

**ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2013 AT 7:00 P.M.**

**COUNCIL COMMITTEE ROOM C
MINUTES**

Present: E. Stahl (Chair) R. Park
E. Blenkhorn K. McNeill
C. Parent B. Mungall
Y. Roy

Regrets: S. Lohnes, G. Johnstone

Staff: A. Labbé, V. Laur, P. Wong

External Groups: Rebecca Hay, MMM Group
Paul F. Puopolo, Polocorp Inc. / IPlus
Krista Walkey, Stantec
Chris Powell, Stantec
Judy Martin, Sierra Club Canada

E. Blenkhorn, declared a conflict of interest on Agenda item #1 - 66 Eastview Environmental Impact Study.

1. 66 Eastview Environmental Impact Study

A. Labbé, Environmental Planner with the City of Guelph, provided a brief overview of the proposal and reviewed the staff report.

Rebecca Hay, from MMM Group, provided brief highlights in regards to the context of the site:

- Revised Figure 3 – Significant Woodlands – included ELC unit 1 and unit 17
- Significant Wildlife – have completed analysis and currently have a table in draft form
- No significant movement corridors

C. Parent noted under Section 2.1 the species list only includes Ecoplans work and not a comprehensive list with information from background sources. He requested a comprehensive list or statement be provided indicating that there are no other species in other information sources.

K. McNeill noted concerns with water balance and to match the numbers and timing.

C. Parent noted on page 24, Schedule 8 - Trails – The City should not encourage trails through the Provincially Significant Wetland.

E. Stahl expressed concern with wetland water balance. She noted she wanted to see additional detail on how it can be maintained (i.e. water levels, conditions (dry year/wet year), infiltration/timing etc.)

The floor was opened to delegations.

Delegation:

Judy Martin, with Sierra Club Canada noted the following concerns:

- Tree Replacement – 3:1 is not enough for tree replacement. Should be requiring calliper replacement for trees removed
- Buffers – there should not be any encroachment in the buffer. Don't let the minimal buffer be impacted
- Need more detail/rationale as to how the buffer was determined in the report.

EAC noted the written comments submitted by Nature Guelph on November 7th, 2013.

Moved by K. McNeill and seconded by Y. Roy

“That the Environmental Advisory Committee conditionally support the Environmental Impact Study prepared by MMM, with the following conditions:

1. Rationale for recommended buffer widths;
2. The limits of the Significant Woodland and Significant Wildlife Habitat through the provision of a revised Figure 3 and the completion of a SWH screening assessment;
3. Addition text with respect to wetland water balance;
4. Consideration to the tree compensation plan beyond 3:1;
5. Consideration of reducing the encroachment into the buffer; and
6. That an Environmental Implementation Report be completed based on an agreed upon terms of reference and including wetland water balance & stormwater management plan, biological monitoring protocols and baseline data; trail alignment and design details; detailed tree conservation plan; restoration/enhancement plans for buffers; invasive & species management; design of education and stewardship materials.”

Motion Carried

1 member abstained

R. Park, declared a conflict of interest on Agenda item #2 – 150 Wellington Street Environmental Impact Study

2. 150 Wellington Street Environmental Impact Study

A. Labbé, Environmental Planner with the City of Guelph, provided a brief overview of the proposal and reviewed the staff report.

Krista Walkey, from Stantec, advised the site is currently vacant and the application is to permit an 18 storey mixed use building. There is also a green roof – 70% of the site.

Chris Powell, from Stantec, advised on the following:

- There are no significant natural heritage features on the subject site.
- There will be an oil-grit separator installed where there currently isn't one.
- Green roof component.
- Landscaping plan – about 44 trees is proposed to be planted at grade. Approximate ratio is 2:1 not 3:1. The 2:1 ratio combined with the green roof should be sufficient.
- No stormwater implications to salt, but alternatives can be looked at.

General discussion took place and the consultant was available to respond to questions.

C. Parent Noted the following:

- Section 8.2.2.1 & 8.2.2.2 – 2 paragraphs on Bird Strikes – looking for elaboration on the basis of this information. Recommend to incorporate design measures to reduce potential bird strikes.
- Page 94, last bullet point - Strengthen the Recommendation to indicate measures be taken to implement measures to reduce bird strikes.

The EAC reviewed email correspondence submitted by Judy Martin, Regional Representative, Sierra Club Canada dated November 13, 2013.

Moved by E. Blenkhorn and seconded by Y. Roy

“That the Environmental Advisory Committee support the Environmental Impact Study prepared by Stantec Consulting Ltd.”

Motion Carried

1 member abstained

3. Approval of Minutes from October 09, 2013

Moved by B. Mungall and seconded by C. Parent –

“To accept the minutes as printed.

**Motion Carried
-Unanimous-**

4. Correspondence and Information

A. Labbé distributed the ToR for an EIR for Pergola Phase II.

5. Other Business**a) EIS ToR Guideline – Feedback from EAC and Next Steps**

A. Labbé asked for feedback from EAC on the EIS ToR Guideline. A. Labbé advised technical appendices are currently being worked on.

EAC members to provide comments to P. Wong by next Friday.

b) Inquiry to Staff and EAC Re: Stormwater Management Pond (SWMP) Remediation – Information from staff and discussion

A. Labbé reviewed the email inquiry dated Sept 04, 2013 from Dr. Dennis and Mrs. Murr and noted the following:

- Has discussed the inquiry with City Engineering to ask how the City approaches stormwater management pond (SWMP) remediation.
- Noted the recently released Terms of Reference online referred to in the inquiry, is for the Stormwater Funding Study, which is being initiated and a Stakeholders Advisory Group is being formed.
- Reported that the City does perform SWMP remediation, however there were no ponds remediated in 2013.
- The City's Stormwater Management Facility Inventory, Assessment and Maintenance Needs Plan (2008) has been implemented since 2008. It includes a checklist to be completed prior to remediation. The inquiry sent in to EAC emphasizes that the checklist does not include baseline data collection for wildlife.
- Staff clarified that the City does address wildlife rescue and relocation during SWMP remediation.
- Provided an example (SWMP 106) where Wildlife Collector's permits from the MNR were obtained in order to undertake a rescue/relocation.
- Advised that the Stormwater Management Facility Inventory, Assessment and Maintenance Needs Plan (2008) is being updated in 2014.

EAC reviewed the information and discussion took place. EAC agreed to review the document entitled "Stormwater Management Facility, Inventory, Assessment and Maintenance Needs Plan Final Report" dated October 2008 on line.

Moved by C. Parent and seconded by R. Park –

“The Environmental Advisory Committee requests that:

- a) The Committee is kept informed on the progress of the update to the “Stormwater Management Facility, Inventory, Assessment and Maintenance Needs Plan Final Report” specifically with respect to the timing of the update.
- b) That the Committee provide input with respect to mitigating impacts to wildlife through the update process.”

**Motion Carried
-Unanimous-**

c) Stormwater Funding Study Stakeholder Advisory Group (Fall 2013-Spring 2014)

A. Labbé advised the Engineering Department is undertaking a Stormwater Funding Study. There is a stakeholder advisory group being formed. An EAC member has been invited to join. Commitment is 2-3 meetings. B. Mungall volunteered to sit on the group.

A. Labbé will advise Engineering that B. Mungall has volunteered.

d) EAC Mandate Clarification RE: Site Plan Applications

A. Labbé clarified the interpretation of the EAC Mandate in regards to Site Plan Applications indicating that they are not applications to be reviewed by Committee. Staff indicated that there are some Site Plan applications which include environmental reports and/or are near natural features and wanted to ensure there is clarity on this item. Staff briefly explained the Site Plan approval process and timelines for review.

The Committee agreed with the interpretation and responded with willingness to review Site Plan application information where Staff determine there would be added value.

6. Next Meeting

December 11, 2013.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

CHAIRMAN