

**CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE
HESPELER WEST SUBWATERSHEDS STUDY
WORKING COMMITTEE
MEETING AGENDA
Thursday, June 17, 2004
Allan Reuter Seniors' Centre, 507 King Street,
Cambridge (Preston)
3:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.**

1. Call to Order
2. Declarations of Pecuniary Interest
3. Confirmation of Minutes (Attached)

THAT the Minutes of the Hespeler West Subwatersheds Study Working Committee meeting held June 3, 2004 be considered for errors and/or omissions.

4. Presentation and Discussion – Updated Floodlines – Ray Tufgar, M. Eng., M.B.A., P. Eng., Manager, Waterloo Office, Totten Sims Hubicki Associates
5. Other Business
 - (a) Revise Natural Heritage Features and Constraint Mapping due to Changes to PSWs
 - (b) Follow-up List Attached
 - (c) List of Topics for Upcoming Meetings Attached
 - (d) Field Visits – Discuss Timing

Next Meeting Date – Thursday, July 8, 2004
Allan Reuter Seniors Centre, 507 King Street
3:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.

**CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE
HESPELER WEST SUBWATERSHEDS STUDY WORKING COMMITTEE
MEETING NO. 12
MINUTES**

Thursday, June 3, 2004
Galt Room, Farmers' Market Building, Dickson St., Cambridge (Galt)

Committee Present: Councillor Rick Cowsill (City) (Chair), Erich Ritzmann (MGWA), John Vasiga (MGWA), Charlene Schiedel (MGWA), Nancy Davy (GRCA), Chris Gosselin (RMOW), Ken Cornelisse (MNR), Wendy Wright (City), April Souwand (City)

Others Present: Ron McKitrick (alternate for Cathy Murphy (MGWA)), Brenda Khes (alternate for Ian Rawlings (Large Property Owners)), Mary and Larry Hammer (landowners), Steve Riorda (student with Ken Cornelisse MNR)

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m. by Rick Cowsill.

2. Declarations of Pecuniary Interest

None

3. Confirmation of Minutes

Moved by Eric Ritzmann Seconded by Brenda Khes

THAT the Minutes of the Hespeler West Subwatersheds Study Working Committee meeting held May 6, 2004 be accepted:

CARRIED

John Vasiga asked a question about the GRCA Wetlands Policy regarding which policy applies to the HWSS. Nancy Davy responded that the HWSS was done using the old policy, as the new one had not been adopted. When the GRCA looks at wetland issues in the area, they would use the new policy when looking at what wetlands could be removed, as this is clearer than the old which did not provide direction on wetland removals. Ken Cornelisse asked if the new policy could be used when the study goes to Council for approval. Wendy Wright asked if the GRCA would have recommended a different buffer under their new policy. Nancy Davy indicated that her educated guess is that it would be the same (science and practice behind it is still the same). The use of Environmental Impact Statements (EISs) when there is a 30 m buffer can be done under the new policy as well as the old one. However, an EIS is not likely to reduce the 30 m adjacent to PSWs.

4. Presentation and Discussion– Natural Heritage System Enhancement and Stewardship Areas – Wendy Wright, City of Cambridge

Wendy Wright continued a discussion on Natural Heritage System Enhancement and Stewardship Areas, using a map showing the different types of buffers. She reminded the committee that buffers do not apply to existing development, but to development proposals. The purpose is to maintain the natural heritage system as it exists today when development occurs in the area. As an aside, it was announced that Ken Cornelisse has finished his review of the PSWs and produced mapping which he has shared with the MGWA and the City. This updated mapping will be used in the City's summary report.

Wendy Wright pointed out Table D2.5.1 Scoped and Full Site EIS Requirements in the Hespeler West Subwatersheds from the Subwatersheds Study. For proposed development within 30 m of a PSW, an EIS would have to be done. If a developer did not want to do an EIS, they could just keep the development outside the 30 m. If they wanted to reduce it, they could do an EIS (which may or may not be approved), to argue less. It was clarified that "discharge areas" in the first column are those outside of PSWs. There was discussion about the area of study that would be defined when one was doing an EIS. The MGWA is recommending buffers of 15 metres or less from PSWs.

For potential ESPAs, the recommended buffer would be 30 m subject to an EIS. Wendy Wright pointed out the Region's Guidelines for EISs in the agenda package (Item 4g)). They have been adopted as an implementation guideline to the Regional Official Policies Plan. Chris Gosselin described the scoping of EISs which narrows down the scope of the study to be done, both with respect to the area and the issues to be addressed. This sets the boundaries and the rules for the developers and their consultants as well as Regional EEAC and staff. It was pointed out that enhancement of the ESPA is also something that is looked at through EISs. Erich Ritzmann asked how more than 30 m could be accomplished if that is what you are starting with. Chris Gosselin described a situation in the City of Waterloo where, due to the undulating topography adjacent to an ESPA and the difficulty in developing the area, the buffer went out to 110 m. The City policies were 7.5 m minimum to 10 m based on a Subwatersheds Study. However, he indicated that it was probably wiser to start with a conservative buffer, and through site-specific study, it could be pulled back. It is highly unusual to get more than the minimum. Erich Ritzmann questioned if the 30 m is not excessive, given the tableland nature of the wetlands. Chris Gosselin said that 30 m from wetlands is standard now. There was discussion that if an ESPA is not a wetland, 30 m might be excessive, but area-sensitive breeding birds could dictate a wider buffer than 30 m when a site specific EIS is done. The MGWA is recommending upland forest buffers of 3 metres or less.

John Vasiga asked about the potential ESPAs, and indicated they should not be shown on the map, as they have no status. Wendy Wright indicated that before the Region will approve the subwatersheds study, the Region would need to complete the ESPA study. The Region needs to approve the subwatersheds study before development approvals can occur.

The next area discussed was buffers in the floodplains (no development areas anyway) which were coloured orange on the map. It was noted that the new floodlines will have to be put on the map.

Finally, the “other” high constraint areas with white buffers were discussed. Wendy Wright pointed out the tables in the agenda package (Item 4d)) which provide information on these polygons with these buffers (Table 3). Wendy Wright is recommending that the buffers for these areas could be refined through further study at the community plan stage, rather than set 30 m now. We don’t have sufficient information at this time to determine what those buffers should be, if less than 30 m.

Erich Ritzmann indicated that the buffer sizes are still too generous for the other features that are within the agency mandates (especially the ESPAs). They would be looking for something that is considerably smaller than 30 m for the potential ESPAs, as often they are surrounded by agricultural uses, which have already disturbed the roots of the trees. He also said that he felt that we did have the information needed in the subwatersheds study to determine appropriate buffers from the “other” high constraint areas. The MGWA is recommending that plantations be buffered by 1 m and that other cultural features have no buffer.

Finally, Wendy Wright pointed out the buffers in red which are recommended to be removed (generally on the other side of a road from a natural feature).

Wendy Wright pointed out Item 4c) which is additional information on buffers in Moffat Creek. There was discussion about buffers in other areas. The consistency is not in the width of the buffer but in how you protect the environmental feature.

John Vasiga asked if the GRCA has been approving buffers of 15 m adjacent to PSWs. Wendy Wright indicated that in Blair, there is a development that had an EIS done and the buffers range from 15 m to 30 m from the PSW because a portion of the property is not adjacent to the PSW and the PSW boundaries are quite generous. Brenda Khes indicated that we are getting more detailed but the pit license is still not identified on any maps and it is getting frustrating to not see it shown.

Ken Cornelisse and Nancy Davy left the meeting at 5 p.m.

Charlene Schiedel pointed out the land that the City owns. She asked who pays for the environmental studies if the City wants to reduce the buffer. Wendy Wright answered that the City’s Economic Development Division would have to pay for these studies if they acted as the developer. However, if the buffers are studied further at the Community Plan stage, they would be funded through development charges. Wendy Wright indicated that the City plans to respect the recommended buffers and not do studies to reduce them on their lands.

There was discussion about reducing the width of the buffer adjacent to the potential ESPAs at this time. Rick Cowsill indicated that perhaps at the community plan stage, the specifics could be worked out, as a resolution is not readily apparent at this time. Brian Cunningham pointed out that smaller buffers seem to have been recommended by the agencies in other areas, adjacent to some wetlands that seem to be more significant. Wendy Wright indicated that getting wider buffers through an EIS is very difficult to do and that is why the conservative approach is taken up front. The MGWA has the opposite concern, that once the conservative buffers are put in place, it is difficult to argue for smaller buffers.

Chris Gosselin discussed the sensitivity of upland areas with respect to breeding birds and the dynamic nature of lists due to destruction of habitat that makes formerly non-listed species appear on the list. He supported the more conservative approach to buffers and that the scaling back occur at the time of development applications.

The Chair indicated that a compromise may not be able to be made at this time. Cambridge Council is not able to change provincial, GRCA or Regional issues.

5. Other Business

- a) Follow-up List – Wendy Wright indicated that the Moffat Creek buffer information is included in today's agenda package and Ken Cornelisse's work is done with respect to updating the wetland mapping.
- b) List of Topics for Upcoming Meetings – Wendy Wright distributed an update of the list of topics for upcoming meetings. Erich Ritzmann pointed out that MGWA concerns about high constraint areas need to be scheduled in. They will get their issues to Wendy Wright before the next meeting, in case the floodline information is not available.
- c) Field Visits – to be scheduled
- d) Ponds Discussion – Maple Grove Wetlands Association
- e) Memo from Hans Madan Re: Toyota Lands and Fill Regulations
- f) Charlene Schiedel asked about the notice in the May 28 Kitchener Record – Improvement of Maple Grove Road Class EA. She wondered if the comment was made regarding the need for wildlife crossings? April Souwand responded that the ESR does indicate that CEAC and MNR made these recommendations.

Rick Cowsill motioned to adjourn.
Meeting adjourned at 5: 51 p.m.

Next meeting – Allan Reuter Centre – 3:30 pm to 5:30 pm – Thursday, June 17, 2004

**CITY OF CAMBRIDGE
 HESPELER WEST SUBWATERSHEDS STUDY WORKING COMMITTEE
 FOLLOW-UP LIST**

SOURCE/ MEETING DATE	ITEM	ASSIGNED TO	COMMENTS	DUE DATE	DONE
HWSSWG Oct. 30/03	Provide full hard copy versions of the HWSS to working committee	April Souwand	Nov. 2003 version to be distributed as soon as it is available from PEIL	Nov. 2003	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HWSSWG Oct. 30/03	Finalize Terms of Reference: <i>Section 7 Time Frame and Work Plan</i> - process for review of community concerns - meetings with individual property owners - review of revised report <i>Section 8 Public Consultation/Information</i> <i>Section 12 Dispute Resolution</i>	Wendy Wright	Wording to be revised based on discussion at meeting	Nov. 19/03	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HWSSWG Oct. 30/03	Choose representative of small property owners	Wendy Wright and Erich Ritzmann	Choose someone who is not represented by MGWA	Nov. 19/03	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HWSSWG Oct. 30/03	Provide name of an alternative representative to committee	Each committee member	An alternative is necessary in cases where member is not able to attend meeting	Nov. 19/03	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HWSSWG Oct. 30/03	Process for review of community concerns	Wendy Wright	Item for discussion on Nov. 19, 2003 Review draft with MGWA – Approved per memo dated Nov. 19, 2003	Nov. 19/03	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HWSSWG Oct. 30/03	Provide list of people wanting site visits	MGWA/City	City has provided MGWA will provide, if needed	Nov. 19/03	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Follow-up List
 City of Cambridge
 Hespeler West Subwatersheds Study Working Committee

SOURCE/ MEETING DATE	ITEM	ASSIGNED TO	COMMENTS	DUE DATE	DONE
HWSSWG Oct. 30/03	Produce a map of property owners in the study area	April Souwand	Map will be used to keep track of site visits	Nov. 19/03	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HWSSWG Oct. 30/03	Invite City Clerk to next meeting to discuss pecuniary interest	April Souwand	City Clerk attended meeting	Nov. 19/03	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HWSSWG Oct. 30/03	Produce list of previous studies done in HWSS	April Souwand	Examples are Cambridge Business Park Stormwater Management Report	Nov. 19/03	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HWSSWG Oct. 30/03	Develop media protocol	April Souwand	See Pesticides Working Group Protocol	Nov. 19/03	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HWSSWG Oct. 30/03	Schedule of Meetings	April Souwand	Next committee meeting	Nov. 19/03	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HWSSWG Nov. 19/03	Updated List of Members and Alternates	April Souwand		Dec. 18/03	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HWSSWG Nov. 19/03	Establish a Lending Library of Reports	April Souwand		Dec. 1/03	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HWSSWG Nov. 19/03	Add media protocol to Terms of Reference	Wendy Wright	See Revised Terms of Reference	Dec. 18/03	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HWSSWG Nov. 19/03	Invite Ken Cornelisse to present Wetland Evaluation and Classification info.	April Souwand		Dec. 18/03	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HWSSWG Nov. 19/03	Inquire into using City's website to distribute agendas	Wendy Wright/ April Souwand	Will continue to send .pdf files by e-mail due to administrative difficulties	Dec. 18/03	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Follow-up List
City of Cambridge
Hespeler West Subwatersheds Study Working Committee

SOURCE/ MEETING DATE	ITEM	ASSIGNED TO	COMMENTS	DUE DATE	DONE
HWSSWG Nov. 19/03	Terms of Reference Section 7.3 – Review of Specific Areas of Community Concern	Wendy Wright	Review following Presentation/ Discussion of Provincially Significant Wetlands		
HWSSWC Jan. 15/04	Provide a map of Scheduled Areas to MGWA	Nancy Davy	May be followed up with a presentation on the Conservation Authority's Fill, Construction and Alteration to Waterways Regulation	Feb. 5/04	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HWSSWC Jan. 15/04	Refine wetland evaluation mapping for PSW	Ken Cornelisse	Some areas require site visit in spring to make a final determination. Four additional areas identified by MGWA will also be looked at for any changes needed.	Spring 2004	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HWSSWC Feb. 5/04	Provide reference from HWSS to the fact that floodline determination was based on full development scenario.	April Souwand	Memo to Committee	Feb. 19/04	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HWSSWC Feb. 19/04	Report on floodplain determination.	Wendy Wright	Memo to Committee	Mar. 18/04	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HWSSWC Feb. 19/04	Subcatchments 2115, 2120 and 2125 boundary revisions	Wendy Wright	Review as part of Floodline recalculation		
HWSSWC Mar. 4/04	Discussion on channel buffers	April Souwand Nancy Davy	Deferred to discussion on buffers in general	Apr. 1/04	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Follow-up List
City of Cambridge
Hespeler West Subwatersheds Study Working Committee

SOURCE/ MEETING DATE	ITEM	ASSIGNED TO	COMMENTS	DUE DATE	DONE
HWSSWC Mar. 4/04	Placement of Fill on S/E corner of Fountain and Maple Grove to build a parking lot (Toyota)	Wendy Wright Nancy Davy	Check the approval process for this	May 6/04	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HWSSWC Mar. 4/04	Fill placement in floodplain of Middle Creek for City Industrial Subdivision Phase II	Wendy Wright	Check the approval process for site servicing by the City of Cambridge		
HWSSWC Mar. 4/04	Fill placement on island in Speed River, east of Speedville Road bridge.	Nancy Davy	Check whether GRCA is aware of this and if it is a regulated activity.	May 6/04	
HWSSWC Mar. 4/04	Questions arising from Ken Cornelisse's presentation on dams and ponds.	MGWA	Compose a list of questions for Ken.	May 6/04	
HWSSWC Mar. 4/04	Update List of Topics for Upcoming Meetings	Wendy Wright	Update list after discussion with MGWA	Mar. 18/04	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HWSSWC Apr. 1/04	Definition of Development	Wendy Wright	Definition from PPS	Apr. 15/04	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HWSSWC Apr. 1/04	Context Sensitive Buffers	Wendy Wright	Review requirements for 30 m buffers	May 6/04 May 20/04	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HWSSWC Apr. 15/04	Greenspace Management Strategy Map – August 2002 version changes to final draft	April Souwand	Memo to Committee	May 6/04	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Follow-up List
City of Cambridge
Hespeler West Subwatersheds Study Working Committee

SOURCE/ MEETING DATE	ITEM	ASSIGNED TO	COMMENTS	DUE DATE	DONE
HWSSWC Apr. 15/04	John Vasiga's request for Ken Cornelisse to clarify his statement regarding determination of wetland boundaries in April 1/04 minutes	Ken Cornelisse	To provide clarification at May 6/04 meeting as he was not present at April 15/04 meeting when question arose	May 6/04	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HWSSWC May 6/04	Moffat Creek Buffers	April Souwand	To provide information on why buffers less than 30 m used in the Moffat Creek Subwatershed Study were not used in HWSS	May 20/04	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HWSSWC May 6/04	Small and/or Man-Made Wetland Buffers	Nancy Davy/ Wendy Wright	To provide information on policy affecting small and/or man-made non-PSW wetlands	June 3/04	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HWSSWC May 6/04	Impact of Pit Licensed Areas on PSW Wetland Score	Ken Cornelisse	To review the PSW score to determine how it would be affected should the extraction of sand eliminate the PSW on the Arriscraft property		
HWSSWC May 6/04	Rationale for Differences in Width of Creek Corridor Enhancement Areas	April Souwand	To provide information on the rationale for corridor widths of East/West and Middle Creeks.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



The Corporation
of the City
of Cambridge

MEMORANDUM

To: Hespeler West Subwatersheds Study
Working Committee

Date: June 15, 2004

From: Wendy Wright
Commissioner of Planning Services

Our File:

Your File:

Re: Topics for Upcoming Meetings

June 17/04	Updated Floodlines – Ray Tufgar, Totten Sims Hubicki
July 8/04	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Presentation/Discussion Enhancement Areas – Wendy Wright• Ponds/Dams (MGWA) Presentation
Weeks of July 12/19/26	Field Visits
July 22/04	Extraction & Scheduled Areas
August 5/04	Review Draft Final Report/Prepare Newsletter
September 2/04	Complete Review of Draft Final Report
September 13/04	Report to General Committee
To Be Scheduled:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Public Open House/Newsletter• Implementation