

**Kanata West – Class Environmental Assessment Studies  
Meeting with Carp River Coalition**

***Thursday, April 20, 2006***

*City of Ottawa – Colonel By Room  
7:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.*

***Meeting Notes***

Purpose of Meeting    Discuss Coalition's April 3<sup>rd</sup> Comments on Class EA documents and process

**Attendees:**

**Carp River Coalition**

David Spence  
Amy Kempster  
Carol Gudz  
Erwin Dreessan  
Gordon Taylor  
Hugh Urbach  
Allen Brown

**City of Ottawa**

Councillor Stavinga, Ward 6  
Councillor Feltmate, Ward 4  
Kerry Bourgaize for Councillor El-Chantiry, Ward 5  
Dennis Jacobs, Director of Planning, Environment and Infrastructure Policy (PEIP)  
Susan Murphy, Senior Planner, Planning, Environmental Management, PEIP  
Rob Phillips, Program Manager, Infrastructure Approvals West  
Jasna Czaharynski, Senior Engineer, Infrastructure Approvals West  
Sally Switzer, Senior Planner, Development Approvals, West  
Curtis Rampersad, Program Manager, Water Resources

**Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority**

John Price, Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority

**Kanata West Owners Group**

Don Kennedy, Project Manager, Kanata West Owners Group  
Guy Cormier, Project Engineer, Kanata West Owners Group  
Brent Stroan, Minto Developments  
Debbie Belfie, D.D./Huntmar Developments  
Rob Boyd, Mattamy Homes  
Ted Phillips, Taggart Realty Management  
Joseline McKenzie, Laurentide Engineering

**Consultant Team**

Steve Pichette, Stantec, Master Servicing Study  
Paul Frigon, Totten Sims Hubicki, Restoration Class EA  
Bruce Kilgour, Stantec, Restoration Class EA  
Kelly Roberts, Delcan, Transportation Master Plan

**1- Introductions & Meeting Purpose - City**

Following introductions of the attendees, Susan Murphy discussed the purpose of the meeting and the work that has been done in preparing a response to the Carp River Coalition's April 3<sup>rd</sup> Letter.

**2- Presentation and Discussion of Coalition's Comments & Response****Approval/Review Process**

1. The Coalition expressed their disappointment in not being afforded the opportunity to review the EA documents in their entirety prior to the next steps in the approval and EA process. They feel that they are at a disadvantage in being able to be prepared for their presentation to the joint PEC and TC meeting May 3<sup>rd</sup>.
2. It was discussed that the staff report does not ask for approval of the EA documents but rather only the preferred projects identified under Schedule B or C of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment documents.
3. At this stage of the study process it is important that the public and Study Team share issues and concerns such that an effort can be made to ensure that the final Class EAs reflect all these issues raised and how they were addressed. If staff recommended City Council approval of the Class EAs prior to the Notice of Completion then this will circumvent the public process that allows comments to be addressed through the 30 day review period. The process by which the final Class EAs are presented for public review is the Notice of Completion process.
4. The Study Team has had several meetings throughout the process to discuss technical comments received from the Agencies-MOE, MNR, MTO. Based on recent discussions with the Agencies held on March 7<sup>th</sup> and March 20<sup>th</sup>, concurrence has been reached regarding the technical analysis conducted or approach to be undertaken to address their concerns. The City issued a letter dated March 31, 2006 with requested attachments summarizing status on issues expressed in the agencies January 31, 2006 letter. In addition, a follow up meeting was held with MOE and MNR on April 5<sup>th</sup> with further analysis being requested associated with riparian storage scenarios. The Study Team is currently

preparing this information and it will be sent out to the Agencies the week of April 24<sup>th</sup>. The meetings and further technical analysis has resulted in concurrence from the agencies. In fact many of the same issues that have been raised by the Coalition are similar to those raised by the Agencies. The Coalition requested a copy of this letter which may assist in avoiding some work for the coalition. The City is considering this request with input from the Ministries who were issued the letter.

5. The financial component of the Class EAs will be discussed at the May 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting. It was stated that the approval of any projects by Council or approval of the Class EAs does not commit Council to funding at this time. The majority of the projects are at the landowners costs through developments charges and are their budgetary responsibility. Any City costs would be reflected through future Council budgetary process.

### **Carp River as Municipal Drain**

6. The Coalition presented original engineering drawings and copies of the drawings of the channelized Carp River works. It was discussed that the Carp River is a legal entity and if documents can prove that it is a Drain, which the Coalition is very confident that the present documents can do this, and then there are legal implications associated with this status. Primarily that any impacts to down stream landowners would put the City in a position to bear damages and defend itself in court. The Coalition stated that presently there does not exist a By-Law that nullifies the status as a Drain. The Coalition feels strongly that the onus should not be on the volunteer citizens group to confirm the Rivers status.
7. The Coalition feels that in 1909 if engineers of the day determined the sufficient outlet is located below the Village of Carp, the restoration project should also be extended to the Village.
8. Mr. Urbach, who is a down stream landowner and has lived in this area for over 37 years stated he has seen the highest water levels in recent years and is concerned that rural residents and farmers downstream of the development will be impacted by flooding.
9. Friends of the Carp, with participation from major landowners, have been planting trees and participating in restorative work to enhance the health of this river. Being in the Ottawa jurisdiction the City can participate to ensure that wonderful things continue to be done to take the restoration to a sufficient outlet downstream that would be of benefit to everyone.
10. The issue was raised that whether the River is a Municipal Drain or not, development upstream is not permitted to cause downstream impacts. The Coalition feel that Drains are subject to different rules and feel that it would be

prudent of the City to confirm the legal status of the River prior to continuing further down the process.

11. The letter sent to the agencies by Dave Ryan, the City's Municipal Drainage Manager, stating the City's position that the Carp River is not a municipal drain was distributed. The City does not have and has not been able to find any documentation that can confirm the Carp River is a Municipal Drain.
12. The Coalition is not opposed to restoration of the river but they cannot speak for downstream landowners. However, as they feel very strongly that the river is a Drain they are prepared to defend their position in court.
13. Dennis Jacobs, Director of Planning, Environment and Infrastructure Policy, agreed that the Study Team and the City do not want to go to court either. He agrees that proper river drainage must be maintained which the study analysis has demonstrated. However, as the status of the Carp River cannot be resolved all must agree to disagree and whatever course of action is required will be followed.
14. The Coalition identified that there exists a Huntley By-Law #333 and can also find dates and numbers for March Township of 1909. At that time there were some who agreed to the Drain and some who did not but the By-Law was implemented. Copies of these documents will be provided to the Study Team.
15. Councillor Stavinga reaffirmed that detrimental impacts to downstream landowners is not permissible whether the Carp River is a drain or not. This has been the focus of the post development modelling exercise. However the Councillor also raised the question of what is truly expected to be achieved by confirming the river is a Drain. It must be considered that as a drain, if restorative works create a benefit for downstream landowners they will be apportioned costs for this work. Rural farmers may not agree to incur the costs of restoration.
16. The Coalition has concerns that recent increases in sedimentation are already causing flooding downstream. The Coalition has spoken to adjacent land owners regarding the potential for downstream restoration and believes that the downstream landowners contribution to the restoration plan would be in the form of land not money.
17. As per Dave Ryan's letter, the Drainage Act does not allow flexibility in terms of stream works to be conducted. The maintenance works must adhere to the specifications of the Engineering report. The Coalition disagrees with this and feels the Drainage Act is reasonable and would allow a new Engineers Report to be prepared.
18. The CRSSW identified other areas of the Carp for restoration but there is currently no financing available. The Study team identified that stream

restoration cannot be funded through Development Charges. For works to be included in the DC by-law, it must be demonstrated that there is supporting documentation that this level of service has been provided consistently for a minimum of 10 years. In light of this, a new restoration budget was set up in 2005 to assist with implementation of stream restoration. The restoration works identified for the Carp River in the rural area could qualify as a project however landowner concurrence would be needed.

19. Don Kennedy, Kanata West Owners Group representative noted that there is history in the Ottawa Area where developers have participated in restoration works. There is further opportunity through subdivision conditions, to restore the Carp River, downstream of KWDA, associated with the Richardson, Broughton, and Interstitial lands in the urban area. There is room to continue to explore options to fund restoration works in the rural area as well.

### **Model and Monitoring Gauges**

20. The Coalition has concerns that money is not being allocated for flow monitoring. To be forward thinking a flow monitoring system should be in place now across the City of Ottawa for future needs and use. This information is needed to calibrate the models. While everyone may be in agreement with the benefits of installing monitoring stations, there is a funding issue to consider.
21. The Study Team identified that it is not unusual to use a model to represent stream flows and elevations. These models have been well tested by Environment Canada. City staff has experience in using these models across the city of Ottawa. The calibration of a model involves setting up the model using parameters based on the physical condition of the watershed and default values as recommended by the model. Parameters are then adjusted if necessary to generate flows that are consistent with monitored results. In the absence of flow monitoring data to calibrate the model, the approach is to conduct a sensitivity analysis by varying parameters to assess effect on flows. While this approach was used for the Carp River, the model was checked against the monitored water levels for the September 9, 2004 rainfall event.
22. The Coalition raised their concerns for future flooding and asked if there has been a risk analysis conducted. The Study Team responded that the hydrologic/hydraulic modelling undertaken for infrastructure designs are completed using conservative assumptions such as coincident occurrence of peak flows and water levels to provide additional safety factors to avoid flooding. Simulations are also completed for other significant historical rainfalls within the Ottawa Area.
23. The Coalition are concerned that snowmelt measurements are incorporated in runoff calculations for rural areas but not in urban areas. MVCA responded that it has been determined that in fact rainfall conditions represent the worst case

- condition for the urban area and, as such accumulation of snowmelt is not considered in the urban areas. In years of modeling, snowmelt has never shown to produce higher flows than rainfall events for an urban area. For Kanata West in the downstream rural reaches snowmelt dominates but this is not the case in the upstream urban area. Modeling is taken very seriously and the goal is to ensure that there are no on-site or downstream impacts.
24. The Coalition presented some examples where flooding took place such as Glen Carin, Kizell Drain, and Shirley's Brook area.
  25. The Study Team noted that these examples are not similar in nature to the Carp watershed and are not a fair comparison. The flooding that occurred in Glen Cairn was a result of capacity deficiencies of the local drainage systems. At Castlefrank Road the culvert did not have sufficient capacity to convey the storm flow and resulted in flows overtopping the banks of the Carp River and flowing along Castlefrank Road. Significant flows then entered the sewer system and resulted in sewer back-ups into basements. These examples are related to local infrastructure constraints and not floodplain issues. The Carp River floodplain analysis as was completed using worst case scenarios to ensure all possibilities are addressed.
  26. The Coalition and study team discussed the tables presented in Exhibit 11 and the Summary Table dated Feb 20, 2006. As the Coalitions did not have the time to review the summary table in detail, it was decided that further clarification was required at a later date. There was confusion with the flow velocity measures in the tables of Exhibit 11. It was stated that the more appropriate comparison of flows is with the flows generated in the 1983 floodplain mapping exercise. The study team identified that significant increase in elevation are considered in the order of 5cm. However, there are no areas identified through the analysis where elevations proposed public hazard or risk due to water levels or erosion rates. .
  27. The Coalition stated they had concerns with water levels in the vicinity of the 417 bridge. Referring to the Feb 20, 2006 table, it shows a decrease in 100 yr water level at 417 considering encroachment and Kanata West build out only. When considering full Official Plan build out and encroachments, there is a 0.03 m increase downstream and a 0.02 m decrease upstream of the structure. The use of models is very commonly used as flow gauge system is limited and thus calibration is not a commonly obtained. The model used for this subwatershed is a very sophisticated dynamic model as opposed to a static model.
  28. Councillor Stavinga raised the fact that an increase in velocity could assist in keeping sediment moving as opposed to settling and building up which has been occurring in the Carp River

29. **ACTION REQUIRED:** The Study Team will provide further clarification, in writing to the Coalition of the data presented in the summary Table Feb20/06 and Exhibit 11. The Tables represent the 100-year flow levels.

**Floodplain Encroachments/Two-Zone Approach**

30. A discussion took place on the encroachment of development into the floodplain. Approval of the two-zone floodplain is a City and CA approval process and not in the jurisdiction of the MOE through the Class EAs. Comprehensive analysis is required to ensure no increase to public safety, assess impact of the encroachment and identify appropriate conditions to address flood proofing. Page 5 of the response letter was discussed and the Coalition requested further information on how the four criteria listed in the PPS have been satisfied
31. Development in the flood fringe must include appropriate flood proofing measures. In this situation the appropriate flood proofing method is to raise the flood fringe area above the Regulatory flood elevation before development occurs. This process will modify the location of the regulatory flood line. The analysis shows that the reduction in floodplain and associated storage as proposed in this reach will not have significant impacts.
32. Concern was expressed by the Coalition that filling in the floodplain will result in flooding. The Study Team responded that the proposed restoration would compensate for the loss of storage.
33. Presently the 2 developments, Taggart and Mattamy, do not require two-zone rezoning amendment as they conform to the Provincial Policy Statement. The two-zone amendment application will be for the entire reach within the KWDA but is not associated with the Class EAs.
34. The Coalition raised concerns over the proposed Del-Brookfield development that has been added to the urban boundary upstream of the KWDA.
35. The Study Team confirmed that this development would have to prepare its own technical studies and analysis demonstrating no downstream impacts as well as an on-site stormwater management for their lands. The technical study requirements would be similar to what was required for KWDA. The City has recommended that an Environmental Management Plan be prepared in conjunction with the Community Design Plan. When Del-Brookfield prepares their analysis they will have to include the downstream KWDA as an existing condition. This is typical of all developments proposals. Presently there is no development proposal for the Del-Brookfield lands which lies in three drainage areas. In comparison, the Broughton and Interstitial lands do have development proposals to a sufficient level of detail that can be included in the KWDA model. The City feels it is premature to include Del-Brookfield in the analysis as it has only recently been

added the urban area and the City does not know the details of potential land uses for this area.

36. It was stressed that the focus should be in the Carp River and how sufficient funds can be generated to assist in the restorative works.
37. Councillor Stavinga noted that Del and Brookfield's future technical studies might determine that restoration works be required on the Carp River. This potentially could include works on site or downstream depending on the results of the analysis. Again, this future work will involve extensive analysis similar to the work being undertaken for the KWDA.
38. The Coalition presented a list of outstanding items that have not been discussed due to time constraints (9:30 pm). The Coalition representatives were offered to participate in another meeting to discuss some of the action items. However they indicated they are under time constraints and may not be available to participate in such meetings. The Coalition is preparing a presentation for the May 3<sup>rd</sup> Joint Committee Meeting and needs to review the material with its experts. The Study Team is prepared to present and discuss all subsequent material to be provided with the Coalition's experts.
39. City staff stated that the Coalition could be provided copies of the Class EAs prior to the Notice of Completion but after City Council meeting of May 24<sup>th</sup>. Depending on the outcome of City Council's consideration on this matter, the Class EAs can then be finalized and circulated. This could allow for approximately 6 weeks review period of the Class EAs. City and KWOG would be available to meet during this time, should questions or issues arise out of the document review.

#### **Summary of Action Items Resulting from Discussion -**

**ACTION REQUIRED:** The Study team is prepared to provide further clarification with the Coalition and or their technical experts on the data presented in the summary Table Feb20/06 and Exhibit 11.

**ACTIONS REQUIRED:** The Study Team asked for a list of the outstanding items from the Coalition, but one was not available. The City offered to prepare a list, based on the discussions and circulate to the Coalition for confirmation and respond as required to the outstanding items.

**Carp Coalition Items Requiring Further Response Following April 20<sup>th</sup>, 2006 meeting with Kanata West Development Study Team, Councillors and Owners.**

**List of Issues as presented by Erwin Dreessan:**



1. Figures 1-12 of the Document 2 - Figures are more detailed than Figures 13-15 that require further details to be clear.
2. Transportation EA Schedule C projects requires description of Design Alternatives.
3. Fig 11- Stormwater Management Alternative 4 - the Coalition is concerned that the review concentrates on the Ultimate Plan with little emphasis on the impacts of interim solutions.
4. Fig 12 identifies submerged sewers. At high water levels what is impact on the submerged sewers? How is current storage capacity being accommodated?
5. Fig 13 differs from Fig. 8.3-A of the CRWSS. Explain the difference.
6. The tables in Exhibit 11 and the Summary Table (dated 20Feb06) need further explanation.
7. Explain the difference between modified floodplain and 2-zone floodplain.
8. With respect to the existing and future flood levels and flows the response was not satisfactory.
9. An OMB decision of 2003 with respect to Burnt River identified increased risk to third parties. The Coalition is not convinced that the restoration would fall under the Schedule B per the Class Environmental Assessment. In light of the scale of the project and the objective to go beyond the development, this project should be an Individual EA.
10. The Coalition would like further clarification and confirmation that while the EAs are presented separately that the road and infrastructure projects have been planned and integrated to ensure all will work together and not be in conflict with one another.
11. As watershed planning downstream of Richardson Side Road is not approved how can the Study Team confirm that downstream restorative efforts already implemented by Friends of the Carp will not be impacted?
12. LRIA – Is there a further level of approval required through the LRIA.
13. Page 10 of response letter regarding road crossings. Further clarification is required that the number of crossings has been minimized.
14. The Coalition would like clarification on the estimated timeframe for the Implementation Plan.

15. The Coalition would like a copy of the MVC letter referred to in both page 5 and 13 of the response.

**Study Tasks and Schedule – City**

40. City staff provided the following overview of the schedule
- May 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2006 Joint PEC/TC meeting.
  - May 24<sup>th</sup>, 2006 Council Meeting
  - Finalization and printing of EA's following approval of EA projects by Council,
  - Circulation of Class EAs in advance of Notice
  - Notice of Completion to be advertised shortly after Council approval.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 9:40 p.m.

*If you find any omissions or errors, within two weeks of receiving the notes of meeting please contact Jasna Czaharynski at [Jasna.Czaharynski@ottawa.ca](mailto:Jasna.Czaharynski@ottawa.ca) o 580-2424 extension 27599 or Susan Murphy [Susan.Murphy@ottawa.ca](mailto:Susan.Murphy@ottawa.ca) or at 580-2424, extension 22518.*