



## Agenda

---

**Date and Time:** August 12, 2014 6:00pm - 9:00pm **Project No.:** 300032275

**Project Name:** Niska Road EA

**Meeting Subject:** Niska Road Community Working Group Meeting No. 6

**Meeting Location:** Guelph City Hall, Meeting room C, 1 Carden Street

---

### Items

1. Review of Meeting Minutes from Wednesday July 23, 2014
2. CWG Member comments on Evaluation of Alternative Tables
3. Discussion of traffic OD data
4. Public Information Centre #1
5. Other



BURNSIDE

[ THE DIFFERENCE IS OUR PEOPLE ]

## Minutes of Meeting

---

**Meeting Date:** July 23, 2014 **Project No.:** 300032275.0000

**Project Name :** Niska Road EA

**Meeting Subject:** Niska Road Community Working Group Meeting No. 5

**Meeting Location:** Guelph City Hall, Meeting Room C

**Date Prepared:** July 27, 2014

---

### Those in attendance were:

Brad Hamilton	City of Guelph
Gwen Zhang	City of Guelph
Don Kudo	City of Guelph
April Nix	City of Guelph
Leonard Rach	R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited
Philip Rowe	R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited
Ashley Gallagher	R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited
Sarah Draper	R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited
Richard Unterman (via teleconference until 7:30)	Unterman McPhail Associates
Judy Martin	CWG Member
Laura Murr	CWG Member
Sandy Nicholls	CWG Member
Shaun Goodyer	CWG Member
Larry Erickson	CWG Member
Samantha Lawson	CWG Member
Peter Lennie	CWG Member

### Those absent were:

Jennifer Vandermeer	R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited
Nather Aziz	CWG Member
Joe Bigley	CWG Member
Vince Hanson	CWG Member

Tim Martin	CWG Member
Terry McLellan	CWG Member
Jim Miller	CWG Member
Lori MacEwen	CWG Member
Sharon Claessens	CWG Member

**Changes in CWG Membership**

As per our CWG agreement, Jim Miller has missed 3 consecutive meetings, as such, he is no longer an active member of the CWG. He can still attend as a viewing public to any meeting, but cannot participate in the project exercises or activities.

The following items were discussed	Action by
<p><b>1. CHER Report Discussion with Richard Unterman</b></p> <p><b>1.1</b> Philip Rowe (P.R.) introduced Richard Unterman (R.U.) and encouraged the CWG members to ask R.U. about any outstanding questions they had regarding the CHER Report.</p> <p>Laura Murr (L.M.) – Did you review the relevant parts of the Cities Official Plan regarding viewsheds? Section 8.3 of the Official Plan indicates that a scenic view can be protected.</p> <p>R.U. - The evaluation is based on the criteria under O.Reg 9/06, there are planning considerations but the criteria that the Ministry of Culture uses was used in this evaluation.</p> <p>L.M. - I am talking about the bridge in the context of the surroundings of the roadway.</p> <p>R.U. - We have made a comment in our report regarding the landscape and that it may be of heritage value.</p> <p>L.M. – Do you recognize that the bridge has significant heritage value?</p> <p>R.U. – We believe that since it scored in all 3 categories that were being evaluated that the bridge is of value. We were not judging it outside of the criteria listed in O.Reg. 9/06. The CHER only uses the criteria found in O.Reg. 9/06. If we looked at a house or park we would use the same criteria, as it is the recommended tool from the Ministry of Culture to ensure consistency across the province.</p> <p>L.M. - Does your CHER Report meet the requirements of the City Plan?</p> <p>R.U. - It doesn't. What it does is state that under O.Reg. 9/06, there is value. The linkage to the City Plan does not exist. It is up to the municipality to look at that perspective.</p> <p>L.M. - As a heritage planner would you recommend that it be protected</p>	

**The following items were discussed**

**Action by**

from Ptarmigan Drive to the bridge?

R.U. – No, we just offer an assessment, it is up to the Municipality to make a recommendation based on the report, and they can agree or disagree with it.

L.M. – The final conclusion in the CHER Report notes that the bridge could be protected or designated, but there is no mention of a heritage value.

R.U. – We didn't use that as a tool to protect a viewshed. The report can contribute to a description or a viewshed value for future study. It can become an element of study or an attribute that can be referenced.

L.M. – I am confused because anything they do to the road can impact the viewshed which the bridge is part of.

R.U. – It depends on the part of the viewshed you are considering. Is it the bridge, the roadscape etc.? That is why the value we talk about in the assessment relates to the bridge's value rather than the bridge's value in context of the landscape.

L.M. - So the cultural heritage landscape is only a part of it, how do we get a study of just that?

R.U. – That is something to be determined by the City. Under the regulation, in this context we have made reference to the value of the river crossing. The value is not in the road itself but more so in the bridge crossing and the passageway. That is what is part of the transportation network history. The type of bridge that gets chosen is important, but our work is more interested in the transportation route and the crossing. In terms of qualities, the attributes include: is it a landmark, where does it fit in the river system? Any bridge that is there will be considered a landmark.

L.M. - So if we want the cultural heritage landscape looked at we have to ask the City for a further study?

R.U. – They could choose to do that, or they could accept the study and say that it is acceptable.

Leonard Rach (L.R.) – It is pretty easy to incorporate features into the design of the bridge that would enhance the viewscape.

R.U. - The nice part about this bridge is it is very low profile. There are options to put in something like a truss bridge, which is very pretty.

L.M. – The rolling nature of the road makes it very scenic.

R.U. – I don't think that putting in a bridge will change the rolling nature of the landscape, there are hills on either side of the valley lands

**The following items were discussed**

**Action by**

leading to the bridge.

L.M. – One of the things that make it such a scenic road is the hedgerow, but any alterations in the grading in the road down to the river is going to impact the view of the river.

R.U. - There may be a short term change, however the vegetation would grow back in and landscaping could be done to reestablish the vegetation.

L.M. – Are there any roads like this that have had a protected viewshed?

R.U. – I think in Caledon they are reestablishing all the fence lines and tree growth on one of their roads heading north. The MTO has been doing that with a lot of their roads in areas where change will occur, such as where roads are dead ended and there are opportunities to re-establish a natural environment. This project may be one that Burnside was working on.

L.R. – I think you are thinking of Gore Road. Airport Road is the next road to the west and goes through Caledon east.

R.U. – A short term change or a long term change should be looked at, and if proper landscaping is done you can re-establish some of those aspects.

L.R. – The Gore Road, Highway 9 to Patterson is what you are thinking of. There is a rolling landscape and homes that were designated as heritage sites.

R.U. – There was a great deal of attention paid to that work as I recall.

L.R. – We wanted to maintain the heritage aspect of the road in the design as much as possible.

Sandy Nicholls (S.N.) – There are old trees with holes in them that are home to different species. These trees cannot be replaced.

R.U. - That would be for the biologist to comment on.

L.M. – Re-grading the road was mentioned as an option; the regarding could change the rolling nature of the road.

R.U. – That is an item that has been discussed and may be determined in the design, I would expect that there are provincial standards for how roads are constructed.

P.R. – We are at a stage where we are looking at the preliminary preferred solution. This stage is to look at whether the road is reconstructed or not. We are not looking at design options yet. People like to jump ahead to the design phase since it is an exciting part of the

**The following items were discussed**

**Action by**

process however, your concerns are important and will be considered in the design phase. The next step is to look at what the solutions are. We will look at design options and how to introduce sidewalks, and protect the viewscape. We know the pavement needs to be replaced and that there are safety concerns to be addressed, but at the same time we are hearing requests not to touch the roadway and not to put in sidewalks.

S.N. – We are only talking about sidewalks from Ptarmigan to where they are missing in the other direction, not down to the bridge.

P.R. - That may be your thought now, and that maybe where the EA ends up, however, we can't presuppose what we do at this point. We have to look at all the design options that are available to us.

L.M. – What school children are there being dropped off down there?

***R.U. left the meeting.***

P.R. – That is just an example that I gave, we will look at how the road is being used and make design decisions based on that. We will use the same process to look at traffic calming features and we can include them in our design. We are currently in Phase II, which does not look at the design options yet. We have a landscape architect on our team who will work through the process, as well, and that person will look at impacts to the environment in Phases 3 and 4 which focus on design. If there are any additional questions for R.U. please submit them to the Niska Road email account and we will forward them to him.

**2. Review of Meeting Minutes from Tuesday June 3, 2014**

**2.1** L.M. – The minutes seem accurate. I thought we were supposed to bring our comments on the criteria to this meeting, and now we are being given new criteria. We spent hours going over the criteria we were given in the last meeting, and my time is valuable. I thought that we were going to take a few meetings to review them.

P.R. – I explained a few things in the last meeting about the assessment process. It was mentioned that the evaluation chart is a draft document. We had just received permission to enter GRCA lands and that we were going to be making changes in the rankings based on this new information. When the committee asked who does the rankings I informed the group that we do the rankings because we have the experience and background and we are qualified to do so. We need to move the process forward, however that does not dismiss the work that you have done. I want your comments, and we value your time, but it is important that we move the project forward.

<b>The following items were discussed</b>	<b>Action by</b>
<p>L.M. and S.N. expressed that they would like us to send them documents in advance to give them a chance to review the documents and become familiar with the material.</p>	
<p>P.R. – We try to avoid giving out new information without any explanation or rationale on how we got through our analysis and evaluations. I have to make a decision about what will be released, and what I feel needs to be explained at the meetings before information is distributed. I appreciate where you are coming from, but I think that everyone has benefitted from having an explanation first before reviewing it. There is a lot of time between now and September, and changes will continue to be made, but we have to move forward and look at what the solutions are. We are going to do things in order though. Is the group in agreement about the minutes, or do we have any more comments on them?</p>	
<p><b><i>There were no additional comments, P.R. moved to accept meeting minutes, seconded by Peter Lennie.</i></b></p>	
<p>L.M. – Is it possible to add an agenda item? I have prepared a document about why this process must be halted until we have a designation on the lands around Niska Road.</p>	
<p>P.R. added the item to the agenda under Section 3 as Future Development Issues on Niska Road.</p>	
<p>Samantha Lawson – Nothing has been decided yet regarding the lands. It becomes the GRCA board’s decision on what they choose to do.</p>	
<p><b>3. Discussion of Traffic Interview Survey</b></p>	
<p><b>3.1</b> L.R. discussed the results of the 12 hour traffic study conducted on Niska Road. The main focus of the study was where the traffic is going and the importance of the corridor to the community. Noted that a 65% sample was taken to avoid creating traffic delays.</p>	
<p>P.L. – Do you have any details on heavy vehicles? In particular trucks. There seem to be more and more.</p>	
<p>L.R. - Just notes that they were trucks or heavy trucks. We will look at options in the design phase to address this issue.</p>	
<p>P.L. Noted that has asked drivers if the route shows up as a preferred option on GPS and the drivers have indicated it does.</p>	
<p>L.M. - Do we know how many trucks exceeded the allowed load on the bridge?</p>	

<b>The following items were discussed</b>	<b>Action by</b>
<p>L.R. – The survey did not cover that.</p> <p>P.R. – We faced the same issue as local enforcement does. There is no weigh station in Guelph which makes enforcing loads an issue for local police. The police cannot stop them from crossing without a scale unless the load is obviously over what the bridge can support.</p> <p>L.M. – A fully loaded gravel truck is clearly well over 5 tonnes.</p> <p>S.N. – Anything over a cube van is in excess and there are a lot of larger vehicles going over that bridge.</p> <p>P.R. – There are some design elements we can put in place to deter that. They are soft elements such as signage and it is up to the driver to do what is right and what is required.</p> <p>S.N. – Now our traffic department is down to 8 officers from 14 officers and we don't get the enforcement.</p> <p>L.M. – A friend took the survey and was asked how we valued the bridge on a scale of 1 to 5. I would like to know what the exact question was that drivers were asked in the survey. I don't recall the question about whether we felt that the bridge was significant or that used the term corridor.</p> <p>P.R. – We will get exactly what was asked from our contractor who did the work. Their main concern was getting vehicles through quickly, there were students asking questions and they may have asked questions a bit differently.</p> <p>L.M. – My friend was confused by the question and I think it goes to the validity of the survey.</p> <p>L.R. – It is strictly semantics, the importance of the bridge and the bridge as it is part of the Niska corridor.</p> <p>S.N. – Can you explain exactly what a 'corridor' is?</p> <p>L.R. – A corridor is a term to describe a road from one end of that road to the other end of that road.</p> <p>Larry Erickson (L.E.) – I was just asked about the roadway not the bridge when I took the survey.</p> <p>A discussion was held between CWG members regarding the use of the term corridor.</p> <p>P.R. – As you take a look at the charts from the study we get a sense of the types of vehicles, percentages of how the roads are being used and the volume of traffic over time.</p> <p>L.M. – My understanding is that you are confirming that 75 % of the</p>	<p>Burnside</p>





**The following items were discussed**

**Action by**

resolved.

L.M. read through the handouts and suggested that due to potential developments plans in the area that we pause the EA process until we know more about the traffic needs that will be required in the future once the developments are put in place. L.M. expressed concern that we will make decisions about the road that will not fit with these development plans and that the road will need to be rebuilt/widened in the future at an additional expense to taxpayers. The following matters were addressed by L.M. as causing potential impacts to the traffic and planning:

- 116 acres of GRCA lands formerly leased to the Niska Wildlife foundation.
- Proposed re-designation of medium and low density housing on 8 ha of GRCA lands on the south side of Niska Road which includes a bonus provision to allow a higher number of units/ha.
- The Kortright Sports Complex forecasted in the 2009 City of Guelph Budget.
- The potential heritage designation of the Speed River Valley Lands.
- The pending move to have all publicly owned Urban River Valley Lands protected as part of the Ontario Greenbelt.

S.L. – An appeal would be submitted regarding the re-designation of the lands. The lands are already zoned P1.

April Nix (A.N.) – They are zoned P1 under the zoning by law. The zone is determined through the zoning bylaw, and designated as open space in the OP. They were re-designated as low density and medium density land through the OP update.

L.M. – What is the density? How many people/ha?

A.N. – You are further ahead than I am. I have not done those calculations, but we would follow what is in the OP.

L.M. – If we have 2 cars per unit, and we have 6 story apartments, that will also alter the viewshed of the area. That is why I say the OP allows up to 6 stories in this area and the road use cannot be determined.

L.M. discussed the Kortright Sports Complex spending over the next 5 years. I believe that at the south end Recreation Centre they are looking at providing parking for 1,000 vehicles. I don't know what the definition for a Sports Centre would be, but this could generate a lot of traffic on Niska Road. I am looking at what the maximum capacity of the road could be with all these plans.

S.L. – This is from 2009, is this still in the budget?

<b>The following items were discussed</b>	<b>Action by</b>
<p>A.N. – I cannot speak to what the Parks Department is doing, but they will need to do additional studies. The line item in the budget may be there, but that is not to say they could not look at alternate sites. It simply indicates a need to set money aside for a park. The Parks Department would have to comment further on this. I would recommend we get the numbers and clarification about the current capital budget from the Parks Department.</p>	
<p>S.L. - A site selection would take place. It is probably just a sports complex that is listed in the budget, not the specific site for the sports complex.</p>	
<p>Brad Hamilton (B.H.) – Parks can confirm if there are or are not definite plans about this.</p>	City
<p>S.L. – There have been no recent discussions about a complex on those lands with the GRCA.</p>	
<p>L.M. discussed the potential heritage designation of the valley lands.</p>	
<p>S.L. asked for clarification if it had been designated already.</p>	
<p>L.M. indicated that this was part of the CHER process and may be happening.</p>	
<p>L.M. discussed the River Valley Lands being included as part of the Greenbelt. Maps were displayed showing the Greenbelt and publicly owned lands designated for protection.</p>	
<p>S.L. – GRCA is a private land owner; we are not a crown corporation. We own the lands we purchase as a private land owner and grant permission for those to be on lands.</p>	
<p>A.N. - In terms of growing the Greenbelt, Council had asked in 2010 that the City look at growing the Greenbelt. The interest was to include publicly owned lands. Staff was directed to approach the province about it. Staff initiated those discussions but there are some challenges in meeting the provinces criteria. The City is not part of the Greenbelt Plan though there remains interest in being involved. The Greenbelt Plan review will start next year. The City will look at public or privately owned lands to be included and will discuss with the GRCA. We have seen examples where GRCA lands were included in other locations and we can discuss it with the GRCA. There would be a consultation process to determine involvement. There will be a lot more discussion in the future, but Guelph is not currently involved in the growing of the Greenbelt.</p>	
<p>L.M. – The Mayor has endorsed this program.</p>	
<p>S.L. – The maps can show that, but the GRCA owns the lands, our</p>	

**The following items were discussed**

**Action by**

lands are not treated the same as municipal lands and parks, we grant permissions for people to use the land, they are not public lands.

A.N. – City staff were directed in 2010 to approach the province to be included in the Greenbelt Plan, the system mapping was created to simply approach the province. No one has designated any lands and Guelph is not part of the Greenbelt Plan; some of the criteria and policies to grow the Greenbelt present challenges for the City. Staff is looking at discussing those challenges in the Greenbelt Plan review.

L.M. – This review is in 2015?

A.N. - The Greenbelt Plan commits to a 10 year review, the process was started in 2005 so if the province lives up to its commitment that process would start in 2015.

L.M. – The lands that the GRCA purchased was done with 90 % taxpayer money.

S.L. – That is correct, but we are private land holder. We have no trespassing signs. For example, unless we permit access to lands on Starkey Hill you are trespassing.

S.N. – There are a lot of people trespassing.

L.M. – The lands could still be part of the Greenbelt Plan?

S.L. – Yes, we would be at the table with other land holders to discuss with the City, but I want to make it clear that we are a private land owner.

P.R. - About 8 to 10 years ago I was involved in lands that went into the Niagara Escarpment, and it had all the private land owners that the Region wished to have as part of the Niagara Escarpment. Some landowners sold, some said no, these maps are a wish list for the City. As Samantha said, it would be on the table, but is private property at the moment.

L.M. – Are my concerns valid for pausing the process? How will that impact the EA?

P.R. - There are always development plans in the works when you start making improvements. There will always be other things going on at the City that may be interconnected. We cannot stop for the other development plans that are happening. We make the best decision that we can in the moment, and move forward. The EA process now has a 10 year shelf life, in that 10 years the City can have an addendum to the EA. This extension of the process came about in recognition that there are other moving parts. If there are significant changes an addendum would be done, and it would be open to the public for a 30

<b>The following items were discussed</b>	<b>Action by</b>
<p>day review period. You have great points, but the City has to move the process forward and make decisions. When a traffic model is done there are certain assumptions that are made regarding traffic volumes. There are numbers here in terms of housing density which those models would take into account using the best knowledge that we have. If there are major changes there could still be a change in the EA.</p> <p>L.M. – Until I started looking at the official plan I had never heard about how many units could go in, and how much traffic those units would generate. Those data need to be included in the forecast.</p> <p>P.R. – We will include all four pages you have presented in our EA document.</p> <p>L.M. - Vince Hanson (V.H.) submitted this map detailing the truck exclusionary zone and how it ends in the middle of Pioneer Trail and does not extend to the city limits.</p>	
<p><b>4. Discussion of Evaluation of Alternatives and Preliminary Preferred Solution</b></p>	
<p><b>4.1</b> P.R. – Some of the material you may have to review on your own due to time constraints. We are at a stage in the process where we are trying to find a solution at a high level. We are currently in the preliminary phase of the project, before PIC #1. We are just determining the Preliminary Preferred option. Then we will determine design concepts and features. This is step one. We're only halfway through Phase 2. The term 'preliminary' is very important, as it identified that the 'solution' is still open for change and/or modification as additional information is gathered or received.</p> <p>This document is always changing as we get more information, data and council resolutions. It is important to understand the context in terms of where we are going. When you go to a PIC you would see an evaluation chart listing the importance of solutions and notes how you get to the preferred solution. To get to that point we must start with the evaluation table. We talk about how experts look at each row and rank it. Those circles translate into numbers 1-5 from least to most preferred.</p> <p>P.R. reviewed the ranking table in terms of significance, frequency, degree of irreversibility etc. and discussed the flow chart with the group to show how ratings were determined in the evaluation table.</p> <p>S.N. – Some of this is subjective.</p> <p>P.R. – Some decisions are subjective but experience-based. Our experts look at many factors and rely on science and their experience to make those determinations. The best way to eliminate how much of it</p>	

**The following items were discussed**

**Action by**

is subjective is to look at each category that you are dealing with. You try not to compare, as an example, water versus trees versus human issues. Instead you compare a category on its own, against the other solutions. You look at the natural environment and rank it separately. It is not about ranking one as more important than another, you only compare one criteria against itself.

Ashley Gallagher (A.G.) - All of these criteria have gone through many people's hands to add to it and gain perspectives. We do not just have one person looking at these criteria; it is a compilation of all of our experts.

Judy Martin (J.M.) – The environment gets 5 1's, or lowest ranking. It is hard not to feel there is some sort of bias here. If you had asked me at the start of this process what the preliminary evaluation would be, it would not be what this comes out to. It is hard to believe that there is not some bias in this.

L.M. – We spent time going through these sheets and found things to be included, and since we are not part of this process we don't feel that our comments are being included. We spent a lot of time doing this.

P.R. – I am missing where 5 1's are identified. The rankings for replacing the bridge are high, but if you go down to technical factors, in the current state of the bridge, it begins to rank low. The bridge in its current state has significant safety concerns. The Natural Environment section has high scores for 'do nothing' or 'close the bridge' and is similar to Social Economic. From a graphical standpoint we have rounded the numbers to 1-5. When you step back and look at the numerical calculations, you will see that the actual calculated numbers for comparison are very close. I understand what you are saying, but an honest evaluation of the bridge was conducted.

S.N. – There are 2 full circles here under replace the bridge with a 2 lane.

P.R. – If I am at 3.4 it would get a score of 3. If I am at 3.6 it would get a 4 because of rounding. This is what the public sees, as a committee looking for your advice, we are ignoring this. We are actually giving you the numbers.

S.L. – I was also of the impression that we were coming with comments and feedback based on the criteria. Can still provide those comments? At the next meeting would you show how you incorporated those comments?

P.R. – That is correct. We were looking to move forward, but as data comes in we will adjust things. I promised you that at the beginning I

**The following items were discussed**

**Action by**

would give an honest effort in the evaluation, and that is what my team has done. This is a summary of that effort.

L.M. – I was provided with information on the 2012 management of roads. We will be pulsing the fish with run off from the roads, we have done our research. I had a lot of additions to this chart.

P.R. – We will take those comments from you.

L.M. Indicated that she would like to keep the sheets with the comments and will provide them to Burnside via email. L.M. expressed concern regarding the groundwater flows at Ptarmigan and Downey and noted the presence of water cress growing in the area and the possibility that it is a fish habitat. S.N. was in agreement with L.M.'s assessment.

P.R. - There are no fish in that habitat based on information from our aquatics expert. The stormwater portion is part of the design process and will be included during the design phase.

L.M. – Will it be piped underground?

P.R. – Again, this is part of the design phase.

L.M. – No hydrogeological assessment will be done until after the preliminary design is decided on? You are making decisions without that information.

P.R. – One of the biggest challenges I have in a process, is that everyone wants to look forward. The stormwater specialist is already thinking of those things when he is looking at the chart. If something does not make sense to our team of experts while they are reviewing the rankings, they would voice that. The rank is based on those issues.

L.M. – How do you know what the impacts are for ranking if you don't do a study? How do you know how you will impact groundwater flows with your design if you don't know where it flows? Without the study this is a subjective analysis and I have a problem with that. Afterwards are you going to do any hydrogeological studies before you take it to the public?

P.R. – We have a geotechnical subcontractor to do that.

L.M. – Are you going to put in piezometers? You have missed spring already and some of these studies were done before we knew what was in the area.

P.R. - You probably see this as a flaw, but the EA process only covers to the 30 % design phase. When you make a decision in an EA and look at design options you are looking at a 30 % design. After the EA you go onto the detailed design. All the things that you are saying a

The following items were discussed	Action by
<p>geotechnical person would be looking at, such as digging boreholes and laying down piezometers, would happen during the next phase of design. You were involved in Hanlon EA, and it went to 30 % design and then to detailed design.</p>	
<p>L.M. - The Hanlon area is not into a sensitive area if you widen the road.</p>	
<p>P.R. – We have to be careful not to use motherhood statements with widening the road.</p>	
<p>L.M. – You have shown us the edge effect in the cross sections.</p>	
<p>P.R. - As a committee you have to see from worst case scenario to a minimal impact scenario. These are not documents carved in stone.</p>	
<p>L.M. – The design would be similar to these would it not?</p>	
<p>P.R. – No, not at all.</p>	
<p>J.M. – Why are background studies considered to be part of the design? Like a groundwater study. That is not a design. That is information that will help come up with a design that minimizes impact.</p>	
<p>L.R. – The study gives context to make decisions.</p>	
<p>L.M. – You don't do the study until after you make the decision. Isn't that what leads to so much impact on the environment?</p>	
<p>P.R. – The overarching solution is to replace the bridge and reconstruct the road, stage two of the preliminary preferred solution would include the rural, urban and semi urban cross sections and anything in between. S.N. talked about where the sidewalk would start and stop, where you might want access to the speed river.</p>	
<p>L.M. – I hear what you are saying, but for example have you looked for Jefferson salamanders?</p>	
<p>P.R. - We have. Early in the study process, we gave our first memo on the natural environment. Later we got permission to go onto GRCA lands. We have added the information we got to the report and we can give you the revised report.</p>	Burnside
<p>L.M. – I understand they are hard to find unless you look in the pools for their eggs. You could not have found that in June.</p>	
<p>P.R. – It is part of the work that we are doing.</p>	
<p>L.M. – You are going to bring forward a preferred option before knowing if there is anything there because you have to wait until spring to do those surveys.</p>	
<p>P.R. – If this happens at the end or near the end of the process or</p>	

**The following items were discussed**

**Action by**

during the design phase there is a section in the EA document for recommendations and considerations. It discusses all the things that need to be done during the detailed design process, or things that need to be done during construction. This includes having an environmental inspector on site during construction. There is recognition that there could be a change in numbers. It may not change the bigger picture but it is important that we note these recommendations in the ESR.

L.M. - Have you identified the corridor for deer? Have you decided in the detailed design of how to deal with the deer? There is no note about the deer wintering yards.

P.R. - If a timing issue is not met, that would be carried forward into the next phase.

L.M. - That falls into safety concerns for people on the road, how do you come to these conclusions without looking at these items? How can you leave it to the design phase?

P.R. - The design is only at 30 %, because of the timing window and the wait for the permit from the GRCA. We can still look at it as part of the design without having field data, and go out in the field during the proper window.

L.M. – Once the final option is chosen it is final. We only find out later that there are a lot of impacts. I think I have valid concerns.

P.R. – When we do file the EA we get a lot of comments from a number of different agencies, such as the MNR and GRCA. We submit the document to the MOE. If something we write does not satisfy, those agencies comments come back asking for further study or explanation. We as experts submit our documentation, other environmental experts respond, and we act appropriately.

L.M. - That has not been the process on all the EAs that I have been on. I think that it is problematic not to do it now in order to make appropriate decisions. We are making subjective decisions about objective things. We know there are frogs because of the dead frogs I have seen on the road. Though your survey did not show any frogs. We have not seen a new survey on frogs.

P.R. - I can't tell you the date that they went out, but our team did go out a second time. In our last meeting Jennifer Vandermeer (J.V.) discussed the results of the second time out and that frogs were found. J.V. did say that we didn't hear calling during the first survey and our first CWG meeting. J.V. said that we felt it was not accurate, and we were going to do additional field work to look for frogs which has been done.

The following items were discussed	Action by
P.L. – These documents have been through a number of hands, and Burnside is asking the committee to review the document and our comments could impact it. You are looking for our input, but the document will keep changing. We just have an example of what is going on at the moment.	
P.R. - You have our evaluation based on what we have done as of today.	
S.L. – You are going to be posting the Draft ESR and the environmental reports that support this on the website?	
P.R. - Not yet.	
S.L. requested the most recent copies of the Evaluation of Alternatives Charts	Burnside
L.E.. - What is an ESR?	
P.R. – An ESR is an Environmental Site Review.	
L.M. requested an additional table for her to fill out.	Burnside
<b><i>P.R. motioned to adjourn the meeting.</i></b>	
<b>5. Next Meeting</b>	
August 12 <sup>th</sup> and 19 <sup>th</sup> are the potential dates for next meeting. CWG members to email the Niska Road email to confirm which day works better for them.	CWG

The preceding are the minutes of the meeting as observed by the undersigned. Should there be a need for revision, please advise within seven days. In the absence of notification to the contrary, these minutes will be deemed to be an accurate record of the meeting.

Minutes prepared by:

**R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited**

Sarah Draper

Administrative Assistant

SD:sd

Enclosure(s) Laura Murr's Handouts provided at meeting

Distribution:

All Attendees



## Memorandum

---

**Date:** August 11, 2014 **Project No.:** 300032275.0000  
**Project Name:** Niska Road/Bridge EA  
**Client Name:** City of Guelph  
**To:** CWG Members  
**From:** Len Rach, P.Eng.

---

FYI enclosed is the origin/destination of trips assembled from our recent 12 hour interview study. As you can see that 52.4% of the trips on Niska Road at the bridge are local in nature.

		Destination			
		External	HCN	KHN	Total
Origin	External	967	237	254	1,458
	HCN	308			308
	KHN	265			265
	Total	<b>1,540</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>2,031</b>

  

		Destination			
		External	HCN	KHN	Total
Origin	External	47.6%	11.7%	12.5%	71.8%
	HCN	15.2%			15.2%
	KHN	13.0%			13.0%
	Total	<b>75.8%</b>	<b>11.7%</b>	<b>12.5%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

HCN = Hanlon Creek Neighbourhood (Edinburgh to the Hanlon plus Kortright)  
KHN = Kortright Hills Neighbourhood (West of the Hanlon and South of Hanlon Creek)

LR:tw

032275\_memo\_140811  
8/12/2014 10:32 AM