to express to City Council that I am completely against having a CTS site anywhere in Cambridge and I am asking that Cambridge be the city that concentrates on getting more / better detox, rehab, sober living and mental health services that could help not just people addicted to drugs but people with any addiction. Its time to do better.

Could you please include my email in the agenda for the CTS site selection please.

Paul Galvao
I am writing to you as my elected officials regarding the decision to put a CTS in the Cambridge area. This harm reduction initiative has been proven not to work in other cities/provinces. The results speak for themselves with increased overdoses, increased deaths, crime and unsafe communities. Cambridge already has enough problems with drugs, discarded drug paraphernalia and crime and I do not feel the a CTS is a viable or compassionate solution. I am asking you to listen to the tax payers of Cambridge and vote against placing a safe injection site in Cambridge. On this very important topic I would like my voice to be heard and I look forward to your support. *Please add my email to the agenda.

Thank you,
Pauline Brittenden
Cambridge citizen for 57 years
I am opposed to Safe Injection Sites in Cambridge Ontario

The argument is simple: safe injection sites have not delivered on their promises and have caused a significant increase in trash, crime, and disorder. Public health experts have built safe injection facilities with little public input, creating problems for long-time residents. As Ontario Premier Doug Ford told reporters: "If I put (a safe injection site) beside your house, you'd be going ballistic."

An emerging body of evidence suggests safe injection sites may cause more harm than good. In Alberta, public health authorities released a bombshell report that showed the sites did not reduce overall overdose deaths or opioid-related emergency calls. And they led to an increase in crime, discarded needles and social disorder in surrounding neighborhoods.

Residents complained that they were not involved in the process and felt "less safe than before." After the release of the report, Alberta Premier Jason Kenney announced that the provincial government would consider closing or relocating some of the safe injection sites.

Ontario, Alberta and Manitoba are three of the five largest Canadian provinces, and home to the urban populations of Toronto, Calgary and Winnipeg. Premiers Doug Ford, Jason Kenney and Brian Pallister all challenge the ideology of "harm reduction" and have spoken on the public's frustration about safe injection sites.

Since taking office, Premier Ford cut funding for three safe injection sites, Premier Kenney froze funding for new safe injection facilities and Premier Pallister announced his intention to support law enforcement over harm reduction.

First, the activist narrative on harm reduction—that it saves lives without collateral costs—cannot be maintained. Safe injection sites have an extremely poor record of moving drug users into treatment and recovery, with some referral rates as low as 1%. As a result, neighborhoods that host safe injection sites, like the Downtown Eastside in Vancouver, often devolve into open-air drug markets, with hundreds of homeless addicts sleeping in the streets. This, of course, only compounds the problem and externalizes the social costs onto neighbors and small businesses.

Already, in some American cities that have come closest to implementing safe injection sites, there are echoes of the Canadian uprising. In 2017, five cities surrounding Seattle quickly passed local ordinances banning safe injection sites; U.S. Attorney Brian Mora warned Seattle lawmakers that any attempt to create a safe injection site would immediately be shut down by the federal government. Earlier this year, Philadelphia announced it would open the nation's first safe injection site, then quickly reversed course after working-class residents in South Philadelphia rebelled against the plan.

Moving forward, opponents of "harm reduction" must build on these successes and develop a coordinated strategy to prevent the establishment of safe injection sites. We all can learn an important lesson from cities like Vancouver and Seattle: there is no such thing as safely using heroin, fentanyl and methamphetamine.
March 29, 2021

Dear Cambridge City Council,

Please include the following letter in the upcoming council meeting scheduled for March 30th, 2021:

As a resident of Galt and a local faith leader, I wanted to take this opportunity to share with you my support for the proposed CTS locations. I am writing to you as a Christian who believes that living out my faith includes supporting and contributing to a world where the sacredness of all life is affirmed. My faith teaches me to build communities where those most marginalized in society are offered the same hospitality, healing, and care that Jesus taught in his ministry. In the wake of a drug poisoning epidemic that has taken far too many lives, I see CTS as a modern day revelation of the life-giving and life-sustaining Spirit of Christ in this world.

Given the ability for CTS to deliver much-needed life saving resources, I hope that the city of Cambridge will not only support the proposed locations of 15 Easton St and 8 Oxford St, but will work to create a city that is committed to combating the stigma that hurts people who use drugs.

I feel very privileged to have been able to learn with and from people who use drugs about the importance of CTS. However, I understand that this is an issue that not all people have had a chance to engage in and that it can be easy to respond to proposals like this from a place of fear or uncertainty. My prayer is that this city will let compassion guide this decision, not fear.

Yours in Christ,
Rev Michiko Bown-Kai
--
peace,

Michiko Bown-Kai
Good afternoon,

My name is Rick Heidenreich, I live with my family at [redacted]. I was very disappointed to hear this past Saturday about the proposed injection sites on East and Oxford streets in Cambridge. Since living at [redacted] for the last 15 years the crime and drug problems have increased because of the bridges. The police say there is nothing they can do to deal with the problems. Now the City of Cambridge thinks it’s a great idea to open a legal [redacted] in our neighborhood. My son, by the age of 8 years old had seen 2 overdoses on our street. We want drug addicts and criminals out of our neighborhood, not brought in with the blessing of the city, protect us don’t [redacted] If you think it’s a good idea to bring drug addicts into a neighborhood then invite them to your street because crime and drugs are out of control in our area and nobody cares. It feels like our area is becoming the city dump if you choose to make that happen then please buy my house before the injection sites devalue it. My family will gladly move away. I say NO to the injection sites.

Rick Heidenreich
To all concerned;

There is data from other jurisdictions that crime increases around safe injection sites and there is so-called "de-policing" or lack of response to drug-related problems in the area. Any proposed injection site will become a nidus of criminal activity. As a resident and taxpayer in the City of Cambridge, I ask that you vote against any motion which includes placing, allowing, or asking for a drug consumption site (also known as a SCS, CTS, SIS or OPS) in the City of Cambridge.

Instead, I ask that you advocate for treatment for those suffering from addictions, by focusing on detox, rehabilitation and mental health supports. I ask that you please listen to those you were elected to represent and work with the province and the Region to find a solution that does not include the continued consumption of illicit substances.

Please ensure that my concerns be included in the agenda for the council meeting scheduled for Tuesday, March 30th.

Thank you

Robert Lofsky, Ward 7
Dear Sirs:

We do not believe that the proposed site on Oxford Street is a suitable location for a consumption and treatment services operation.

The location is in the midst of a large residential area populated by mainly retired seniors. We believe it would be more suitably located in a location central to the downtown core. We would ask that you take these comments into consideration and provide us with any notice of public meetings pertaining to this issue.

Yours truly,

Bob and Gail Pettit,
Yes, we are in favor.
These people need our help.
Ron & Marlyn MacFarlane
March 29. 2021

To the Mayor and Councillors of Cambridge

We learned of the two sites chosen for a possible CTS site on the 6:00 news, no notification about the choice of site via mail, flyer or posted sign at the site by the city.

Yes, there is a problem with drugs in Cambridge. However, drug use is illegal and as much as we have sympathy for people who are addicted. Allowing a standalone taxpayer funded site is sending the wrong message to users.

Council did not want this CTS site in the core areas, the same reasoning should apply for all areas and neighbourhoods in the city. Before you dismiss this as NIMBYism, how may Councillors and Advocates can honestly say they would welcome one in their immediate neighbourhood.

One site chosen is in close proximity to 3 daycares, 2 schools, a homeless shelter and a youth emergency shelter.

There are already problems in the area with local addicts, the problems do not need to be compounded by drawing addicts from the Preston and Hespeler areas along with their suppliers.

Two final thoughts - Instead of funding a stand-alone site spend the money on shutting down the supply of illegal drugs.

-If a CTS site is truly needed, put it at a site that taxpayers already fund and where overdoses end up- at the Hospital (it’s reasonably central and on a bus route).

In closing, we request that neither site be funded or approved by council.

Yours truly

Ron and Barbara Rogers
To Mayor, council and staff,

Please include my email in the upcoming agenda package for council.

I find it concerning despite the overwhelming opposition to any such site by your elected constituents and consultation reports that we now have 2 proposed locations in residential areas!

I have lived in Cambridge for 48 years! I do not support a drug consumption site anywhere in Cambridge. I do not support the continuing path of site selection.

Regards,

Rondi Zeeman
Hello,

I am opposed to safe consumption sites in the city of Cambridge Ontario. I believe there is no such thing as safely using heroin, fentanyl and methamphetamine. I believe rehabilitation is the way to truly help and cure an addiction.

I moved and purchased a house in Cambridge Ontario 2 years ago in the hopes of building a nice, safe and tranquil family life for myself, my husband and my now 2 sons. I do not want them to grow up being exposed to injection sites and drug users whenever they go outside the doors. Cambridge cannot continue to keep going into this direction, in order to make a real change the people with drug addictions need real sustainable help and the citizens need safety, peace and quiet.

Please include my letter to the agenda of the council meeting scheduled for March 30, 2021.

Thank you,
A very concerned tax payer and citizen of the city of Cambridge, Ontario.

Sabrina Laramee
Please include the below email in the agenda for council for March 30th regarding the CTS... Thank you,
Sandy Falkiner

Hello and I hope this email finds everyone well and safe. I am writing to you with regarding the latest information concerning the two locations for a possible Consumption Treatment Site in Cambridge. While I understand that this is a terribly difficult position for council to be in, I continue to remain steadfast in my initial stance that I cannot support the current model of a Consumption Treatment Site, or in other words, a standalone CTS in Cambridge at either of these locations or in any locations, whatsoever, as this model stands. I have taken strides to try and understand both the pros and cons of this issue, and it is with the utmost respect for all human life that I find I simply cannot change my mind and support a standalone CTS. There is no “treatment” component to the model.

I understand the need to connect and meet persons with addictions on their own level, and I understand that the upper tier governments have given us very little to operate with in order to help resolve this ever-growing crisis. I understand that to some people, it is a question of life-and-death and I respect and value those sentiments, opinions, beliefs, and in some cases, lived experience. I would ask that you try and understand, respect, and value my opinion as well with this matter. I also have lived experience, through the eyes of the children of our community who, in some cases, came into care because of addiction within their family. I do NOT judge a person who has found themselves in this desperate situation, but I DO rise to defend the children who are continually hurt, disappointed, and traumatized because of the domino effects of addictions. I have lost former foster children to addiction. On a personal level, I have watched two of my foster grandchildren succumb to fentanyl and lose custody of their children. I have and continue to support their mother as she raises these grandchildren, and already we see the trauma in the eyes of her 5-year-old grandson who doesn’t understand why he can’t live with his mom. These are MY lived experiences; different than persons with addictions themselves, but equally devastating and painful.

In January 2018, the 3rd Edition of Principal of Drug Addiction Treatment: A Research-Based Guide was released by the NIH (National Institute on Drug Abuse). There are 13 key recommendations or guidelines outlined here. I will not list them all but will provide the website for your perusal. I must; however, point out two key points without entering into discussion or elaborating on them. They speak for themselves; number three is “Treatment needs to be readily available” and number eleven “Treatment does not need to be voluntary to be effective”. I urge council to continue to push for better access to on-demand treatment and not settle for a consumption site. A consumption site is just that; a place for consumption of illicit drugs, and in my opinion, will lead to more and more of them. We only need to look to B.C. to see the terrifying reality of not offering treatment. I worry that we will follow the slippery slope that BC seems intent on in terms of the provision of youth consumption sites. After 26 years of fostering and supporting children, no one will ever convince me that we should teach children how to inject and provide them with the tools to do so. When a child cuts to alleviate their inner pain, I do not provide the razor or a safe room to cut. I remove the razor and take pains to lock up all and any sharpies, and then I dig for the root of the problem. Same concept, for to do otherwise is, in my opinion, neglect.

Approximately 45% of the proportion of calls for opioid overdose in our region is in the 20 to 34 year-old-age range. What seriously alarms me is that we, without so much as a sigh, watched 25 youth beds for 16-24 year old’s disappear from our community overnight and in the middle of a pandemic. The message that sends to me is that we don’t care enough to make sure they have a roof over their head,
but we will ensure they can use their illicit drugs safely. That is not a message of love and connection, in my humble and respectful opinion.


Regards,
Sandy Falkiner, resident of Cambridge.
My name is Scott Corbett. I'm a resident and home owner on Wellington street in Cambridge. I've lived in Cambridge for nearly 40 years. My wife has also lived in Cambridge for over forty years. We have 2 children.

Because of our home's location near Bridges, we have had several uncomfortable situations with people leaving or heading to Bridges. My wife and children are afraid to use our front yard because some of these troubled people yell and scream as well as beg. We have had packages stolen off the front porch. I've chased away a homeless woman stealing packages off the neighbor's porch.

We DO NOT need a drug consumption site in Cambridge.

WE DO NOT NEED A DRUG CONSUMPTION SITE IN THIS AREA AS WE ALREADY HAVE MORE THAN OUR SHARE.

Manchester school is in our neighborhood as well as some daycares and we don't want more reasons for troubled people to be roaming around our neighborhood.

These people are in need of help, providing them with help to get past their problems, not places to continue.

Please ensure my concerns and letter are included in any council meetings including March 30th 2021.
To my elected members of the city of Cambridge. My name is Shane, and I live on Haddington st. In Galt. I've been a home owner since 2012, and a resident of Cambridge since 2007. I am not in favour of a CTS site in Cambridge, and utmost adamantly against a CTS site in my neighbourhood. CTS sites don't belong around schools, daycares, and in neighbourhoods where working class citizens work and live. These sites bring crime, and instability to these areas. If one of these two proposed locations are decided, especially for the proposed easton st. Site, Haddington st. will be a street chosen by users to access easton st. Being a homeowner of Haddington st. I am very concerned for the safety of my property, and walking in my neighbourhood at anytime of the day. These sites are only a band-aid solution, and will not fix the underlying problem. This proposed CTS site will definitely have a negative effect on property values in this area. If my elected members of the city of Cambridge are in favour of a CTS site, then they should propose to have sites established in there neighbourhoods, not in mine!! My elected members OWE it to me as a tax paying citizen of Cambridge, to provide a safe city and neighbourhood for me to work and live. Putting a CTS site in my neighbourhood, or any other neighbourhood will not make any citizen of this city feel any safer. Absolutely NO CTS sites in the city of Cambridge. There is already a CTS site in kitchener. The Region of Waterloo has a very efficient public transportation network to transport addicks to the CTS location in Kitchener. I request a moratorium on the public consultation be delayed until the pandemic is over. Thanks for taking my concerns into consideration in this matter. Shane.
Hello,
My name is Shannon Heidenreich I live on Brook street for the past 15 years. We found out the disappointing news, that two injection sites will be placed in our neighbourhood, East & Oxford street both close to day cares and schools.
Since the bridges has opened our cars and home have been broken into by addicts and the police tell us their is nothing they can do. My son can not even go to Soper Park due to the addicts and their needles there. It’s an unsafe park. Now our council is wanting to open two injection site, inviting more crime into our neibourhood. How am I as a mother able to allow my son to go outside and play knowing that the City of Cambridge protect the drug dealers and addicts more than my family who pays their taxes and contributes to the community.
I ask council to help protect and keep our children safe in their own community, please say NO to the injection site so my son can safely play outside.
Thank you
Shannon Heidenreich
An open letter to mayor, council and staff, regarding site selection of Drug Consumption Sites in Cambridge.

Attention to Mayor, council and staff,

Please include my email in the upcoming agenda package for council.

It's taken me a few days to compose this email to all of you in regards to site selection of a CTS within Cambridge.

What can I possibly say, that hasn't already been said and ignored? I've been pondering over the years of emails, delegations, reports, statistics, public consultations, recommendations, petitions and community feedback. We don't want this at all!!! When are you going to start listening to the people who live here, voted you in, and pay taxes?

I find it alarming that we are now at the point of proposed site locations, despite the overwhelming opposition to any such site by your elected constituents and consultation reports.

I do not doubt that there are some who support, mainly invested proponents of drug consumption sites from surrounding communities, but there continues to be a lack of consideration from the thousands of voices in opposition. May I remind council and staff of the report in which it addressed and affirmed, that council was not listening.

I will simply write this; I do not support a drug consumption site anywhere in Cambridge. I do not support the continuing path of site selection.

I know I will be called upon by my community to speak again with the need to stand up for our concerns. I will not let our voices be cast aside.

Regards,

Shari Vezeau
Hi, I'm emailing to state what we think about these needle places on either Easton or Haddington areas...we live on Norfolk Ave our house is behind the plaza so we experience alot as of now we do not need to experience anymore its bad enough ppl go down on the tracks hollering and sometimes they are under the bridge not sure if you see under there but its a huhe mess waterloo region will not tend to this area as its CP's area when you call them the officer comes from Hamilton it is very dangerous but no one cares our taxes are raised but yet we have to keep everyrhing pad licked our garage and yard we need to put cameras up to help keep our place safe I have a note on my front door to ring the door bell its not fair what about all the children and teens in these areas please find a different option as Cambridge does not want this here....we the voters will be voting the ones out who push for this as well we are done....

Shell
March 24, 2021

Please add this letter to any discussions or council meetings when these sites will be discussed.

I was shocked to read a letter to the editor of a Dan who was in support of Consumption Sites. I thought council understood that the residents of Cambridge did not and will not support a site anywhere in Cambridge. Council stated that they would not support one in the downtown core and yet, that letter is trying to convince people that it will be a good thing to have a drug injection site near residents and schools. Our new councillor Scott was told that we did not want a site when he came to our door. Why do we have to keep on saying the same thing over and over again?

The location does not matter and these sites do nothing much to help those suffering addiction. We all know that this will be just one step closer to safe supply of drugs. This is wrong on so many levels that I can’t write them all down in this email. I have friends in Vancouver that volunteered in this sector and saw first hand how addicts using safe supply also end up taking street drugs to get the high that they need.

These harm reduction initiatives do not work. They are short lived, and nothing more than a band aid solution. The more that these addicts stay on drugs, either a safe supply or illegal, the more harm they do to themselves and their families. These harm reduction methods only promote harm to the addict and the surrounding community and to their children, if they have any, starting a new generation of children who are traumatized in youth and then seek drugs to numb their struggles. Approving a site will make all of council culpable of this harm being continued.

Council represents everyone in this city and not just one group or the social agencies who profit on the backs of taxpayers to grow their business. Our city needs to stop trying to sustain lives in a continuous addicted lifestyle, and wasting so much money on the expansion of failing injection sites, and start putting money to better use, with on demand and in house treatment centers for mental well being and a better quality of life.

Thank you for listening

Shelly Snyder

Cambridge Resident
Please include my email in the upcoming agenda package for council.

It's taken me a few days to compose this email to all of you in regards to site selection of a CTS within Cambridge.

What can I possibly say, that hasn't already been said and ignored? I've been pondering over the years of emails, delegations, reports, statistics, public consultations, recommendations, petitions and community feedback.

I find it alarming that we are now at the point of proposed site locations, despite the overwhelming opposition to any such site by your elected constituents and consultation reports.

I do not doubt that there are some who support, mainly invested proponents of drug consumption sites from surrounding communities, but there continues to be a lack of consideration from the thousands of voices in opposition. May I remind council and staff of the report in which it addressed and affirmed, that council was not listening.

I will simply write this; I do not support a drug consumption site anywhere in Cambridge. I do not support the continuing path of site selection.

I know I will be called upon by my community to speak again with the need to stand up for our concerns. I will not let our voices be cast aside.

Regards,

Sherri Roy
March 29, 2021

To Whom It May Concern,

RE: OPPOSITION NOTICE TO THE PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL CTS SITE

This letter is in representation of the Board of Directors of the Montessori School of Cambridge, as well as our entire Montessori community.

We understand there has been an increase in both opioid usage and deaths within our City. The facts surrounding usage and deaths are disheartening and we want to offer our thank you to all those who continue to advocate and care for those in these troubling situations.

Our school houses 85 children ages 18 months to 6 years and we employ 15 staff. The school is located on Roseview Avenue in a beautiful yellow brick building. It is our purpose as Montessori Educators not only to support and foster healthy relationships and community, but to in fact delve deeper and play an important role in raising children who are confident, self assured and have strong leadership skills. We work with children to ensure they have compassion for others with a focus on community awareness and helping others.

With the above being said, the Montessori School of Cambridge has been the epitome of diversity, culture, education, community and family for just short of 50 years in Cambridge/Galt and generations of families have attended and supported our school. Furthermore, we have created a safe place for families within our community.

Being a member of the Cambridge/Galt community since 1972, we feel this contribution and dedication must continue now and well into the future. We must stand with our many families who live within close proximity and are safely able to walk from their houses to school without being at risk of crime related events. In addition, it is our duty as educators to provide a safe place for families and children to attend school.

While we understand that the approved distance from a “Consumption and Treatment Services” site (CTS) to schools or daycares is at least 200m, our school is 280m away; not far outside of this approved acceptable distance. It is also located within a residential neighbourhood and is surrounded by family homes; which is not part of the criteria for a CTS site location. In addition, the proposed travel route from the Bridges and Downtown Core up Cambridge St. is a short 66m to our school if they choose to take this route. They could in fact go up Park Hill, which would then lead them to go right past our school on their way to the CTS site. Both of these scenarios are unacceptable in keeping our children and families safe!
Further, Laneway 173 is directly behind our school and is adjacent to our playground. This creates another clear pathway between the school and the CTS site as well as providing a sheltered area for those using and discarding needles. We have grave concern that by having a CTS site so close to the school and within a residential area, this will promote more crime related activity.

Quite pointedly, by having a CTS so close to our school, it will put our business at risk of closure due to parents not wanting to send their young children to a school that is in such close proximity.

We empathize with the complexity of the ongoing opioid crisis and hope that alternative options are provided to help those in need.

In conclusion, the proposed CTS location is unacceptable and we oppose such a site being in any residential community.

Sincerely,

Principal
Good afternoon,
I am writing this letter to be included in the agenda for the upcoming council meeting scheduled Tuesday March 30th.
I am not in support of the proposed location on Oxford Street. This location is visible from my front door, we already have enough problems in this neighborhood with the Cambridge shelter in close proximity. I already feel unsafe walking in my own neighborhood we do not need this at my own home. This is a family neighborhood with many schools and daycares in the area. I don't believe these centres should be in residential areas, or at all. We should be supporting treatment centres not continuing to support their addiction.
Sincerely
S.perry
Dear Cambridge Council

I am writing with regards to the 2 proposed Consumption and Treatment Services sites at 15 Easton Street and 8 Oxford Streets. As a Cambridge resident I strongly oppose the opening of ANY CTS sites and especially oppose opening them in residential areas where local communities will be so negatively impacted. 8 Oxford street is in remarkably close proximity to the Montessori School of Cambridge (only 280 metres away) where I work and where my 4-year-old son attends. We often walk through the neighbourhood and pass this proposed site and we are not the only ones to do so. There are many families that live in this neighbourhood as well as another childcare centre Pluto Day Care (only 350m away). The residential neighbourhood around 8 Oxford is also within the catchment area for Manchester Public school and GCI high school and many children and teens walk these routes to get to school. The thought of putting a consumption site in the middle of this residential neighbourhood within such close proximity to families, schools and childcare centre’s is not acceptable.

It is a known fact that these sites bring increased crime to the area. Not to mention the number of discarded needles and other drug paraphernalia that will be left on the community streets. According to the Kitchener CTS site dashboard, since opening in November 2019, 457 needles have been recovered within the perimeter of the 150 Duke Street site during needle sweeps. Those are needles that have been unsafely discarded directly outside of the centre with a dedicated needle drop, the program is obviously not being used. I can only imagine how many more needles are littered in the surrounding areas beyond the site’s perimeter, left for children and neighbours to find.

Something needs to be done to lower the Overdose fatalities in the region, however a CTS Site is not the answer. The time, effort and funds need to be directed to detox and rehab services that are so desperately needed so that when someone suffering from addiction wants to get help, the proper help is available for them.

Please include my email in the Meeting agenda scheduled for March 30th 2021.

Stacy Vazquez-Abrams
I am a very concerned resident on Cambridge St in the high rise and a mother of a 11 year old girl, who I would like to add likes to go for walks with her friend in the neighborhood and walks around the block on Oxford st. We don’t have a back yard and going for walks in the close neighborhood is all she has for outdoor fresh air and exercise after school. So if this CTS site goes on Oxford st, you are taking away her freedom of being able to go for a walk and get some fresh air with her friend, because I won’t allow her to walk the neighborhood with who knows what roaming the area. I’m already paranoid of who she may bump into now. Also I can’t believe that this site would even be an option with a daycare a 4 mins walk away, what are you thinking. It’s bad enough we have the trouble and needles and drug stuff happening right down the street you want to add this to the neighborhood. I’m sure there is a non residential area and not 4 mins away from a daycare around Preston or hespeler in a non residential area. Please I am begging you as a mother and a resident of this area please do not put a CTS site on Oxford st. I would like my email included in the agenda, also I would like any notifications of any upcoming meetings regarding this topic. Why are these sites not being considered away from residential areas? I see enough addicts in this area shooting up, getting high, walking around tweeking out on god knows what. I as an adult of 45ys, don’t feel safe as is it is walking in this area and now you are considering this to add to it. I seriously don’t know who came up with this area but you didn’t think it through very good. Please I am begging you do not put the CTS site on Oxford St. Why are these sites not on hospital property where these ppl can get medical treatment if needed without having to use an ambulance to bring them to the hospital. These sites should not even exists to begin with!! Why isn’t the money being used to help mental illness and help the addicts instead of helping them get high! Do you not see what is happening to our beautiful Cambridge!!!! It is being taken over be drug addicts and mental health. Cambridge was once a beautiful city to live in and now it’s full of garbage and drugs.

Stephanie Pye
To major of Cambridge

We moved to Hespeler over 10 years ago to make a life and settle in a fantastic caring village. Only in the last three years the city has approved numerous developments and we are rapidly losing the village community.

The more Cambridge grows the more big city issue crime and drug use homelessness. I was part of a previous group for Hespeler and we had many closed door meetings with the previous major and even had the present major join us on walks highlighting the homeless issues and illegal camps in the area. My wife runs a home daycare and we NEVER thought we would see the day we would be teaching babies not to touch discarded needles and drug paraphernalia left laying around the sidewalks and pathways. We never thought we would have to install cctv around our home to deter criminals from stealing from us.

STOP the consumption sites doesn’t allow the drug use and don’t enable people to commit crimes to feed their drug habits. Put the resources to helping rehabilitate the people give them a second chance of a good life. Don’t enable them to destroy themselves, families and many more.

This is a complete insult to the honest voters that put you in the major seat not listening not understanding and not having an option what is correct for Hespeler and for Cambridge.

Think twice this is not good for anyone. !!

Steve Melia GSC
In consideration of a proposed CTS site location in Cambridge ON,

I find it beyond comprehension that you collectively, the Cambridge City Council directed by the Region of Waterloo, are now at the point of proposing site locations for a CTS site, despite the overwhelming opposition to any such site by an ever growing number of your elected constituents, consultants, by hoards of emails, delegations, reports, statistics, public consultations, recommendations, petitions and community feedback not only here, but across Canada. Obviously there is a sector who will support this effort, proponents of the idealism of harm reduction, fanfare from neighbouring communities in Ontario, those that expect financial gain from such endeavours, but there continues to be a lack of consideration from the thousands of voices in opposition in the city of Cambridge and Waterloo Region to this direction.

I wish my voice to be heard. **I DO NOT SUPPORT A DRUG CONSUMPTION SITE ANYWHERE IN CAMBRIDGE, ON.** I do not support the continued path of this site selection.

Stuart Johnston
My husband and I want you all to know that we are totally AGAINST these proposed sites that are almost NEXT DOOR to a public school AND a daycare!
WHAT ARE YOU PEOPLE THINKING?????

We are requesting that this email/letter (whatever you want to call it) (OUR VOICES) be added to the agenda for the council meeting scheduled on Tuesday March 30th.

Respectfully,
Sue Balfour and Gord Balfour
"Aspire to Inspire
before you Expire"
Mayor McGarry and Cambridge City Councillors

I am writing this email in support of moving forward with plans for a CTS for the City of Cambridge. When we began this discussion years ago, it was to establish a safe injection site (SIS), and our Church Council was ready to recommend to our congregation that we offer a place for that to happen, recognizing the good work that Sanguen was doing in our community, and knowing more was needed. We even had our property assessed for what changes would need to be made to our facilities to make that happen. Of course, that plan was halted because of the bylaw preventing the establishment of an SIS in the core. In the interim, the WINS Program (Working to Improve Neighbourhood Safety) did have a home in our church facility, until its recent move to 150 Main St. Since then, the discussion has evolved from a Safe Injection Site to a Consumption and Treatment Site - not just a place for "injection", but for consumption - recognizing that some consumption is oral, but can still be contaminated with fentanyl, carfentanyl, or other dangerous chemicals - something that can be assessed for clients of a CTS before consumption.

The concern for access to treatment that has been the focus of some opposition to the original SIS concept, is now a part of the CTS with the presence of wraparound social services that give clients the opportunity and access to supports should they wish to explore their options.

As a Council, you have supported the identification of some potential sites for a CTS - the report for which is coming to you for consideration this week. I would encourage each of you to support acceptance of this report, and its recommendations for community consultation so that, as a community, we can continue to move toward a solution to this issue in our community. The issue will not go away, no matter how long we try to ignore it. A CTS may not be the perfect answer, but I believe it is one step in the right direction to address the needs, not only of our citizens suffering addiction, but also those surrounding businesses and communities impacted by public and unsafe consumption.

Sincerely,
Sue Rivers
To Cambridge City Council:

I have been operating Cedar Lake Studios on Ainslie St. N for the last three and a half years. I looked at a number of cities before deciding on Galt, which had all I was looking for: a thriving local community, gorgeous architecture and natural beauty to attract out-of-town visitors, and a growing downtown. All of those have helped my business be successful. However, there have been ups and downs because of the homeless/drug situation.

Last September the problem had escalated so much that I seriously considered moving the business to another city. I had three encounters within my store, and had some nervous walks home (even in daylight). I however was buoyed by the increased police presence and the addition of the night-time security, and decided to stay (for now).

I was glad that I stayed, as the community came together like never before to support local business during the fall and Christmas season, and there seemed to be a decline in incidents.

So many people continued, and many more started to shop downtown, and commented on how they had made a conscious effort to do so because of the pandemic, and its impact on small business. The wide-spread commitment resulted in the best last-quarter sales yet. I believe it is a win-win-win situation, and builds a stronger community.

After all this, and with two lock-downs in less than a year, I am incredibly disappointed to hear that council may be back peddling on their commitment to keep a CTS site away from the area. I have personally experienced negative situations with people who are clearly not in a sober or clean state, and likely also have nothing more to lose. In fact as I write this email, someone is walking by the front of the gallery swearing loudly enough to be heard at the back of my space. Having a site where people can inject drugs and then wander the downtown is not a good idea. It also attracts those desperate for money for drugs, and drug dealers, both of which are not good for business.

Finding the right balance in this is surely difficult, but I wonder if the amount of time and energy directed to the location of CTS site could have been better spent dealing with the roots of the issue, rather than focusing on a band-aid.

If you want to know if the downtown business and residents have changed their position on this situation, another survey should be completed. Anecdotal information, like that which I have given, is only helpful to alert one of a situation or to give it a human face.

Thank you for considering the perspective of this business owner, and Galt resident.

Susan

--

Susan Benton
I am writing this on behalf of myself who owns a home at 110 Winston Blvd and my daughter who owns a home at 170 Adler. Safe injection sites are not the answer and we do not want them in the Hespeler area. My sister is an addict and she went to BC and lived there for 3 years taking advantage of this program. In her mind she has been off drugs for 3 years as the government paid for them and it was all legal. She returned to Ontario 4 months ago and went into withdrawal and was back to getting a hit off the street. In both cases she still stole from people. The only thing that changed was the drugs were free, she went back to BC, they can keep their sites, the area around these areas are terrible and devalued and I do not want to see that in our lovely city,
sincerely two of your voters

Tabatha Dean
Dear Mayor McGarry and City Councillors,

I am writing to you today to express my firm support for a Consumption and Treatment Services Site in the City of Cambridge. Please include my letter as part of the official records for the meeting of March 30, 2021.

As a resident of the Region of Waterloo and Undergrad Student in the Faculty of Psychology and Neuroscience at WLU, I recognize the advantages to a CTS site in Kitchener, of utmost importance the saving of lives. Within the first 6 months of the Kitchener site being open, 71 overdoses occurred. None of which were fatal. Had the CTS not been running, many, if not all of these people would have died. Similarly, at InSite in BC, since opening in 2003 there have been 2395 overdoses and not a single fatality.

Simply, CTS’s save lives. The people who need this service are people; they are human beings. They are members of our communities who are our parents, siblings, aunts, uncles, friends, children. They are citizens of the City of Cambridge and deserve access to a safe, supportive environment in which to use drugs. You may not understand why people use drugs, however, one thing I am hopeful you can understand is that they deserve to live. A CTS will significantly increase the chances that they will.

I urge you to open a CTS site in the City of Cambridge and to do so with haste as it is literally a matter of life and death.

Sincerely,

Taylor Dunstan
Undergrad Student, WLU
Resident of Waterloo Region
I just found out that 8 Oxford Street has been put forward as a potential site for CTS in Cambridge. Reading through the information in the agenda for Tuesday’s meeting, I see that it checks all the boxes except for residential areas.

I would like to express my extreme opposition to this site. I have lived at 50 Roseview Ave for over 36 years and have seen the street evolve from rather run down to a much more pleasant street with property upgrades from one end to the other. When The Bridges was first proposed, I was one of the few in the neighbourhood not vehemently opposed to the project. My wife and I were very ok with the way it ran for the first few years. Then we encountered a number of incidents ranging from vandalism, trespass, break and enter and theft. (over $20000 in losses, much not covered by insurance). The city eventually responded with erecting a fence that has cut down on the use of our property as a thoroughfare between The Bridges and Roseview, a campsite and drug consumption but minor thefts and vandalism continue to be an issue.

If the decision is made to place the CTS on Oxford street, we will literally have the problem in our backyard and front yard. I feel this neighbourhood has done its share in helping the city cope with a difficult situation. In addition, the site barely meets the 200 m setback from Pluto Day Care, Cambridge Montessori School, GCI, Manchester School and the Cambridge Muslim School.

The above concerns do not take into account whatsoever my opposition to consumption sites in general, but that is another matter.

Please make the right decision and reject any CTS site in any residential area in Cambridge.

Ted & Cheryl Kewley
Please uphold your promise to stakeholders; that no CTS will be located in the core or within 500m of the downtown. BUT a report from City staff, putting forth a location for approval to proceed to Public Consultation, within the 500m buffer of the downtown Galt core, threatens our assurance from Council.

Tena Chaves
To whom it might concern

I AM strongly Opposed to have a consumption site anywhere in Cambridge whatsoever. Spend our tax dollars on rehab, not on more harm(reduction) and get all the already over drogged people back on their feet by giving em real help, not more drugs.

Regards
Tibor Muzslai
Good morning.

I'd like this letter to be included in your planned city council meeting on Tuesday March 30, 2021.

I read a report on CTV news this morning about the 2 proposed CTS sites on Easton St and Oxford St in Galt and am appalled that these locations have been chosen so close to residential, retail and school areas.

What were you thinking? We already have enough drug dependant people standing at the intersection of Hespeler / Water street and Corenation / Dundas St begging for money to feed their addictions and this is only going to make it worse.

I know the Freshco at Dundas & Hespeler is already dealing with the drug dependant people on a pretty much daily basis and thats without a safe injection site within a 2 minute walk / 140 m distance to the store. Nothing like having freshly shot up junkies walking into a grocery store (where resident families should be able to shop in safety!) to get beer to further fuel their high! Great thinking...

This is only going to drag the dependants from the Bridges area and downtown Galt right into the residential areas and small retail area, making it unsafe for people like me and my family to leave my home in the evening to walk my dog. My twenty year old daughter already feels unsafe here after dark and now your planning on adding this to the mix? NO THANK YOU!

I shouldn't have to feel unsafe walking in my own neighborhood.

I am AGAINST not only these proposed sites rather against CTS sites in Cambridge as a whole!

Regards,

Todd Wilson.
A concerned citizen.
To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing this email to voice my opinion about putting in a CTS (drug injection site) in Cambridge. I am completely against having a CTS in Cambridge. We should be using this money for services that will get people off of drugs and break the cycle for the next generation and when I say services I do not mean a safe drug supply. The government funded rehab, detox and mental services currently offered in waterloo region have long wait lists and mountains of red tape which will deter most people before they get in to a program.

So I am asking you to not put a CTS in Cambridge. I would also like this email included in the next council agenda that will be dealing with the CTS process.

Regards,
Tony D
Dear sirs and madams,

I firmly and staunchly oppose the building of these 2 sites. It is reprehensible and evidence of a morally bankrupt council that these sites were even suggested or supported given their locations.

Tony Potopilnyj
To Council,

I wanted you to simply know that I am in support of moving forward with the site selection and assessments.

I see that there are many people in fear of this being located in their city. I think it would be prudent for City of Cambridge to implement a carefully thought out PR campaign to dispel fears of it being in their neighbourhood.
I see a great campaign being done right now by the province working hard to dispel fears over vaccines.

I am in support of this. Thank you for your work on this. I am sure it is a stressful topic.

Thank you,
Tracy Shaban
I do not want an injection SITE in my City of Cambridge or in Galt. We need to spend more money and time in helping the people who have additions get the help they need to get better.
I DO NOT WANT AN INJECTION SITE IN MY CITY.
I want to walk without worrying about my dog stepping on a needled. I don't want tent city's in my community

This needs to STOP

I pay taxes to live in a safe city.

trish miner😊
March 26, 2021

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Please note my strong opposition to the establishment of a CTS site in our city of Cambridge. Although I am well aware of the existing problem of addiction in our community, I do not understand how such a facility will provide relief. Rather - will the provision of a safe consumption site not enable users and hence prolong the addiction by providing an aura of „normalcy“? It seems to me that a hospital is best suited to provide help and referral to appropriate therapies.

The two proposed sites may check most of the identified boxes for CTS sites, however they are situated within established neighbourhoods and very close to a school and a daycare centre. Please consider the needs of the people living there.

I would appreciate receiving further information as you try to arrive at the best solution for Cambridge and especially the neighbours in the vicinity of the proposed sites.

Sincerely,

Ulrike Gute
Good evening,

I’m writing in support of my mother’s previous email condemning the proposed safe injection site being discussed here in Cambridge. I live at 170 Adler Drive here in the Hespeler community. I am NOT in support of these drug consumption sites and fear that this will be the demise of our beautiful city. The amount of crime and harassment that has been a result of the Bridges location has been devastating, especially for our small business owners. The Shopper Drug Mart employees across from the bridges face the consequences of this every day, I urge you to go and ask their opinion on adding another avenue for this destruction here in Cambridge. Not to mention, the safety of the individuals at the local library in Galt. My fiancée used to go there to study frequently but couldn’t go anymore because so many drug addicts were frequenting to use the internet- some taking the opportunity to watch adult movies. We need to find a way to rehabilitate these individuals, not aid in progressing the addiction and homelessness in our city and surrounding areas. I agree, something must be done to help these individuals but the current strategy and the proposed strategy of safe injection sites is not it. We ourselves have a family member who’s struggled with addiction for over 3 decades. She believes she’s on the road to recovery because she’s doing drugs SAFELY at these injection sites with encouragement from the local government- this is not the way!

I am urging you to reconsider these developments by talking to locals who care about this community. Please, go speak with local businesses impacted by the Bridges Center as well as shoppers drug mart employees, local home owners and our librarians. Let’s work as a community to find a better solution with a heavy focus on rehabilitation and healthy assistance programs.

Thank you in advance for your time and I appreciate your consideration in keeping our beautiful city healthy and safe for all of its members.

Regards,
Victoria Dean
March 28, 2021

Re: Consumption and Treatment Services

Mayor McGarry and members of Council,

On behalf of the Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council (WRCPC), I am pleased to report that the WRCPC strongly supports efforts to establish Consumption and Treatment Services (CTS) within the City of Cambridge. The WRCPC is a 35-member collaborative and national model for crime prevention through social development. The first in Canada to anticipate and identify the bootleg fentanyl as a threat to public health and safety, the WRCPC continues to advise on opportunities, and function as a collaborative catalyst for life-saving initiatives at local, provincial, and national levels.

Consumption and treatment services are a critical pathway for meeting our neighbours where they are at, both literally and figuratively. The evidence from the plethora of studies indicates supervised consumption services achieve their intended purpose of preventing, reducing, and/or treating acute and chronic medical conditions, preventing fatal overdoses onsite, and establishing authentic opportunities for engagement with community, health, and social service systems. The WRCPC is not aware of any evidence that CTS increases crime, rather CTS reduces issues of disorder, contributing to an overall positive impact for communities. We note that the evidence of this positive impact has grown in the decade since the Supreme Court of Canada unanimously affirmed the evidence in favour of consumption services in a 9-0 decision. The addition of wrap-around services as a feature strengthens the value of local consumption and treatment services for both individuals and communities.

Consumption and treatment services are a guaranteed life-saving opportunity in an era where fatality data continues an alarming trend in the wrong direction, with little end in sight. The WRCPC encourages sustained and concentrated investment in a suite of evidence-informed approaches in prevention, harm reduction, and treatment as part of a robust, comprehensive strategy to improve public health and safety for all members of the community. Consumption and treatment services are a key intervention in that suite of opportunities.

The WRCPC recognizes that the poisoning crisis continues to provoke health debates in ways that other important but less common health issues do not, in communities and councils from coast to coast to coast. The WRCPC very much acknowledges the challenges before members of Council, and trusts that the final decision is one that is reflective of the robust evidence base, and the high value experienced in municipalities that have established consumption and treatment services.
The WRCPC extends its gratitude to Councillors for consideration of consumption and treatment services in Cambridge. The lives at stake matter and their deaths are preventable through the interventions that you are considering. If we can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact us at your convenience.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Richard Eibach, Chair
Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council
March 29th, 2021

City of Cambridge
Special Council Meeting
Consumption and Treatment Services Site

Dear Cambridge Council,

On behalf of the Waterloo Region Integrated Drugs Strategy (WRIDS), we urge the City of Cambridge to implement a Consumption and Treatment Services (CTS) site in Cambridge. In 2020, the Waterloo Region recorded an unprecedented number of opioid-related poisoning fatalities and from 2019 to 2020, there was a 56% increase in suspected opioid-related deaths. The urgency to avoid similar preventable deaths in 2021 and beyond can not be overstated.

The WRIDS is a multi-sectoral collaborative strategy that aims to prevent, reduce, and/or eliminate problematic substance use and its consequences in Waterloo Region through efforts in prevention, harm reduction, recovery and rehabilitation, enforcement and justice, and integration. The WRIDS has approximately 130 individuals that participate in the Steering Committee, Pillar Coordinating Committees, and various working groups, all working together to help create Waterloo Region safer and healthier for all.

The WRIDS, through its Steering Committee and with support of community partners, supports CTS as a part of a public health approach grounded in health equity. Research shows that providing harm reduction services like CTS leads to a reduction in fatal and non-fatal drug poisonings and are an important life saving service. CTS also offers a wide range of other benefits including providing a safe space where people can receive care free from stigma, reduces risk factors that lead to infectious diseases, and increases access to health and social services.

Problematic substance use is a complex health and social issue, the response needs to be comprehensive, collaborative, compassionate, and evidence-based. The WRIDS sincerely hopes that a CTS site in Cambridge will be implemented to improve both individual and community health and safety.

Sincerely,

Eugene Fenton

Chair of the WRIDS Steering Committee
An open letter to mayor, council and staff, regarding site selection of Drug Consumption Sites in Cambridge.

Attention to Mayor, council and staff,

Please include my email in the upcoming agenda package for council.

It's taken me a few days to compose this email to all of you in regards to site selection of a CTS within Cambridge.

What can I possibly say, that hasn't already been said and ignored? I've been pondering over the years of emails, delegations, reports, statistics, public consultations, recommendations, petitions and community feedback.

I find it alarming that we are now at the point of proposed site locations, despite the overwhelming opposition to any such site by your elected constituents and consultation reports.

I do not doubt that there are some who support, mainly invested proponents of drug consumption sites from surrounding communities, but there continues to be a lack of consideration from the thousands of voices in opposition. May I remind council and staff of the report in which it addressed and affirmed, that council was not listening.

I will simply write this; I do not support a drug consumption site anywhere in Cambridge. I do not support the continuing path of site selection.

I know I will be called upon by my community to speak again with the need to stand up for our concerns. I will not let our voices be cast aside.

Regards,

Wesley Crawford
March 29, 2021

*Katie bounded into my preschool door with her huge infectious smile and saucer like eyes, full of curiously and light. Katie was always full of energy, laughter, and goodness. She was always the positive one, the one to make others laugh... including me.*

*Sitting at Katie’s funeral a few short years ago, I thought of this moment and my heart ached for her mother, her family, and our community.*

*Katie (not her real name) died from drug poisoning.*

Dear Council Members,

I beg you to support the proposed creation of supervised consumption services in Cambridge.

It’s time to re-think how we see the problem of drug usage in our communities and to realize how much of this problem the result of our own ignorance is, prejudice, and a “war on drugs approach” to drug policies.

We need a new drug policy strategy, a strategy which includes a variety of initiatives including the creation of safe, supervised consumption service sites and address a wide range of drug related issues including mental health, food insecurity, and homelessness.

I know this is a hard decision. But I beg you to be brave and courageous.

I beg you to help create the change needed on how we see and address the pain, suffering, and trauma our youth and young adults who rely on drugs face.

Do this so you or I or anyone else never again attends a funeral due to drug use.

Trisha Robinson
Executive Director, Wilmot Family Resource Centre
*Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council Member*
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Date: 04/01/2021 Internal Memo #: IM21-003(CRE)

To: Council

Circulated to: Corporate Leadership Team

Department: Corporate Enterprise

Division: Facilities

From: Cheryl Zahnleiter, Deputy City Manager
       Corporate Enterprise

Subject: Outside Services Facilities Master Plan and Refueling Strategy

Comments

As part of the 2019 Capital Budget, Staff received approval to move forward with a Corporate Outside Services Facilities Master Plan and refuelling strategy.

Delays were encountered due to the municipal government review, the recruitment process for the Manager of Facilities, and the COVID-19 pandemic. The purpose of this update is to advise that staff are now able to move forward to initiate this capital project.

The results of the 2016 Outside Service Review Report recommended that the City prepare a strategic facility plan to address issues pertaining to support front line, supervisory, administration, and management staff as well as house equipment, supplies, and materials to support the Roads, Water, Sewer, Cemetery, Parks, Trails, Arena, and Recreation services to the citizens of Cambridge. This plan will include a review of the existing Bishop St Operations facility and other satellite workshops to determine the functionality of the sites. It will also include the feasibility of building satellite works yards to accommodate existing services and the anticipated growth to service Cambridge for the next 30 year time frame. Impacts to consider include the future plans for LRT as well as densification/urbanization and expansion of Cambridge as per the Official Plan.

Key considerations in this plan would include, but are not limited to: travel time to maximize productivity of staff; GHG emissions associated with daily trips to/from work site and yard(s); optimal use of common spaces (training rooms, meeting rooms, change rooms, etc.); and minimizing response times to issues of a re-active nature (i.e. sewage blockages, public complaints, etc.). Staff have already worked with Operations, Environmental Services and Fleet to develop a preliminary list of objectives for the project and the City will receive
Requests for Proposals through a public procurement process proposed to begin in May 2021, with a final report anticipated for early 2022.

Financially, Capital funding of $250,000 has already been approved for this study as part of 2019 Capital Budget. Future financial implications will be identified and recommended as part of the objectives of the plan. The results, including financial implications, will be presented to Council and any associated budget impacts will be requested for approval through regular budgeting processes.

Attachments

N/A

Approvals:
☐ Manager/Supervisor  ☒ Deputy City Manager  ☒ City Manager
March 19\(^{th}\) 2021

Re: Carbon Tax

Please be advised that on March 10\(^{th}\) 2021 the Town of Plympton-Wyoming Council passed the following motion to support the Norfolk County Agricultural Advisory Boards letter regarding the application of the carbon tax on primary agriculture producers. It is the recommendation of Norfolk County Council that the Federal Government consider the concerns of the agricultural community and move to exempt all primary agriculture producers from current and future carbon taxes.

*Motion #13 – Moved by Netty McEwen, Seconded by Tim Wilkins that Council support item “q)” from Norfolk County regarding Carbon Tax on Agriculture Producers.*

*Motion Carried.*

If you have any questions regarding the above motion, please do not hesitate to contact me by phone or email at ekwarcia@plympton-wyoming.ca.

Sincerely,

Erin Kwarciak
Clerk
Town of Plympton-Wyoming

cc. Association of Municipalities of Ontario
Federation of Canadian Municipalities
Ontario Municipalities
February 23, 2021

The Honourable Jonathan Wilkinson  
Minister of Environment and Climate Change  
House of Commons  
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6

The Honourable Marie-Claude Bibeau  
Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food  
House of Commons  
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A6

Dear Ministers,

I am writing to advise that Norfolk County Council supports the attached Norfolk County Agricultural Advisory Board’s letter regarding the application of the carbon tax on primary agriculture producers. It is the recommendation of Norfolk County Council that the Federal Government consider the concerns of the agricultural community and move to exempt all primary agriculture producers from current and future carbon taxes. Please find attached the full recommendation.

Thank you for your attention,

Yours truly,

Kristal Chopp  
Mayor, Norfolk County

P.c. Norfolk County Council  
Association of Municipalities of Ontario  
Federation of Canadian Municipalities  
Ontario Municipalities
Dec 7, 2020

The Honourable Marie-Claude Bibeau, MP
Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0A6

Dear Minister Bibeau,

Our agricultural advisory board (AAB) who represents the agricultural sector in Norfolk County, Ontario is very concerned about the federal government’s current carbon pricing policies. It is our hope that you consider our concerns and move to exempt all primary agriculture producers from current and future carbon taxes.

Carbon tax remains as a major cost of production for producers in Norfolk County. Although some farm fuel purchases are exempt, it is selective and does not meet the needs of the entire agriculture industry. Currently crop drying, heating/cooling of livestock barns and cooling of perishable commodities are still subject to full carbon taxes.

Currently there are no replacements for fossil fuels in agricultural production. As a result, carbon tax policies are not appropriate for the agricultural sector and only decrease farm margins.

Norfolk County which is known as Ontario's garden is home to one of the country's largest diversity of crop production. In addition to the extensive vegetable, fruit and grain production it boasts some of the highest ecological diverse natural habitats, plants and animals in Canada. There is approximately 25% tree cover in the county which is the highest percentage of forested land in Southwestern Ontario. Norfolk County It is also home to over 10,000 acres of woodlots and wetlands protected under Long Point Conservation Authority. In addition to the natural woodlots and wetlands there is also extensive fruit production with 2000 acres of apples and 1000 acres of sour cherries. A mature orchard can fix upwards of 18 mt of CO2 annually.

The adoption of production practices to protect the soil and environment are advanced in Norfolk County. There has been a wide implementation of cover cropping, planting green and reduced tillage practices all of which sequester carbon. Additional farming practices of 4R nutrient management coupled with precision technology ensure that appropriate nutrients are applied at the right time, place and rate. In many cases sensitive water sources around ponds and wetlands are planted with buffer strips and soil erosion control measures of grassed waterways and windbreaks are also common practices. ALUS (alternative land use) programs have been embraced across the county, taking unproductive land out of production, and returning it to natural native grass plantings, trees and constructed wetlands. Currently there are 1148 active projects with 189 producers covering 1573 acres in Norfolk County managed under the ALUS program.
The agriculture industry has made great strides to protect the environment and will continue to improve production practices that reduces the carbon footprint in food production.

The AAB board believes that all on farm fuels used in agricultural production should be exempt from carbon tax. This should include natural gas, propane, gas, and diesel. We strongly urge the government to be consistent with a sector wide exemption to current carbon tax policies.

Sincerely,

Dustin Zamecnik  
Chair of Norfolk County Agriculture Advisory Board
March 19th 2021

Re: Town of Gravenhurst Resolution – Ontario Fire College

Please be advised that on March 10th 2021 the Town of Plympton-Wyoming Council passed the following motion to support the Town of Gravenhurst – Ontario Fire College.

Motion #13 – Moved by Netty McEwen, Seconded by Tim Wilkins that Council support item “v)” from the Town of Gravenhurst regarding the Ontario Fire College.

Motion Carried.

WHEREAS the Ontario Fire College Campus has been in operation in Gravenhurst since 1958; and

WHEREAS the Ontario Fire College Campus is one of the primary sources of certified training for Ontario Firefighters; and

WHEREAS the Ontario Fire College Campus has built a reputation of integrity, credibility, and reliability in providing some of the best training to our Fire Services within the Province of Ontario; and

WHEREAS the Ontario Fire College Campus has been used to train and certify both Volunteer, Part-Time and Career firefighters throughout Ontario; and

WHEREAS the Regional Training Centers are not all created equal and similar in function to the Ontario Fire College Campus; and

WHEREAS the Ontario Fire College Campus gives Ontario Firefighters another option other than Regional Training Centers to obtain National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) certifications; and

WHEREAS the Ontario Fire College Campus is the most cost-effective method for municipalities to certify Firefighters to NFPA Standards in Ontario; and

WHEREAS the Ontario Government enacted and revoked O. Reg. 379/18: Firefighter Certification in 2018; and
WHEREAS when the Ontario Government revoked O. Reg. 379/18: Firefighter Certification, it was made known by the Office of the Solicitor General that the act would be amended and brought back in the future; and

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Town of Plympton-Wyoming requests that the Province of Ontario reverse their decision to close the Ontario Fire College Campus in Gravenhurst as the OFC is one of the best and most cost-effective methods for municipalities to train their firefighters which assists us in protecting our residents; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT this Resolution is forwarded to the Honourable Doug Ford Premier of Ontario, the Honourable Sylvia Jones, Ontario Solicitor General, the Honourable Steve Clark, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the Ontario Fire Marshal; Jon Pegg, and all municipalities within the Province of Ontario.

If you have any questions regarding the above motion, please do not hesitate to contact me by phone or email at ekwarcia@plympton-wyoming.ca.

Sincerely,

Erin Kwarcia
Clerk
Town of Plympton-Wyoming
February 11, 2021

RE: TOWN OF GRAVENHURST RESOLUTION – ONTARIO FIRE COLLEGE

At the Town of Gravenhurst Committee of the Whole meeting held on February 9, 2021 the following resolution was passed:

Moved by Councillor Lorenz
Seconded by Councillor Murray

WHEREAS the site of the Ontario Fire College has been in institutional use since 1902 as the Muskoka Free Hospital for Consumptives and the site of many heritage buildings that require protection;

AND WHEREAS the Town of Gravenhurst has been home to the Ontario Fire College since 1957, providing world-class training and camaraderie to thousands of Firefighters from across the Province in a unique setting;

AND WHEREAS the Ontario Fire College has established the reputation to certify both Volunteer and Career firefighters in a cost effective manner, offering top-tier training to all Fire Departments in Ontario;

AND WHEREAS there is concern from several municipalities and firefighters across the Province that the closure is detrimental to their training and that downloading of training is simply too expensive for municipalities and not included in their 2021 budgets;

AND WHEREAS the Fire Marshal has a duty (F.P.P.A.S 9.2(e)) to operate and maintain a central fire college and that regional training facilities are unproven and the closure of the Ontario Fire College was implemented with no stakeholder consultation;

AND WHEREAS the community of Gravenhurst has benefitted from the employment opportunities that the Ontario Fire College has provided;

AND WHEREAS the closure of the facility will result in significant job losses and would be a detriment to the broader community;
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Province of Ontario reconsider the closure of the Ontario Fire College;

AND THAT if the closure occurs, the facility and site in the Town of Gravenhurst be considered to be the location of a Regional Training Centre for Fire and Emergency Services, for all the people of Ontario;

AND THAT the Province engage the Town of Gravenhurst and community partners to use the site in a matter that fosters growth of the community in a responsible way;

AND FINALLY THAT this motion be forwarded to the Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario, the Honourable Sylvia Jones, Ontario Solicitor General, the Honourable Steve Clark, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, MPP Norm Miller, the Ontario Fire Marshal, Jon Pegg and all Ontario Municipalities.

CARRIED

Sincerely,

Kayla Thibeault
Director of Legislative Services / Clerk
Town of Gravenhurst
DRAFT MOTION:

WHEREAS the Ontario Fire College Campus has been in operation in Gravenhurst since 1958; and

WHEREAS the Ontario Fire College Campus is one of the primary sources of certified training for Ontario Firefighters; and

WHEREAS the Ontario Fire College Campus has built a reputation of integrity, credibility, and reliability in providing some of the best training to our Fire Services within the Province of Ontario; and

WHEREAS the Ontario Fire College Campus has been used to train and certify both Volunteer, Part-Time and Career firefighters throughout Ontario; and

WHEREAS the Regional Training Centers are not all created equal and similar in function to the Ontario Fire College Campus; and

WHEREAS the Ontario Fire College Campus gives Ontario Firefighters another option other than Regional Training Centers to obtain National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) certifications; and

WHEREAS the Ontario Fire College Campus is the most cost-effective method for municipalities to certify Firefighters to NFPA Standards in Ontario; and

WHEREAS the Ontario Government enacted and revoked 0. Reg. 379/18: Firefighter Certification in 2018; and

WHEREAS when the Ontario Government revoked 0. Reg. 379/18: Firefighter Certification, it was made known by the Office of the Solicitor General that the act would be amended and brought back in the future; and

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the TOWNSHIP/MUNICIPALITY requests that the Province of Ontario reverse their decision to close the Ontario Fire College Campus in Gravenhurst as the OFC is one of the best and most cost-effective methods for municipalities to train their firefighters which assists us in protecting our residents; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT this Resolution is forwarded to the Honourable Doug Ford Premier of Ontario, the Honourable Sylvia Jones; Ontario Solicitor General, the Honourable Steve Clark, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the Ontario Fire Marshal; Jon Pegg, and all municipalities within the Province of Ontario.
March 4, 2021

CL 4-2021, February 25, 2021
PHSSC 2-2021, February 16, 2021
Minute Item No. 5.1, February 16, 2021

MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION OF MUNICIPALITIES OF ONTARIO (AMO)

SENT ELECTRONICALLY

Motion respecting Homelessness, Mental Health and Addiction in Niagara
Minute Item No. 5.1

Regional Council, at its meeting held on February 25, 2021, approved the following resolution from its Public Health and Social Services Committee:

WHEREAS Niagara Region prides itself as being a caring and compassionate community that continually strives to be a place where people want to live, work and play;
WHEREAS providing access to safe, adequate and affordable housing for everyone is fundamental to achieving that goal;
WHEREAS Niagara Region acknowledges that mental health, mental illness, addiction and homelessness, while important issues, are not homogenous, interchangeable or consistently interconnected, and doing so may over simplify exceptionally complex issues that require targeted policy solutions and intervention;
WHEREAS Niagara Region’s 10-year Housing and Homelessness Action Plan (HHAP), A Home For All, outlines the Region’s vision, challenges, and the actions required to achieve its goals;
WHEREAS Niagara Region has embarked on an ambitious effort to end chronic homelessness through participation in the national Built for Zero campaign;
WHEREAS Regional Council formally adopted Mental Health and Wellbeing (2.2) and Addressing Affordable Housing Needs (2.3) as strategic priorities for the current term of our Council;
WHEREAS a recent KPMG report commissioned by Niagara Region indicated that Council invests more levy funding than its peers into homelessness, demonstrating a steadfast commitment to addressing the issue;
WHEREAS Niagara Region acknowledges that people living in shelters are part of the crisis and not the solution;
WHEREAS Niagara Region has two planned housing projects that would directly address those in Niagara who experience chronic homelessness;
WHEREAS the implementation plan for Council’s strategic objectives states that staff will identify gaps within the mental health system to increase the functionality and collaboration within it;
WHEREAS the same implementation plan directed staff to partner with Ontario Health (formally the LHIN) to review the local landscape to identify opportunities, including new investment;
WHEREAS the treatment and supports for mental illness, addiction, and homelessness are predominantly funded and directed by the Province;
WHEREAS the success of the Region’s Housing and Homelessness Action Plan is dependent on a commitment of sustained and increased funding (both operational and capital) from all levels of government to address the issues of housing insecurity and homelessness in Niagara; and
WHEREAS the needs of the community far outweigh Niagara Region's available resources and funding required to effectively address these issues, and the support of both the Provincial and Federal governments are needed to meet these needs.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. That Niagara Region Council officially ACKNOWLEDGE that a significant crisis exists in Niagara in regard to the prevalence of chronic homelessness and the lack of affordable housing that far surpasses the Region’s ability to meet the vision dictated in its 10-year Housing and Homelessness Action Plan (HHAP);

2. That the Regional Chair BE DIRECTED to send advocacy letters directly to the appropriate Federal and Provincial ministries outlining Niagara’s current situation and requesting additional funding be provided to ensure Niagara can meet the vision outlined in its housing action plan;

3. That the Regional Chair BE DIRECTED to advocate to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing and the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development for the required operational funding for the planned supportive and bridge housing initiatives;

4. That Regional staff BE DIRECTED, in alignment with the planned review of Council’s strategic priorities, to produce a report specifically highlighting the progress being made and critical gaps in regard to services related to mental health, addictions and wellbeing;

5. That Regional staff BE DIRECTED to continue providing Regional Council updates on the HHAP and Built for Zero initiatives;

6. That Regional staff BE DIRECTED to request an update from the Overdose Prevention and Education Network of Niagara (OPENN) regarding the current status of the actions being taken to address addiction related issues in Niagara; and
7. That a copy of this motion be sent to all members of the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO).

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Ann-Marie Norio
Regional Clerk

CLK-C 2021-044
March 23, 2021
File #120203
Sent via email: premier@ontario.ca

The Honourable Doug Ford,
Premier of Ontario
Room 281, Legislative Building, Queen's Park
Toronto, ON M7A 1A1

Honourable and Dear Sir:

Re: City of Sarnia - Advocate the Province of Ontario to Adjust the Capacity Limits as part of the COVID-19 Colour Coded System

Please be advised the Municipal Council of the Town of Fort Erie at its meeting of March 22, 2021 received and supported correspondence from the City of Sarnia dated March 4, 2021 advocating the Province of Ontario to adjust the capacity limits for dining, restaurants, sporting and recreational facilities, places of worship, event centers, and all retail/small businesses as part of the COVID-19 Colour Coded System.

Attached please find a copy of the City of Sarnia’s correspondence dated March 4, 2021.

Thank you for your attention to this matter

Yours very truly,

Carol Schofield, Dipl.M.A.
Manager, Legislative Services/Clerk
cschofield@forterie.ca

CS: dlk
Attach

C.C.
Tony Baldinelli, MP, Niagara Falls tony.baldinelli@parl.gc.ca
Wayne Gates, MPP wgates-co@ndp.on.ca
Niagara Region ann-marie.norio@niagararegion.ca
Ontario Municipalities
March 4, 2021

The Honourable Doug Ford
Premier of Ontario
Legislative Building
Queen's Park
Toronto, ON M7A 1A1

Dear Premier Ford,

Re: Colour Coded Capacity Limits

At its meeting held on March 1, 2021, Sarnia City Council discussed the challenges local businesses are facing with respect to the colour coded system within the Province’s COVID-19 Response Framework. The following motion was adopted:

That Sarnia City Council strongly advocate to the Province of Ontario that they adjust the capacity limits for dining, restaurants, sporting and recreational facilities, places of worship, event centers, and all retail/small businesses as part of the colour coded system.

The following rationale was provided with the introduction of the motion:

- The red zone currently only allows 10 people indoors at a dining or a sporting / recreational facility (regardless of the size), places of worship are capped at 30% or 50 people, and retail / small business is limited to a 50% capacity.
- These businesses and organizations have heavily invested in facility improvements and expensive upgrades to ensure safe social distancing and have all the appropriate safety and protection measures in place.
- Businesses in particular cannot properly plan under the current uncertainty and that means the loss of jobs and income for both workers and owners as well as mental health challenges.

Received by
MARCH 22, 2021
COUNCIL
Indoor capacity limits for restaurants, dining, sporting / recreational facilities, event centers, retail / small business, and places of worship should not involve arbitrary numbers (regardless of size), but instead be changed to the amount of people per facility which ensures that strict and safe social distancing can be maintained.

Sarnia City Council has requested that all municipalities in Ontario join this advocacy effort.

On behalf of Sarnia City Council, I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

Amy Burkhart
Acting City Clerk

Cc: All Ontario Municipalities
    Ms. Marilyn Gladu, MP Sarnia-Lambton
    Mr. Bob Bailey, MPP Sarnia-Lambton
March 22, 2021

RE: Ontario Fire College Closure

Please be advised that the Council of the Municipality of Grey Highlands, at its meeting held March 17, 2021, passed the following resolution:

2021-195
Moved by Aakash Desai, Seconded by Danielle Valiquette

Whereas Council received the resolution 59/21 from the Township of Howick; and

Whereas, the Province of Ontario has announced that as of March 31, 2021 the Gravenhurst campus of the Ontario Fire College will be permanently closed; and

Whereas, the Province of Ontario announced plans to modernize and expand access to firefighter training in Ontario; and

Whereas, there has been no clear plan communicated by the Province of Ontario on how to obtain firefighter training in the absence of the Ontario Fire College campus; and

Whereas, there has been no clear plan communicated by the Province of Ontario on how firefighter training in Ontario will be modernized and expanded; and

Whereas, there has been no clear plan communicated by the Province of Ontario regarding the costs or funding for modernized and expanded firefighter training in Ontario; and

Whereas, the Municipality of Grey Highlands is a small municipality that operates a volunteer fire department to provide fire protection;

Now therefore, be it resolved that Council respectfully request a clear plan be communicated that establishes how the Province intends to modernize and expand firefighter training ensuring equal access to all municipal fire departments in Ontario, and as well, present a plan for funding to subsidize and/or regulate the cost for firefighter training in the Province of Ontario; and
That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Solicitor General, MPP Bill Walker, the Ontario Fire Marshal, the Ontario Association of Fire Chiefs, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, and all Ontario Municipalities.
CARRIED.

As per the above resolution, please accept a copy of this correspondence for your information and consideration.

Sincerely,

Jerri-Lynn Levitt
Deputy Clerk
Council and Legislative Services
Municipality of Grey Highlands
March 3, 2021

Premier Doug Ford

By email only premier@ontario.ca

Dear Premier Ford:

Please be advised that the following resolution was passed at the March 2, 2021 Howick Council meeting:

Moved by Deputy Reeve Bowman; Seconded by Councillor Hargrave:
Whereas, the Province of Ontario has announced that as of March 31, 2021 the Gravenhurst campus of the Ontario Fire College will be permanently closed; and Whereas, the Province of Ontario announced plans to modernize and expand access to firefighter training in Ontario; and Whereas, there has been no clear plan communicated by the Province of Ontario on how to obtain firefighter training in the absence of the Ontario Fire College campus; and Whereas, there has been no clear plan communicated by the Province of Ontario on how firefighter training in Ontario will be modernized and expanded; and Whereas, there has been no clear plan communicated by the Province of Ontario regarding the costs or funding for modernized and expanded firefighter training in Ontario; and Whereas, the Township of Howick is a small rural municipality that operates a volunteer fire department to provide fire protection; Now therefore, be it resolved that Council respectfully request a clear plan be communicated that establishes how the Province intends to modernize and expand firefighter training ensuring equal access to all municipal fire departments in Ontario, and as well, present a plan for funding to subsidize and or regulate the cost for firefighter training in the Province of Ontario. Carried.
Resolution No. 59/21

If you require any further information, please contact this office, thank you.

Yours truly,

Carol Watson
Carol Watson, Clerk
Township of Howick

Cc Solicitor General Sylvia Jones
Huron-Bruce MPP Lisa Thompson
Ontario Fire Marshal Jon Pegg
Ontario Association of Fire Chiefs Mark McDonald
AMO President Graydon Smith
All Ontario Municipalities
WHEREAS the Ontario Fire College has been in operation since 1949, where its primary responsibility is to develop and delivery academically sound educational and hands on training programs to meet the needs of both today’s and tomorrow’s fire services; and
WHEREAS the Ontario Fire College’s main objective is to assist the students to become the best trained and most professional members of the Ontario fire service; and
WHEREAS the Ontario Fire College is one of the primary sources of certified training for Ontario and Municipal Firefighters; and
WHEREAS the Ontario Fire College has built a reputation of integrity, credibility, and reliability in providing some of the best training for our fire services within the Province of Ontario; and
WHEREAS the Ontario Fire College has been utilized by the Township of Edwardsburgh Cardinal for numerous years to train and certify our volunteer fire fighters; and
WHEREAS the Township of Edwardsburgh Cardinal Volunteer Fire Department is on call 24/7 for 365 days a year, with regular jobs and families that expect them to come home safely each and every time; and
WHEREAS the Ontario Fire College provides fire fighters with another option other than Regional Training Centres to obtain their National Fire Protection Association certification; and
WHEREAS the Ontario Fire College is the most cost effective method to certify fire fighters to National Fire Protection Association standards in Ontario; and
WHEREAS when the Government of Ontario enacted and revoked Ontario Regulation 379/18: Firefighter Certification, it was made known by the Office of the Solicitor General that the Act would be amended and brought back in the future; and
WHEREAS the Ontario Fire Service stakeholders were not consulted regarding the closure of the Ontario Fire College training facility in Gravenhurst; and

☐ Carried  ☐ Defeated  ☐ Unanimous

**Mayor:**

**RECORDED VOTE REQUESTED BY:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>YEA</th>
<th>NAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillor H. Cameron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor S. Dillabough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor J. Hunter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Mayor T. Deschamps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor P. Sayeau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resolution Number: 2021-________
Moved By: ____________________________
Seconded By: __________________________

WHEREAS municipalities in the Province of Ontario are mandated to establish a program including public education and fire prevention, and provide fire protection services as it deems may be necessary with its needs and circumstance. 
NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVES THAT the Council of the Corporation of the Township of Edwardsburgh Cardinal hereby strongly requests that the Government of Ontario reverse their decision to close the Ontario Fire College as it is one of the best and most cost effective methods for municipalities to educate and train their firefighters which assists in protecting all residents; and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT if the Government of Ontario chooses to not reverse its decision to close the Ontario Fire College, the Province should provide direct financial support to municipalities to offset the increased training costs of providing Provincially mandated firefighting services; and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT this resolution be forwarded to the Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario, the Honourable Sylvia Jones; Ontario Solicitor General, the Honourable Steve Clark, Minister of Municipal Affairs and House, the Ontario Fire Marshal, and all municipalities within the Province of Ontario.

☐ Carried  ☐ Defeated  ☐ Unanimous

Mayor: ____________________________

RECORDED VOTE REQUESTED BY: ____________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>YEA</th>
<th>NAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillor H. Cameron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor S. Dillabough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor J. Hunter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Mayor T. Deschamps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor P. Sayeau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SENT VIA EMAIL

March 25, 2021

The Right Honourable Justin Trudeau, MP
Prime Minister of Canada
Langevin Block
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0A2

Prime Minister:

RE: Bill C-21, An Act to amend certain Acts and to make certain consequential amendments (firearms)

At its Regular Meeting held on March 8, 2021 Council of the Town of Kingsville passed the following Resolution:

"205-2021
Moved By Councillor Thomas Neufeld, Seconded By Councillor Larry Patterson

A Resolution concerning Bill C-21, An Act to amend certain Acts and to make certain consequential amendments (firearms), specifically Amendment 26, Section (58.01 (1-8), Conditions-bylaw.

WHEREAS municipalities have never been responsible for gun control laws in Canada;

AND WHEREAS law abiding Kingsville residents who own legal handguns have already been thoroughly vetted through the CFSC, PAL and ATT applications;

AND WHEREAS illegal gun owners and smugglers do not respect postal codes;

AND WHEREAS if one municipality enacts a ban and not a neighbouring municipality, this will create a patchwork of by-laws;

AND WHEREAS a municipal ban would be difficult to enforce and easy to get around.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that The Corporation of the Town of Kingsville is OPPOSED to the adoption of any by-laws restricting the possession, storage and transportation of legally obtained handguns;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution be forwarded to the following public officials: MP Chris Lewis-Essex, MPP Taras Natyshak-Essex, Premier of Ontario The Honourable Doug Ford, Leader of the Official Opposition Andrea Horwath, Prime Minister of Canada The Honourable Justin Trudeau, and Leader of Official Opposition The Honourable Erin O'Toole."

..2/
If you require any further information, please contact the undersigned.

Yours very truly,

Sandra Kitchen
Deputy Clerk-Council Services
Legislative Services Department
skitchen@kingsville.ca

cc: Hon. Doug Ford, Premier
cc: Hon. Andrea Horwath, Official Leader of the Opposition
cc: Hon. Erin O’Toole, Official Leader of the Opposition
cc: MP Chris Lewis- Essex
cc: MPP Taras Natyshak-Essex
cc: Hon. Bill Blair, Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness
cc: MP Shannon Stubbs
cc: Mayor Aldo DiCarlo, Town of Amherstburg
cc: Mayor Larry Snively, Town of Essex
cc: Mayor Tom Bain, Town of Lakeshore
cc: Mayor Marc Bondy, Town of LaSalle
cc: Mayor Hilda MacDonald, Municipality of Leamington
cc: Mayor Gary McNamara, Town of Tecumseh
cc: all Municipalities in Ontario
Committee Members in Attendance: Councillor Adhsade, Councillor Devine, Sheri-Lynn Roberts, Dan Lajoie, John Dunham, Erin Moerman, Jaime Griffis, Joyce Barlow, Joyce Haines, and Barb Schutz.

Members Regrets: Nathan M. Packiya, Scott Lindsay and Robert Rappolt.

Staff Members in Attendance: Briar Allison, Council Committee Services Coordinator; Vanessa Lopak, Accessibility and Diversity Supervisor; Paul Willms, Sustainability Planner; Shane Taylor, Landscape Architect and Danielle Manton, City Clerk.

Meeting Called to Order

The meeting of the Accessibility Advisory Committee of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge was held virtually via zoom. Committee Chair Dan Lajoie welcomed everyone present and called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m. and the meeting adjourned at 2:22 p.m.

Disclosure of Interest

There were no declarations of pecuniary interests / conflicts of interest.

Presentations

None

Delegations

None

Minutes of Previous Meeting

Moved by: Sheri-Lynn Roberts

Seconded by: Councillor Adshade
THAT the minutes from the Accessibility Advisory Committee meeting held on January 25, 2021 be approved.

CARRIED

Agenda Items

7.1 North Park, Paul Willms, Sustainability Planner, Shane Taylor, Landscape Architect, James Lockhart, MHBC Planning Consultants

Via a powerpoint presentation, Paul and Shane provided an overall summary which included context in relation to the location in Cambridge, path and connections, a concept plan, and inclusive park amenities.

7.2 Update on Staff Consultation/Capital Projects – Danielle Manton, City Clerk

Danielle provided the committee with an update on staff consultation on capital projects in regards to accessibility. Several internal changes are in the works, which include but are not limited to, a change in the staff report template and an annual plan review for all capital projects.

7.3 Action Plan Status Update - Vanessa Lopak, Supervisor of Accessibility and Diversity Services

Vanessa has drafted the accessibility plan and the committee will receive the document in the short future.

7.4 May CAAC Meeting Date – Robyn Hyland, Inclusion Coordinator

MOTION

Moved by: Sheri-Lyn Roberts

Seconded by: Barb Schutz

THAT the scheduled Accessibility Advisory Committee meeting on Monday, May 24th, 2021 be rescheduled to Monday, May 31st, 2021.
7.5 Agency Updates – Barb Schutz, Community Living Cambridge, Joyce Haynes, Canadian Hearing Society

Barb provided the committee with an update on how Community Living Cambridge is utilizing technology to connect and get creative with each other. Contact Barb Schutz at bschutz@clcambridge.ca for more information on online programming.

Joyce Haynes provided the committee with an update on the Canadian Hearing Society on new programs and equipment that they are offering in a virtual setting. Contact Joyce Haynes at jhaynes@chs.ca for more information.

Dan Lajoie and Sheri-Lyn Roberts provided the committee with an update on the Independent Living Centre. Contact Dan or Sheri for more information.

Other Business

1.1 Chair Report

None

1.2 Councillor’s Report

Councillor’s Devine and Adshade advised that the recreation complex concept design was approved.

1.3 Staff Report

None

Next Meeting

Date & Time: Monday, March 22, 2021 1:00pm-3:00pm

Location: Zoom

Close of Meeting

Moved by: Joyce Barlow

Seconded by: Joyce Haynes
THAT the Cambridge Accessibility Advisory Committee meeting of February 22, 2021 be adjourned at 2:22 pm.

Dan Lajoie  
Chair

Briar Allison  
Council Committee Services Coordinator

Dan Lajoie  
Briar Allison
The regular meeting of the Economic Development Advisory Committee of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge was held via Zoom Video Conferencing. J. Goodram welcomed everyone present and called the meeting to order at 3:47 p.m. The meeting adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

Notice of Regrets
Regrets were received from Paul Brown.

Declarations of Pecuniary Interest
There were no declarations of pecuniary interest from committee members.

Presentations
There were none.

Confirmation of Minutes
Moved by: Tony Schmidt
Seconded by: Councillor Pam Wolf

THAT the minutes of the Economic Development Advisory Committee held on Wednesday, March 11, 2020, be considered for errors and/or omissions.

CARRIED
City of Cambridge  
Economic Development Advisory Committee (EDAC)  
Minutes  

**Agenda Items**  
a) Welcome and Introduction of New Members  
The committee welcomed the newest members, Erik Dahm and Filip Ivanovski, and introductions were made.

b) Elections for Chair and Vice Chair  
The committee agreed to allow P. Brown (Chair) and T. Schmidt (Vice Chair), to remain in their current positions for the 2021 year. Due to the Covid-19 Pandemic, EDAC did not meet from April to December 2020.

c) Future EDAC Topics  
J. Goodram requested that group members bring forward ideas at the February meeting to create a list of topics, presentations, guest speakers and/or concerns for future meeting discussion.

It was encouraged that members attend meetings regularly to ensure a productive, effective and meaningful discussion. It was advised the EDAC Terms of Reference is tentatively scheduled to be brought forward to council on March 16, 2021. If approved, one representative from the Hespeler Village BIA and one representative from the Downtown Cambridge BIA will be included in the composition of the committee.

**Additions to the Agenda**  
None  

**Business Arising from the Minutes**  
None  

**Council Update**  
It was noted the IP Park (North Cambridge Business Park) Project development is underway and the paving of Intermarket road has been completed. J. Goodram noted there are two new businesses in the North Cambridge Business Park, Angstrom Engineering and Fusion Products. It was advised the Preston Arena project and the Recreation Complex project in southeast Galt has begun.

Councillor Wolf provided updates on the following items,

- Cambridge West Sub-Division
City of Cambridge
Economic Development Advisory Committee (EDAC)
Minutes

- Gaslight District Towers
- Former Dickson School
- Galt Height Study and Heritage District Study
- Affordable Housing

Other Business
J. Goodram was informed by the City Clerk that beginning in February or March all EDAC meetings will be live stream and posted on the City’s YouTube channel for public accessibility and transparency. He opened the floor for discussion on the matter and several concerns were raised. Members agreed live streaming will change the dynamic of the meetings making them less effective and honest. It was also noted that discussion of confidential Core Areas Transformation Fund (CATF) applications will be difficult. J. Goodram to share concerns with the City Clerk and noted he could be contacted directly for further discussion.

The Community Improvement Plan Financial Incentives will be reviewed at the next meeting for input and discussion.

The new zoning by-law is currently being updated and city staff is reviewing the policies to encourage affordability in the region.

City/Priority List Items for Updates
a) Economic Response Activities

J. Goodram reviewed in detail the various measures the City of Cambridge has implemented to assist residents and the business community throughout the pandemic including the INVEST web page that was developed for everything Covid-19 related. He discussed the different Federal, Provincial and Municipal programs being offered, support services and activities throughout the region, where the information can be found and staff contacts to support business owners. Positive feedback was received on the municipal programs that have been offered. It was noted the Cambridge Chamber of Commerce and the Greater Kitchener Waterloo Chamber of Commerce have teamed up and launched interactive workshops for businesses to access for assistance (staff to provide information to the committee members). It was explained the Business and Economic Support Team of Waterloo Region (BESTWR) was developed to share best practices and concerns and to work on a collaborative approach throughout the region.
For more details on Cambridge Economic Response Plan please see Council Report 20-146(CRE) (item #12) from June 2020.

b) Cambridge Chamber of Commerce Visitor Services Annual Report

It was noted the annual report was circulated with the agenda. J. Goodram advised the Chamber of Commerce has been opened and providing in person and online services to the public during the pandemic.

**Future Suggested Presentations for EDAC (from 2020)**

a) Zoning By-Law (D. Friess, Manager of Development Planning)
b) SRED tax incentives (ITC or Mentorworks)
c) Airport Master Plan - Update (C. Wood, General Manager)
d) Brownfield Redevelopment Strategy – Look at odd/sitting properties also
e) City of Cambridge Strategic Plan – Economic Development focus and promotion

**Next Meeting**

Wednesday, February 10, 2021
Virtual Meeting
Zoom Video Conferencing
3:45 to 5:30 p.m.

**Close of Meeting**

Moved by: Brian Punambolam
Seconded by: Tony Schmidt

THAT the Wednesday, January 13, 2021 meeting of the Economic Development Advisory Committee (EDAC) does now adjourn at 5:01 p.m.

CARRIED
To: COUNCIL
Meeting Date: 04/13/21
Subject: Request to Alter a Part IV Designated Property – 50 Lansdowne Road South
Submitted By: Elaine Brunn Shaw, Chief Planner
Prepared By: Chelsey Tyers, BES, MCIP, RPP, Cultural Heritage Specialist, WSP Canada Inc and Abraham Plunkett-Latimer, Senior Planner – Heritage
Report No.: 21-085(CD)
File No.: R01.01.134

Recommendations

THAT Report 21-085 (CD) – Request to Alter a Part IV Designated Property – 50 Lansdowne Road South – be received for information;

AND THAT Council approve the request to alter the Part IV Designated Property, municipally known as 50 Lansdowne Road South by replacing wood window in kind;

AND THAT Council approve funding from the Heritage Conservation Reserve Fund for the designated property municipally known as 50 Lansdowne Road South to a maximum of $2,500 for the replacement of the windows in accordance with the recommendations in Report 21-085 (CD);

AND THAT Council state its intention to amend Designating By-law 9-17 to correct the location of the bay window from east to south elevation in the list of heritage attributes in accordance with Section 30.1(3) of the Ontario Heritage Act;

AND THAT Council direct staff to provide notice of the proposed amendment to Designating By-law 9-17 to the owner of 50 Lansdowne South in accordance with Sections 30.1(3) and 30.1(4) of the Ontario Heritage Act;

AND THAT Council authorize the City Clerk to present the amending by-law to Council, provided there is no objection to the statement of intention to amend designating by-law 9-17 and to provide notice of this amendment to the owner of 50 Lansdowne South and to the Ontario Heritage Trust in accordance with Section 31.1(9) the Ontario Heritage Act;
AND FURTHER THAT Council authorize the City Clerk to take necessary actions in the event of an objection to the statement of intention to amend by-law 9-17 pursuant to section 29(7) of the Ontario Heritage Act.

Executive Summary

Purpose

• The property located at 50 Lansdowne Road South is designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act by By-law 9-17.
• The property owner is requesting permission to replace wood windows on the façade and north elevation of 50 Lansdowne Road South.

Key Findings

• The proposed replacement of the three-bay wood window on the front facade and the bay window on the south elevation are consistent with best heritage practice to replace deteriorated original features with like materials and design.
• The Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommended approval of the replacement of windows in kind at their meeting on March 18, 2021.

Financial Implications

• The property owner has been awarded $2,500 in funding from the Designated Heritage Property Grant Program which has made available $15,000 in total funding to be allocated to grant applications through the 2021 – Operating Budget.
• It is also recommended that Council approve additional funding from the Heritage Conservation Reserve Fund to a maximum of $2,500 for the replacement of windows.
• The remainder of the cost of the project will be the responsibility of the property owner.

Background

The subject property is designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act by By-law 9-17 (Attachment 1). The two-storey dwelling was constructed in 1906 and displays Italianate and Queen Anne style influences (Figure 1).
The property owner is seeking permission to replace the three-bay window on the façade and the bay window on the south elevation. Additionally, the property owner is also seeking funding from the Designated Heritage Grant Program to replace these windows with wood windows that match the existing fenestration patterns. An application and two quotes have been submitted for consideration (Attachment 2).

On March 18, 2021 the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee passed the following resolutions:

THAT Report 21-005 (MHAC) – Request to Alter and for Funding from the Designated Heritage Property Grant Program – 50 Lansdowne Road South – be received;

AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommend Council approve the replacement of the windows at 50 Lansdowne Road South as outlined in Report 21-005 (MHAC);

AND THAT the MHAC recommend Council direct staff to amend By-law 9-17, to correct the location of the bay window in the list of heritage attributes in accordance with Section 30.1 of the Ontario Heritage Act;

AND THAT the MHAC recommends the application for funding from the 2021 Operating Budget be approved by the Deputy City Manager of Community Development for the designated property municipally known as 50 Lansdowne Road South, for $2,500 for the replacement of the windows;
AND THAT the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) recommends that City Council (Council) approve additional funding from the Heritage Conservation Reserve Fund for the designated property municipally known as 50 Lansdowne Road South to a maximum of $2,500 for the replacement of the windows in accordance with the recommendations in Report 21-005 (MHAC);

AND THAT the approved work must be completed by November 1, 2021;

AND FURTHER THAT the grant is conditional on the inspection of the completed work to the satisfaction of the MHAC or its designated representative.

Analysis

Strategic Alignment

PLACE: To take care of, celebrate and share the great features in Cambridge that we love and mean the most to us.

Goal #3 - Arts, Culture, Heritage and Architecture

Objective 3.2 Conserve and make positive contributions to our heritage districts and buildings throughout the community.

The City encourages sympathetic maintenance of designated heritage properties to celebrate our built heritage and create attractive, viable neighbourhoods.

Comments

The existing three-bay windows on the façade, consists of a grouping of three wood windows, one large rectangular window flanked by two narrow rectangular windows. The flanking windows are double hung, but are currently inoperable. The existing bay window on the south elevation consists of a grouping of three wood windows, one large rectangular window flanked by two narrow rectangular windows. The designation by-law identifies both windows as heritage attributes, however, it does mistakenly refer to the bay window on the south elevation as located on the east elevation. Amendments of designation by-laws for clarification or correction purposes is subject to Section 30.1 of the Ontario Heritage Act. Section 30.1(2) of the Ontario Heritage Act, provides a streamlined process to clarify or correct the statement of cultural heritage value or interest or the description of heritage attributes in a designation by-law. Under this process, Council may proceed with passing the amending by-law without issuing a Notice of Intention to Designate, and this by-law cannot be appealed.

A site visit was conducted on March 3, 2021 to review the window conditions in detail from the exterior of the building (see Images 1-8 in Attachment 3). At the site visit, the property owner confirmed that during their ownership the windows were painted as
required and most recently they were painted 2 years ago and the woodwork on the façade, including the front window, was striped and sanded prior to repainting. The storm windows could not be removed for observation given their weight, size and the difficulty in reinstalling them. The windows appear to be in good condition, though closer examination reveals the storm windows are ill fitting with some observable gaps and demonstrate deterioration at the sill. Layers of paint have rendered most of the hung windows inoperable. The window sills on the façade have been temporarily reinforced and will need to be replaced. The property owner noted that they were interested in only replacing the deteriorated portions of wood on the sill, but given the structural importance of the sill, a new solid piece of wood will likely be required.

The windows on the south elevation demonstrate acute deterioration at the sill level. While these windows were painted two years ago, the paint began to peel after only a year. This suggests there is excess moisture in the wood frames and, based on the observed deterioration, there may be additional areas of rot under the recently painted surface.

In addition to the Designated Heritage Property Grant Programs which offers a maximum of $2,500, the City of Cambridge also has the Heritage Conservation Reserve Fund for appropriate restoration and repairs. The proposed replacement of windows in kind would be an eligible project under the Heritage Conservation Reserve Fund.

If Council does not approve the proposed replacement of windows then the existing windows will continue to sustain moisture damage and may compromise the integrity of the house.

If Council does not approve additional funding from the Heritage Conservation Reserve Fund, the owner will still receive $2,500 from the Designated Heritage Property Grants Program and will assume the remainder of the cost of replacement.

**Existing Policy/By-Law**

Ontario Heritage Act

Section 33(1) states that no owner of a property shall make an alteration to a property designated under Part IV without the approval in writing of Council.

Designation By-law 9-17 is the by-law designating 50 Lansdowne Road South.

The Ontario Heritage Act provides a process through which designating by-laws may be amended to correct the property’s heritage attributes without repealing the by-law.

Section 30.1 (1) states that,

The council of a municipality may, by by-law, amend a by-law designating property made under section 29 and section 29 applies with necessary modifications to an
amending by-law as though it were a by-law to designate property under that
section. 2005, c. 6, s. 19.

Section 30.1 (2) states, despite subsection (1), subsections 29 (1) to (6) [describing the
repeal of a by-law] do not apply to an amending by-law if the purpose of the amendment is,

(a) to clarify or correct the statement explaining the property’s cultural heritage value or
interest or the description of the property’s heritage attributes;

(b) to correct the legal description of the property; or

(c) to otherwise revise the language of the by-law to make it consistent with the
requirements of this Act or the regulations. 2005, c. 6, s. 19.

City of Cambridge Official Plan

Section 4.2.1(c) of the City of Cambridge Official Plan states that preservation and
adaptive re-use of heritage buildings for compatible residential intensification and/or
other appropriate uses is encouraged.

Section 4.5.3 states that Council will consult with the Municipal Heritage Advisory
Committee on alterations to designated structures.

Section 4.6.1a states that Council will pass by-laws to designate properties that are of
cultural heritage significance.

Regarding funding, the Official Plan states:

The City encourages the restoration or rehabilitation of privately owned
properties designated in accordance with the provisions of Policies 4.6.1 of this
Plan. Pursuant to the Ontario Heritage Act, Council may pass by-laws providing
for the making of a grant or loan to the owner of such designated property for the
purpose of paying for the whole or any part of the cost of the alteration of such
designated property on such terms and conditions as Council may prescribe
where such alteration will serve to protect or enhance the heritage characteristics
of such designated property.

Designating By-law

The subject property is designated by By-law 9-17. Attachment 1 provides a copy of
this by-law.

Financial Impact

The Heritage Conservation Reserve Fund is available to assist designated property
owners with funds to cover the costs of emergency repairs or for high cost projects
which help conserve the identified cultural heritage attributes of the property. The Reserve Fund is topped up annually with unused funds from the Designated Heritage Property Grant Program. There was currently $79,116 in the Reserve Fund as of December 31, 2020.

As of March 16, 2021, Council has approved $25,000 from the Heritage Conservation Reserve Fund to be allocated to eligible projects to be paid out by November 1st, 2021. If these funds are disbursed by November 1st, there will be $54,116 remaining by the end of the calendar year.

The remainder of the cost of the project will be the responsibility of the property owner.

Public Input

MHAC meetings are open to the public.

Internal/External Consultation

Planning staff have corresponded with the property owner. The Council meeting agenda is posted publicly as part of the report process.

Conclusion

Replacement of the wood windows is considered reasonable given their deterioration and signs of moisture in the wood. The property owner proposes to replace the windows with wood windows that will match the style of the existing storm windows. However, it is recommended that the replacement windows replicate the style of the windows which have less muntin bars than some of the storm windows. Replacement of deteriorated original features with replicated features of the same material and design is consistent with best heritage practice. This includes the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries' (MHSTCI) Eight Guiding Principles in the Conservation of Historic Properties that recommends repairing with like materials when necessary and Parks Canada’s Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada that recommends replacing in kind deteriorated windows based on surviving prototypes.

It is recommended that the application for alteration as outlined in this report be approved by City Council. Additionally, it is recommended that Council approve a grant to a maximum of $2,500 under the Heritage Conservation Reserve Fund to support appropriate heritage conservation measures. Lastly, it is recommended that City Council direct staff to amend the designation by-law to correct the location of the bay window in accordance with Section 30.1 of the Ontario Heritage Act. These recommendations are consistent with the City encouraging sympathetic maintenance of designated heritage properties to celebrate our built heritage and create attractive, viable neighbourhoods.
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This document was retrieved from the Ontario Heritage Act Register, which is accessible through the website of the Ontario Heritage Trust at www.heritagetrust.on.ca.

Ce document est tiré du registre aux fins de la Loi sur le patrimoine de l’Ontario, accessible à partir du site Web de la Fiducie du patrimoine ontarien sur www.heritagetrust.on.ca.
WHEREAS the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 2005 Chapter 0.18 authorizes the Council of a municipality to enact by-laws to designate real property including all buildings and structures thereon, to be of cultural value or interest;

AND WHEREAS Notice of Intention to Designate 50 Lansdowne Road South, Cambridge, Ontario, have been duly published and served;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Corporation of the City of Cambridge enacts as follows:

1. THAT there is designated, as being of cultural heritage significance, the exterior of the structure located on the real property, more particularly described in Schedule “A” attached hereto, known as 50 Lansdowne Road South, Cambridge, Ontario. The reasons for designation are as set out in Schedule “B” attached hereto;

2. THAT the City of Cambridge is hereby authorized to cause a copy of this by-law to be served upon the owner of the said property and upon the Ontario Heritage Trust and to cause notice of this by-law to be published in a newspaper having general circulation in the City of Cambridge.
3. THAT it is Acknowledged and Directed that the office of the City Solicitor, or his/her designate, be authorized to register electronically any and all documents in connection with this transaction.

4. THAT this by-law shall come into full force on the day it is passed.

PASSED AND ENACTED this 24th day of January, 2017

MAYOR

CLERK
BY-LAW NO. 9-17

of the

CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

ALL AND SINGULAR that certain parcel or tract of land and premises, situate, lying and being in the City of Cambridge, in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo, (formerly in the Town of Galt) being comprised of PLAN 110 LOT 4.
SCHEDULE “B”

TO BY-LAW NO. 9-17

of the

CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

The subject property, municipally known as 50 Lansdowne Road South, was designated because of its cultural heritage significance.

Description of Property

The subject property is a two storey buff brick house within the Dickson Hill area of west Galt in Cambridge. The property faces east onto Lansdowne Road South.

Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

This residence was constructed in 1906 of buff coloured brick in a vernacular expression of the Italianate and Queen Anne styles. True to the Queen Anne architecture style, 50 Lansdowne Road South is an L-shaped, two storey house with a simple hipped roof. The structure sits on a grey, quarry-faced, broken course limestone foundation. The main construction materials are stretcher-laid yellow brick which form voussoirs over most of the doors and windows on the structure, including the basement level windows. The front façade has a half porch with a mansard style roof that supports a second floor balcony deck. The front porch also has two large turned, wooden support columns. The property at 50 Lansdowne Road South is believed to have been constructed shortly after the street was surveyed in 1906 by Florence Dickson who, at one point, owned much of the land that now makes up the area of Dickson Hill in west Galt. George Last, a machinist with the Goldie and McCulloch Company Limited, bought this lot from Florence Dickson for $200 in August 1906 and constructed the house.
Description of Heritage Attributes

The key exterior attributes which characterize the cultural heritage value of the property at 50 Lansdowne Road South are the:

- Buff brick construction;
- Quarry faced, broken course limestone foundation;
- Hipped roofline;
- Square plan and protruding gable end on the front façade;
- Wooden front door with glazing;
- Front porch and balcony construction including spindle bannisters, newels, turned wood columns and open spandrel;
- Circular topped window on the front façade with standing soldier, multi-centred arch;
- Decorative king post and fenestrations on the front gable;
- Large three bay wood window on the front gable façade;
- Protruding wooden bow window in all its configurations on the east elevation; and
- Voussoirs above all windows.
## Estimate

**ADDRESS**
Roger Agler  
Cambridgew On  

---

**ESTIMATE # 1100**  
**DATE 30-10-2020**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>TAX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales Front Window Side units</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>HST ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- active units either as single hung or tilt and turn windows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- insert units to be installed into existing frames</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- multipoint hardware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- factory finished</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- delivered to site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- installation not include but can be performed on a time and material basis (very rough estimate 4-8 hrs per unit at $80 per hour with tilt and turn units being at the lower end)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Front Center top and bottom units</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,450.00</td>
<td>2,450.00</td>
<td>HST ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- new fixed sash to be installed into existing frame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- factory finished</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- delivered to site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- installation not included but can be performed on a time and material basis (very rough estimate of 4 to 6 hours for the pair)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Driveway Window Side units</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>HST ON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- active units either as single hung or tilt and turn windows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- insert units to be installed into existing frames</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- multipoint hardware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- factory finished</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- delivered to site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- installation not include but can be performed on a time and material basis (very rough estimate 4-8 hrs per unit at $80 per hour with tilt and turn units being at the lower end)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,250.00</td>
<td>2,250.00</td>
<td>HST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>TAX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driveway Center top and bottom units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- new fixed sash to be installed into existing frame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- factory finished</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- delivered to site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- installation not included but can be performed on a time and material basis (very rough estimate of 4 to 6 hours for the pair)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SUBTOTAL                   | 12,700.00 |       |        |     |
| HST (ON) @ 13%             | 1,651.00  |       |        |     |
| TOTAL                     |           |       |        | $14,351.00 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAX SUMMARY</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RATE</td>
<td></td>
<td>TAX</td>
<td>NET</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST (ON) @ 13%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,651.00</td>
<td>12,700.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accepted By

Accepted Date
**BAVARIAN WINDOW WORKS**  
2236, SHIRLEY DRIVE  
KITCHENER, ON, N2B 3Y1  
Phone: 519-578-3938  
Fax: 519-578-6073

**Quotation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer:</th>
<th>Ship to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agler, Roger</td>
<td>Agler, Roger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Lansdowne Rd S, Cambridge, N1S 2T4</td>
<td>50 Lansdowne Rd S, Cambridge, N1S 2T4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone:</th>
<th>Fax:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>519-241-9899</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order Date:</th>
<th>Not ordered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Last Revision:</td>
<td>10/27/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation Date:</td>
<td>10/27/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.S.:</td>
<td>Catherine Eby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. no.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date requested:</td>
<td>1/1/0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotation no:</td>
<td>360453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job:</td>
<td>Agler, Roger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>100-1</strong></th>
<th><strong>PK: 486</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>552 X 1648 mm</td>
<td>578 X 1661 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PRODUCT = COMPLET UNIT, Special WH100-11 - Wood H-100 Hung Series - 21 3/4&quot; W X 64 7/8&quot; H (552 X 1648 mm) - Double - Sash Split : Even</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- FRAME = Frame 4 9/16&quot; natural, Wood Mahogany : , Ext.: Designer coat 492 Cream lg, Int.: Designer coat 492 Cream lg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- SASH = Other option for sash exterior : Prod. std colonial, Other option for sash interior : Glass stop std (colonial), Wood Mahogany, Ext.: Designer coat 492 Cream lg, Int.: Designer coat 492 Cream lg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- GLASS = Insulated (double), Low-e LOF/argon (North region), Spacer: Technoform, Color spacer: Bronze</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- SCREEN = Half Screen, Optional Color 492 Cream lg, Screen Mesh Type: Invisible (std)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- HARDWARE = Fusion hardware (std), Handle std, Oil Rubbed Bronze handle, Handle Qty: 1, Oil Rubbed Bronze locks, Locks Qty: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- OTHER OPTIONS = Nat. reg. sill ext w/o horns (GB-021) std, Wood species for sill extension : Mahogany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Viewed from the outside**  
Location: W1-Front DH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>200-1</strong></th>
<th><strong>PK: 485</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38&quot; L X 44 1/2&quot; H</td>
<td>R.O.: 39&quot; W X 45&quot; H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>965 X 1130 mm</td>
<td>991 X 1143 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PRODUCT = COMPLET UNIT, Special WSH100 - Wood Hung transoms or Picture H-100 - 38&quot; W X 44 1/2&quot; H (965 X 1130 mm) ** TRANSOM** - With sash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- FRAME = Frame 4 9/16&quot; natural, Wood Mahogany : , Ext.: Designer coat 492 Cream lg, Int.: Designer coat 492 Cream lg, Flat sill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- SASH = Other option for sash exterior : Prod. std colonial, Other option for sash interior : Glass stop std (colonial) 1 3/4 sash, Narrow bottom rail, Wood Mahogany, Ext.: Designer coat 492 Cream lg, Int.: Designer coat 492 Cream lg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- GLASS = Insulated (double), Low-e LOF/argon (North region), Spacer: Technoform, Color spacer: Bronze</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- OTHER OPTIONS = Nat. reg. sill ext w/o horns (GB-021) std, Wood species for sill extension : Mahogany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Viewed from the outside**  
Location: W2-Front
Customer:  
Agler, Roger  
50 Lansdowne Rd S,  
Cambridge, , N1S 2T4

Ship to:  
Agler, Roger  
50 Lansdowne Rd S,  
Cambridge, , N1S 2T4

C.S.:  
Catherine Eby

P.O. no:  

Date requested:  
1/1/0001

Quotation no:  
360453

Job:  
Agler, Roger

---

**300-1 PK: 486**

30" L X 18 3/8" H
965 X 467 mm

R.O.:  39" W X 18 7/8" H
991 X 479 mm

- PRODUCT = COMPLETE UNIT, Special WSH100 - Wood Hung transoms or Picture H-100 - 38" W X 18 3/8" H (965 X 467 mm) ** TRANSOM** - With sash
- FRAME = Frame 4 9/16" natural, Wood Mahogany : , Ext.: Designer coat 492 Cream l/g, Int.: Designer coat 492 Cream l/g, Flat sill
- SASH = Other option for sash exterior : Prod. std colonial, Other option for sash interior : Glass stop std (colonial) 1 3/4 sash, Narrow bottom rail, Wood Mahogany, Ext.: Designer coat 492 Cream l/g , Int.: Designer coat 492 Cream l/g
- GLASS = Insulated (double), Low-e LOF/argon (North region), Spacer: Technoform, Color spacer: Bronze
- OTHER OPTIONS = Nat. reg. sill ext w/o horns (GB-021) std, Wood species for sill extension : Mahogany

Exterior 1" natural flush

**Location:** W3-Front

---

**400-1 PK: 486**

21 3/4" L X 65 1/4" H
552 X 1657 mm

R.O.:  22 3/4" W X 65 3/4" H
578 X 1670 mm

- PRODUCT = COMPLETE UNIT, Special WH100-11 - Wood H-100 Hung Series - 21 3/4" W X 65 1/4" H (552 X 1657 mm) - Double - Sash Split : Even
- FRAME = Frame 4 9/16" natural, Wood Mahogany : , Ext.: Designer coat 492 Cream l/g, Int.: Designer coat 492 Cream l/g
- SASH = Other option for sash exterior : Prod. std colonial, Other option for sash interior : Glass stop std (colonial), Wood Mahogany, Ext.: Designer coat 492 Cream l/g , Int.: Designer coat 492 Cream l/g
- GLASS = Insulated (double), Low-e LOF/argon (North region), Spacer: Technoform, Color spacer: Bronze
- GRILLES = SDL 7/8" Ext: Standard Int: Standard Position: Top & bottom, same color as sash, With spacer: Bronze spacers, Grille pattern: Colonial
- SCREEN = Half Screen, Optional Color 492 Cream l/g, Screen Mesh Type: Invisible (std)
- HARDWARE = Fusion hardware (std), Handle std, Oil Rubbed Bronze handle, Handle Qty: 1, Oil Rubbed Bronze locks, Locks Qty: 1
- OTHER OPTIONS = Nat. reg. sill ext w/o horns (GB-021) std, Wood species for sill extension : Mahogany

Exterior 1" natural flush

**Location:** W4- Side DH

---

**500-1 PK: 486**

34" L X 42 1/4" H
864 X 1073 mm

R.O.:  35" W X 42 3/4" H
889 X 1086 mm

- PRODUCT = COMPLETE UNIT, Special WSH100 - Wood Hung transoms or Picture H-100 - 34" W X 42 1/4" H (864 X 1073 mm) ** TRANSOM** - With sash
- FRAME = Frame 4 9/16" natural, Wood Mahogany : , Ext.: Designer coat 492 Cream l/g, Int.: Designer coat 492 Cream l/g, Flat sill
- SASH = Other option for sash exterior : Prod. std colonial, Other option for sash interior : Glass stop std (colonial) 1 3/4 sash, Narrow bottom rail, Wood Mahogany, Ext.: Designer coat 492 Cream l/g , Int.: Designer coat 492 Cream l/g
- GLASS = Insulated (double), Low-e LOF/argon (North region), Spacer: Technoform, Color spacer: Bronze
- GRILLES = SDL 7/8" Ext: Standard Int: Standard, same color as sash, With spacer: Bronze spacers, Grille pattern: Colonial
- OTHER OPTIONS = Nat. reg. sill ext w/o horns (GB-021) std, Wood species for sill extension : Mahogany

Exterior 1" natural flush

**Location:** W5- Side

---

**Lepage Mill-Quote, PK485**

2020-10-27 14:51:00

**Dealer - Net Price**

Page of 2 3
**Customer:**
Ager, Roger  
50 Lansdowne Rd S,  
Cambridge, , N1S 2T4

**Ship to:**
Ager, Roger  
50 Lansdowne Rd S,  
Cambridge, , N1S 2T4

**C.S.:**  
Catherine Eby

**P.O. no.:**  

**Date requested:**  
1/1/0001

**Quotation no.:**  
360453

**Job:**  
Ager, Roger

---

**600-1**  
**PK : 486**

**34" L X 20 3/8" H**  
864 X 518 mm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRODUCT = COMPLET UNIT, Special WSH100 - Wood Hung transoms or Picture H-100 - 34&quot; W X 20 3/8&quot; H (864 X 518 mm) <strong>TRANSOM</strong> - With sash</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,209.24</td>
<td>$1,209.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRAME = Frame 4 9/16&quot; natural, Wood Mahogany , Ext.: Designer coat 492 Cream I/g, Int.: Designer coat 492 Cream I/g, Flat sill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,209.24</td>
<td>$1,209.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SASH = Other option for sash exterior : Prod. std colonial, Other option for sash interior : Glass stop std (colonial) 1 3/4 sash, Narrow bottom rail, Wood Mahogany, Ext.: Designer coat 492 Cream I/g , Int.: Designer coat 492 Cream I/g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,209.24</td>
<td>$1,209.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GLASS = Insulated (double), Low-e LOF/argon (North region), Spacer: Technoform, Color spacer: Bronze</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,209.24</td>
<td>$1,209.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRILLES = SDL 7/8&quot; Ext: Standard Int: Standard, same color as sash, With spacer: Bronze spacer, Grille pattern: Colonial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,209.24</td>
<td>$1,209.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OTHER OPTIONS = Nat. reg. sill ext w/o horns (GB-021) std, Wood species for sill extension : Mahogany</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,209.24</td>
<td>$1,209.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exterior 1&quot; natural flush</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,209.24</td>
<td>$1,209.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Do not hesitate to contact us should you require any additional information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Total (Net): $14,183.27  
Sub-Total (Net): $1,843.82  
Sub-Total (Net): $0.00  
Sub-Total (Net): $16,027.09

**Total Item Quantity:** 8  
**Quote valid for:** 30 days

---

Customer signature: ___________________________________________  
Date: __/__/__  

---

Lepage Mill-Quote, PK485  
2020-10-27 14:51:00

Dealer - Net Price  
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Image 1: View of the three-bay window on the front facade

Image 2: Detail of the bottom of the window on the facade, note deterioration at the bottom and gap.
Attachment 3: Photos from March 3, 2021 site visit

Image 3: Detail of sill on front facade window.

Image 4: View of the bay window on the south elevation
Attachment 3: Photos from March 3, 2021 site visit

Image 5: View of the bottom of a window on the south elevation.

Image 6: Detail of the bottom of a side window on the south elevation, note deterioration.

Page 3 of 4
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Attachment 3: Photos from March 3, 2021 site visit

Image 7: Detail of bottom of central window on the south elevation.

Image 8: View of cracking paint on the window frame.
Recommendation(s)

THAT report 21-022(CRS) Development Charges Statement for the year ended December 31, 2020, be received as information.

Executive Summary

Purpose

- In 2019, the City enacted an updated development charges by-law. Section 43 of the Development Charge Act, 1997, S.O. 1997, c. 27, as amended requires the Treasurer to provide Council a financial statement relating to development charge by-laws and reserve funds. Section 17.2 of the City’s development charges by-law 19-094 requires this statement to be provided to Council by April 30th of the following year.

Key Findings

- The Development Charge Statement provides detailed information related to opening and closing balances of the City’s development charge reserve funds and of the transactions related to the funds. Revenues include contributions received, funds returned from completed capital projects, as well as other revenue received and interest income earned. The expenditures include contributions to capital projects, contributions to operating, and other expenditures.
• The statement also provides the required details on all assets whose capital costs were funded under a development charge by-law during the year. For these assets, information is included on other sources of financing and amounts spent on the project.

Financial Implications

• The City’s development charge reserve funds at the end of 2020 have an overall funded position of $28,925,417, an increase from the opening balance of $15,423,800. From the total development charge funded position of $28,925,417, an amount of $16,648,887 has already been committed to approved capital projects. These funds have not yet been transferred to the capital projects as the capital expenditures have not yet been incurred.

• Development Charge exemptions in the amount of $641,417 were funded from the City’s operating fund in 2020.

Background

The Development Charges Act

The Development Charges Act 1997, S.O. 1997, c. 27, as amended, Section 43(1) requires the treasurer of the municipality to provide City Council with an annual financial statement relating to development charge reserve funds, as set out in By-law19-094.

The Development Charges Act also requires that the statement be made available to the public and the Treasurer is to give a copy of the statement to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing on request.

The Development Charges Statement

The City’s financial system tracks the activity for each development charge reserve fund. Revenue and expenditure transactions are recorded by reserve fund, providing the details for the Development Charge Statement attached.

Analysis

Strategic Alignment

PEOPLE To actively engage, inform and create opportunities for people to participate in community building – making Cambridge a better place to live, work, play and learn for all.

Goal #2 - Governance and Leadership

Objective 2.5 Focus on the responsible management of financial resources, ensuring transparency and accountability.
The Development Charges Statement for the City of Cambridge applies to objective 2.5 as it disseminates information to the public on the financial activities of the City of Cambridge’s development charges reserve funds for the year 2020.

Comments

Analysis:

The following summarizes the activities of the development charges reserve funds for the year 2020:

**Revenues:** $19,272,633 in revenue was allocated to development charge reserve funds, which includes $4,565,854 collected in development charges, and $14,256,196 unused funding returned from capital projects. Additionally, there was net interest earned of $450,583.

Development charges are fees that are paid by new development to fund new infrastructure and services constructed throughout the City. In order to promote certain development, some properties are exempt from development charges, such as the exemption for core area development. During these instances the city funds these exemptions by transferring operational funds to the development charge reserve funds. In 2020 the waived development charges totalled $641,417.

In 2020, Finance changed its accounting process to only fund capital projects by development charges as capital expenditures are incurred. This is in comparison from the old process where capital projects were funded by development charges once Council approved the capital project. As a result of this change in process, a total of $14,256,196 of excess funds from capital projects has been returned to the development charge reserve funds. Schedule A in the attachment breaks down the return excess funds by each capital project.

**Expenditures:** $5,771,016 in contributions from the development charge reserve funds, which includes $5,560,816 of contributions to fund capital projects during the year and an additional $210,200 was provided to offset related operating expenditures.

**Year End Balance:** The net balance of the development charge reserve funds at December 31, 2020 is $28,925,417, an increase from the opening balance of $15,423,800.

**Positive Reserve Fund Balances:**

The development charge reserve funds for stormwater, water, roadways, engineering studies, indoor recreation, outdoor recreation, library, public works facilities and fleet, government studies, and parking have positive fund balances.
The following summarizes the major activities of these positive reserve fund balances:

- **Roadways**: the fund has increased by $6,052,377. This is primarily due to the return excess funds from capital projects totalling $4,787,664, contributions received from development charges of $1,678,049. The largest return excess funds from capital projects is $1,022,301 from capital project A/00666-10 Land Acquisition. The increase is offset by contributions to capital funds of $689,784 and other transfers from the City Engineering reserve fund of $282,800. The City Engineering reserve fund had return excess funding of $114,000 from A/00437-20 Sanitary Sewer Model Calibration and $168,800 from A/00785-20 Corporate Facilities Master Plan. Per the Development Charges study in 2019, the City Engineering reserve fund was consolidated into the Roadways reserve fund, the transfer of $282,800 was moved from City Engineering into Roadways.

- **Indoor Recreation**: the fund has increased by $2,275,823. This is mainly due to the return of excess funds from capital projects totalling $1,807,131 and contributions received from development charges of $961,981. The largest return of excess funds from capital projects is $1,480,185 from capital project A/00463-40 Rec Complex-Site Prep & Servicing. The increase is offset by contributions to capital and operating funds of $712,804 and $32,000 respectively.

- **Stormwater**: the fund has increased by $1,657,862. This is primarily due to the return of excess funds from capital projects totalling $1,506,010 and contributions received from development charges of $163,998. The largest return of excess funds from capital projects is $1,277,264 from capital project A/00221-40 SE Galt 2102 Infrastructure Upsize Wesley Blvd. The increase is primarily offset by contributions to capital and operating funds of $26,905 and $42,000 respectively.

- **Water**: the fund has increased by $1,204,002. This is mainly due to the return of excess funds from capital projects totalling $1,283,484 and contributions received from development charges of $66,480. The largest return of excess funds from capital projects is $369,600 from capital project A/00239-40 SE Galt 3240 Branchton Rd Watermain & Sanitary. The increase is offset by contributions to capital and operating funds of $174,896 and $42,100 respectively.

**Negative Reserve Fund Balances:**

The development charge reserve funds for wastewater and fire services have negative fund balances. The following summarizes the major activities of these negative reserve fund balances:
• **Wastewater:** the fund has improved by $622,790. This is mainly due to the return of excess funding of capital of $3,189,551 as well as contributions received in development charges of $650,509. The largest return of excess funds from capital projects is $1,163,088 from capital project A/00221-40 SE Galt 2102 Infrastructure Upsize Wesley Blvd. The increase is offset in part by contributions to the capital fund totaling $3,062,267. Of the amount contributed to the capital fund, $2,218,948 was contributed to A/00219-41 Blair Forcemain From PS to Treatment Plant.

• **Fire Services:** the fund has increased by $299,487. This is mainly due to return of excess funds from capital of $218,965 as well as contributions received totalling $89,762. The main return of excess funds from capital projects include $212,904 from A/00196-40 Station 6 Construction.

Development charge reserve funds can experience an overdrawn position due to the timing of the emplacement of infrastructure ahead of complete funding being available. This overdrawn position is recovered through future funds to be received from developers.

To ensure an overall positive balance and sufficient cash flow on the development charges reserve funds as a whole, Council approved the debt financing of certain North Cambridge development projects in the 2020 Capital Budget. These projects are necessary to support the development of these employment growth lands, but required significant amounts of development charge funding not available in the associated development charge reserve funds (roads, water, and sanitary sewers). In total, $8,409,000 of growth-funded debt is to be issued, as approved through the Capital Budget by Council on December 12, 2019. This debt financing is as follows:

- $2,448,000 for A/00394-40 Dover St Pumping Station
- $500,000 for A/00431-41 North Cambridge Lands Railway Diversion
- $5,461,000 for A/00449-40 East Side Allendale Rd (Fountain – NS Collectors)

The principal and interest payments on this debt will be funded through development charge revenues collected in the future as the development planned for in the Development Charges Background Study takes place. Should growth and intensification not hit the targets identified in the Development Charges Background Study, this may have an impact to tax and water/sewer rates in order to fund the required debt payments as they become due.

As required by the *Development Charges Act*, the City of Cambridge has not imposed directly or indirectly, a charge related to a development or requirement to construct a service related to development, except as permitted by the *Development Charges Act* or another Act.
**Existing Policy/By-Law**

The City enacted by-law 19-94 for development charges in 2019 and is required by the *Development Charges Act* to report annually on the balances and transactions of the development charge reserve funds.

The annual activity disclosed in the Development Charge Statement, is in compliance with the existing development charge by-law.

**Financial Impact**

The Development Charge Statement provides detailed information related to opening and closing balances of the City’s development charge reserve funds and of the transactions related to the funds. The statements also provide the required details on all assets whose capital costs were funded under a development charge by-law during the year. For these assets, information is included on other sources of financing and amounts spent on the project.

The development charge reserve funds for stormwater, water, roadways, engineering studies, indoor recreation, outdoor recreation, library, public works facilities and fleet, government studies, and parking have positive fund balances.

The development charge reserve funds for wastewater and fire services have negative fund balances.

From the total development charge funded position of $28,925,417, an amount of $16,648,887 has already been committed to approved capital projects, which represents 57.6% of the total balance. As of December 31, 2020, $12,276,530 of the development charge balance remains uncommitted and to be used for future capital projects.

The City was required to fund $641,417 in development charge exemptions that are permitted through the Development Charges Act or the City’s Development Charge Bylaw. These exemptions are funded from the City's operating fund.

**Public Input**

Posted publicly as part of the report process.

**Internal/External Consultation**

City departments provided input on the establishment of the development charge by-law and external consultation was obtained from the development industry at the time of the development charge background study.
Conclusion

The Development Charge Statement for the year 2020 is presented, which meets the requirements of the Development Charges Act 1997, Section 43. The annual Development Charge report will be made available to the public.

Signature

Division Approval

Name: Sheryl Ayres, CPA, CGA
Title: Chief Financial Officer

Departmental Approval

Name: Dave Bush
Title: Deputy City Manager, Corporate Services

City Manager Approval

Name: David Calder
Title: City Manager

Attachments

### Appendix A

#### THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

**DEVELOPMENT CHARGES STATEMENT**

**FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REVENUES</th>
<th></th>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th></th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>Return Excess</td>
<td>Contributions to</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>January 1</td>
<td>Received</td>
<td>Funding from</td>
<td>Revenue Fund</td>
<td>Transfers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Development Charges</td>
<td>Capital Projects Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>($6,434,535)</td>
<td>$650,509</td>
<td>3,189,551 ($113,003)</td>
<td>$3,062,267</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>2,018,900</td>
<td>163,998</td>
<td>1,506,010</td>
<td>56,759</td>
<td>26,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>2,871,883</td>
<td>66,480</td>
<td>1,283,484</td>
<td>71,034</td>
<td>174,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadways</td>
<td>(899,363)</td>
<td>1,678,049</td>
<td>4,787,664</td>
<td>35,748</td>
<td>689,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Studies</td>
<td>965,628</td>
<td>(7,881)</td>
<td>466,000</td>
<td>23,651</td>
<td>30,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>(1,477,487)</td>
<td>2,551,155</td>
<td>11,232,789</td>
<td>74,189</td>
<td>3,984,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Recreation</td>
<td>11,302,869</td>
<td>961,981</td>
<td>1,807,131</td>
<td>251,515</td>
<td>712,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Recreation</td>
<td>2,901,069</td>
<td>419,233</td>
<td>105,859</td>
<td>61,448</td>
<td>262,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Services</td>
<td>(604,007)</td>
<td>89,762</td>
<td>218,965 (9,240)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>2,743,687</td>
<td>185,847</td>
<td>179,559</td>
<td>57,671</td>
<td>169,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Facilities &amp; Fleet</td>
<td>202,024</td>
<td>201,451</td>
<td>429,173</td>
<td>7,148</td>
<td>365,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Studies</td>
<td>293,653</td>
<td>66,919</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,085</td>
<td>65,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Engineering</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>282,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>61,992</td>
<td>89,506</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$15,423,800</td>
<td>$4,565,854</td>
<td>$14,256,190</td>
<td>$480,593</td>
<td>$5,568,818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Excess Funds Returned to Development Charges Reserve Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Name of Capital Project</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Balance December 31 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>Stormwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00089-40</td>
<td>Regional Project - 1618 Franklin Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>(1,576,954)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>110,446</td>
<td>894,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td>(1,466,508)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00091-30</td>
<td>Black Bridge Road, Design of Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>(879,408)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>130,811</td>
<td>395,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td>(748,597)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00149-10</td>
<td>Recreation Complex - Feasibility Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>(426,946)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>65,411</td>
<td>326,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td>(361,535)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00157-40</td>
<td>Sheffield Equipment Storage Bldg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>(34,463)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>30,592</td>
<td>20,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td>(3,871)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00180-40</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Park Dev - Chrisview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>(13,859)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>5,608</td>
<td>2,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td>(8,251)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00186-40</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Park Dev - Limerick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>(115,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>103,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td>(113,320)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00195-30</td>
<td>Station 6 Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>(6,061)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>6,061</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td>(6,061)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Schedule A

### Excess Funds Returned to Development Charges Reserve Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Name of Capital Project</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Balance December 31, 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00196-40</td>
<td>Station 6 Construction</td>
<td>(212,904)</td>
<td>(212,904)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>212,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00215-40</td>
<td>SE Galt &amp; W/M Grth Related</td>
<td>(30,002)</td>
<td>(30,002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00221-40</td>
<td>SE Galt 2102 Infra Upsize Wesley Blvd</td>
<td>(3,562,700)</td>
<td>(3,562,700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(57,118) 3,594,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00223-20</td>
<td>East Side Lands MESP</td>
<td>(150,000)</td>
<td>(150,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00225-30</td>
<td>SE Galt 3236 Dundas St Water Gravity</td>
<td>(1,080,600)</td>
<td>(1,080,600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,080,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00239-40</td>
<td>SE Galt 3240 Branchton Rd Wm &amp; Sanitary</td>
<td>(646,800)</td>
<td>(646,800)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>646,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00264-40</td>
<td>Sanitary Sewer Upsize - 3207 River Bluff</td>
<td>(140,000)</td>
<td>(140,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Information

- **Balance December 31, 2020** includes excess funds returned to Development Charges Reserve Funds.
- **Activities during current year** reflect the funds contributed by various entities.
- **Other Contributions from DC** are not applicable in this context.
- **City Engineering** is not applicable in this context.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Name of Capital Project</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Wastewater</th>
<th>Stormwater</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Roadways</th>
<th>Engineering Studies</th>
<th>Indoor Recreation</th>
<th>Outdoor Recreation</th>
<th>Fire Services</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Public Works Facilities &amp; Fleet</th>
<th>Government Studies</th>
<th>City Funding</th>
<th>Other Funding from Reserves</th>
<th>Contributions from DC</th>
<th>Balance on December 31 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>100,428</td>
<td>39,167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>139,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>61,261</td>
<td>39,167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00305-30</td>
<td>SE Galt 3237 Dundas St PS</td>
<td>(200,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(200,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00379-40</td>
<td>18Y009 Sanitary Sewer Upsize 3234 Lisbon</td>
<td>(376,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(376,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>156,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00431-30</td>
<td>East side EW and NS Collector Rd Design</td>
<td>(907,785)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(907,785)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>678,789</td>
<td>39,154</td>
<td>56,328</td>
<td>715,158</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>628,918</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>528,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00433-40</td>
<td>East Side Lands 3401 Stage 1</td>
<td>(624,961)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(624,961)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>2,358,057</td>
<td>535,109</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(419,943)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00437-20</td>
<td>Sanitary Sewer Model Calibration</td>
<td>(114,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(114,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>114,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>114,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00449-30</td>
<td>Allendale Road (Fountain Street to N-S C)</td>
<td>(757,573)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(757,573)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>184,450</td>
<td>50,833</td>
<td>62,647</td>
<td>528,918</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(110,275)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Schedule A

### Excess Funds Returned to Development Charges Reserve Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Name of Capital Project</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Wastewater</th>
<th>Stormwater</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Roadways</th>
<th>Engineering Studies</th>
<th>Indoor Recreation</th>
<th>Outdoor Recreation</th>
<th>Fire Services</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Public Works &amp; Fleet</th>
<th>Government Studies</th>
<th>City Engineering</th>
<th>Funding from DC</th>
<th>Contributions</th>
<th>Other Contributions</th>
<th>Balance December 31, 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00463-40</td>
<td>Rec Complex - Site Prep &amp; Servicing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,336,242)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>(2,336,242)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,336,242)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>889,141</td>
<td>1,480,185</td>
<td>179,559</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(696,335)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td>(1,447,101)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,480,185</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>179,559</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(483,692)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00666-10</td>
<td>Land Acquisition 1 - Confidential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,747,965)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>(1,747,965)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,747,965)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>2,588,464</td>
<td>1,022,301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,130,013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td>840,499</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,022,301</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(267,213)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00679-30</td>
<td>Blenheim Road Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,051,600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>(1,051,600)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,051,600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>199,000</td>
<td>181,900</td>
<td>33,800</td>
<td>398,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(812,900)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td>(1,051,600)</td>
<td>199,000</td>
<td>181,900</td>
<td>33,800</td>
<td>398,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>812,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00734-20</td>
<td>Hespeler Village Core Area Parking Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(57,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>(57,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(57,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>51,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td>(57,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5,700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00736-40</td>
<td>Radford Road Cul-de-Sac - Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(83,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>(83,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(83,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>41,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td>(83,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(41,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00738-20</td>
<td>Growth Management Study Update (2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(250,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>(250,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(250,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>30,250</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(30,250)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td>(219,750)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(70,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00785-20</td>
<td>Corporate Facilities Master plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(250,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>(250,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(250,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>50,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>168,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td>(250,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>168,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(30,600)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Excess Funds Returned to Development Charges Reserve Funds

### Schedule A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Name of Capital Project</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Wastewater</th>
<th>Stormwater</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Roadways</th>
<th>Engineering Studies</th>
<th>Indoor Recreation</th>
<th>Outdoor Recreation</th>
<th>Fire Services</th>
<th>Public Works</th>
<th>Facilities &amp; Fleet</th>
<th>Government Studies</th>
<th>City Engineering</th>
<th>Other Funding from Reserves</th>
<th>Contributions from DC</th>
<th>Balance December 31, 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00861-20</td>
<td>Parkland Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>184,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(43,200)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(227,300)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(227,300)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>184,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>184,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td>(227,300)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(43,200)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00889-10</td>
<td>Equipment Growth (2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>408,757</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,962</td>
<td>(345,361)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(819,100)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(819,100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>408,757</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,962</td>
<td>(345,361)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td>(151,558)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(57,200)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total funds returned to Development Charges</td>
<td>3,189,551</td>
<td>1,506,010</td>
<td>1,283,484</td>
<td>4,787,664</td>
<td>466,000</td>
<td>1,807,131</td>
<td>105,859</td>
<td>218,965</td>
<td>179,559</td>
<td>429,173</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>282,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Schedule B

#### Contribution from Development Charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Name of Capital Project</th>
<th>Total Wastewater</th>
<th>Stormwater</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Roadways</th>
<th>Engineering Studies</th>
<th>Indoor Recreation</th>
<th>Outdoor Recreation</th>
<th>Fire Services</th>
<th>Public Works</th>
<th>Facilities &amp; Fleet</th>
<th>Government Studies</th>
<th>City Engineering</th>
<th>Other Funding from Reserves</th>
<th>Excess Funding Returned</th>
<th>Balance December 31, 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00091-30</td>
<td>Black Bridge Road, Design of Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>(879,408)</td>
<td>(65,109)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>130,811</td>
<td></td>
<td>(65,109)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>395,106</td>
<td>395,106</td>
<td>460,808</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td>(748,597)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(65,109)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00149-10</td>
<td>Recreation Complex - Feasibility Study</td>
<td>5,070,464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>(426,946)</td>
<td>(65,411)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>326,946</td>
<td>326,946</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>65,411</td>
<td></td>
<td>(65,411)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td>(361,535)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(65,411)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>326,946</td>
<td>326,946</td>
<td>(100,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00157-40</td>
<td>Sheffield Equipment Storage Bldg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>(34,463)</td>
<td>(20,416)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,416</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>30,592</td>
<td></td>
<td>(20,416)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td>(3,871)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(20,416)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20,416</td>
<td>(3,871)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00180-40</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Park Dev - Chrisview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>(13,859)</td>
<td>(2,359)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,359</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>5,608</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,359)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td>(8,251)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2,359)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,359</td>
<td>(8,251)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00186-40</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Park Dev - Limerick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>(115,000)</td>
<td>(1,680)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,680)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td>(113,320)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1,680)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>(11,500)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00219-40</td>
<td>Blair Foremain fm PS to Treatment Plant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>126,871</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>82,594</td>
<td></td>
<td>(165,188)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(44,277)</td>
<td>(126,871)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td>209,465</td>
<td></td>
<td>(165,188)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(44,277)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00219-41</td>
<td>Blair Foremain fm PS to Treatment Plant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>2,218,948</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,218,948)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2,218,948)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td>2,218,948</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,218,948)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2,218,948)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Contribution from Development Charges

#### Schedule B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Name of Capital Project</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Other Funding from Reserves</th>
<th>Excess Funding Returned</th>
<th>Balance December 31, 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Roadways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00221-40</td>
<td>SE Galt 2102 Infra Upsize Wesley Blvd</td>
<td>(3,562,700)</td>
<td>(3,562,700)</td>
<td>124,033</td>
<td>(11,250)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00420-30</td>
<td>Preston Auditorium - Design</td>
<td>42,161</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00431-30</td>
<td>East side EW and NS Collector Rd Design</td>
<td>42,161</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00433-40</td>
<td>East Side Lands 3401</td>
<td>42,161</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00449-30</td>
<td>Allendale Road (Fountain Street)</td>
<td>42,161</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00449-40</td>
<td>East Side Allendale Rd (Fountain St-NS)</td>
<td>42,161</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00463-30</td>
<td>Recreation Complex - Design</td>
<td>42,161</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Schedule B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Name of Capital Project</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Wastewater</th>
<th>Stormwater</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Roadways</th>
<th>Engineering Studies</th>
<th>Indoor Recreation</th>
<th>Outdoor Recreation</th>
<th>Fire Services</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Public Works</th>
<th>Facilities &amp; Fleet</th>
<th>Government Studies</th>
<th>City Funding</th>
<th>Engineering Reserves</th>
<th>Other Funding</th>
<th>Excess Funding</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>Balance December 31 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00463-40</td>
<td>Rec Complex - Site Prep &amp; Servicing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>(2,336,242)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>889,141</td>
<td></td>
<td>(621,001)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(75,333)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td>(1,447,101)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(621,001)</td>
<td>(75,333)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,659,744</td>
<td>(483,691)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00465-40</td>
<td>Multi-Use Trail Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>68,123</td>
<td></td>
<td>(68,123)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(20,400)</td>
<td>(20,400)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td>68,123</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(68,123)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(20,400)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00471-30</td>
<td>Fountain St Soccer Facility Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>193,035</td>
<td></td>
<td>(190,490)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(61,440)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(58,895)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td>193,035</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(190,490)</td>
<td>(61,440)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(58,895)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00475-10</td>
<td>Library Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>(94,500)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10,500)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(94,500)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00666-10</td>
<td>Land Acquisition - Confidential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>(1,747,965)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,747,965)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>2,588,464</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5,014)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,125,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,022,301</td>
<td>(1,480,751)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td>840,499</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(5,014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,125,000)</td>
<td>(1,022,301)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(267,214)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00738-20</td>
<td>Growth Management Study Update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>(250,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(250,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>30,250</td>
<td></td>
<td>(30,250)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td>(219,750)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(30,250)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(219,750)</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>(70,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00889-10</td>
<td>Equipment Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>(819,100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(819,100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>667,542</td>
<td></td>
<td>(345,361)</td>
<td></td>
<td>30,962</td>
<td>408,757</td>
<td>761,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td>(151,558)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(345,361)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30,962</td>
<td>408,757</td>
<td></td>
<td>(57,200)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Schedule B

#### Contribution from Development Charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Name of Capital Project</th>
<th>Total Wastewater</th>
<th>Stormwater</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Roadways</th>
<th>Engineering Studies</th>
<th>Indoor Recreation</th>
<th>Outdoor Recreation</th>
<th>Fire Services</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Public Works</th>
<th>Facilities &amp; Fleet</th>
<th>Government Studies</th>
<th>City Engineering</th>
<th>Other Funding from Reserves</th>
<th>Excess Funding Returned</th>
<th>Balance December 31 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00946-20</td>
<td>Community Benefits Charge Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>3,756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3,756)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td>3,756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3,756)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01032-20</td>
<td>River Road Nhood - Plan &amp; Service Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3,756)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2019</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities during current year</td>
<td>61,843</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(61,843)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance December 31, 2020</td>
<td>61,843</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(61,843)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Contributions from Development Charges:

(3,062,267) (26,905) (174,896) (689,784) (30,250) (712,804) (262,652) 0 (169,882) (365,777) (65,599) 0
Recommendation(s)

THAT Council report 21-039 (CRS) re: 2020 Year End Operating Financial Update be received in accordance with the Budget Control By-Law;

AND THAT the tax-supported and water utility operating budget variances for the December 2020 reporting period, reportable under Budget Control By-Law and as outlined in report 21-039 (CRS), be approved;

AND THAT the tax-supported operating surplus of $3,595,933 be transferred to the Rate Stabilization Reserve;

AND THAT $357,334 be transferred from the Building Permit Stabilization Reserve Fund to offset the shortfall in building permit revenue;

AND THAT the water surplus of $792,735 be transferred to the Water Rate Stabilization Reserve Fund and the Water Capital Reserve Fund;

AND FURTHER THAT the wastewater surplus of $2,852,855 be transferred to the Wastewater Rate Stabilization Reserve Fund and the Wastewater Capital Reserve Fund.

Executive Summary

Purpose

- As per the City’s budget control by-law, Council is to be provided with regular updates related to operating budget variances. This report is an update for the 2020 year-end operating variances for the tax-supported and water utility budgets.
Key Findings

- The 2020 tax-supported operating surplus is $3,595,933 which represents 2.64% of the gross operating budget of $135,898,700.

- The global pandemic experienced in 2020 presented many financial challenges for the City as well as the global economy. The loss in revenue and additional costs related to COVID-19 total $8,040,384 and staff were successful in entirely offsetting this financial burden through the proactive implementation of the City’s Cost Containment Plan early in the pandemic and ensuring the financial sustainability of the City.

- In addition to savings realized through the Cost Containment Plan, the main drivers of the 2020 tax-supported operating surplus include:
  
  o Salary savings as a result of staff vacancies and gapping $2.3M;
  
  o Waived development charges of $641,417 which is lower than the budget of $1.35M; and
  
  o Higher than anticipated application fees revenue in Planning Services.

- The total water utility surplus for 2020 is $3,645,590 of which $792,735 is from water and $2,852,855 is from sewer. This represents 5.18% of the water utility gross operating budget of $70,359,700. The main drivers of the surplus in the Water division include:

  o Lower than anticipated cost for service related repairs;
  
  o Reduced cost of locates services due to temporary stoppage of construction permits as a result of the pandemic;
  
  o One-time increase in third party billing due to catching up on previous years deposit also added to the surplus.
  
  o Lower than budgeted debt charges due to the delay in the implementation of the AMI program as a result of COVID; and
  
  o Decrease in staff training and print and mail costs, as a result of cost containment measures only mandatory training was approved.

- The overall Water surplus was partially offset by additional cost for regional purchase of water and lower than expected water billing revenue. The main drivers of the surplus in the Sewer division include:

  o Lower than anticipated Inflow and Infiltration (I&I) due to significantly dry summer, as such the City realized actual I&I of 23% versus a budgeted I&I of 30% resulting in lower purchase requirements from the Region and higher revenue billing;
- One-time increase in third party billings resulting in a one-time increase in revenue for billable work;
- Lower than budgeted debt charges due to the delay in the implementation of the AMI program as a result of COVID;
- Decrease in staff training, as a result of cost containment measures only mandatory training was approved; and
- Additional savings in supplies, materials and equipment were realized due to lower than anticipated expenditures in sewer line and pumping station maintenance.

Financial Implications

- The City’s 2020 tax-supported surplus is $3,595,933 and the City’s total 2020 water utility surplus is $3,645,590. This represents only 2.64% of the gross operating budget for tax-supported operations, and 5.18% for water utility operations.

- The tax-supported loss in revenue and additional costs related to COVID-19 total $8,040,384 which are offset by savings in the City’s Cost Containment Plan of $8,266,939. Other variances unrelated to COVID-19 contribute to the majority of the City’s surplus in tax-supported operations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax-Supported Operating Financial Update</th>
<th>December Year to Date Actuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss in revenue</td>
<td>$4,323,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional expenses related to COVID-19</td>
<td>$3,717,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings related to cost containment strategies</td>
<td>($8,266,939)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variances unrelated to COVID-19</td>
<td>($3,369,378)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Surplus</td>
<td>($3,595,933)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The City received $4,367,100 in Safe Restart Funding from the Province to safely restart the local economy and to continue to deliver essential services. This funding is being held in the Rate Stabilization Reserve and will be used to reinstate service levels to pre-pandemic levels, where appropriate, while continuing to ensure the safety of staff and the public and following provincial guidelines.
In accordance with the Reserve Fund By-Law 2-17, as amended by By-law 19-144, and corporate policy COR-260.010, staff recommends that the 2020 surpluses be transferred to the following reserve and reserve funds:

- Tax-supported surplus of $3,595,933 to the Rate Stabilization Reserve;
- 50% of the total $792,735 Water surplus to the Water Rate Stabilization Reserve Fund and 50% to the Water Capital Reserve Fund;
- $899,796 of the total $2,852,855 Sewer surplus to the Wastewater Rate Stabilization Reserve Fund and the remaining $1,953,059 to the Wastewater Capital Reserve Fund.

**Background**

**COVID-19 Pressures and Financial Relief**

2020 has been an unprecedented year with significant challenges as a result of the COVID-19 worldwide pandemic with Canada Real GDP, the Bank of Canada overnight lending rate, the unemployment rate and the inflation rate all falling to unprecedented lows. Canada’s economy began to recover with the gradual lifting of lockdowns and business reopening’s beginning in May. After declining numbers of COVID-19 cases during the summer, the fall of 2020 saw increases in the rate of spread of the virus which resulted in further restrictions being put in place and another lockdown of the economy by the end of the year. The economic recovery has been slow and still uncertain with many restrictions and measures that have been put in place to protect the public and control the spread of the virus.

Cambridge City Council approved various measures of financial relief to citizens as the COVID-19 pandemic created financial strain on the global economy with many individuals and businesses being impacted. Locally, it was expected that residents and businesses may face challenges paying property taxes, water utility bills and there may be an increase in payments being returned as non-sufficient funds (NSF). To help alleviate some of the financial burden, Council approved the waiving of penalties, interest, late payment charges and other fees for the months of April and May 2020 (report 20-108 (CRS) re: Financial Implications Related to COVID-19 approved by Council on March 25, 2020). Some of these relief measures were extended for the month of June (report 20-125 (CRS) re: Operating Financial Update and Phase 2 Economic Relief approved by Council on May 19, 2020), these included:

- Waiving penalties and interest on property taxes for the month of June 2020;
- Waiving late payment charges on utility bills and miscellaneous receivable invoices for the month of June 2020;
Suspending collection activities for water and wastewater accounts in arrears until August 31, 2020;

Waiving Non-Sufficient Fund (NSF) fees charged by the City on customer accounts for the month of June 2020;

Waiving of any penalties, interest and collection activities on City property leases through to August 31, 2020; and,

Implementing an application-based property tax deferral program to extend the 2020 final property tax due dates by 60 days for residents and businesses who qualify.

Other significant factors which impacted City finances in response to the COVID-19 pandemic included:

Closure of Recreation Facilities, Idea Exchange locations, as well as, the cancellation of recreation programming;

Eased parking enforcement;

Farmers Market closure and additional safety protocols once reopening was permitted; and

Lower Investment Income.

Subsequently, as businesses began to reopen and schools resumed in-person learning, the COVID-19 cases began to increase causing a second wave in September. As the province declared another lockdown, the City was prepared for additional COVID-19 protocols and program cancellations.

**Safe Restart Funding**

On July 16, 2020 the federal government announced the Safe Restart Agreement which would provide funding to help provinces and territories safely restart their economies and for municipalities to continue to deliver essential services. As part of the Phase 1 funding allocation, the City of Cambridge received $3,069,100 based on a per household basis to support COVID-19 operating costs and pressures.

Subsequently, in December 2020 the City received notification of an additional $1,298,000 in safe restart funding. As per the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, "This joint funding will help Ontario’s municipalities recover from the impacts of COVID-19 faster, by helping them to enter into 2021 without operating deficits from this year, by ensuring our municipal partners are in a sound financial position to begin the new year, they can focus on keeping their capital projects on track while continuing to provide the critical services their residents rely on."
Additionally, the City has been informed that the federal government will provide an additional $2,491,652 in safe restart funding to the City of Cambridge based on the proportion of COVID-19 cases in the Public Health Unit for our respective Municipality during the period of January 1, 2021 to February 18, 2021. Any amount of the funding received in excess of the current COVID-19 operating costs shall be placed into a reserve to be accessed to support any future COVID-19 operating costs and pressures.

**Previous Forecast**

Although the COVID-19 pandemic continued to provide challenges to the City’s operations and service delivery, staff remained resilient and adaptive to the changing restrictions to ensure the correct balance of services were being provided to the community while managing financial sustainability and safety of staff and the public. Staff prepared detailed financial forecasting for 2020 based on information available as at September 30th and subsequently reported a net surplus of $419,910 in report 20-252 (CRS) re: Operating Financial Update – September Forecast approved by Council on November 3, 2020. At the time of September forecasting, staff assumed facilities and programming would continue to be open, with restrictions, until end of year. However, on November 23rd the City moved back into the red zone of provincial lockdown measures and bookings were subsequently cancelled. This resulted in the increase to the forecasted City’s surplus at year end because cost savings were more than lost revenues.

City staff were able to mitigate the risk of a potential year-end deficit from COVID-19 costs and pressures through an early implementation of cost containment strategies implemented by City staff as outlined in the April 16, 2020 Council approved report 20-118(CRS).

**Analysis**

**Strategic Alignment**

**PEOPLE** To actively engage, inform and create opportunities for people to participate in community building – making Cambridge a better place to live, work, play and learn for all.

**Goal #2 - Governance and Leadership**

**Objective 2.5** Focus on the responsible management of financial resources, ensuring transparency and accountability.

Providing updates to Council on operating budget variances supports responsible oversight of financial resources. It also ensures program managers and departments are accountable for the programs they manage and provide transparency as to where public dollars are spent.
Comments

Tax-Supported Variance

Throughout 2020 the COVID-19 pandemic continued to provide unprecedented challenges to the City’s operations and service delivery. Staff remained resilient and adaptive to the changing restrictions to ensure the correct balance of services were being provided to the community while managing financial sustainability.

Overall the City is estimating a net surplus of $3,595,933 in the tax-supported operations for 2020. Staff is recommending the year-end surplus be transferred to the City’s Rate Stabilization Reserve. The purpose of this reserve is to provide a contingency for unforeseen events, stabilize tax rate fluctuations caused by one-time expenditures, previous years’ operating deficits or revenue shortfalls and to maintain the City’s cash flow by minimizing the need for short term borrowing. The Rate Stabilization Reserve is currently underfunded compared to best practices and guidelines published by the Government Finance Officers Association. The reserve has a balance of $5,207,375 at December 31, 2020, exclusive of the Safe Restart funding provided by the Province. This compares to a target balance of 5% – 15% of tax revenues or $4.68M - $14.06M.

The following table summarizes the estimated surplus as it relates to the COVID-19 pandemic and the City’s operations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax-Supported Operating Financial Update</th>
<th>December Year to Date Actuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss in revenue</td>
<td>$4,323,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional expenses related to COVID-19</td>
<td>$3,717,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings related to cost containment strategies</td>
<td>($8,266,939)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variances unrelated to COVID-19</td>
<td>($3,369,378)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Surplus</td>
<td>($3,595,933)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variances Related to COVID-19

Based on the table above, the loss in revenue and additional costs related to COVID-19 total $8,040,384 and staff were successful in entirely offsetting this financial burden through the cost containment savings of $8,266,939. The proactive implementation of the City’s Cost Containment Plan early in the pandemic met the goal of ensuring the financial sustainability of the City.
Loss of Revenues


The majority of the $4,323,239 in revenue losses was as a result of the waiving of penalties and interest on taxes, accounts receivable invoices and non-sufficient funds fees, as well as, reduced recreation and facility bookings, decreased Farmers Market revenue and lower investment income.

COVID-19 Direct Costs

In response to the COVID-19 pandemic and following public health guidelines, the City incurred additional costs that were unbudgeted. These costs included such things as overtime in certain areas in response to the pandemic, personal protective equipment, enhanced cleaning of surfaces and facility spaces and measures that were required to reopen facilities safely to the public and protect staff such as plexiglass barriers and signage. The total costs as a result of COVID-19 was $3,717,145.

Throughout the year the forecast for these types of expenditures has continued to increase as further restrictions were put in place to protect staff and the public.

Cost Containment Plan

To ensure financial sustainability of the City a cost containment plan was implemented early in the pandemic. Staff were able to mitigate a potential year-end deficit by the reduction of spending in such categories as professional development, overtime, program supplies and materials, promotion and marketing, other staffing costs (meals and catering, mileage and clothing allowance), general maintenance/professional services, equipment and fuel, utilities, recruitment and staffing.

These cost containment measures were aggressive and implemented on a short-term basis to help with the uncertainty surrounding the City’s financial position in 2020. Staff will be reviewing the cost containment strategy in 2021 as some of the measures which were implemented are not sustainable and can negatively effect service delivery in 2021 and future years. Examples of this include reducing grass cutting which impacts the quality of sportsfields, reducing the maintenance on trails which has resulted in overgrowth of weeds and reducing professional development for City staff which ensures staff have the required knowledge to perform their job duties.

The total savings as a result of cost containment measures was $8,266,939.
Vforcements Unrelated to COVID-19

Additional positive variances resulting in the City’s year end surplus include such things as salary savings as a result of staff vacancies and gapping of $2.3M and lower than budgeted waived development charges of $708,583. Historically waived development charges were not included in the City’s budget however, in the 2020 budget staff included a 1.50% tax rate increase to cover the City’s 4-year running average waived development charges obligation. The total positive variance unrelated to COVID-19 was $3,369,378.

Further details on the variance by department and division are provided in the next section.

Variance Analysis by Department

The following summary shows the variance between the annual Council approved budget and year to date actuals for each department, for tax-supported operations:

*Due to an organizational restructure in September 2020, the information presented in this report is under the previous administrative structure. Under the former structure Environmental Services and Operations were under the responsibility of Community Development and Project Management Office/Asset Management were under the responsibility of Corporate Enterprise. Financial information will be reported on the new structure starting in 2021.

The 2020 tax-supported operating surplus is $3,595,933 which represents 2.64% of the gross operating budget of $135,898,700.

The main drivers of the 2020 tax-supported operating surplus include:

- Overall City savings in discretionary spending as a result of cost containment measures which includes professional development of $518,353, promotion and marketing of $271,009 and print and mail costs of $107,961;

- Overall City savings in utilities primarily due to facility closures as a result of COVID-19 $231,199;

- Recreation and Idea Exchange programming and facility bookings savings of $3.4M in part time salaries and benefits, other staffing costs, program supplies
and materials, general maintenance, professional services as a result of COVID-19;

- Salary savings as a result of staff vacancies and gapping $2.3M;
- Increased taxation revenue from penalties and interest of $1.17M, which is offset by an increase in tax write off and rebates as noted in the direct costs related to COVID-19;
- In 2020 the waived development charges totalled $641,417 which is lower than the budget of $1,35M; and
- Deferred maintenance and contract work as a result of COVID-19, primarily in condition inspection and assessment of $120,181 and Public Works third party sidewalk restorations of $200,000 and catch basin cleaning maintenance of $166,000.

The above noted savings were partially offset by the following negative variances:

- $3.7M in COVID-19 direct costs which includes tax write offs and rebates, increased cleaning costs, personal protective equipment and overtime for essential services such as Fire Suppression;
- Increased professional services costs in Legal Services of $142,146;
- Decreased permit revenues of $135,835 and parking enforcement revenues of $286,887 in the By-Law division due to financial relief measures as a result of the pandemic;
- $3.3M reduced recreation programming and facility bookings revenues as a result of the pandemic and provincial lockdown measures; and
- Decrease in investment income of $805,111 which reflects the actual hydro dividend received from Energy+. This decrease in revenues was offset by a reduction in the contribution to the Hydro Dividend Stabilization Reserve Fund.

### Mayor and Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ORIGINAL BUDGET</th>
<th>IN YEAR CHANGES</th>
<th>TOTAL RESTATED BUDGET</th>
<th>PREVIOUS FORECAST</th>
<th>YTD ACTUALS</th>
<th>OVER/(UNDER) BUDGET</th>
<th>% OF RESTATED BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor and Council</td>
<td>$1,088,800</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$1,089,000</td>
<td>$929,804</td>
<td>$886,635</td>
<td>($202,365)</td>
<td>(18.58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Mayor and Council</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,088,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>$200</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,089,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$929,804</strong></td>
<td><strong>$886,635</strong></td>
<td><strong>($202,365)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(18.58%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The operating surplus of $202,365 in the Mayor and Council area is a result of savings in salaries and benefits from a staff vacancy and reduced expenditures in professional development and program supplies and materials as a result of cost containment measures.

Office of the City Manager

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ORIGINAL BUDGET</th>
<th>IN YEAR CHANGES</th>
<th>TOTAL RESTATE BUDGET</th>
<th>PREVIOUS FORECAST</th>
<th>YTD ACTUALS</th>
<th>OVER/ (UNDER) BUDGET</th>
<th>% OF RESTATED BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office of the City Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. City Manager</td>
<td>$500,800</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$501,100</td>
<td>$483,700</td>
<td>$453,686</td>
<td>($47,414)</td>
<td>(9.46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>$821,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$821,500</td>
<td>$909,600</td>
<td>$963,135</td>
<td>$141,635</td>
<td>17.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Communications</td>
<td>$856,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$856,000</td>
<td>$853,000</td>
<td>$673,275</td>
<td>($182,725)</td>
<td>(21.35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Office of the City Manager</td>
<td>$2,178,300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$2,178,600</td>
<td>$2,246,300</td>
<td>$2,090,096</td>
<td>($88,504)</td>
<td>(4.06%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The operating surplus of $88,504 in the Office of the City Manager area is primarily due to savings in salaries and benefits from a staff vacancy in the Corporate Communications division, as well as, reduced expenditures in professional development and program supplies and materials from cost containment measures. The overall department savings are partially offset by an increase in professional services costs in Legal Services.

Corporate Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ORIGINAL BUDGET</th>
<th>IN YEAR CHANGES</th>
<th>TOTAL RESTATE BUDGET</th>
<th>PREVIOUS FORECAST</th>
<th>YTD ACTUALS</th>
<th>OVER/ (UNDER) BUDGET</th>
<th>% OF RESTATED BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. Corporate Services</td>
<td>$500,500</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$501,300</td>
<td>$440,900</td>
<td>$430,010</td>
<td>($71,290)</td>
<td>(14.22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Clerk</td>
<td>$2,316,800</td>
<td>($10,600)</td>
<td>$2,306,200</td>
<td>$2,829,663</td>
<td>$2,702,606</td>
<td>$396,406</td>
<td>17.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Emergency Planning</td>
<td>$312,900</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$312,900</td>
<td>$324,650</td>
<td>$283,405</td>
<td>($29,495)</td>
<td>(9.43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>$3,251,800</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$3,275,800</td>
<td>$3,241,233</td>
<td>$2,919,430</td>
<td>($356,370)</td>
<td>(10.88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Services</td>
<td>$25,689,900</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>$25,691,000</td>
<td>$25,525,900</td>
<td>$24,801,533</td>
<td>($889,467)</td>
<td>(3.46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>$2,515,100</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$2,516,100</td>
<td>$2,336,201</td>
<td>$2,098,351</td>
<td>($417,749)</td>
<td>(16.60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Services</td>
<td>$6,515,500</td>
<td>($29,800)</td>
<td>$6,485,700</td>
<td>$6,355,700</td>
<td>$6,334,228</td>
<td>($151,472)</td>
<td>(2.34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Corporate Services</td>
<td>$41,102,500</td>
<td>($13,500)</td>
<td>$41,089,000</td>
<td>$41,054,247</td>
<td>$39,569,563</td>
<td>($1,519,437)</td>
<td>(3.70%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The operating surplus of $1,519,437 in the Corporate Services department is mainly due to salary savings in Fire Services, as well as, cost containment savings in the professional development and professional services accounts in the Administration Corporate Services, Technology Services and Human Resources divisions. Also, the Financial Services division realized savings in part time salaries and benefits in Service Cambridge as a result of the pandemic and facility closures.
The overall savings identified in the Corporate Services department were partially offset with decreased permit and parking enforcement revenues in the City Clerks budget due to financial relief measures implemented to help with the financial strains individuals and businesses were experiencing due to the pandemic.

**Corporate Enterprise**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>In Year Changes</th>
<th>Total Restated Budget</th>
<th>Previous Forecast</th>
<th>YTD Actuals</th>
<th>Over/Under Budget</th>
<th>% of Restated Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin. Corporate Enterprise</td>
<td>$354,300</td>
<td>$35,200</td>
<td>$389,500</td>
<td>$350,845</td>
<td>$348,189</td>
<td>($41,311)</td>
<td>(10.61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Management &amp; Project Management</td>
<td>$4,860,300</td>
<td>($10,500)</td>
<td>$4,849,800</td>
<td>$4,426,356</td>
<td>$4,010,497</td>
<td>($839,303)</td>
<td>(17.31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td>($6,800)</td>
<td>$263,200</td>
<td>$262,350</td>
<td>$261,658</td>
<td>($1,542)</td>
<td>(0.59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Strategy</td>
<td>$592,700</td>
<td>($9,100)</td>
<td>$583,600</td>
<td>$574,263</td>
<td>$556,689</td>
<td>($26,911)</td>
<td>(4.61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>$873,800</td>
<td>$41,200</td>
<td>$915,000</td>
<td>$901,889</td>
<td>$875,821</td>
<td>($39,179)</td>
<td>(4.28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Corporate Enterprise</strong></td>
<td>$6,951,100</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$7,001,100</td>
<td>$6,515,703</td>
<td>$6,052,854</td>
<td>($948,246)</td>
<td>(13.54%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The operating surplus of $948,246 in the Corporate Enterprise department is mainly driven by a positive variance in the Admin Corporate Enterprise and Asset Management and Project Management division. This is as a result of the cost containment strategies put in place to reduce professional development and professional service contracts such as condition assessment and inspections, as well as, reduced facility maintenance costs due to facility closures.

**Community Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>In Year Changes</th>
<th>Total Restated Budget</th>
<th>Previous Forecast</th>
<th>YTD Actuals</th>
<th>Over/Under Budget</th>
<th>% of Restated Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin. Community Development</td>
<td>$614,300</td>
<td>($21,600)</td>
<td>$592,700</td>
<td>$453,975</td>
<td>$364,016</td>
<td>($228,684)</td>
<td>(38.58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Transportation Services</td>
<td>$3,791,700</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$3,792,900</td>
<td>$3,741,417</td>
<td>$3,308,273</td>
<td>($484,627)</td>
<td>(12.78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>$6,789,900</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,789,900</td>
<td>$6,340,319</td>
<td>$5,872,418</td>
<td>($517,842)</td>
<td>(13.51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Services</td>
<td>($888,200)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($888,200)</td>
<td>($888,200)</td>
<td>($817,763)</td>
<td>$70,437</td>
<td>(7.93%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Services</td>
<td>$1,668,400</td>
<td>($49,100)</td>
<td>$1,619,300</td>
<td>$1,624,206</td>
<td>$1,325,779</td>
<td>($293,521)</td>
<td>(18.13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, Recreation &amp; Culture</td>
<td>$13,825,500</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$13,826,100</td>
<td>$13,638,269</td>
<td>$13,240,411</td>
<td>($385,689)</td>
<td>(4.24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Community Development</strong></td>
<td>$25,801,600</td>
<td>($68,900)</td>
<td>$25,732,700</td>
<td>$24,909,986</td>
<td>$23,293,134</td>
<td>($2,439,566)</td>
<td>(9.48%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The operating surplus of $2,439,566 in the Community Development department is driven savings in Public Works and Parks, Recreation and Culture.

Administration Community Development division realized savings in promotion and marketing, leased vehicles, professional development and program supplies and materials as a result of cost containment measures.
Engineering and Transportation Services realized salary savings for crossing guards as a result of school closures due to COVID-19, as well as, savings in streetlighting hydro and higher than anticipated revenue from internal recovery for capital works.

Public Works is underspent due to savings in third party sidewalk restorations and catch basin cleaning maintenance contract deferral due to COVID-19 cost containment measures.

Building Services was slightly overspent as building permit revenues was lower than original budget.

Planning Services was under budget as a result of higher than anticipated application fees and savings in salaries and benefits due to staffing vacancies.

The overall savings in Parks, Recreation and Culture is a result of changes in programming due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Significant savings were realized in salary gapping, as well as, general maintenance, supplies, minor capital, equipment and fuel and utilities which were partially offset by an increase in equipment charges.

**Corporate Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ORIGINAL BUDGET</th>
<th>IN YEAR CHANGES</th>
<th>TOTAL RESTATED BUDGET</th>
<th>PREVIOUS FORECAST</th>
<th>YTD ACTUALS</th>
<th>OVER/UNDER BUDGET</th>
<th>% OF RESTATED BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Financing</td>
<td>$14,663,300</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$14,663,300</td>
<td>$16,014,350</td>
<td>$17,764,852</td>
<td>($3,101,552)</td>
<td>21.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Funding</td>
<td>$2,110,800</td>
<td>$1,900</td>
<td>$2,021,700</td>
<td>$2,042,100</td>
<td>$1,974,439</td>
<td>($138,261)</td>
<td>(6.54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>$1,061,200</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,061,200</td>
<td>$1,061,200</td>
<td>$1,061,200</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income From Investment</td>
<td>($3,488,300)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($3,488,300)</td>
<td>($3,488,300)</td>
<td>($3,588,513)</td>
<td>($100,213)</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxation Revenue</td>
<td>($96,006,000)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($96,006,000)</td>
<td>($95,947,000)</td>
<td>($96,883,008)</td>
<td>($877,008)</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment in Lieu</td>
<td>($962,200)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($962,200)</td>
<td>($962,200)</td>
<td>($983,623)</td>
<td>($21,423)</td>
<td>2.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Grants</td>
<td>($134,000)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($134,000)</td>
<td>($134,000)</td>
<td>($134,000)</td>
<td>($134,000)</td>
<td>(2.15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Allocations</td>
<td>($1,963,100)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($1,963,100)</td>
<td>($1,963,100)</td>
<td>($1,997,683)</td>
<td>($34,583)</td>
<td>1.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Corporate Expenditures</td>
<td>($84,718,300)</td>
<td>$1,900</td>
<td>($84,716,400)</td>
<td>($83,376,950)</td>
<td>($82,789,215)</td>
<td>$1,927,185</td>
<td>(2.27%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The operating deficit of $1,927,185 in the Corporate Expenditures area is due to the additional expenditures directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic. These costs amount to $5,401,710 and have been captured under Corporate Financing. The overall variance in Corporate Financing is $3,101,552 as the COVID-19 costs were partially offset by a savings in financial obligations and debt charges as actual waived development charges and debenture principal and interest payments were lower than budgeted.

Additionally, there were savings in the External Funding for grants to groups as a result of event cancellations and Income from Investment was also lower than anticipated due to COVID-19. Finally, there were savings in Taxation Revenue as a result of an increase in penalties and interest due which were partially offset by an increase in tax write-offs and rebates.
Water Utility Variance

The following summary shows the variance between the annual Council approved budget and year to date actuals for each department, for water utility operations.

### Water

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORIGINAl BUDget</th>
<th>IN YEAR CHANGES</th>
<th>TOTAL RESTATEd BUDGET</th>
<th>PREVIOUS FORECAST</th>
<th>YTD ACTUALS</th>
<th>OVER/ (UNDER) BUDGET</th>
<th>% OF RESTATED BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Expenses</td>
<td>$37,126,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$37,126,000</td>
<td>$36,061,950</td>
<td>$35,429,208</td>
<td>($1,696,792) 4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>($37,126,000)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($37,126,000)</td>
<td>($36,741,200)</td>
<td>($36,221,943)</td>
<td>$904,057 2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Water</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($679,250)</td>
<td>($792,735)</td>
<td>($792,735)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sewer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORIGINAl BUDget</th>
<th>IN YEAR CHANGES</th>
<th>TOTAL RESTATEd BUDGET</th>
<th>PREVIOUS FORECAST</th>
<th>YTD ACTUALS</th>
<th>OVER/ (UNDER) BUDGET</th>
<th>% OF RESTATED BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>$33,233,700</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$33,233,700</td>
<td>$31,752,404</td>
<td>$30,472,759</td>
<td>($2,760,941) 8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>($33,233,700)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($33,233,700)</td>
<td>($33,603,500)</td>
<td>($33,325,614)</td>
<td>($91,914) 0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sewer</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($1,851,096)</td>
<td>($2,852,855)</td>
<td>($2,852,855)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total City of Cambridge Water & Sewer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORIGINAl BUDget</th>
<th>IN YEAR CHANGES</th>
<th>TOTAL RESTATEd BUDGET</th>
<th>PREVIOUS FORECAST</th>
<th>YTD ACTUALS</th>
<th>OVER/ (UNDER) BUDGET</th>
<th>% OF RESTATED BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($2,530,346)</td>
<td>($3,645,590)</td>
<td>($3,645,590)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total water utility surplus for 2020 is $3,645,590 of which $792,735 is for water and $2,852,855 is for sewer.

The main drivers of the surplus in the Water division include:

- Lower than anticipated cost for service related repairs;
- Reduced cost of locates services likely due to temporary stoppage of construction permits as a result of the pandemic;
- One-time increase in third party billing due to catching up on previous years deposit also added to the surplus;
- Lower than budgeted debt charges due to the delay in the implementation of the AMI program as a result of COVID; and
- Decrease in staff training and print and mail costs, as a result of cost containment measures only mandatory training was approved.

The overall Water surplus was partially offset by additional cost for regional purchase of water and lower than expected water billing revenue.

The main drivers of the surplus in the Sewer division include:

- Lower than anticipated Inflow and Infiltration (I&I) due to significantly dry summer, as such the City realized actual I&I of 23% versus a budgeted I&I of 30% resulting in lower purchase requirements from the Region and higher revenue billing;
- One-time increase in third party billings resulting in a one-time increase in revenue for billable work;
• Lower than budgeted debt charges due to the delay in the implementation of the AMI program as a result of COVID; and
• Decrease in staff training, as a result of cost containment measures only mandatory training was approved.

**Existing Policy/By-Law**

The Budget Control By-Law 152-14 identifies roles, responsibilities and spending authorities for accountability around the City’s financial management. It also identifies reporting requirements to ensure both accountability and transparency around the City’s finances. Under the by-law, Council approval is required for the following operating spending deviations:

- Transfers between divisions exceeding the lesser of 10% or $100,000;
- Any net overall deficit within a department.

The Reserve Fund By-Law 2-17 as amended by By-law 19-144 and corporate policy COR-260.010 identify how tax-supported operating surpluses are to be treated.

**Financial Impact**

The 2020 tax-supported operating surplus is $3,595,933 which represents 2.64% of the gross operating budget of $135,898,700.

The total water utility surplus for 2020 is $3,645,590 of which $792,735 is from water and $2,852,855 is from sewer. This represents 5.18% of the water utility gross operating budget of $70,359,700.

In accordance with the Reserve Fund By-Law 2-17 as amended by By-law 19-144 and corporate policy COR-260.010, staff recommends the following surpluses be transferred to their respective reserve and reserve funds:

- Tax-supported surplus of $3,595,933 to the Rate Stabilization Reserve;
- 50% of the total $792,735 Water surplus to the Water Rate Stabilization Reserve Fund and 50% to the Water Capital Reserve Fund;
- $899,796 of the total $2,852,855 Sewer surplus to the Wastewater Rate Stabilization Reserve Fund and the remaining $1,953,059 to the Wastewater Capital Reserve Fund.

The City’s tax-supported surplus and water utility surplus is after various transfers to and from reserve funds in accordance with the reserve fund by-law 2-17 as amended by By-law 19-144. These transfers and an update to the final reserve fund balances as at December 31, 2020 are shown in Appendix A.
Public Input

This report is posted for the public as part of the on-line Council meeting agenda.

Internal/External Consultation

Departments are responsible for submitting explanations on their operating variances that have been included in this report.

Conclusion

The 2020 tax-supported operating surplus is $3,595,933 and the total water utility surplus is $3,645,590. The realized surpluses represent only 2.64% of the gross operating budget for tax-supported operations, and 5.18% for water utility operations.

In accordance with the Reserve Fund By-Law 2-17 as amended by By-law 19-144 and corporate policy COR-260.010, staff recommends that the 2020 surpluses be transferred to the following reserve and reserve funds:

- Tax-supported surplus of $3,595,933 to the Rate Stabilization Reserve;
- 50% of the total $792,735 Water surplus to the Water Rate Stabilization Reserve Fund and 50% to the Water Capital Reserve Fund;
- $899,796 of the total $2,852,855 Sewer surplus to the Wastewater Rate Stabilization Reserve Fund and the remaining $1,953,059 to the Wastewater Capital Reserve Fund.

Signature

Division Approval

Name: Sheryl Ayres
Title: Chief Financial Officer

Departmental Approval

Name: Dave Bush
Title: Deputy City Manager, Corporate Services
City Manager Approval

Name: David Calder
Title: City Manager

Attachments

- Appendix A: Impacts to Reserve and Reserve Funds
### 2020 Reserve Fund Balance Update

#### Reserves & Reserve Funds for Tax-Supported Operating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reserves &amp; Reserve Funds for Tax-Supported Operating</th>
<th>Year End Entries</th>
<th>Balance as of Dec 31, 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contaminated Sites Grant Progr</td>
<td>(547,980)</td>
<td>(327,014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg Revitalization Program</td>
<td>(108,064)</td>
<td>(9,574,476)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate Stabilization</td>
<td>(2,345,207)</td>
<td>(1,040,821)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydro Dividend Stabiliztn R.F.</td>
<td>567,511</td>
<td>(547,980)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Discretionary Reserve Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discretionary Reserve Funds</th>
<th>Year End Entries</th>
<th>Balance as of Dec 31, 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Works Debt Retirement</td>
<td>(74,800)</td>
<td>(1,065,352)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Conservation</td>
<td>(8,576)</td>
<td>(79,117)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives Reserve Fund</td>
<td>(39,999)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election</td>
<td>83,899</td>
<td>(301,813)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Maintenance</td>
<td>(270,736)</td>
<td>(293,512)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Insurance Reserve Fund</td>
<td>230,506</td>
<td>(2,021,485)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Employee Benefits</td>
<td>(729,069)</td>
<td>(11,302,127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Safety &amp; Insurance</td>
<td>(167,430)</td>
<td>(2,626,993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing RF</td>
<td>(17,389)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Tree Planting RF</td>
<td>23,073</td>
<td>(122,278)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Accomodation Tax</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>(365,553)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Area Transformation Fund</td>
<td>(19,318,523)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ (2,773,892)</td>
<td>$ (49,044,432)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Library Discretionary Reserve Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Discretionary Reserve Funds</th>
<th>Year End Entries</th>
<th>Balance as of Dec 31, 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility Mtce-Library</td>
<td>(449,715)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Processing -Library</td>
<td>(14,662)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Purchase-Library</td>
<td>(193,762)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ (658,139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year End Entries</td>
<td>Balance as of Dec 31, 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Utilities Discretionary Reserve Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Rate Stabilization</td>
<td>(229,228)</td>
<td>4,038,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Rate Stabilization R.F.</td>
<td>(403,388)</td>
<td>4,188,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ (632,616)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ (8,227,081)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Discretionary Reserve Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Works Reserve Fund</td>
<td>(5,748,042)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Works Committed Fund</td>
<td>(1,189,345)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>(13,407)</td>
<td>7,355,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water System Capital Res Fund</td>
<td>(188,475)</td>
<td>10,395,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Improvements</td>
<td>(398,320)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Land Purchase</td>
<td>(69,401)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbarium Purchase Res Fund</td>
<td>(138,725)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Reserve Fund</td>
<td>(1,180,991)</td>
<td>4,178,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Meter Replacement R.F.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Mtce RF</td>
<td>(35,000)</td>
<td>3,912,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Field Revitalization RF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Hespeler Field RF</td>
<td>18,786</td>
<td>(247,276)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer Facility Capital Exp</td>
<td>(229,886)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Art Reserve Fund</td>
<td>(221,186)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Conservation</td>
<td>(22,846)</td>
<td>1,643,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>(205,512)</td>
<td>10,392,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ (1,627,444)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ (46,120,057)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year End Entries</td>
<td>Balance as of Dec 31, 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obligatory Reserve Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash in Lieu of Parking</td>
<td>(25,832)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Tax Reserve Fund</td>
<td>(4,984,266)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charges-San. Sewer</td>
<td>5,811,745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charges-Storm Sew.</td>
<td>(3,676,762)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charges-Watermains</td>
<td>(4,075,885)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charges-Roadways</td>
<td>(5,153,014)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charges-Indoor Rec</td>
<td>(13,578,690)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charges-Parks</td>
<td>(3,214,957)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charges-Fire Serv.</td>
<td>304,519</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charges-Library</td>
<td>(2,996,882)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charges-Works Yard</td>
<td>(474,020)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charges-Studies</td>
<td>(1,417,148)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev Charges-General Government</td>
<td>(301,059)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev Charges-City Engineering</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland Cash in Lieu</td>
<td>182,352</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit Stabilization</td>
<td>(3,131,469)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charges-Parking</td>
<td>(153,265)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 100,444</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ (36,884,634)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: COUNCIL  
Meeting Date: 04/13/21  
Subject: 7 Queen’s Square, Central Presbyterian Church – Request for Funding from the Heritage Conservation Reserve Fund  
Submitted By: Elaine Brunn Shaw, MCIP, RPP, Chief Planner  
Prepared By: Abraham Plunkett-Latimer, Senior Planner - Heritage Position  
Report No.: 21-079(CD)  
File No.: R01.01.50

Recommendations

THAT staff report 21-079(CD)– 7 Queen’s Square, Central Presbyterian Church – Request for Funding from the Heritage Conservation Reserve Fund – be received;  
AND THAT Council approve funding from the Heritage Conservation Reserve Fund for the designated property municipally known as 7 Queen’s Square, Central Presbyterian Church, to a maximum of $20,000 for replacement of the slate roof and associated repairs after receipt of paid invoices by the City from the applicant.  
AND FURTHER THAT the work must be completed by November 1, 2021.

Executive Summary

Purpose

- The Central Presbyterian Church is requesting funding from the Heritage Conservation Reserve Fund to assist with the restoration of the slate roof and associated repairs.

Key Findings

- The property was designated in 1987 under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act;  
- The property is a landmark in the City of Cambridge  
- The slate roof contributes to the structure’s distinctive appearance and is important to the community.
Financial Implications

- The cost to replace the slate roof and associated repairs has been quoted at $1,611,000.

- The Heritage Conservation Reserve Fund is available to assist designated property owners with funds to cover the costs of emergency repairs for high-cost projects that help conserve the identified cultural heritage attributes of the property. The Reserve Fund is topped up annually with unused funds from the Designated Heritage Property Grant Program. The balance of the Heritage Conservation Reserve Fund is $79,116 as of December 31, 2020.

- The recommended funding of $20,000 from the Heritage Conservation Reserve Fund is in addition to an MHAC-approved grant for $2,500 from the operating budget.

Background

The property was designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act in 1987 for its architectural and historical significance. The distinctive octagonal church spire was identified as a primary view in the Council-adopted City of Cambridge Downtown Urban Design Guidelines.

The roof replacement project was initiated in 2009 and divided into three phases to help manage costs. It has been supported by previous grants through the Designated Heritage Property Grant Program.

- In 2004 the City of Cambridge granted $1,500 in funding through the Designated Heritage Property Grant Program to assess the roof condition.

- In 2009 The City of Cambridge granted $10,000 in funding through Designated Heritage Property Grant Program for the replacement of the slate shingles as part of phase one of the roof restoration work.

In 2019 the church received an additional $20,000 in funding from the Heritage Conservation Reserve Fund for the restoration of stained-glass windows.

The current proposal is the third and final stage of work to complete the roof restoration.

On February 18, 2021 the Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) approved $2,500 in funding from the Designated Heritage Grants Program to be allocated to the project and recommended that Council approve an additional $20,000 in funding to be disbursed from the Heritage Conservation Reserve Fund for a total of $22,500 (grant and reserve funding combined).
Analysis

Strategic Alignment

PLACE: To take care of, celebrate and share the great features in Cambridge that we love and mean the most to us.

Goal #3 - Arts, Culture, Heritage and Architecture

Objective 3.2 Conserve and make positive contributions to our heritage districts and buildings throughout the community.

The Central Presbyterian Church is a landmark in the City of Cambridge. Sensitive and appropriate restoration of the roof, particularly its distinctive spire, will help maintain the City’s unique heritage identity.

Comments

City of Cambridge designating by-law 106-87 (Attachment 2) identifies the Central Presbyterian Church as an outstanding and well-preserved example of architectural design and an important City landmark. The church’s slate roof and octagonal spire contribute to the church’s ornate Gothic design.

The slate roof was identified as requiring replacement in 2007 for the long-term conservation of the structure. This work is necessary to prevent leaks that may damage the Church’s interior. Due to the cost of the repair, work was divided into three phases. The first phase was completed in 2009, the second phase was completed in 2011. The Church is now in the process of completing the third and final phase of work for the replacement of the roof.

The Central Presbyterian Church is seeking funds to help complete the slate roof replacement project. This third phase of the roof replacement is estimated to cost $1,611,000 (Attachment 1) The 2021 deadline for completion of work subject to a heritage grant from the City is November 1.

The scope of Phase 3 of the work is the replacement of shingles and associated repairs for the southern portion of the roof and the spire. The applicant is proposing to replace the roof with like materials including slate shingles and lead-coated copper flashing as outlined in (Attachment 1).
The current application is a continuation of a very extensive project, encompassing approximately 5000 square feet of the church roof.

On February 18, 2021 The Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) approved a grant of $2,500 to be allocated to this project from the Designated Heritage Property Grants Program. This year the MHAC grants program has a budget of $15,000. Currently there are six grant applications that meet the criteria for funding. MHAC has only dealt with three of those applications at the time of writing this report.

Due to the high cost of restoration work and the status of the Church as an important landmark in the City of Cambridge, MHAC recommended that Council approve an additional $20,000 from the heritage reserve fund to assist with this restoration in addition to the MHAC approved grant of $2,500 from the Designated Heritage Property Grants Program.

The purpose of the Heritage Conservation Reserve Fund is to fund the acquisition, preservation and ongoing rehabilitation of heritage facilities or items of architectural or cultural significance. The intent of the Reserve Fund is to assist designated property owners with funds to cover the costs of emergency repairs or for special projects which have value to the entire community.
The Reserve Fund is topped up annually with unallocated funds from the Designated Heritage Property Grant Program. There is currently $79,116 in the Reserve Fund as of December 31st, 2020.

Due to the high cost of the slate roof restoration and the status of 7 Queen’s Square, Central Presbyterian Church as a landmark in the City of Cambridge, Staff recommend that Council approve $20,000 from the Heritage Conservation Reserve Fund to assist with this restoration project in addition to a $2,500 MHAC-approved grant.

If Council does not approve the requested funding, the roof replacement project will proceed as planned.

**Existing Policy/By-Law**

Designation By-law 106-87 is a by-law designating the exterior of the property under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.

**Financial Impact**

The Heritage Conservation Reserve Fund is topped up annually with unallocated funds from the Designated Heritage Property Grants Program. There is currently $79,116 available in the reserve fund as of December 31, 2020.

MHAC has approved $2,500 in funding to be allocated from the Designated Heritage Property Grants Program which is funded through the 2021 Operating Budget.

If the additional requested funding of $20,000 is approved it will be deducted from the Heritage Conservation Reserve Fund.

**Public Input**

The Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC) meetings are open to the public. On February 18, 2021, the MHAC approved the allocation of $2,500 from the Designated Heritage Properties Grant Program and recommended that Council approve an additional $20,000 from the Heritage Conservation Reserve Fund.

**Internal/External Consultation**

The Senior Planner – Heritage liaised with the agent for the property owner on documents required for the Designated Heritage Property Grant Program.

**Conclusion**

The Central Presbyterian Church is a landmark within the City of Cambridge. Conservation of its unique slate roof will contribute positively to the community and is a
high-cost project. It has, therefore, been determined that the project meets the criteria for funding through the Heritage Conservation Reserve Fund.

Based on the analysis above, staff recommends that Council approve funding from the Heritage Conservation Reserve Fund for the designated property municipally known as 7 Queens Square, to a maximum of $20,000 for the replacement of the slate roof and associated repairs to be completed by November 1, 2021. Funds are not paid until the work is done and paid invoices are submitted.

Signature

Division Approval

Reviewed by the CFO
Reviewed by Legal Services

Name: Elaine Brunn Shaw
Title: Chief Planner

Departmental Approval

Name: Hardy Bromberg
Title: Deputy City Manager, Community Development

City Manager Approval

Name: David Calder
Title: City Manager

Attachments

- Attachment 2 - City of Cambridge designating by-law 106-87
# Slate and Copper Roof Restoration

**Stone Restoration**
Central Presbyterian Church
Cambridge

## Tender Closing of December 18, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLATE AND COPPER ROOF RESTORATION</th>
<th>BASE BID PRICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clifford Restoration</td>
<td>$1,950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson Restoration</td>
<td>$1,661,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LOWEST BID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bid Received?</th>
<th>Robertson Restoration</th>
<th>2nd LOWEST BID</th>
<th>Roof Tile Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Bid Price on the bottom of Page (excluding HST)

- Higher Than the Low Bid - $$: $0
- Higher Than the Low Bid - %: 0.0%

### Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Date (MMM DD, YYYY)</th>
<th>Estimated from their text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-Mar-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restart Date</th>
<th>Estimated from their text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Completion Date | 30-Nov-21 | Estimated from their text | 04-Nov-21 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>37.1</th>
<th>42.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher Than the Low Bid - %</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Schedule of Prices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Low Bid</th>
<th>2nd Lowest Bid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Mobilization, etc.</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$12,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Than the Low Bid - %</td>
<td>228%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Demo and disposal, underlayments, etc. at the main roof</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>$86,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Than the Low Bid - %</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Scaffold</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$267,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Than the Low Bid - %</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 Demo and disposal, underlayments, etc. at the main roof</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$58,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Than the Low Bid - %</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5 Lightning protection</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$14,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Than the Low Bid - %</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6 State of the main roof</td>
<td>$285,000</td>
<td>$436,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Than the Low Bid - %</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
2186 MOUNTAIN GROVE AVENUE, #452
BURLINGTON  ONTARIO  L7P 4X4

Building Sciences
CAMBRIDGE, ONTARIO

REVISIONS:
STAGE 3
PLAN
---
---

Date: Scale:

2'-2" 47°
TO THE MAXIMUM EXTENT POSSIBLE, WATER WILL BE PREVENTED FROM FLOWING DOWN THE EAST SIDE OF THE STONE FINIAL AND WILL BE CAUGHT IN A NEW GUTTER, CONVEYED BY DOWNPIPE TO A NEW COLLECTOR BOX, AND THEN TO GRADE.

AN EXISTING SHORT LENGTH OF "RETROFIT" GUTTER WITH DOWNPIPE APPEARS TO SERVE TO DIVERT RUN-OFF AWAY FROM THE DOORWAY BELOW; THIS WILL BE RESTORED WITH NEW GUTTER, AND NEW DOWNPIPE EXTENDING TO THE NEW COLLECTOR BOX.

TO AID IN MINIMIZING WATER FLOW TO VULNERABLE AREAS, REFER ALSO TO 2 IDENTICAL WATER DIVERTERS IN STAGE 2 WORK.

NEW "CURB" TO DIVERT WATER WESTWARD AROUND THE STONE FINIAL.

THE FULL COPING IS L.C.C. CLAD; THE INDICATED METAL IS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE FULLY SOLDERED AND WATERPROOFED AREA OF THE VALLEY SIDES.

UNUSED CHIMNEY TO BE CAPPED WITH LEAD-COATED COPPER PER 3/R2.

WATER CURRENTLY FLOWS TO THE EAST OF THE FINIAL, BUT WILL BE DIVERTED TO THE WEST SIDE INSTEAD.

THE FULL COPING IS L.C.C. CLAD; THE INDICATED METAL IS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE FULLY SOLDERED AND WATERPROOFED AREA OF THE VALLEY SIDES.

THE FULL COPING IS L.C.C. CLAD; THE INDICATED METAL IS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE FULLY SOLDERED AND WATERPROOFED AREA OF THE VALLEY SIDES.

THE FULL COPING IS L.C.C. CLAD; THE INDICATED METAL IS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE FULLY SOLDERED AND WATERPROOFED AREA OF THE VALLEY SIDES.
BY-LAW NO. 106 - 87

OF THE

CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

Being a by-law of the City of Cambridge
to designate the interior and exterior
of CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, QUEEN'S
SQUARE, Cambridge, as a property of
architectural and historical significance.

WHEREAS the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O., 1980, c. 237 authorizes the
Council of a municipality to enact by-laws to designate real property including
all buildings and structures thereof, to be of historic or architectural value
or interest;

AND WHEREAS Notice of Intention to so designate CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN
CHURCH, QUEEN'S SQUARE, Cambridge, Ontario have been duly published and served;

AND WHEREAS it is considered desirable to designate the properties
known as CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH - QUEEN'S SQUARE, Cambridge, Ontario;

NOW THEREFORE, THE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF
CAMBRIDGE ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:-

1. THAT there is designated as being of historical and architectural
significance the interior and exterior of the original structure and all
attached buildings located on the real property, more particularly
described in Schedule "A" attached hereto, known as CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN
CHURCH - QUEEN'S SQUARE, Cambridge, Ontario. The reasons for designation
are as set out in Schedule "B" attached hereto.

2. THAT the City of Cambridge is hereby authorized to cause a copy of this
by-law to be served upon the owner of the said properties and upon the
Ontario Heritage Foundation and to cause notice of this by-law to be
published in a newspaper having general circulation in the City of
Cambridge.

READ A FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD TIME,

[Signatures]
MAYOR
CLERK
SCHEDULE "A"

ALL AND SINGULAR that certain parcel or tract of land and premises situate, lying and being in the City of Cambridge, Region of Waterloo (formerly in the City of Galt) and Province of Ontario and being composed of lots 2, 3 and 4 and part lot 5, plan 456 the latter being more particularly described as follows:

COMMENCING in the Easterly limit of Melville Street at the point where it is intersected by the Northerly limit of said Lot four; thence Northerly along said Easterly Street limit, ten feet; thence Easterly parallel to the Northerly limit of said Lot Four to the Easterly limit of said Lot Five; thence Southerly along said Easterly lot limit ten feet to the Northerly limit of said lot four; and thence Westerly along said last mentioned limit to the place of beginning.
HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION

The first Church in the hamlet, later to be named Galt, was erected in 1828; this congregation eventually become First United Church. The first Scottish settlers arrived from New York State and a little later from Dumfrieshire, Scotland. The Rev. William Stewart, a missionary sent out by the Church of Scotland, established St. Andrew's Church (in the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland) in 1831-32. The first services were held in Abasalom Shade's Red Store. This congregation's first church was completed in 1835, the year in which the Rev. John Bayne arrived. Bayne has been called "the father of the Free Church in Canada", referring to his role in separating the Canadian Presbyterian Church from that of the Established Church in Scotland, in 1844. In that year the St. Andrew's congregation split, a part of it forming the Free Church in Galt, now called Knox's Presbyterian, under Rev. Bayne. In May, 1860 the remainder of St. Andrew's congregation joined with the Union Church, Galt, to form Central Presbyterian Church. The Union Church was created from the Melville Church and the Bayne Church, the latter comprised of former members of Knox's Church, Galt, who felt that the Westminster Standards were not properly followed. The Union Church dates from 1870. These three congregations comprise the present Central Presbyterian Church: St. Andrew's (in part), Melville Church and Bayne's Church. This new church gave much assistance to other churches, helping to form the Presbyterians in Preston, and gave early assistance to the Salvation Army, among others.

ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

The foundation stone of this outstanding church building was laid July 26, 1880.

Architects: Hall and Mallory
Contractors: G. Stevens and Son,
George Pike and Son (mason work)
Inspector of Mason Work: Thomas Dagleish
Building Committee Chairman: Alexander Barrie
Secretary: James Young

The architectural style is based mainly on Romanesque ("Greek cross" plan) and Gothic, this latter style clearly predominating, and marked by such features as fleche (actually a roof-top ventilator), spire (octagonal in shape), pinnacles, buttresses, and pointed arch apertures. The building is 77 feet wide across the transepts, and 108 feet in length. The peak of the roof is 64 feet above ground and the spire is 184 feet in height, while the east side tower is 60 feet in height. The building was completed in 1882. The Wadsworth organ was later replaced by a Warren organ at a cost of $3,200.

The 1880 construction and alterations of 1889, addition of bells and replacement of organ probably cost close to $20,000. The walls are constructed largely of gray-coloured granite and most feature work is done in limestone. After the appearance of railroads in Galt, many things were imported to the community and local influence is lessened. In this church, the use of the softer and more easily carved sandstone is noted in the pinnacles atop the buttresses; this is not local stone.

Central Church is an exceptional example of the richly ornamented late Victorian Gothic Style, or Victorian High Gothic, as it is called at times. Its commanding position on the riverbank retaining wall and graceful presence on Queen's Square are exceptional in Ontario. The competent handling of decorative forms and the general massing of the building and adjacent schoolroom are frequently noted by authorities on Canadian architecture. The three large windows of the Church are outstanding examples of stained glass work, most particularly that window facing south, which are erected as a memorial to John Goldie.
A more detailed description of the architectural features of this building can be found in the L.A.C.A.C. Building Description dated January 13, 1987.

REASONS FOR DESIGNATION

1. It is a good, representative example of the work of an outstanding architect or firm (Hall and Mallory) and local mason (Thomas Daveleigh).

2. It is a well preserved example and illustration of the City's social and cultural history.

3. It is an outstanding and well preserved example of architectural design.

4. It is generally recognized as an important city landmark.

5. It is a well preserved example of outstanding interior design.

6. It makes an important contribution to the urban composition and streetscape of which it forms a part.
Recommendation(s)

THAT Report 21-112(CRS) Dover Street Sanitary Pump Station Upgrade be received;
AND THAT Council approve the transfers to/from Reserve Funds as outlined in the Financial Impact section of this report;
AND FURTHER THAT Council approve the award of Tender 21-03 Dover Street Sanitary Pump Station Upgrade to ASCO Construction (Toronto) Ltd., of Mississauga for the total tendered price of $4,727,712, including H.S.T., this being the lowest compliant bid received as outlined in Report 21-112(CRS).

Executive Summary

Purpose

- Council approval is required to transfer additional funding to the capital project and award the project as detailed here-in.

Key Findings

- There were two (2) compliant bids received through a competitive tender process with an average bid price of $5,178,035.73. The bid submitted by ASCO Construction (Toronto) Ltd. is $450,353.65 or approximately 9.5% below average bid.

Financial Implications

- The award of this tender will require additional funding from Wastewater Development Charges Debenture in the amount of $594,557 and the Wastewater Capital Reserve Fund in the amount of $396,372 to fund the costs that exceed the approved budget.
Background

The tender was released to obtain competitive bids for the upgrade of Dover Street Sanitary Pump Station.

Three (3) bids were received in response to the tender. One bid was subsequently deemed non-compliant as it failed to comply with the Mandatory Technical Requirements of the RFT.

Analysis

Strategic Alignment

PEOPLE To actively engage, inform and create opportunities for people to participate in community building – making Cambridge a better place to live, work, play and learn for all.

Goal #2 - Governance and Leadership

Objective 2.5 Focus on the responsible management of financial resources, ensuring transparency and accountability.

The public bidding process ensures the City maintains an open and transparent public process that provides accountability on the utilization of financial resources.

Comments

Three bids were received in response to the tender as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) ASCO Construction (Toronto) Ltd.</td>
<td>Mississauga, ON</td>
<td>$4,727,712.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) MJ.K. Construction Inc.</td>
<td>Mississauga, ON</td>
<td>$Non-compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Sona Constructor Inc.</td>
<td>Hamilton, ON</td>
<td>$5,628,358.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procurement confirms that the rules under Procurement By-law No. 19-187 were adhered to in the issuing ad awarding of this solicitation.

Existing Policy/By-Law

Under Procurement By-law 19-187, the Manager of Procurement, or their designate who is under the general direction of the Chief Financial Officer, is delegated the authority to approve the award of Tenders and Proposals over $500,000 when all of the following conditions have been satisfied:

a) when there is sufficient funding, as approved by Council through the budget process and verified by the Finance Division by the Departmental Recommendation to Award Report.

b) when all procedures in accordance with this By-law, have been followed.
c) when the lowest compliant Tender bid or highest scored Proposal is accepted and recommended; and
d) when at least three valid responses from vendors have been received.

This procurement requires approval from Council as additional funding is required.

Financial Impact

The net impact of the overall bid is a deficit of $900,929 as outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funding</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Tender T21-03</th>
<th>Other Commitments</th>
<th>Savings/(Deficit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>$1,632,000</td>
<td>$1,924,372</td>
<td>$104,000</td>
<td>$(396,372)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Development Charges - Debenture</td>
<td>2,448,000</td>
<td>2,886,557</td>
<td>156,000</td>
<td>$(594,557)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$4,080,000</td>
<td>$4,810,929</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>$(990,929)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were three (3) bids received through a competitive tender process and the above costs are considered to be an accurate reflection of the work required.

Public Input

Request for Tender documents for this project were made available to the public for viewing and submission on the City’s Bids and Tenders website.

This tender had fifty-eight (58) plan takers, includes sub-trades and suppliers, and three (3) submissions were received.

Internal/External Consultation

Request for Tender documents were compiled by Procurement, however the detailed specifications contained within the tender documents were prepared and submitted to Procurement by the Community Development Department.

The advertising for this tender was as follows:

- a) Advertised on the City’s Bids and Tenders website: February 5, 2021
- b) Tender Closing Date: February 26, 2021
- Final Date for Acceptance of Tender: May 26, 2021
Conclusion

Council approval of additional funding is required to award Tender T21-03 Dover Street Sanitary Pump Station Upgrade.

Signature

Division Approval

Name: Sheryl Ayres  
Title: Chief Financial Officer

Departmental Approval

Name: Dave Bush  
Title: Deputy City Manager, Corporate Services

City Manager Approval

Name: David Calder  
Title: City Manager

Attachments

- N/A
Recommendation(s)

THAT Report 21-090(IFS) re: Capital Projects Status and Forecast Update as of December 31, 2020 be received;

AND THAT the closure of capital projects identified to be closed in report 21-090(IFS) be approved;

AND THAT the capital forecast changes requiring approval under the Budget Control By-law as identified in report 21-090(IFS) be approved;

AND FURTHER THAT transfers to and from reserve funds as identified in report 20-090(IFS) be approved.

Executive Summary

Purpose

- This report provides a summary of capital portfolio performance through December 31, 2020.
- As per the City’s Budget Control By-Law, Council is to be provided updates related to capital forecast and status twice a year.

Key Findings

As of December 31, 2020, there are 205 open projects. This includes:

- 132 active projects underway (Approved, In Progress, Delayed)
• 41 projects where work is substantially complete (In Maintenance, Project work complete)
• 30 projects ready for closure
• 2 projects to be cancelled

Since 2017, the City of Cambridge has approved 313 capital projects with an original approved community investment of $204 million to maintain existing infrastructure and build new infrastructure. Of the projects approved in 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020, the average percent complete for the portfolio of projects is 92%, 82%, 70% and 50%, respectively.

Based on current forecast (December 2020) the estimated cost to implement the approved 2017 - 2020 capital program is $197.3 million. This current forecast is 3.3% lower than the original approved budget.

**Financial Implications**

The forecast changes as reported in the Comments section resulted in transfers to and from reserve funds as well as changes to other sources of funding such as debenture and external recoveries. The funding impacts of the forecast changes are as follows:

• Overall net decrease of $2,931,198 in required funding.
• Net return of $2,744,933 to various reserve funds as shown in Appendix D
• Net decrease of $177,301 in tax supported debt financing debenture due to project A/00390-40 Main Street Streetscaping expected to be completed under budget.
• Net decrease of $12,500 from Federal Grant funding due to project A/00317-50 Curbside Electric Vehicle Charging Units expected to be completed under budget.
• Net increase of $3,536 as a result of reduced funding from external sources to complete projects.
Background

The purpose of the capital investment program is to replace and maintain existing infrastructure and build new infrastructure required to support growth and intensification. Infrastructure built and maintained through the capital investment program supports and improves existing services provided by the City. Each year Council provides approval to fund a portfolio of projects, and reviews a nine-year forecast for future projects.

It is the mandate of the Project Management Office (PMO) to keep Cambridge’s management team and the project management community informed. This is achieved by providing a variety of regular updates ranging from monthly status of projects to an annual report on the organization’s progress at institutionalizing project management. Further, the PMO seeks to deliver successful capital projects by providing project management mentoring and coaching, and oversight for capital projects.

To enable project managers to operate efficiently and effectively while remaining accountable and transparent, the Budget Control By-Law (By-Law 152-14) identifies policies pertaining to budget control, including the requirement for status and forecast change updates to Council.

Analysis

Strategic Alignment

PEOPLE To actively engage, inform and create opportunities for people to participate in community building – making Cambridge a better place to live, work, play and learn for all.

Goal #2 - Governance and Leadership

Objective 2.5  Focus on the responsible management of financial resources, ensuring transparency and accountability.

Regular status reports provide an update on capital project status to Council and the community. This update is in addition to the project specific communication being provided to council by various project managers through the project life-cycle.
Comments

Project Successes

In 2019 and 2020, the Waste water team undertook the renewal of the Eagle Street and Burnett Avenue sanitary pumping stations. In both instances, an inhouse construction management approach was taken to service and equipment procurement. Instead of hiring a consultant and general contractor to manage the work, City staff undertook the detailed management and direction of the project. City resources were used where possible, ranging from using a City Vactor truck to stop flows to the wet well so construction could occur, use of the crane to lift pumps and panels into confined spaces, and assigning City operators to conduct much of the work. In this way, City staff became extremely familiar with the workings of each station, and significant savings were realized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Final Cost</th>
<th>Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00753-40 Burnett Avenue Pumping Station Renewal</td>
<td>$433,700</td>
<td>$247,795</td>
<td>$185,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00754-40 Eagle Street Pumping Station Renewal</td>
<td>$308,000</td>
<td>$80,287</td>
<td>$227,712</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Waste water team is to be commended for their excellent planning and work to complete the project scope of work in a timely and cost-effective way.

Status of Key Projects – as of March 2021

2021 Road and underground infrastructure construction

Construction is planned for 11 City streets in 2021. Streets that will be under construction in 2021 include:

- Centre Street (Concession to South)
- Short Street (Centre to dead end)
- Hamilton Street (Eagle to Dover)
- Dover Street (King to Moore)
- Sheldon Drive (Wolseley to Franklin)
- Salisbury Avenue (Grand to dead end)
- Rooshill Avenue (Queen to Bechtel)
• Millvue Street (Rooshill to Bechtel)
• Highridge Court (Pinebush to end)
• Boxwood Drive (Vondrau to Vondrau)
• Cambridge Street (Bond to Dundas) – this is a continuation of the 2020 construction project

The Engineering Division will also be undertaking asphalt rehabilitation (road resurface) works, Storm Pond Cleaning projects (two ponds), construction of the Beverly Street pedestrian underpass of the CP rail line and watermain relining.

Of the 13 projects planned to be tendered in 2021, the total budget is $19M. To date five tenders have closed (under budget by 11% overall). Attachment A summarizes the infrastructure engineering project tenders. Competitive pricing for these projects was received due to efforts to tender early in the year.

Up to date information about project scope, construction schedule, current status and contact information for respective projects can be found on the Current Projects website at: www.cambridge.ca/construction

Regional Projects
Regional reconstruction of King Street in Preston continues in 2021, this final phase includes the completion of underground (watermain, sanitary and storm sewer) works between Montrose Street and Bishop Street as well as the completion of surface works (curb, sidewalk, asphalt, streetscaping) between Lowther Street and Bishop Street.

The Region is also reconstructing Dundas Street between Hespeler Road and Franklin Boulevard, this initiative started in 2020 and will be implemented over four years. 2021 works will include reconstruction between Beverly Street and Elgin Street. The work will include lengthening the pedestrian tunnel in Soper Park.

Work along Coronation Boulevard to create a new water pressure zone within Cambridge will occur in 2021. The City is not contributing funding to this project, although City infrastructure (storm sewer) will be relocated to accommodate a new trunk watermain. Additional information on the Cambridge Pressure Zone 1 project can be found on the Region’s website: https://www.regionofwaterloo.ca/en/living-here/current-projects.aspx#water.

Further water system planning and design is underway for a new watermain on Avenue Road between Hespeler Road and Franklin Boulevard. The Region anticipates starting construction in 2021.

Full details of the Region of Waterloo Planned 2021 Construction program can be found in the Council Information Package dated February 19, 2021.
Development Projects

Projects supporting the North Cambridge Business Park are proceeding as planned to prepare serviced lands for future development. This includes construction of Intermarket Road between Boychuk Road and Allendale Road, reconstruction of Allendale Road, construction of a sanitary pumping station and completion of design of Boychuk Road and a railway grade separation.

Development of the Cambridge West area continues with the start of construction of the realignment of Blenheim Road and associated infrastructure, which is being led by the developers through a Credit for Service Agreement with the City.

Site preparation and servicing commenced in August of 2020 for the South Point subdivision (formerly called Bosdale subdivision). The City will contribute to the extension of Wesley Boulevard and construction of Faith Street as a land owner within the subdivision. The oversizing of municipal infrastructure to accommodate future growth is funded through Development Charges.

Facilities

Recreation Complex – Site preparation and Servicing – A/00463-40, Design – A00463-30

Results of the Joint Use Campus Feasibility Study were presented to Council in February 2021. The intent of the study was to explore and identify synergies between all partners (the City, school Boards and Idea Exchange), and evaluate various campus and facility space programs. Design of the future joint use campus will include two separate buildings with shared amenities. The two schools will share one facility, and the Recreation Complex and Idea Exchange will share the second facility. The two facilities will frame a community park. The City and school Boards will be entering into development and operating agreements for the site. Detailed design of the City facility will begin in 2021.

With respect to site preparation, grading of the city-owned lands is complete. Construction of roads and installation of municipal services (sewers and watermain) started in December 2020 and is scheduled to be completed in summer 2021. The construction work includes:
- Wesley Boulevard: to be extended from the existing terminus west of Moffat Creek to Faith Street
- Faith Street: from Wesley Boulevard to Dundas Street

Preston Auditorium Expansion Design – A/00420-30

The concept design of the expansion and improvement of Preston Auditorium is complete, the next step is to continue with schematic design. The project will include constructing a new ice pad with change rooms and other facilities. The existing change rooms and ice resurfacer room will be updated. Updates on the project can be found on the Current Projects web page: www.cambridge.ca/PrestonAudExpansion
The project team has completed community engagement regarding the proposed design of the expansion. The outcome of the community engagement will be presented to Council for further direction.

**David Durward Centre and Cambridge Center for the Arts Heritage Restoration – A/00949-40**

Heritage restoration work on the east façade of the building will be completed in 2021. The work includes stone repointing, masonry cleaning, steel window painting and caulking, dutchman repairs and lintel replacement. This project was put on hold in 2020 because of the Covid-19 pandemic. The work is a continuation of a project completed in 2019 to restore the south façade, which included stone repointing, masonry cleaning, replacement of damaged stones, window painting and caulking, dutchman repairs, rebuilt parapet bay and flashing.

**Galt Riverbank Heritage Buildings – A/00933-40**

This project includes repainting and application of protective glazing for energy savings and window protection at Landreth Cottage, Ferguson Cottage and Lutz House. Design specification development has started and work is expected to occur in 2021.

**Active Transportation**

**Dunbar Road Active Transportation – A/00384-41**

Works to include the construction of a 3m asphalt multi-use trail on the south side of Dunbar Road from Concession Road to Industrial Road. Construction to begin in March of 2021. A second phase of work from Industrial Road to Hespeler Road has been designed and Transportation Engineering are working to identify applicable grant funding opportunities for this work.

**Trails, Parks, and Cemeteries**

**Fountain Street Soccer Facility Design – A/00471-30**

The design consultant has been hired and the team is evaluating the site layout and amenities. Public consultation will take place in March followed by approvals and then detailed design phase. Construction of the facility is expected to start fall of 2021.

**Blair-Preston Trail and Pedestrian Bridge EA – A/00910-20**

Environmental assessment (EA) work for the Blair-Preston trail and pedestrian bridge is underway. Work completed to date includes preliminary archeological studies and seasonal ecological studies. The study is expected to be completed in May, 2021. The EA for this project is being funded by the Region of Waterloo. The priority for design of the bridge and remaining archaeological work will be established as part of the 2022-2031 capital budget.
Hespeler Pedestrian Bridge (A/01159-20)

An Environmental Assessment (Schedule B) will start in April 2021 to evaluate possible locations for a pedestrian bridge across the Speed River and its corresponding trail connections in Hespeler. The City's Trails Master Plan (2010) and Cycling Master Plan (2020) identified the need for this crossing in the approximate area of 215 Queen Street West. A request for proposal is being developed and will be posted in March 2021 to select a consultant to complete the study.

Parklawn Cemetery Scattering Garden – A/00504-40

The development of a scattering garden at Parklawn Cemetery will allow for the scattering of cremated remains. Approximately 70% of Ontarians select cremation for final disposition. Adding a scattering garden to the City’s current burial and niche options will provide an affordable option for residents. Work on the scattering garden is expected to occur through the summer/fall 2021 construction season.

Other Infrastructure Projects

Dover Street Pumping Station – A/00394-40

The tender for the Dover Street Pumping Station construction closed on February 26, 2021. Timing on the commencement of construction work is dependent on when the contract can be officially awarded. The scope of work includes the reconstruction of the pumping station to increase capacity and address the fact that the station is at the end of its serviceable life.

Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI) Implementation – A/00238-40

As of February 22, 2021, there are now approximately 23,172 residents and businesses transmitting water meter data on the City’s network. The COVID-19 pandemic has continued to delay the installation schedule. COVID-19 restrictions have limited the ability to enter homes to complete the necessary water meter exchanges. With the current restrictions, outside Smart Point installations continue where no access to the inside water meter is required.

Installations completed are as follows: Commercial (52%), West Galt (90%), Preston (90%), South Galt (78%), East Galt (64%), North Galt (18%), Hespeler (5%).

The AMI team has successfully completed integration of Advanced Metering Infrastructure and the Meter Data Management (MDM) system, and both systems are now operating in sync. This technology integration is a big milestone for the project.

The MDM Home connect and Biz Connect portal will be launched to the public in Q3 2021. A launch in Q3 is planned to allow for issues to be worked out within the system and with the hopes that field installations of the meters and Smart points will be complete or near completion at that time. Key benefits of the portal include:
Online customer access to water usage patterns and billing information

More timely notices of billing irregularities, such as high-water usage

Service representatives will be able to troubleshoot issues over the phone using real-time meter readings

Fewer home appointments required for investigation of meter issues

LED Streetlight Conversion and King Street Decorative Lights – A/00083-40 and A/00973-40

Planning has started for two lighting projects. About 4,177 existing non-standard and decorative post top lights will be converted to LED lights in late 2021. The King Street Decorative lights project will see the installation of decorative lighting features in Preston in late 2021. The lighting features will enhance the streetscape and act as an entrance feature to the City.

Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure – A/01004-40 and A/00352-10

Over the winter, three electric vehicle charging stations were installed in the 17 Cambridge Street parking lot. The level-2 chargers are designated for City vehicle use and will be operational in April, 2021. Further, the Facilities team is working with Regional partners to procure and install six level-2 charges in four locations throughout public parking lots. The chargers will be accessible to the public and are planned to be operational in December, 2021.

Portfolio Status – December 31, 2020

As of December 31, 2020 there are 205 open projects. This includes:

- 132 active projects underway (Approved, In Progress, Delayed)
- 41 projects where work is substantially complete (In Maintenance, Project work complete)
- 30 projects ready for closure
- 2 projects to be cancelled

Appendix B: Capital Project Status Report provides detailed information for all active and substantially complete projects. The following graphic summarizes percent complete as reported by project managers, organized by project approval year.
Observations from this analysis include:

- As would be expected, projects from earlier approval years are closer to completion than more recent approval years.

- It should be noted that, in 2020 a higher proportion of 2019 and 2020 projects were delayed as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. Project managers will be moving forward with these projects in 2021.

**Budget Summary**

**2021 Budget Approval**

On December 2, 2020, the 2021 capital budget was approved. The budget includes 56 projects, for a total value of $61.6M.

**2020 and Prior Budget Years**

As noted above, as of December 31, 2020 there were 132 active projects in the early planning phase (approved status), in progress or delayed. The current budget for these projects is $119.9M, to date $47.2M has been spent.

Since 2017, the City of Cambridge has approved $204M for community investments to maintain existing infrastructure and build new infrastructure. It should be noted that, in the November 3, 2020 Capital Status and Forecast report to Council the total approved investment program for 2017 through 2020 was reported as $196M, it is in fact $204M. This includes capital projects approved during the annual capital budget process, as well as supplementary projects approved throughout the year, for a total of 313 capital projects approved over four years. Infrastructure built and maintained through the capital program supports and improves services provided by the City. Total approved capital projects by budget year are 85, 78, 79 and 71 for the budget years 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020 respectively.

The following graphic shows the average percent expended for the full project portfolio by approval year as of December 31, 2020. The dollar values in brackets provide the current approved capital budget (as at Dec 31, 2020) by approval year.
Notes about active projects include:

- There are 15 active projects from approval years prior to 2017. This includes 3 projects with significant unspent budgets that will be moving forward in 2021.
  - Upsize of Wesley Boulevard infrastructure (A/00221-40): As noted in the Key Project section of this report, work on the South Point subdivision (formerly known as the Bosdale subdivision) is underway. The Wesley Boulevard extension is anticipated to be completed by the end of the summer. Remaining budget: $3.7M
  - LED Streetlight Conversion (A/00083-40): As noted in the Key Projects section of this report, planning is underway for phase 2 and installation of LED lights is expected by the end of the year. Remaining budget: $1.7M
  - Riverside Dam Detailed Design (A/00024-20): Design of the dam is expected to be substantially complete in 2021. Remaining budget: $0.5M

- The City currently has $27.7M budgeted and $16.5M in unspent funds dedicated to development of the North Cambridge Business Park (this includes all projects with a name that starts with “East Side”) in the summary report. As noted in the Key Project section of this report, considerable work will be advancing in the North Cambridge Business Park in 2021.

- Construction of the Dover Street Pump Station will commence in 2021. Construction budget: $4M.

**Budget Comparison**

The following chart illustrates approval year original budget and current forecasted budget (plan cost) including the forecast changes proposed in this report. Based on the current forecast (December 2020) the estimated cost to implement the approved 2017 - 2020 capital program is $197.3 million. This current forecast is 3.3% lower than the original approved budget. By approval year, the current plan cost is 0.5% more, 13% less, 1.4% less and 1.6% less than original approved budgets for 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020, respectively.
As illustrated in the chart below, according to the current forecast 58%, 73%, 81% and 76% of projects are expected to be completed within the original approved budget for the approval years 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020.

**Projects to be cancelled**

There are two projects to be cancelled in this reporting period.

Project A/00682-40 WG Johnson Redundancy Boiler is proposed for cancellation for the following reasons. The redundancy boiler would be a back up to the primary boiler which was replaced in 2018 and provides heat to the hot tub and supplements the geothermal system for radiant heating. As the primary boiler is new, repair and replacement parts are cost effective and easily accessible. In the event of primary boiler failure, the radiant heating system would rely solely on the geothermal heat with little or
no impact to the facility, and there may be a temporary closure of the hot tub as repairs are made. As such, it is recommended that this project be cancelled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Previous Forecast</th>
<th>Actual Cost</th>
<th>Over / (Under)</th>
<th>Funding Source / Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00682-40 W.G. Johnson</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>7,479</td>
<td>(57,521)</td>
<td>Return $7,250.64 to Capital Works RF and $50,000 to Gas Tax RF to cancel this project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy Boiler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(57,521)</td>
<td><strong>Funding Returned</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the project above, A/00429-10 Station Alerting was approved to be cancelled by special report to Council on November 3, 2020 (Report to Council: 20-217(CRS)). The project scope was deemed to be part of A/00202-10 P25 Radio Compliance project scope and a forecast change moving the budget from A/00429-10 to A/00202-10 is reflected in Appendix C.

**Ready for Financial Close**

There are a total of 30 projects to be closed during this reporting period. For these projects:

- A total of $1,600,101 is being returned to reserve from projects that are to be closed during this reporting period. Construction efficiencies, receipts of grants, savings realized for provisional items and contingency allowed for projects to be completed under budget.
- 16 projects were completed below previous forecasted amount for all funding sources.
- 4 projects were completed below previous forecasted amounts but require Council approval to draw additional funds from reserves under the Budget Control By-Law due to change in funding sources.
- 10 projects require Council approval to draw additional funds from reserve funds under the Budget Control By-Law.
### Project closures requiring Council approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Previous Forecast</th>
<th>Actual Cost</th>
<th>Over / (Under)</th>
<th>Funding Source / Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00159-40 Neighbourhood Park Dev (13K001)</td>
<td>221,000</td>
<td>220,447</td>
<td>221,193</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>Draw $746.20 from Capital Works RF to close.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00262-20 Sanitary Lateral Renewal Strategy (16Y009)</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>139,900</td>
<td>148,807</td>
<td>8,907</td>
<td>Draw $8,907 from WasteWater RF to close this project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00317-50 Curbside Electric Vehicle Charging Units (17C400)</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>55,992</td>
<td>(9,008)</td>
<td>Reduce $12,500 from Grants and Draw $3,492 from Capital Works RF to close this project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00344-40 18F067 Security &amp; Monitoring Enhancement (18F067)</td>
<td>174,000</td>
<td>174,000</td>
<td>176,725</td>
<td>2,725</td>
<td>Draw $2,725 from Capital Works RF to close project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00668-40 Hewat Street and Edgar Street Reconstruction</td>
<td>1,450,000</td>
<td>1,467,047</td>
<td>1,330,072</td>
<td>(136,975)</td>
<td>Return $71,090 to Capital Works RF, return $28,221 to Water RF, return $48,846 to Gas Tax RF, and Draw $9,182 from WasteWater RF to close out these projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Project closures requiring Council approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Previous Forecast</th>
<th>Actual Cost</th>
<th>Over / (Under)</th>
<th>Funding Source / Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00673-40</td>
<td>Francis Street Reconstruction</td>
<td>1,870,000</td>
<td>1,825,052</td>
<td>1,713,675</td>
<td>(111,377)</td>
<td>Return $31,195 to Wastewater RF, $37,780 to Water RF, $50,299 to Gas Tax RF and draw $7,897 from Capital Works RF to close this project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00759-40</td>
<td>New Hope/Parklawn Office - Repaving/Repl</td>
<td>60,600</td>
<td>114,931</td>
<td>116,165</td>
<td>1,234</td>
<td>Draw $1,234 from Cemetery Improvements RF to close.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00760-40</td>
<td>Mountview Cemetery - Repaving/Replacement</td>
<td>151,500</td>
<td>134,617</td>
<td>136,004</td>
<td>1,387</td>
<td>Draw $1,387 from Cemetery Improvements RF to close.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00768-40</td>
<td>Galt Arena Rink Board replacement</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>52,228</td>
<td>60,228</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>Draw $8,000 from the Facility Maintenance RF to close.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00921-10</td>
<td>Laptop/Desktop Replacement Lifecycle (2020)</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>180,549</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>Draw $550 from Capital Works RF to close this project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00971-40</td>
<td>GCI Pedestrian Crossing</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>84,221</td>
<td>4,221</td>
<td>Draw $4,223 from Capital Works RF to close this project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00972-40</td>
<td>Asphalt Resurfacing Program 2020</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>742,320</td>
<td>677,835</td>
<td>(64,485)</td>
<td>Draw $5,404 from Capital Works RF and return $69,889 to Gas Tax RF to close this project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01038-10</td>
<td>74 Queen St East Property Acquisition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,220,669</td>
<td>1,224,169</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>Draw $3,500 from Core Area Transformation RF to close out this project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00328-40</td>
<td>18C044 Glebe, Cant and Fraser Recon (18C044)</td>
<td>2,260,000</td>
<td>1,419,792</td>
<td>1,420,195</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>Draw $403 from Capital Works RF to close this project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Project closures not requiring Council approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Previous Forecast</th>
<th>Actual Cost</th>
<th>Over / (Under)</th>
<th>Funding Source / Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00023-40 2094 Dickson Streetscape Improvements (13C027)</td>
<td>430,000</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>1,331,055</td>
<td>(68,945)</td>
<td>Return $68,944 to Capital Works RF to close this project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00045-40 B2R 3071 Hespeler St Scape (Queen-Adam-G (15C032)</td>
<td>4,591,600</td>
<td>6,463,433</td>
<td>6,399,938</td>
<td>(63,495)</td>
<td>Return $104,539 to Capital Works RF, and Recognize $9,333 from Others and $31,712 from Region to close out this project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00093-40 Rd Recons 3062 Wellington St (Dickson – (17C049)</td>
<td>755,000</td>
<td>762,142</td>
<td>762,142</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Reduce $3,043 in external funding and draw $3,043 from Capital Works RF to close project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00133-50 Fleet System Implementation (16F100)</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>127,900</td>
<td>(2,100)</td>
<td>Return $2,100 to Capital Works RF to close this project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00157-40 Sheffield Equipment Storage Bldg. (16H016)</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>76,130</td>
<td>(3,870)</td>
<td>Return $387 to Capital Works RF and $3,484 to DC Public Works Facility RF to close this project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00376-40 Mount View Columbarium Site Prep (18M002)</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>45,106</td>
<td>(29,894)</td>
<td>Return $29,894 to Columbarium Purchase RF to close.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00390-40 Main Street Streetscaping (19C023)</td>
<td>2,920,000</td>
<td>2,755,817</td>
<td>2,454,697</td>
<td>(301,120)</td>
<td>Return $217,101, external recovery by $40,136 and return $43,912 to Wastewater RF to close out this project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00396-40 Melrose St and Frederick St Reconstruction (19C038)</td>
<td>1,420,000</td>
<td>1,325,000</td>
<td>1,254,323</td>
<td>(70,677)</td>
<td>Return $10,924 to Capital Works RF, $16,635 to Wastewater RF, $24,884 to Water RF, and $18,233 to Gas Tax RF to close this project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00449-30 East Side Allendale Rd Reconstruction (Fountain St - EW Collector)</td>
<td>758,800</td>
<td>758,800</td>
<td>185,677</td>
<td>(573,123)</td>
<td>Return $30,967 to Capital Works RF, $42,901 to DC Wastewater RF, $52,871 to DC Water RF, and $446,383 to DC Roadways RF to close this project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00474-10 Bunker Gear 2020</td>
<td>178,000</td>
<td>178,000</td>
<td>177,632</td>
<td>(368)</td>
<td>Return $368 to Capital Works RF to close this project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00664-20 Asset Management Plan and Program Advancement</td>
<td>219,200</td>
<td>219,222</td>
<td>210,284</td>
<td>(8,938)</td>
<td>Return $2,979 to Capital Works RF, $2,979 to Wastewater RF, and $2,979 back to Water RF to close this project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00671-40 Blair Road Reconstruction</td>
<td>1,965,000</td>
<td>2,065,312</td>
<td>1,953,557</td>
<td>(111,755)</td>
<td>Return $45,323 to WasteWater RF, $44,964 to Water RF, and $21,468 to Gas Tax to close project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project closures not requiring Council approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Previous Forecast</th>
<th>Actual Cost</th>
<th>Over / (Under)</th>
<th>Funding Source / Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00699-40 Energy Management – Dickson/MacIntosh Arenas</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>75,788</td>
<td>(4,212)</td>
<td>Return $9,852 to Energy conservation RF and recognize $5,640 in Other revenue to close out this project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00754-40 Eagle St. Pumping Station</td>
<td>308,000</td>
<td>308,000</td>
<td>72,301</td>
<td>(235,699)</td>
<td>Return $235,699 to WasteWater RF and close out the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00918-40 Watermain Re-lining Various Streets</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>874,477</td>
<td>(125,523)</td>
<td>Return $125,521 to Water RF to close out this project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00428-10 Bunker Gear (19Q002)</td>
<td>178,000</td>
<td>170,301</td>
<td>169,919</td>
<td>(382)</td>
<td>Return $382 from Capital Works RF to close this project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** | **(1,600,101)** Underspending

### Forecast Changes Requiring Approval

Under the Budget Control By-Law 152-14, if the project is anticipated to have an overage exceeding the lesser of 10% or $250,000 then that additional spending requires Council approval. Additionally, when funds are required to be drawn from a reserve or reserve fund, this draw requires Council approval.

There are three forecast changes for this reporting period that require approval due to them needing additional funding form reserves. Forecast change(s) requiring approval are itemized in the following table, as detailed in the Status of Project Changes section above.
### Project forecast changes requiring Council approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Previous Forecast</th>
<th>Actual Cost To December 2020</th>
<th>Forecast Increase / (Decrease)</th>
<th>Funding Source &amp; Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00440-40 Wright Ave and Goldie Ave Reconstruction (19C039)</td>
<td>1,670,000</td>
<td>1,969,298</td>
<td>1,998,489</td>
<td>33,025</td>
<td>Return $13,276 to Capital Works RF, Draw 18,540 from Wastewater RF and Draw $27,761 from Water RF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00915-40 Clarence and Tannery Street Reconstruction</td>
<td>2,235,000</td>
<td>2,306,164</td>
<td>1,973,997</td>
<td>(42,000)</td>
<td>Return $22,949 to Capital Works RF, return $89,417 to Gas Tax RF, draw $17,698 from Wastewater RF and draw $52,668 from Water RF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00955-40 Devil's Creek Trail - Retaining Wall Replacement</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>56,163</td>
<td>71,087</td>
<td>14,924</td>
<td>Draw $14,924 from Capital Works RF as per approved interal Memo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total net project increase** 5,949

### Forecast Changes Not Requiring Approval

During this reporting period, there were eleven forecast changes made within the limits of staff delegated authority under the Budget Control By-law. These are reported for information only and do not require Council approval.

Additionally, during the reporting period six forecast changes were made through separate reports to Council. These are included in this report for information only, in support of financial transparency by consolidating all forecast change impacts to reserve funds during the reporting period.

These forecast changes not requiring approval and previously approved by Council are returning total funds of $489,361 and are reported in Appendix C.

### Existing Policy/By-Law

The Budget Control By-Law 152-14 provides necessary guidelines to ensure accountability and controls for the financial management of the city. The By-Law includes Capital budget financial controls.

### Financial Impact

The forecast changes as reported in the Comments section resulted in transfers to and from reserve funds as well as changes to other sources of funding such as debenture and external recoveries. The funding impacts of the forecast changes are as follows:

- Overall net decrease of $2,931,198 in required funding.
- Net return of $2,744,933 to various reserve funds as shown in Appendix D
• Net decrease of $177,301 in tax supported debt financing debenture due to project A/00390-40 Main Street Streetscaping expected to be completed under budget.

• Net decrease of $12,500 from Federal Grant funding due to project A/00317-50 expected to be completed under budget.

• Net increase of $3,536 from recognizing additional funding from external sources to complete projects.

Public Input

No public input was sought in the preparation of this report. Report posted publicly as part of the report process.

Internal/External Consultation

This report is prepared using information provided by respective project managers through the project management software. The PMO Analyst and Budget Analysts meet regularly with project managers to review the status of their projects and to provide mentoring and coaching.

The PMO provides the Capital Project Status Report to the members of the Corporate Leadership Team and Senior Management Team on a monthly basis.

Conclusion

This report provides a summary of capital portfolio performance through December 31, 2020. After closing of 30 projects and cancellation of 2 projects, the current capital project portfolio includes 173 ongoing projects. Of the projects approved in 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020, the work for 92%, 82%, 70% and 50% is complete, respectively. Forecast changes are reported in accordance with the Budget Control By-law, and result in transfers to and from reserve funds as well as changes to other sources of funding such as debenture and external recoveries.
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### Appendix A: Summary of Infrastructure Engineering Project Tenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Project Name(s)</th>
<th>Budget Total</th>
<th>Tender No.</th>
<th>Issued</th>
<th>Closed</th>
<th>Price Total</th>
<th>Over/(Under)</th>
<th>% Over/Under</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00670-40</td>
<td>Trenchless Sanitary Sewer Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>20-77</td>
<td>05-Nov-20</td>
<td>19-Nov-20</td>
<td>$746,232</td>
<td>($3,768)</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00489-40</td>
<td>Centre St. (Concession to South) &amp; Short St. (Centre to Dead End) Full Reconstruction</td>
<td>$2,130,000</td>
<td>20-82</td>
<td>07-Dec-20</td>
<td>21-Dec-20</td>
<td>$2,026,770</td>
<td>($103,230)</td>
<td>-4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01042-40</td>
<td>Hamilton St. (Eagle to Dover) &amp; Dover St. (King to Moore) Full Reconstruction</td>
<td>$2,370,000</td>
<td>21-09</td>
<td>11-Jan-21</td>
<td>25-Jan-21</td>
<td>$2,049,736</td>
<td>($320,264)</td>
<td>-13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01045-40</td>
<td>Sheldon Dr. (Wolseley to Franklin) Partial Reconstruction (widening &amp; base)</td>
<td>$1,395,000</td>
<td>21-10</td>
<td>29-Jan-21</td>
<td>18-Feb-21</td>
<td>$1,009,275</td>
<td>($385,725)</td>
<td>-27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01039-40</td>
<td>Salisbury Ave. Full Reconstruction (Grand Ave. to Dead End)</td>
<td>$4,300,000</td>
<td>21-19</td>
<td>12-Feb-21</td>
<td>01-Mar-21</td>
<td>$3,761,841</td>
<td>($538,159)</td>
<td>-12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01044-40</td>
<td>Rooshill Ave. (Queen to Bechtel) &amp; Millvue St. (Rooshill to Bechtel) Full Reconstruction</td>
<td>$1,890,000</td>
<td>Wk Mar 1st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01046-40</td>
<td>Highridge Crt. (Pinebush to End) Partial Reconstruction (road base)</td>
<td>$720,000</td>
<td>Wk Mar 8th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01064-40</td>
<td>Boxwood Dr. (Vondrau to Vondrau) Partial Reconstruction (road base)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00984-40</td>
<td>Annual Asphalt Program (various locations)</td>
<td>$1,245,000</td>
<td>Wk Mar 22nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00398-40</td>
<td>Goddard Cres. &amp; Heroux Devtek Cr. Surface Asphalt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00983-40</td>
<td>Beverly St. Pedestrian Underpass</td>
<td>$2,720,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00749-40</td>
<td>SWM Pond 163 and 155 Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$570,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01067-40</td>
<td>Watermain Lining Rehabilitation MacLaren Ave (Dundas to Franklin)</td>
<td>$930,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B: Capital Project Status Report as of December 31, 2020 - Open Projects

#### Community Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Id - Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>% Completed</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Plan Cost</th>
<th>Unexpended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00425-40 - Cemetery Improvements</td>
<td>Community Improvement</td>
<td>Shane Taylor</td>
<td>All project work completed. Maintenance period to end May 2021.</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Apr-2019 to May-2021</td>
<td>$396,515.00</td>
<td>$8,393.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00473-40 - Mount View Columbarium (2020)</td>
<td>Community Improvement</td>
<td>Shane Taylor</td>
<td>Units were installed November 11, 2020. 1-year warranty inspection to take place early November 2021.</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Mar-2020 to Nov-2021</td>
<td>$130,000.00</td>
<td>$19,392.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Development Engineering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Id - Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>% Completed</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Plan Cost</th>
<th>Unexpended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00099-40 - Reg Pj Back to River 1555 Fountain St</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Sarah Austin</td>
<td>Surface asphalt has been completed.</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>Jun-2018 to Dec-2020</td>
<td>$1,450,000.00</td>
<td>$323,902.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00215-40 - SE Galt San &amp; W/M Grth Related</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Adam Ripper</td>
<td>Balance of Phase 4 &amp; Phase 5 cost sharing items have been paid with the exception of the future Wesley Boulevard extension to the Bosdale Subdivision. This remaining work is to be complete in 2021.</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Jan-2017 to May-2021</td>
<td>$448,445.00</td>
<td>$30,003.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00221-40 - SE Galt 2102 Infra Upsize Wesley Blvd, F</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Adam Ripper</td>
<td>Draft Plan Approval has been received. Cost Sharing Agreement has been executed and pre-servicing agreement executed. Servicing work to commence in late 2020 and continue in 2021.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to Dec-2021</td>
<td>$3,806,157.00</td>
<td>$315,257.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00225-30 - SE Galt 3236 Dundas St Water Gravity Sew</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Adam Ripper</td>
<td>GM Blueplan has working through approvals with MTO and GRCA.</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Jan-2017 to Dec-2021</td>
<td>$1,080,600.00</td>
<td>$1,080,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00226-40 - East Side 3134 San Pump Station Royal Oak</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Adam Ripper</td>
<td>Most minor deficiencies have been addressed. Still awaiting MOE approval of RSC.</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>Jan-2017 to Apr-2021</td>
<td>$10,471,338.00</td>
<td>$274,447.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00304-30 - East Side Stage 1 Pump Station Design</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Alex Nichols</td>
<td>Negotiating extras and awaiting final invoice from consultant.</td>
<td>Project work complete</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Feb-2018 to Oct-2020</td>
<td>$327,211.00</td>
<td>$124,167.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00305-30 - SE Galt 3237 Dundas St PS, FM &amp; WM</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Adam Ripper</td>
<td>Subdivision approvals are working towards a pre-servicing agreement. 90% design submission has been made for the pump station.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to Dec-2021</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00326-30 - 18C042 Dover St Pumping Station Design</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Alex Nichols</td>
<td>Tender documents complete.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Mar-2019 to Nov-2020</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
<td>$26,115.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00393-40 - Region-Dundas St - Ph1 (Shade-Briercrest)</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Adam Ripper</td>
<td>2020 Phase 1A and Phase 1B construction work has been completed. Phase 2 work from Lowell St to Shade St to commence in spring 2021.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Apr-2020 to Dec-2021</td>
<td>$3,002,200.00</td>
<td>$1,584,445.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Id - Project Name</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Work Completed</td>
<td>Project Status</td>
<td>% Completed</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Plan Cost</td>
<td>Unexpended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00394-40 -Dover Street PS - Construction</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>Alex Nichols</td>
<td>Construction yet to begin.</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Nov-2020 to Nov-2021</td>
<td>$4,080,000.00</td>
<td>$4,080,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00431-30 -East side EW and NS Collector Rd Design</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Alex Nichols</td>
<td>Design continues for EW Road and a submission has been made to CP for the grade separated rail crossing.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Sep-2018 to Feb-2021</td>
<td>$1,265,000.00</td>
<td>$228,996.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00431-40 -East Side EW Collector Rd</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Alex Nichols</td>
<td>Construction has yet to begin.</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Mar-2021 to Oct-2021</td>
<td>$2,692,000.00</td>
<td>$2,692,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Development Engineering

- $54,061,268.00
- $29,241,404.27
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Id - Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
<th>Project Status % Completed</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Plan Cost</th>
<th>Unexpended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00001-30 - Beaverdale Rd Recons Stg 3-Storm</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Walter Buettel</td>
<td>Wood Environmental has completed their design portion of the project and has submitted their final design expectations.</td>
<td>Project work complete 100%</td>
<td>Aug-2008 to Dec-2020</td>
<td>$61,909.00</td>
<td>$5,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00064-30 - Infrastructure Design 2016</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Jamie Croft</td>
<td>Five (5) 2018 Design Assignments have been awarded. Three Design Assignments Complete. Elgin St. Design and Design Assignment 1 still in progress. Elgin Street Design ongoing with change to multi use trail from bike lanes being reviewed to reduce utility</td>
<td>In progress 90%</td>
<td>Sep-2016 to Jun-2021</td>
<td>$967,292.00</td>
<td>$142,769.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00081-20 - Beverly St EA/Design</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Prasad Samarakoon</td>
<td>Receive /reviewed 60 % Beverly street design submission.</td>
<td>In progress 70%</td>
<td>Feb-2018 to May-2021</td>
<td>$459,482.00</td>
<td>$203,563.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00091-30 - Black Bridge Road and Bridge, Design</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Scott Macdonald</td>
<td>Additional funding was approved by Council and the design assignment has been awarded.</td>
<td>In progress 41%</td>
<td>May-2018 to Apr-2022</td>
<td>$1,300,000.00</td>
<td>$748,597.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00268-30 - Queen Street Pumping Station Design 3412</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Prasad Samarakoon</td>
<td>Design work completed. Contract administration/inspection continues until construction ends. Construction complete 100%. Expecting one last invoice early in the new year from Aecom.</td>
<td>In progress 100%</td>
<td>Jun-2017 to Dec-2020</td>
<td>$300,284.00</td>
<td>$13,090.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00319-30 - Infrastructure Design 2018</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Jamie Croft</td>
<td>Dickson Streetscape Design is at 60%. Stakeholder 1 meeting held, stakeholder 2 meeting and virtual PIC held summer 2020. Awaiting 90% design submission expected late Fall 2020. Design Assignment 1 is 90% complete, reviewing consultant 90% packages</td>
<td>In progress 85%</td>
<td>May-2018 to Feb-2021</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
<td>$107,856.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00389-30 - Infrastructure Design 2019</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Jamie Croft</td>
<td>Design Assignment 2 awarded to AECOM. 30% Review completed. PIC's ongoing via virtual Engage Cambridge Fall 2020. Design proceeding to 60%.</td>
<td>In progress 40%</td>
<td>Nov-2019 to Jun-2021</td>
<td>$449,868.00</td>
<td>$226,975.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00391-30 - Region - King Street (Dover to Bishop)</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Sarah Austin</td>
<td>Underground work is completed in Stage 3 and portions of Stage 4, with road construction complete in the same areas.</td>
<td>In progress 75%</td>
<td>Jun-2019 to Aug-2021</td>
<td>$7,844,000.00</td>
<td>$3,206,845.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00392-40 - Regional Project - Franklin Blvd Improve</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Matt Holland</td>
<td>Project is in maintenance period. Awaiting final invoice from Region.</td>
<td>In maintenance 99%</td>
<td>May-2019 to Jun-2021</td>
<td>$1,868,000.00</td>
<td>$971,927.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00397-40 - Elliot St and Burrows St Reconstruction</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Xin Huang</td>
<td>Construction completed</td>
<td>In maintenance 90%</td>
<td>Jan-2019 to Oct-2021</td>
<td>$2,258,003.00</td>
<td>$294,743.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00439-40 - Queen St Pumping Station Upgrade</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>Prasad Samarakoon</td>
<td>100% of upgrade work complete. All deficiency work completed. Expecting one invoice from the contractor in the new year</td>
<td>In maintenance 100%</td>
<td>Mar-2019 to Dec-2020</td>
<td>$2,056,444.00</td>
<td>$113,907.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Id - Project Name</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Work Completed</td>
<td>Project Status</td>
<td>% Completed</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Plan Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/003440-40 -Wright Ave and Goldie Ave Reconstruction</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Scott Macdonald</td>
<td>Final inspection was completed and final payment certificate issued.</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Jan-2019 to Oct-2020</td>
<td>$1,969,298.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/003442-40 -Blair Road Culvert DV2162 Renewal</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Prasad Samarakoon</td>
<td>Project Complete</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Jun-2020 to Mar-2021</td>
<td>$560,742.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00444-30 -Infrastructure Design (2020)</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Jamie Croft</td>
<td>Moving towards 30% design on various streets Assignment 3. Virtual consultation starting Fall 2020, into Winter 2021. Design Assignment 4 RFP released and pending award.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>May-2020 to Jun-2022</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00667-40 -Forest Rd Reconstruction</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Prasad Samarakoon</td>
<td>Forest Road Stage 1 (Churchill to Cedar St) 100% complete. Stage 2 (Cedar St to Victoria St) 98% complete</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>May-2020 to Dec-2021</td>
<td>$1,634,039.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00689-40 -Old Mill Road Culvert Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Prasad Samarakoon</td>
<td>Still continues discussions with subject properties (ACL). Continue finalizing Agreement with subject property owners and Complete design work and construction by Summer 2021.</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Jul-2019 to Dec-2021</td>
<td>$400,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00670-40 -Trenchless Sanitary Sewer Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>Prasad Samarakoon</td>
<td>Tender awarded to a Contractor November 2020.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Mar-2021 to Jun-2021</td>
<td>$750,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00674-40 -Lutz St Reconstruction and Mill St Lot</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Xin Huang</td>
<td>Construction completed</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>May-2020 to Oct-2021</td>
<td>$1,334,034.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00675-10 -Elgin St N Utility Easement Acquisition</td>
<td>Land/Property</td>
<td>Paul Kan</td>
<td>Realty Services is securing easements from 9 properties. 8 of the property owners have agreed to terms and Realty Services is preparing agreements and reference plans. The 9th property owner has yet to respond. Realty Services is investigating further.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to Nov-2021</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00747-40 -SWM Pond 155 &amp; 163 - Design and Rehab</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>Walter Buettel</td>
<td>Design for Ponds 155 and 157 is being completed by Wood Engineering, design for Pond 163 is complete</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Aug-2020 to Aug-2021</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00751-40 -SWM Pond 118 - Design &amp; Rehab</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>Walter Buettel</td>
<td>Pond Rehab is now complete, restoration is complete. Outstanding issue at outfall of pond.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Sep-2020 to Oct-2020</td>
<td>$650,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00911-40 -Retaining Wall Maintenance (50 Queen St)</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>James Lawson</td>
<td>Work completed, in maintenance.</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Feb-2019 to Jul-2021</td>
<td>$94,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00915-40 -Clarence and Tannery Street Reconstruct</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Walter Buettel</td>
<td>Terracon has completed all site works</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Apr-2020 to Oct-2021</td>
<td>$2,306,164.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00916-40 -Selkirk and Tait Reconstruction</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Matt Holland</td>
<td>Selkirk St is completed to base asphalt. Tait St is completed to base asphalt. Surface paving planned for next year.</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Apr-2020 to Oct-2021</td>
<td>$2,818,805.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00917-40 -Cambridge and Park Hill Rd East Reconstr</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Scott Macdonald</td>
<td>Phase 2 is substantially complete.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to Dec-2021</td>
<td>$4,142,578.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00919-40 -Lansdowne Watermain Replacement</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Xin Huang</td>
<td>in maintenance.</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Apr-2020 to Oct-2021</td>
<td>$562,006.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00964-40 -Fearnwood St, Shaw Ave and Trillium Ave</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Walter Buettel</td>
<td>Fearnwood, Trillium and Shaw undergrounds, services and base asphalt is complete</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Aug-2020 to Jul-2021</td>
<td>$3,108,141.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00973-40 -King Street Decorative Lighting</td>
<td>Community Improvement</td>
<td>Sarah Austin</td>
<td>Design and installation to be completed in 2021.</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to Dec-2021</td>
<td>$630,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Id - Project Name</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Work Completed</td>
<td>Project Status</td>
<td>% Completed</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Plan Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00998-40 -Francis and John St Watermark Reconstruc</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Xin Huang</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Apr-2020 to Oct-2021</td>
<td>$479,324.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00997-40 -Cooper Street Relief Storm Sewer</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Matt Holland</td>
<td>Consultant is finished setting up storm model and will be sharing for review shortly with preliminary findings. Meeting to be set up to discuss consultant findings.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to May-2021</td>
<td>$270,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00999-20 -Dam Safety Assessments &amp; Implementation Study</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Scott Macdonald</td>
<td>Waiting for technical memo from Sanchez.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Jul-2020 to Sep-2021</td>
<td>$72,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01030-20 -Milling Rd Conceptual Development Study</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Matt Holland</td>
<td>Background information gathering complete. Contact with owners has been made and first stakeholder meeting has been set up for January 7th.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Feb-2020 to Aug-2021</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Cost:** $40,989,660.00 $15,186,272.23

---

**Parks, Recreation and Culture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Id - Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>% Completed</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Plan Cost</th>
<th>Unexpended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00002-30 -Hespeler Trail Project - Queen to Guelph</td>
<td>Active Transportation</td>
<td>Lisa Chominiec</td>
<td>Design contract awarded.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Aug-2020 to Mar-2021</td>
<td>$142,211.00</td>
<td>$140,684.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00178-40 -Riverside Park - Sports Netting</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Christopher Ziemski</td>
<td>Negotiations ongoing with MTO to recoup costs. Realty Services now has legal counsel dealing with the matter and legal discussions taking place.</td>
<td>Project work complete</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>Sep-2019 to Dec-2020</td>
<td>$142,449.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00180-40 -Neighbourhood Park Dev - Chrisview</td>
<td>Park Development</td>
<td>Shane Taylor</td>
<td>Park signage destroyed in car accident, to be replaced. Replacement sign has been ordered. All other site work now completed.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>Jan-2018 to Dec-2020</td>
<td>$115,000.00</td>
<td>$8,251.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00184-40 -Centennial Park - Relandscape/Lights</td>
<td>Park Development</td>
<td>Christopher Ziemski</td>
<td>Dry stone wall re-build arranged delayed until Oct. Lighting option review to be completed in Oct.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Jun-2015 to Jun-2021</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$123,668.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00186-40 -Neighbourhood Park Dev - Limerick</td>
<td>Park Development</td>
<td>Shane Taylor</td>
<td>Developer delays - park block not ready - soils need to be graded before seeding can happen. Anticipate grading to be completed by developer in 2020. Capital funding deferred to 2021.</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Jan-2018 to Nov-2021</td>
<td>$115,000.00</td>
<td>$113,319.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00193-20 -Special Events Strategy</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Lesley Head</td>
<td>Report is completed. Under review by DCM.</td>
<td>Project work complete</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>Jan-2018 to Mar-2019</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>$10,019.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00311-40 -Sports Facility Infra Rev</td>
<td>Park Development</td>
<td>Christopher Ziemski</td>
<td>Finance still working on the contribution funding within discussions over the language of the agreement. A report to go to council early 2021 for approval of new contribution agreement.</td>
<td>Project work complete</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>May-2018 to Mar-2021</td>
<td>$389,700.00</td>
<td>$8,170.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00464-40 -Neighbourhood Park Dev - Highland Ridge</td>
<td>Park Development</td>
<td>Christopher Ziemski</td>
<td>Playground installation to take place late spring of 2021 following review of Playground submissions to the developer.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Apr-2020 to Apr-2021</td>
<td>$292,700.00</td>
<td>$292,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00465-40 -Multi-Use Trail Development (2020)</td>
<td>Active Transportation</td>
<td>Shane Taylor</td>
<td>Phase 1 construction complete and in maintenance. Environmental studies and design of future phases not yet underway.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Apr-2020 to Aug-2021</td>
<td>$204,000.00</td>
<td>$135,877.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Total Cost:** $40,989,660.00 $15,186,272.23
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Id - Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>% Completed</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Plan Cost</th>
<th>Unexpended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00006-40 -Galt St Park - Playground Replacement</td>
<td>Park Development</td>
<td>Shane Taylor</td>
<td>Currently on ‘pause’ due to COVID-19 restrictions</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Jun-2020 to Nov-2021</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00007-40 -Northview Heights Lookout - Playground</td>
<td>Park Development</td>
<td>Shane Taylor</td>
<td>Currently on ‘pause’ due to COVID-19 restrictions</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Jun-2020 to Nov-2021</td>
<td>$85,000.00</td>
<td>$95,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00010-40 -Fountain St Soccer Facility Design</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Shane Taylor</td>
<td>Concept/schematic design underway.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Mar-2020 to Apr-2021</td>
<td>$614,390.00</td>
<td>$604,621.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00027-40 -Wilmer Park Improvement</td>
<td>Park Development</td>
<td>Shane Taylor</td>
<td>Construction complete and accepted into maintenance September 30, 2020. 1-year warranty inspection to be completed September 2021.</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Jul-2019 to Sep-2021</td>
<td>$258,340.00</td>
<td>$31,927.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00058-40 -Trail Bridges Replacement (2019)</td>
<td>Active Transportation</td>
<td>Shane Taylor</td>
<td>All site work now completed. In maintenance until August 2021.</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Feb-2019 to Sep-2021</td>
<td>$637,000.00</td>
<td>$22,030.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00061-20 -Parkland Strategy</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Brian Geerts</td>
<td>Request for Proposal being drafted for review and release by year end or into Jan 2021.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Aug-2019 to Oct-2020</td>
<td>$227,300.00</td>
<td>$227,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00091-20 -Blair/Preston Pedestrian Bridge - EA</td>
<td>Active Transportation</td>
<td>Shane Taylor</td>
<td>Archaeological stage 1 &amp; 2 completed, stage 3&amp;4 will be required. Public consultation was run on the Engage platform for the month of November.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Apr-2019 to Jul-2021</td>
<td>$179,052.00</td>
<td>$43,949.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00095-40 -Devil’s Creek Trail - Retaining Wall</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Shane Taylor</td>
<td>Construction completed October 2020. 1-year warranty inspection in October 2021.</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to Oct-2021</td>
<td>$56,163.00</td>
<td>$13,198.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01025-40 -Grand River Access Point Improvement</td>
<td>Community Improvement</td>
<td>Christopher Ziemski</td>
<td>Awaiting the scheduling of the design review. Following up with RT04 on funding concerns. Tree inventory and survey now complete.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>Sep-2019 to Feb-2022</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>$145,675.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01037-40 -Grand Trunk Trail Upgrade</td>
<td>Active Transportation</td>
<td>Shane Taylor</td>
<td>Trail construction completed, safety fence and service gate installation taking place early December 2020.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Aug-2020 to Nov-2021</td>
<td>$90,000.00</td>
<td>$29,721.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parks, Recreation and Culture**

$4,058,305.00 $2,121,115.78

---

**Planning Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Id - Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>% Completed</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Plan Cost</th>
<th>Unexpended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00008-20 -Zoning By-Law Update</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Deanne Friess</td>
<td>Project underway. Final draft comments sent to consultant. Waiting for final draft from consultant. Work still to be done internally to revise 2019 and 2020 site specific.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>Jul-2013 to Dec-2020</td>
<td>$269,937.00</td>
<td>$120,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00007-20 -Assessing Infilling &amp; Intensification</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Valerie Norris</td>
<td>Percentage of work completed remains unchanged as staff and consultant are working to complete review/revisions of the final draft of the Hespeler Road Corridor Secondary Plan.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>Apr-2015 to Dec-2020</td>
<td>$305,226.00</td>
<td>$12,778.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00010-20 -Urban Design - Galt Height Guidelines</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Deanne Friess</td>
<td>Draft guidelines prepared and provided to steering committee. Next steps to do visualizations and schedule public consultation. Visualization proposals submitted by consultant and to be added to workplan</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>Jun-2018 to Dec-2020</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$4,949.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00223-20 -East Side Lands MESP</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Katherine Padgett</td>
<td>Hearing scheduled for Feb 25, 2021 for five weeks and and will be de novo under the new LPAT rules</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>Jan-2016 to Jun-2021</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Id - Project Name</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Work Completed</td>
<td>Project Status</td>
<td>% Completed</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Plan Cost</td>
<td>Unexpended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00738-20 -Growth Management Study Update (2019)</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Elaine Brunn Shaw</td>
<td>This work will commence in Q4 2020 to allow time for the Region's OP update to inform the City's Growth Management Study. ROP completion is delayed.</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Mar-2019 to Mar-2020</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>$219,750.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00739-20 -Galt Core Heritage Conservation District</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Abraham Plunkett Latimer</td>
<td>A temporary Senior Planner - Heritage has been hired. A RFQ was released. The Project Steering Committee met on December 21st and approved the hiring of ASI as project consultants to begin work on the project in January subject to the required approvals.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Oct-2020 to May-2021</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,115,707.00</td>
<td>$473,997.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Works - Sanitary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00257-40 -Pumping Station Security Access Control</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Jason Alexander</td>
<td>All stations security systems have been installed, Electrical modifications almost complete and programming of system complete. Final invoicing for work should be received by the end of November.</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Sep-2016 to Dec-2019</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$37,603.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00261-20 -Pumping Station Operating Procedure Dev</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Harpreet Sumra</td>
<td>Received 50% Draft report for Review.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Mar-2020 to Mar-2021</td>
<td>$246,661.00</td>
<td>$161,478.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00380-40 -White Oak Pump Station Renewal</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>Harpreet Sumra</td>
<td></td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Sep-2020 to Dec-2021</td>
<td>$852,700.00</td>
<td>$105,408.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00753-40 -Burnett Pumping Station Renewal</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>Harpreet Sumra</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Feb-2020 to Jan-2021</td>
<td>$433,700.00</td>
<td>$235,299.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Works - Sanitary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,506,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public works - Water</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00238-40 -AMl Implementation</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>Walter Malcolm</td>
<td>As of December 29 2020 17,768 meters are transmitting on the network. Completion by district are as follows: East Galt (26.5%), South Galt (62.7%), Preston (98.2%), West Galt (87.9%).</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>Jun-2018 to Jun-2021</td>
<td>$11,921,000.00</td>
<td>$3,418,447.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public works - Water</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,921,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Id - Project Name</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Work Completed</td>
<td>Project Status</td>
<td>% Completed</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Plan Cost</td>
<td>Unexpended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00083-40 - LED Street Lighting Installation</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>Walter Malcolm</td>
<td>Phase 1, conversion of all Cobrahead streetlights complete Phase 2, Decorative and Post top Street Light conversion, project will start again over Winter 2020/21 to start installation in 2021.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Jan-2016 to May-2022</td>
<td>$3,400,000.00</td>
<td>$1,858,793.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00384-41 - Dunbar Rd Active Transportation</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Lisa Chominiec</td>
<td>Additional funds approved. Contract awarded for construction.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>Dec-2019 to Aug-2021</td>
<td>$412,724.00</td>
<td>$360,397.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00448-40 - Railway Improvements</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>Dennis Lopes</td>
<td>Major improvements Work Plan Developed May - September 2021 Completion Transport Canada Grant Funding Applications Completed Minor Improvements (Signage &amp; Pavement Markings) Completed</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Jan-2019 to Oct-2021</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$97,849.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00734-20 - Hespeler Village Core Area Parking Study</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Juliana Petrovich</td>
<td>Working on Request for Proposal to hire consultant, first draft of scope complete. Delayed to accommodate COVID-19 disruptions to parking patterns. Current anticipated resumption Spring 2021.</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Mar-2020 to Dec-2021</td>
<td>$57,000.00</td>
<td>$57,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00735-40 - Newman Drive Sidewalk Installation</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development</td>
<td>Dennis Lopes</td>
<td>Detail Design 60% Completed. Planning for PIC January 2021</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>Mar-2019 to Aug-2021</td>
<td>$70,000.00</td>
<td>$58,001.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00960-40 - Traffic Calming Implementation</td>
<td>Community Improvement</td>
<td>Shannon Noonan</td>
<td>Majority of work to be completed by end of 2020, some work will be completed in 2021.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to Jun-2021</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$105,140.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transportation Engineering

$4,239,724.00 $2,337,182.49
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Id - Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>% Completed</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Plan Cost</th>
<th>Unexpended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Enterprise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00149-10 - Recreation Complex - Feasibility Study</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Mary Kennedy</td>
<td>Preston Memorial Auditorium Improvement and Expansion</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Mar-2015 to Dec-2021</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00278-20 - Asset Life Cycle Planning Tool Expansion</td>
<td>New Enterprise Application</td>
<td>Johannes Krijnen</td>
<td>Upgrade to asset renewal planning system delayed to 2021; Reviewing existing Inframodes system and evaluating other systems available for upgrades.</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>Oct-2017 to Dec-2020</td>
<td>$70,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00968-40 - Sanitary Forcemain Inspection</td>
<td>Condition Assessment</td>
<td>Matthew Zevenbergen</td>
<td>Field work for the Sanitary Forcemain inspection for the two (2) forcemains at Dover Pump Station has been completed. Review of the final results is underway.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to Dec-2020</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Management &amp; PMO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,270,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00869-20 - Strategic Plan (2020-2023)</td>
<td>Strategy &amp; Governance</td>
<td>Nicole Drake</td>
<td>Phase 2 final report to Council on January 12; Proceeding with action and implementation planning (Phase 3) in Q1</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Oct-2019 to Mar-2021</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00690-40 - Security Cameras Phase 3</td>
<td>Security &amp; Risk Mgmt</td>
<td>Trevor McWilliams</td>
<td>Project to be initiated in 2021 after completion of King Street Streetscaping.</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>May-2020 to Dec-2020</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01036-20 - Sponsorship &amp; Advertising Strategy</td>
<td>Community Improvement</td>
<td>Trevor McWilliams</td>
<td></td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Id - Project Name</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Work Completed</td>
<td>Project Status</td>
<td>% Completed</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Plan Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00352-10 -Green Fleet Initiative</td>
<td>Community Improvement</td>
<td>Andrew Corstorphine</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>May-2018 to Apr-2021</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00417-40 -Energy Management - Galt Arena</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Andrew Corstorphine</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Mar-2019 to Jun-2021</td>
<td>$381,000.00</td>
<td>$254,289.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00691-40 -Elgin St Storage Building Air Exhaust Sy</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Andrew Corstorphine</td>
<td>Project work complete</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Mar-2019 to Dec-2020</td>
<td>$118,372.00</td>
<td>$9,512.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00695-40 -Gore Fountain</td>
<td>Community Improvement</td>
<td>Andrew Corstorphine</td>
<td>Quote awarded</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Apr-2020 to Sep-2021</td>
<td>$55,000.00</td>
<td>$55,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00785-20 -Corp Facilities Master plan &amp; Fuel study</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Lisa Keys</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Aug-2019 to Sep-2021</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01004-40 -EV Charging Infrastructure</td>
<td>Community Improvement</td>
<td>Andrew Corstorphine</td>
<td>Contractor selected</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to Jun-2021</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01015-30 -Outdoor Pool Infrastructure</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Andrew Corstorphine</td>
<td>Pumps replaced at Hancock Pool, pump installation at Soper delayed. Additional investigations for off-season work being completed.</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>Feb-2020 to Dec-2021</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$92,491.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Facilities**

$1,054,372.00 $811,294.07 $243,078.00

**Fleet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Id - Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>% Completed</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Plan Cost</th>
<th>Unexpended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00356-10 -Rep. Equip. - 3/4 ton Crew Cab Service T</td>
<td>Equipment Purchase</td>
<td>Michael Hewlett</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Feb-2017 to Jun-2021</td>
<td>$120,700.00</td>
<td>$120,700.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00277-10 -AVL System expansion</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Michael Hewlett</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Jun-2017 to Jan-2021</td>
<td>$64,700.00</td>
<td>$9,796.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00333-10 -2-Way Radio Equipment Replacement</td>
<td>Equipment Purchase</td>
<td>Michael Hewlett</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Jan-2018 to Sep-2021</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>$155,777.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00337-10 -Rep. Equip. 3 Ton Roll Off Unit (7968)</td>
<td>Equipment Purchase</td>
<td>Michael Hewlett</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Feb-2018 to Jul-2021</td>
<td>$125,300.00</td>
<td>$125,300.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00339-10 -Rep. Equip. Crew Cab Truck (8980)</td>
<td>Equipment Purchase</td>
<td>Michael Hewlett</td>
<td>Vehicle has been awarded and ordered. Awaiting delivery.</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Feb-2018 to Jan-2021</td>
<td>$57,600.00</td>
<td>$57,600.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Id - Project Name</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Work Completed</td>
<td>Project Status % Completed</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Plan Cost</td>
<td>Unexpended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00348-10 - Traffic Control Truck (Asset 10406)</td>
<td>Equipment Purchase</td>
<td>Michael Hewlett</td>
<td>Cab and chassis awarded January 2020 delivery. Custom body design complete, RFQ specification under development. Specifications defined, currently RFQ in draft.</td>
<td>In progress 30%</td>
<td>May-2018 to Jun-2021</td>
<td>$72,600.00</td>
<td>$72,600.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00351-20 - Remote Fuel Storage Tank Assessment</td>
<td>Condition Assessment</td>
<td>Michael Hewlett</td>
<td>Storage tank reviews ongoing. Parklawn diesel tank planning in progress.</td>
<td>In progress 30%</td>
<td>May-2018 to Jun-2021</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
<td>$75,524.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00859-10 - Equipment Growth (2019)</td>
<td>Equipment Purchase</td>
<td>Michael Hewlett</td>
<td>Ice Resurfacer and ATV are remaining replacements to be completed. All other assets identified in this project have been completed. ATV needs under review (electric vs gas)</td>
<td>In progress 80%</td>
<td>May-2019 to Dec-2021</td>
<td>$819,100.00</td>
<td>$151,557.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00855-10 - Equipment Replacement (2019)</td>
<td>Equipment Purchase</td>
<td>Michael Hewlett</td>
<td>Multiple replacement pickup trucks have been ordered with an anticipated January delivery, up-fit will follow. Traffic truck body design has been developed and specification under development for RFQ. Chassis ordered with January delivery.</td>
<td>In progress 70%</td>
<td>May-2019 to Jul-2021</td>
<td>$1,035,567.00</td>
<td>$860,830.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00896-10 - Fleet Equipment Replacement 2020</td>
<td>Equipment Purchase</td>
<td>Michael Hewlett</td>
<td>Pickup trucks in this project awarded. Other specifications under development. Specification development for other assets identified in this project are under development.</td>
<td>In progress 45%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to Jun-2021</td>
<td>$3,190,285.00</td>
<td>$2,385,131.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,815,852.00</td>
<td>$4,014,818.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk and Compliance</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
<th>Project Status % Completed</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Plan Cost</th>
<th>Unexpended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00329-20 - Enterprise Risk Management</td>
<td>Security &amp; Risk Mgmnt</td>
<td>Olu Ojikutu</td>
<td>Project is in progress with the ERM Software purchased, configured and live for incidents and certificates of insurance. The ERM framework has been documented and approved. Consultants to do operational risk assessments will be initiated fall 2020.</td>
<td>In progress 50%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to Jun-2021</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>$56,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk and Compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>$56,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable Design &amp; Dev</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
<th>Project Status % Completed</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Plan Cost</th>
<th>Unexpended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00102-40 - Historic Post Office Renovations</td>
<td>New Facility</td>
<td>Slobodanka Lekic</td>
<td>In the heritage stairwell contractor installed drywall over waterproofing.</td>
<td>In maintenance 99%</td>
<td>Mar-2015 to Dec-2021</td>
<td>$14,984,597.00</td>
<td>$729,029.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00102-42 - Historic Post Office - Snow Guards</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Slobodanka Lekic</td>
<td>Snow guards on the west elevation is installed. The contractor obtain a permit from the Region of Waterloo to close sidewalk.</td>
<td>In progress 50%</td>
<td>Jun-2020 to Mar-2021</td>
<td>$85,000.00</td>
<td>$85,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00142-10 - 17 Cambridge Street</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Slobodanka Lekic</td>
<td>Electrical, mechanical, canopy structural work, flooring and paint work are done.</td>
<td>In progress 90%</td>
<td>Mar-2020 to Mar-2021</td>
<td>$955,664.00</td>
<td>$86,455.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Id - Project Name</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Work Completed</td>
<td>Project Status</td>
<td>% Completed</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Plan Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00173-40 - Forbes Park Revitalization Phase I</td>
<td>Park Development</td>
<td>Steven Ruffini</td>
<td>substantial performance achieved</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>Apr-2016 to Jun-2021</td>
<td>$375,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00195-30 - Station 6 Design</td>
<td>New Facility</td>
<td>Steven Ruffini</td>
<td>LEED submission review,</td>
<td>Project work complete</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>Aug-2016 to Dec-2020</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00196-40 - Station 6 Construction</td>
<td>New Facility</td>
<td>Steven Ruffini</td>
<td>maintenance manuals review, electrical info for Leed</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>Nov-2016 to Jun-2021</td>
<td>$4,272,470.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00359-30 - Farmers' Market Design</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Slobodanka Lekic</td>
<td>Electrical work, ceiling and windows are complete.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Feb-2018 to Jun-2021</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00362-40 - Riverside Grandstand Roof Replacement</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Steven Ruffini</td>
<td>Capital project change form completed</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Feb-2018 to Dec-2020</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00414-40 - Fire Hall Infrastructure - Station 2</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Slobodanka Lekic</td>
<td>Restoration is completed. Substantial performance is achieved.</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>Mar-2019 to Jun-2021</td>
<td>$247,889.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00420-30 - Preston Auditorium - Design</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Steven Ruffini</td>
<td>Schematic design approval</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to Dec-2022</td>
<td>$984,365.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00421-40 - Market Building Renovations</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Slobodanka Lekic</td>
<td>Electrical work, ceiling and windows are complete.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>May-2020 to Jun-2021</td>
<td>$562,188.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00463-30 - Recreation Complex - Design</td>
<td>New Facility</td>
<td>Slobodanka Lekic</td>
<td>A feasibility study to investigate opportunities to share amenities and facilities with the School Board and library is underway as a part of project A/00149-10.</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to Jul-2025</td>
<td>$5,585,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00463-40 - Rec Complex - Site Prep &amp; Servicing</td>
<td>New Facility</td>
<td>Slobodanka Lekic</td>
<td>Grading is complete.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Sep-2019 to Dec-2021</td>
<td>$4,400,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00861-40 - Hespeler Arena Entrance Improvement</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Slobodanka Lekic</td>
<td>Construction is complete.</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>May-2019 to Jan-2021</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00889-30 - Historic City Hall Belfry Restore Design</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Slobodanka Lekic</td>
<td>Scaffolding is removed and deficiencies corrected. Installation of storm windows near completion. Substantial performance certificate is achieved.</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>Jul-2019 to Jun-2021</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00893-30 - Design - Facility Renovations</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Slobodanka Lekic</td>
<td>Due to project manager's workload this project is on hold.</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>May-2020 to Dec-2021</td>
<td>$70,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00966-40 - Historic City Hall Restoration</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Slobodanka Lekic</td>
<td>Scaffolding is removed, storm windows are near completion. Substantial completion certificate is achieved.</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to May-2022</td>
<td>$429,428.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00761-40 - Heritage restoration, flat roof CCA/DDC</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Slobodanka Lekic</td>
<td>All deficiencies of heritage restoration work are completed. As built documentation is submitted and approved.</td>
<td>In maintenance</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>Feb-2019 to Jun-2021</td>
<td>$417,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00949-40 - DDC &amp; Arts Centre Roof &amp; Heritage</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Slobodanka Lekic</td>
<td>RFP for prequalification of heritage contractors is closed.</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to May-2022</td>
<td>$355,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00951-40 - Hespeler Arena Skylights</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Steven Ruffini</td>
<td>shop drawings, construction</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Feb-2020 to Jun-2021</td>
<td>$196,722.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sustainable Design & Dev**

$34,670,423.00 $12,557,331.70
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Id - Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>% Completed</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Plan Cost</th>
<th>Unexpended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00202-10 -P25 Radio Compliance</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Damond Jamieson</td>
<td>Successful switchover to new P25 system.</td>
<td>Project work complete</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>May-2017 to Dec-2020</td>
<td>$412,000.00</td>
<td>-$51,908.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00378-10 -Intergraph Computer Aided Dispatch</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Damond Jamieson</td>
<td>ICAD installation has completed at Kitchener Fire Department Headquarters.</td>
<td>Project work complete</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>Feb-2018 to Dec-2020</td>
<td>$742,000.00</td>
<td>$30,160.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00504-10 -Fire Apparatus 2020</td>
<td>Equipment Purchase</td>
<td>Damond Jamieson</td>
<td>Pre-build completed.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Oct-2020 to Dec-2021</td>
<td>$1,430,000.00</td>
<td>$1,430,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01029-40 -Fire Services Dispatch Renovations</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Damond Jamieson</td>
<td>Phase I of work complete.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to Dec-2020</td>
<td>$137,500.00</td>
<td>$67,407.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,721,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Id - Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Plan Cost</th>
<th>Unexpended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00275-50 -Employee Intranet Development</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Mohammad Mamun</td>
<td>Project on hold. Evaluating project timeline. Initial stakeholder consultation complete.</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Jan-2017 to Dec-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00282-50 -TS Data architecture and Process review</td>
<td>Networks &amp; Information Mgmt</td>
<td>Kirby Childerhose</td>
<td>Initial scope defined. Infotech is engaged as a partner and the project charter is currently being worked on and will be delivered by the end of the quarter.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>May-2017 to Dec-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00341-40 -Amanda Roadmap Implementation (2018)</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Mohammad Mamun</td>
<td>Digitalization plan is complete. Currently working on requirements for updates to film permit, trade licenses and permit rebates.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Mar-2018 to Jun-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00347-10 -Disaster Recovery Site Enhancements</td>
<td>Security &amp; Risk Mgmt</td>
<td>Mohammad Mamun</td>
<td>Recruitment for the emergency planning coordinator is ongoing, interviews to be completed by Feb 7th.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Feb-2018 to Jun-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00407-10 -Relational Database -Oracle MSSQL Upgrade</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Mohammad Mamun</td>
<td>Recruitment for the emergency planning coordinator is ongoing, interviews to be completed by Feb 7th.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to Dec-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00788-40 -ActiveNet Roadmap Implementation 2019</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Mohammad Mamun</td>
<td>SAP/ActiveNet refund integration complete. Other ActiveNET project plans currently being validated with stakeholders. Discussions with business units has started in regards to a long term plan for ActiveNET.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Mar-2019 to Jun-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00791-40 -Corporate BI, Dashboard and Reporting 20</td>
<td>New Enterprise Application</td>
<td>Kirby Childerhose</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to Dec-2021</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00793-20 -Corporate Payment System Assess/Upgrade</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Mohammad Mamun</td>
<td>We are working on moving all online payments to 3rd party vendor to reduce the risk. This work is ongoing.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Mar-2019 to Jun-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00795-40 -Enterprise Content Mgmt Implementation</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Mohammad Mamun</td>
<td>Implementation of base ECM system is still ongoing and further work under this project will commence upon its completion. Decommissioning of Documentum has begun.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to Jun-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00796-40 -Fire Technology Strategy Implementation</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Mohammad Mamun</td>
<td>Planning has been completed.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Jan-2019 to Jun-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00797-40 -GIS Strategy Implementation 2019</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Kirby Childerhose</td>
<td>Planning underway, continuing through 2020. Work will be initiated in 2021. No funds are currently being spent.</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Jan-2021 to Jun-2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00798-40 -Service Desk Configuration Management and Management Enhancements</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Ryan Small</td>
<td>Implementation for tracking hardware assets in the IT Service Management application is ongoing.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Oct-2019 to Jun-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00803-40 -CityONE (SAP) Enhancements 2020</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Mohammad Mamun</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to Mar-2021</td>
<td>$350,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Id · Project Name</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Work Completed</td>
<td>Project Status</td>
<td>% Completed</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00922-10 · IT Security Enhancements 2020</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Ryan Small</td>
<td>Security roadmap, gap analysis and solution testing work is ongoing. Identity and Access Management solution procurement is in its ongoing.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to Dec-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00923-10 · MS Office and Exchange- End of Life 2020</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Ryan Small</td>
<td>Currently rolling out Office with users receiving the updated software. Exchange environment has been install, configured and integrated into the current environment.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to Jun-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01000-40 · Amanda Roadmap Implementation 2020</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Kirby Childerhose</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to Apr-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01001-40 · City-Wide Maximo Implementation 2020</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Mohammad Mamun</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to Jun-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Id - Project Name</td>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Work Completed</td>
<td>Project Status</td>
<td>% Completed</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00362-10 - Library Computer Equipment (18R003)</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Mirna Raponi</td>
<td>Work completed</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Feb-2018 to Oct-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00363-40 - Library Queen Sq Boiler Replace</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Mirna Raponi</td>
<td>Boiler installed and commissioned. Air intake system installed.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Feb-2018 to Nov-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00475-10 - Library Materials</td>
<td>Community Improvement</td>
<td>Mirna Raponi</td>
<td>Complete.</td>
<td>Project work complete</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to Dec-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00476-10 - Library Computer Equipment</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Mirna Raponi</td>
<td>Project planning.</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to Mar-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00479-10 - Library Website Upgrade</td>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>Mirna Raponi</td>
<td>Project planning</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Jan-2020 to Mar-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00826-40 - Library Roof Replacement - QS 1968</td>
<td>Facility Renovation</td>
<td>Mirna Raponi</td>
<td>Roof condition assessment.</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Oct-2020 to Oct-2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Library**

**Project Type** | **Project Status** | **% Completed** | **Schedule** | **Plan Cost** | **Unexpended**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Technology Upgrades | In progress | 100% | Feb-2018 to Oct-2020 | $203,000.00 | $12,848.95
Facility Renovation | Boiler installed and commissioned. Air intake system installed. | In progress | 95% | Feb-2018 to Nov-2020 | $249,000.00 | $49,994.35
Community Improvement | Complete. | Project work complete | 100% | Jan-2020 to Dec-2020 | $105,000.00 | $0.00
Technology Upgrades | Project planning. | Delayed | 0% | Jan-2020 to Mar-2021 | $112,000.00 | $112,000.00
Technology Upgrades | Project planning | In progress | 5% | Jan-2020 to Mar-2021 | $66,000.00 | $66,000.00
Facility Renovation | Roof condition assessment. | Delayed | 0% | Oct-2020 to Oct-2021 | $275,000.00 | $275,000.00
Technology Upgrades | Staff computer purchase complete. Security cameras for one location complete. Internet management hardware contract awarded. | In progress | 45% | Jan-2019 to Mar-2021 | $150,000.00 | $99,232.33

**Library**

---

$1,160,000.00 | $615,075.63
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Id - Project Name</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Work Completed</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>% Completed</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Plan Cost</th>
<th>Unexpended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00150-10 - Land Acquisition</td>
<td>Land/Property Acquisition</td>
<td>Paul Kan</td>
<td>Land acquisition completed on March 31, 2020. Property turned-over to PRC for design and construction. Outstanding item is to recover $100K commitment from Cambridge Youth Soccer at construction completion.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Jun-2018 to Mar-2020</td>
<td>$1,271,100.00</td>
<td>$10,724.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00263-10 - Sanitary Sewer Easement Acquisition</td>
<td>Land/Property Acquisition</td>
<td>Paul Kan</td>
<td>7 of the 10 current easement files have been acquired. 3 are ongoing. No recent change.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>May-2016 to Jan-2021</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
<td>$280,200.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00666-10 - Land Acquisition 1 - Confidential</td>
<td>Land/Property Acquisition</td>
<td>Paul Kan</td>
<td>There are a total of 11 properties required for the Black Bridge project of which 5 have been acquired to date. Acquisition of 1000 Black Bridge Road scheduled to close November 16, 2020.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Mar-2019 to Dec-2021</td>
<td>$3,875,000.00</td>
<td>$1,284,500.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00746-10 - Land Acquisition 2 - Confidential</td>
<td>Land/Property Acquisition</td>
<td>Paul Kan</td>
<td>Property requirement and business case to be determined.</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Aug-2020 to Dec-2021</td>
<td>$650,000.00</td>
<td>$650,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Realty and Property Services
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Previous Forecast</th>
<th>Actual Cost To December 2020</th>
<th>Forecast Increase / (Decrease)</th>
<th>Funding Source &amp; Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/00392-40 Regional Project - Franklin Blvd Improvements Year 2 North (19C033)</td>
<td>1,868,000</td>
<td>1,868,000</td>
<td>896,073</td>
<td>(936,927)</td>
<td>Return $368,927 to Water RF and $568,000 to DC Roadways RF to close this project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00397-40 Elliott St and Burrows St Reconstruction (19C040)</td>
<td>2,335,000</td>
<td>2,258,003</td>
<td>2,009,656</td>
<td>(91,041)</td>
<td>Return $69 to Capital Works RF, $22,048 to Wastewater RF, $38,924 to Water RF and $30,000 to Gas tax RF to close this project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00420-30 Preston Auditorium - Design (2020)</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>984,365</td>
<td>42,162</td>
<td>39,800</td>
<td>Transfer $39,800 via debenture from construction project A/00420-40 as approved through project change form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00442-40 Blair Road Culvert DV2162 Renewal</td>
<td>588,000</td>
<td>560,742</td>
<td>539,083</td>
<td>(7,560)</td>
<td>Return $7,560 to Gas tax RF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00667-40 Forest Rd Reconstruction</td>
<td>1,571,000</td>
<td>1,634,039</td>
<td>1,367,425</td>
<td>(55,000)</td>
<td>Return $4,105 to Capital Works RF, 19,559 to Wastewater RF, $10,117 to Water RF, and $21,219 to Gas Tax RF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00670-40 Trenchless Sanitary Sewer Rehabilitation (CIPP)</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(3,767)</td>
<td>Return $3,767 to Capital Works RF as per approved tender T20-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00674-40 Lutz Street Reconstruction and Mill Street Parking Lot Reconstruction</td>
<td>1,850,000</td>
<td>1,334,034</td>
<td>948,574</td>
<td>(235,272)</td>
<td>Return $141,429 to Capital Works RF, $55,693 to Wastewater RF, and $38,150 back to Water RF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00916-40 Selkirk and Tait Reconstruction</td>
<td>2,850,000</td>
<td>2,818,805</td>
<td>2,181,277</td>
<td>(335,000)</td>
<td>Return $9,785 to Capital Works RF, $91,181 to Wastewater RF, $7,664 to Water RF, and $226,370 to gas tax RF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00919-40 Landsdowne Watermain Replacement</td>
<td>532,000</td>
<td>502,006</td>
<td>347,502</td>
<td>(100,685)</td>
<td>Return $100,685 to Water RF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00964-40 Fearnwood St, Shaw Ave and Trillium Ave Reconstruction</td>
<td>3,095,000</td>
<td>3,108,141</td>
<td>2,549,025</td>
<td>(259,028)</td>
<td>Return $52,992 to Capital Works RF, $52,094 to Wastewater RF, $61,170 to Water RF, and $92,722 to Gas Tax RF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00996-40 Francis and John Street Watermain Reconstruction</td>
<td>805,000</td>
<td>479,324</td>
<td>335,613</td>
<td>(96,405)</td>
<td>Return $96,405 to Water RF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Previous Forecast</th>
<th>Actual Cost To December 2020</th>
<th>Forecast Increase / (Decrease)</th>
<th>Funding Source &amp; Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A/0091-30 Black Bridge Road, Design of Bridge and (17C043)</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>551,403</td>
<td>170,669</td>
<td>Draw $159,669 from Capital Works RF and $11,002 from DC Roadway RF as per approved report 20-303 (CRS) - P20-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00202-10 P25 Radio Compliance (17Q006)</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>412,000</td>
<td>815,927</td>
<td>413,196</td>
<td>as per report 20-271 (CRS) a forecast increase of $413,196 from the closure of A/00429-10 $100,000 and a contribution from CWRF $313,196.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00384-41 Dunbar Rd Active Transportation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>412,724</td>
<td>56,904</td>
<td>304,659</td>
<td>Draw $304,659 from Capital Works RF as per approved report 20-253 (CRS) - Tender T20-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00429-10 Station Alerting System (19Q004)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(100,000)</td>
<td>Cancel project and transfer $100,000 to A/000202-10 as per approved report 20-271 (CRS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/00666-10 Land Acquisition 1 - CONFIDENTIAL</td>
<td>1,750,000</td>
<td>3,375,000</td>
<td>2,590,499</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>Draw $500,000 from Cap Works RF as per approved Report 20-208(OCM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/01015-30 Design - Decommission outdoor pools</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>7,509</td>
<td>303,000</td>
<td>Draw $303,000 from Facility Mtc RF as per approved report 20-300 (CRE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Total net project decrease | (489,361) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reserve Fund</th>
<th>Actual Current Balance as of December 31, 2020</th>
<th>Committed to Capital Projects</th>
<th>Uncommitted Balance</th>
<th>Forecast Change Impact</th>
<th>Revised Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Works Reserve Fund</td>
<td>$5,748,042</td>
<td>$10,025</td>
<td>$5,758,067</td>
<td>$(276,122)</td>
<td>$5,481,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Capital Reserve Fund</td>
<td>$7,355,214</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,355,214</td>
<td>$521,846</td>
<td>$7,877,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water System Capital Res Fund</td>
<td>$10,395,628</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,395,628</td>
<td>$949,874</td>
<td>$11,345,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Improvements</td>
<td>$398,320</td>
<td></td>
<td>$398,320</td>
<td>$(2,621)</td>
<td>$395,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbarium Purchase Res Fund</td>
<td>$138,725</td>
<td></td>
<td>$138,725</td>
<td>$29,894</td>
<td>$168,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Mtce RF</td>
<td>$3,912,100</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,912,100</td>
<td>$(311,000)</td>
<td>$3,601,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Conservation</td>
<td>$1,643,781</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,643,781</td>
<td>$9,852</td>
<td>$1,653,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Tax Reserve Fund</td>
<td>$4,984,266</td>
<td>$(4,457,331)</td>
<td>$526,935</td>
<td>$724,073</td>
<td>$1,251,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charges-San. Sewer</td>
<td>$(5,811,745)</td>
<td>$(2,268,627)</td>
<td>$(8,080,372)</td>
<td>$42,901</td>
<td>$(8,037,471)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charges-Watermains</td>
<td>$4,075,885</td>
<td>$(1,244,740)</td>
<td>$2,831,145</td>
<td>$52,871</td>
<td>$2,884,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charges-Roadways</td>
<td>$5,153,014</td>
<td>$(3,544,269)</td>
<td>$1,608,745</td>
<td>$1,003,381</td>
<td>$2,612,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charges-Works Yard</td>
<td>$474,020</td>
<td>$(63,396)</td>
<td>$410,624</td>
<td>$3,484</td>
<td>$414,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Area Transformation Fund</td>
<td>$19,318,523</td>
<td></td>
<td>$19,318,523</td>
<td>$(3,500)</td>
<td>$19,315,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$57,785,774</strong></td>
<td><strong>$(11,568,338)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$46,217,436</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,744,933</strong></td>
<td><strong>$48,962,369</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation(s)

THAT Report No. 21-135 (CRS) Fire Safety Grant from the Office of the Fire Marshal be received;

AND THAT Council approves the application for a grant in the amount of $36,000 from the Province of Ontario to be used for the Blue Card Incident Command training by the Cambridge Fire Department;

AND FURTHER THAT the Mayor and City Clerk be authorized to execute the Fire Safety Grant Transfer Payment Agreement with the Province of Ontario, subject to the satisfaction of the City Solicitor.

Executive Summary

Purpose

- On March 11, 2021, the province announced a conditional grant of $5 million from the Office of the Fire Marshal (OFM) intended to provide fire departments with the flexibility to support ongoing training or fire safety inspection needs. Staff has identified Incident Command training as a priority requirement.

- The total allocation for Cambridge Fire Department is $36,600 which includes a base amount of $4,500 for all fire departments plus additional funding using census population data.

- Formalization of the grant allocation and the Transfer Payment Agreement is required with a resolution letter from Council advising that they have approved the purchases to be made with the Fire Safety Grant allocation.
Following Council’s approval of the proposed spending, the OFM will initiate execution of the Transfer Payment Agreement.

Key Findings

- The COVID-19 environment has resulted in challenges and restrictions in the ability to train Cambridge Fire Department personnel. The online Blue Card Command Certification Program and the previous acquisition of more computer hardware in our stations provides an opportunity to deliver impactful, interactive and useful programing while maintaining physical distancing.

Financial Implications

- The anticipated costs of the program include:
  - 21 x Annual subscription renewal for staff currently certified but requiring full continuing education access at a total cost of $3,360 + GST/HST.
  - 31 x New registrations in the initial 32-hour online program for staff at a cost of $15,500 + GST/HST
  - Two (2) staff members to receive the Blue Card Train-the-Trainer course Instructor Certification (online and in-person) at a total cost of $16,800 + GST/HST. This would then allow us to run our own in-house simulation labs and then bring our staff that complete the online training up to the Blue Card certification level.
  - Funds are to be spent by August 31, 2021.

Background

On March 11, 2021, the Ontario government announced that it is providing a Fire Safety Grant in the amount of $5 million to help fire services across Ontario address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. The funding will enhance fire safety training and support fire safety inspection programs.

Each municipality was able to submit proposals for an initial $4,500 base grant plus additional funding dependent on population served. The allocation for the City of Cambridge Fire Department is $36,600.

This one-time funding will enhance in-person and online educational instruction needs by increasing access to additional training while minimizing exposure to the virus. Accordingly, Cambridge Fire Department is working towards delivery of Blue Card Incident Command training.

The Blue Card Command Certification Program teaches Incident Commanders and other fire officers how to standardize incident operations across their department, as
well as inter-operability across multiple jurisdictions. The grant will allow registrations in
the initial 32-hour online program and staff members will receive the online (and later, in
person) Blue Card Train-the-Trainer course Instructor Certification.

Pending formal approval from Council, the Fire Chief submitted the grant application on
March 18, 2021 and the signed Letter of Intent acknowledging the sum of $36,600 on
March 25, 2021. The signed Fire Safety Grant Transfer Payment Agreement and
Council resolution is due no later than April 30, 2021.

At the request of the province, no proactive media relations involving the grant,
including websites and social media, has been conducted to date, as local MPPs may
want the opportunity to communicate the specific grant allocations supporting local
initiatives.

**Analysis**

**Strategic Alignment**

PEOPLE To actively engage, inform and create opportunities for people to participate in
community building – making Cambridge a better place to live, work, play and learn for
all.

Goal #2 - Governance and Leadership

Objective 2.5  Focus on the responsible management of financial resources, ensuring
transparency and accountability.

The policy aligns with the strategic plan by ensuring reliable provision of fire protection
services to the community.

Responsible management of financial resources is achieved through taking advantage
of rare fire service grant opportunities.

**Comments**

The Incident Command System (ICS) is a standardized on-site management system
designed to enable effective, efficient incident management by integrating a
combination of facilities, equipment, personnel, procedures, and communications
operating within a common, scalable organizational structure.

The Blue Card Incident Command Training program was identified by staff as the most
comprehensive and effective procedural and training program. It provides Platoon
Chiefs, Platoon Training Officers, Captains and Acting Captains a standardized
approach to hazard zone management and provides for the protection of firefighters
within the hazard zone by creating standardized conditions, through standardized
actions and resulting in standardized outcomes.
Existing Policy/By-Law

None.

Financial Impact

The grant of $36,600 from the OFM represents one-time cost avoidance for the City of Cambridge in 2022. Incident Command System (ICS) training was identified as a priority for the department during an analysis from late 2020 to early 2021. Staff was anticipating a one-time operating budget request of up to $40,000 for 2022 in order to deliver this training, however, as a result of the grant funding, the one-time request will not be built into the 2022 operating budget.

Public Input

Posted publicly as part of the report process.

Internal/External Consultation

Internal consultation was conducted with Clerks, Finance and Legal Services.

A jurisdictional scan identified numerous departments in the province as having received conditional approval for Blue Card Incident Command training. A collaborative effort will endeavour to deliver a Train-the-Trainer course in Ontario which will adhere to public health protocols for COVID-19.

Conclusion

The Office of the Fire Marshal requires a resolution from Council supporting the proposed allocation of Fire Safety Grant funding as well the City entering into a Fire Safety Grant Transfer Payment Agreement with the province.

Signature

Division Approval

Reviewed by the CFO

Name: Brian Arnold
Title: Fire Chief

Departmental Approval
Name: Dave Bush  
Title: Deputy City Manager, Corporate Services

City Manager Approval

[Signature]

Name: David Calder  
Title: City Manager

Attachments

- Appendix A - Fire Safety Grant Memo
- Appendix B - Signed Letter of Intent
- Appendix C - Transfer Payment Agreement
MEMORANDUM TO: Mayor Kathryn McGarry
              CAO David Calder
              Clerk Danielle Manton
              Fire Chief Brian Arnold

FROM: Jon Pegg
      Ontario Fire Marshal

DATE: March 11th, 2021

SUBJECT: Fire Safety Grant Announcement

Earlier today, the Government of Ontario announced a one time $5M grant to municipal fire services to assist in addressing challenges associated with training and virtual inspections due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Since the start of the pandemic, Ontario’s fire services have faced unprecedented challenges and have voiced those concerns to me as Fire Marshal. The ability to train fire service members in a COVID environment brought with it new restrictions and despite opportunities to train online and through other modes, I know that not all training priorities may have been met over the last year. In addition, my office has heard concerns from fire departments about fire code enforcement and the ability to enter premises to conduct inspections and promote fire safety. It is hoped that this grant will work to support fire services through this period of uncertainty and ongoing challenges.

I am pleased to advise that the City of Cambridge is eligible to receive up to $36,600.00 as part of this grant program.

The grant is intended to provide fire departments with the flexibility to support two priority areas. First, this grant may be put towards ongoing training needs including registration, administrative programming, technology upgrades and associated costs for attending as well for providing services. In addition, if code compliance and inspections continue to be challenging, addressing opportunities for an inspection program may include technology, capital costs and training to ensure that fire services are able to meet the demand of this need at the local level.

In order to receive funds, the Office of the Fire Marshal (OFM) requires that the attached application be submitted by a representative of the municipality. As decisions regarding
the grant may not have time to proceed to municipal council for approval within the timeframes identified below, my office would be comfortable with the fire chief accepting the grant in principle on behalf of the municipality, pending formal approval from the council. To help facilitate this process, once the grant applications are approved, I will send the respective fire chief a letter of intent that will be contingent upon council’s deliberations. In order to allocate funds before March 31, 2021, all applications must be received by my office no later than March 19, 2021. In addition, as a condition of the grant, these funds must be spent by August 1, 2021, and a report back to the Fire Marshal will be required by September 1, 2021, to outline how the grant was utilized at the department level.

Completed agreements should be sent by email to the Office of the Fire Marshal at ofm@ontario.ca. If you have any questions about this grant, do not hesitate to reach out to your Fire Protection Adviser.

Yours truly,

Jon Pegg
Ontario Fire Marshal
March 25, 2021

Brian Arnold  
City of Cambridge  
50 Dickson Street, PO Box 669  
Cambridge, ON  N1R5W8

Dear Brian Arnold,

Further to ongoing discussions regarding the Fire Safety Grant Program, I am writing to confirm that the fire service has agreed (in principle) to utilizing its grant allocation to support its intended purpose as outlined below.

The City of Cambridge will be provided a total of $36,600.00 to support:

- Increased training opportunities

This aligns with the intended purpose of Fire Safety Grant Program.

As part of this process, formalization of the grant allocation and the Transfer Payment Agreement is required and will be tabled by you for your municipal council at its next meeting.

The Office of the Fire Marshal will reach out to finalize and execute the Transfer Payment Agreement once municipal council has had the opportunity to approve your proposal for spending the funds provided.

Sincerely,

Jon Pegg  
Fire Marshal

Instructions to the Municipal Representative:

Please complete and submit a copy of this document to our office at ofm@ontario.ca by no later than March 29, 2021.

I hereby accept the grant allocation and proposed strategy for utilization, pending approval by City of Cambridge as outlined above.

Print Name: Brian Arnold  
Title: Fire Chief  
Signature:  
Date: March 25, 2021
THE AGREEMENT, effective as of the day of , 20 (the “Effective Date”) 

BETWEEN:

Her Majesty the Queen in right of Ontario 
as represented by the Office of the Fire Marshal

(the “Province”) 

- and -

City of Cambridge

(the “Recipient”) 

CONSIDERATION 

In consideration of the mutual covenants and agreements contained in this Agreement and for other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which are expressly acknowledged, the Province and the Recipient agree as follows:

1.0 ENTIRE AGREEMENT 

1.1 The agreement, together with:

Schedule “A” - General Terms and Conditions
Schedule “B” - Project Specific Information and Additional Provisions
Schedule “C” - Project
Schedule “D” - Budget
Schedule “E” - Reports, and

any amending agreement entered into as provided for in section 3.1, 

constitutes the entire agreement between the Parties with respect to the subject matter contained in the Agreement and supersedes all prior oral or written representations and agreements.

2.0 CONFLICT OR INCONSISTENCY 

2.1 In the event of a conflict or inconsistency between the Additional Provisions and Schedule “A”, the Additional Provisions will prevail.
3.0 AMENDING THE AGREEMENT

3.1 The Agreement may only be amended by a written agreement duly executed by the Parties.

4.0 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

4.1 The Recipient acknowledges that:

(a) the Funds are:

(i) to assist the Recipient to carry out the Project and not to provide goods or services to the Province;

(ii) funding for the purposes of the Public Sector Salary Disclosure Act, 1996 (Ontario);

(b) the Province is not responsible for carrying out the Project; and

(c) the Province is bound by the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (Ontario) and that any information provided to the Province in connection with the Project or otherwise in connection with the Agreement may be subject to disclosure in accordance with that Act.

The Parties have executed the Agreement on the dates set out below.

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN IN RIGHT OF ONTARIO as represented by the Office of the Fire Marshal

Click or tap here to enter text.

Signature: ________________________________
Date
Name: Douglas Browne
Title: Deputy Fire Marshal

City of Cambridge

Click or tap here to enter text.

Signature: ________________________________
Date
Name: Click or tap here to enter text.
Title: Click or tap here to enter text.
I have authority to bind the Recipient.
A1.0 DEFINITIONS

A1.1 Definitions. In the Agreement, the following terms will have the following meanings:

“Additional Provisions” means the terms and conditions set out in Schedule “B”.

“Agreement” means this agreement entered into between the Province and the Recipient, all of the schedules listed in section 1.1, and any amending agreement entered into pursuant to section 3.1.

“Budget” means the budget attached to the Agreement as Schedule “D”.

“Effective Date” means the date set out at the top of the Agreement.

“Event of Default” has the meaning ascribed to it in section A12.1.

“Expiry Date” means the expiry date set out in Schedule “B”.

“Funding Year” means:

(a) in the case of the first Funding Year, the period commencing on March 31, 2021 and ending on August 31, 2021; and

“Funds” means the money the Province provides to the Recipient pursuant to the Agreement.

“Indemnified Parties” means Her Majesty the Queen in right of Ontario, Her ministers, agents, appointees and employees.

“Maximum Funds” means the maximum Funds set out in Schedule “B”.

“Notice” means any communication given or required to be given pursuant to the Agreement.

“Notice Period” means the period of time within which the Recipient is required to remedy an Event of Default, and includes any such period or periods of time by which the Province extends that time.

“Parties” means the Province and the Recipient.

“Party” means either the Province or the Recipient.
“Project” means the undertaking described in Schedule “C”.

“Reports” means the reports described in Schedule “E”.

A2.0 REPRESENTATIONS, WARRANTIES AND COVENANTS

A2.1 General. The Recipient represents, warrants and covenants that:

(a) it is, and will continue to be a validly existing legal entity with full power to fulfill its obligations under the Agreement;

(b) it has the full power and authority to enter into the Agreement and has taken all necessary actions to authorize the execution of the Agreement;

(c) it has, and will continue to have the experience and expertise necessary to carry out the Project;

(d) it is in compliance with, and will continue to comply with all federal and provincial laws and regulations, all municipal by-laws, and any other orders, rules and by-laws related to any aspect of the Project, the Funds or both; and

(e) unless otherwise provided for in the Agreement, any information the Recipient provided to the Province in support of its request for funds (including information relating to any eligibility requirements) was true and complete at the time the Recipient provided it and will continue to be true and complete.

A2.2 Governance. The Recipient represents, warrants and covenants that it has, will maintain, in writing, and will follow:

(a) a code of conduct and ethical responsibilities for all persons at all levels of the Recipient’s organization;

(b) procedures to enable the Recipient’s ongoing effective functioning;

(c) decision-making mechanisms for the Recipient;

(d) procedures to enable the Recipient to manage Funds prudently and effectively;

(e) procedures to enable the Recipient to complete the Project successfully; and

(f) procedures to enable the preparation and submission of all Reports required pursuant to Article A6.0.

A3.0 TERM OF THE AGREEMENT
A3.1 Term. The term of the Agreement will commence on March 31, 2021 and will expire on the Expiry Date.

A4.0 FUNDS AND CARRYING OUT THE PROJECT

A4.1 Funds Provided. The Province will:

(a) provide the Recipient up to the Maximum Funds allocated as part of this grant exercise;
(b) provide the Funds to the Recipient in accordance with the payment plan set out in Schedule “D”; and
(c) deposit the Funds into an account designated by the Recipient provided that the account:
   (i) resides at a Canadian financial institution; and
   (ii) is in the name of the Recipient.

A4.2 Use of Funds and Carry Out the Project. The Recipient will do all of the following:

(a) carry out the Project in accordance with the Agreement;
(b) use the Funds only for the purpose of carrying out the Project;
(c) spend the Funds only in accordance with the Budget;
(d) not use the Funds to cover any cost that has or will be funded or reimbursed by one or more of any third party, ministry, agency or organization of the Government of Ontario.

A5.0 CONFLICT OF INTEREST

A5.1 No Conflict of Interest. The Recipient will carry out the Project and use the Funds without a conflict of interest. The Recipient will disclose to the Province, without delay, any situation that a reasonable person would interpret as an actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest; and comply with any terms and conditions that the Province may prescribe as a result of the disclosure.

A6.0 REPORTING, ACCOUNTING AND REVIEW

A6.1 Preparation and Submission. The Recipient will submit to the Province at the address referred to in section A15.1, all Reports in accordance with the timelines and content requirements provided for in Schedule “E”, or in a form as specified by the Province from time to time.
A6.2 **Record Maintenance.** The Recipient will keep, maintain and make available to the Province, its authorized representatives or an independent auditor identified by the Province for inspection and copying:

(a) all financial records (including invoices) relating to the Funds or otherwise to the Project in a manner consistent with generally accepted accounting principles; and

(b) all non-financial documents and records relating to the Funds or otherwise to the Project.

A7.0 **COMMUNICATIONS REQUIREMENTS**

A7.1 **Acknowledge Support.** Unless otherwise directed by the Province, the Recipient will acknowledge the support of the Province for the Project in a form and manner as directed by the Province.

A7.2 **Publication.** The Recipient will indicate, in any of its Project-related publications, whether written, oral, or visual, that the views expressed in the publication are the views of the Recipient and do not necessarily reflect those of the Province.

A8.0 **INDEMNITY**

A8.1 **Indemnification.** The Recipient will indemnify and hold harmless the Indemnified Parties from and against any and all liability, loss, costs, damages and expenses (including legal, expert and consultant fees), causes of action, actions, claims, demands, lawsuits or other proceedings, by whomever made, sustained, incurred, brought or prosecuted, in any way arising out of or in connection with the Project or otherwise in connection with the Agreement, unless solely caused by the negligence or wilful misconduct of the Indemnified Parties.

A9.0 **INSURANCE**

A9.1 **Recipient’s Insurance.** The Recipient represents, warrants and covenants that it has, and will maintain, at its own cost and expense, with insurers having a secure A.M. Best rating of B+ or greater, or the equivalent, all the necessary and appropriate insurance that a prudent person carrying out a project similar to the Project would maintain, including commercial general liability insurance on an occurrence basis for third party bodily injury, personal injury and property damage, to an inclusive limit of not less than the amount provided for in Schedule “B” per occurrence. The insurance policy will include the following:

(a) the Indemnified Parties as additional insureds with respect to liability
arising in the course of performance of the Recipient’s obligations under, or otherwise in connection with, the Agreement;

(b) a cross-liability clause;

(c) contractual liability coverage; and

(d) a 30 day written notice of cancellation.

A9.2 Proof of Insurance. If requested, the Recipient will provide the Province with certificates of insurance, or other proof as may be requested by the Province, that confirms the insurance coverage as provided for in section A9.1.

A10.0 EVENT OF DEFAULT, CORRECTIVE ACTION AND TERMINATION FOR DEFAULT

A10.1 Events of Default. Each of the following events will constitute an Event of Default:

(a) in the opinion of the Province, the Recipient breaches any representation, warranty, covenant or other material term of the Agreement, including failing to do any of the following in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Agreement:

(i) carry out the Project;

(ii) use or spend Funds; or

(iii) provide, in accordance with section A6.1, Reports or such other reports as may have been requested by the Province;

(b) the Recipient’s operations, its financial condition, or its organizational structure, changes such that it no longer meets one or more of the eligibility requirements of the program under which the Province provides the Funds;

(c) the Recipient makes an assignment, proposal, compromise, or arrangement for the benefit of creditors, or a creditor makes an application for an order adjudging the Recipient bankrupt, or applies for the appointment of a receiver; or

(d) the Recipient ceases to operate.

A10.2 Consequences of Events of Default and Corrective Action. If an Event of Default occurs, the Province may, at any time, take one or more of the following actions:

(a) initiate any action the Province considers necessary in order to facilitate the successful continuation or completion of the Project;
(b) provide the Recipient with an opportunity to remedy the Event of Default;
(c) suspend the payment of Funds for such period as the Province determines appropriate;
(d) reduce the amount of the Funds;
(e) cancel further instalments of Funds;
(f) demand from the Recipient the payment of any Funds remaining in the possession or under the control of the Recipient;
(g) demand from the Recipient the payment of an amount equal to any Funds the Recipient used, but did not use in accordance with the Agreement;
(h) demand from the Recipient the payment of an amount equal to any Funds the Province provided to the Recipient; and
(i) terminate the Agreement at any time, including immediately, without liability, penalty or costs to the Province upon giving Notice to the Recipient.

A10.3 When Termination Effective. Termination under this Article will take effect as provided for in the Notice.

A11.0 FUNDS AT THE END OF A FUNDING YEAR

A11.1 Funds at the End of a Funding Year. Without limiting any rights of the Province under Article A12.0, if the Recipient has not spent all of the Funds allocated for the Funding Year as provided for in the Budget, the Province may take one or both of the following actions:

(a) demand from the Recipient the payment of the unspent Funds; and
(b) adjust the amount of any further instalments of Funds accordingly.

A12.0 FUNDS UPON EXPIRY

A12.1 Funds Upon Expiry. The Recipient will, upon expiry of the Agreement, pay to the Province any Funds remaining in its possession or under its control.

A13.0 NOTICE

A13.1 Notice in Writing and Addressed. Notice will be in writing and will be delivered by email, postage-prepaid mail, personal delivery or fax, and will be addressed to the Province and the Recipient respectively as provided for in Schedule "B", or as either Party later designates to the other by Notice.
A13.2 **Notice Given.** Notice will be deemed to have been given:

(a) in the case of postage-prepaid mail, five business days after the Notice is mailed; or

(b) in the case of email, personal delivery or fax, one business day after the Notice is delivered.

A14.0 **CONSENT BY PROVINCE AND COMPLIANCE BY RECIPIENT**

A14.1 **Consent.** When the Province provides its consent pursuant to the Agreement, it may impose any terms and conditions on such consent and the Recipient will comply with such terms and conditions.

A15.0 **INDEPENDENT PARTIES**

A15.1 **Parties Independent.** The Recipient is not an agent, joint venturer, partner or employee of the Province, and the Recipient will not represent itself in any way that might be taken by a reasonable person to suggest that it is, or take any actions that could establish or imply such a relationship.

A16.0 **ASSIGNMENT OF AGREEMENT OR FUNDS**

A16.1 **No Assignment.** The Recipient will not, without the prior written consent of the Province, assign any of its rights, or obligations under the Agreement. All rights and obligations contained in the Agreement will extend to and be binding on the Parties’ permitted assigns.

A17.0 **GOVERNING LAW**

A17.1 **Governing Law.** The Agreement and the rights, obligations and relations of the Parties will be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the Province of Ontario and the applicable federal laws of Canada. Any actions or proceedings arising in connection with the Agreement will be conducted in the courts of Ontario, which will have exclusive jurisdiction over such proceedings.

A18.0 **FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH OTHER AGREEMENTS**

A18.1 **Other Agreements.** If the Recipient:

(a) has failed to comply with any term, condition or obligation under any other agreement with Her Majesty the Queen in right of Ontario or one of Her agencies (a “Failure”);

(b) has been provided with notice of such Failure in accordance with the TP Agreement – Shortened.
requirements of such other agreement;

(c) has, if applicable, failed to rectify such Failure in accordance with the requirements of such other agreement; and

(d) such Failure is continuing,

the Province may suspend the payment of Funds for such period as the Province determines appropriate.

A19.0 SURVIVAL

A19.1 Survival. All Articles and sections, and all applicable cross-referenced sections and schedules, will continue in full force and effect for a period of seven years from the date of expiry or termination of the Agreement.

- END OF GENERAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS –
## SCHEDULE “B”
### PROJECT SPECIFIC INFORMATION AND ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Funds</th>
<th>$36,600.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expiry Date</td>
<td>August 1, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contact information for the purposes of Notice to the Province**

- **Position:** Brian Arnold, Fire Chief
- **Address:** 1625 Bishop Street North, Cambridge, ON N1R 7J4
- **Fax:** (519) 621-4521
- **Email:** arnoldb@cambridge.ca

**Contact information for the purposes of Notice to the Recipient**

- **Position:** Brian Arnold, Fire Chief
- **Address:** 1625 Bishop Street North, Cambridge, ON N1R 7J4
- **Fax:** (519) 621-4521
- **Email:** arnoldb@cambridge.ca

**Contact information for the senior financial person in the Recipient organization (e.g., CFO, CAO) – to respond as required to requests from the Province related to the Agreement**

- **Position:** Sheryl Ayres, Chief Financial Officer
- **Address:** 50 Dickson Street, Cambridge, ON N1R 5W8
- **Fax:** (519) 623-6364
- **Email:** ayress@cambridge.ca

**Additional Provisions:**

(None)
The Municipal Fire Protection Grant has been established to provide critical support to municipalities in 2020-21 to offset costs and potential barriers for issues stemming from the COVID-19 pandemic. Such issues include access to training, and equipment or other critical upgrades that are needed at the local level to support virtual inspections.

Ontario’s fire departments vary in size and capacity and they all serve different communities that each present different levels of risk. There is a significant cost to ensure that every department has skilled first responders who are adequately trained and equipped to meet the needs of their community.

Funding could represent the difference in allowing fire departments to train more staff, purchase much needed equipment to allow them to adapt and respond to COVID-19 related risks in their communities in a way that ensures both community and personnel safety.

The use of the one-time 2020-21 Municipal Fire Protection Grant will focus on the needs of municipal fire departments to ensure community safety with a focus on issues that have presented due to the COVID-19 pandemic, including:

- Training to offset the pressures in training as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.
- Specialty training to respond to the dynamics of the COVID-19 pandemic and the need to ensure fire safety in their communities such as virtual inspections.
- Small improvements to fire department infrastructure, such as accessing high speed internet to support training and virtual inspections.

The fire service has expressed concerns with training and fire code compliance since the start of the pandemic. Some of these concerns include critical inspections being delayed or impacted given the apprehension with entering premises. Similarly, training has been impacted given that fire services have been responding to challenges associated with the pandemic (staffing shortages, increased calls for service, etc.). Many departments continued training online as the Office of the Fire Marshal enhanced its online course availability at the start of the pandemic. This emergency COVID relief funding provides support for increased access to training, support for fire code compliance inspections through virtual inspections, and equipment or other critical upgrades that are needed at the local level to support community risks during the pandemic and the switch to virtual training and inspections.
March 25, 2021

Brian Arnold
City of Cambridge
50 Dickson Street, PO Box 669
Cambridge, ON N1R5W8

Dear Brian Arnold,

Further to ongoing discussions regarding the Fire Safety Grant Program, I am writing to confirm that the fire service has agreed (in principle) to utilizing its grant allocation to support its intended purpose as outlined below.

The City of Cambridge will be provided a total of $36,600.00 to support:

- Increased training opportunities

This aligns with the intended purpose of Fire Safety Grant Program.

As part of this process, formalization of the grant allocation and the Transfer Payment Agreement is required and will be tabled by you for your municipal council at its next meeting.

The Office of the Fire Marshal will reach out to finalize and execute the Transfer Payment Agreement once municipal council has had the opportunity to approve your proposal for spending the funds provided.

Sincerely,

Jon Pegg
Fire Marshal

Instructions to the Municipal Representative:

Please complete and submit a copy of this document to our office at ofm@ontario.ca by no later than March 29, 2021.

I hereby accept the grant allocation and proposed strategy for utilization, pending approval by City of Cambridge as outlined above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print Name:</th>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Signature:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian Arnold</td>
<td>Fire Chief</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>March 25, 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCHEDULE “D”

BUDGET

Funding will be provided to the City of Cambridge upon execution of this Agreement. The funds will need to be spent by the municipality by August 1, 2021.
SCHEDULE “E”

REPORTS

As a condition of the Municipal Fire Protection Grant, a report back to the Office of the Fire Marshal must be received by September 1, 2021 to outline how the grant was utilized at the department level.
Recommendation(s)

THAT Council report 21-064(CRS) re: Grants to Groups be received;

AND THAT the recommendations from the Grants to Groups Review Committee, as outlined in Appendix A, be approved by Council.

Executive Summary

Purpose

- To provide municipal grants to community organizations that offer programs and services that improve the health, lifestyle and community wellbeing of residents of the City of Cambridge.

Key Findings

- The Grants to Groups Review Committee consists of Councillor Nicholas Ermeta (chair), Mayor Kathryn McGarry, Councillor Donna Reid and Councillor Mike Mann.

- The Committee met virtually on three occasions to review the 2021 grant applications.

- The Committee received 26 applications requesting a total of $202,077 and are recommending grant allocations to 15 groups in the total amount of $65,200 as identified in Appendix A.
• A total of ten applications were not allotted funding due to a variety of reasons. The applications for Galt Kiltie Band and Cambridge Cardiac Care Centre Healthy Heart Day were deemed ineligible because they provide funding to other organizations. The applications for Kind Minds Family Wellness and Cambridge Cultural Association were deemed ineligible because their funding requests were greater than 70% of their total revenue. The application for Active Cambridge Fitness Program was not allotted funding and Recreation and Culture will be working with the group in 2021. The Fashion History Museum was not provided Grants to Groups funding as they received funding from the City of Cambridge through the 2021 operating budget. The remaining four applications for Victoria Park Community Homes, Cambridge Concert Band, Penny and Pound Theatre Productions and the Preston Scout House Band were not allotted funds due to their financial stability.

• The Friends of Mill Creek: Mill Creek Ranger Program removed their application from consideration because they will not be running the program again this year due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Financial Implications

• The City of Cambridge has allotted $94,700 in the 2021 Operating Budget to support and enable the work of local non-profit agencies, groups and individuals dedicated to enhancing the quality of life for residents.

• The Grants to Groups Committee has held back $7,500 for requests that may emerge during the remainder of the year. The Committee has $22,000 unallocated that can be used for requests that arise throughout the year.

Background

The 2021 Grants to Groups application process opened in November 2020. A total of 26 applications were received compared to 37 applications in 2020. Total funding requested in 2021 was $202,077 compared to $183,330 in 2020. A summary of the 2021 grant applicants and their requests are attached in Appendix A.

Through a comprehensive review of all the applications, the committee was able to meet the objective of the Grants to Groups Policy within the funding allocated in the 2021 budget.
Analysis

Strategic Alignment

PEOPLE To actively engage, inform and create opportunities for people to participate in community building – making Cambridge a better place to live, work, play and learn for all.

Goal #2 - Governance and Leadership

Objective 2.5 Focus on the responsible management of financial resources, ensuring transparency and accountability.

The primary goal of the Corporation of the City of Cambridge’s Grant request program is to enable and encourage effective citizen involvement in community groups and in civic events related to the self-fulfillment of individuals, and to attempt to provide an excellent quality of life in the community.

Comments

The Grants Review Committee is recommending grant allocations to 15 groups in the total amount of $65,200. A summary of the 2021 grant applicants and their requests is attached in Appendix A.

Letters were sent to each of the groups that applied for funding to notify them of the Committee’s decision in regards to their application. Under the City’s Grants to Groups policy, each of the organizations that applied for funding have been notified that they may appeal the recommendation of the Committee to Council at the meeting on April 13, 2021.

Existing Policy/By-Law

Policy #C-10.080 – Grants to Groups

The objectives under the Grants to Groups Policy (C-10.080) include:

- To provide municipal funds or other forms of financial assistance, in limited amounts to community groups and/or organizations that warrant City support, and show a desire to help themselves.

- To consider each grant on its own merit and to deal with it in as equitable and objective a manner as possible. To ensure that an adequate administrative system of review and counselling takes place with the groups or organizations making requests. This should include reviewing the groups’ future plans and the management of their respective funds.
• To ensure that a proper system of accountability is developed and maintained by the community groups and/or organizations requesting and receiving approval for assistance from the City.

Financial Impact

The Grants to Groups Committee is recommending funding be provided to 15 groups totalling $65,200. This funding is within the 2021 Operating Budget of $94,700. The unallocated funding of $29,500 is available to be allocated for requests that may emerge during the remainder of the year and would be subject to approval by Council.

Public Input

The Grants Review Committee heard from five delegations in the second meeting. These groups presented an overview of the organization and request for funding. In some situations, further consultation was done with individual groups to better understand their operations or programs offered in Cambridge.

Internal/External Consultation

All Grants to Groups applicants have been informed of the recommendations that have been made to Council. The applicants have been advised of the appeal process.

Conclusion

A summary of the 2021 grant applicants and their requests is attached in Appendix A.

Signature

Division Approval

Reviewed by Legal Services

Name: Sheryl Ayres, CPA, CGA
Title: Chief Financial Officer
Departmental Approval

Name: Dave Bush
Title: Deputy City Manager, Corporate Services

City Manager Approval

Name: David Calder
Title: City Manager

Attachments

- Appendix A - 2021 Grants to Groups Summary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts, Culture, Events</th>
<th>Amount of Request</th>
<th>Revised Request</th>
<th>Recommended Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Kiwanis Boys Choir</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter Arts Matrix</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener-Waterloo Symphony</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera Causa Opera</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcady</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECTRUM - Waterloo Region’s Rainbow Space</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Cultural Association</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny &amp; Pound Theatre Productions</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston Scout House Band Inc</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galt Kiltie Band</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Concert Band</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion History Museum</td>
<td>777.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Arts, Culture, Events</strong></td>
<td><strong>54,277.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,000.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic &amp; Leisure Interests</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guelph Hiking Trail Club</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Capables</td>
<td>1,200.00</td>
<td>1,200.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Civic &amp; Leisure Interests</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,200.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,200.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreation and Sport</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Minor Lacrosse</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Tennis Club</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Regional REACT</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Cambridge Fitness Program Inc.</td>
<td>3,600.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Mill Creek</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Recreation and Sport</strong></td>
<td><strong>35,600.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,500.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Services</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Witness Centre of Waterloo Region</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Canadian Legion Branch 126 Preston</td>
<td>36,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter Movers</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Support Connections</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind Minds Family Wellness</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Cardiac Care Centre Healthy Heart Day: Regaining your heart health post pandemic</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Park Community Homes Inc.</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Social Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>109,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>37,500.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Funding Approved                     |                   |                | **65,200.00**       |
Recommendations

THAT Cambridge Council receives Report No. 21-097(CD) – Consultation on Growing the Size of the Greenbelt – City of Cambridge Opportunity to Respond – for information;

AND THAT Cambridge Council endorse the recommendation by City staff to oppose any expansion of the Greenbelt Plan in the City of Cambridge unless the Province provides for the following:

i) modify the Greenbelt Plan to allow municipalities to adopt or retain Official Plan policies more stringent than the requirements of the Greenbelt Plan in relation to mineral aggregate resources and the protection of municipal drinking water supplies;

ii) modify the Greenbelt Plan to include a policy framework that provides for the protection of ground water resources that supply municipal drinking water; and

iii) consult directly with the City of Cambridge, the Region of Waterloo, and the Grand River Conservation Authority to delineate the location of any Greenbelt expansion using the best available ecological and hydrogeological data and other relevant technical information.

AND FURTHER THAT Report No. 21-097(CD) and its resulting resolution be provided to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing as the City of Cambridge comments.
Executive Summary

Purpose

- The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing is seeking feedback on ways to expand the Greenbelt. At this stage of consultation there are no proposed changes to the Greenbelt boundary.

- The purpose of this report is to provide City staff’s recommendation to Cambridge Council in response to the Province’s consultation on expanding the Greenbelt.

Key Findings

- The Regional and City’s Official Plans include strong policies with respect to mineral aggregate resources and the protection of municipal drinking water supplies. If the Province does intend to expand the Greenbelt into Cambridge, the Greenbelt Plan should allow for municipalities to adopt or retain policies more stringent than the requirements of the Greenbelt Plan.

- Protection of water resources for municipal drinking water wells should be addressed in the Greenbelt Plan.

- Any expansion to the Greenbelt Plan mapping into Cambridge should be based on the best available ecological and hydrogeological data and other relevant technical information.

Financial Implications

- There are no direct financial implications at this time.

Background

Ontario’s Greenbelt was established in 2005 to permanently protect approximately 810,000 hectares of greenspace, farmland, communities, natural areas and watersheds and prevent significant urban development. An amendment to the Greenbelt Plan took effect July 1, 2007 under the Greenbelt Act, 2005.

The Greenbelt Plan and A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Growth Plan), have worked together for over 15 years to provide a framework for where and how growth should be accommodated in southern Ontario. Currently, the Greenbelt Area includes lands covered by the policies of the Greenbelt Plan, the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan and the Niagara Escarpment Plan. Collectively, these plans identify where urbanization should not occur. The Plans provide protection to the agricultural land base and the ecological and hydrological features, areas and functions within the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH) and beyond.
They work together with the Growth Plan, which provides the overarching strategy for where and how growth can be accommodated in the GGH. Currently, the Greenbelt Plan does not apply to the City of Cambridge. In the Region of Waterloo, the Greenbelt Plan only applies to a portion of the southeastern part of the Township of North Dumfries (see **Attachment No. 1**).

In 2017, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) sought feedback for potential Greenbelt expansion in the outer ring of the GGH. During that time the study area included large portions of the Region of Waterloo. City staff provided comments to MMAH on the study area for the potential Greenbelt expansion which were outlined in Report No. 18-052(CD) dated March 27, 2018 (see **Attachment No. 2** for City staff comments on the previous consultation).

The MMAH is currently seeking feedback on ways to expand and further enhance the quality of the Greenbelt. The consultation held in 2017 was posted by the previous government and is no longer active; however, comments submitted as part of that consultation will be considered as part of this consultation. The current proposal places a priority on:

a) A study area of lands focused on the Paris Galt Moraine (see **Attachment No. 3**). The Paris Galt Moraine runs roughly from Caledon in the northeast to Brantford in the southwest and is the headwaters for many rivers and streams flowing off of it. Comprised of sand and gravel deposits, it helps to protect and recharge the groundwater aquifers that provide the basis for a broad range of needs, including drinking water supply for many of the communities, sustaining local ecosystems, and growth and economic management. Moraines allow rain and snowmelt to soak into the ground more rapidly and in greater amounts than the surrounding, less permeable areas. This process provides a reliable supply of water called baseflow to rivers and streams. The map of the Paris Galt Moraine is for discussion purposes only and does not represent a proposed boundary; and

b) Ideas for adding, expanding and further protecting Urban River Valleys which applies to lands in river valleys within an urban context (see **Attachment No. 4**).

The Province has outlined the following principles for expanding the Greenbelt:

1. No consideration of removal requests or land exchanges – The Province will not consider the removal of any lands from the current Greenbelt Area.

2. No consideration of policy changes – Any potential expansions will be based on existing policies in the Greenbelt Plan.

3. Supports Greenbelt Plan objectives, visions and goals – Lands to be considered for addition support the Greenbelt Plan’s objectives, vision and goals of providing

---

Inclusiveness - Respect - Integrity - Service
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permanent protection to the agricultural land base and the ecological and hydrological features, areas and functions occurring on this landscape and providing for the inclusion of publicly owned lands in urban river valleys.

4. Follows existing Amendment Process – The Greenbelt Act, 2005 sets out the legislated public process that will apply to any proposed Greenbelt Plan amendments. This would include requiring consultation with affected public bodies such as the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry and the Greenbelt Council, municipalities in the Greenbelt Area, an opportunity for consultation with general public, as well as ensuring any proposed amendment does not reduce the total land area within the Greenbelt Plan. Engaging with Indigenous communities would also occur before any amendments are made.

5. Connects physically and/or functionally to the current Greenbelt – Any expansions should be directly connected or have a strong functional connection through the Greenbelt’s natural heritage, water resource or agricultural system or not create unconnected islands of Greenbelt land.

6. Consider impacts on existing provincial priorities – Expansions to the Greenbelt must consider their effects on other key provincial priorities outlined in the Provincial Policy Statement or Growth Plan.

Analysis

Strategic Alignment

PROSPERITY: To support and encourage the growth of a highly competitive local economy where there is opportunity for everyone to contribute and succeed.

Goal #2 - Governance and Leadership

Objective 2.4  Work collaboratively with other government agencies and partners to achieve common goals and ensure representation of community interests.

City staff collaborated with Regional staff in the preparation of this response.

Comments

Paris Galt Moraine Study Area

The Province has proposed to use the Paris Galt Moraine as a study area for potentially expanding the Greenbelt (see Attachment No. 3). The study area includes a portion of the northeast part of Cambridge. These lands are beyond the Urban Area Boundary and are designated predominantly as Prime Agricultural and Natural Open Space System with a few pockets of Rural Residential. City staff provide the following comments on expanding the Greenbelt to Cambridge:
Mineral Aggregate Resources

Lands in the northeast part of Cambridge are identified as having Aggregate Bedrock Deposits and Mineral Aggregate Resource Areas. Much of this area coincides with the Paris Galt Moraine Study Area. The Regional Official Plan (ROP) and Cambridge Official Plan currently contain policies that are more restrictive than the Greenbelt Plan with respect to aggregate resources. While the Greenbelt Plan states that there is nothing in the Greenbelt Plan that limits the ability of decision-makers on planning matters to adopt policies that are more stringent than the requirements of the Greenbelt Plan, the Greenbelt Plan does not permit municipalities to have more restrictive policies for mineral aggregate resources.

If the Greenbelt were to be expanded into Cambridge, the reference in the Greenbelt Plan to municipalities not being permitted to have more restrictive Official Plan policies for mineral aggregate resources should be removed. Additionally, provisions to allow for municipalities to regulate the depth of mineral aggregate extraction should be added to the Greenbelt Plan.

Ground Water

The ground water resource policies of the Greenbelt Plan do not provide for specific policy direction related to the protection of water resources that supply municipal drinking water wells. The Region of Waterloo is the largest urban municipality to rely almost exclusively on groundwater supplies for its drinking water and protecting this resource is critical. In order to support expansion of the Greenbelt into Cambridge, the Greenbelt Plan should be amended to provide policy direction for the protection of municipal drinking water supplies and should allow for municipalities to adopt or retain more stringent Official Plan policies.

Mapping

Any expansion to the Greenbelt boundary should include direct consultation with the City of Cambridge, the Region of Waterloo and the Grand River Conservation Authority to delineate the location using the best available ecological and hydrogeological data and other relevant technical information.

Urban River Valleys

The Urban River Valley designation in the Greenbelt Plan applies to lands in river valleys within an urban context. Currently, Urban River Valleys connect the Greenbelt’s protected countryside lands to the Great Lakes and inland lakes (e.g., Don River, Duffins Creek in the Greater Toronto Area) (see Attachment No. 4). The policies apply only to publicly owned lands within this designation and are often lands designated in municipal official plans as parks, open space, recreation, conservation and/or
environmental protection. The Greenbelt currently includes 21 Urban River Valleys and associated coastal wetlands.

The Province is seeking feedback for adding new Urban River Valleys, including connections to the Paris Galt Moraine through the Speed River in the urban area of Cambridge.

If there is an expansion of the Greenbelt into Cambridge (subject to the points outlined above), City staff are not opposed to exploring options for identifying Urban River Valleys to connect the Greenbelt to the Speed River.

Any resulting Council resolutions arising from this Report will be provided to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

**Existing Policy/By-Law**

The City of Cambridge is not currently impacted by the Greenbelt Plan, 2017.

**Financial Impact**

The Province is consulting about the extent of the study area and matters to be studied for a possible Greenbelt expansion and is not currently proposing any changes to the boundary of the Greenbelt. Therefore, there are no direct financial impacts at this time.

**Public Input**

The proposal was posted on the Environmental Registry of Ontario for a 61-day public consultation period from February 17, 2021 to April 19, 2021. The previous government consulted on this topic in 2017; comments submitted as part of that consultation will be considered as part of this consultation.

Posted publicly as part of the report process.

**Internal/External Consultation**

City staff reviewed the Province’s consultation documents and had discussions with Regional staff. The City staff correspondence on Urban River Valleys was also prepared in consultation with staff in the Park Operations Division.

**Conclusion**

The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing is currently seeking feedback on ways to expand and further enhance the quality of the Greenbelt with a focus on the Paris Galt Moraine and Urban River Valleys. City staff recommend opposing the expansion of the Greenbelt in the City of Cambridge unless a number of changes are made.
This aligns with the Strategic Plan of Governance and Leadership; by working collaboratively with other government agencies and partners to achieve common goals and ensure representation of community interests.

**Signature**

**Division Approval**

![Signature]

Name: Elaine Brunn Shaw  
Title: Chief Planner

**Departmental Approval**

![Signature]

Name: Hardy Bromberg  
Title: Deputy City Manager, Community Development

**City Manager Approval**

![Signature]

Name: David Calder  
Title: City Manager

**Attachments**

Attachment No. 1 – Current Extent of the Greenbelt Plan

Attachment No. 2 – March 7, 2018 City of Cambridge staff comments on previous consultation

Attachment No. 3 – Growing the Greenbelt Study Area – Paris Galt Moraine

Attachment No. 4 – Urban River Valleys
March 7, 2018
Protecting Water
Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
777 Bay Street 13th Floor
Toronto, ON M5G 2E5

Dear Sir or Madam:

Re: Response to EBR # 013-1661

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the study area associated with Protecting Water for Future Generations: Growing the Greenbelt in the Outer Ring, specifically Area 1 for the Waterloo and Paris/Galt Moraines.

It is acknowledged that there are no proposed changes to the Greenbelt boundary at this time and that subsequent consultation will be undertaken to consider any proposed future boundary changes.

City staff comments have been prepared in collaboration with the Region of Waterloo and we share many of the same thoughts as Regional staff.

1. Currently there are strong policies in the Region of Waterloo and City of Cambridge Official Plans regarding agricultural, natural heritage and ground water resources. It appears that these policies are stronger than those in the current Greenbelt Plan. If the Province does intend to propose an expansion of the Greenbelt around parts of the City of Cambridge in the Region of Waterloo, we request that the strongest policies prevail and be used for the Greenbelt Plan in this area.
2. The current Greenbelt Plan's groundwater resource policies are not specifically related to the protection of water resources for municipal drinking water wells and this matter should be included in the Plan.

3. Greenbelt Plan mapping should be based upon the best available mapping information, including recent subwatershed studies. Also, when the Province is involved in the next phase of review for the Greenbelt boundary, it would be beneficial to provide GIS related mapping as part of the consultation process so that people can more accurately review the potential lands affected by the proposed revised boundary.

4. From the mapping provided, it appears that the Province is including employment lands in the Village of Blair proximate to Conestoga College and lands in north Cambridge in the study area. If that is correct, the Province should be aware that these areas are planned for future growth in Cambridge. These lands should not be included as part of the Greenbelt Plan study area or constrained by a future Greenbelt boundary, unless the portion of the lands which are already constrained from development due to environmental features are the only parts which are under consideration by the Province.

Due to the commenting deadlines, we have not had a chance to share these comments with our Council at this time. We do plan on sharing this letter with our Council. If Cambridge Council has subsequent comments, we will provide them to you after the commenting deadline.

We look forward to the opportunity to comment in future as part of a consultation process on any proposed changes to the Greenbelt Plan policies and boundaries. Should you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me using the information above.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Elaine Brunn Shaw
City Planner

M1EBS\March 2018 response to Province regarding Greenbelt Plan study.doc
Recommendations

THAT report 21-071(CD) – Newman Drive Sidewalk Installation be received by Council;

AND FURTHER THAT Newman Drive Sidewalk Design Option 1 as outlined in this report proceed towards tender and construction in 2021.

Executive Summary

Purpose

• The purpose of this report is to update Council on the potential sidewalk design options for Newman Drive and seek Council approval to proceed with Design Option 1.

Key Findings

• During the Cambridge West Community Subdivision planning, concerns were received about pedestrian safety on Newman Drive due to the lack of continuous sidewalk on the street. As a result, the developers agreed to contribute funding to the installation of a sidewalk on Newman Drive.

• Newman Drive is currently ranked in the top 25 on the City’s sidewalk infill priority list.

• The City retained the services of Stantec Consulting to design the Newman Drive sidewalk. Through the preliminary design review, it was determined that the sidewalk should be placed on the north/west side of Newman Drive from Princess Street to 61 Newman Drive.
• A Virtual public information center (PIC) was held in January 2021 for feedback on the sidewalk design, 11 responses were received. The main concerns expressed included the number of tree removals, loss of driveway length, and impacts to existing properties.

• Based on the feedback received through the public consultation three design options for the installation of the sidewalk were considered.

• Staff recommend Design Option 1 as outlined in this report of which includes the installation of a new 1.5 metre sidewalk with a varying 1.0-1.6 metre boulevard on the north/east side of Newman Drive from Princess Street to 61 Newman Drive.

Financial Implications

• The Cambridge West Developers have increased their contributions to a total of $180,000 towards the installation of the Newman Drive sidewalk.

• The contributions received for the installation of the sidewalk will cover the costs of design option 1 which is estimated at $180,000. Design options 2 and 3 would increase the project costs by $115,000 and $135,000, respectively.

• Additional City funding would be required to proceed with Design options 2 and 3.

Background

During the Cambridge West Community Subdivision planning, concerns were received about pedestrian safety on Newman Drive due to the lack of continuous sidewalk on the street. As such, the installation of a sidewalk on Newman Drive from Princess Street to 61 Newman Drive was included as part of the subdivision draft plan approvals.

The City retained the services of Stantec Consulting to design the Newman Drive sidewalk. Through the preliminary design review, it was determined that the sidewalk should be placed on the north/west side of Newman Drive from Princess Street to 61 Newman Drive. The south/east side of Newman Drive was excluded due to the significant grading required on private property, removal of eleven trees and need for a retaining wall throughout the corridor.

In January 2021, a virtual PIC through Engage Cambridge was conducted to present the proposed sidewalk design on the north/west side of Newman Drive. During the comment period of the PIC, the main concerns expressed included the number of tree removals, loss of driveway length, and impacts to existing properties (refer to PIC comments in Appendix A). As a result, two additional sidewalk options were explored.
Analysis

Strategic Alignment

PEOPLE To actively engage, inform and create opportunities for people to participate in community building – making Cambridge a better place to live, work, play and learn for all.

Goal #7 - Transportation and Infrastructure

Objective 7.1 Find new ways to help people move within and beyond the city without using a car (walking, cycling and transit).

The recommendation supports the City’s strategic plan by promoting a more pedestrian friendly environment, and promoting active transportation. Boulevard sidewalks also improve pedestrian safety and accessibility.

Comments

Three design options for the installation of the sidewalk on the north/west side of Newman Drive from Princess Street to 61 Newman Drive have been considered.

The design options were compared based on a ranking system that classified the key impacts as low, medium or high with the lowest score being the preferred design option, as outlined in Table 1.0 below. The key impacts considered were primarily based on the comments received through public consultation and include existing tree canopy and landscape, existing driveway impacts, utility infrastructure and cost.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Design 1</th>
<th>Design 2</th>
<th>Design 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Tree Canopy &amp; Landscape</strong></td>
<td>Low (1 point)</td>
<td>Low (1 Point)</td>
<td>Low (1 Point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four trees will be required to be removed</td>
<td>Four trees will be required to be removed</td>
<td>Four trees will be required to be removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-foot-high retaining wall required to be constructed in front of 55 Newman Drive</td>
<td>2-foot-high retaining wall required to be constructed in front of 55 Newman Drive</td>
<td>2-foot-high retaining wall required to be constructed in front of 55 Newman Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Driveways</strong></td>
<td>High (3 Points)</td>
<td>Medium (2 Points)</td>
<td>Low (1 Point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The installation of the sidewalk within the City right-of-way continues to provide the off-street parking that is required in the Zoning By-law</td>
<td>The installation of the sidewalk within the City right-of-way continues to provide the off-street parking that is required in the Zoning By-law</td>
<td>The installation of the sidewalk within the City right-of-way continues to provide the off-street parking that is required in the Zoning By-law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All driveways impacted. Driveway lengths will be reduced by 2.5-3.1 metres.</td>
<td>All driveways impacted. Driveway lengths will be reduced by 2.5 metres.</td>
<td>All driveways impacted. Driveway lengths will be reduced by 1.8 metres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>Low (1 Point)</td>
<td>High (3 Points)</td>
<td>High (3 Points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four street light poles and a Bell Canada pedestal are required to be relocated</td>
<td>Twelve street light poles, Energy Plus hydro vault and Bell Canada pedestal required to be relocated</td>
<td>Thirteen street light poles and Energy Plus hydro vault required to be relocated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost</strong></td>
<td>Low (1 Point)</td>
<td>High (3 Points)</td>
<td>High (3 Points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Score</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See Financial Section of this report for more details*
Design Option 1 scored the lowest overall impact and is therefore the recommended preferred design to proceed to tender and construction as illustrated in Appendix B.

While the preferred Design Option 1 has the greatest impact to existing driveways, it is important to note that any design option would have an impact on driveways. The preferred Design Option 1 provides the best balance between the impacts of all options. Staff will continue to work with the property owners affected during the construction stage to minimize driveway impacts, if feasible.

It should also be noted that Newman Drive is currently ranked in the top 25 on the City’s sidewalk infill priority list.

Existing Policy/By-Law

Cambridge Official Plan

Section 5.1 identifies urban design objectives one of which is “design our community at the pedestrian scale in support of fostering social interaction, active streetscapes and walkable neighbourhoods”; 

Section 5.2 states that “The City will support the integration of pedestrian and cycling facilities into existing and new development areas”; 

Section 6.11 states that “The City in partnership with the Region and other agencies, will seek to enhance the provision of safe facilities for pedestrians and cyclists”.

Pedestrian Charter for the Municipalities of Waterloo Region

In 2005, City of Cambridge Council endorsed the Region of Waterloo’s Pedestrian Charter. The Charter sets out a number of principles to be followed including that the City “provide and maintain infrastructure that gives pedestrians safe and convenient passage while walking along and crossing streets.”

Engineering Standards & Development Manual 2013

The City’s Engineering Standards and Development Manual provides cross-sections for all road categories from arterial to minor local. It is best practice to adhere to such standards whenever feasible which for a local road such as Newman Drive would include sidewalk on at least one side of the street.

Sidewalk Installation Policy (TPW-12/08)

This 2008 policy report approved by Council outlines sidewalk infill requirements in the City (and how sidewalk infill is prioritized). Newman Drive is currently ranked as twenty-three on the City’s sidewalk priority list, with a total score of 61/100. Some of the criteria the sidewalk installation policy system considers are proximity to schools and seniors’
facilities, public space links, sidewalk continuity, transit connections, and commercial land use.

City of Cambridge Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Policy – Report 17-053(CRP)

The City of Cambridge’s Accessibility policy as endorsed by Council in 2017 states that “The City of Cambridge shall comply with the AODA Design of Public Spaces Standards when undertaking new construction and redevelopment of public spaces.”

Financial Impact

Three design options for sidewalk on Newman Drive were considered as outlined above. The preliminary estimated costs of these designs and financial impacts are presented below:

- **Design Option 1 (Preferred):** Total cost is $180,000 with contribution from Cambridge West developers no additional funds will be required.

- **Design Option 2:** Total cost is $295,000, with contribution from Cambridge West developers an additional $115,000 will be required to be funded by the City for the construction of the sidewalk.

- **Design Option 3:** Total cost is $315,000, with contribution from Cambridge West developers an additional $135,000 will be required to be funded by the City for the construction of the sidewalk.

The initial cost estimate for the installation of sidewalk on Newman Drive was $70,000. As part of the Cambridge West Plan of Subdivision approvals, the developers have agreed to make an additional contribution, for a total of $180,000.

Should Council select Design Option 2 or 3, additional funds from the City’s Capital Works Reserve Fund would be required.

Public Input

A virtual public information center (PIC) through Engage Cambridge was held during the month of January 2021. The proposed sidewalk design plan presented at the PIC identified the existing streetlights, trees to be removed, potential trees to be removed, vegetation impacts, new retaining wall and the sidewalk.

During the PIC, 11 responses were received. The main concerns expressed included the number of tree removals, loss of driveway length, and impacts to existing properties (refer to PIC comments in Appendix A). These concerns were reviewed and some design adjustments were made such as reducing the number of potential tree removals from 12 to 4, minimizing driveway impacts and reducing retaining wall impacts (See
Appendix C – Preferred Design). Where necessary and feasible, staff will continue to work with individual property owners during construction to further reduce impacts where feasible.

Internal/External Consultation

Staff from Design & Approvals and Transportation Engineering staff worked with Stantec Consulting to develop the design options. In addition, Forestry staff were consulted with regard to the impacts of the sidewalk design to the existing tree landscape.

Conclusion

Based on the above information and in keeping with a number of Council endorsed policies and best practices, it is recommended that the preferred Design Option 1 proceed to tender and construction. This design includes the installation of a new 1.5 metre sidewalk with a 1.0-1.6 metre boulevard on the north/east side of Newman Drive from Princess Street to 61 Newman Drive.

Signature
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Attachments

- Appendix A – Newman Drive PIC Comments
- Appendix B – Newman Drive Sidewalk Preferred Design
APPENDIX A – Newman Drive Sidewalk Installation PIC Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments Received</th>
<th>City Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tree Removal Comments:</strong></td>
<td>The Project Team have reviewed the project with Forestry Staff and have identified 4 trees will be required to be removed for the installation of the sidewalk with a 1.0-1.6 metre boulevard and for the installation of curb face sidewalk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleven (11) comments were received regarding the removal of trees and potential tree removals. Below are a few comments received.</td>
<td>1 of the trees is being removed due to the condition/health of the tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are greatly concerned that the planned design will require the removal of so many mature and healthy trees.</td>
<td>Also, residents abutting the properties that the trees are removed will be asked if they would like a new tree placed in front of there property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>According to this sidewalk design at least a dozen healthy, large, mature trees are scheduled for removal or possible removal. So, I am asking for consideration in achieving the safety obligation with minimal impact to our properties and the surrounding vegetation, ie trees, gardens, etc. After reviewing the street plan online, I would like to propose sidewalks be installed directly against the curb thereby eliminating blvds. Doing so would reduce the need to remove various trees &amp; vegetation and minimize erosion of established driveways, walkways, gardens, etc.</td>
<td>Minimum sidewalk width is 1.5 metres with a boulevard, 1.8 metres minimum width for curb-face sidewalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am concerned about the removal of trees along the street which takes away the appeal of an older neighbourhood. If it must go through I would prefer no grass boulevard and have the sidewalk installed right against the curb as they were completed on Blair Road.</td>
<td>Minimum boulevard width is 0.5 metres, however in wider right-of-way such as Newman Drive best practice is 1.0 metres to provide adequate snow storage, room for boulevard utility infrastructure and separation from the roadway. The minimum boulevard width presents challenges for sod growth as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is concern about maintaining the ambience of the street and for some, the construction will require tree removal. As an alternative, we would like to suggest that the sidewalk be placed adjacent to the inside of the lamp posts. This would give a narrower boulevard than proposed. Also constructing a narrower sidewalk than</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
proposed would reduce the impact on the residents. A sidewalk that accommodates 2 people side by side should be sufficient. Perhaps a 1 metre width would be adequate. This is a unique community and there should be accommodation to reflect this, rather than following a city-wide policy.

The current plan calls for a grass boulevard that varies from 1.0 m – 1.9 m. Revising the design to eliminate it and have the sidewalk abut the existing curb would save at least fifteen (15) trees and other shrubs, flower beds etc. The residents affected by this project are very concerned about having the final streetscape as unchanged and aesthetically pleasing as possible so making such a revision would be enthusiastically supported. Note that this revised design would mimic existing sidewalk/curb designs in the vicinity of Newman Drive.

The plan calls for far too many trees to be removed. Moving the sidewalk to the curb moves it further away from the tress, reducing the need for “potential tree removal”. I think it would also make sense to consult the city’s arborist to see if alternative construction techniques could be used during construction/excavation to eliminate the removal of so many trees.

**Boulevard Width Comments:**

**Six (6) comments were received regarding the boulevard width and installing curb face sidewalk. Below are a few comments received.**

Are the 1 – 1.6-meter grass boulevard’s necessary? Or can the boulevard size be reduced to lessen the impact?

Minimum boulevard width is 0.5 metres, however in wider right-of-way such as Newman Drive best practice is 1.0 metres to provide adequate snow storage, room for boulevard utility infrastructure and separation from the roadway. The minimum boulevard width presents challenges for sod growth as well.

The condition for the installation of curb side sidewalk is based on the width of the
We support a sidewalk that abuts the curb, not having the additional space of a boulevard.

What are the conditions that need to be met in order to have a sidewalk installed against the curb?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Impact Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Many people will experience “damage” to their properties as they currently enjoy them. Some of us will have our driveways damaged. Some will lose parking that they need and use every day. Others will have retaining walls built. All of the above will negatively affect property values. All things that were not expected when we purchased our homes. Impacts that can be greatly reduced by some alterations to the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sidewalk would also remove an essential parking spot on my current driveway. The ascetics of a sidewalk are not appealing to me. It will require further maintenance (shovelling snow) on my large property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a flower bed that has existed prior to 1994 when I purchased the house. It has a well constructed garden wall around it and is tagged with the “remove existing vegetation” note on the sidewalk plan. Removing the grass boulevard from the plan would either eliminate the need to remove the part that's infringing on the sidewalk or at least reduce the effect on the garden wall while maintaining the aesthetics of the new sidewalk design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 2012 I replaced my decrepit 40-year-old asphalt driveway with coloured concrete at right-of-way. For a narrow right-of-way (10-12 metres) the City will install curb side sidewalks if no other options are available to install a boulevard. The City of Cambridge standard is to have a sidewalk installed with a boulevard for snow storage and to enhance pedestrian safety. Also, the installation of a curb side sidewalk requires that the sidewalk width be widen to 1.8 metres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The installation of the sidewalk within the City right-of-way will have the same impacts to parking with the sidewalk being constructed with a 1.0 metre boulevard or constructed curb face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On some construction projects we find that residents have constructed gardens, shrubs, hedges, and fences within the City road allowance. If the specific landscape feature is in conflict with the proposed sidewalk location, you will be asked to relocate the garden, hedge etc. onto your property prior to construction taking place. When constructing the sidewalk, it may be necessary to cut back some driveways to match the new grade. If this is the case, the driveway will be saw-cut and a patch placed using the same material if possible. Impressed or coloured concrete driveways cannot be replaced to match the original, which is also the case with paving stone driveways (unless the owner has a supply of matching stones that the contractor could use). If you have a sprinkler system installed along the edge of the roadway within the City’s road allowance, please remove the piping prior to construction as the contractor will not be responsible for damage and the City will not replace it. You may have it reinstalled on private property after construction is completed if you wish.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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considerable expense. While I appreciate that the new sidewalk will cross it and can’t match the existing concrete’s colour, I’d like to minimize the amount of “saw cutting” and concrete replacement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sidewalk Side Selection Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On one hand the plan seems to improve pedestrian safety. But on the other hand, the plan seems to compromise pedestrian safety by putting the proposed sidewalk on only one side of the street, forcing pedestrians to cross Newman Drive. Please let us know the reason for having the sidewalk on only one side of the street. I see no mention in your plan as to why you’ve chosen one side over the other. Please let us know the reason for having sidewalk on the north side rather than the south side. Most pedestrians will prefer the sidewalk on the south side as it is most likely their side of arrival at Newman Drive and most likely their preferred side to exist from Newman Drive (perhaps heading to the school, to the bus or simply just carrying on with their walk around the neighbourhood.) In particular, at the bottom of Newman Drive the plan calls for pedestrians to cross both Newman Drive and Princess Street to get to the connecting sidewalk. Crossing Newman Drive at that intersection in the winter is exceptionally dangerous. Cars coming down Newman Drive regularly fail to stop in time due to ice on the roadway. It would be far, far safer to have the pedestrians arrive at Princess Street on the south side of Newman Drive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retaining Wall Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The plans as they stand would require a large, 4-5 ft. high retaining wall to be built. The installation of the sidewalk of Newman Drive will require the construction of a retaining wall to protect existing utility infrastructure, the retaining wall will be 0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The north/east side of Newman Drive from Princess Street to 61 Newman Drive was selected as the proposed corridor for the sidewalk installation as the south/west side corridor would have a greater impact to the residential properties and neighbourhood aesthetics.

The installation of the sidewalk on the south/west side would require sufficient grading of private properties and the installation of retaining walls.
adjacent to our property. We would like to see specific plans as to how this would be undertaken. Would construction workers need to access our private property? Would the city be responsible for damages? How will the city prevent people from sitting and/or loitering along the top of this retaining wall should this become an issue?

| metres (2 feet) high and 20 metres (65 feet) and will be built to current City standards. Also, the retaining wall will be required with the installation of curb-face sidewalk. |
| Construction of the retaining wall will be completed using the City right-of-way. |
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Meeting Date:  03/16/21
Subject:    Bishop Street Community Update
Submitted By:  Elaine Brunn Shaw, Chief Planner, MCIP, RPP
Prepared By:  Kathy Padgett, Senior Planner – Environment, MCIP, RPP
Report No.:  21-001(CD)
File No.:  D03.04.07

Recommendation

THAT report 21-001(CD) – Bishop Street Community Update – be received.

Executive Summary

Purpose

- Provide an update to Council on the ongoing efforts to mitigate trichloroethylene (TCE) contamination in the Bishop Street Community.

Key Findings

- The Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) continues to oversee the environmental monitoring, remediation and mitigation work to address TCE contamination in groundwater, as well as the indoor air mitigation systems in residential homes and a number of monitoring programs. The MECP works in consultation with Region of Waterloo Public Health and GE Canada.

Financial Implications

- There are no financial implications to the City of Cambridge.

Background

Northstar Aerospace Canada (Northstar) operated an aerospace parts manufacturing facility at 679/695 Bishop Street North (site) in Cambridge from 1981 to 2009. Aerospace manufacturing at this site by other companies dates back to the 1950s and 1960s.
In 2004, Northstar identified trichloroethylene (TCE) contamination in soil and groundwater at its site. In 2005, Northstar identified that TCE impacted groundwater migrated off-site. At that time, Northstar implemented an extensive groundwater remediation and indoor air quality monitoring and mitigation program, including: the installation and operation of an on-site groundwater extraction and treatment system with on-site and off-site extraction wells; installation and maintenance of indoor air mitigation systems at impacted properties within the Bishop Street Community; conducting an indoor air monitoring program for properties in the study area of the Bishop Street Community; and, the completion of groundwater and surface water monitoring.

TCE is a volatile organic compound (VOC) which was used as a degreaser for metal parts manufactured at the Northstar manufacturing site. The TCE present in groundwater has not impacted the City of Cambridge drinking water supply, but it is of concern for indoor air quality due to its ability to easily evaporate. When TCE is present in groundwater, it can evaporate, migrate through the soil and eventually enter basements through cracks, drains, sumps and other openings in the foundation, known as vapour intrusion.

In 2007, additional investigations confirmed the presence of a second source of TCE contributing to the existing groundwater contaminant plume from 610 Bishop Street North, located across the street from the Northstar plant. At this time, GE Canada, a corporate successor to Borg-Warner Canada Inc., one of the former owners of 610 Bishop Street North associated with the use of TCE in its processes, began to work with the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) to investigate soil and groundwater conditions on the property and in the surrounding area. The current owner of 610 Bishop Street North, Rozell Inc. are a custom fabricator of sheet metal which has never used TCE in its processes.
The area in Cambridge impacted by this TCE contamination is known as the Bishop Street Community and is generally located south of Montrose Street North, north of Pinewood Avenue, and west of Ryerson Public School to the Grand River.

As of August 27, 2012, Northstar was bankrupt and ceased to have funds available to operate, maintain, and monitor the groundwater and indoor air mitigation measures that had been put in place at the site and within the Bishop Street Community. The MECP has taken steps to continue the operation of the mitigation systems at the former Northstar site to ensure TCE levels in indoor air in residential homes are maintained within the acceptable health-based levels as well as to prevent the further migration of contaminants off-site into the residential community.

The MECP continues to oversee the environmental remediation work to address TCE contamination in groundwater, as well as the indoor mitigation systems and a number of monitoring programs. The MECP works in consultation with Region of Waterloo Public Health and GE Canada. The MECP has contracted AET Group Inc. to manage day-to-day activities, including operating and maintaining mitigation systems, routinely collecting samples and acting as a resource for the community via the Bishop Street Community Information Centre (CIC). The City of Cambridge does not have a role in the environmental monitoring, remediation or mitigation work.
Analysis

Strategic Alignment

PLACE: To take care of, celebrate and share the great features in Cambridge that we love and mean the most to us.

Goal #1 - Community Wellbeing

Objective 1.1 Work with partners to create a safe, inclusive and accessible city.

The ongoing environmental monitoring, remediation and mitigation measures undertaken by the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks and GE Canada continue to protect the health of the residents in the Bishop Street Community.

Comments

Indoor Air Monitoring Program

Currently, there are 368 residential homes involved in the Bishop Street Community indoor air monitoring program which measures the TCE levels inside homes. The indoor air monitoring program is conducted annually in an effort to verify indoor air TCE levels, to ensure that appropriate indoor air mitigation is installed in homes to meet the Region of Waterloo Public Health’s recommended action level of 0.5 micrograms per cubic metre ($\mu g/m^3$) or less, and to verify the effectiveness of the indoor air mitigation equipment.

Currently, there are 218 residential homes in the Bishop Street Community that have indoor air mitigation systems to ensure indoor TCE levels stay below 0.5 $\mu g/m^3$ which is a protective level where no further remedial action is required. A number of different air mitigation systems have been installed in homes in the Bishop Street Community which are effective at reducing TCE concentrations in homes to below Region of Waterloo Public Health recommended action levels.

In an effort to reduce the concentrations of TCE in homes that are testing over 0.5 $\mu g/m^3$, a contract was implemented in 2020 by the MECP to install free Sub-Slab Depressurization (SSD) systems in homes that do not currently have an SSD system. An SSD system consists of a fan or blower which draws air from the soil beneath a building foundation and discharges it to the outdoor air through a series of pipes which removes TCE vapour from under the basement of homes. The SSD system installation program will continue through 2021. The diagram below shows how an SSD system works. While the image below references radon, the same mitigation measures can be applied to TCE.
AET Group Inc., on behalf of the MECP and GE Canada, are responsible for running the indoor air monitoring and mitigation programs. This program has not experienced delays due to COVID-19.

**Groundwater Remediation and Sampling Program**

Annual groundwater sampling continues to be conducted by AET Group Inc. throughout the Bishop Street Community to confirm the effectiveness of the groundwater extraction and treatment system to ensure that contaminants are no longer migrating off the former Northstar site. Technical staff at MECP reviews the sampling data.

In 2009, GE Canada began treating soil and groundwater in the southwestern portion of 610 Bishop Street North with potassium permanganate. GE Canada’s efforts injecting potassium permanganate into the ground have been effective in reducing TCE in the soil and groundwater. In 2015, GE Canada discontinued the use of potassium permanganate in consultation with the MECP and began a monitoring program to assess the long-term effects of the remedial efforts. Based on the results of this ongoing monitoring program, GE Canada and MECP will jointly determine the next steps.
Surface Water Sampling Program

Surface water sampling of the Grand River continues to be conducted twice a year by AET Group Inc. on behalf of MECP. Technical staff at MECP review the sampling data to ensure water quality continues to meet applicable Provincial guidelines.

Communications

Information is provided and accessible about the Bishop Street Community through various means:

- **Bishop Street Community Information Centre (CIC):** The CIC is managed by AET Group Inc. and acts as a one-window access point for the community. All relevant information pertaining to the Bishop Street Community can be obtained by contacting the CIC by telephone and email. The CIC is often contacted by real estate agents on behalf of home buyers/sellers in the area as well as area residents who may be considering a basement renovation.

- **CIC Newsletters:** Newsletters are prepared from time to time by AET Group Inc. with input from the MECP, Region of Waterloo Public Health and GE Canada to inform the Bishop Street Community of updates to the program. The last newsletter was prepared in November 2019 (see Attachment No. 1).

- **Open House:** The MECP, Region of Waterloo Public Health and GE Canada have held several public meetings over the years to keep the community informed when there are major milestones or developments that would have an impact on the community. The most recent public open house was held in May 2017 to update residents in the community on the groundwater remediation program and indoor air mitigation activities.

Quarterly agency meetings are also held with the MECP, GE Canada, Region of Waterloo Public Health, Region of Waterloo Water Services and City of Cambridge.

This report is for information purposes, there are no implications if Council does not accept the report.

**Existing Policy/By-Law**

There is no existing policy/by-law.

**Financial Impact**

There are no financial implications to the City of Cambridge.
Public Input

Residents in the Bishop Street Community continue to stay informed about updates to the program through the Bishop Street Community Information Centre, newsletters and open houses.

Internal/External Consultation

The Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks, Region of Waterloo Public Health, Region of Waterloo Water Services and GE Canada reviewed the contents of this report.

Conclusion

The Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) in consultation with Region of Waterloo Public Health and GE Canada continue to oversee the environmental monitoring, remediation and mitigation work to address TCE contamination in groundwater, as well as the indoor mitigation systems and a number of monitoring programs in the Bishop Street Community. These ongoing measures supports the City’s Strategic Alignment by continuing to ensure the health of the residents in the Bishop Street Community.

Signature

Division Approval

Reviewed by the CFO

Reviewed by Legal Services

Name: Elaine Brunn Shaw, MCIP, RPP
Title: Chief Planner

Departmental Approval
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City Manager Approval

Name: David Calder
Title: City Manager

Attachments

1. Community Update Newsletter (November 2019)
This newsletter has been developed to share updates about the on-going environmental work in the Bishop Street Community.

Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks Update

The ministry continues to oversee the environmental work to address trichloroethylene (TCE) contamination in groundwater, as well as the indoor mitigation systems and a number of monitoring programs.

This is to ensure the community remains protected.

The ministry works in consultation with the Region of Waterloo Public Health and GE Canada.

More homes to receive indoor air mitigation systems

Beginning in December, the indoor air mitigation program will be expanded to include up to 112 additional homes. As a result of the Region of Waterloo Public Health long-term goal to bring all homes down to 0.5 micrograms per cubic metre (μg/m³) or less, the ministry and GE Canada are prioritizing homes for mitigation that were assessed in the past year to have concentrations of TCE in indoor air between 0.5 and 5 μg/m³.

The air mitigation systems are necessary to ensure concentrations of TCE stay below 0.5 μg/m³, a protective level where no further action is required.

AET Group Inc. (AET) will contact the additional 112 homeowners to provide additional information about the air mitigation systems, answer questions and coordinate an appointment for installation.

The ministry anticipates these mitigation systems will be installed before the end of 2021.

A number of different air mitigation systems with varying technologies have been installed in homes in the Bishop Street Community. These systems are effective at reducing TCE concentrations in homes to below Public Health recommended levels.

Evaluation of homes with multiple indoor air mitigation systems

AET, on behalf of the ministry and GE Canada, will be conducting a study in homes that have multiple types of air mitigation systems to determine whether the older systems can be turned off. This study will be part of the winter indoor air monitoring program.

In the coming months, AET will contact homeowners with multiple systems to provide additional information about the study.

On-going groundwater remediation and sampling programs

The ministry, through contract with AET, continues to operate and maintain the groundwater extraction system located at the former Northstar Aerospace Canada property at 679 Bishop Street. This system prevents further migration of contaminated groundwater from the site and treats it to acceptable levels.

Indoor air sampling

The annual winter air sampling program will begin in December 2019 and run through March 2020. Indoor air sampling allows us to determine when air mitigation is required to reduce levels of TCE in homes, as well as confirm TCE levels remain below acceptable levels.

AET, through the Community Information Centre (CIC), will coordinate the air sampling with home owners.

Groundwater sampling

Annual groundwater sampling continues to be conducted throughout the Bishop Street Community to confirm the effectiveness of the groundwater collection and treatment system and that contaminants are no longer migrating off the former Northstar site.

The 2019 sampling was completed in May and is being reviewed by ministry technical staff.

Surface water sampling

Surface water sampling of the Grand River continues to be conducted twice a year. The 2019 sampling program was completed in June and August. The ministry is reviewing the sampling data to ensure water quality continues to meet applicable provincial guidelines.
Region of Waterloo Public Health Update

Mitigation measures in homes continue to be very successful at reducing levels of TCE in indoor air, and have resulted in the large majority of homes having concentrations of TCE below 5 μg/m³. The long-term goal of this program is to bring all homes down to 0.5 μg/m³ or less. Region of Waterloo Public Health will continue to review the results of the indoor air sampling program, which is carried out by AET and overseen by the ministry, to ensure these levels remain low.

Public Health continues to recommend that the ministry direct resources towards remedial options for indoor air TCE levels that will achieve the long-term goal of less than 0.5 μg/m³, using the following action levels:

**Action Levels:**
- Less than 0.5 μg/m³ → No further remedial actions are required.
- Between 0.5 μg/m³ and 5 μg/m³ → Continue annual indoor air monitoring. Public Health will work with the ministry to prioritize homes to receive remedial options.
- Above 5 μg/m³ → Continue to be prioritized for indoor air assessments and remediation. Continue annual indoor air monitoring.

In addition, Public Health has recommended, when choosing between effective options for indoor air mitigation, that consideration should be given to minimizing stress and inconvenience for Bishop Street Community residents. For the Public Health Fact Sheet on TCE or additional information, visit the Public Health website on TCE www.regionofwaterloo.ca/TCE or contact Public Health directly at 519-575-4400.

GE Canada Update

Since 2007, GE Canada has been undertaking investigations and remedial efforts at 610 Bishop Street North and has shared in mitigation efforts in the Bishop Street Community. GE Canada provides support to both indoor air mitigation and monitoring work conducted by the CIC.

In 2009, GE Canada began treating soil and groundwater in the southwestern portion of the 610 Site with potassium permanganate. GE Canada’s remedial efforts have been effective in destroying TCE in the soil and groundwater. In 2015, GE Canada discontinued the use of potassium permanganate in consultation with the ministry and began a monitoring program to assess the long-term effects of the remedial efforts. Based on the results of the ongoing monitoring program, next steps will be determined in consultation with the ministry.

CIC Update

AET continues to manage the CIC as a one-window access point for the community. All relevant information pertaining to the Bishop Street Community can still be obtained by contacting the CIC at AET’s Cambridge office (see CIC contact information below).

**Indoor Air Monitoring: Winter 2020**

CIC staff wish to thank everyone for their continued cooperation during the winter air sampling programs. From calling us back promptly to shoveling your walkway, we appreciate your help.
To: COUNCIL
Meeting Date: 03/30/21
Subject: Additional Building Division Staff
Submitted By: Dennis Purcell, Chief Building Official
Prepared By: Dennis Purcell, Chief Building Official
Report No.: 21-089(CD)
File No.: C1101

Recommendations

THAT Report 21-089(CD) – Additional Building Division Staff – be received;

AND THAT the Building Division increases its staffing complement of Municipal Building Officials by 2 FTE to manage increased volume of permit activity.

Executive Summary

Purpose

The City of Cambridge has seen a significant increase in construction activity with growth forecasts suggesting it will continue into the foreseeable future.

As a result, the workload of the Building Division has also substantially increased with a higher volume of permit applications and heightened demands for permit issuance and inspections. It has been challenging for the Division to manage all the demands being made of it.

This report will provide justification for the hiring of 2 additional staff in the Building Division.

Key Findings

- The City of Cambridge has seen a significant increase in construction activity with growth forecasts suggesting it will continue into the foreseeable future.

- Current Building Stabilization Reserve Fund is $3,131,469.
StatsCan has identified Kitchener-Waterloo and Cambridge as communities with the third highest population growth rate in the country. StatsCan shows an estimated increase of 33.6% increase by 2031.

In 2019, $76,687 was paid to RSM Consultants to assist the Building Division to meet the legislated service levels during peak demand times.

Financial Implications

- The addition of two FTE's to the Building Services Division would add approximately $170,000 to the operating costs per year.
- The Building Division's operating budget is funded through permit revenue, and therefore there is no impact to the City's overall tax base.
- In 2019, $20,761 was paid in overtime.
- In 2019, $76,687 was paid to RSM Consultants for assistance during peak demand times.
- In 2020, $12,272 was paid in overtime.
- In 2019, $2,411,390 was budgeted for operating costs. Permit revenue was $3,495,576.
- In 2020, operating costs amounted to $2,666,019. Permit revenue was $2,308,685. The decrease in permit revenue was largely due to COVID-19 impacts. $357,334 was drawn from the Building Permit Stabilization Reserve.
- Building Stabilization Reserve Fund permits a maximum of 150% of operating expenditures, which is $4,215,600. The current balance of the reserve fund is $3,131,469.
- The financial data bears out that the Building Division is in a position to support the addition of two FTE’s to its staffing complement.

Background

Cambridge has evolved into a thriving mid-sized city. Interest in Cambridge from developers, builders, homeowners and the business community continues to grow and keeps pressure on building officials and the Division to adapt and deliver effective and timely services. The current complement of building officials has been working overtime to keep up with demand and ensure plans review and inspections are completed in the mandated timeframes. With developments such as the Limerick Road and Mattamy subdivisions where construction of hundreds of homes are being constructed in less than a 6 month time frame, and other high profile projects such as the hospital and the
Gaslight District, building officials are struggling to keep up with mandated timeframes set out by the code and the increasing demands of our clients. As a short-term measure, during specific peak demand periods through the year, RSM Consultants, a registered code agency, was hired to help the Building Division.

In 2019 a total of 1642 permits, at a construction value of $455,980,194 were issued, an increase from 2018, where a total of 1051 permits were issued with a construction value of $370,997,292. In 2018 the number of residential units constructed was 578 and nearly doubled in 2019 to 1049 residential units constructed.

In 2020 a total of 1251 permits at a construction value of $258,443,157 were issued. The number of residential units constructed was down to 385. These decreases were due to the impacts of COVID-19.

Analysis

Strategic Alignment

PROSPERITY: To support and encourage the growth of a highly competitive local economy where there is opportunity for everyone to contribute and succeed.

Goal #2 - Governance and Leadership

Objective 2.3  Encourage a culture of innovation and engagement that allows all staff to contribute to the ongoing renewal of city

The addition of 2 FTE’s will contribute towards keeping the Building Division responsive, agile and a leader in helping the public navigate the approvals process, get permits issued faster and help support the economic development and growth of the City.

Comments

StatsCan has identified Kitchener-Waterloo and Cambridge as communities with the third highest population growth rate in the country. StatsCan shows an estimated increase of 33.6% increase by 2031, for a predicted population of 176 000, for the City of Cambridge.
The graphs show a general upward trend in overall construction, with 2019 having the highest construction value in the past 10 years, while 2020 was impacted by Covid-19. All indicators (StatsCan data and the staging of development report in Appendix) predict that 2021 -2023, at the least, will be back on track for increased overall development.

It should be noted that residential alteration permits show a steady climb year after year and has significantly spiked during the pandemic. While these permits generally do not generate much overall revenue, it is a significant contributor to the volume of permits that still require processing and often requires significantly more time to review plans and inspect construction as building officials help homeowners through a process they are generally not familiar with.

Our Economic Development Division anticipates in excess of a million square feet of new industrial space will be built in the City over the next year.

Cambridge Memorial Hospital continues with its next phase of construction and has almost reached a stage where assigning a building official exclusively to the hospital to manage the volume of inspections will be required to meet schedules. This will create a ripple effect for the rest of the inspection team.

In addition to the steady increase of overall development the Building Division has 4448 permit files open currently.

Of those:

- 3673 are more than 1 year old, and
- 775 had been started (permit submitted) within the last year and would be considered current applications
Taken from previous WRCBOC Stats - the ratio of permits issued per year/per site inspector is as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019 Issued Permits</th>
<th>Site Inspection Staff</th>
<th>Aggregate permits per inspector</th>
<th>Notes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>2975</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Kitchener is seeing a surge in development and their ratio is still lower than ours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>1265</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>Number of inspectors was previously 8 - not sure if they had temporary vacancies that impacted 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guelph</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

200 – 250 is generally the capacity of a site inspector (on average). This gives an idea of the scope of taking on clean-up of the inactive open permits. It will take additional staff and at least a few years to work through these.

With the last of green field development happening in the City, infill and redevelopment is on the rise and with it, more diverse and complex projects that require a shift in focus, approach and skillset. Further, there is increased interest and investment in Cambridge’s core areas, including the repurposing of existing heritage structures, which will have its challenges with approvals. The addition of these two FTE’s will help keep the Division responsive, agile and a leader in helping the public navigate the approvals process.

If Council does not approve the addition of 2 FTE’s for the Building Division, the division would be required to retain the services of a private registered code agency during peak demand periods to ensure we meet the minimum legislated service levels.

It should be noted that 3 current building officials are eligible to retire in 2021 and will put additional demands on the Division. Should construction activity slow down as a result of future imposed restrictions due to the pandemic in the future there will be the flexibility to not immediately backfill the positions.

**Existing Policy/By-Law**

- Building bylaw
- Section 3.(2) of the *Building Code Act*, whereby the Council of a municipality shall appoint a chief building official and such inspectors as are necessary for the enforcement of the Act in the areas in which the municipality has jurisdiction

**Financial Impact**

Permit revenues from 2016 through 2019 have exceeded operational costs by approximately $500,000 per year. It is anticipated that these permit revenues will continue to exceed operational costs into 2023.
The addition of two FTE to the Building Services Division would add approximately $170,000 to the operating costs of the division per year. This dollar figure includes salary, benefits and impact to the indirect costs.

Operating costs of the building division are fully funded from users through permit fees, and therefore changes to staff levels do not impact the tax base funding.

**Public Input**

While public input is neither mandated, nor is there required legislated consultation for this request, informal suggestions have been made from the industry, including member builders of the Waterloo Region Homebuilders’ Association, to hire additional staff to manage the increased workload that has burdened the approvals process.

This report is posted publicly as part of the report process.

**Internal/External Consultation**

Financial Services has been consulted in regards to:

- Future growth projections for the City of Cambridge
- Operating budget
- Costs associated with increased staff complement
- Permit revenue
- Building Stabilization Reserve
- Direct and indirect costs of the Building Division

**Conclusion**

Cambridge is a mid-sized city that is experiencing momentous growth and development with a substantial upsurge in construction and building activity. GTA builders are migrating west in search of other development opportunities and find Cambridge to be a desirable location. There is a proliferation of business and industry locating facilities and operations in Cambridge due to its location along the 401 corridor and its relative proximity to the GTA and the American border. This is translating into a steady increase in the volume of permit applications that are being applied for and processed in the Building Division. Adding to the staff complement will aid in dealing with increased permit activity, improve turnaround times on permit review and the timely issuance of building permits.

**Signature**
Division Approval
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Departmental Approval
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City Manager Approval

Name: David Calder
Title: City Manager

Attachments

- Appendix A – Workload Planning
- Appendix B – 2020 Staging of Development
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Name</th>
<th>Development Location</th>
<th>(#) Baseline: New market units</th>
<th>Total Estimated Number of Units (1)</th>
<th>Freehold + Condo (mix in adjacent cell)</th>
<th>Mix (please indicate in adjacent cell)</th>
<th>Local first-time buyers</th>
<th>Local downsizing 80%</th>
<th>Other (please indicate in adjacent cell)</th>
<th>Total Estimated Number of Units (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>River Mill West</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>770 Equinox Way</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southpoint</td>
<td>221 &amp; 1236 Dundas St. S</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison Creek Estates</td>
<td>8 Dundas St. S.</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siprae</td>
<td>249 Righton Way &amp; 124 Rose Point Dr.</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverwood Village</td>
<td>268 Birnmark Dr.</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverwood Village</td>
<td>625 Blenheim Rd.</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>431 Sparrow Ave.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>295 Hespeler Rd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activa</td>
<td>25 Isherwood Ave</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>208 Hespeler Rd.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X A</td>
<td>220 River Rd.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>308 &amp; 416 Dundas St S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>512 Franklin Blvd.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Condominium</td>
<td>360-362 River Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>2-16 Queen St. W.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X A</td>
<td>26 George St.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>365 Blair Rd.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Rowhouse are rows as defined for the Census. Includes townhouse, Cluster Townhouse/condominiums, and Free Hold Townhouse/Condominiums
(2) Apartments include Duplex, Rental Apartment Building, Condo Apartment Building, Residential/Commercial Mix, Market Tenure
Estimated Number of Dwelling Units Created
Total Single Detached Units to have Foundations in 2021
Total Semi-detached Units to have Foundations in 2021
Total Rowhouse (1) Units to have Foundations in 2021
Total Condo Units to have Foundations in 2021
Estimated Number of Foundations in 2021

City of Cambridge - Residential subdivisions/development projects (new foundation) anticipated to have their foundation in place (i.e. concrete poured) in 2021

Probability foundation(s) will be in place in 2021 (0-100%)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planner on File</th>
<th>Construction Year - Estimated Internally</th>
<th>Construction Year - Estimated by Developer</th>
<th>Application Number</th>
<th>Associated File(s)</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Date Approved or Applied YY-MM-DD</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Single Detached</th>
<th>Semi-detached</th>
<th>Rowhouse</th>
<th>Apartments</th>
<th>Current Total</th>
<th>Initial Units*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>SP20-20 - this year</td>
<td>R02-21 - early 2022, maybe late 2021</td>
<td>12104(2)</td>
<td>SP20-20 (Blk4)</td>
<td>Draft Approved</td>
<td>2016.05.12</td>
<td>N/E of Speedsvale Rd &amp; Hwy 401, 270 Equestrian Way</td>
<td>Arriscraft International Inc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>693</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Q3 2021 for towns, singles</td>
<td>Q3/4 2021 for singles</td>
<td>13103</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Approved</td>
<td>2020.02.18</td>
<td>Dundas St (N.side, across from Branchton Rd.), 1261 &amp; 1265 Dundas St. S.</td>
<td>BosdaleFarms</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>registering stage 2 -spring, permits in summer</td>
<td></td>
<td>14102</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Approved, SP to be submitted for multi-blocks</td>
<td>2019.12.23</td>
<td>Dundas St (N.side) &amp; Varier Drive, 0 Dundas St. S.</td>
<td>Lakeview Homes</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>553</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>Not sure about stage 1 -2022</td>
<td>Serviceing started. Register in spring. Permits end of summer Register entire</td>
<td>15101</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Approved</td>
<td>2018.12.29</td>
<td>Former Saginaw Golf Course, 124 Saginaw Pkwy &amp; 161 Essex Point Dr.</td>
<td>Saginaw Developments Corp.</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>368</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>16101 (3)</td>
<td>servicing started. Register in spring. Permits end of summer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Approved</td>
<td>2019.07.22</td>
<td>4045 Maple Grove Rd.</td>
<td>Maple Mills (Hespeler Ltd.)</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>16103 (4)</td>
<td>Register entire 2021. Permits end of summer for 1st stage. Register 1 phase. Permits end of summer Registering in next couple weeks. Permits in Feb. Spring/summer for site plan units.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SP36-20 (Blk3, Stg4)</td>
<td>Draft Approved</td>
<td>2020.05.00</td>
<td>Cambridge West</td>
<td>Cachet Developments (CamWest) Inc.</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>412</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>16104 (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Approved</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Cambridge West</td>
<td>Hallman Construction Ltd.</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>16105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Approved</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Cambridge West</td>
<td>Huron Creek Developments</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>17101 (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>17101 (6)</td>
<td>SP06-20 (Blk2&amp;4)</td>
<td>Draft Approved</td>
<td>2019.07.25</td>
<td>0 &amp; 112 Pinebush Avenue</td>
<td>Branthaven Belmont Pinebush Inc.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>19101</td>
<td></td>
<td>19101</td>
<td>SP07-18</td>
<td>Draft Approved</td>
<td>2020.10.09</td>
<td>51 Sparrow Ave</td>
<td>Greengate Village Ltd.</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deanne</td>
<td>12102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No recent activity</td>
<td>12.08.27</td>
<td>90 &amp; 96 Branchton Rd</td>
<td>Manor Wood Homes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>13101(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>13101(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing, resubmission Dec 2020</td>
<td>1395 Main Street East, aka Moffat Creek, (former Hammersley Lands)</td>
<td>LVH (MC) Developments Inc</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>424</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deanne</td>
<td>07102</td>
<td></td>
<td>07102</td>
<td></td>
<td>No recent activity</td>
<td>07.04.19</td>
<td>S of Dundas St, E of Branchton Rd</td>
<td>Activa Holdings Inc/GSP Gro</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planner on File</td>
<td>Construction Year - Estimated Internally</td>
<td>Application Number</td>
<td>Associated File(s)</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Date Approved or Applied YY.MM.DD</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Single Detached</td>
<td>Semi-detached</td>
<td>Rowhouse</td>
<td>Apartm ents</td>
<td>Current Total</td>
<td>Initial Units*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>Draft approval this year. Permits 2022.</td>
<td>20101</td>
<td>R03-20</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>20.05.08 215 Blenheim Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Ridge Estates Ltd.</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>2023 N.A.</td>
<td>Block 352, 30T-03102</td>
<td>R03-20, B23-20, B24-20, B25-20, R16/07EB</td>
<td>Not submitted, pre-consultations in 2019 and 2020</td>
<td>1081 Dundas St. S.</td>
<td>Green Gate Village Ltd.</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deanne</td>
<td>Inactive.</td>
<td>SP40-04DDB</td>
<td>B03-20, B23-20, B24-20, B25-20, R16/07EB</td>
<td>Seeking severances through COA</td>
<td>11 Bechtel St.</td>
<td>P.Romeo</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td></td>
<td>SP17-14</td>
<td>R14-16</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>3 Liberty Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paderski</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td></td>
<td>SP27-15</td>
<td>R14-16</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>235 Lena Crescent</td>
<td></td>
<td>SWBC Lena Ltd.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>SP21-16</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Zoning Approved, but not active on SP submission</td>
<td>27-31 Cambridge St.</td>
<td>Douglas Development Corporation</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>SP31-16 (4)</td>
<td>R1351 BKA</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>2019.09.12 350 Fishermills Rd.(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bousfields Inc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>Site servicing permit issued in 2020.</td>
<td>SP41-16</td>
<td>R09-15</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>2016.10.24 264 Blair Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td>FAE Development &amp; Construction Inc.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reassigned</td>
<td></td>
<td>SP07-17</td>
<td>58M477, R02-17</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>415 Water St. S</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chrisview Custom Homes Ltd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>pull permits in mid-2021</td>
<td>SP28-17</td>
<td>R14-16</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>65 St.Andrews St.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summerco Properties Inc.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>Spring/summer 2021</td>
<td>SP41-17</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>2019.05.21 147 Elgin St.N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cambridge Vineyard Christian Fellowship</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td></td>
<td>SP13-18</td>
<td>OR02-18</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>2019.08.30 195 Hespeler Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td>NHDG (Hespeler) Inc.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>Spring 2021, Block 1-8 submitted for permits in 2020, but not issued.</td>
<td>SP45-18</td>
<td>OR01-18</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>2021 258 Hespeler Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2406461 Ont.Ltd.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>SP01-19</td>
<td>58M302 Blk7</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>2019.11.27 1100 Fountain St. N.</td>
<td>1100 Fountain St. Inc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>Summer 2021, Site servicing started 2020, Ready for approval. Waiting on securities. Permits expected 2021.</td>
<td>SP09-19</td>
<td>OR03-18</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>406 &amp; 416 Dundas St.S</td>
<td>2577917 Ont.Ltd.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>SP18-19</td>
<td>OR04-18</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>721 Franklin Blvd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2415274 Ont. Ltd.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>SP23-19</td>
<td>58M604 Blk190</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>2020.06.23 124 Compass Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hunt Club Valley Corp.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>Summer 2021</td>
<td>SP28-19</td>
<td>RP1526, Block 23</td>
<td>Ongoing, 2nd submission</td>
<td>165 &amp; 185 Greenbrier Rd.</td>
<td>2548912 Ontario Inc.</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planner on File</td>
<td>Application Number</td>
<td>Reference Code</td>
<td>Date Approved or Applied</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Single Detached</td>
<td>Semi-detached</td>
<td>Rowhouse</td>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>Current Total</td>
<td>Initial Units*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>SP31-19</td>
<td>P12-18 (famly R02-10YR)(2)</td>
<td>Approved 2020.09.29</td>
<td>25 Ishenwood Ave</td>
<td>Activa Holdings Inc.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>SP38-19</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>220 Blaire Rd.</td>
<td>Doma Homes &amp; Realty Corp.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>SP02-20</td>
<td>R10-18</td>
<td>Ongoing 2021.01.18</td>
<td>340-352-360 River Rd.</td>
<td>Reid's Heritage Homes</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>SP04-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>2-16 Queen St. W.</td>
<td>Concept Development</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline/Bryan</td>
<td>SP06-20</td>
<td>30T17101 Blk2&amp;14</td>
<td>Ongoing 108 &amp; 110 Pinebush Rd.</td>
<td>Branthaven Belmont Pinebush</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline/Bryan</td>
<td>SP20-20</td>
<td>30T12104</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>270 Equestrian Way</td>
<td>River Mill Development Corp.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>SP22-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>30 George St. S.</td>
<td>McDan Holdings</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>SP30-20</td>
<td>OR01-19</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>4 Branchton Rd.</td>
<td>Wil-O Homes</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline</td>
<td>SP36-20</td>
<td>30T16103</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>288 Bismark Dr.</td>
<td>Cachet Developments (CamWest) Inc.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>R12-17</td>
<td>Plan182</td>
<td>Approved 2019</td>
<td>647 Coronation Blvd.</td>
<td>Holman Designs Ltd.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>R12-18</td>
<td>30T18103</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>155-171 Guelph Ave.</td>
<td>Polocorp Inc. c/o M.Poupolo</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>R17-18</td>
<td>Plan715, SP46-18</td>
<td>Withdrew</td>
<td>1701 King St E.</td>
<td>Sribalaji Holdings</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>R03-19</td>
<td>58M184, SP38-20</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>151 Main St.</td>
<td>River Park Village Corp.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>R04-19</td>
<td>Plan590</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>442-448 River Rd.</td>
<td>KKAH Group Inc. (Butternut Grove)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>R02-19</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>0 &amp; 55 Kerr St.</td>
<td>50 Shade St. Investments Inc.</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>592</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>OR01-20</td>
<td>Plan615</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>15 Clover Ave</td>
<td>10184217 Canada Corp.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>OR03-20</td>
<td>Plan455</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>61-69 Ainslie St. S.</td>
<td>2699380 Ontario Inc.</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>392</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Number</td>
<td>Date Approved or Applied YY MM DD</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Single Detached</td>
<td>Semi-detached</td>
<td>Rowhouses</td>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>Current Total</td>
<td>Initial Units*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>Approval this year. Either this year or next construction. OR04-20</td>
<td>Ongoing 61 Nottingham Dr. 1370823 Ontario Inc.</td>
<td>367 367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>2024 OR06-20 applied for draft plan</td>
<td>Ongoing 1005 Main St</td>
<td>Greengate Village Ltd. &amp; LVH Developments (CW) Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69 132 204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>Construction next year. OR07-20</td>
<td>932 Eagle St. N. BHR Properties</td>
<td>18 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>2023 OR08-20 &amp; OR09-20 River Mill West (Phase 4) - applied for draft plan Approval 2021-2022 will need to apply for site plan 1134 Hunt Club Rd., 1285 Speedsville Rd., 800 Briardean Rd. River Mill Development Communities</td>
<td>Ongoing 405 Myers Rd 147 1027 690 1864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96 96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>2021 R01-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Estate of John Fraser c/o Granite Homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>late 2022 or early 2023 R07-20</td>
<td>Ongoing 285 Limerick Rd. 2404445 Ontario Inc.</td>
<td>7 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin/Malcolm</td>
<td>Jun-21 R09-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Azeez Bacchus KIAH Group Inc. (Vista Ridge) Inc.</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>2024 R10-20</td>
<td>Ongoing 436 Fountain St. S. 11 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm</td>
<td>late 2021/early 2022 R15-20</td>
<td>102 Spruce St. 2368122 Ontario Inc. 11 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>mid-late 2022 R14-20</td>
<td>Ongoing 355 Guelph Ave. 2753144 Ontario Inc.</td>
<td>9 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: COUNCIL

Meeting Date: 04/13/2021

Subject: Request to Scatter Cremated Remains in the Grand River

Submitted By: Michael Hausser, Director of Operations

Prepared By: Corina Burnell, Cemetery Operations Manager

Report No.: 21-059(IFS)

File No.: C1101

Recommendation(s)

THAT report 21-059(IFS) re Request to Scatter Cremated Remains in the Grand River be received for information.

AND THAT Council refer to the existing options available to scatter cremated remains in Cambridge and in the Province of Ontario.

Executive Summary

Purpose

This report provides information to Council regarding a request to scatter cremated remains into the Grand River.

Key Findings

- The City of Cambridge is in the process of developing a scattering garden in the Parklawn Cemetery that is expected to be available for services in the latter part of 2021.

- Options are available to scatter cremated remains on a number of provincially owned lands and on water as outlined in this report and as per Attachment – 2 published by the Bereavement Authority of Ontario.

- The scattering of cremated human remains on land is permitted on private property with the written consent of the land owner.

- The City of Cambridge is not the owner of the Grand River and it does not have the authority or jurisdiction to permit or prohibit the request to scatter cremated remains in the Grand River.
Financial Implications

The request offers a $20,000 contribution towards constructing a structure at an access point to the Grand River for the purposes of scattering cremated remains into the River.

The donation for a structure for public use would be a welcome addition, however, as the City does not have jurisdiction to permit or prohibit scattering of cremated remains into the Grand River, if agreeable to the donor, the structure would be considered to be donated in memory of one or more individuals of their Community, but, for general public use not for the purposes of scattering of cremated remains.

There is work in progress to improve the Grand River access point at the south end of Cambridge. A donation to enhance the shelter planned for this location could be an option to consider.

Background

Issue: Request to scatter cremated human remains in the Grand River:

Mr. Prakash Venkataraman sent an email on January 19, 2021 to City staff, requesting permission from the City to scatter cremated remains into the Grand River on behalf of the Hindu Community (included in this report as Attachment – 1).

Staff are not aware of any similar requests to date that have been brought to Council before.

Scattering Cremated Remains in Ontario:

The Government of Ontario determines what is permissible with regard to the scattering of cremated remains in Ontario, as outlined in the A Guide to Death Care in Ontario, published by the Bereavement Authority of Ontario, an administrative authority under the Ministry of Government and Consumer Services, Government of Ontario. A copy of this guide is included in this report as Attachment – 2.

Cremated human remains may be scattered, buried in the ground or interred in above-ground niches (compartments) in columbariums in designated areas in cemeteries, on municipal land (where no by-law exists to prohibit it) or scattered on private property with the written consent of the land owner.

The practice of interring or scattering cremated remains is an important part of many religious beliefs and traditions. The City of Cambridge provides for all in-ground burial or above-ground interment options for cremated remains in its cemeteries.

A scattering garden, permitting scattering to take place in a designated area within the Parklawn Cemetery will be established in 2021.
To accommodate requests to scatter cremated remains on land (outside established cemeteries) and in water, the Government of Ontario established a policy outlining what is permissible in Ontario and designated specific areas where cremated remains may be scattered. This is identified as unoccupied Crown land or Crown land covered by water and defined in Ontario as the Great Lakes, provincial parks and conservation reserves.

Provincially-designated areas for scattering cremated remains on land or in water in Ontario include the Great Lakes, 340 provincial parks and 295 conservation reserves.

Analysis

Strategic Alignment

PLACE: To take care of, celebrate and share the great features in Cambridge that we love and mean the most to us.

Goal #2 - Governance and Leadership

Objective 2.4 Work collaboratively with other government agencies and partners to achieve common goals and ensure representation of community interests.

Goal #4 – Environment and Rivers

Objective 4.3 Work with other partners to educate the public and help make changes to improve and protect our natural heritage features.

Objective 4.4 Manage city resources in a responsible and sustainable manner, considering future needs for resiliency and community adaptation.

This report aligns with these objectives and supports the Government of Ontario’s policy regarding the scattering of cremated remains on land and in waterways.

Comments

Owners/Stakeholders of the Grand River:

Scattering in inland waterways, such as rivers and lakes in Ontario is complex because there is no sole or exclusive “owner” of the waterways to obtain permission from. The Grand River is a shared, natural resource that flows through many jurisdictions and there are several potential stakeholders.

Stakeholders include, but are not limited to, provincial and federal governments, including the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry, the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks, the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Resources, Environment and Climate Change Canada, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Natural Resources Canada, several municipalities and towns that border inland rivers and
lakes, environmental protection agencies, several First Nations and the public.

The City of Cambridge, although a stakeholder, is not the owner of the Grand River and as such, does not have the authority or jurisdiction regarding the uses of the Grand River by the public.

**Provincial Policy regarding Scattering Cremated Remains in Ontario:**

As outlined in A Guide to Death Care in Ontario, scattering of cremated remains is permitted on land and in water in most provincial parks and conservation reserves, unless there is a sign posted that prohibits the practice, which may occur in some environmentally sensitive areas.

Permission is not required to scatter and there is no fee to do so in the designated areas. Most provincial parks have restrictions in place regarding what may be placed into the water or left at the site during scattering ceremonies. It is suggested that any person who wishes to scatter in provincial parks or conservation reserves contact the park or conservation area directly to let the staff know of the intended visit and to clarify any restrictions.

The provincial policy provides Mr. Venkataraman with potentially 340 provincial parks and 295 conservation reserves in Ontario in which to scatter cremated remains.

Although there are no provincial parks or conservation reserves within Waterloo Region, there are approximately 6 parks/reserves located within 1 hour of Cambridge with options to scatter remains in water.

In addition, some provincial parks, including Bronte Creek (Oakville), Darlington (Bowmanville), Earl Rowe (Alliston), Forks of the Credit (Caledon), Rideau River (Kemptville) have areas within the parks specifically for scattering ceremonies.

**Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA):**

Mr. Venkataraman attended the GRCA General Membership Meeting on September 25, 2020. The minutes of this meeting are included in this report as Attachment – 3 and Attachment – 4.

The GRCA indicated it does not own the river and does not have the jurisdiction to permit or prohibit the scattering of cremated remains in the Grand River.

The GRCA confirmed to staff that it is not a conservation reserve and that access to the Grand River through GRCA properties to scatter is also prohibited.

**Scattering Options Within Cambridge:**

As noted in the background of this report, Cambridge is pleased to offer a new scattering garden option that is currently under development in the Parklawn Cemetery and is anticipated to be available for services late in autumn of 2021.
Alignment with Other Municipalities, Governments and Authorities:

Other provinces in Canada also have similar provisions in place as those in Ontario. The City of Kitchener and the City of Waterloo currently have scattering gardens in place within their cemeteries.

Other municipalities consulted, including Kitchener and Waterloo, have not received requests to scatter cremated remains in local waterways, but indicated that this would be outside their jurisdiction and that requests received would be referred to the designated areas provided by the Government of Ontario, where scattering in waterways is permitted.

Existing Policy/By-Law

There are no known existing City of Cambridge by-laws that permit or prohibit scattering of cremated remains on land owned by the municipality.

Cambridge abides by the policies set out by the Government of Ontario, as outlined in this report.

Financial Impact

The request offers a $20,000 contribution towards constructing a structure at an access point to the Grand River for the purposes of scattering cremated remains into the River.

The donation for a structure for public use would be a welcome addition, however, as the City does not have jurisdiction to permit or prohibit scattering of cremated remains into the Grand River, if agreeable to the donor, the structure would be considered to be donated in memory of one or more individuals, but, for general public use and not for the purposes of scattering cremated human remains. There is work in progress to improve the Grand River access point at the south end of Cambridge. A donation to enhance the shelter planned for this location could be an option to consider.

Public Input

Posted publicly as part of the report process.

No other public input was solicited for this report.

Internal/External Consultation

There was no internal/external consultation undertaken as this report relates to a matter that is outside the jurisdiction and authority of the City of Cambridge.
Conclusion

A number of options exist to scatter human remains on land and in water as permitted by the Province of Ontario as outlined in this report.

The City of Cambridge does not have jurisdiction over the Grand River and is not in a position to prohibit or permit the request.
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- Attachment 1 – Request to Scatter Cremated Remains in the Grand River Email request dated January 19th, 2021 from Mr. Prakash Venkataraman
• Attachment 2 – Scattering: What is Permissible in Ontario?

Excerpt taken from A Guide to Death Care in Ontario, published by the Bereavement Authority of Ontario, Government of Ontario

• Attachment 3 – GRCA Minutes, Meeting, September 25, 2020

• Attachment 4 – GRCA Report # GM-09-20-62, September 25, 2020
Greetings Mr. Calder,

Reference: In person representation by Prakash Venkataraman as a delegate to the board of GRCA on this subject through Zoom on Sep 25th 2020.

In person representation by Prakash Venkataraman through Zoom meeting with City Manager and Mayor, City of Cambridge on Nov 23rd 2020

Hope you are well. Further to our discussion, I would like to reach out to you to provide some updated information.

We, as a community can spend/pitch in up to CAD 20,000.00 dollars (could be increased if needed) for the creation and/or to the cost of a place or structure dedicated for community along the grand river, wherever staff recommends safe access to the water to do scattering of ashes ceremony in the City of Cambridge.

GRCA already confirmed on that they have no objection in relates to water as long as respective city ensures public access through the land owned by the City.

I believe city staff are in the process of identifying multiple options for the location and recommendation. I am willing and ready to be a delegation representing the community to the council on this subject, whenever needed.

Thank you very much your kind attention, guidance, and support. If you or staff require any additional details please don't hesitate to contact me any time. Have a great day.

Best Regards,

Prakash Venkataraman
226 218 1910
A Guide to Death Care in Ontario

Everything you need to know.
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SCATTERING: WHAT IS PERMISSIBLE IN ONTARIO?

Here are some choices:

- You may buy rights to bury or scatter the remains in a designated part of a cemetery. Scattering rights may not be available at all cemeteries.
- You may buy rights to place the cremated remains in a niche (or compartment) in a columbarium.
- Although the burial of cremated remains is not permitted outside a licensed cemetery, you may scatter the ashes or cremated remains on private property with the written consent of the land owner.
- You may also hire a Provider to scatter the remains. Only a Provider is permitted to charge you for this service.
- You may also scatter the cremated remains on unoccupied Crown lands and Crown lands covered by water so long as there are no signs prohibiting scattering.
- If you wish to scatter cremated remains on municipally-owned lands, check local by-laws first.
- For more information, visit www.ontario.ca and search for the crown use policy.

WHAT SHOULD I KNOW ABOUT BUYING INTERMENT OR SCATTERING RIGHTS?

Before you make a purchase, each cemetery must provide:

- Its current price list;
- Its by-laws; and
- An explanation of any restrictions on the rights you are buying (such as restrictions on memorialization options, monuments, etc.).

Contact a cemetery directly, compare prices and review the by-laws before you decide where to inter or scatter your loved one’s remains. Your contract will specify the number of interments (bodies or cremated remains) or scatterings you are entitled to with each interment or scattering right.

Part of the money you pay for interment and scattering rights will be placed in a care and maintenance fund. Income earned from this fund is used to maintain the cemetery for the future. The care and maintenance contribution depends on the type and cost of the interment rights.

ARE THERE ANY TYPES OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS?

If you do not have enough money to pay for funeral or transfer services or for cremation or burial, you may be eligible for assistance from your local municipality. Speak to your Provider and/or municipality, and take the appropriate follow-up measures before you sign a contract with a Provider.

If approved, the municipality’s financial assistance plan may limit your choice of casket, urn or grave and related services. Some municipalities may require that you pay a portion of the cost.

cemetery’s current price list. If the by-laws do not allow you to resell the rights to a third party, the cemetery operator must buy them from you at the price on the cemetery’s current price list, less any payments that were made to the cemetery’s care and maintenance fund. A cemetery operator may charge an administration fee when you resell your rights. The cemetery does not have to buy back rights for a grave in a plot (two or more lots originally bought as a unit) if one of those graves has been used.
Grand River Conservation Authority

Report number: GM–09-20-62
Date: September 25, 2020
To: Members of the Grand River Conservation Authority
Subject: Request for Handling Remains (cremation or alkaline hydrolysis) on GRCA Lands

Recommendation:
THAT Report Number GM-09-20-62 – Request for Handling Remains (cremation or alkaline hydrolysis) on GRCA Lands be received as information.

Summary:
Occasionally, requests from the public are made of the GRCA to provide permission to scatter cremated human remains in GRCA conservation areas and on other GRCA-owned conservation lands. Requests to scatter remains on GRCA have not been allowed. As a private land owner, the GRCA would require designation as a cemetery to be able to comply with provincial legislation for this to occur. The Ministry of Consumer Services provides guidance on the scattering of ashes in Ontario.

Report:
The Ontario government has identified the parameters for scattering ashes in the province of Ontario and specifically on private property; GRCA lands are private property. To facilitate the scattering of ashes on private property, each location of private property where remains would be scattered would be required to register as a designated cemetery and provide a licensed cemetery operator for each site.

The Government of Ontario allows for the scattering of remains on Crown land (land owned by the government), except where expressly prohibited, or on municipally-owned lands providing that there is no by-law to prohibit the act.

In or near the GRCA watershed there are many opportunities to access Crown land such as Provincial Parks, Provincial Conservation Reserves and Provincial Nature Reserves. The Ministry of Environment and Parks, via Ontario Parks manages the provincially-owned Crown lands where alkaline hydrolysis is permitted.

For reference, the province provides the following guidance on this issue on their website: Handling remains (cremation or alkaline hydrolysis)

In Ontario, you may:
• buy rights to bury or scatter the remains from cremation or alkaline hydrolysis in a registered cemetery
• buy rights to place the remains from cremation or alkaline hydrolysis in a niche within a columbarium in a registered cemetery.
• columbarium is an above-ground structure that contains a number of niches. Placing the remains from cremation or alkaline hydrolysis in a niche is an interment, meaning a burial
• scatter the remains from cremation or alkaline hydrolysis on private property with the consent of the land owner
• if a land owner wants to allow repeated scatterings to take place on a specific piece of property, the landowner must establish that land as a cemetery and have a licensed cemetery operator for the cemetery
• sign a contract with the licensed operator of a cemetery, crematorium, funeral home, alternative disposition facility or transfer service to scatter the remains of cremation or alkaline hydrolysis on your behalf
• scatter the remains from cremation or alkaline hydrolysis on Crown land, including land covered by water, if it is unoccupied (for example provincial park, conservation reserve, Great Lakes) and there are no signs or postings that prohibit scattering
• scatter the remains from cremation or alkaline hydrolysis on municipally-owned lands (contact the municipality to check if there are by-laws that prohibit scattering in certain areas such as municipal parks)
• transport the remains from cremation or alkaline hydrolysis out of Ontario

Source: https://www.ontario.ca/page/arrange-funeral-burial-cremation-alkaline-hydrolysis-or-scattering

Financial implications:
Not applicable.

Other department considerations:
The Property Department was consulted in the preparation of this report.

Prepared by: Pam Walther-Mabee
Manager of Conservation Areas

Approved by: Karen Armstrong
Deputy CAO/Secretary-Treasurer
1. **Call to Order**
The Meeting was called to order by the Chair at 9:35 a.m.

2. **Certification of Quorum**
The Secretary-Treasurer certified quorum with 23 Members present. A total of 25 Members attended the meeting.

3. **Chair’s Remarks**
The following Chair's Remarks were read in the previous Source Protection Authority meeting and are copied here for ease of reference:
• On September 28, S.Lawson and H.Jowett will attend a virtual Conservation Ontario Council meeting. Minister Yurek has been invited to address CO Council this month, and he will be joined by Serge Imbrogno, the Deputy Minister with MECP. Any pertinent information will be shared with this Board.
• On October 1, S.Lawson will host a third virtual Town Hall meeting for staff with a focus on keeping staff connected and engaged throughout the pandemic related closures.
• On October 2, S.Lawson, K.Armstrong, and H.Jowett, along with Superintendent Brad Straus, will host Minister Yurek for a tour of our Brant Conservation Area. The Minister's office reached out for a tour of the park, and it is hoped this interaction will continue to strengthen provincial partnerships, and give the Minister a chance to experience first-hand the natural beauty of the Grand River watershed.

4. Review of Agenda  
   Moved By Guy Gardhouse  
   Seconded By Marcus Adili  
   THAT the agenda for the General Membership Meeting be approved as circulated.  
   Carried

5. Declarations of Pecuniary Interest  
   There were no declarations of pecuniary interests made in relation to the matters to be dealt with.

6. Minutes of the Previous Meetings  
   Moved By Warren Stauch  
   Seconded By Rodrigo Goller  
   THAT the minutes of the General Membership Meeting of August 28, 2020 be approved as circulated.  
   Carried

7. Business Arising from Previous Minutes  
   There was no business arising from the minutes of the previous meeting.
   B.Whale joined the meeting at 9:37 a.m.

8. Hearing of Delegations  
   8.1 Group - Snowmobiling on GRCA Trails  
   The Board heard from Karen Buratynski, OFSC District 9; Paul Shaughnessy, OFSC; and Patrick Connor, Ontario Trails Council regarding snowmobiling on GRCA properties. Ms. Buratynski spoke in regard to items that were presented to the Board at the August 28, 2020 meeting, and wished to clarify OFSC permit fees, and highlight infrastructure improvements made on trails by the snowmobile
clubs and the benefits of the shared use of trails. Mr. Shaughnessy addressed
the Board regarding insurance information from the perspective of the
snowmobile clubs, highlighting the OFSC insurance coverage and its protection
for landowners. Mr. Conner then discussed the shared use of trails and
insurance protection from the perspective of the Ontario Trails Council. The
delegation group wished to encourage collaboration of the many parties involved
in seeking a resolution to outstanding matters.

There was discussion from Board members looking to clarify the issue of
insurance coverage, liability, and the increased risk to the GRCA. B.Brown
responded to questions, highlighting that the proposed changes in the original
agreements with the snowmobile clubs would put the GRCA in a position of
significantly increased risk, and that the GRCA does not have available
resources to create an enhanced risk management program to mitigate the
GRCA’s obligations, liability and risk.

Following discussion, the Chair noted that the GRCA will continue to work with
the OFSC to explore alternate solutions, and the delegation exited the meeting.

B.Banbury joined the meeting at 9:47 a.m.

8.2 Prakash Ventkataraman - Scattering of Ashes on GRCA Properties

The Board heard from Prakash Ventkataraman regarding the scattering of
remains on GRCA properties and the Grand River. Mr. Ventkataraman thanked
the Board and watershed member municipalities for hearing his request to have
the GRCA allow the scattering of remains in the Grand River. Mr. Ventkataraman
pointed to Provincial legislation and uncertainty regarding what is allowed, and
requested clarity from the Board.

The Board discussed the request, and S.Lawson confirmed that the GRCA does
not have the appropriate jurisdiction to provide permission to perform this act in
the Grand River, as the GRCA does not own the river. Permission to access the
river through private property must be requested from local municipalities or
individual landowners. On GRCA properties, the scattering of ashes is not
permitted due to permitting and licensing requirements.

The Chair thanked the delegation and reiterated that the GRCA does not have
the jurisdictional right to provide permission for this request. The Chair suggested
that Mr. Ventkataraman reach out to local municipalities to discuss this request in
specific locations. Mr. Ventkataraman then thanked the Members and exited the
meeting.

9. Presentations

There were no Presentations.

10. Correspondence

10.1 Prakash Ventkataraman - Scattering of Ashes on GRCA Properties
10.2 Hunter and Associates - Fergus/Elora Water Supply Master Plan and Tier 3

10.3 Robert Nash - Critical Bank Swallow Habitat - LJM Development Property

J. Mitchell requested further information on this item. K. McGarry and N. Davy confirmed that the development of property in critical habitats falls under Provincial legislation.

10.4 Jan Beveridge - Concerning Report GM-09-20-65 - Correspondence-Centre Wellington Tier 3 Water Budget Study

20-119
Moved By John Challinor II
Seconded By Susan Foxton

THAT Correspondence from Hunter and Associates regarding the Fergus/Elora Water Supply Master Plan and Tier 3, and from Prakash Ventkataraman regarding scattering ashes on GRCA properties, and from Jan Beveridge regarding the Fergus/Elora Water Supply Master Plan and Tier 3 report, and from Robert Nash regarding Critical Bank Swallow Habitat be received as information.

Carried

11. 1st and 2nd Reading of By-Laws

None.

12. Reports:

12.1 GM-09-20-60 - Budget 2021 (Draft #1)

S. Radoja provided an overview of the Budget 2021 first draft, highlighting the uncertainty caused by the pandemic, potential changes in Provincial regulations, and program areas that will require further analysis and could have a potential impact on the 2021 budget. S. Radoja also discussed major and minor assumptions, projected expenses and revenues used to determine the draft budget for 2021 and the associated municipal levy increase.

Board members discussed the levy increase as well as the proposed increase for staffing costs, and S. Radoja confirmed that the increase is consistent with recent years.

C. White noted that it should be highlighted through the budget process that the GRCA did not receive government funding to offset unexpected costs associated with the pandemic.

20-120
Moved By Susan Foxton
Seconded By Kathryn McGarry

THAT Report Number GM-09-20-60 – Budget 2021 (Draft #1) be received as information.
12.2 GM-09-20-59 - Budget 2021 (Draft #1) - Municipal Levy Apportionment

B. Whale had questions about the levy breakdown and clarity on the different impact for municipalities. K. Armstrong will follow up directly with B. Whale to ensure the request is understood for future budget drafts if required.

*Following the meeting, an error was noted in the draft levy apportionment table. A corrected version will be provided to Members and included in the October board package.

20-121
Moved By Chris White
Seconded By Les Armstrong

THAT Report Number GM-09-20-59 – Budget 2021 (Draft #1) – General Municipal Levy Apportionment be received as information.

Carried

12.3 GM-09-20-63 - Financial Summary

20-122
Moved By Bernie Corbett
Seconded By Bruce Whale

THAT the Financial Summary for the period ending August 31, 2020 be approved.

Carried

12.4 GM-09-20-58 - Cash and Investment Status

20-123
Moved By Joan Gatward
Seconded By Marcus Adili

THAT Report Number GM-09-20-58 Cash and Investment Status – August 2020 be received as information.

Carried

12.5 GM-09-20-62 - Request for Handling Remains (cremation or alkaline hydrolysis) on GRCA Property

Board members inquired about private landowners needing to be contacted to access the water through their property, granting permission for river access on GRCA properties for the specific purpose of scattering ashes, and what is allowed in Provincial parks. P. Walther-Mabee confirmed that the land surrounding the Grand River has various landowners, and permission would be required from the landowner to access the water through their land, and that as private landowners the GRCA would be required to register as a cemetery for each of its properties along the river.
K.McGarry provided some information on the Provincial parks, noting that the scattering of ashes is allowed on Provincial parks properties and any waterbodies contained therein, and that in some of the parks, infrastructure has been created to provide shelter while performing ceremonies. K.McGarry added that municipalities do have the ability to obtain a cemetery license for their own properties.

There was some discussion about one local municipality that may have passed a motion for their municipal properties, and P.Walth-Mabbe will follow up with municipal staff to confirm.

R.Carpenter requested that a copy of the resolution in that municipality, as well as a copy of Mr. Venkataraman's correspondence be forwarded to Board Members following the meeting, along with a copy of staff report GM-09-20-62.

20-124
Moved By Marcus Adili
Seconded By Jane Mitchell

THAT Report Number GM-09-20-62 – Request for Handling Remains (cremation or alkaline hydrolysis) on GRCA Lands be received as information.

Carried

12.6 GM-09-20-64 - Brantford Ice Jam Mitigation Feasibility Study Consulting Contract
20-125
Moved By Richard Carpenter
Seconded By Marcus Adili

THAT Report Number GM-09-20-64 – Brantford Ice Jam Mitigation Feasibility Study Consulting Contract be received as information.

Carried

12.7 GM-09-20-65 - Correspondence - Centre Wellington Tier 3 Water Budget Study
20-126
Moved By Susan Foxton
Seconded By John Challinor II

THAT Report Number GM-09-20-65 – Correspondence – Centre Wellington Tier 3 Water Budget Study be received as information;
AND THAT a copy of this board report be sent to the Township of Centre Wellington and the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP).

Carried

12.8 GM-09-20-61 - Current Watershed Conditions
THAT Report Number GM-09-20-61 – Current Watershed Conditions as of September 16, 2020 be received as information.  

Carried

13. Committee of the Whole
Not required.

14. General Business
There was no General Business.

15. 3rd Reading of By-Laws
None.

16. Other Business

17. Closed Meeting

20-128
Moved By Marcus Adili
Seconded By Chris White

THAT the General Membership enter a closed meeting to discuss a proposed or pending acquisition or disposition.

Carried

Board members convened in closed session and the live meeting stream was stopped.

20-129
Moved By Richard Carpenter
Seconded By John Challinor II

THAT the General Membership return open session.

Carried

Board members reconvened in open session and the live meeting stream was resumed.

17.1 Minutes of the Previous Closed Session

20-130
Moved By Marcus Adili
Seconded By Bruce Whale

THAT the Minutes of the previous closed session be approved as circulated.

Carried

17.2 GM-09-20-C05 - Granting of Easement to Enbridge Gas Inc.
Enbridge Gas Inc. will be installing a corrosion line within the Water Street North road allowance to help reduce corrosion on steel pipes in the area. As part of that work, Enbridge Gas Inc. has requested an easement (as shown on Map 1) for the installation of a rectifier and a hydro meter. The scope of the work will involve the installation of a post with a mounted hydro meter and rectifier box, with an underground connection to the corrosion line and hydro supply. The location was chosen as it is adjacent to a number of other utilities and hydro supply is readily available from a pole directly to the east. Approval to grant the easement will be required from the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks.

20-131
Moved By Joe Nowak
Seconded By Richard Carpenter

IN ORDER TO FURTHER THE OBJECTS of the Grand River Conservation Authority by assisting a utility in providing services;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Grand River Conservation Authority grant an easement over a portion of lands described as Part of Lot 15, Plan D-9, City of Cambridge, Region of Waterloo, to be more particularly described on a Reference Plan to be deposited, for the installation and maintenance of a rectifier and hydro meter, for the nominal consideration of $2.00.

Carried

18. Next Meeting - October 23, 2020 at 9:30 a.m.
19. Adjourn

20-132
Moved By Warren Stauch
Seconded By Marcus Adili

THAT the meeting of the General Membership be adjourned.

Carried

The meeting was adjourned at 11:27 a.m.

__________________________
Chair

__________________________
Secretary-Treasurer