

**CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE
HESPELER WEST SUBWATERSHEDS STUDY WORKING COMMITTEE
MEETING NO. 18
MINUTES**

Thursday, September 9, 2004
Galt Room, Farmers' Market Building, Dickson Street, Cambridge (Galt)

Committee Present: Councillor Rick Cowsill (City) (Chair), Erich Ritzmann (MGWA), John Vasiga (MGWA), Wendy Wright (City), April Souwand (City), Brian Cunningham (Small Property Owners), Ian Rawlings (Large Property Owners), Cathy Murphy (MGWA), Charlene Schiedel (MGWA), Chris Gosselin (Region of Waterloo), Ken Cornelisse (MNR)

Others Present: Ron McKittrick (alternate (MGWA)), Brenda Khes(alternate (Large Property Owners)), Gus Rungis (GRCA), Ray Tufgar (TSH), Dru Dron (TSH), Mary Hammer (landowner), Matt Pugliese (alternate (Small Property Owners)), Jeff Martens (MTE)

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 3:40 p.m. by Wendy Wright for Rick Cowsill who was delayed getting to the meeting.

2. Declarations of Pecuniary Interest

None.

3. Confirmation of Minutes

Moved by Brian Cunningham Seconded by Ian Rawlings

THAT the Minutes of the Hespeler West Subwatersheds Study Working Committee meeting held September 2, 2004 be adopted as read.

CARRIED

4. TSH Floodline Report Review

Dru Dron and Ray Tufgar from Totten, Sims, Hubicki were in attendance at the meeting to respond to any questions arising from the distribution of their final draft floodline corrections review report distributed at the last meeting. John Vasiga asked what were the terms of reference for this assignment? Wendy Wright responded that it was on one of the committee's past agendas. John Vasiga asked how was it decided to survey around the Maple Grove Road school. Gus Rungis responded that the questions around the differences in the Delcan work from the PEIL study necessitated a confirmation as to which one was right (based on comments from this committee). TSH also used survey

information from MTE for the Hammer property at the northeast corner of Fountain Street and Middle Block Road. There was also some City of Cambridge survey data on the Vasiga property north west of Fountain Street and Banat Road which was used in the TSH study. PEIL re-surveyed all of the culverts from their original floodline work. John Vasiga expressed a concern that the committee has not seen the revised PEIL report. Wendy Wright indicated that this would be distributed by next Friday. John Vasiga asked when PEIL updated the culvert data and it was indicated that this was done in April 2004. John Vasiga inquired what “desktop” review meant when describing the confirmation of the upstream boundary of Middle Creek? Dru Dron responded that this was based on paper records (available mapping), including MTE data and also, he did go out in the field to review the area.

Rick Cowsill arrived at the meeting

The committee then proceeded to go through the TSH report on a page-by-page basis:

P. 3 – With respect to the discrepancies in the comparison of Delcan work which warranted re-survey work north of Maple Grove Road, the difference in floodline from the Delcan report to PEIL report south of Maple Grove Road was not described anywhere – why? .Gus Rungis indicated that the Delcan work was focused on looking at floodlines further upstream, but not necessary downstream, so boundary conditions would be different for the comprehensive floodline work done by TSH. It was decided to add a short description of this to the final TSH report.

P 3 – The accuracy of the 0.5 m contour interval map was questioned. It was decided to add the paragraph from the Region that April Souwand had received previously. The Region’s contour map was incorrect in the northeast corner of Maple Grove Road and Speedsville Road. Gus Rungis indicated that maintenance of the Digital Elevation Model would be good practice. Nigel Roberts at the Region of Waterloo will be made aware of the discrepancy found in this study.

P.6 - Erich Ritzmann asked about the minor culverts which were missing. He wondered if a map would be helpful to describe which ones they are referring to. Erich will look them up in the Delcan report to see if they are adequately described there already.

P. 8 – John Vasiga need clarification about which culvert crossing Fountain Street is being described. Gus Rungis suggested reducing the drawing from the City and reproducing it in the report so that it is clear. This will be done.

P. 9 –John Vasiga commented that the City’s survey elevation is very close to that shown on the topographic map on Page 9.

P. 10 – Photo 4 – spelling of the word “ditch”.

P. 11 – Erich Ritzmann queried the assumption re: 2125 draining towards Fountain Street when the area to the N/W is of the same elevation. He wondered why it would be

assumed to drain S/E towards Fountain Street? Ray Tufgar responded that when looking at drainage areas, you have to look at the “lay of the land” when determining boundaries. Erich Ritzmann and John Vasiga took photographs today which challenge the assumption. Ray Tufgar will discuss this with Gus Rungis and report back to the committee.

P. 11 – S 4.1.3. The revised stage-storage-discharge relationship statement was queried by Cathy Murphy. She also asked about the size of the culvert on Middle Block Road – does it back up the floodwaters? The response was yes, the culvert is undersized.. She asked if all 3 culverts under Middle Block Road were taken into account. The response was that there were two taken into account.

P. 11 - S 4.1.2 – It was queried if natural storage is understood to be wetland storage? The response was yes, it is the same thing. For future land use conditions, it was assumed to replace natural storage with hypothetical SWM pond (in the model). Ian Rawlings indicated that natural storage could be a wetland or an area that holds water in a flood condition. Ray Tufgar pointed out that this is a hydrologic study, not an environmental study (look at it from a pure storage perspective – wetland happens to be coincident with this).

Cathy Murphy asked about the level of significance with respect to a couple of inches. Ray Tufgar responded that you have to look at volume as well as depth.

P. 12 – S 4.2.1 Case 1 - Existing Conditions, Baseline: – It was asked with respect to the reduction of peak discharge via the Fountain Street culvert – which one is being referred to? It was responded that it is the 825 mm. Add the word “are” after “Low flows from Catchment 2125”. Regarding the pipe capacity of 0.033m³/s, John Vasiga indicated that at a previous HWSSWC meeting, the pipe was stated to have a carrying capacity of 89 l/s or .089 m³/s by Miron Docev. Dru Dron will check his calculations for the minimum maximum capacity of this pipe. John Vasiga asked again for the clarification of flows to the NW for subcatchment 2125.

P 12 – Cathy Murphy asked re 2115, “weir flow across private laneway to the north has been taken into account”. Should the catchment referred to be 2116? Also, if a culvert is opened in that area will it have any impact on the floodline? It was stated that this would allow more flow, which could impact the floodline, depending on the flow that was allowed through.

P. 16 Erich Ritzmann noted that they have a photo of the culvert NW of 2125 under Middle Block Road showing it is 16”.

P. 17 – S 5.2 Regarding the second sentence indicating that several other factors were recently taken into account – what are they? Are they relevant? Dru Dron responded that this was meant as a segue into information in following paragraphs.

Ken Cornelisse left the meeting.

P. 19 – Matt Pulgiere asked about the Beavertdale Road Spill Area and gap. He wondered why they would eliminate this from future development in the community plan. It was responded that this is common nomenclature when dealing with a spill area – water is getting out of the floodplain. This can happen when you have a road crossing which causes a constriction in the waterway, floodplain goes up and it spills out – likely down the roadway in this case. When defining floodlines in a spillway, it depends on what happens with the roadway, etc. The difference is that within the floodline, that is the area that contains the main floodway. A spill area can have different policies as it is not being counted on as being the main passage for the floodwaters. However, you still need to protect those areas, and don't allow people to build houses where their houses would be flooded – there is a need to protect those people and their property. TSH is suggesting a policy needs to be in place and that in this area where water can spill, it needs to be protected by regulations under the Conservation Authorities Act. With respect to the present homes, they would be considered to be in the floodplain and require permits. In response to an inquiry, Nancy Davy indicated she does not know the effect on property values. However, people need to know they are in the floodplain. New homes would be prohibited in the floodplain under a one-zone floodplain policy. Storm sewers are not designed to carry Regional flows. In response to concern raised by committee members, Ray Tufgar indicated that the agencies are doing their due diligence. Hurricane Hazel is used to define risk to life and property in the Province of Ontario. There is a need to determine a policy framework for the spill zone areas through community planning. Wendy Wright indicated that it would be appropriate to know what the policy would be for the spill area by the time we complete the community plan. Brian Cunningham indicated since this is a risk management exercise, he expected a due diligence process of notification of a major flood. Nancy Davy indicated there is no individual mail out to landowners, it is done through planning processes, like the community plan.

Page 25 – S 6.1.2, point 5 – diversion of low flows – identify the subdrain as previously discussed and a resolution about the spill going east and west.

Page 26 – S 6.2 – Recommendation 2 – the first culvert east of Fountain Street on Middle Block Road – might not be the first one (use a metre measurement from the intersection to specify which one is being referred to).

Jeff Martens (MTE) was invited by the Chairperson to make any comments, now that the committee had completed its discussion. Jeff Martens indicated with respect to the accuracy of the mapping, aside from areas with known errors, what do we believe the accuracy of the mapping would be? This will be addressed in the e-mail from the Region which will be put in the final report.

Jeff Martens then commented that flows across Middle Block Road - flow rates at Middle Block 6.5 cms, now 2.69 cms (change in flow of 66% - this is large – change in flood levels relatively small, but in terms of the floodline on the property, they have a lot of significance). It was clarified that this was in comparison to the cases analyzed, not the PEIL report.

Jeff Martens commented on the floodlines plotted based on an ultimate condition. The change in flood level between ultimate and existing –upstream of Middle Block ... should they not be mapped for the existing? Ray Tufgar indicated that the difference was 4-5 cm so to provide a conservative floodline, went with ultimate. Jeff Martens continued questioning putting a floodline on the Hammer field. He will review the floodline on the existing conditions model versus ultimate.

John Vasiga questioned how he could review the TSH report when the committee has not seen the PEIL April 2004 corrected information. This will be sent to them as soon as it can be copied.

Ray Tufgar and Dru Dron left the meeting.
Gus Rungis left the meeting.
Jeff Martens left the meeting.
Ken Cornelisse left the meeting.

It was agreed to deal with Item 6.

6. Other Business

- a) Speed River Island Fill – Nancy Davy indicated she was not at the last meeting when this was brought up. Erich Ritzmann indicated that the transitory nature of the fill seems to be an important issue with respect to the GRCA enforcing its fill regulations. Nancy Davy responded that there is a progression that can be seen through air photos but there are not elevations available. MOE involvement was with respect to burning, and Nancy Davy has information that MOE monitors the site on an ad hoc basis. Her understanding is GRCA staff has not been monitoring the site regularly but they do go back out and investigate if there appears to be fill where it shouldn't be. The group suggested that it be revisited. Nancy Davy indicated that this could happen. John Vasiga indicated he was considering a business to stockpile topsoil on his property. He was cautioned that the City has a grading by-law which may apply. John Vasiga asked for the City's fill permit for the Maple Grove Industrial Subdivision. It was given to him by April Souwand.

Nancy Davy left the meeting.

- b) Proposed Agenda for Public Meeting – September 16, 2004– Brian Cunningham has agreed to chair. Wendy Wright indicated that she would like to have maps available for people to review, with a Greenspace Management Strategy map that they could take away from the meeting. The presentation would be 15 to 20 minutes total with Wendy Wright and John Vasiga making the presentations. Other members of Council will be encouraged to come to the meeting.

- c) Follow-up List – With respect to the request to MNR to have a written submission on how the wetland feature in subcatchment 2125 is complexed , this has not been received yet. Ken Cornelisse needed to look at the floodline report in order to make a final determination. The questions raised today may delay that determination. The process for removal of 2.11 from the Maple Grove Wetland Complex is in the new summary report that is in committee members' inboxes today.
- d) List of Topics for Upcoming Meetings – The final meeting on the 23rd will resolve all of the outstanding questions and deal with input from public meeting.

Rick Cowsill motioned to adjourn.

Meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

5. Review of Floodline Information/Enhancement Areas Discussion

Was conducted by those still present after the regular meeting was adjourned.

Next meeting – Allan Reuter Seniors' Centre (Dining Room), 507 King Street – 3:30 pm to 5:30 pm, September 23, 3004.