

**ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 2016 AT 7:00 P.M.**

**COUNCIL COMMITTEE ROOM C
MINUTES**

Present: C. Oaks (Chair) A. Baron
M. Mosco L. Todd
M. Wilson A. Singh
V. Capmourteres L. Renzetti
H. Wheeler

Regrets:

City Staff: A. Labbé, A. Watts, M. Ursic

External Groups: Steve Davies, Matrix Solutions
Ryan Hamelin, Aboud & Associates Inc.
Hugh Whiteley, Delegate
John Ambros, Delegate
John Vanos, University of Guelph
Cheryl-Anne Ross, Aboud & Associates Inc.
Sean Fox, Citizen
Todd Fell, Dougan & Associates
Ric Jordan, Citizen
Tanya Lonsdale, Braun Consulting
Jenn Bock, Nature Guelph
Shari Muscat, Stantec Consulting Inc.
Kevin Brousseau, Stantec Consulting Inc.
Llyod Grinham, Grinham Architect

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. **86 Arthur Street EIS TOR**

A. Labbé, City of Guelph Environmental Planner, provided a summary of the staff report and was available to answer questions from the Environmental Advisory Committee.

General comments from the Committee:

- Discussion regarding the proposed width of the severed lot
- GRCA comments indicate that no development is permitted in the Floodway
- GRCA develops the floodway mapping

Ryan Hamelin and Cheryl-Anne Ross from Aboud & Associates spoke on behalf of the application.

General discussion:

- Site is within the 2 zone flood area, development is prohibited within the floodway but permitted within the flood fringe.
- GRCA has site design policies- i.e., egress, no basements, flood proofing
- Discussion about aquatic birds and shore bird habitat
- Social impacts is considered out of the EIS scope

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

Moved by V. Capmourteres and seconded by H.Wheeler.

THAT the Environmental Advisory Committee conditionally support the Environmental Impact Study Terms of Reference prepared by Aboude and Associates Inc. subject to the following:

THAT a revised EIS TOR is provided which includes:

- **Clarification and greater consideration of alternatives to ensure that the overall development limits are proposed outside of the Significant Valleyland and Floodway Areas.**
- **That the edge management guidelines and any planting plans for compensation consider opportunities to enhance habitat for snapping turtle breeding and methods to deter beavers to ensure vegetation is able to establish.**

THAT potential building envelopes and restoration areas are identified in the consent application.

**Motion Carried
- Unanimous -**

5. 1159 Victoria Road South - Victoria Park Village EIR Resubmission

M. Ursic from Beacon Consulting on behalf of the City of Guelph provided a summary of the staff report and was available to answer questions from the Environmental Advisory Committee.

General comments from the Committee:

- Discussion regarding turtle nesting and movement mitigation
- Frogs and toads to be included in the submission to MNRF

Shari Muscat & Kevin Brousseau from Stantec Consulting Inc. spoke on behalf of the application.

Comments and discussion:

- Have been working with the City for 4 years on this project
- Most comments are easy for team to address
- Have created 2 new turtle nesting locations
- Consideration for low impact development- infiltration trenches and permeable pavers to achieve the water balance and storm water management facilities throughout
- Section 5.2 dewatering- permit to take water was not filed prior to writing the report
- Cooling trenches proposed with support from GRCA and City of Guelph Engineering Department- sized for 10mm storm event
- Education should be provided for location of storm facility on private property. A few measures are in place including the subdivision agreement and purchase and sale agreement
- Post-construction monitoring includes stream temperature monitoring
- Confirmed that Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act permit not required
- Pond was surveyed for fish, as well as upstream and downstream

Delegation by Hugh Whitely:

- Not clear that there is adequate data for maximum groundwater table on site
- Naturalization of the stream, base design on what's surrounding, for example Mitchell Woods. The proposed design looks like it's a southwestern U.S. stream.
- Money still available from GRCA for Torrance Creek monitoring program, has never been fully implemented
- Refer to City of Kitchener's February 2016 monitoring program Reference to the City of Edmonton workshop on the integration of natural wetlands and improving design of natural stormwater management facilities

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

Moved by M. Wilson and seconded by L. Todd.

THAT the Environmental Advisory Committee approve the Updated Environmental Implementation Report prepared by Stantec Consulting Ltd. for 1159 Victoria Road (February 2016) conditional upon provision of an Addendum to the EIR, the satisfaction of to the City, that includes the following items:

More detailed and comprehensive turtle habitat mitigation measures during construction that consider: (a) turtle nesting areas and protection of viable eggs, and (b) turtle rescue, particularly from Pond A and Pond C;

- **More detailed and comprehensive mitigation measures related to fish rescue during construction that consider the appropriate timing windows;**

- **Water quality data for Pond A prior to construction;**
- **A commitment to undertake groundwater monitoring for two years following 90% completion of the development (rather than the current commitment of 75%);**
- **A single consolidated monitoring table that integrates the recommendations in the text and includes, for each monitoring component, an objective, methodology in brief, duration, frequency and seasonality, potential remedial action(s), and reporting format;**
- **Related specifically to the Natural Channel Design:**
 - **A meander belt width calculation for the proposed channel and clarify how the proposed design meets this requirement;**
 - **Details regarding the bridge footings in the detailed cross-sections and relevant design drawing(s);**
 - **Provide a cross-section that includes the West Tributary, to clarify how the downstream portion of the tributary will be constructed through the former Pond C;**
 - **J-Hooks removed from the proposed design, if considered appropriate from an engineering and hydrogeologic perspective; and**
 - **Ensure a contractor that specializes in natural channel design must be retained and that the City (presumably with GRCA) sign off on channel works prior to flow introduction.**
- **THAT post-development environmental monitoring reports be returned to EAC to review performance and function of the proposed mitigation measures.**

**Motion Carried
-Unanimous-**

6. University of Guelph Turfgrass Institute Relocation EIS

A. Labbé, City of Guelph Environmental Planner, provided a summary of the staff report and was available to answer questions from the Environmental Advisory Committee.

General comments from EAC:

- Discussion about deferral versus approval of the EIS
- Storm water management criteria comes from Engineering Department
- Discussion about stormwater management- not enough information provided in submission.

Todd Fell from Dougan & Associates, Steve Davies, Matrix Solutions, Llyod Grinham, Grinham Architects, Tanya Lonsdale, Braun Consulting and John Vanos, University of Guelph were available to answer questions from the Environmental Advisory Committee.

General comments from EAC:

- In the process of putting together the Site Plan application
- Previous comments regarding hydrology, water balance, storm water management information not addressed

- More groundwater information to be collected to make it more complete
- Discussion about the monitoring timing from August to December. This is not a realistic timeline for collecting natural heritage data, data set is missing
- Provide dates for the 3 season botanical surveys and include field data sheets included in EIS
- Would like to see habitat of species of special concern addressed, i.e. milk snake, eastern wood peewee
- Include descriptions of day to day operations of Turfgrass Institute, i.e. fertilizers, pesticides
- Breeding bird survey- should include chimney swift, Harrison House might be a suitable location for chimney swifts
- Mapping of study area is inconsistent, primary and secondary study areas should be presented consistently
- How is the bobolink habitat defined? Mapping doesn't show where the observations were made
- May be opportunities to enhance areas for pollinators and biodiversity
- Opportunities for enhancement of watercourse- include description of fisheries/aquatic habitat
- Discussion regarding culvert relining
- Species at risk (SAR) habitat is being relocated. An analysis showing why this habitat can't be moved within the University site should be included
- Importing/exporting soil- measures to reduce seeds of non-native species being moving around

Delegation by John Ambrose:

- 1974-1994 curator of Arboretum
- Windbreaks and meadows were intentional
- Feels that what is being proposed is an inappropriate plan
- Disregards the integrity of the Arboretum and collections
- Doesn't fit with philosophy of the gentle management of land
- Species at risk- mitigation is always the first route, we don't really know how relocation works
- Losing species from the City
- The University should be a leader and set an example
- Would like project to be moved off the Arboretum- discussion of other sites
- The effects of use of pesticides in research could result in a population sink
- Should be restrictions on use of fertilizers and/or pesticides
- No information on how GTI will deal with wildlife management, groundhog, deer, rabbits
- Reduce the footprint of the site to demonstration plots and move research plots to another site
- Opportunities for partnerships
- Better management practices, turf management without pesticides

Delegation by Hugh Whitely:

- Lack of context provided- no subwatershed map, 2 branches to stream, second branch not included
- Discussion of the type of stream
- Should use uniform terminology for hydrology
- In Hugh's opinion, the EIS doesn't meet the standards based on the quality of the data
- EIR should include an examination of a porous pavement parking lot

Motion to go past 10:00 p.m.

Moved by L. Renzetti and seconded by A. Baron.

**Motion Carried
-8 in favour, 1 abstained-**

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

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

That the Environmental Advisory Committee defers the EIS, until such time that an EIS Addendum is prepared which includes:

- a) **Thermal data to confirm thermal regime of the stream;**
- b) **Further investigations and clarifications on the flow regime of the stream;**
- c) **A figure that depicts fish habitat features and a description of existing habitat;**
- d) **Further consideration for stream restoration, particularly daylighting the piped portion of the stream;**
- e) **Confirmation in principle that the future SWM Design will not negatively impact natural heritage features or functions;**
- f) **Commitment to incorporate LIDs, preferably treatment train, through the Site Plan design and SWM Design by including a summary of opportunities in this regard as an appendix and that a permeable pavement parking lot be explored specifically as one of the opportunities due to the suitable field conditions and appropriateness for a university research site;**
- g) **A post-development monthly water balance should incorporate irrigation activities at the site;**
- h) **A collated list of wildlife records (with dates, source and location) and an analysis for Habitat of Significant Species;**
- i) **A detailed significant species compensation report including an analysis of feasible potential sites within the City;**
- j) **A figure which depicts post-development habitat creation opportunities and goals to guide mitigation and compensation efforts;**
- k) **Updates to the City's Tree Compensation practice and commitment to protecting the hedgerow west of the maintenance building;**
- l) **Updated drawings for the Site Alteration Permit which clearly indicates tree protection zones, sediment and erosion controls and compensation plans;**

- m) **A revised policy analysis to clarify the applicable City OP, the Clean Water Act implications, and gaps identified in the impact analysis;**
- n) **Further details on the adaptive mitigation and monitoring plan;**
- o) **Describe proposed activities and detailed limitations on activities at the site which have potential environmental implications**

And

THAT a concise EIR be provided at the time of Site Plan Application to summarize how the EIS is being incorporated into the design.

**Motion Carried
-Unanimous-**

7. Adoption of Minutes from Previous Meeting

Moved by A. Baron and seconded by V. Capmourteres.

“To accept the minutes.”

**Motion Carried
-7 in favour, 2 abstained-**

8. Correspondence & Information

- Hart’s EIR

9. Other Business

- Alex Chapman, Program Manager Energy, will be seeking Committee input on lighting impacts on the natural environment
- Opportunity for EAC to go out on site visits with City Staff

10. Next Meeting- June 8, 2016

11. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 10:36 p.m.
Moved by H. Wheeler and seconded by M. Wilson

**Motion Carried
-Unanimous-**

CHAIRMAN