

**ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 14, 2015 AT 7:00 P.M.**

**COUNCIL COMMITTEE ROOM C
MINUTES**

Present: K. McNeill Y. Roy (Chair)
M. Mosco L. Renzetti
S. Jobber

Regrets: N. Yap, M. Wilson, H. Wheeler, C. Oaks

City: P. Patel, A. Nix, A. Watts, M. Ursic (Beacon Environmental)

External Groups: Nick Assasd, Dougan & Associates
John Vanos, University of Guelph
Steve Davies, Matrix Solutions
Todd Fell, Dougan & Associates
Mike Sampson, Student
Astrid Clos, AJC Planning
Hugh Whiteley, LRG3
Pete Graham, Acorn Developments
Terry Everly, Moshi Holdings
Mike Watt, Moshi Holdings
Ryan Archer, Natural Resource Solutions Inc.
Steve Peterson, MTE Consultants
Jeff Mortens, MTE Consultants
Rob O'Flannagan, Guelph Mercury
Frank Valeriotte, Carousel Estate Homes Inc.
Joel Varkey, Carousel Estate Homes Inc.

- 1. Call to Order**
The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm.
- 2. Call and Certification of Quorum**
Attendance was noted and a quorum was declared.
- 3. Declarations of Pecuniary Interest or Conflict of Interest**
None
- 4. 60 Arkell Road (Gallery Towns) EIR**

M. Ursic from Beacon Environmental reviewed the EIR and prepared the staff report on behalf of the City of Guelph, and was available to answer questions from the Environmental Advisory Committee.

Ryan Archer from NRSI and Steve Peterson from MTE reviewed the staff report and overall they accept the comments and suggested motion. Steve provided further clarification around the retaining wall, swale and boardwalk, and proposed slopes of the property.

Comments from Committee:

- Clarification around the number of hazardous trees requiring removal (55/56)
- Discussion around tree removal of hazardous trees and requirement for compensation.

The Environmental Advisory Committee went into committee to discuss a motion.

Moved by L. Renzetti and seconded by M. Mosco.

The Environmental Advisory Committee support the Environmental Implementation Report (EIR) Study dated September 2015 prepared by NRSI with the following conditions to be addressed in an Addendum to the EIR:

- THAT additional analysis and discussion be provided in relation to the proposed retaining wall to the north of the site, along with a current Site Grading & SWM Plan (C2.1) that (a) confirms the proposed height and length of this wall, and (b) assesses the potential impacts of this structure to: (i) the site drainage and water balance, particularly as it relates to the PSW, (ii) the connectivity between the protected wetland / woodland and associated buffer and the wildlife corridor, (iii) the proposed plantings in the buffer (both in terms light and moisture), and (iv) the potential for seepage at the base of the wall and related impacts to the proposed trail;
- THAT the monitoring program : (a) include monitoring for surface and groundwater quality monitoring, (b) consider adding one more permanent vegetation plot in a reference area, (c) verify the value of breeding bird monitoring in relation to the proposed development, and (d) provide some consideration for up to 10 to 15 year performance / effectiveness monitoring; and
- THAT options for reducing the slope of the 10 m wide strip allocated for the wildlife corridor (currently identified as being up to 5:1) be explored, and that consideration also be given to how this corridor will “blend” with the other half of the corridor identified on the adjacent property.

The Environmental Advisory Committee support the Environmental Implementation Report (EIR) Study dated September 2015 and prepared by NRSI with the following conditions to be implemented as part of Site Plan Approval:

- THAT an onsite review of identified hazard trees with appropriate City staff is undertaken prior to any removals being undertaken;
- THAT trail site preparation, including designs for and installation of tree protection fencing, will be the proponent’s responsibility;

-
- THAT Landscape Plans be reviewed to consider integration of: (a) a greater proportion of plant species found less attractive to deer as browse, (b) some larger caliper specimens, and (c) potentially some site-appropriate Provincially significant species (i.e., ranked by NHIC as S1, S2 or S3) that are not also identified as endangered or threatened;
 - THAT the Enviro Guide Insert (Appendix XI) be revised to be more engaging, less technical, and highlight “do’s” and “don’ts” more boldly; and

THAT the summary table of commitments (Appendix XVII) be a bit better organized to facilitate its use as a reference document moving forward.

**Motion Carried
-Unanimous-**

5. University of Guelph Turfgrass Institute (GTI) EIS TOR

A. Nix, Environmental Planner with the City of Guelph, reviewed the staff report and was available to answer questions from the Environmental Advisory Committee.

Todd Fell from Dougan & Associates and Steve Davies from Matrix Solutions provided further information on the hydrological study (map to be included as part of the EIS). Clarification was requested on behalf of the consultants regarding the 3rd point of the suggested motion related to the wording “alterative options and measures.” City Staff provided clarification. Through the EIS process it’s not unusual to look at alternative design to help facilitate mitigation measures and provide some flexibility to look at or consider potential changes to the concept depending on environmental concerns identified.

The Consultants requested further clarification about the wording “induced impacts” in the suggested motion. City Staff deferred clarification to the City of Guelph Draft EIS guidelines.

Comments from the Committee:

- Would like to see LID options integrated into Stormwater Management.
- Clarification that snake survey/birding survey have been completed
- Provide dates of surveys that have been completed

Delegate: Hugh Whiteley

- Buried pipe was a surface water monitoring site in the 1950s, included 2 branches to this tributary on the arboretum grounds
- University has older data on this stream
- Salinity impacts from historic use
- Phase 2 OPA 42 report- significant areas of meadow habitat should be retained
- Cumulative effects of loss of meadow habitat in the EIS

The Environmental Advisory Committee went into Committee to discuss a motion.

Moved by M. Mosco and seconded by K. McNeill.

The Environmental Advisory Committee conditionally support the EIS TOR, subject to the following conditions:

- Incorporation of a study area map into the TOR document
- That the characterization of tributary also address the ability of the stream to handle new flows; assess the stability of the water course; identify any existing potential erosion issues; and identify opportunities to enhance the stream corridor.
- That the data analysis include details regarding how all policy and regulatory requirements are being met/addressed as part of the proposal, as well as providing for evaluating alternative options and measures, and include recommendations regarding monitoring.
- Include consideration for locally significant species and their habitats following the City's habitat for significant species policies.
- Include consultation to incorporate historic reference to stream hydrology conditions in the EIS.
- Vegetative and alternative LID measures should be considered through the design.
- That the impact assessment also speak to induced impacts.

**Motion Carried
-Unanimous-**

6. 1300 Gordon Street EIS TOR

P. Prachi, Environmental Planner with the City of Guelph, reviewed the staff report and was available to answer questions from the Environmental Advisory Committee.

Comments from EAC:

- Clarification of point 4 of the suggested motion

Ryan Archer from NRSI spoke on behalf of the project team. They have concerns over accommodating a future crossing as this would be difficult not knowing what that crossing may be. Further consideration or refinement of this point is needed.

Clarification of what's triggering point 5 of the suggested motion as this will not be the largest building in the vicinity. Recommendation to address this through design of building and mitigation measures for bird collision.

No other objections with City comments and the project team will address various conditions outlined.

Comments from EAC:

- Restoration measures for ecological linkage recommended
- Discussion regarding migratory birds. Expectation is a desktop analysis related to design elements using existing information
- Post construction monitoring should speak to the work already done in order to compare data

- Design needs to be defensible (why 10 metres?)

The Environmental Advisory Committee went into Committee to discuss a motion.

Moved by Lynette and seconded by Shane Jobber.

Environmental Advisory Committee conditionally support the proposed Terms of Reference for Environmental Impact Study prepared by Natural Resource Solutions Inc. related to 1300 Gordon development application with the following conditions:

THAT the EIS TOR be conditionally accepted subject to the following additions:

- That the regional/local species status (County of Wellington) be documented and addressed as part of the EIS.
- That consultation with MNRFP associated with ESA and related documents be included as appendix to the EIS
- That the EIS address any site-specific implications on the width of the Ecological Linkage and required mitigation measures considering the property fronting to Gordon Street and the future road widening as recognized under the OP.
- That the EIS consider the existing wildlife crossing at Gordon Street.
- That the EIS TOR incorporate investigating and assessing migratory bird routes and appropriate mitigation measures and design elements to minimize bird collision conflicts be incorporated as part of the EIS.
- That appropriate infiltration practices be investigated and incorporated through the EIS with emphasis on infiltration practices & vegetative best management practices which promote natural as opposed to structural infiltration.
- That to ensure effective functionality of the wildlife corridor a preliminary restoration plan that includes consideration of restoration in the adjacent properties be included as part of the EIS.
- That through the EIS the required compliance monitoring be clearly identified and include 3 years of post-construction monitoring and consideration to incorporate a 10th year and 15th year monitoring to assess the effectiveness of the ecological linkage.
- THAT a list of all commitments be compiled and submitted as part of the EIS (including but not limited to suggested recommendations, mitigation measures, compensation, restoration and enhancement and monitoring elements)

**Motion Carried
-Unanimous-**

7. Adoption of Minutes from Previous Meeting

Moved by K. McNeill and seconded by M. Mosco.

“To accept the minutes as amended.”

**Motion Carried
-Unanimous-**

8. Correspondence & Information

- Draft TOR for the Clair-Maltby Secondary Plan will be circulated in the next couple weeks for discussion at the November meeting

9. Other Business

- Follow up SWM- City Engineering and Risk Management Official

10. Next Meeting- November 12th, 2015

11. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 8:53 p.m.

Moved by M. Mosco and seconded by K. McNeill.

**Motion Carried
-Unanimous-**

CHAIRMAN