

Chairman Cowsill suggested that the information included for this item be received for information only and become part of the Working Committee's report to Council. No one disagreed.

John Vasiga noted that the Committee has not received the TSH report regarding Polygon 2125 as yet. Wendy Wright advised that the report has not been finalized but will be included in Appendix B of the final report. Ken Cornelisse noted that the e-mail from Gus Rungis, dated September 14, 2004, provides a response and is based on the draft information he has received from TSH. The Committee requested that Gus Rungis's e-mail be included with the minutes of this meeting.

One additional comment sheet from the public meeting was submitted following the completion of minutes and will be added to Appendix A.9.3.6.

5. Discussion - Buffers

Councillor Cowsill noted that a great deal of progress has been made to find a compromise for the buffer widths. However, there is neither a unanimous position nor the expectation of one. Both the landowners and agencies/staff feel justified in their position and the agencies are not expected to change their position on the width of buffer without an EIS. He, therefore, suggested that the report should go to Council as is with the positions of both the landowners and staff noted.

Wendy Wright noted that she has made an attempt to clarify this issue further. She then presented Map 4 – Detailed Buffers Map that uses different colours for PSW/LSW, ESPA and Other High Constraint Features. The associated buffers were also colour coded separately as were those already in the floodplain. While the map and use of different colours assisted in understanding the type of constraints and related buffers in final conclusion the landowners were concerned with the extent (width) of buffers.

At the public meeting, the landowners noted that there has been no change from the Steering Committee report in the buffer requirements on Map 3 – Greenspace Management Strategy. This appeared to be the case because they were all coloured the same. Wendy Wright presented a revised Map 3 – Greenspace Management Strategy that showed the buffers that were in the floodplain, buffers that were to be deferred for further environmental analysis and review during the Community Plan and 30 m buffers adjacent to PSW/LSW/ESPA that could be further considered if additional environmental information was prepared during an Environmental Impact Study.

Ken Cornelisse noted that, in his opinion, a great deal of progress has been made. Generally, the buffers have been reduced from 120 m to 30 m. Furthermore, there is more in depth understanding in the area of Arriscraft Pit license area and wetland.

Wendy Wright noted that there would be no additional buffer or need for a buffer where the 30 m or the required buffer is inside the floodplain. In response to a question as to the authority for the 120 m wide buffer, staff advised that this is a requirement of the

Provincial Policy Statement and copies of the relevant information have been provided to the Working Committee.

John Vasiga questioned the extent of proposed ESPA on his land in the area of Polygon 2125. While Wendy Wright was of the understanding that the area outside the PSW is shown on the draft Map 4 – Detailed Buffers Map presented at this meeting. Chris Gosselin (Region) has to review the information and make final determination on the boundaries of the ESPA to be recommended.

John Vasiga and Charlene Schiedel questioned justification of the 30 m buffer for upland woodlots when Page D.6 of the PEIL Report, November 2003, suggests only 7 m. The section reads as follows:

“ESPA: 1.5 x the crown radius (trunk to dripline) measured outwards from the dripline, minimum 7 metres with no significant, vulnerable or rare species.”

It was agreed that Chris Gosselin be consulted about whether the 30 m buffer width could be reduced as part of the HWSS or whether Chris Gosselin could establish an appropriate buffer for upland woodlots relative to potential ESPAs when he was doing his field work.

The landowners expressed concern about not being able to either reduce or the possibility of increased buffers in the future if these are not fixed at this time. Ken Cornelisse advised that setting a buffer now is no guarantee that the province will not mandate larger buffers in the future. He cited the examples of Oak Ridges Moraine and Niagara Escarpment where lands were frozen or developments severely curtailed even though these were designated for development.

The Committee directed that Wendy Wright finalize Map 4 – Detailed Buffers Map showing different buffer types for the September 28, 2004 meeting.

Jim Dougan’s rationale for 30 m Buffer Approach was received for information.

6. Specific Requests for Land Use Changes

- a) McCrae: Wendy Wright noted that she has not been able to finalize this, as Chris Gosselin wants to look at the area reclassified from PSW as a potential ESPA. Chris Gosselin needs to complete his review before she can finalize the extent of the land that may be rezoned to residential.
- b) Ritzmann and School Property: Official Plan amendments may be necessary to rezone these parcels. Official Plan amendments in turn will trigger requirements of the Subwatersheds Study. She needs to further review this.

7. Other Business

- a) The revised PEIL Report, September 2004 was distributed. The Committee was advised that PEIL agreed to review what was requested on their list of Errata. The list will also be included in the final report.
- b) Draft #5 has been distributed and Wendy Wright requested comments ASAP. New items or unresolved points are bolded in this draft. A few Tables and Appendices are being finalized and are to be added. Staff would like to finalize the report by the end of next week after the September 28, 2004 meeting.

If Chris Gosselin is not able to attend the September 28, 2004 meeting and provide his position, then a special meeting could be held. These items should be included as outstanding items.

The Committee suggested that copies of the final report be placed in the Libraries, City's web page and distributed to MGWA.

- c) Follow-up List: Impact of Pit License in PSW is not completed as MNR is awaiting information from Ian Rawlings.

TSH report is expected by Monday. April Souwand will distribute it to the Committee.

- d) Upcoming Meetings: Tuesday, September 28, 2004, Cambridge Room, Historic City Hall, 46 Dickson Street, Cambridge (Galt), 3:30 to 9:00 p.m. Sandwiches to be provided.
- e) Copies of the Notice of October 26, 2004 Public Meeting were distributed.

Rick Cowsill motioned to adjourn.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Next meeting – Cambridge Room, Historic City Hall (46 Dickson Street) – 3:30 pm to 9:00 pm – Tuesday, September 28, 2004

Wendy Wright

From: Wendy Wright
Sent: September 20, 2004 3:23 PM
To: John Vasiga (E-mail); Erich Ritzmann (E-mail)
Cc: Gus Rungis (E-mail); Ken Cornelisse (E-mail)
Subject: FW: HWSS polygon 2.01; drainage area 2125

This is the response I got when I asked Ken Cornelisse to re-review Polygon 2.01 and what I put in the language of Draft #4.

-----Original Message-----

From: ken.cornelisse@mnr.gov.on.ca [mailto:ken.cornelisse@mnr.gov.on.ca]
Sent: September 14, 2004 1:56 PM
To: Wendy Wright; April Souwand
Cc: jdougan@dougan.ca; grungis@grandriver.ca
Subject: FW: HWSS polygon 2.01; drainage area 2125

Hello Wendy,

I asked Gus about the drainage of polygon # 2.01 in relation to Middle Creek and the Maple Grove Wetland Complex. Based on his response (below), polygon # 2.01 is hydraulically, and therefore functionally connected to the Maple Grove Wetland Complex. As such, polygon 2.01 remains part of the Maple Grove Wetland Complex.

Thank you.

Ken Cornelisse

-----Original Message-----

From: Gus Rungis [mailto:grungis@grandriver.ca]
Sent: Tuesday, September 14, 2004 12:25 PM
To: ken.cornelisse@mnr.gov.on.ca
Subject: RE: HWSS polygon 2.01; drainage area 2125

Hello Ken,

Subcatchment 2125 has been included and retained as part of the Middle Creek watershed because it will contribute runoff to Middle Creek during storm runoff events. From information assembled through the study, my understanding is that low flows for the catchment are directed to Freeport Creek via a field tile from the catchment and incorporated into the municipal drainage system. Surface runoff from subcatchment 2125 in excess of the tile capacity and storage in the area of the wetland will drain via a larger diameter storm sewer to Middle Creek. This system was installed as part of a Class EA in the adjacent industrial development to handle flows from this area.

The frequency of drainage to the Middle Creek drainage system is a function of the magnitude of the runoff event and storage in the area. Table 5.4.3.1 of the "Final Draft" report completed by TSH indicates that the catchment will flow to Middle Creek under a two year design storm event.

Hope this helps.

Gus

-----Original Message-----

From: ken.cornelisse@mnr.gov.on.ca [mailto:ken.cornelisse@mnr.gov.on.ca]
Sent: Tuesday, September 14, 2004 10:54 AM
To: Gus Rungis; WrightW@city.cambridge.on.ca; SouwandA@city.cambridge.on.ca

Subject: HWSS polygon 2.01; drainage area 2125

Hello Gus,

Polygon # 2.01 from the HWSS is considered part of the Maple Grove Wetland Complex because it meets the criteria for complexing. The criteria for complexing are that it is within 750m of the next closest wetland polygon (polygon # 2.15 - 607 m away) and that it is functionally connected (in this case a hydrological connection). There has been a lot of discussion and analysis of this area during the subwatershed study. I believe the engineers have concluded that this area, which is approximately consistent with polygon # 2125, continues to drain to the Maple Grove Wetland Complex.

Could you please clarify that polygon # 2125 drains to Middle Creek? How frequently does it drain in the direction of Middle Creek?

If this polygon does drain toward Middle Creek, polygon 2.01 will remain as part of the Maple Grove Wetland Complex.

Thank you.

Ken
(519) 826-6849