

# MEETING MINUTES

MEETING DATE	<b>River Systems Advisory Committee</b> May 17, 2017
LOCATION TIME	City Hall - Meeting Room B 4:00 – 6:00 p.m.
MEMBERS PRESENT	Mariette Pushkar (Chair), Nicola Lower, Beth Anne Fischer, Jesse VanPatter, Kendall Flower, Eric Wilson, Ryan VanEngen
EXTERNAL GROUPS	Rob Amos & Ash Baron (Aquafor Beech Ltd.)
STAFF PRESENT	Adele Labbe, Madeleine Myhill, Andrew Janes, Majde Qaqish
MEMBERS ABSENT	Javier Acosta, Barry Smith

## DISCUSSION ITEMS

ITEM #	DESCRIPTION
1	<p><b>Welcome:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Roll call and certification of quorum - attendance was noted and quorum was declared</li><li>• Declaration of pecuniary interest or conflict of interest</li></ul>
2	<p><b>Agenda:</b></p> <p><b>Emma to Earl Street Bridge Environmental Assessment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Adele Labbe, Environmental Planner with the City, reviewed her staff report and presented the trail network and location map</li><li>- The City has initiated Class Environmental Assessment (EA) for a proposed pedestrian bridge connecting Emma Street to Earl Street over the Speed River. The EA study will determine if a pedestrian bridge is needed at this location and if so, the style of bridge to be constructed</li><li>- The consultants presented images of the alternative options and discussed each</li><li>- Existing watermain and hydro servicing is in this area meaning that there would have already been excavation at some point to accommodate these</li><li>- Existing watermain under the Speed River was put in 1960s but perhaps as early as 1950s</li><li>- Alternative 1 has least overall impact on river system and natural corridor, but does have highest cost implications. It is the only option that meets the spirit and intent of Natural Heritage System policies in Official Plan</li><li>- Water level/flood level discussion</li><li>- This project provides an opportunity to remove invasive species and replace with native</li></ul>

species

- Presented Alternative 2 and 3 and discussed the implications of each
- The scale and duration of construction and operational impacts of Alternative 2 are considerably more intense than Alternative 1 and are not able to be fully mitigated (i.e., wetland loss, impacts to SWH).
- The scale and duration of construction and operational impacts of Alternative 3 are more intense than Alternatives 1 & 2 and are not able to be fully mitigated (i.e., wetland loss, impacts to SWH, impacts to fish habitat and habitat for locally significant species)
- Alternatives 2 and 3 do not meet the City's Natural Heritage System policies
- Discussion around the costs and maintenance of each alternative
- Alternative 3 – how were fish impacts considered given the proposed pier in the middle of the channel as well as impacts of construction? Consultants to further consider this
- Public consultation to occur on June 7<sup>th</sup> at the Evergreen Centre– suggested that RSAC members come to second PIC
- Some indication of compensation/restoration target should be included in this phase
- Detailed design will be coming back to RSAC should the project move forward
- RSAC raised question about how the City could proceed with alternatives that do not meet City policy

RSAC went into Committee to discuss.

**Moved by Kendall Flower and seconded by Nicola Lower,**

**THAT the River System Advisory Committee conditionally support the selection of Alternative 1: Single span bridge as the preferred bridge alternative as it is the only option that ensures the long term protection of the NHS and it meets the spirit and intent, goals and objectives of City policy; and**

**THAT the Project File for the Environmental Assessment clearly indicate, through scoring of alternatives, that Alternative 1: Single Span Bridge is preferred from a natural environment technical perspective and that the report include the following information based on updates to the Ecological Studies, as needed:**

- **Additional flood information (i.e., 10 yr, 25 yr and 50 yr);**
- **Metrics to quantify impacts to natural heritage system (i.e., hectares of wetland and SWH lost, estimated number of trees lost, etc.) and achieve net enhancement through restoration;**
- **Additional detail related to the footprint of the proposed footing in the valley (i.e., disturbance to install footing within the valley and what constitutes ample scour protection);**
- **Refinement of buffer recommendations; and**
- **THAT the following studies are undertaken to inform detailed design:**
- **Feature delineation;**
- **Surveys for bat habitat during leaf off period;**

- **Detailed Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan that seeks to preserve mature large caliper trees which provide substantial canopy cover;**
- **Detailed floral inventory that covers the disturbance area in detail;**
- **Detailed Mitigation Plans for short-term and long-term impacts;**
- **Detailed Restoration and Enhancement Plans including, but not limited to:**
  - **invasive species management plan extending beyond the direct limits of disturbance;**
  - **soils, substrates and moisture regime characterization**
  - **to aid in the coolwater management of the fishery; and**
  - **a post-construction monitoring plan to determine restoration effectiveness.**

**Motion Carried  
Unanimous**

**York Trunk Sewer and Paisley Clythe Watermain Phase 2B**

- Adele Labbe, Environmental Planner with the City, reviewed the presentation and image of location
- This detailed design project results from the Schedule B Class EA study completed by the City in 2012 which identified a preferred alternative for the improvements of the York Trunk Sewer and provision of a new feedermain
- It will provide a second sanitary sewer line to the existing York Trunk Sanitary Sewer, which was found to be at capacity during study, and provides a new water feedermain
- Total project length is approximately 9.4 km crossing the City from west to east and is being installed in phases
- The subject of this review is Phase 2B which runs from Lyon Park to Vitoria Road within Eramosa River Valley
- Aerial photograph of Phase 2B design presented and discussed
- Natural Heritage is a work in progress – agency contact (MNRF and GRCA) to update previous data request and add the request for additional information for the siphon crossing
- Arborist report has been completed and provided to inform compensation requirements and restoration plans
- Trees at the end of the cul-de-sacs will be impacted
- Mitigation measures include avoidance through alignment, TIPP and landscape restoration plans, construction timing windows, ESC plans, landscape plans to include native plantings, and invasive species management
- Next steps/timing – design to be completed by early summer (end of June) – construction to commence in late summer/early fall
- Discussion around topsoil retention and amount of cover over utilities
- Discussion around the type of seed bed preparation done before planting and restoration – should look for decompaction results in areas to be restored with vegetation - 1 m above pipe with gravel and fill
- Discussion around backfill and compaction of soil – issues of roots infiltrating pipes and need

- to ensure there is a half of a metre for rooting zone
- Meadow systems require 600 mm of topsoil
- Detailed spec that always follows standards based on width of trench and Parks Department also has standards
- In previous phases, City encountered contaminated material from old landfill –old material taken out and new material brought in – anything excavated removed from the site
- Dewatering groundwater will go into filtration tanks and into sanitary sewer

RSAC went in committee to discuss motion.

**Moved by Nicola Lower and seconded by Eric Wilson,**

**THAT the River Systems Advisory Committee support the modified alignment of the York Trunk Sanitary Sewer and Paisley Clythe feedermain provided the following principles are integrated into the final design:**

- Tree removals are further minimized to the extent possible through tightening up the work area;
- Vegetation compensation is provided through the use of native species (tree, shrub and groundcover) that support wildlife functions, including pollinators and to enhance the riparian corridor;
- Beaver protection is provided for new plant material within the valley;
- Consideration is given to providing tree compensation along Brockville Ave, Florence Lane and the project vicinity, wherever possible (i.e., to minimize urban heat effects).
- Erosion and sediment control plans include spills prevention and emergency management plans; and
- The timing of implementation considers wildlife functions including breeding birds and potential bat habitat as well as groundwater levels.

**Motion Carried  
Unanimous**

Moved by Kendall Flower and seconded by Beth Anne Fischer,

**THAT the minutes from the March 15, 2017 meeting be approved.**

**Motion Carried  
Unanimous**

Moved by Eric Wilson and seconded by Jesse VanPatter, as amended UNANIMOUS

**THAT the minutes from the April 19, 2017 meeting be approved as amended.**

**Motion Carried  
Unanimous**

	<p><b>Information Updates:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Speedvale Trail Underpass - hardcopy of report circulated and report with appendices are on RSAC webpage coming next month</li> <li>• Niska Road update</li> <li>• Eastview Road improvements – trees removed along swamp edge</li> </ul>
3.	<p><b>Next meeting of RSAC will be June 21, 2017</b></p>
4.	<p><b>Adjourn</b></p> <p>Moved by Ryan VanEngen and seconded by Kendall Flower,</p> <p><b>The meeting was adjourned at 6:05 p.m.</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Motion Carried Unanimous</b></p>